Посветено на 80 -годишнината од раѓањето на проф. д-р БранкоПанов

СОДРЖИНА
CONTENTS

ПРИКАЗИ / BOOK REVIEWS

Александар
АТАНАСОВСКИ

Универзитет „Св. Кирил и
Методиј" – Скопје

НАСТАВНО-НАУЧНИОТ ПРОФИЛ НА ПРОФ. Д-Р БРАНКО ПАНОВ

Името на Бранко Панов во македонската и пошироко во светската јавност се поврзува со онаа генерација историчари и научни работници кои дадоа евидентен придонес во етаблирањето и подемот на современата македонска медиевистика и воопшто во развојот на историографијата во Македонија. Тој е еден од осново-положниците на проучување на византологијата како мошне значајна научна дисциплина во рамките на академското и интеграл-ното претставување на историската наука на Универзитетот „Св. Кирил и Методиј" во Скопје.

Неговата универзитетска и научноистражувачка кариера започнува во далечната 1956 година како асистент по предметот Општа историја на средниот век. Непосредно по докторирањето во 1966 година, како ученик произлезен од школата на Стјепан Антолјак, е избран за доцент по предметот Историја на Византија, а почнувајќи од 1972 година е ангажиран и на предметот Историја на македонскиот народ – среден век.

Освен во наставата во рамките на додипломските студии, професорот Панов активно партиципира и во реализирањето на постдипломските студии на групата Историја на македонскиот народ од VI до крајот на XIV век, што, секако, кореспондира со секогаш актуелната амбиција за создавање сериозен профил на млади научни работници кои успешно ќе се справуваат со предизвиците на историската наука.

Професорската активност на Бранко Панов, поврзана со проблематиката на средновековната историја на македонскиот народ и пошироко со историјата на Византија, освен на Универзи-тетот „Св. Кирил и Методиј" во Скопје се реализира и надвор од

Македонија, имено на универзитетите во Љубљана, Москва, Воронеж, Краков, Познањ, Варшава и Братислава.

Јасно поставените професионални принципи и етика во рамките на неговата активност како наставник и педагог, кој несебично ги споделува своите искуства и знаење, резултираат со високото републичко признание што му е доделено во 1992 година – наградата „Св. Климент Охридски".

Напоредно со професорската дејност, Бранко Панов развива интензивна научноистражувачка активност заснована на истражувања кои се одвиваат во релевантни научни институции, архиви и библиотеки во Белград, Дубровник, Сплит, Задар, Виена, Венеција, Рим, Москва, Варшава и во Краков.

Евидентно е неговото партиципирање на голем број локални и меѓународни научни симпозиуми, конгреси, конференции и семинари. Во тој контекст, како посебно значајни ги издвојуваме настапите во Нитра (1969), Вториот балканолошки конгрес во Атина (1970), Третиот славистички конгрес во Салцбург и Регенсбург (1970), Светскиот конгрес на историчарите во Москва (1970), Меѓународниот научен собир во Краков (1989), како и континуираното учество на византолошките конгреси одржани во Охрид (1961), во Букурешт (1971), во Атина (1976), во Виена (1981), во Вашингтон (1986), во Москва (1991) и во Копенхаген (1996).

Проследувајќи ја богатата библиографија на Бранко Панов, која инкорпорира корпус од над 130 научни труда, недвосмислено се наметнува впечатокот дека тој пред пошироката научна јавност презентирал и научно аргументирал повеќе фундаментални прашања за македонската историографија. Тоа, пред сè, се однесува на проблематиката,поврзана со дејноста на светите Кирил и Методиј, со создавањето на првата словенска азбука, значењето на Брегалничката и на Моравската мисија, понатаму за дипломатските мисии меѓу Сараците и Хазарите, како и книжевно-творечка активност. Уште повеќе што голем дел од неговите научни сознанија подоцна наоѓаат поткрепа со археолошките ископувања реализирани по должината на реката Брегалница.

Во контекст на перманентниот развој на словенската писменост Панов посебно се осврнува и на културно-просветната дејност на светите Климент и Наум Охридски, како есенцијални фигури во македонскиот и пошироко во балканскиот историо-

графски дискурс. Во фокусот на творечкиот опус значајно место
зазема Охридската книжевна школа со статус на прв словенски
универзитет, како и народносната мисија на Климент и Наум
Охридски, кои воспоставиле активна и непосредна комуникација со
македонското население, што резултира со јасно издиференци-
раниот култ кон светците, особено изразен во охридскиот крај.

        Особено значајни се неговите потфати во етаблирање и
реконструирање на проблематиката поврзана со етногенезата на
македонскиот народ, со богомилството како специфична духовна
појава, чии почетоци кореспондираат со територијата на југозапад-
на Македонија, формирањето на феудалните односи во Македонија,
создавањето на македонската средновековна држава, востанијата на
македонскиот народ во периодот на византиското владеење,
аграрната историја, црковната историја на македонскиот народ,
како и историската реконструкција на македонските средновековни
градови – Охрид, Штип, Струмица, Дебар и сл.

        Тритомната *Историја на македонскиот народ* (1969),
двотомните *Документи за борбата на македонскиот народ за
самостојност и за национална држава* (1981) и повеќетомната
Историја на македонскиот народ, каде што се јавува како уредник
и коавтор на првиот том (2000), се само дел од широкиот дијапазон
научни трудови во кои се третира горенаведената проблематика.
Како автентичен научен труд секако треба да се спомене и
публикацијата *Средновековна Македонија* (т. II и т. III, Скопје,
1985) во која освен Теофилакт Охридски, кој е интегрално разрабо-
тен во својство на примарен извор, се проследени и движечките
историски процеси за македонскиот народ, почнувајќи од доселува-
њето на Словените во Македонија, па сè до нејзиното потпаѓање
под османлиска власт. Не помалку значајна е и монографијата
Македонија низ историјата (1999), во која се третираат епохалните
настани и појави од средновековието, како и прашања од историјата
и културата на Македонија во периодот на XIX и на XX век.

        За својот сестран ангажман и долгогодишен научен
ентузијазам во функција на афирмација на македонската историска
мисла, Бранко Панов е добитник на повеќе награди и признанија,
пред сè од неговата матична установа во рамките на Филозофскиот
факултет во Скопје, како и од релевантните научни институции
чијашто примарна дејност е фокусирана на проучување на исто-
ријата во Македонија. Во таа смисла ќе ги спомене наградата „13

Ноември" за монографскиот труд *Теофилакт Охридски како извор за средновековната историја на македонскиот народ* (1972), Орденот на трудот со златен венец" (1978), престижната наградата „Гоце Делчев" за публикацијата *Средновековна Македонија* (1986), и наградите „Кој е кој во светот" (1997) и „2000 најистакнати личности на XX век" (1998) од Интернационалниот библиографски институт во Кембриц, чиешто доделување се заснова врз релевантни референтни вредности и исклучителни лични достигнувања на поединците.

* * *

Бранко Панов во својство на неуморен учител и еминентен научен работник беше присутен на наставно-научната сцена во Македонија и пошироко повеќе од четири децинии. Она што посебно треба да се истакне во оваа пригода секако е неговата бескомпромисна борба и далекусежна визија за создавање историографска стратегија и единство како приоритет за зачувување и негување на националните и традиционалните вредности на македонскиот народ.

СПИСОК НА ОБЈАВЕНИ ТРУДОВИ
НА ПРОФ. Д-Р БРАНКО ПАНОВ

1958
1. Смртта на Самоила. *Нова Македонија*, 15 декември 1958, 7.
1959
2. Црковно-просветните борби во Струмичко во XIX век. *Гласник на Институтот за национална историја*, III/2, Скопје 1959, 83-120.
1961
3. Активноста на една руска научна експедиција во Македонија во 1898 година. *Нова Македонија*, 10 септември 1961, 3.
4. Општествено-политичките прилики во Струмичката област од крајот на VI до почетокот на X век. *Гласник на Институтот за национална историја*, V/2, Скопје 1961, 201-243.

1963

5. *Карактерот на дејноста на браќата Кирил и Методиј во Македонија*. „Просветно дело", 7-8, Скопје 1963, 375-388.
6. Орде Иваносвски, Македонските Словени од VI до IX век. *Гласник на Институтот за национална историја*, VII/1, Скопје 1963, 280-283 (рецензија).

1965

7. Богомилското движење во Македонија. *Историја*, I/1, Скопје 1965, 50-57.

1967

8. Климент Охридски. *Историја*, III/1, Скопје 1967, 32-53.
9. М. Пандевски, Политичките партии и организации во Македонија (1908-1912), Скопје 1966. *Историја*, III/2, Скопје 1967, 171-173 (приказ).
10. С. Антољак, Помошни историски науки. Универзитет во Скопје, Скопје 1966. *Историја*, III/2, Скопје 1967, 171-173 (приказ).

1968

11. А. А. Сванидзе, Ремесло и ремесленики в средневековной Швеции (XIV-XV в.), Москва 1967. *Историја*, IV/2, Скопје 1968, 221-223 (приказ)
12. Николај М. Дурново за македонското прашање. *Историја*, IV/2, Скопје 1968, 77-89; *Разгледи* X/10, Скопје 1968, 1177-1190.
13. Општословенското дело на Кирил и Методиј. *Нова Македонија*, Скопје, 24 мај 1968.

1969

14. Британски документи за историјата на македонскиот народ. т. I (1797-1839). Под редакција на Х. Андонов-Полјански, Архив на Македонија, Скопје 1968, *Историја*, V/1, Скопје 1969, 253-255 (приказ).
15. Дејноста на Климент Охридски во Македонија. *Иселенички календар*, Скопје 1969, 46-52.
16. *Историја на македонскиот народ*, кн. I, Институт за национална историја, Скопје 1969, 95-98, 107-115, 143-175.
17. Македонија татковина на словенската писменост. *Нова Македонија*, Скопје 25 мај 1969.
18. Нови податоци за востанието на комитопулите во 969 година. (С. Антољак, Miscelanea medievalia Jugoslavica. *Годишен зборник на Филозофскиот факултет на*

Универзитетот во Скопје, кн. 20, Скопје 1968; *Историја*, V/1, Скопје 1969, 269-271 (приказ).

19. Струмица за време на Балканските и Првата светска војна (со прилози 5 нови документи). *Историја*, V/1, Скопје 1969, 84-110.

20. Cyril a Metod v Macedonii. *Vydal uv SAKS,* Bratislava 1969, 7.

1970

21. Дејноста на Кирил и Методиј во Македонија. *Зборник Кирил Солунски,* I, МАНУ, Скопје 1970, 163-185.

22. Имунитетот и феудалната рента во Македонија во XI и XII век според писмата на Теофилакт Охридски. *Годишен зборник на Филозофскиот факултет на Универзитетот во Скопје,* кн. 22, Скопје 1970, 225-269.

23. L'activite de Theophilakt d'Ohride en Macédoine. Recueil d'articles scientiques *La Macedoine et les Macedoniens dans la passé*, ed. Institut de l histoire nationale - Skopje 1970, 45-60.

24. Меѓународна научна средба по повод 1000- годишнината од востанието на комитопулите и создавањето на Самоиловата држава. *Историја*, VI/1, Скопје 1970, 269-273.

25. Опис на средновековните градови. *Историја*, VI/1, Скопје 1970, 213-218 (рецензија).

26. С. Антољак, Самоиловата држава. Скопје 1969, *Историја*, VI/1, Скопје 1970, 213-218 (рецензија).

27. „Славянский век" за Илинденското востание. *Зборник „Илинден 1903"*, Институт за национална историја, Скопје 1970, 331-336.

1971

28. Македонија од населувањето на Словените до паѓањето под турска власт, Организационен комитет на шаховските олимпијади 1972, 13-17 (на руски и на англиски јазик).

29. Струмичката област во време на Самоил. *Зборник „Илјада години востанието на комитопулите и создавањето на Самоиловата држава"*, Скопје 1971, 149-170.

30. *Теофилакт Охридски како извор за средновековната историја на македонскиот народ,* „Култура", Скопје 1971.

1972

31. I Santi Cirillo et Metodio e la loro attivita panslava. *Gloria a san Cirillo*. 24 maddio, Romna 1972, 7-14.

32. Во која област на Македонија бил кнез словенскиот просветител Методиј. *Гласник на Институтот за национална историја*, XVI/1, Скопје 1972, 125-135.

33. The Life and Work of Theophilactus of Ohrid. *Macedonian Review,* 1, Skopje 1972, 53-57.

34. За етногенезата на македонскиот народ. *Гласник на Институтот за национална историја*, XVI/3, Скопје 1972, 77-89.

35. В какой области Македоний был Мефодий князем. *Actes du II Congress International des Etudes du Sud-est Europeen,* t. II. Athenes 1972, 367-376.

36. Cyril and Methodius and their Pan-slavic Work. *Macedonian Review*, 2, Skopje 1972, 183-188.

37. Брегалничката мисија на Константин Филозоф-Кирил. *Историја*, VIII/1, Скопје 1972, 41-49.

38. Етногенезата на македонскиот народ. *Предавања на VIII семинар за македонски јазик, литература и култура*, Универзитет „Кирил и Методиј“, Скопје 1972, 157-170.

                                  1973
39. Краток осврт на остварувањето на историската наука во СР Македонија. *Историја*, IX/1, Скопје 1973, 179-187 (заедно со А. Стојановски, Р. Поплазаров и В. Ивановски).

40. Cyril and Methodius and their Pan-slavic Work. *Македонија*, илустрирано списание на Матицата на иселениците од Македонија, год. XX, бр. 241, Скопје 1973, 4-6.

                                  1974
41. За етногенезата на македонскиот народ. *Иселенички календар*, Скопје 1974, 37- 41.

                                  1975
42. *The historiography of Jugoslavia 1965-1975*. Belgrade 1975, 52-60.

43. *Oružane borbe makedonskog naroda od VI do XX veka*, Vojnoistoriski institut, Beograd 1975, 218-36, 50-54, 61-66.

44. Охрид во крајот на XI и почетокот на XII век во светлината на писмата на Теофилакт Охридски. *Зборник посветен на Димче Коцо*, Археолошкиот музеј на Македонија, VI-VII, Скопје 1975, 181-195.

45. Војните, востанијата и буржуаските револуции во средниот век одразени во делата на класиците на марксизмот-ленинизмот. *Историја*, XI/1, Скопје 1975, 121-126.

1976

46. Активноста на ВМРО непосредно по Илинденското востание одразена во виенското списание „Славянский век“. *Зборник посветен на Јане Сандански 1915-1975,* Институт за национална историја, Скопје 1976, 231-239.

47. Богомильское движение в Македоний на оснований писем Феофилакта Охридского. *Actes du XIV Congress International des Etudes byzantines*, III, Bucarest 1976, 721-729.

1977

48. Die Mission von Bregalnitza Konstantin der Philosophen- Kiril. *Годишен зборник на Филозофскиот факултет на Универзитетот во Скопје*, кн.3 (29), Скопје 1977, 107-117.

49. Теофилакт Охридски за музиката во Македонија во XI-XII век. *Македонска музика*, 2, Скопје 1977/78, 39-46.

1978

50. Охрид и Охридската област во првите векови по словенската колонизација. *Предавања на XI семинар за македонски јазик, литература и култура*, Универзитет „Кирил и Методиј“, Скопје 1978, 1-16.

51. Охрид и Охридската област во првите векови по словенската колонизација (VI-VII век). *Годишен зборник на Филозофскиот факултет на Универзитетот во Скопје*, кн. 4 (30), 119-137.

1979

52. Од средновековното минато на градот Охрид (IX - почетокот на X век). *Предавања на XII семинар за македонски јазик, литература и култура,* Универзитет „Кирил и Методиј“, Скопје 1979, 1-14.

53. Ohrid and Ohrid region in the First Centuries after the Slav Colonisation. *Macedonian Review*, 3, Skopje 1979, 241-248.

54. Охрид и Охридската област во време на бугарското владеење (средина на IX - 969 г.). *Годишен зборник на Филозофскиот факултет на Универзитетот во Скопје*, кн. 5-6 (31-32), Скопје 1979/80, 137-159.

1980

55. Охрид и Охридската област во време на византиското владеење (XI-XII век). *Предавања на XIII-от семинар за*

македонски јазик, литература и култура. Универзитет „Кирил и Методиј“, Скопје 1980, 1-14.

56.   Самуиловото царство. *Иселенички календар*, Матица на иселениците од Македонија, Скопје 1980, 164-167.

57.   Активноста на Боро Џони меѓу младината на Струмица во периодот помеѓу двете светски војни. *Струмица и Струмичко во НОВ 1941-1943*. Општински одбор на Здружението на борците од НОБ - Струмица, Струмица 1980, 81-100.

1981

58.   *Документи за борбата на македонскиот народ за самостојност и за национална држава*, т. I. Универзитет „Кирил и Методиј“, Скопје 1981, 19-80, 92-95, 97-114, 116-122, 125-132, 139-140, 155-157, 159-161, 446-447.

59.   Toward the etnogenesis of the Macedonian people. *Macedoniene*, Institut d'histoire nationale, Skopje 1981, 34-47.

60.   Городское самоуправление в Охриде в время Алексия I Комнина. *Actes du XV Congress International d'Etudes byzantines*, Athenes 1981.

61.   *Историографија на Македонија 1965-1975*. Сојуз на друштвата на историчарите на СРМ, Скопје 1981, 9-26.

62.   Градската самоуправа во Охрид кон крајот на XI и почетокот на XII век. *Историја*, XVII/2, Скопје 1981, 87-93.

63.   За дејноста на Антон Панов во периодот меѓу двете светски војни. *Дојрански ракувања 1981*, Струмица 1981, 23-42.

1982

64.   Кон некои прашања за богомилството во Македонија за време на Комнените. *Богомилството на Балканот во светлината на најновите истражувања*, Скопје 1982, 67-89.

65.   Штип и Брегалничката област во средниот век (VI - крајот на XII век). *Годишен зборник на Филозофскиот факултет на Универзитетот во Скопје*, кн. 8 (34), Скопје 1982, 39-85.

1983

66.   Охрид и Охридската област од средината на X до крајот на XII век. *Годишен зборник на Филозофскиот факултет на Универзитетот во Скопје*, 1983, 65-110.

67.   Марксизмот и современата византологија. *Годишен зборник на Филозофскиот факултет на Универзитетот во Скопје*, кн. 9 (35), Скопје 1983, 333-343.

68.   Освободительное движение в Западной Македоний в конце XI века, отражение в писмах Феофилакта Охридского. *Akten*

11/2 Jahrbuh der Ostereischen Byzantistik, 32/2, Wien 1983, 195-205.

69. Марксизмот и современата византологија. *Историја*, XIX/2, Скопје 1983, 61-71.

70. Богомилското учење и движење. *Историја*, XIX/2, Скопје 1983, 137-167.

<div align="center">1984</div>

71. Струмица и Струмичката област во средниот век (VI-XI век). *Acta Veljusa*. Филозофски факултет при Универзитетот „Кирил и Методиј“, Скопје 1984, 45-72.

72. Професор д-р Христо Андонов-Полјански – добитник на највисокото југословенско општествено признание наградата АВНОЈ за 1983 г. *Историја*, XX/1, Скопје 1984, 7-24.

73. Мисијата на Константин Филозоф меѓу Сарацените. *Историја*, XX/1, Скопје 1984, 245-251.

74. Професорот д-р Стјепан Антолјак (по повод 75-годишнината од раѓањето и 50-годишнината од научната дејност) / заедно со Стјепо Обад. *Историја*, XX/2, Скопје 1984, 13-27.

75. Охрид и Охридската област во XII и XIV век. *Годишен зборник на Филозофскиот факултет на Универзитетот во Скопје*, кн. 11 (37), Скопје 1984, 19-49.

<div align="center">1985</div>

76. *Средновековна Македонија*, т. II, „Мисла“, Скопје 1985.

77. *Средновековна Македонија*. т. III, „Мисла“, Скопје 1985.

78. Охрид и Охридско во средниот век (VI-XIV век). *Охрид и Охридско низ историјата*, кн. I, дел IV и V, Институт за национална историја во Скопје, Скопје 1985, 175-268.

79. Потеклото и најраните години од животот и дејноста на Кирил и Методиј. *Културен живот*, XXX/6, Скопје 1985, 3-9.

80. 1100 години од смртта на македонскиот и сесловенски просветител Методиј. *Млад борец*, бр.1459, Скопје 1985, 13.

81. За потеклото и најраните години од животот и дејноста на Кирил и Методиј. *Историја*, XXI/2, Скопје 1985, 51-67.

82. Кон 1100-годишнината од смртта на македонскиот и сесловенскиот просветител Методиј. *Годишен зборник на Филозофскиот факултет на Универзитетот во Скопје*, кн. 12 (38), Скопје 1985, 33-41.

<div align="center">1986</div>

83. Кон некои прашања за класната и ослободителната борба во Македонија во првите векови од османлиското владеење (XV-

XVII век). *Стопанските, социјалните и етничките промени на територијата на Југославија и Чехословачка од средината на XVI до средината на XVIII век*, Институт за национална историја, Скопје 1986, 53-61.

84. 1100 години од доаѓањето на Климент во Охрид и формирањето на Охридската школа за словенска писменост и култура. *Просветен работник*, 15 април, Скопје 1986.

85. Грижа на пастирот за своето папство (1100 години од доаѓањето на Климент во Охрид). *Нова Македонија*, Скопје, 12 април 1986.

86. Развојот на словенската писменост во Македонија до средината на IX век. *Историја*, XXII/2, Скопје 1986.

87. Седумнаесетти меѓународен византолошки конгрес. *Историја*, XXII/2, Скопје 1986, 405-407.

88. Охрид во епохата на Климент и Наум. Во кн.: *Климент Охридски. Студии,* Скопје 1986, 183-203.

89. Николај Н. Дурново за македонското прашање. *Годишен зборник на Филозофскиот факултет на Универзитетот во Скопје*, 13 (39), Скопје 1986, 196-209.

90. Штип и брегалничката област од VI до XII век. *Штип низ вековите*, кн. I. Штип 1986, 135-174.

91. 1100 години од доаѓањето на Климент во Охрид. *Македонски весник*, г. II/5, Сиднеј (Австралија), 15-30 мај 1986, 9.

92. Климент Охридски и неговото сесловенско дело. *Историја*, XXII/1, Скопје 1986, 7-28.

93. Брегалничката мисиија на Константин Филозоф - Кирил и создавањето на словенската азбука. *XII научна дискусија*, Семинар за македонски јазик, литература и култура при Универзитетот „Св. Кирил и Методиј", Скопје 1986, 75-90.

<center>1987</center>

94. За престојот на Кирил и Методиј во малоазиската планина Олимп. *Годишен зборник на Филозофскиот факултет на Универзитетот во Скопје*, кн. 14, (40) Скопје 1987, 111-115.

95. Климент Охридски и неговото сесловенско дело. РТВ Сараево, јуни 1987.

<center>1988</center>

95. Кон преродбенското движење во струмичко-дојранскиот регион. *Дојрански ракувања*, Гевгелија 1988, 49-60.

96. За Методиевото словенско кнежество и создавањето на „Закон судны людем". *Зборник „Кирило-методиевскиот*

старословенскиот период и Кирило-методиевската традиција во Македонија“, МАНУ, Скопје 1988, 289-303.

<div align="center">1989</div>

97. Мисионерската дејност на Климент Охридски во Македонија. *Зборник „Климент Охридски и улогата на Охридската книжевна школа во развојот на словенската просвета“*, МАНУ, Скопје 1989, 299-323.

98. *Струмица за време на Балканските и Првата светска војна,* зборник на трудови. Музеј на Струмица, Струмица 1989, 239-265.

99. Кон некои прашања за почетоците на словенската писменост (VI-IX век). *Obdobja*, 10, izd. Univerza Edvarda Kardelja v Ljubljani, Znanstveni institut Filozofske fakultete. Ljubljana 1989, 313-328.

100. Света гора и развојот на културата во Долнореканскиот крај. *Гласник на Институтот за национална историја*, XXX/1, Скопје 1989, 53-63.

<div align="center">1990</div>

101. Цар Самуил. *Нова Македонија*, Скопје, октомври 1990.

<div align="center">1991</div>

102. Кон историјата на древните Македонци. *Нова Македонија*, Скопје, 14. август 1991.

103. Македонските градови во XI-XII век. *Историја*, XXIV-XXV/1-4, Скопје 1991, 27-36.

104. The Centre of the Powerful World Kingdom. *Macedonian Review*, XXI/ 3, Skopje, 1991, 121-126.

105. О феодалъной аристократий в Македоний во время византийского государства (XI-XII вв.). *Международний конгес византинистов*, резюме, сообщения, Москва, 1991, 856-857.

<div align="center">1992</div>

106. Политиката на Византија спрема Македонските Словени одразена во дејноста на Кирил и Методиј. *Прилози*, XXIII/1, МАНУ, Скопје 1992.

107. Македония во время Косовской битви. *600 lecie bitwy na Kosowyt polu*, pod red. K. Backowskiego, Nakladam Univerzytetu Jagiellonskiego, Krakow 1992, 87-98.

108. *Историја* за I клас на природно-математичката гимназија и правна струка. „Просветно дело“, Скопје 1992 (заедно со С. Младеновски и С. Наумоски).

109. *Историја* за VI одделение. „Просветно дело“, Скопје 1992.

110. *Историја* за II клас гимназија (општа и јазична). „Просветно дело“, Скопје 1992.

111. *Historia* per klasem VI, „Prosvetno delo“, Skopje 1992.

112. *Tarih* sinif 6. „Prosvetno delo“, Skopje 1992.

113. Одразот на Косовската битка во Македонија. *Историја*, XXVIII/1-2, Скопје 1992, 43-54.

1993

114. Кон некои прашања за личноста и дејноста на Јован Кукузел. *Македонски фолклор*, XXVI/52, Скопје 1993, 87-97.

115. *Историска читанка* за 6 одделение. „Просветно дело“, Скопје 116. Мисионерската дејност на Климент Охридски во Македонија. *Годишен зборник на Филозофскиот факултет на Универзитетот „Св. Кирил и Методиј“*, кн. 20 (46). Скопје 1993, 5-30.

117. Македонија од доселувањето на Словените до османлиското завојување. *Македонија и односите со Грција*, МАНУ, Скопје 1993, 15-21.

1994

118. Мисијата на св. Климент Охридски во Македонија. *Предавања на XXVI Меѓународен семинар за македонски јазик, литература и култура*, Универзитет „Св. Кирил и Методиј“. Скопје 1994, 125-148.

1995

119. Албанците од V-XVI век. *Прилози за наставата по историја во основното и средното образование*, 3. Педагошки завод на Македонија. Скопје 1995, 36-113.

120. *Tarih* okuma kitdabi sinif VI. „Prosvetno delo“. Skopje 1995.

121. Богомилството во Македонија. *Содржински и методолошки прашања во истражувањето на историјата на културата на Македонија*, кн. 1, МАНУ, Скопје 1995, 83-95.

122. Создавање и развој на македонската средновековна држава. *Предавања од XXVII меѓународен семинар за македонски јазик, литература и култура*, Универзитет „Св. Кирил и Методиј“, Скопје 1995, 137-152.

1996

123. Светите Кирил и Методиј и нивното македонско и сесловенско дело. *Годишен зборник на Филозофскиот факултет на Универзитетот „Св. Кирил и Методиј“*, Скопје 1996, 181-191.

124. Етногенезата на македонскиот народ. *Етнологија на Македонците*, МАНУ, Скопје 1996, 15-20.
125. *Historia* për vitim II gjimnar (të përgjithëm dhe gjuhësor). „Prosvetno delo", Skopje 1996.
126. Theophylactes of Ohrid and Alexius I Comnenus – Byzantium Identity, Image, Influence, *abstracts XIX International Congress of Byzantine Studies,* Copenhagen, 18-24 August, 1996, p. 6223.

1998

127. Богомилството во Македонија. *Предавања од XXX меѓународен семинар за македонски јазик, литература и култура.* Универзитет „Св. Кирил и Методиј", Скопје 1998, 160-176.

1999

128. *Македонија низ историјата.* „Менора", Скопје 1999.
129. *Климентовиот универзитет во Охрид - македонско и сесловенско културно-просветно средиште.* „Просветно дело", г. LII/3, Скопје 1999, 3-11.

2000

131. *Историја на македонскиот народ. Од праисториско време до паѓањето на Македонија под турска власт,* т. 1 (редактор и коавтор), ИНИ, Скопје 2000.
132. *Светителите на Македонија: Кирил и Методиј, Климент и Наум Охридски*, „Матица Македонска" (во печат).

Маќеј ХЕЛБИГ

Шљонски универзитет –
Катовице

СИЛФИУМОТ – НАЈГОЛЕМАТА ТАЈНА НА АНТИЧКАТА БОТАНИКА

Идентификацијата на растенијата што се појавуваат во различни делови на античката книжевност е многу долг и тежок процес, кој понекогаш завршува безуспешно. Нема сомнение дека овој вид истражувања се поеднакво интересни како за филолозите така и за биолозите, кои се обидуваат да одговорат на прашањата поврзани со различни видови растенија споменати кај старите автори. Резултатите на таквото истражување на античката литература се важен инструмент во приближувањето на претставата за древниот природен свет и за односот кон природата. Сепак, најголем проблем најчесто е решавањето на загатката кој вид растение го спомнал авторот, без што не е можно да се определи, на пример, неговата функција во дадена култура.

Се претпоставува дека најважен автор во врска со прашањата од ботаниката во античко време е Теофраст од Ерез, инаку ученик и следбеник на Аристотел. Во согласност со податоците од Диоген Лаертски,[1] Теофраст бил автор на 227 труда од различни области, но сепак својот најголем придонес го дал во однос на реконструирањето на низа прашањата од областа на ботаниката. Неговите истражувања околу физиологијата и морфологијата на различните видови растенија презентирани во двете главни и најпознати дела *Историја на растенијата* (*De historia plantarum*) и *Потекло на растенијата* (*De causis plantarum*) дури и денес претставуваат релевантен извор на информации. Секако, треба да се спомене дека

---

[1] *Diogenis Laertii De vitis philosophorum libri decem*, V 50, ed. Carolus Tauchnitius (Lipsiae 1895), 229.

Теофраст бил прв од филозофите што ја вовел класификацијата на сите видови растенија[2] што му биле познати и благодарение на тоа современите биолошки науки можеле да развијат систематски одделни сегменти од своите истражувања. Според оваа класификација, растенијата можат да спаѓаат во групата на дрвја (δένδρον), на грмушки (θάμνος), на помали грмушки (φρύγανον) и на билки (πόα).[3]

Исто така, треба да се напомене дека истражувачката методологија на Теофраст, на некој начин, претставува нов однос кон опишувањето на природниот свет. Новост не е само тоа што тој, веројатно, е првиот што создал две значајни дела само за природата, туку и тоа што го разработил методот на опис на видовите растенија: описот треба да се тече одоздола нагоре, значи од коренот до цветот. Повеќето од своите истражувања тој најверојатно ги правел *in situ*, патувајќи низ својата поблиска околина, иако, како што вели Артур Хорт,[4] голем број од опсервациите изгледаат како да произлегле како резултат на неговите врски со други лица. Сепак, не можеме да го негираме фактот дека неговиот метод на собирање и дескрипција на растенијата стана задолжителен елемент на современите биолошки истражувања, особено во однос на систематизацијата.

Во двата дела посветени на растенијата Теофраст опишува околу 500 таксономски единици, т.н. таксони. Поголемиот дел од нив се обични и веќе познати, но, од друга страна, постои една поголема група растенија кои се доста проблематични во процесот на идентификација. Тешкотијата при нивната систематска класификација се состои во тоа што тие растеле многу одамна, но и поради фактот што можеле да исчезнат без никаква трага во книжевноста или во културата.

Најпознат и најинтересен пример на растение што предизвикува големи проблеми при класификувањето е билката

---

[2] *Theophrasti De historia plantarum*, I 3, 1, ed. et trans. Arthur Hort, vol. I, (London 1916), 22.

[3] Henryk Wójtowicz, „Klasyfikacja roślin u Teofrasta", *Classica Wratislaviensia* 22 (2001): 62-63.

[4] Со Артур Хорт не се согласува Џон Рејвен. Според него, иако Теофраст никогаш не патувал во континентална Азија, најверојатно, пред да ја напише *Историјата на растенијата*, патувал низ Кипар, Египет или низ Либија. John E. Raven, *Plants and Plant Lore in Ancient Greece* (Oxford: Leopard's Head Press, 2000), 18.

позната под својот грчки назив σίλφιον, латински *silphium* или *laserpitium*/*laserpicium*. Досега никој не успеал да ја демистифицира оваа билка, ниту, пак, да најде соодветно решение. Проблемот, меѓу другото, се должи на фактот што ова растение исчезнало во почетокот на нашата ера. Она што го имаме на располагање се само поедноставени слики на монетите и траги во античката книжевност, која претставува фундамент на ваквиот вид истражувања.

Терминот σίλφιον многупати се појавува во веќе спомнатите дела од Теофраст посветени на ботаниката, но се чини дека нај-важни за овие истражувања се фрагментите каде што се наоѓаат деталните информации за растението. Фрагментите од *Историја на растенијата*[5] ги содржат неопходните информации за морфо-логијата и за физиологијата на силфиумот кои го овозможуваат процесот на идентификација. Сепак, најинтересен и многу важен факт за силфиумот е дека најверојатно станува збор за ендем[6] огра-ничен исклучиво на територијата на Киренајка во северна Африка. Теофраст спомнал дека овој вид растение бил најкарактеристичен за спомнатиот регион:

> ἐν δὲ τῇ Κυρηναίᾳ κυπάρισσος καὶ ἐλάαι τε κάλλισται καὶ ἔλαιον πλεῖστον. ἰδιώτατον δὲ πάντων τὸ σίλφιον.[7]

Теофраст го искористил суперлативот од придавката ἴδιος, што може да значи ’сопствен, приватен‘, но, исто така, и ’специ-фичен‘, и во наведениот контекст употребата на оваа придавка изгледа како силна потврда за ендемичноста на растението. Покрај својот ендемичен карактер, според Теофраст, растението силфиум растело на една поширока територија во северна Африка, а најголемите хабитати[8] се простирале од Сидра, па сè до Хесперид во западна Киренајка:

---

[5] *Theophrasti De historia…*, IV, 3; VI, 5; IX, 1, 1-4, 7, vol. I-II.

[6] Ендемот е вид (растение или животно) уникатен за одредено место, т.е. се јавува на ограничен простор и природно не се појавува никаде на друго место. Затоа неговата дистрибуција е ограничена само на една територија, регион, држава итн.

[7] *Theophrasti De historia…*, IV 3, 1, vol. I, 302.

[8] Зборот *хабитат* (од лат. *habito, -are* ’живее‘) означува живеалиште, значи секоја средина населена со некој вид растение, животно или друг организам.

Τόπον δὲ πολὺν ἐπέχει τῆς Λιβύης· πλείω γάρ φασιν ἢ τετρακισχίλια στάδια· πλεῖστα δὲ γίνεσθαι περὶ τὴν σύρτιν ἀπὸ τῶν Εὐεσπερίδων.[9]

Според авторот, главниот хабитат на растението бил долг 4000 стадии (околу 740 километри, бидејќи 1 стадиј = са. 185 м) и е ограничен до крајбрежјето помеѓу денешните градови Бенгази и Шахат. Местото каде што растел силфиумот е спомнато само еднаш од страна на авторот и затоа вистинскиот број не е познат, иако може да се претпостави дека бил огромен.

Римскиот поет Катул во една од своите поеми посветени на Лесбија споменал дека толку му требале нејзините бакнежи колку што имало песок во Кирена, каде што растел силфиумот:

> quam magnus numerus Libyssae harenae
> lasarpiciferis iacet Cyrenis.[10]

Придавка *lasarpicifer* ('она што дава силфиум') се однесува на градот Кирена и може да ја означува конкретната појава на растението за кое станува збор. Катул не ќе ја искористел придавката *lasarpicifer* ако ова растение не било карактеристично само за оваа територија. Затоа неговото кратко споменување на силфиумот (во многу определен контекст), според мене, ги поткрепува информациите за ендемичноста дадени од страна на Теофраст.

Кирена била многу позната со оваа ограничена дистрибуција на силфиумот и ја користела својата доминантна позиција во трговијата на продукти изработени од „киренајското злато", бидејќи продажбата била под строга државна контрола. Киликс од 6 век пр.н.е. го претставува кралот Аркесилај кој лично вршел надзор на мерењето, пакувањето и на товарењето на силфиумот, иако некои истражувачи тврдат дека на сликата станува збор за волна. Со таквото мислење не се согласува Џон М. Ридел. Според него, извозот на волна од Кирена во континетална Грција би немал смисла и би изгледал како возење јаглен во Њукасл.[11] Градот Кирена (денес Шахат во регионот Џабал ал Ахдар) бил грчка

---

[9] *Theophrasti De historia…*, VI 3, 3, vol. II, 16.

[10] Catullus, 7, 3-4, *Römische Elegiker*, ed. Alfred Biele (Leipzig 1890), 3.

[11] John M. Riddle, *Eve's Herbes: A history of Contraception and Abortion in the West* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 45.

колонија основана во 7 век пр.н.е. од страна на Доријците од Санторини. Трговијата на силфиум со грчките полиси датира од 638 година пр.н.е. и траела дури до римското владеење во почетокот на нашата ера, кога растението исчезнало.[12]

Најважен фрагмент за истражувањата во оваа статија, всушност, е описот на растението, иако тој не е баш прецизен, како што би се очекувало. Имено, наместо зборот *опис*, би требало да се употреби биолошкиот термин *дијагноза*, затоа што фрагментов ги исполнува сите услови за таква класификација: тој е кратка и многу конкретна изјава за суштинските карактеристики на организмот. Како и да е, ова е најстарата дијагноза што била направена за силфиумот:

> Τὸ δὲ σίλφιον ἔχει ῥίζαν μὲν πολλὴν καὶ παχεῖαν, τὸν δὲ καυλὸν ἡλίκον νάρθηξ, σχεδὸν δὲ καὶ τῷ πάχει παραπλήσιον, τὸ δὲ φύλλον, ὃ καλοῦσι μάσπετον, ὅμοιον τῷ σελίνῳ· σπέρμα δ' ἔχει πλατύ, οἷον φυλλῶδες, τὸ λεγόμενον φύλλον. ἐπετειόκαυλον δ' ἐστίν, ὥσπερ ὁ νάρθηξ.[13]

Потоа Теофраст додал дека коренот има црна кора, а лисјата се со златна боја. Во согласност со сите морфолошки информации, растението имало дебел темноцрн главен корен со мноштво влакнести корени, долг најверојатно 46 центиметри (ῥίζαν πηχυαίαν)[14] и со глава во средината. Главата, наречена *млеко*, била највисок од сите органи на коренот, стрчела над земјата и од неа израснувало стеблото. Стеблото било со височина помеѓу 1 и 4 метри, со тројно поделени лисја (*folia tripinnata*) со зелена или со златнозелена боја. За жал, Теофраст не споменал ништо за цветовите, но тие можеле да бидат во форма на огромни штитови. Јапонската сликарка Асука Хишики, која специјализирала на ликовниот изглед на различни видови растенија, меѓу другото, го реконструирала и изгледот на силфиумот, имајќи го предвид описот во делата на Теофраст и веќе споменатите монети од Кирена.[15]

---

[12] Andrew Dalby, "The Phenix nest", in *Dangerous tastes: the story of Spices* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000), 17.

[13] *Theophrasti De historia…*, VI 3, 1-2, vol. II, 14-16.

[14] 1 πῆχυς ca. 46cm

[15] Jeff Cox, „The Ghost of Silphium Past", *Horticulture* 107 (2010): 40-42.

Во дијагнозата уште се наоѓаат важни информации за семето на растението. Теофраст напишал дека семето било плоскаво или широко ($\pi\lambda\alpha\tau\acute{\upsilon}$) и многу слично на младо лисје ($\varphi\upsilon\lambda\lambda\tilde{\omega}\delta\varepsilon\varsigma$), личело на целер, ама тешко е да се каже дали станува збор за див или за култивиран. Лисјата на целерот се единично или двојно поделени со ромбоидни ливчиња. Семето претставено на монетите има форма на срце, но прашање е со кое значење грчката придавка $\pi\lambda\alpha\tau\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ е употребена во однос на семето на силфиумот (дали дека е тоа плоскаво или дека е широко). Формата на семето е многу важна за систематската класификација дадена на крајот од статијава.

Повеќе простор во своите дела Теофраст им посветил на физиологијата и на медицинското својство на растението. Тој вели дека со почетокот на пролетта коренот раѓал лист (маспетон) кој, доколку им се дал на овците, предизвикувал дијареја ама, исто така, придонесувал нивното месо да добие специфичен вкус. Се чини дека Теофраст го интересирало и размножувањето. Веќе кажавме дека во средината на коренот се наоѓала глава која растела над земја. Таа потоа раѓала вид на стебло наречено *магидарис*,[16] а по заоѓањето на Сириус, магидарисот раѓал семе и дури тогаш израснувал вистинскиот силфиум. За жал, и овој фрагмент не содржи никакви информации за цветовите, кои се вистинските генеративни органи.

Иако целото растение побудувало интерес во античко време, сепак најпознато и најценето било поради смолата. Според Теофраст, постоеле два вида смола: една од стеблото и друга од коренот. Во *Историја на растенијата* тој дал детални информации околу процесот на собирање на смолата: се лупела кората од коренот (стеблото не било лупено) и потоа се сечел да пушти сок. Капките сок биле собирани и сушени. Финален продукт била смолата, на латински позната како *laser*. Смолата од коренот била чиста, погуста и потранспарентна отколку смолата од стеблото и, се разбира – поскапа. Најчесто се користела за пургатив или за контрацепција, но, исто така, и како зачин за приготвување различна храна. За хемиските својства на смолата не можеме да кажеме ништо повеќе, но може да се претпостави дека била слична на асафетида добиена од растенија од редот *Ferula*. Асафетидата е, исто така, смола, со карактеристичен и многу интензивен мирис,

---

[16] Μαγυδάρις овде го означува семето на силфиум.

ама од коренот или од стеблото на растението *Ferula assa-foetida* L., кое денес расте во Иран, Ирак, Индија и во Авганистан. Низ вековите била користена во исхраната и во фармацијата. Уште во античко време асафетидата често имала функција на поевтин сурогат на силфиум-смолата, особено во Рим.[17]

Теофраст уште го забележал ова што нема можност за култивирање на силфиумот. Вели дека ова растение е диво и не му било потребно никакво одгледување, а сите обиди за култивирање во централна Грција завршиле неповолно.[18] Се чини дека неможноста за култивирање била една од главните причини за исчезнување на силфиумот. Од друга страна, и самиот Теофраст не е сигурен дали растението може да се култивира. Со тек на време бројот на силфиумот почнал да се намалува, а тоа особено дошло до израз во времето на Нерон. Најверојатно ова претставува краен момент кога целосно исчезнува силфиумот. Плиниј Постариот напишал дека во негово време растението одамна не било видено во својот хабитат.[19]

Постојат различни причини за исчезнување на силфиумот, но се чини дека најсериозни биле:

1. Прекумерната експлоатација – премногу силфиум бил берен главно во римско време, без притоа да се води сметка дали растението може да се репродуцира. Повеќето Римјани не дозволувале земјата да се обновува и повторно да биде плодородна, а истовремено саделе други култури, на пример лук, пченка, ким, качунка итн. Природните услови за силфиумот биле уништени и неговото растење било оневозможено.

2. Прекумерното пасење – на многу стада овци им било дозволено да јадат „маспетон“ и зрелото растение не можело

---

[17] Marina Heilmeyer, *Ancient Herbs* (London: Frances Lincoln Ltd 2007), 22.

[18] Потврда за зборовите на Теофраст се наоѓа кај Хипократ: Hp. *Morb.* IV, 34, 17-21.

ἀλλ' ὅμως οὐ δυνατόν, πολλῶν ἤδη πειρασαμένων, οὔτε ἐν Ἰωνίη οὔτε ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ σίλφιον φῦναι· ἐν δὲ τῇ Λιβύῃ αὐτόματον φύεται· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν οὔτε ἐν Ἰωνίῃ οὔτε ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ ἰκμὰς τοιαύτη, ὥστε τρέφειν αὐτό.

[19] *Plinii Caii Secundi Naturalis Historia*, XIX, 39, 1-5, vol. III, rec. D. Detlefsen (Berolini 1866), 179. multis iam annis in ea terra non invenitur, quoniam publicani, qui pascua conducunt, maius ita lucrum sentientes depopulantur pecorum pabulo. unus omnino caulis nostra memoria repertus Neroni principi missus est.

да се развие. Луѓето верувале дека младите лисја ќе влијаат на тоа месото на овците да добие специфичен вкус. Затоа сè повеќе стада паселе, иако дење тоа било спротивно на законот.

3. Ерозијата на почвата – Теофраст во делото *Потекло на растенијата* спомнал дека силфиумот се појавил во Кирена по обилни и поројни дождови (πιττώδους τινὸς ὕδατος γενομένου καὶ πάχεος). Во исто време се појавила и шума што претходно не постоела.[20] Главно дрво во оваа шума било θύον, што денеска се идентификува со *Tetraclinis articulata* Vahl. (= *Callitris quadrivalvis* Vent.), од семејството *Cupressaceae*. Станува збор за големо зимзелено дрво, со височина од 6 до, најчесто, 8 метри (најмногу до 15 метри), со црвеникаво-кафеаво стебло. Расте во јужна Шпанија, Мароко, северен Алжир и во Малта. Исто така, го имало и во Џабал ал Ахдар (древна Кирена), регион каде што растел и силфиумот.[21] Распространетоста на дрвото најверојатно се вкрстувала со онаа на силфиумот што може да значи дека двете растенија биле во симбиоза. Во античко време *T. articulata* L. била ценета поради дрвото и, пред сè, поради смолата, т.н. сандарак. Честопати од дрвото се правеле различни предмети, како што се мебел, крокови, скулптури итн. Кен Парејко тврди дека исчезнувањето на силфиумот може да се поврзе со уништувањето на шумата сандарак[22]. Може да се претпостави дека шумата претставувала специфичен амбиент, соодветен за силфиумот, и кога таа била срушена, хабитатот на силфиумот бил уништен, со што неговиот број се намалил.[23]

Споменатите три фактори се одговорни за промена во природните услови на киренајскиот хабитат и силфиумот најверојатно не можел да опстане во новата животна средина. Од

---

[20] *Theophrasti De causis plantarum*, I 5, 1 in *Theophrastii Eresii opera, quae supersunt omnia*, rec. Fridericus Wimmer (Parisiis 1866), 169.

[21] Според она што го предадол Теофраст дрвото растело околу храм на божество Амон и во Киренајка.

[22] Ken Parejko, *Pliny the Elder's Silphium: first recorded species extinction*, "Conservation Biology" 17.3 (2003): 926.

[23] Johnson Donald Hughes, *Pan's Travail. Environmental Problems of the Ancient Greeks and Romans* (London: The Johns Hopkins University Press 1996), 79.

друга страна, се чини дека на неговото исчезнување најмногу влијаело преголемото користење од страна на Римјаните. Нивната прекумерна експлоатација довела до деградација на земјата. Римските патрони, заинтересирани за брз профит, воопшто не се грижеле за состојбата на природата. Таквиот однос на Римјаните, главно, го предизвикал исчезнувањето на силфиумот.

Идентитетот, или систематската класификација, на растението σίλφιον е непознат. Веќе два века истражувачите не веруваат дека силфиумот можел едноставно да исчезне и од време на време се чита или се слуша дека е најден некаде во светот. За жал, многу од ваквите претпоставки треба да се отфрлат, бидејќи не се однесуваат на ендемите во северна Африка. Она што останало се само поедноставени слики на растението, лисјето, стеблото или на семето од монетите од Киренајка и описи што се наоѓаат во книжевноста.

Изгледа дека, најверојатно, силфиумот влегувал во семејството на *Apiaceae* (=*Umbelliferae*) – штитоцветните – од редот *Apiales* (= *Umbelliflorae*). Во ова семејство влегуваат повеќегодиш-ни растенија што имаат цветови распоредени во форма на штит. Плодот најчесто е сув шизокарп, кој се дели на две половини. Органите на силфиумот презентирани на киренајските монети изгледаат многу слично: цветовите се огромни штитови, а семето, иако на монетите било гравирано со поедноставена форма на срце, според моето мислење, може да се смета за шизокарп. Формата на лисјето, исто така, упатува на семејството штитоцветни. Според Теофраст, маспетонот личи на лисјето на целерот и затоа силфиумот може да влезе во истото семејство со него.

Во фамилијата *Apiaceae* се вклучуваат околу 3000 видови билки, но собирајќи ги информациите што ги добивме досега, се чини дека видови од редот *Ferula* (νάρθηξ), како што се, на пример, *Ferula assa-foetida*, *F. tingitana* или *F. communis*, на прв поглед им одговараат на собраните информации. *Ferula assa-feotida* L., исто како и силфиумот има црн главен корен со многу влакнести корења, лисје како целерот и цветови одредени во огромни штитови. Исто така, растението дава смола – т.н. асафетида. Уште во античко време *F. assa-foetida* била погрешно поистоветувана со силфиумот и најчесто служела како негов поевтин сурогат. За жал, ниедно растение од редот *Ferula* не може да биде силфиум, и тоа пред сѐ, поради тоа што тие потекнуваат од Азија и никогаш не

растеле во Киранајка (значи тие не можеле да бидат ендеми зашто ендемите се јавуваат само во еден регион). Понатаму, видовите од редот *Ferula* се многу обични за средоземноморската флора и тешко дека Грците или Римјаните би плаќале со злато или со сребро за нешто што растело под нивните прозорци. Што е најважно, овие видови имаат елиптични плодови, што не соодветствува на формата на семето од киренајските монети. Ова е главен аргумент за да се отфрли поистоветувањето на силфиумот со редот *Ferula*. Треба да се отфрлат и другите обиди за идентификација, како, на пример, дека се работи за *Angelica archangelica*, *Angelica officinalis*, *Salvia salvatica* и за *Thapsia gargaica*. Првите четири немаат такви својства какви што имал силфиумот, а последното растение е отровно.

Како што кажавме претходно, на истражувачите не им се верувало дека силфиумот можел да исчезне и постојано се труделе да го најдат некаде. Се чини дека полскиот ботаничар Кшиштоф Спалик од Варшавскиот универзитет, кој се занимава со систематиката и историската биогеографија на штитоцветните растенија, конечно нашол решение за најголемата тајна на античката ботаника. Според него, меѓу штитоцветните има еден вид што ги исполнува сите услови дадени преку информациите што ги имаме за силфиумот. Античкиот силфиум најверојатно бил вид од редот *Laserpitium*, бидејќи плодот на растенијата од овој ред има широки лисја во форма на срце и неговото семе изгледа како она што се наоѓа на монетите од Кирена,[24] уште повеќе што ласерпициумот постигнува иста височина како и асафетидата и од него исто така се добива смола.

Дали веќе најдовме решение на она што е најголемата тајна на античкиот свет за нас и, конечно, дали можеме да го класификуваме силфиумот? Оваа мистерија, до моментот кога ќе се најде некоја физичка трага, на пример, остаток од стебло или од семе, ќе остане нерешена. Ако се најдеше трага на присуство на силфиумот некаде во неговиот поранешен хабитат, сè ќе беше јасно. Се чини дека денес сме поблиску да го демистифицираме прашањето за растението, ама е потребно многу време пред да се направи тоа со сигурност.

---

[24] K. Spalik, „Smutna i pouczająca opowieść o silphium", *Wiedza i życie* 3 (2007): 34-36.

Maciej HELBIG

SILPHIUM -THE BIGGEST SECRET
OF THE ANCIENT BOTANY

- s u m m a r y -

The main aim of this study is to bring some light on possible identification of *silphium*, one of the most mysterious plants of Antiquity. Even though many investigations both on the field of botany and classical studies were made, still scientists have problems to give a satisfying answer. The basis for the analysis are fragments from the botanical treaties of Theophrastus where *silphium* was widely described, correlated with achievements of modern taxonomists. Putting all the pieces of information together may help solve this interesting problem.

Yuri STOYANOV

School of Oriental
and African Studies
University of London

MANICHAEAN AND EASTERN CHRISTIAN DUALIST ELEMENTS IN ALEVISM AND BEKTASHISM – EVIDENCE AND CONJECTURES

The existence of earlier Manichaean and/or later, medieval Eastern Christian dualist layers in Ottoman Alevism (*Alevilik)*/Kızılbaşism (*Kızılbaşlık*) and Bektashism has been variously postulated, argued for, assumed and conjectured in a number of early, more recent, and newly published studies focused largely or in passing on their ritual and belief systems. Admittedly, early publications on Alevism and Bektashism had at their disposal far less primary internal and external evidence than today while, on the other hand, anthropologists, travelers and missionaries had access to these sectarian communities' networks and cultic sites which were subsequently gravely affected during the process of the dismemberment of the Ottoman empire and the early post-Ottoman period. Such early publications could also be variously affected by the nation-building and confessional agendas of the different evolving and crystallizing Balkan national historiographies of the late Ottoman era, as well as by the explicit or implicit missionary raison d'être of some of the early Western accounts of and approaches to Alevism and Bektashism.

Contemporary studies of Alevism and Bektashism are in a much better position as far as their access to relevant published primary material is concerned. The growth of the evidence-oriented research in this sphere of scholarly enquiry (especially in the last 30 years or so) has resulted in the publication and studies of principal source material such as the the Alevi doctrinal-catechistic book, the *Buyruk*, the *Maqālat,* (the "sayings" attributed to the eponymous founder of the Bektashi order,

Hacı Bektaş Veli (c. 1300 ?), the *Menakıb-nāmes* and *Vilāyet-nāmes* of Alevi and Bektashi sacred personages and the religious hymns, *nefes*, as well as the results of much valuable oral traditions material assembled during the field-work of anthropologists and folklorists. Still, in a number of such recent popular and some scholarly publications on Alevism and Bektashism all this lately assembled and growing primary evidence (available in several languages) is duly ignored or used selectively. Instead of drawing on this invaluable material, such publications have tended to reiterate and/or paraphrase some of the interpretative schemas and generalizing theories of studies of and perspectives on Alevism and Belktashism dating from the earlier (or even earliest stages of) research on this problematic. Some of these inherited historiographic constructs and perspectives are concerned with the otherwise important problem of the interchange between Christian and Islamic heterodoxies (as well as popular beliefs and practices) and thus directly or indirectly also with the posited existence of Manichaean and Eastern Christian dualist elements in Alevism and Bektashism.

　　　The continuing attraction, re-use and reformulation of these rather fixed explanatory frameworks and assumptions regarding the provenance and evolution of pre/non-Islamic layers in Alevism and Bektashism undoubtedly result from the perceived relation of this particular problematic with certain larger areas of the historical study of the late Byzantine and Ottoman periods with intermittently actualized religio-political importance. Such areas include the relationship between Christianity and Islam and the dynamics of the processes of Islamicisation in the Balkans and Anatolia during these periods as well as the origins and nature of the non-Turkish Islamic communities in these regions. The proposed evidence and theories regarding Manichaean and Eastern Christian dualist strata in Alevism and Bektashism need to be treated, therefore, in the larger framework of the main trends of research as well as inherited and newly advanced historiographic models in these wider areas of study, as they have also variously determined and shaped both scholarly and general approaches to the Alevi/Bektashi problematic.

　　　One of the most popular and continuously instrumentalized of already mentioned nineteenth-century historiographic models postulates mass conversions of Christian sectarian communities in the Balkans and Anatolia to Islam during the early Ottoman period. This model was applied in the nineteenth century to the versions of medieval Christian dualism in Eastern Christendom, Bogomilism and Paulicianism (and re-

lated currents, communities and individual heresiarchs)[1] and subsequently re-used and remains in currency in various modern confessional and religious-political contexts. The model was based on the theory that Christian dualist heretical communities in Anatolia and the Balkans converted swiftly and in large numbers to Islam as a reaction against the persecution which they had suffered at the hands of secular and ecclesiastical authorities in the Eastern Orthodox world during the medieval the pre-Ottoman era. It was first most forcefully applied to early Ottoman Bosnia-Herzegovina which in the period preceding its conquest by the Ottoman armies in the second half of the fifteenth century was the scene of a severe religio-political collision between the adherents of the Bosnian Church (schismatic both from Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy and generally known as 'Patareni' and 'Krstjani') and Catholicism. The Catholic suppression of the Bosnian Church (the much debated nature of its relationship with the Christian dualist movement in the Western Balkans remains outside the scope of this article), which reportedly included forcible conversions of its adherents or their banishment from Bosnia, led according to this line of reasoning to the collaboration of the Bosnian Patarenes with the Ottoman invaders and their large-scale acceptance of Islam.[2]

By the time of the last references to active dualist heretics in the Bosnian lands in the latter half of the fifteenth century Bosnia had been repeatedly described by Catholic heresiologists, travelers and observers as a land inhabited by 'Manichaeans''. From the medieval period onwards the "Manichaean" paradigm continued to be applied to the medieval Bosnian Church in subsequent general and polemical contexts in Europe and inevitably exercised a major impact on early historiographic approaches to pre-Ottoman Bosnia-Herzegowina.[3] The late medieval

---

[1] On the rise, historical development and teachings of the Christian dualist movements and trends in the medieval Eastern Orthodox world, see the anthology of translated primary sources in J. Hamilton and B. Hamilton, eds., Y. Stoyanov, assist. ed., *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World c.650-c.1450* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1998).

[2] See note 4 below.

[3] On the provenance and evolution of the "Manichaean" paradigm of the Bosnian Church, see Y. Stoyanov, 'Between Heresiology and Political Theology: the Rise of the Paradigm of the Heretical Bosnian Church and the Paradoxes of its Medieval and Modern Developments', In; *Political Theologies of the Monotheistic Religions. Representation of the Divine and Dynamics of Power, e*d. G. Filoramo, La Morcelliana, Brescia, 2005, pp. 161-180.

stereotype of heretical and "Manichaean" Bosnia eventually re-emerged as a focus of confessional debate when medieval dualist heresy came to be implicated in the evolving Catholic-Protestant controversies and debates over the nature and genealogy of medieval heretical, dissenting and reformist groups. These Catholic-Protestant controversies over the nature of medieval heresy continued and were subjected to various re-interpretations in novel religio-political contexts during the nineteenth century which in Eastern Europe included the newly formulated Slavo-phile, Slavophile-influenced and nationalist historiographic approaches to and versions of medieval and modern political and confessional history. It was in such a political, intellectual and religious climate that the Bogomil/Manichaean thesis of the reasons for Ottoman Bosnia's wide-spread Islamicisation evolved. It postulated the rapid and full-scale conversion of the hierarchy and adherents of the "Manichaean" Bosnian Church to Islam and came to be used in a variety of contemporaneous popular, nationalist and scholarly texts on Bosnia-Herzegowina, betraying contrasting and often conflicting agendas.[4]

     To make this conjectured process of transition from Christian dualism in Islam in Bosnian-Herzegowina even more sweeping, it was also applied to all other Balkan and Anatolian areas where Christian dualist communities were known to have existed in the medieval period.[5] The predictable next step was to characterize all, or at least a substantial part, of the Slavonic-speaking Muslim communities in the Balkans descendants of the medieval Christian dualists envisaged to have

---

[4] For characteristic and emphatic nineteenth-century expressions of this line of argument, see, for example, A. Evans, Through Bosnia and Herzegovina on Foot during the Insurrection, August and September 1875: *with an Historical Review of Bosnia, and a Glimpse at the Croats, Slavonians, and the Ancient Republic of Ragusa*, (London: Longmans, Green 1876), p. lv; J. von Asboth, *Bosnien und die Herzegowina. Reisebilder und Studien* (Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1888), pp. 86-87; H. C. Lea, *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1888), vol. 2, pp. 307-313; J. J. I. von Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters*, (Munich: Nördlingen, 1890; repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968), vol. 1, pp. 126-127, 242-250.

[5] For typical early articulations of this viewpoint, see, for example, K. Irechek, *Istoriia na bŭlgarite*, tr. by N. A. Rainov i Z. Boiiadzhiev (Tŭrnovo, 1886: Pechtanitsa na K. Tuleshkov, 1886); 2nd ed., ed. by V. N. Zlatarski, tr. by A. Diamandiev and I. Raev (Sofia: S. Slavchev, 1929), pp. 271, 289; A. Teodorov-Balan, 'Bŭlgarskite katolitsi v Svishtovsko i tiahnata cherkovna borba', *Letopis na bŭlgarskoto knizhovno druzhestvo*, 2, 1902, pp. 101-211, esp. pp. 123ff.

embraced Islam in the early Ottoman period.[6] Subsequent evidence-based and –oriented research has progressively demonstrated the untenability and ideological foundations and biases of this "Christian dualism to Islam" model, highlighting a variety of other religious, political and economic factors which determined the differing courses of the Islamization process in the various Balkan and Anatolian regions. But it has also shown remarkable vitality in being repeatedly resurrected, whether in its sweeping or less extreme forms, both in general and scholarly discourses, especially in periods of increasing external and internal focus on and preoccupations with past and present Balkan and Anatolian religious and political history.

At this early stage of research on the fortunes of Christian heterodoxy in the late Byzantine and Ottoman periods the hypothetical mass Islamization of Eastern Christian heretical communities was thought of as the principal venue for the entry of Manichean/Eastern Christian dualist traditions into Ottoman Islam. However, no direct or circumstantial evidence was sought or offered to prove such an influx and spread of non-Islamic heretical traditions. The subsequent gradually increasing awareness that early Ottoman Islam in the Balkans and Anatolia was not homogeneous, normative Sunnism but a rather heterogeneous phenomenon, with its array of syncretistic, antinomian and Shia-related and –influenced trends, was accompanied by a growing interest and research into Alevism and Bektashism and their doctrinal and historical genealogies. Some nineteenth-and early twentieth-century missionaries' and travelers' reports of their encounters with Alevism/*Kızılbaşism* and Bektashism have drawn attention to the negative Sunni attitudes to the perceived "heresy" and antinomianism of these sectarian communities as well as what appeared to them Christian-related notions in their beliefs and cult observances.[7] Highlighting what they recognize as Christian layers in Alevi and Bektashi teachings and practices, the

---

[6] See, for example, Irechek, *Istoriia na bŭlgarite*, pp. 271, 289; more recently, Starvo Skendi, 'Crypto-Christianity in the Balkan Area under the Ottomans', in *Balkan Cultural Studies,* ed. Stavro Skendi, pp. 233-257. Boulder, Colo.; New York: East European Monographs distributed by Columbia University Press*,*1980 (first published in *Slavic Review* 26 (1967): 227–46), p. 240.

[7] For a select bibliography of such early missionaries' and travelers' reports, see Y. Stoyanov, On Some Parallels Between Anatolian and Balkan Islamic Heterodox Traditions and the Problem of their Co-Existence and Interchange with Popular Christianity', in *Sycrétismes et hérésies dans l''Orient seljoukide et ottoman des XIIe-XVIIIe siècles*, Paris, 2004, ed. G. Veinstein, Paris, 2005, pp. 75-119, at pp. 94-95, n. 44.

missionary account is particular in effect attempt to disassociate these communities from Islam in general and thus legitimize their proselytizing agenda among them.[8] Scholarly, ideological and general interest in such presumed or reconstructed Christian layers in Alevism and Bektashism was understandably high in the post-Ottoman Christian majority states, underpinning what could be defined as the indigenization approach to and instrumentalization of this problematic, a trend of research and analysis that was and remains periodically rather prominent in South-Eastern Europe. The indigenization approach attempted to anchor Alevi and Bektashi identities in the local Christian (and generally non-Muslim folk) environment, deliberately ignoring or downplaying their historical affiliations with their co-religionists in Asia Minor and other Islamic religious minorities in the Near East.[9] Arguments in conjunction with suspect or fabricated evidence that Alevi and Bektashi communities actually were descendants of Christian groups (orthodox or heterodox), forcibly Islamicized in the Ottoman period, understandably represented a highly charged topic in the historiographic, religious and general discourses in the Christian-majority post-Ottoman states.

     In some of the early applications of the indigenization approach the initially separate arguments regarding respectively the posited Christian origins of and/or elements in Alevism and Bektashism and the conjectured en masse conversion of Christian dualist groups to Islam in the early Ottoman era began to merge into a new theoretical construct, hypothesizing a Christian dualist pedigree for the Alevi and Bektashi communities as a whole. Since the formulation of this hypothesis the expanding scholarly evidence-based research has accumulated valuable material and observations for and against its premises, increasing in the process substantially our knowledge of Christian-Islamic co-existence and interchange in the Ottoman period. Scholarly study, however (espe-

---

[8] For recent scrutinies of the Protestant missionary approaches to and interactions with the *Kızılbaş*, see A. Karakaya-Stump, 'The Emergence of the Kizilbas in Western Thought: Missionary Accounts and their Aftermath', in D. Shankland, ed., *Archaeology, Anthropology and Heritage in the Balkans and Anatolia: the Life and Times of F.W. Hasluck, 1878-1920* (Istanbul: Isis, 2004), vol. 1, pp. 328-353; Hans-Lukas Kieser, 'Muslim Heterodoxy and Protestant Utopia. The Interactions between Alevis and Missionaries', *Die Welt des Islams*, n. s., 41:1 (2001), pp. 89-111.

[9] See Y. Stoyanov, "Contested Post-Ottoman Alevi and Bektashi Identities in the Balkans and their Shi'ite Component", in Lloyd Ridgeon (ed.), *Shi'i Islam and Identity: Religion, Politics and Change in the Global Muslim Community*, London: Tauris, 2012, pp. 171-219, at pp. 183-185

cially in South-Eastern Europe and Turkey), has coexisted and occasionally overlapped with top-down political and religio-political projects executed by ideologues with little or non-existent grasp of the relevant problematic, intended to mould public opinion and "official" historiographies in accordance with the ideological directives of the respective political and religious establishments.

The advance in research and publications of primary and secondary sources on Alevi and Bektashi history and religious traditions as well as on the Ottoman period in the Balkans and Anatolia in general allow for a critical reappraisal of some of the early and still periodically reiterated argument for the hypothesized (and occurring nearly immediately after the Ottoman conquest) mass conversion of the Christian dualist communities to Islam. As already observed, the theory that Christian dualist sectarians converted to Islam as a reaction against their past and recent suppression by the established church has not been supported by the publication and analysis of the various sources for the religious and cross-confessional dynamics of the early, mid- or later Ottoman era. Recent research on Paulicianism in the Balkans in the early Ottoman era, for example, has completely disproved the earlier theories that the Paulicians went over rapidly and en masse to Islam in the wake of the Ottoman conquest - during the first two centuries of Ottoman domination in the Balkans their communities actually stabilized and even may have grown before they became a target of Catholic proselytism from the last decades of the seventeenth century onwards.[10] But the Paulician communities which embraced Catholicism found themselves drawn in the continuous and intense Habsburg-Ottoman conflicts which unfolded in the second half of the seventeenth and early eighteenth century, compelling some of these communities to flee from Ottoman territories. Amid these severe political and religious tensions and pressure faced by the Paulician communities which stayed in the Ottoman empire, some of them chose to embrace Orthodoxy or Islam, while others of the new Paulician converts went over to Orthodoxy, practiced dissimulation, or lapsed openly back to

---

[10] See now the summary of the evidence of the history of the Balkan Paulician communities during the fifteenth-eighteenthcenturies and its up-to-date analysis in M. Iovkov, *Pavlikiani i pavlikianski selishta v bŭlgarskite zemi XV-XVIII v.* (Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Okhridski" 1991). Some of the important documents related to the Catholic missions to the Paulician communities in the Balkans have been published in B. Primov *et al.* (eds.), *Dokumenti za katolicheskata deinost v Bŭlgariia prez XVII vek* (Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Okhridski", 1993).

Paulicianism.[11] Late seventeenth and early eighteenth century was not the only period that Paulician communities found themselves in political and religious conflict with an Islamic power – when in the ninth century Byzantine campaigns had forced Paulician groups to flee to areas under and bordering Arab Islamic powers in eastern Anatolia, these groups formed strategic alliances with these powers but also could be engaged in rivalry and confrontation with them. All these developments traceable through and demonstrated in the primary sources highlight the complicated nature of the religious and political processes in which Paulician communities found themselves involved vis-à-vis Catholicism, Orthodoxy and Islam from the early seventeenth century onwards and again, expose the obsolete and one-dimensional nature of the schema of swift and thorough absorption of Balkan Christian dualism into Ottoman Islam.

        Another type of argument has also been advanced, attempting to theorize that such transition from Christian dualism and Islam was made possible and effected by the supposed rapport and correspondences between their religiosity and ethics. Such presumed "points of resemblance' between these two religious traditions were exemplified by the repudiation of the veneration of the cross, icons, clerical hierarchy and liturgical ceremonies and the sacraments of baptism and marriage.[12] So far, however, no actual direct or circumstantial evidence has been offered to substantiate such claims which thus remain theoretical presuppositions which can begin to considered only if and when such evidence is offered. Other arguments that Puritanism, the "simple fatalism" and "simplicity" of Islam[13] had especial appeal to late medieval Christian dualists are even less convincing and hardly merit serious consideration. Of these suggested points of resemblance it is perhaps the parallels between Christian dualist and Islamic iconoclasm that would need a proper exploration in late Byzantine and Ottoman contexts but this needs to be preceded by a comparative survey of these attitudes and any records of their interaction in the above period which has not been attempted as yet.

        As far as the attempts to pose parallels between Christian dualist and Islamic attitudes to normative Christian sacramentalism are concerned, these should take into close consideration the immediate histori-

---

[11] On these complicated religious processes, see now the survey of the evidence in Iovkov, *Pavlikiani i pavlikianski selishta*, pp. 66-102.

[12] See, for example, Asboth, *Bosnien und die Herzegowina*, p. 87.

[13] See S. Runciman, *The Medieval Manichee. A Study of the Christian Dualist Heresy*, Cambridge: Camridge University Press, 1946, p. 114; the "Muslim simplicity" argument has been reiterated more recently by Skendi, 'Crypto-Christianity', p. 240.

cal and religious contexts of the relevant periods and areas under discussion, otherwise they appear ahistorical and exceedingly sweeping. Claims, for example, that the Paulicians' negative stance on the established Armenian and Byzantine Churches' sacraments led to an accord between their communities in eastern Anatolia and the various Turkoman groups who entered and began to settle in the region in the Seljuk period,[14] need to situate this conjectured accord in concrete historical and religious environments and offer some evidence from the period during which this process was supposed to have taken place. Furthermore, generalizations about early and evolving Paulician non-/anti-sacramentalism may have to be revised in view of the continuing debate over the nature and theology of original Armenian and later Byzantine and Balkan Paulicianism (which has implications regarding their earlier and later ritual practices) and the indications that Bogomil sacramentalism may have influenced Paulician communities in the Balkans.[15] In any case, arguments for non-/anti-sacramentalism as an alleged factor facilitating Christian dualist-Islamic affinity is definitely inapplicable to the other version of medieval Eastern Christian dualism in the Balkans and Anatolia: Bogomilism. Bogomilism developed what can be described as a sacramental system, parallel and opposed to that of normative medieval Christianity, in which the rite of spiritual baptism, *teleiosis*, was of central salvationist and eschatological importance, making it effectively a telling example of Christian dualist sacramentalism.[16] Attempts, therefore, to describe Islamic non-sacramentalism as a feature which propelled late medieval Christian dualist sectarians to endorse and embrace Islam, rest on outdated and superficial knowledge and understanding of the history and theology of medieval eastern Christian dualism.

The above schemas of purported religious affinity between late medieval Eastern Christian dualism and Islam (leading to the assimila-

---

[14] See J. R. Barnes, 'The Dervish Orders in the Ottoman Empire', in   R. Lifchez (ed.), *The Dervish Lodge: Architecture, Art, and Sufism in Ottoman Turkey*, Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992, pp. 34-35

[15] See the discussion of the very plausible association of Balkan Paulicianism with the radical Balkan dualist church of Drugunthia and the importance of the rite of baptism in Spirit for both moderate and radical medieval dualist communities in Y. Stoyanov, *The Other God. Dualist Religions from Antiquity to the Cathar Heresy*, London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000, pp. 197-201.

[16] On the sacramental character of the Bogomil/Cathar version of Christian dualism, see J. van den Broek, 'The Cathars: Medieval Gnostics', in J. van den Broek *Studies in Alexandrian Christianity and Gnosticism*, Leiden: Brill, 1996, pp. 157-78; Stoyanov, *The Other God*, pp. 170, 197-200, 274.

tion of the Eastern Christian dualist communities into Ottoman Islam) as a rule completely ignore or avoid any even general discussion of the vital doctrinal spheres on which any such comparison-based argumentation should have been based. And it is in virtually all significant spheres of doctrine – cosmology, theology, anthropology, soteriology and eschatology (which in the case of Christian dualism were created and elaborated by a doctrinally-conscious religious elite and literati) – that Christian dualism and Islam (especially normative Sunni Islam) display a series of evident and emphatic incompatibilities and ultimately irreconcilable differences. These incompatibilities and conflicting doctrinal positions underlie Islamic polemics against Manichaeism, the most systematic and influential system of religious dualism which Islam encountered in the Near East.[17] Proposing an assimilation into Islam initiated by the Christian dualist elite, based on a conjectured religious affinity between Christian dualism and Islam, while ignoring all the crucial doctrinal evidence which belies this supposed affinity, is patently the wrong starting point and premise for a religious history investigation or theory.

Undergoing conversion from one religious tradition to another as a consequence of perceived religious affinities between the two traditions should not be confused, moreover, with a cross-confessional rapprochement for religio-political or socio-political reasons – as in the case of the Anatolian Paulician communities who, faced with Byzantine military and political pressure in the eight century, entered strategic alliances with the Arab Islamic powers in eastern Asia Minor. As in normative Christianity, cases in which individual or communal heterodox Christian conversion to Islam could occur for socio-economic and political reasons as well as instances of the simulated adoption of Islam (after which the new pseudo-Muslim continues to practice his true confession in secrecy) fall into an altogether different category of inter-confessional dynamics. Further investigation and publication of the records of the processes of Islamization in the Ottoman empire have already and will doubtless continue to throw much new light on such conversion patterns among orthodox and heterodox Christians. The study of the patterns and types of Christian conversion to Islam in the Balkans and Anatolia dur-

---

[17] For an up-to-date survey of Islamic testimonia about Manichaeism's history and teachings in the Islamic world, see now J. C. Reeves, *Prolegomena to a History of Islamic Manichaeism*, Sheffield: Equinox, 2011. On the place of Manichaeism (real and perceived) in Islamic heresiography, see, for example, C. F. Ernst, *The Words of Ecstasy in Sufism*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1985, pp. 117-132.

ing and after the Ottoman conquests, however, has been for more than a century in South East Europe and to some extent Turkey, a field heavily contested by rival nationalist and confessional agendas and still rife with controversies and semi-taboo areas after all the decades of the respective regimes' manipulation and control of research and publications. It will need further de-ideologization, a process which been advancing slowly but steadily in post-Communist South-East Europe but still needs some way to go before the field can throw off this legacy and be able to integrate the theoretical and practical insights of some recent valuable comparative studies of post-Islamic conquest Islamization patterns in Asia and Africa.

This brief survey of the state of research (with a focus on some of the anachronistic but still intermittently and widely enough applied schemas of ethno-religious and socio-political provenance) and knowledge of the fortunes of Christian dualism in the Ottoman era and its variously assessed links with the process of Islamization will provide the essential historiographic background to the following analysis of early and more recent approaches to Alevi/Bektashi interrelations with normative and heterodox Christianity in the Balkans and Anatolia. The various patterns and manifestations of Christian-Islamic interchange and syncretism attracted the attention of many of the early observers and explorers of the religious life of the late Ottoman empire.[18] The question of whether such movement towards religious interchange and syncretism developed also in the spheres of Christian and Islamic heterodoxy and heresy was also introduced in some of the early studies on Alevism and Bektashism, variously betraying the impact of the contemporaneous influential schemas and conjectures regarding the history of Christian dualist communities in the Ottoman period. Characteristically, approaches to this question could blend elements of the already mentioned indigenization thesis (seeking to derive Alevi and Bektashi beliefs and ritual practices from local Christian and pre-Christian traditions) with

---

[18] The collection and examination of valuable material related to the interaction and syncreticism of popular Islamic and Christian beliefs and cultic observances in the Ottoman Balkans and Anatolia in F. W. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, 2 vols., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929), has been followed by a series of studies and publications of further primary source material demonstrating more cases of such syncretism and interchange or re-examining Hasluck's material and interpretations such as D. Shankland, ed., *Archaeology, Anthropology and Heritage in the Balkans and Anatolia: the Life and Times of F.W. Hasluck, 1878-1920*, 2 vols., (Istanbul: Isis, 2004).

arguments for their continuity with pre-Ottoman Christian heretical and heterodox communities (forcibly or voluntarily converted to Islam).[19]

While such approaches were clearly related to contemporaneous ethno-religious attitudes to and lines of interpretation of national and religious history, the growing research and data on Alevi/Bektashi problematic provided some interesting indications that some regions in the Balkans and Anatolia where medieval Christian heterodox and heretical communities were known to have resided in or been active, happened to be also hotbeds of Islamic heterodoxy during the Seljuk (in Asia Minor) and Ottoman eras, often assuming a religio-political character challenging the Seljuk and Ottoman rule and order. Both earlier and more recent studies of the religious currents and conflicts within Islam in Anatolia and the Balkans during the Seljuk and Ottoman periods came to point to a possible historical continuity between the prevalence of medieval Christian and later Islamic heterodoxies in more or less the same or nearby regions. It has to be said that in a number of other Balkan and Anatolian areas the presence of medieval Christian heresy has not been superceded by any analogous anti-conformist Muslim heterodox religious development but such could evolve in other regions where similar Christian precedents have not been attested. Furthermore, in the geography of Alevism and Bektashism issues such as the centre-periphery dichotomy in the sphere of religious control and authority (and definition of orthodoxy and heresy) as well as the patterns of socio-economic migration and settlement arrangements of the various *Kızılbaş* and Baba'î tribal groups (often a result of their religiously-instigated rebellions and inter-tribal relations) need to be considered first before forging schemas of Christian-Islamic heterodox continuity over the span of several centuries.

The suggestion that Kizlibash groups may have reached a religio-political rapprochement with Anatolian or Balkan Christian heretical groups on the basis of their shared non-conformist and anti-establishment ethos[20] remains a theoretical construct which would merit consideration only once it is supported by some concrete evidence. As

---

[19] See, for example, D. Marinov, "Narodna viara i religiozni narodni obichai", S*bornik za narodni umotvoreniia, nauka i knizhnina*, 28 (1914), pp. 423f. V. Marinov, *Deliorman (Iuzhna chast). Oblastno-geografsko izuchavane, (*Sofia: Self-published, 1941), pp. 54f., 79-80.

[20] See, for example, MÉLIKOFF,   "Recherches sur les composantes du syncrétisme Bektachi-Alevi", 59-60.

the matters stand, even the most obvious first step of exploring whether the Balkan Paulician communities which are recorded to have undergone full-scale or partial Islamization may have had any contacts with Kizli-bash groups has not been taken as yet.

Still, this is clearly a potentially rewarding venue of research worth pursuing, particularly regarding, for example, the territories of earlier medieval substantial Paulician settlements and activities in Cilicia and Cappadocia in central and eastern Asia Minor (more concentrated specifically in the Erzincan-Divriği-Sivas district) which became the centers of the Baba'î and *Kızılbaş* groups' activities and agitation during the Seljuk and Ottoman periods.[21] Similarly areas in Thrace and Macedonia in the Balkans which also had been repeatedly acknowledged in the medieval period as focuses of Christian heresy and heterodoxy in the Ottoman era characteristically display dense Bektashi network of settlements and cultic sites as well as active presence of Islamic heterodox groups. Localities in and around Philippopolis/Plovdiv in Thrace which were known for their sizeable Paulician communities in the medieval through the Ottoman eras, for example, became later also major focal points in the establishment and spread of Hurufism and its secretive

---

[21] See, for example, F. Cumont, 'Kizil Bash', in *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. by James Hastings, with the assist. of J. A. Selbie *et al*, vol. 7 (Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark ; New York : C. Scribner's Sons 1914), pp. 744-45 at p. 745; F. Köprülü, *Islam in Anatolia after the Turkish Invasion*, tr. ed. and intr. by G. Leiser (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press 1993), pp. 60n12, 72n46; M. Moosa, *Extremist Shiites: the ghulat sects* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1988), pp. 435ff.; I. Mélikoff, "Recherches sur les composantes du syncrétisme Bektachi-Alevi", in A. Gallotta and U. Marazzi (eds.), *Studia Turcologica—Memoriae Alexii Bombaci dicata,* Naples, 1982,   379–395; repr. in *idem*, *Sur le traces du soufisme turc. Recherches sur l'Islam populaire ena Anatolie*, Istanbul: Isis, 1992, pp. 41-61, at pp. 59-60; *idem*, 'Bektashi/*Kızılbaş*: Historical Bipartition and its Consequences', in T. Olsson, E. Özdalga and C. Raudvere, eds., *Alevi Identity: Cultural, Religious and Social Perspectives (*Istanbul: Swedish Research Institute, 1998), pp. 1-6, at p. 6; *idem*, *Hadji Bektach: un mythe et ses avatars: genèse et évolution du soufisme populaire en Turquie (Leiden: Brill, 1998)*, pp. 36-37, 163-64; *idem*, "Le gnosticisme chez les Bektachis/Alévis et les interférences avec d'autres mouvements gnostiques", in Veinstein, *Sycrétismes et heresies*, pp. 65-75, at pp. 69-71; A. Y. Ocak, 'Un aperçu général sur l''hétérodoxie musulmane en Turquie: réflexions sur les origines et les caractéristiques du Kizilbachisme (Alévisme) dans la perspective de l'histoire', in K. Kehl- Bodrogi, B. Kellner-Heinkele and A. Otter-Beaujean, eds., *Syncretistic Religious Communities in the Near East* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 198ff.

network in the Balkans in the sixteenth century.[22]   Similarly, the further study of any extant evidence that may potentially link the enduring presence of Christian heterodoxies and dualist heresy in the pre-Ottoman western Balkans and the Hamzevite movement and agitation of the Mālamī Shaykh Hamza of early Ottoman Bosnia-Herzegowina deserves attention and may bring some worthwhile results.[23] Still more potentially instructive data may emerge from further research on the various records of the rise, spread and rebellious activities of the early Ottoman-era trans-confessional and universalistic religio-political movement of Shaykh Badr al-Dîn (d. 1417/1420)   and its geography,[24] especially in the already mentioned Balkan areas of Christian heterodox presence and intermittent anti-clerical agitation.

Future research in these spheres certainly could enrich and transform our knowledge of the religious life and transmutations of the late Byzantine/Byzantine Commonwealth and early Ottoman periods in the Balkans and Anatolia but it is still severely hampered by the very insuf-

---

[22] On the concentration of Hurufism in Thrace and the Philipopolis area, see Mélikoff, *Hadji Bektach*, pp. 175, 237.

[23] On Shaykh Hamza, his movement and role in the history of *Malāmatiyya*, see T. OKIÇ, "Quelques documents inédits concernant les Hamzawites", in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Congress of Orientalists held in Istanbul September 15 to 27nd 1951*, vol. 2, Istanbul 1957, pp. 279-286; Colin IMBER, "Malāmatiyya", *Encyclopedia of Islam*, vol. 6, Leiden: Brill, 1991, pp. 227-28; H. T. Norris, *Islam in the Balkans: Religion and Society between Europe and the Arab World*, London: Hurst, 1993, pp. 116-19; D. Ćehajić, *Derviški redovi u jugoslovenskim zemljama sa posevnim osvrtom na Bosnu i Hercegovinu*, Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu, 1986, pp. 185-208; H. ALGAR, "The Hamzeviyye*:* A deviant movement in Bosnian Sufism", *Islamic Studies*, 36:2 (Islambad 1997), pp. 243-261; Slobodan ILIĆ, "Hamzeviiskaia i hurufitskaia eres v Bosni kak reaktsiia na politicheskiı krizis Ottomanskoi imperii vo vtoroi polovine XVI stoletiia", *Bulgarian Historical Review*, 28:1–2 (2000), pp. 34–40.

[24] Earlier studies of Shaykh Badr al-Din and his movement include Franz Babinger, "Schejch Bedr ed-Din, der Sohn des Richters von Simaw", *Der Islam*, 11 (1921) pp. 1-106, and Nedim Filipović, *Princ Musa i šejh Bedreddin*, Sarajevo: "Svjetlost", 1971; more recent studies include M. Balivet, *Islam mystique et révolution armée dans les Balkans ottomans: Vie du cheikh Bedreddin, le "Hallâj des Turcs", 1358/59-1416* (Istanbul: Isis, 1995); Dimitris Kastritsis, "The Revolt of Şeykh Bedreddin in the Context of the Ottoman Civil War of 1402-1413", in *Halcyon Days in Crete VII*, Rethymno: Crete University Press, PP. 221-238 (forthcoming). For arguments that heterodox Christian apocalypticism played a major role in the religio-political agitation in the Ottoman empire in the early sixteenth century, see K. Zhukov, "K istorii religioznykh dvizhenii v vostochnom sredizemnomor'e v XIV-XV vv.: novaiia interpretatsiia vosstaniia Berkliudzhe Mustafy v Turtsii (okolo 1415 g.)", *Pravoslavnyi Palestinskii Sbornik*, 98 (35) (1998), pp. 84-98.

ficient work on the various extant and not insubstantial number of manuscripts belonging to or relevant to Hurufism and the movements of Shaykh Hamza and Shaykh Badr al-Dîn. Of these manuscripts some have been studied and published (or are approaching publications stage) but a great number of them remain little-studied or virtually unexplored. Before the necessary textological and historical-critical work on these manuscripts has been carried out it would be very premature to leap to wide-ranging conclusions, as has been the case with statements in some scholarly studies, declaring that in Ottoman Thrace Bektashism was a successor to pre-Ottoman Christian heresies in the region,[25] that Bektashism implanted itself and became well-rooted in Balkan areas where crypto-Christianity used to thrive[26] or even that the religio-political ideology of Shaykh Badr al-Dîn's movement represented a blend of Bogomilism and Muslim mysticism.[27] Such general statements should not precede but follow and result from systematic work on the diverse types of relevant evidence (internal and external manuscript sources, inscriptions, funerary stele, reliable oral histories, etc.), otherwise, given their sweeping nature, they could be rather injudicious and misleading on the theoretical and practical level.

When finally de-ideologized, the promising but frequently biased and doctrinaire study of crypto-Christianity in the Ottoman-era Balkans and Anatolia[28] can also be of considerable importance for the exploration of the interaction of Alevism/Bektashism with normative, popular and heterodox Christianity. Generally, the steadily advancing research on the patterns of interchange and overlap in the spheres of cult and belief between the various local versions of Christianity and Islam in the Middle East, Caucasus, the Eastern Mediterranean, Balkans and Anatolia from the medieval to the modern periods has provided significant material and valuable observations with a number of direct implications for

---

[25] Eustratios Zenkines, *Ho bektasismos ste D. Thrake: symvole sten historia tes diadoseos tou Mousoulmanismou ston Helladiko choro*, Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1988, p. 249.

[26] Skendi, "Crypto-Christianity", pp. 249-50.

[27] P. Konstantinov, *Istoriia na Bŭlgariia*, Sofia: Feniks, 1993, p. 42.

[28] On the phenomenon of Crypto-Christianity in the Balkans and Anatolia, cf., for example, Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam*, vol. 2, pp. 469-74; R. M. Dawkins, "The Crypto-Christians of Turkey", *Byzantion*, 8 (1933), pp. 247-75; Skendi, 'Crypto-Christianity'; S. Dimitrov, "Skritoto khristiianstvo i isliamizatsionnite protsesi v osmanskata dŭrzhava", *Istoricheski pregled*, 2 (1987), pp. 18-34**; K.** Photiades, *Peges tes historias tou kryptochristianikou provlematos* (Ekdot. Oikos, 1997).

the study of Alevism and Bektashism. This is especially the case in the widely attested phenomena of shared sanctuaries, saints and saintly figures, feasts and various superstitious observances in popular Christianity and Islam in these areas, with such cross-religious borrowing and exchange being predictably and typically much more active and extensive at the popular rather than at the elite religious levels (although interchange at the latter level also took place on various occasions).

The study of Christian-Islam interaction and types of syncretism and symbiosis in the Ottoman period has been greatly enhanced by the expanding research on the role of dervish orders (including the Bektashi order) in the process of Ottoman colonization in newly conquered territories during which they came to use or took control of Christian churches, saints' tombs and sites of veneration.[29] Whether actual convergence with Christianity was sought or not, one of the consequences of this course of action, among other things, was the emergence of dual/mixed veneration cultic sites in the Balkans at some of which such sharing arrangements and observances still continue.[30] The miscellaneous evidence gathered and analyzed in previous and ongoing research on

---

[29] See Ömer L. Barkan, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğundu bir iskân ve kolonizasyon metodu olarak vakıflar ve temilikler. I: Istilâ devirlerinin Kolonizatör Türk dervişleri ve zaviyeleri", *Vakıflar Dergisi*, II (Ankara,1942), pp. 279-386; Irène Mélikoff, "Un ordre de derviches colonisateurs: les Bektaşis", repr. in *idem,Sur le traces du soufisme turc*, pp. 115-26; G. G. Arnakis, "Futuwwa Traditions in the Ottoman Empire. Akhis, Bektashi Dervishes, and Craftsmen", *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 12:4 (1953), pp. 243-44; Zenkines, *Ho bektasismos ste D. Thrake*, pp. 77-129; John D. Norton, 'The Bektashis in the Balkans', in Celia Hawkesworth, Muriel Heppell and Harry T. Norris (eds.), *Religious Quest and National Identity in the Balkans*, Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave, 2001, pp. 168-200, at pp. 185-188.

[30] See, for example, S. Dimitrov, 'Kŭm istoriiata na dobrudzhanskite dvuobredni svetilishta', *Dobrudzha*, 11 (1994), pp. 76-94; E. I. Germanova, 'Sŭborŭt pri Demir Baba teke – proiava na religiozen i kulturen sinkretizŭm', *Godishnik na muzeite ot Severna Bŭlgariia*, 20 (1994), pp. 297-313; P. Magnarella, 'St Nicholas in Christian and Muslim Lands', repr. in *Anatolia's Loom. Studies in Turkish Culture, Sociology, Politics and Law*, Istanbul, 1998, pp. 193-201; Ger Duijzings,"Christian Shrines and Muslim Pilgrims: Joint Pilgrimages and Ambiguous Sanctuaries", Chapter 3 in *idem*, *Religion and the Politics of Identity in Kosovo*. New York: Columbia University Press. 2000. pp. 65-85; D. Radionova, "Kum vuprosa za genezisa na dvuobrednite svetilishta v severo-iztochna Bŭlgariia prez XIV-XIX vek", *Nauchni Suobshteniia na SUB, klon Dobrich*, *Istoriia*, 3 (2001), pp. 160-171; E. Koneska and R. Jankulski, *Zaednichki svetilishta/Shared Shrines*, Skopje: Macedonia Center for Photography, 2009; Glen Bowman, "Orthodox-Muslim Interactions at 'Mixed Shrines' in Macedonia" in Chris Hann and Hermann Goltz (eds.), *Eastern Christians in Anthropological Perspective* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010, pp. 195-219.

these phenomena has been of direct relevance to some of the characteristic earlier arguments for a Christian impact on Bektashi and Alevi ritual, types of initiatory and rites-of passage practices, veneration of saintly and charismatic figures, celebration of Christian-like festivals and (adopted) saints. Such Christian influences have been sought, for example, in the Bektashi reception ceremony, with its distribution of bread wine, bread and cheese to novices and what various observers have interpreted as a Bektashi practice of the confession of sins and absolution.[31] Some early Western accounts of encounters with *Kızılbaş* groups describe them as observing practices resembling the Eucharist, the Christian kiss of peace and the Agape.[32] Occasionally Christian influences have been also sought in Alevi and Bektashi hierarchies[33] and the establishment of the celibacy for the *babas* in the Babagân branch of Bektashism as a result of the reforms of Balim Sultan (d. 1519) seen in such views as betraying the impact of Christian monasticism.[34] Parallels with Christianity have also been sought in the distinctive Alevi/Bektashi "trinity" of Allah, Mohammed and Ali and what some have construed as a Christ-like exaltation of Ali in Alevism and some other related heterodox traditions.[35] Future explora-

---

[31] Cf. for example, G. Jacob, 'Fortleben von antiken Mysterien und Alt-Christlichem in Islam', *Der Islam*, 2 (1) (1911), pp. 232-34; John K. Birge, *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes.* London: Luzac, 1937 (repr. 1994), pp. 215-16; R. Tschudi, 'Bektashiyya', in *Encyclopedia of Islam*, vol. 1, Leiden: Brill, 1960, p. 1162; H. Rinngren, 'The Initiation Ceremony of the Bektashis', in C. J. Bleeker (ed.), *Initiation: contributions to the theme of the study-conference of the International Association for the History of Religions held at Strasburg, September 17th to 22nd 1964* (Studies in the history of religions. Supplements to Numen 10), Leiden: Brill. 1965, pp. 202-208, p. 207; Mélikoff, "Recherches sur les composantes du syncrétisme Bektachi-Alevi" p. 42; *idem*, *Hadji Bektach*, pp. 160, 180.

[32] G. Nutting, "Mission to Central Turkey: Oorfa: Letter from Mr Nutting, 30 July 1860", *Missionary Herald*, 56 (November 1860), pp. 345-47; G. E. White, The Shia Turks", *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, 40, 1908, pp. 225-39, at p. 231; E. Huntington, "Through the Great Canon of the Euphrates River", *The Geographical Journal*, 20 (1902), pp. 175-200.

[33] See, for example, Cumont, 'Kizil Bash', pp. 744-45; Matti Moosa, *Extremist Shiites: the ghulat sects*, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1988, pp. 422-23.

[34] Cf., for example, Birge, *The Bektashi Order*, p. 216; Mélikoff, *Hadji Bektach*, pp. 154-61; Barnes, 'The Dervish Orders' pp. 36-37.

[35] On Alevi/Bektāşī teachings concerning the "trinity" of God, Mohammed and Ali, see, for example, Birge, *The Bektashi Orde*, pp.132ff; Moosa, *Extremist Shiites,* pp. 50ff.; Frederick De Jong, "The Iconography of Bektashism. A survey of themes and symbolism in clerical costume, liturgical objects and pictorial art", *Manuscripts of the Middle East,* vol. 4, 1989, pp. 8-9; K. Kehl-Bodrogi, *Die Kizilbaş/Aleviten. Untersuchungen über eine esoterische Glaubensgemeinschaft in Anatolien*, Berlin: K.

tion and synthesis (when ultimately accomplished) of the earlier and recently accumulated (and still growing) evidence of Ottoman-era Christian-Islamic interaction will offer a good base from which to assess the validity of these arguments and parallels as well as the attribution of these posited Christian traits in Alevism and Bektashism to the Bektashi association with the Janissaries and/or Bektashi missionary tactic to attract Christian converts with a more adaptable and recognizable system of belief and ritual.[36] In this context traditions recorded among some Bektashi groups[37] that their ancestors had been Christian should be assembled and their validity and provenance re-examined.

Virtually all of these purported Christian elements in Alevi and Bektashi teachings and observances, however, relate to normative and popular but not heretical dualist Christianity which rejected the Eucharistic theology and sacrament of the established church, the use of wine in church ritual and generally among its adherents (in the case of Bogomilism), professed Docetic Christology (which could not be reconciled with the incarnationist tendencies among the Alevis and some *ghulāt* and *ghulāt*-influenced traditions), conceptualized trinitarian cosmological and theological speculations (in the case of medieval Eastern Christian moderate dualism) which are at complete variance both with normative Christianity and the Trinitarian-like notions in Alevism/Bektashism (it is worth noting that medieval Christian radical dualism variant advanced

Schwarz Verlag, 1988, pp. 135-38; Norris, *Islam in the Balkans*, pp. 94ff.; Karin Vorhoff, *Zwischen Glaube, Nation und neuer Gemeinschaft. alevitische Identität in der Türkei der Gegenwart* (Berlin: K. Schwarz Verlag, 1995), pp. 64ff. For discussions of a potential Christian provenance of this trinity of God, Mohammed and Ali and what some see as a Christ-like exaltation of Ali in Alevi/Bektāşī teachings, see, for example, M. E. Grenard, "Une secte religieuse d'Asie Mineure: les Kyzyl-Bâchs", *Journal Asiatique*, ser. 10, 3 (1904), pp. 511-22; Moosa, *Extremist Shiites*, pp. 40-42; White, 'The Shia Turks', pp. 225-39; Mélikoff, 'L'Islam hétérodoxe en Anatolie', *Turkica* 14 (1982), pp. 142-154, at 151-153.

[36] Opinions on these issues still vary - see, for example, Birge, *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes*, pp. 215-16; Tschudi, 'Bektashiyya', p. 1162; Norton, 'The Bektashis in the Balkans', pp. 186-87; Skendi, 'Crypto-Christianity in the Balkan area under the Ottomans', pp. 249-50; D. P. Hupchick, *The Bulgarians in the Seventeenth Century, Slavic Orthodox Society and Culture Under Ottoman Rule,* Jefferson , N.C. and London: McFarlan, 1993, pp. 60-61; Moosa, *Extremist Shiites*, pp. 19-20, 48, 424-25, 430-31; Mélikoff, *Hadji Bektach*, pp. 153-54.

[37] M. Filipović, "The Bektashis in the District of Strumica (Macedonia)", *Man*, 54 (Jan 1954), pp. 10-13, at p. 11; on the oral traditions concerning the Christian origins of Alevis in the Deli Orman area, see F. de Jong, "Problems concerning the Origins of the Qizilbāş in Bulgaria: Remnants of the Safaviyya?", in *Convegno sul tema: La Shi'a nell'Impero Ottomano (Roma, 15 Aprile 1991)* (Rome: Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, 1993), pp. 203-16, at 207.

dyadic rather than triadic systems of supernatural principles which are even more far removed from the theology of orthodox Christianity and even the most unorthodox forms of Islam). Therefore, if future re-assessment of the above arguments for Alev/Bektashi interaction with Christianity (on the basis of the combined evidence of earlier and new research) confirms its impact on certain Alevi/Bektashi beliefs and ritual observances, the source of such an impact would have been certainly not heretical dualist Christian groups but normative Christianity, especially its popular versions which as elsewhere variously included a number of pre-Christian traditions and superstitious practices.

Any future scholarly quest for mainstream and heterodox Christian-related/influenced notions in Alevism and Bektashism also needs to take into consideration the characteristic mutability of Kızılbaşism/Alevism both in its belief and ritual systems which has over time integrated a variety of local traditions (deriving from folk versions of Islam and Christianity as well as pre-Christian and pre-Islamic traditions) in areas extending from the north-east Balkans to eastern Anatolia, where the religious processes can be indeed defined as "a permanent procedure of catalysis".[38] This permanent "catalysis" often makes the detection and dating of such locally-obtained elements and differentiation from the earliest and core layers in Alevism (and to some extent in Bektashism) a particularly challenging task. In an earlier investigation of the Ahl-e Haqq teachings and practices their belief system has been defined as "conglomerate-like" (comprising ancient animism and a solar cult, popular Mazdaism, Christian sectarian teachings, Islamic Shi'ite layers – Ismaili and Safavid-related). [39]A similar approach has been attempted to stratify the components of Alevi/ Kızılbaş syncretism[40] but the perceived emphasizing or deemphasizing of some of the strata of the "conglomerate" has attracted some criticism.[41] The contrasting and conflicting prioritizing of respectively, ancient Anatolian, pre-Islamic Turkic/Central Asia shamanistic, Shi'ite-related and Iranian (in Kurdish- and Zaza-speaking Alevi circles) layers in such a perceived Alevi conglomerate structure has also played a major role in recent and current Alevi identity

---

[38] Mélikoff, 'Bektashi/*Kızılbaş*', 6.

[39] V. Ivanow, *The Truth-Worshippers of Kurdistan*: *Ahl-i haqq Texts* (Bombay: Maṭba'-i Qādirī, 1950), pp. 31-75.

[40] Variously advanced in Mélikoff's studies of Alevism and Bektāşīsm but most systematically in Mélikoff, 'Recherches sur les composantes du syncrétisme Bektachi-Alevi' and and *idem, Hadji Bektach*, chap. 4.

[41] See, for example, the reviews of Mélikoff*, Hadji Bektach*, respectively by H. Algar, in the *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 36 (4) (2004), 687-689, and M. van Bruinessen, in *Turcica* 31 (1999), 549-553.

politics in Turkey and among the Alevi diasporas in Western Europe and North America.[42] The study of the antiquity, precedence and religious significance of these or other elements and strata in Alevi/Bektashi syncretism has acquired thus some topicality and importance in Alevi-focused historiographic, confessional, popular, media as well as internal Alevi discourses which need to be considered critically and cautiously.

A number of studies have drawn attention, moreover, to the existence of a possible Manichaean layer in Alevi/*Kızılbaş* teachings and practices, usually construed as traceable to the exposure to and adoption of Manichaeism by Central Asian Turkic groups, most consequentially, the Uighurs, after the ruling elite of the Uighur empire converted to Manichaeism converted to Manichaeism in 762 and it remained the official religion of the empire for more than a century. Parallels have been highlighted between the Manichaean prescription of the 'Three Seals' (the seals of mouth, hands and breast) and the Alevi/Bektashi triple rule: '*eline, diline, beline sahib olmak*', ('to be master of one's hand, tongue and one's loins') and its other variants, attested both in Anatolia and the Balkans.[43] Arguments have been advanced that further analogies between Manichaiesm and Alevism can be detected in the use of the notion and symbolism of light (especially in the sphere of prophetology), religious hierarchy and the practice of confession.[44] The analogies between the Manichaean

---

[42] See the summary of research and these different and contrasting approaches to the components of this Alevi "conglomerate structure" in Stoyanov, "Contested Post-Ottoman Alevi and Bektashi Identities", pp. 174-180.

[43] See C. Elsas, 'Religionsfreiheit für die türkisch-manichäisch-(pseudo)muslimischen Aleviten', in H. Preissler and H. Seiwert (eds.), *Gnosisforschung und religions-geschicgte. Festschrifte für Kurt Rudolph zum 65 Geburtstag*, Marburg: Diagonal Verlag, 1994, pp. 80-94, at pp. 85; Mélikoff , "Recherches sur les composantes du syncrétisme Bektachi-Alevi", pp. 56-57; *idem*, *Hadji Bektach*, pp. 163, 181; *idem*, "Hasluck's Study of the Bektashis and its Contemporary Significance", in Shankland, *Archaeology, Anthropology and Heritage*, pp. 297-308, at pp. 302; *idem*, "Le gnosticisme chez les Bektachis/Alévis et les interférences avec d'autres mouvements gnostiques", in Veinstein, *Sycrétismes et heresies*, pp. 65-75; at p. 67. The triple rule is attested not only in the Anatolian Alevi/Bektashi traditions but also in those in the Balkans in the version*: 'eline tek, diline pek, beline berk'*, see I. Georgieva (ed.), *Bŭlgarskite aliani. Sbornik etnograficheski materiali*, Sofia: UI "Sv. Kliment Okhridski", 1991, p. 93 (reference to material gathered during a field work among Alevi groups in the Deli Orman area undertaken in the 1980s).

[44] See Elsas, 'Religionsfreiheit', pp. 83-85; Mélikoff , 'Recherches sur les composantes du syncrétisme Bektachi-Alevi', 57; *idem*, *Hadji Bektach*, pp. 20-21, 163; *idem*, 'Hasluck's Study', pp. 302-305; *idem*, 'Le gnosticisme chez les Bektachis/Alévis', pp.

and Alevi (or Bektashi) religious hierarchy are inconclusive (the differences seem more pronounced than the similarities) and the same applies to the use of the symbolism and semantics of light in the cosmologies and prophetologies of the two systems. Regarding the "Triple Rule" one needs much more textual evidence from Central Asian Turkic Manichaean texts than the proponents of the thesis of Manchaean Turkic-Alevi/Bektashi affiliation usually offer, given the increasing availability and publications of such valuable Central Asian Turkic material.[45] Before such direct textual support from Central Asian Turkic sources is provided, the proposed "Triple Rule" connection remains a provisional and unsubstantiated theory. Further comparative textual study of the Central Asian Turkic Manichaean manuscripts and corresponding Alevi and Bektashi material (in areas such as religious terminology and phraseology) is certainly worth pursuing and has not been attempted in any more systematic fashion as yet – again, any general conclusions regarding the conjectured Manichaean Turkic-Alevi connections/analogies need to stem from, not precede such comparative study.

One of the characteristic traits of the earlier and current proponents of the Alevi/Bektashi-focused indigenization and "Islamic-Christian heterodox" continuity theses in South-Eastern Europe has been their general unawareness or deliberate disregard for the Shi'ite-related Islamic layers in Alevi/Bektashi syncretism as well as the ongoing debates regarding its variously reconstructed Turkic shamanic and archaic Iranian strata and even the above arguments for its absorption of Central Asian Manichaean Turkic notions and religious vocabulary. This selective or defective approach to Alevi/Bektashi problematic is accompanied by an inability to or lack of interest in applying the latest advances in research on heterodox religious minorities in the Middle East and the Levant and the important results of the increasing amount of work on their oral traditions and the refinement of oral history methodologies. Consequently, recent re-deployments of the Alevi/Bektashi indigeniza-

---

65-68. Cf. the cautious analysis of potential Manichaean- Alevi/Bektāşī interaction in A. Haas, *Die Bektaşi: Riten und Mysterien eines islamischen Ordens*, Berlin: Express edition, 1988, pp. 147-150.

[45] On the latest state of research on Central Asian Turkic Manichaean texts, see the relevant Turcological contributions in the recently published *Der östliche Manichäismus – Gattungs- und Werksgeschichte*, Z. Özertural and J. Wilkens (eds), Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2011. The Series Turkica of *Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum* envisages the publication of 3 volumes of Turkic Manichaean sources.

tion and Islamic-Christian heterodoxy continuity theses have been replete with major factual errors, ahistorical and anachronistic assertions and contentions, underpinned by simplistic and outdated methodologies.[46] Based to a large extent on recent fieldwork among Alevi communities in the Balkans, these publications actually present some valuable findings but the authors have chosen to mould this material into preconceived schemas of a postulated impact of Christian dualism (Bogomilism) on Alevism in the spheres of organizational hierarchy, sociopolitical attitudes, angelology, diabology, visionary mysticism and eschatology.[47] Virtually all of the presented arguments for such parallels and continuities are either anachronistic or theologically and historically unsustainable,[48] but inevitably have their impact on local public discourses on Alevism.

Other recent reinstatements of the thesis of original Christian dualist layers in Alevism in Turkey have actually gone so far as to falsify relevant primary sources for the history and teachings of medieval Eastern Christian dualist heresies.[49] To concoct such a Christian dualist strata in Alevism fragments of medieval source texts have been misused and mistranslated to prove a supposed direct continuity between Anatolian Paulicianism and Alevism in the spheres of organizational hierarchy, general religious vocabulary, communal network, sectarian assemblies and other related areas.[50] All these recent and continuing reinven-

---

[46] See, for exsample, R. Lipchev, 'Bŭlgarski ezicheski i khristiianski elementi v obredite, obichaite i poveriiata na kŭzŭlbashite v Severoiztochna Bŭlagriia', *Dobrudzha*, 2 (1985), pp. 136-145; *idem*, 'Bogomilski elementi, motivi i siuzheti v obichaino-obrednata sistema na bŭlgarskite aliani', *Dobrudzha*, 6 (1989), pp. 26-38; I. Kasabov, *Kŭzŭlbashite otvŭtre i otvŭn* (Silistra: Tibo, 2004), pp. 97-125.

[47] See especially, Lipchev, 'Bogomilski elementi', pp. 27, 28, 29-30, 31-32, 33-34; Kasabov, *Kŭzŭlbashite*, pp. 43, 59, 60, 70, 85, 146-148, 151-52.

[48] See the detailed analysis of these arguments for Christian dualist-Alevi continuities in Y. Stoyanov, "Early and Recent Formulations of Theories for a Formative Christian Heterodox Impact on Alevism", *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, December 2010, 37(3), pp. 261–272, at pp. 268-272.

[49] These fabrications of primary source evidence have been carried out in three successive books of E. Çınar, *Kayıp Bir Alevi Yılı*, Istanbul: Kalkedon Yayıları, 2007; *idem*, *Kayıp Bir Alevi Efsanesi*, Istanbul: Kalkedon Yayıları, 2007; *idem*, *Aleviliğin Kökleri* (Istanbul: Kalkedon Yayıları, 2008, as well as in a pirated and duly falsified edition of the anthology of translated primary sources in Hamilton, Hamilton and Stoyanov, *Christian Dualist Heresies* published by Kalkedon Yayıları in 2010 but subsequently withdrawn from the market for violation of copyright.

[50] See, for example, Çınar, *Kayıp Bir Alevi Efsanesi*, pp. 144, 145, 158; *idem*, *Aleviliğin Kökleri*, pp. 78, 140, 137, 142-143, 149. These falsifications of original textual evi-

tions of the early theories of the equation between Alevism and preceding Eastern Christian dualist heresies have direct implications for the ongoing competing discourses on the religious essence and affiliations of Alevism in Turkey, South-Eastern Europe and among the Alevi diaspora communities in Western Europe on whether Alevism should be defined as an authentic Islamic tradition, a secularizing current in Islam or an extra-Islamic confession.

Such debates regarding the Islamic or non-Islamic nature of Alevism are interestingly reminiscent of the scholarly controversies triggered by some scholars' recent assertions that the belief systems of the syncretistic religious minorities in Anatolia and the Near East have little or nothing in common with Islam, i. e. they are of a 'pseudo-Muslim' character.[51] The transfer of concepts such as "heresy" and "syncretism" from external scholarly to internal Alevi discourse to define Alevi religious identity has been observed in some recent studies of Alevism and Islamic heresiography in general[52] and this process may be also of relevance to the internal Alevi debates over the Islamic or non-Islamic character of Alevism.

The above ongoing attempts to verify the existence of Balkan and Anatolian dualist layers in Alevism respectively have also aimed to prioritize them as the historically and theologically original strata in Alevi teachings and practices. The outdated and arbitrary techniques used to mould and fix the evidence in rigid preconceived models of the

---

dence have been analyzed in H. Aksut, H. Harmancı and Ünsal Öztürk , *Alevi Tarıh Yazmında Skandal* (Istanbul: Yurt Kıtap, 2010) and Stoyanov, "Early and Recent Formulations of Theories", pp. 271-272.

[51] Klaus Muller, *Kulturhistorische Studien zur Genese pseudo-islamischer Sektengebilde in Vorderasien*, Wiesbaden, F. Steiner, 1967, chs. 2 and 3; Elsas, 'Religionsfreiheit für die türkisch-manichäisch-(pseudo)muslimischen Aleviten', Hamzeh'ee, 'Methodological Notes on Interdisciplinary Research on Near Eastern Religious Minorities', in Kehl-Bodrogi, *et al.*, *Syncretistic Religious Communities,* pp. 119-39, at pp. 108-109; Barnes, 'The Dervish Orders in the Ottoman Empire', pp. 34, 35.

[52] See the observations of this process in Robert Langer and Udo Simon, "The Dynamics of Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy. Dealing with Divergence in Muslim Discourses and Islamic Studies", *Die Welt des Islams: International Journal for the Study of Modern Islam* 48 (2008), pp. 273-288, at pp. 285-288; Janina Karolewski, 'What is Heterodox About Alevism? The Development of Anti-Alevi Discrimination and Resentment', *Die Welt des Islams: International Journal for the Study of Modern Islam* 48 (2008), pp. 434-456, at pp. 455-456; M. Dressler, 'How to Conceptualize Inner-Islamic Plurality/Difference: 'Heterodoxy' and 'Syncretism' in the Writings of Mehmet F. Köprülü (1890–1966)', *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 2010, 37(3), pp. 241-260, at pp. 258-259.

first approach and the outrageous violation of textual sources to forge false historical and religious data ventured in the second approach have not offered any new primary sources-based or theoretical support to the case for the existence of such layers in Alevism – if anything it has weakened it and has compromised further such ideologically-warped treatments of the problematic. Such opportunistic reinstatements of obsolete nineteenth-century historiographic models should not, of course, prejudice the further scholarly quest for evidence of the potential interaction of Alevism/Bektashism with Christian heterodoxies in the Ottoman-era Anatolia and Balkans.

Indeed the evolving study of Ottoman and post-Ottoman *Kızılba-şlık* and Bektāşīsm has continued to bring new material and observations to spheres which could shed a new light on the interaction of heterodox and popular forms of Christianity and Islam in the Ottoman era. The most promising of these spheres concern some telling points of analogies (and potential contact) between the cosmogonies, anthropogonies and satanologies of popular and heterodox Christianity and Islam in the Balkans and Anatolia[53] whose study will need a methodologically balanced and prudent approach. It will also need some methodological and terminological clarity given the ambiguous and potentially misleading methodological approaches and terminology in earlier and some current studies of the problematic. In the Middle Ages both the Eastern and Western Churches generally tended to condemn medieval dualist heresies as a resurgence of the old dualist rival of the early Church, Manichaeism, and accordingly drew on relevant patristic texts in their polemics against Christian dualism. Adopting such clear-cut definitions from medieval Christian heresiology can lead to very erroneous conclusions. When such medieval descriptions of Paulicianism as a "Manichaean heresy" are quoted uncritically and then Paulicianism is conjectured to have exercised an impact on Alevism, a fictitious Manichaean chain of transmission can be constructed and claims for "Manichaean" layers in Alevism/Bektashism accordingly advanced without any concrete evidence. Indeed differing readings of references to the Paulicians in Armenian and Byzantine sources have led to conflicting conclusions as to whether they were originally dualist or whether after initially adhering to Adoptionist but non-dualist teachings some Paulician groups embraced dualism later in their history.[54] Symptomitically, when

---

[53] Y. Stoyanov, 'Islamic and Christian Heterodox Cosmogonies'; *idem*, 'On Some Parallels', pp. 101-118; *idem*, 'Early and Recent Formulations', pp. 269-270;

[54] See the summary of research and scholarly debate on the original nature of religious evolution of Paulicianism in Y. Stoyanov, 'The Interchange between Religious Hetero-

proposing a potential Paulician impact on Islamic heterodox groups in Asia Minor and Upper Mesopotamia, Ivanov was referring mostly to a late eighteenth-century text of Adoptionist and non-dualist character, *The Key of Truth*,[55] whose provenance and authenticity have been questioned in recent scholarship. But this text, being representative of an Adoptionist and non-dualist current in Armenian heterodoxy, clearly cannot be used to substantiate a Paulician dualist impact on Alevism or any other Near Eastern Islamic heterdox groups which has been done on occasions.[56] Furthermore, the Alevi/Bektashi teachings focused on man's ultimate aim to awake from the sleep of unconsciousness and be brought back to his divine origin is not sufficient to define Alevism/Bektashism as a Gnostic creed[57] where indeed salvation is reached by knowledge (*gnosis*) about the origins of the inner self in the spiritual realm. Gnostic systems, however, develop also a theological and anti-cosmic dualism which is notably absent in Alevism/Bektashism but is one of the main characteristics of medieval Christian dualism. The absence of such type of Gnostic or Gnostic-related theological dualism in Alevism/Bektashism needs to be emphasized but regrettably the differentiation between the existence of "gnosis" and non-existence of Gnostic theology proper in Alevism/Bektashism is rarely made.[58] Furthermore, nineteenth-century evidence and developments in Alevism and Bektashism (when the latter in particular was opened to Western influences) need to be treated cautiously and critically. Such notions detectable in nineteenth-century Albanian Bektashism[59], for example, which

doxies in the Balkans and Caucasus - the Case of the Paulicians', in I. Biliarsky, O. Cristea and A. Oroveanu (eds.), *The Balkans and Caucasus: Parallel Processes on the Opposite Sides of the Black Sea*, Cambridge 2012, pp. 106-116.

[55]Published by F. C. Conybeare, ed. and tr., *The Key of Truth: a Manual of the Paulician Church of Armenia*, Oxford 1898. For arguments regarding its influence on Islamic heterodoxy in Asia Minor and Upper Mesopotamia see IVANOW, *The Truth-Worshippers*, pp. 50-57, and Moosa, *Extremist Shiites*, pp. 439-42.

[56] For such treatment of the *The Key of Truth*, see, for example, Mélikoff, *Hadji Bektach*, pp. 164, 194; *idem*, 'Le gnosticisme chez les Bektachis/Alévis', p. 74.

[57] Mélikoff, 'Le gnosticisme chez les Bektachis/Alévis', *passim*; *idem*, 'Universalisme et gnosticisme dans les heterodoxies du proche et du moyen-orient', *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 26 (2) (2002), pp. 135- 154, *passim*; *idem*, 'Hasluck's Study', pp. 304-305.

[58] This important distinction was made, for example, by A. Gökalp, *Têtes rouges et bouches noires. Une confrérie tribale de l'Ouest anatolien*, Paris 1980, pp. 176-182.

[59] See V.L.Guidetti, *Elementi dualistici e gnostici della religione bektashi in Albania fra il XVII e il XIX secolo*, in G. Sfameni Gasparro (a cura di), *Destino e salvezza tra culti pagani e gnosi cristiana (Itinerari storico-religiosi sulle orme di Ugo Bianchi)*, Cosenza 1998, pp. 239-264.

could be construed as reminiscent of Gnostic or dualist traditions may be the result of such external impact whose likelihood should be assessed first before being projected back to the earlier religious history of Alevism and Bektashism in the Ottoman empire.

The objective appraisal of the question of the existence of dualist layers in Alevism/Bektashism is thus of some importance not only to the field of the study of Islamic heterodoxy during the Ottoman period but also the current instrumentalization of the problematic in the dialogue and interchange between theological, scholarly and internal Alevi discourses on Alevism and Bektashism in South-Eastern Europe and Turkey. It will also contribute to the further exploration of important wider spheres of the medieval and Ottoman-era religious and cultural history of the Balkans and Asia Minor which will need to be better integrated into the study of Mediterranean Europe and the Near East during these periods and within the corresponding spheres of research which have enjoyed a rather impressive progress and the application of new and original research methodologies in the last decades.

Yuri STOYANOV

MANICHAEAN AND EASTERN CHRISTIAN DUALIST ELEMENTS IN ALEVISM AND BEKTASHISM – EVIDENCE AND CONJECTURES

- s u m m a r y -

The article reassesses the problem of the purported existence of earlier Manichaean and/or later, medieval Eastern Christian dualist layers in Ottoman Alevism (*Alevilik)*/Kızılbaşism (*Kızılbaşlık*) and Bektashism. It offers a reappraisal of the early historiographical models advanced to postulate the presence and provenance of such strata in Alvism and Bektashism as well as newly published studies focused largely or in passing on their ritual and belief systems. These earliest and most recent theories and conjectures are re-examined against the background of the current state of knowledge and research on the interaction and interchange between heterodox forms of Islam and Christianity in the late Byzantine and early Ottoman era.

Florin CURTA

University of Florida

WERE THERE ANY SLAVS IN SEVENTH-CENTURY MACEDONIA?

Ever since the 1970s, the common opinion among historians has been that following the Avar and Slavic raids into the central Balkans (culminating in the first three sieges of Thessalonica mentioned in the *Miracles of St. Demetrius*), the Slavs settled in the lands now within the Republic of Macedonia.[1] Beginning with the 630s, the lands in western Macedonia between the present-day cities of Veles, Prilep, Bitola, Kičevo, Debar, Ohrid, and Prespa were occupied by the Berzetes, a tribe mentioned in the second book of the *Miracles of St. Demetrius* as participating in a large alliance of Slavic tribes bent on conquering Thessalonica.[2] They formed a *sklavinia* known to later Byzantine sources as

---

[1] Boško Babić, "Arheološki tragovi iz antičkog i srednjevekovnog perioda u Prilepskom kraju," in *Varvarske migracije u jugoistočnoj Evropi i nijhov odnos prema autohtonoj populaciji. Referati i koreferati*, edited by Danica Dimitrijević (Belgrade: Arheološko društvo Jugoslavije/Narodni Muzej Prilep, 1972), 21-38, at 27; Бранко Панов, "Охрид и Охридската област во првите векови по словенската колонизација (VI-VIII век)," *Годишен зборник. Философски факултет на Универзитетот Скопје* 30 (1976-1977), no. 4, 119-136, at 123; Boško Babić, "Ohrid, Byzanz und die Slawen in Mazedonien," in *Welt der Slawen. Geschichte, Gesellschaft, Kultur*, edited by Joachim Herrmann (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1986), pp. 83-88; Бошко Бабич, "Раннесредневековые славянские поселения на территорий Социалистической Республики Македонии," in *Труды Международного конгресса археологов-славистов, Киев 18-25 сентября 1985 г.*, edited by Petro P. Tolochko (Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1988), pp. 195-196.

[2] *Miracles of St. Demetrius* II 1.180, edited by Paul Lemerle (Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1979), p. 175. See Mitko B. Panov, "On the Slav colonization and the ethnic changes in Macedonia by the end of the 6th and the

Berzitia.[3] This scenario remains to this day generally accepted, at least in Macedonia, despite a number of recent studies directly challenging the notion of a Slavic settlement in the Balkans shortly after AD 600, and inviting a more nuanced interpretation of the *Miracles of St. Demetrius*.[4] Equally important in this respect has been the re-evaluation of the archaeological evidence in the western Balkans (Albania, Montenegro, and the Dalmatian coast of Croatia) pertaining to the seventh century.[5] It is worth taking therefore a fresh look at the old thesis of the Macedonian historiography in the light of those new approaches and ideas.

---

first half of the 7th century," *Balcanica Posnaniensia* 11-12 (2001), 23-33, at 27. According to Boško Babić, the Berzetes lived within the vast territory between the Vardar River and the Adriatic Sea. See Boško Babić, "Badania w zakresie archeologii słowiańskiej w Republice Macedonii od 1965 do 1995 roku," *Slavia Antiqua* 37 (1996), 73-88, at 87.

[3] Babić, "Arheološki tragovi," p. 123. See also Pananos Sophoulis, *Byzantium and Bulgaria, 775-831* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012), p. 94. For *Sklaviniai*, see Evangelos K. Chrysos, "Settlements of Slavs and Byzantine sovereignty in the Balkans," in *Byzantina Mediterranea. Festschrift für Johannes Koder zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by Klaus Belke, Ewald Kislinger, Andreas Külzer and Maria Stassinopoulou (Vienna: Böhlau, 2007), pp. 123-135; Florin Curta, "*Sklaviniai* and ethnic adjectives: a clarification," *Byzantion Nea Hellás* 30 (2011), 85-98.

[4] Florin Curta, The Making of the Slavs. History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube Region, c. 500-700 (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Αμαλία Κ. Ηλιάδι, Τα θαύματα του Αγίου Δημητρίου ως ιστορικές πηγές. Επιδρομές και Σλαβικές εποικίσεις εντεύθεν του Δουνάβεος (Trikala: Vogiatzouglou Thrasyvoulos, 2003); Florin Curta, "Etnicitet u ranosrednjovjekovnoj arheologiji: primjer ranoslavenskih nalaza u jadranskoj regiji," Starohrvatska prosvjeta 37 (2010), 17-48; Florin Curta, "Still waiting for the barbarians? The making of the Slavs in 'Dark-Age' Greece," in Neglected Barbarians, edited by Florin Curta (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), pp. 403-478.

[5] Etleva Nallbani, "La civilisation de 'Komani' de l'Antiquité tardive au Haut Moyen Age," Ph. D. Dissertation, Université de Paris-I Sorbonne (Paris, 2002); William Bowden, *Epirus Vetus. The Archaeology of a Late Antique Province* (London: Duckworth, 2003); Etleva Nallbani, "Transformations et continuité dans l'ouest des Balkans: le cas de la civilisation de Komani (VIe-IXe siècles)," in *L'Illyrie méridionale et l'Epire dans l'Antiquité. IV. Actes du IVe colloque international de Grenoble, 10-12 octobre 2002*, edited by Pierre Cabanes and Jean-Luc Lamboley (Paris: De Boccard, 2004), pp. 481-490 ; Danijel Dzino, *Becoming Slav, Becoming Croat. Identity Transformation in Post-Roman and Early Medieval Dalmatia* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010); Although rich in information regarding new excavations in southwestern Montenegro, Đorđe Janković's book (*Српско Поморје од 7. до 10. столећа* [Belgrade: Srpsko arheološko društvo, 2007]) must be used with great caution, given the author's notoriously nationalist slant.

The second book of the *Miracles of St. Demetrius* was written by an unknown author at some point during the last two decades of the seventh century.[6] To him, the Slavs were savage, brutish, heathen barbarians. However, he also calls them repeatedly "our Slavic neighbors," who lived so close to the city that, after the imperial troops chased them from the coastal region, the inhabitants of Thessalonica—men, women, and children—walked to their abandoned villages and carried home all provisions left behind.[7] Conversely, those who besieged Thessalonica at some point during the first decade of Emperor Heraclius' reign (610-641) are said to have brought with them their families, for "they had promised to establish them in the city after its conquest."[8] This strongly suggests that the "multitude of tribes" mentioned by the author of Book II—Drugubites, Sagudates, Belegezites, Baiunetes, and Berzetes—came from the surrounding countryside, not from afar.[9] There are several cross-references to some of those tribes in Book II, but not to the Berzetes. For example, during the siege of 677, the Belegezites, who lived at that time near Thebes and Demetrias, did not participate in the revolt of the Rynchines, the Sagudates, and the Drugubites, but instead supplied the besieged city with grain.[10] The Berzetes do not appear anywhere else in the *Miracles of St. Demetrius*. Could they, like the Belegezites, have meanwhile moved from the vicinity of Thessalonica to a greater distance

---

[6] Paul Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils des Miracles de Saint Démétrius et la pénétration des Slaves dans les Balkans. II: Commentaire* (Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1981), p. 172; О. В. Иванова, "Чудеса Св. Димитрия Солунского," in *Свод древнейших письменных известии о славянах*, edited by Sergei A. Ivanov, Gennadii G. Litavrin and Vladimir K. Ronin (Moscow: "Vostochnaia literatura" RAN, 1995), pp. 91-211, at 200.

[7] *Miracles of St. Demetrius* II 3.219, 3.222, and 4.231, pp. 194 and 208.

[8] *Miracles of St. Demetrius* II 1.180, p. 175. For the date of the fourth siege of Constantinople, see Франјо Баришић, *Чуда Димитрија Солунског као историски извори* (Belgrade: Srpska Akademija Nauka, 1953), pp. 86-95; Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils*, pp. 91-94.

[9] *Miracles of St. Demetrius* II 1.179, p. 175.

[10] *Miracles of St. Demetrius* II 4.254 and 4.268, pp. 214 and 218. Both Thebes and Demetrias are mentioned in the text. An *archon* of the Belegezites named Tichomiros appears on an eighth- or early ninth-century seal, for which see Werner Seibt, "Siegel als Quelle für Slawenarchonten in Griechenland," *Studies in Byzantine Sigillography* 6 (1999), 27-36, at 28. A second *archon* of the Belegezites, a man named Akamiros, is mentioned in the sources for attempting in 799 to release the sons of Constantine V from their exile in Athens and to proclaim one of them as emperor (Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia*, edited by Carl de Boor, vol. 2 [Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1885], pp. 473-474).

from the city, namely to western Macedonia? Theoretically, this is of course possible, but there is nothing in the *Miracles of St. Demetrius* to support such an interpretation. In locating the Berzetes between Ohrid, Bitola, and Prilep, Paul Lemerle followed the Czech archaeologist Lubor Niederle.[11] The basis of this interpretation seems to be a passage in Theophanes's *Chronographia* mentioning a region named Berzitia, which Telerig, the ruler of Bulgaria, was about to capture in 774 in order to "transfer its inhabitants to Bulgaria."[12] Leaving aside the fact that there is absolutely no geographical indication in Theophanes as to where Berzitia may have been located (although one may assume that it could not have been too far from the late eighth-century borders of Bulgaria), the connection between the Berzetes and Berzitia is unwarranted, since it is purely linguistic. The inhabitants whom Telerig wanted to move to Bulgaria are never called Berzetes, and it simply cannot be assumed that Berzitia was called so because of being (or, at least, having been at one point in time) populated by Berzetes. Moreover, even if Berzitia took its name from the Berzetes, it cannot be located in present-day Macedonia. Judging from the surprise attack, which in retaliation to Telerig's plans, Emperor Constantine V launched on Bulgaria, one would expect Berzitia to have been closer to the theme of Thrace, perhaps within the area between the Struma and the Marica, which in 788 became the theme of Macedonia.[13] At any rate, Berzitia is not mentioned as a *sklavinia* in any Byzantine source.[14] The only time the Berzetes are mentioned in the *Miracles of St. Demetrius*, they appear to be familiar to the author of

---

[11] Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils*, p. 90, citing Lubor Niederle, *Manuel de l'antiquité slave. L'histoire* (Paris: Champion, 1923), p. 106.

[12] Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia*, p. 447; English translation from Cyril Mango and Roger Scott (transl.), *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor. Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284-813* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), p. 617.

[13] Sophoulis, *Byzantium*, p. 98. If the Berzetes of the early seventh century were somewhere around Thessalonica, it makes more sense to look for Berzitia in southern Macedonia, i.e., within Greek Macedonia.

[14] Gennadii Litavrin's interpretation of Berzitia as a Sklavinia is based both on a misunderstanding of Theophanes' text and a confusion between Berzetes and Bel(ege)zetes, which goes back to Max Vasmer, *Die Slaven in Griechenland* (Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1941), pp. 85 and 177. Litavrin specifically mistook Akamiros, the *archon* of the Belegezites, to be a ruler of Berzitia. See Геннадий Г. Литаврин, "Славинии VII-IX вв. Социально-политические организации славян," in *Этногенез народов Балкан и северного Причерноморья. Лингвистика, история, археология*, edited by Samuil B. Bernshtein and L. A. Gindin (Moscow: Nauka, 1984), pp. 193-203, at 200.

Book II, an indication that they may have not lived too far from walls of Thessalonica. Had they then moved to western Macedonia, it is remarkable that the author of Book II had no knowledge of their new whereabouts, even though he had good information about the Belegezites, who had meanwhile moved at an equally long distance from Thessalonica. Be as it may, there is no subsequent mention of the Berzetes, and no source locates them in the lands now within the Republic of Macedonia.

No doubt aware that there was nothing in the written sources about an early presence of the Slavs in Macedonia, Boško Babić turned to the archaeological evidence. The 1966 excavations inside the early Byzantine fort in Debrešte, near Prilep, have produced evidence of a later occupation of the site in the form of a number of sunken-floored buildings with stone ovens, as well as handmade pottery, including fragments of clay pans. The plan of only one house has been published, but without any of the associated finds. On the basis of a hasty comparison with a few selected sunken-floored buildings from sites in Ukraine and Slovakia, Babić attributed the house in Debrešte to the so-called Prague culture supposedly belonging to the early Slavs.[15] In reality, in the absence of any associated finds, it is impossible to assess the date of the house, for houses like that in Debrešte are known from later centuries as well. Nor can the presence of clay pans be an indication of an early, presumably seventh-century date. Despite Babić's claims to the contrary, clay pans appear comparatively later in the central and southern Balkans than in the regions north of the Danube River, in which early Byzantine authors placed the sixth-century Sclavenes.[16] The few specimens found in recent times in Macedonia are all stray finds from sites that were apparently re-occupied during the tenth and eleventh cen-

---

[15] Babić, "Badania," 75 and 75 fig. 1.1. For a critique of the concept of "Prague culture," see Florin Curta, "The Prague type: a critical approach to pottery classification," *Archaeologia Bulgarica* 5 (2001), no. 1, 73-106.

[16] Boško Babić, "Crepulja,crepna, podnica-posebno značajan oslonac za atribuciju srednjovekovnih arheoloških nalazišta balkanskog poluostrova slovenima poreklom sa istoka," in *Varvarske migracije u jugoistočnoj Evropi i nijhov odnos prema autohtonoj populaciji. Referati i koreferati*, edited by Danica Dimitrijević (Belgrade: Arheološko drustvo Jugoslavije/Narodni Muzej Prilep, 1972), pp. 101-123. Equally problematic is the seventh-century date attributed to the handmade pottery accidentally found in Star Karaorman, Štip, and Berovo, for which see Звонко Белдедовски, *Брегалничкиот басен во римскот и раниот средновековен период* (Štip: Zavod za zashtita na spomenicite na kult, 1990), pp. 75-76; 46 fig. 33; 48 fig. 35; 49 fig. 38.

turies.[17] In southwestern Serbia, at Pazarište near Novi Pazar, clay pans have been found in several houses together with typically tenth- and eleventh-century artifacts, such as double-handled jugs with incised signs and Middle Byzantine *engolpia*.[18]

Nonetheless, a number of finds *can* be dated with a great degree of confidence to the seventh century, although they require an interpretation very different from that until now accepted by most archaeologists and historians. Three coin hoards are known from seventh-century Macedonia, all to the east of the river Vardar. The first one was found in the 1930s in Valandovo and is a collection of some 40 gold coins, the latest of which have been struck for Emperor Heraclius between 613 and 629.[19] The structure of the coin assemblage is very similar to that of two other hoards of gold found in the eastern Balkans, in which the latest coins have also been minted between 613 and 629.[20] One of them (Çatalca) was found only 43 km away from Constantinople, and contained 152 coins, which was a considerable amount of wealth, perhaps belonging to a high-ranking officer of the Roman army. The same may be true for the Valandovo hoard. Unfortunately, the exact location and circumstances of its finding remain unknown, but another hoard most certainly comes from the ruins of the early Byzantine fort next to the city, at Hisar (Kula).[21] This second hoard consists of ten silver coins—five hexagrams struck for Heraclius, and five for Constans II, the latest

---

[17] Виктор Лилчиќ, "Научно-истражувацки проект северо-западна Македонија во доцната антика и средниот век. Полог, Кичевија, Порече," *Македонско наследство* 2 (1996), 53-84, at 66 (Stenče near Gostivar) and 80 (Modrište near Poreče). This is also the case of Debrešte: the early Byzantine site was occupied betwen ninth and the eleventh centuries by an open settlement with sunken-floored buildings and an inhumation cemetery. See Witold Hensel and Jadwiga Rauhutowa, "Archaeological research at Debrešte (Macedonia) 1974-1978," *Archaeologia Polona* 20 (1981), 191-225, at 212-216.

[18] Марко Поповић, *Тврђава Рас* (Belgrade: Arheološki Institut, 1999), pp. 142-145, 147-149, and 150-151; 143 fig. 89.12, 13; 145 fig. 92.1-5, 8.

[19] Ivan Mikulčić, Spätantike und frühbyzantinische Befestigungen in Nordmakedonien. Städte-Vici-Refugien-Kastelle (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2002), p. 112.

[20] Cécile Morrisson, Vladislav Popović, and Vujadin Ivanišević, *Les trésors monétaires byzantins des Balkans et d'Asie Mineure (491-713)* (Paris: Lethielleux, 2006), pp. 118-119 (Çatalca) and 141 (Nesebăr).

[21] Весна Радић, "Налаз сребрног новца царева Ираклија и Констанса из збирке Народног Музеја у Београду," *Нумизматичар* 17 (1994), 75-84, at 78-80. For sixth-century coin finds from Hisar, see Mikulčić, *Spätantike und frühbyzantinische Befestigungen*, p. 450.

between 659 and 668.[22] In the Balkans, there is only one other hoard of silver struck for Emperor Constans II, that from Valea Teilor, in northern Dobrudja. However, there was only one hexagram of Constans II in that hoard.[23] Valandovo II is therefore a unique assemblage for the entire region of the Balkans. A third hoard found in Gradec near Vinica consisted of some 60 solidi and tremisses, the latest of which is a coin struck for Emperor Constans II, possibly between 662 and 667.[24] Gradec may be compared to the very large hoard of gold struck for Emperor Constans II, which was found in 1876 or 1877 within the Asklepieion in Athens. There were 234 coins in the Athens hoard, four times more than in Gradec.[25] Like Çatalca, this considerable amount of gold must be regarded as the fortune of a well-to-do person. Given that the unusually large number of copper coins of Constans II found in Athens have been attributed to the military preparations preceding the mobilization of the fleet for the emperor's campaign to Italy, it is likely that the Asklepieion hoard may also be related to the presence of the Byzantine military, perhaps even attributed to a high-ranking officer of the fleet.[26] At any rate, finds of gold and silver coins struck for Emperor Constans II are extremely rare in the Balkans.[27] The cluster of no less than three hoards in

---

[22] Morrisson, Popović, and Ivanišević, *Les trésors monétaires*, p. 201.

[23] Ernest Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Monede bizantine din secolele VII-X descoperite în nordul Dobrogei," *Studii şi cercetări de numismatică* 7 (1980), 163-165, at 164-165.

[24] Maja Hadži-Maneva, "Coin hoards from the late 6th and 7th century discovered in the Republic of Macedonia," in Byzantine Coins in Central Europe Between the 5th and 10th Century. Proceedings from the Conference Organized by the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences and the Institute of Archaeology of the University of Rzeszów under the Patronage of Union Académique International (Programme No. 57 Moravia Magna), Kraków, 23-26 IV 2007, edited by Marcin Wołoszyn (Cracow: Institute of Archaeology University of Rzeszów, 2009), pp. 47-56, at 51. Only 32 coins have survived and are now in the Numismatic Collection of the National Bank of the Republic of Macedonia.

[25] Morrisson, Popović, and Ivanišević, *Les trésors monétaires*, p. 227.

[26] Florin Curta, "Byzantium in Dark-Age Greece (the numismatic evidence in its Balkan context)," *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 29 (2005), 113-146, at 118-119.

[27] Only two other gold coins are known from unknown locations in Bosnia and Dobrudzha, respectively. See Ivan Mirnik and Andrej Šemrov, "Byzantine coins in the Zagreb Archaeological Museum Numismatic Collection. Anastasius I (A.D. 497-518)-Anastasius II (A.D. 713-715)," *Vjesnik Arheološkog Muzeja u Zagrebu* 30-31 (1997-1998), 129-258, at 199; Gheorghe Poenaru-Bordea and Radu Ocheşeanu, "Tezaurul de monede bizantine de aur descoperit în săpăturile arheologice din anul 1899 de la Axiopolis," *Buletinul Societăţii Numismatice Române* 77-79 (1983-1985), nos. 131-133, 177-197, at 193-194. Similarly, only one other hexagram is known from Silistra (Bulgaria), for which see Ernest Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Monnaies byzantines des VIIe-

Macedonia—two of them found on one and the same site, and two with latest coins struck for Emperor Constans II—is therefore unlikely to be an accident of research. Their analogies in the Balkans strongly suggest that the three hoards were valuables of high-ranking members of the Byzantine society, possibly officers in the army. The fact that one of those hoards was found within the ruins of an early Byzantine fort substantiates that suggestion. Could the fort in Hisar near Valandovo have still been occupied during the seventh century? In the absence of systematic archaeological excavations, it is impossible to answer that question. However, there are clear signs of a seventh-century occupation on several sites in western Macedonia, especially on and around the northern shore of Lake Ohrid.

Trial excavations, between 1952 and 1954, in the prehistoric cemetery near the village of Trebeništa produced a belt buckle of the Boly-Želovce class.[28] Such buckles have been found primarily in the circum-Mediterranean region and are imitations of luxury (i.e., gold) specimens, such as found in the Kratigos hoard.[29] In the Balkans, buckles of the Boly-Želovce class appear primarily in the coastal regions of Greece and Albania, which were most likely in Byzantine hands during the seventh century.[30] To the same direction points the pair of earrings

Xe siècles découvertes Silistra, dans la collection de l'académicien Péricle Papahagi, conservées au Cabinet des Médailles du Musée National d'Histoire de Roumanie," *Cercetări numismatice* 7 (1996), 97-127, at 120.

[28] Васил Лахтов, "Археолошко ископување на Требенишко кале кај селото Требениште-Охридско 1953-1954 година," *Лихнид. Годишен зборник на Народниот музеј во Охрид* 2-3 (1959), 23-24; pl. VI.1.

[29] Ursula Ibler, "Pannonische Gürtelschnallen des späten 6. und 7. Jahrhunderts," *Arheološki vestnik* 43 (1991), 135-148, at 140; Vladimír Varsik, "Byzantinische Gürtelschnallen im mittleren und unteren Donauraum im 6. und 7. Jahrhundert," *Slovenská Archeológia* 40 (1992), no. 1, 77-103, at 89. The Kratigos hoard includes 32 solidi, 28 of which have been struck in Constantinople for Emperor Heraclius, the latest between 616 and 625. See Isabella Baldini Lippolis, *L'oreficeria nell'impero di Costantinopoli tra IV e VII secolo* (Bari: EdiPuglia, 1999), pp. 229 and 37; Morrisson, Popović, and Ivanišević, *Les trésors monétaires*, pp. 386-387.

[30] J. Travlos and Alison Frantz, "The church of St. Dionysios the Areopagite and the palace of the archbishop of Athens in the 16th century," *Hesperia* 34 (1965), no. 3, 157-202, at 167 with pl. 43e; Etleva Nallbani, "Three buckles from the late antique period," in *Byzantine Butrint: Excavations and Surveys, 1994-99*, edited by Richard Hodges, William Bowden and Kosta Lako (Oxford: Oxbow, 2004), pp. 398-399, at 398; 399 fig. A3.2; Gladys R. Davidson, *The Minor Objects* (Princeton: American School of Classical Studies in Athens, 1952), pl. 114.2186, 2188-2190; Fatos Tartari, "Një varrezë e mesjetës së hershme në Durrës," *Iliria* 14 (1984), no. 1, 227-250, at

with croissant-shaped pendant and open-work ornament from the ceme-
tery excavated to the east from the Church of St. Demetrius on the Stenje
Island in the Lake Prespa.[31] Their analogies have been found in the
Mersin hoard together with coins struck for Emperor Heraclius between
630 and 640, but such earrings appear frequently in southern Italy and in
the Crimea.[32] Only two other earrings of this kind are known from the
Balkans, both found in Albania.[33] To sites in Albania also point the
analogies for the earring with croissant-shaped pendant accidentally
found in Orovnik, near Ohrid.[34] In grave 3 in Shurdhah and grave 8 in
Krujë, such earrings were associated with seventh-century fibulae with
bent stem very similar to those found in Prilep.[35]

230-231; pl. II.28.1, 2; pl. IV.6; Γιώργος Γουνάρις, "Χάλκινες πόρπες από το
οκτάγωνο των Φιλίππων και την κεντρική Μακεδονία," *Βυζαντιάκα* 4 (1984), 49-59, at
57 and 56 fig. 2γ.

[31] Vera Bitrakova-Grozdanova, "Izkopuvanjata na Golem grad od 1981-1986 godina,"
Macedoniae Acta Archaeologica 10 (1985-1986), 101-103; 102 fig. 1. No analogies are
known for the iron earring from grave 63 of that same cemetery (Mikulčić, *Spätantike
und frühbyzantinische Befestigungen*, p. 379 fig. 280.4).

[32] Isabella Baldini Lippolis, "Gli orecchini a corpo semilunato: classificazione
tipologica (note preliminare)," *Corso di cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina* 38
(1991), 67-101; Isabella Baldini Lippolis, *L'oreficeria nell'impero di Costantinopoli tra
IV e VII secolo* (Bari: EdiPuglia, 1999), p. 38.

[33] Muzafer Korkuti and Mehmet Kallfa, *Shqiperia arkeologjike* (Tirana: Universiteti
shteterör, 1971), p. 130; Skënder Anamali, "Die Albaner, Nachkommen der Illyrer," in
Albanien. Schätze aus dem Land der Skipetaren, edited by Arne Eggebrecht (Mainz:
Philipp von Zabern, 1988), pp. 148-155, at 457 fig. 370.

[34] Владо Маленко, "Раносредновековната материјална култура во Охрид и
Охридско," in *Охрид и Охридско низ историјата*, edited by Mihailo Apostolski
(Skopje: Sobranie na obshtina Okhrid 1985), pp. 269-315 at 291 and pl. VII.6.

[35] Damian Komata, "Varrëza arbërore e Shurdhahut (Rrethi i Shkodres)," *Iliria* 9-10
(1979-1980), 105-121, at 120 pl. VI.6, 7; Skënder Anamali and Hëna Spahiu, "Varrëza
e herëshme mesjëtare e Krujës," *Buletin i Universitetit shtetëror të Tiranës* 17 (1963),
no. 2, 3-85, at 13; Jovan Kovačević, "Βάβας," in *Зборник посветен на Бошко Бабић.
Mélange Boško Babić 1924-1984*, edited by Mihailo Apostolski (Prilep: Institut des
recherches scientifiques de la culture des anciens Slaves - Prilep1986), pp. 119-121, at
120 and fig. For the chronology of the later fibulae with bent stem, see Florin Curta,
"Seventh-century fibulae with bent stem in the Balkans," *Starinar* 62 (2012), forthcom-
ing. In addition, four so-called "Slavic" bow fibulae are so far known from Macedonia,
two of Werner's class I C (both fragments), one of his class I F, and another of his class
II C (fragment, perforated): Mirjana Čorović-Ljubinković, "Les Slaves du centre bal-
kanique du VI-e au XI-e siècle," *Balcanoslavica* 1 (1972), 43-54, at 47 and fig. 1.3;
Аница Ѓорѓиевска, "Аваро-словенски моменти во Heraclea Lyncestis," in
Етногенез и этнокультурные контакты славян, edited by Valentin V. Sedov
(Moscow: Institut Arkheologii RAN, 1997), pp. 64-72, at 67 fig. 2.3; Стамен

Two cemeteries very similar to those excavated in Shurdhah, Krujë, and a number of other sites in central and northern Albania are known from western Macedonia. One of them is located on the shore of Lake Ohrid, at a short distance from the village of Radolishta. The cemetery was excavated between 1956 and 1959 and then, again, between 1976 and 1980. The excavations revealed 136 graves, all stone cists within the ruins of a sixth-century basilica, *spolia* from which were used for the building of some cists.[36] No burial has been properly published, only some of the more spectacular grave goods, such as two earrings with star-shaped pendant, a torc, a semicircular pendant with open-work ornament and three suspension loops, and a fibula with bent stem.[37] Such artifacts point to a seventh-century date, but there are others (e.g., earrings with pear-shaped pendant) which are clearly of a later, possibly eighth- or even ninth-century date. The cemetery may have started in the seventh, and then continued into the eighth or early ninth century.[38] A little further to the northwest, but still within a short distance from the shore of Lake Ohrid, the 1974 salvage excavations revealed 124 graves inside and outside the ruins of a sixth-century basilica. Some burials have cut through the mosaic pavement in the nave, others were directly on top of the mosaic pavement. All graves were stone and

Михайлов, "Раносредновековни фибули в България," *Известия на Археологическия Институт* 24 (1961), 37-60, at 43 and 41 fig. 3.1; Маленко, "Раносредновековната материјална култура," p. 289 and pl. VI.4. For the chronology of "Slavic" bow fibulae and a critique of their ethnic attribution, see Florin Curta, "Once again on bow fibulae of the 'Pietroasele type' (Werner's class I F)," *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 59 (2008), 465-492; "Some remarks on bow fibulae of Werner's class I C," *Slavia Antiqua* 49 (2008), 45-98; "Женшина из Данчень или к вопросу о фибулах типа II C по Вернеру," *Tyragetia* 5 (2011), no. 1, 153-92.

[36] Stone cists have also been found in Prilep, next to the Baba hillfort, but nothing is known about the relation of that cemetery to the ruins of any late antique building (Kovačević, "Βάβας," p. 120).

[37] For a detailed discussion of the chronology of those artifacts, see Florin Curta, "The beginning of the Middle Ages in the Balkans," *Millennium* 9 (2012), forthcoming; and Curta, "Seventh-century fibulae."

[38] Маленко, "Раносредновековната материјална култура," pp. 291-293 and pl. XVIII-XXI; Mikulčić, *Spätantike und frühbyzantinische Befestigungen*, pp. 491; 490 fig. 409; 490 fig. 410.1-4. According to Elica Maneva, "La survie des centres paléochrétiens de Macédoine au Haut Moyen Age," in *Radovi XIII. Međunarodnog Kongresa za starokršćansku arheologiju. Split-Poreč (25.9.-1.10. 1994)*, edited by Nenad Cambi and Emilio Marin (Vatican/Split: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana/Arheološki Muzej, 1998), pp. 843-858, at 847 the later phase of the cemetery extends well into the fourteenth century.

brick cists. Some had no grave goods whatsoever. Much like with Radolishta, no burials have been published, only a few grave goods: seven fibulae with bent stem, two earrings with star-shaped pendant, a semicircular pendant with open-work ornament and suspension loops, pendants, torcs, and pottery.[39] There are three arrow heads known from the cemetery. The earliest graves cluster in the southern aisles on the southern side of the basilica, later graves dated to the early ninth century appear in the nave and in the northern apse.[40] The association of the cemeteries in Radolishta and Sv. Erazmo with ruins of sixth-century basilicas strongly suggests that those were Christian communities, but without a detailed publication of every burial assemblage and of the corresponding settlements it is impossible to assess the role of Christianity in social practices.[41] Nonetheless, cist graves also appear in Macedonia without any associated churches. The trial excavations carried out in 1959 in Viničani near Veles by Todor Grujev and Mirjana Čorović-Ljubinković revealed a cemetery very similar in layout and grave construction to the other two on the northern shore of Lake Ohrid.[42] One of them (grave 6) produced a one-handled jug with painted ornament.[43]

---

[39] See note 37. It is not clear whether the pottery found on the site—handmade, but also wheel-made, including a double-handled jug—was associated with earlier or later graves.

[40] Владо Маленко, Нови археолошки наоди на локалитете 'Козлук', 'Габавци' и 'Св. Еразмо'," *Macedoniae Acta Archaeologica* 2 (1976), 219-235, at 222 and 232-234; 223 fig. 2; 224 fig. 3; 231 fig. 13; 234 fig. 14; Маленко, "Раносредновековната материјална култура," pp. 288-289; pls. V-XIII; Бошко Бабиќ, "Денешните територии на Република Македонија и Република Албанија во VII и VIII века," in *Цивилизации на почвата на Македонија* (Skopje: MANU, 1995), pp. 153-182, at 161; Maneva, "La survie," p. 846; Mikulčić, *Spätantike und frühbyzantinische Befestigungen*, pp. 480; 481 fig. 400 and 401.1-5.

[41] The graves at Shurdhah were placed on the southern side and around the apse of a church (Hëna Spahiu and Damian Komata, "Shurdhahu-Sarda qytet i fortifikuar mesjetar Shqiptar(Rezultatet e gërmimeve të viteve 1967-1970)," *Iliria* 3 [1974], 257-328, at 316). Similarly, the foundations of three churches (St. George, St. Michael, and St. Nicholas) were found to the east of the cemetery in Koman, while two other churches were located to the west of that cemetery (Etleva Nallbani, "Résurgence des traditions de l'Antiquité tardive dans les Balkans occidentaux: étude des sépultures du nord de l'Albanie," *Hortus Artium Medievalium* 10 [2004], 25-42, at 41 with n. 4).

[42] Mirjana Čorović-Ljubinković, "Viničani," in *Зборник посветен на Бошко Бабиќ. Mélange Boško Babić 1924-1984*, edited by Mihailo Apostolski (Prilep: Institut des recherches scientifiques de la culture des anciens Slaves - Prilep1986), pp. 133-137.

[43] Čorović-Ljubinković, "Viničani," p. 136 fig. 3; Mikulčić, *Spätantike und frühbyzantinische Befestigungen*, p. 442 and fig. 355.1.

Such jugs appear occasionally on other sites in Albania and Bulgaria,[44] but also in southern Italy. In fact, one- or two-handled jugs with painted decoration are the most common painted ware form on seventh- and eighth-century cemetery sites in Apulia and Campania.[45]

The existence of Christian communities in seventh-century Macedonia nicely dovetails with the meager evidence from the written sources. Two bishops of Stobi participated in the Sixth Ecumenical Council of 680-681 and in the Quinisext Council of 692.[46] They were most likely not residents of Stobi, a city which had long been abandoned, but they were also not living in Constantinople at that time. It is possible that they were based somewhere in western Macedonia. If so, then the obvious ties which communities in western Macedonia (as well as Albania) maintained with the Empire must have been much more intense than apparent from the examination of finger-rings with Greek monograms or inscriptions.[47] Seventh-century hoards of gold and silver

---

[44] The largest number of specimens is from Krujë (Anamali and Hëna Spahiu, "Varrëza, pp. 13; 23 pl. V.3-4, 6, 9-11; 26 pl. VI.1, 3, 5-8, 11-12; 27 fig. 9; 28 fig. 10; Skënder Anamali and Hëna Spahiu, "Varrëza arbërore e Krujes," *Iliria* 9-10 [1979-1980], 47-103, at 53 and 51 fig. 3). For Bulgaria, see Dimka Stoianova-Serafimova, "Die neuentdeckte mittelalterliche Nekropole beim Dorf Tuchovište, Kreis Blagoevgrad," in *Rapports du III-e Congrès international d'archéologie slave. Bratislava 7-14 septembre 1975*, edited by Bohuslav Chropovský (Bratislava: VEDA, 1979), pp. 789-804, at 793.

[45] Paul Arthur and Helen Patterson, "Ceramics and early medieval central and southern Italy: 'a potted history'," in La storia dell'Alto Medioevo italiano (VI-X secolo) alla luce dell'archeologia. Convegno internazionale (Siena, 2-6 dicembre 1992), edited by Ricardo Francovich and Ghislaine Noyé (Florence: Insegna del Giglio, 1994), pp. 409-441, at 427; Paul Arthur and Helen Patterson, "Local pottery in southern Puglia in the sixth and seventh centuries," in Ceramica in Italia: VI-VII secolo. Atti del Convegno in onore di John W. Hayes, Roma, 11-13 maggio 1995, edited by Lucia Saguì (Florence: Insegna del Giglio, 1998), pp. 511-530, at 528.

[46] Bishops John and Margarites, for whom see Rajko Bratož, "Die frühchristliche Kirche in Makedonien und ihr Verhältnis zu Rom," in *Klassisches Altertum, Spätantike und frühes Christentum. Adolf Lippold zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet*, edited by Karlheinz Dietz, Dieter Hennig and Hans Kaletsch (Würzburg: Der christliche Osten, 1993), pp. 509-551, at 549.

[47] For two finger-rings with Greek monogram on the bezel, which were found in Radolishta, see Маленко, "Раносредновековната материјална култура," pl. XX. For finger-rings with Greek inscriptions from Albania, see Hasan Čeka, "Mbishkrimet bizantine të unazave te Komanit dhe datimi i tyre," *Studime Historike* 19 (1965), no. 4, 39-46; Hëna Spahiu, "Unaza të reja me mbishkrim nga Komani," *Iliria* 15 (1985), no. 1, 229-246; Hëna Spahiu, "Bagues aux inscriptions byzantines à Koman," *Corso di cul-

coins have so far been found to the east from the river Vardar, a region which has not produced any remains comparable to those of western Macedonia.[48] It remains unclear what, if any, was the relation of the communities in western Macedonia to the owners of those hoards. Nor is the power structure known which may have existed in those communities, and especially whether or not they still occupied the many sixth-century fortified sites in the region.[49] Nonetheless, it is quite clear that, despite claims to the contrary,[50] burial assemblages associated with the so-called Komani culture, such as those known from Radolishta, Sv. Erazmo and Viničani have nothing to do either with sixth- to seventh-century sites in the Lower Danube region known from written sources to have been inhabited by Slavs, or with cremation and biritual cemeteries, such as Olympia (Greece), Balchik and Razdelna (Bulgaria), which have been dated to the seventh century and viewed as solid evidence of the presence of "barbarians."[51] In many respects, the communities who buried their dead in western Macedonia continued the traditions of Late Antiquity: stone or brick cists, cenotaphs and multiple burials within one and the same grave, the west-east grave orientation, female fashions with earrings and fibulae with bent stem.[52] There are of course new elements, such as furnished burials, the deposition of weapons, and stark gender differentiation. But nothing indicates that those were communities com-

---

tura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina 40 (1993), 435-46. Such finger-rings have also been found in southern Bulgaria: Живка Въжарова, *Славяни и прабългари (по данни на некрополите от VI-XI в. на територията на България)*(Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bălgarskata Akademiia na Naukite, 1976), pp. 340-341; 309 fig. 193.10.

[48] However, two inhumation burials are known from Sandanski, just across the border in southwestern Bulgaria, and one of them produced a finger-ring with Greek inscription on the bezel (Въжарова, *Славяни*, p. 341).

[49] Nothing is known about the end of the late antique phase of occupation on such sites as Lychnidos (Ohrid), Heraclea Lyncestis (near Bitola), or Baba (near Prilep).

[50] Никос Чаусидис, "Релације између 'Комани' културе и 'Салтово-Мајацке' и проблем порекла њихових носилаца," in *Становиштво словенског поријекла у Албанији. Зборник радова са Међународног научног скупа одржаног у Цетињу, 21, 22 и 23 јуна 1990* (Titograd: Istorijski Institut SR Crne Gore, 1991), pp. 57-62, at 62.

[51] Speros Vryonis, "The Slavic pottery (jars) from Olympia, Greece," in *Byzantine Studies. Essays on the Slavic World and the Eleventh Century*, edited by Speros Vryonis, Jr. (New Rochelle, New York: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1992), pp. 15-42; Людмила Дончева-Петкова, "Некрополът при Балчик. Нови данни за прабългарите," *Археология* 50 (2009), nos. 1-2, 76-88; Uwe Fiedler, *Studien zu Gräberfeldern des 6. bis 9. Jahrhunderts an der unteren Donau* (Bonn: Rudolf. Habelt, 1992), pp. 463-484.

[52] Curta, "Beginning of the Middle Ages."

ing from beyond the borders of the Empire. Judging from the archaeo-logical evidence, no Slavs have settled in Macedonia during the seventh century.

Florin CURTA

WERE THERE ANY SLAVS IN SEVENTH-CENTURY MACEDONIA

- s u m m a r y -

The article deals with a long-standing historiographic assumption, according to which, shortly after 600 the Slavs settled the territory of the present-day Republic of Macedonia, where they organized a *sklavinia*. However, a close examination of the written sources shows no indication of a Slavic migration to Macedonia. Nor is the archaeological evidence in any way related to assemblages north of the Lower Danube inhabited by Slavs during the sixth century. Seventh-century assemblages and stray finds from Macedonia unmistakably point a very different population, one that maintained strong ties with the Empire and was most likely Christian.

Peter IVANIČ

University of Nitra

WESTERN SLAVS IN THE 6th AND 7th CENTURY[1]

The history of the Slavs in the Early Middle Ages was already taken down in a number of works of contemporary chroniclers. The interest in the topic did not fade out even in the following periods. Foundations of the research into the issue were laid by Pavol Jozef Šafárik in his work *Slovanské starožitnosti*[2]. A multi-volume work of Lubor Niederle entitled *Slovanské starožitnosti*[3] and published 1902 – 1925, together with its culture-dedicated part *Život starých Slovanů*[4] from between

---

[1] This paper was written as a part of the project KEGA 014UKF-4/2012 - Multimediálna didaktická pomôcka vo webovom prostredí dejepisu - "Slovania a Európa v ranom stredoveku" pre stredné školy.

[2] Pawel Josef Šafářík, *Slowanské starožitnosti: Oddíl dějepisný* (Praha, 1837). Pawel Josef Šafářík, *Slowanské starožitnosti II* (Praha 1863)

[3] Lubor Niederle, *Slovanské starožitnosti. Původ a počátky národa slovanského. Díl I. Sv. 1.* (Praha: Nákladem Bursíka a Kohouta, 1902). Lubor Niederle, *Slovanské starožitnosti: Původ a počátky Slovanů jižních. Díl II. Sv. 1.* (Praha: Nákladem Bursíka a Kohouta, 1906). Lubor Niederle, *Slovanské starožitnosti: Původ a počátky Slovanů jižních. Díl II. Sv. 2.* (Praha: Nákladem Bursíka a Kohouta, 1910). Lubor Niederle, Slovanské *starožitnosti: Původ a počátky Slovanů západních. Díl III.* (Praha: Nákladem Bursíka a Kohouta, 1919). Lubor Niederle*, Slovanské starožitnosti: Původ a počátky Slovanů východních. Oddíl I. Sv. 4.* (Praha: Nákladem Bursíka a Kohouta, 1924).

[4] Lubor Niederle, *Život starých Slovanů: Oddíl kulturní. Základy kulturních starožitností slovanských. Díl I. Sv. 1.* (Praha: Nákladem Bursíka a Kohouta, 1911). Lubor Niederle, *Slovanské starožitnosti: Oddíl kulturní. Život starých Slovanů. Základy kulturních starožitností slovanských. Díl I. Sv. 2.* (Praha: Nákladem Bursíka a Kohouta, 1913). Lubor Niederle, *Slovanské starožitnosti: Oddíl kulturní. Díl II.* (Praha: Nákladem Bursíka a Kohouta, 1916). Lubor Niederle, *Slovanské starožitnosti: Oddíl kulturní. Díl III.* (Praha: Nákladem Bursíka a Kohouta, 1919). Lubor Niederle, *Život starých Slovanů: Základy kulturních starožitností slovanských. Díl II. Sv. 1. (Praha : Nákladem Bursíka a Kohouta, 1924).* Lubor Niederle, *Slovanské starožitnosti: Oddíl kulturní. Život starých Slovanů. O právu soukromém u Slovanů v dobách straších. Napsal Theodor Saturník. Díl II. Sv. 2.* (Praha : Nákladem Bursíka a Kohouta, 1934). Lubor Niederle, *Slovanské starožitnosti: Oddíl kulturní. Život starých Slovanů. Základy*

1911 and 1925, is considered to be the foundations for modern research into the Slavic peoples. The interest in Slavic archaeology experienced its rapid growth after the WWI and mainly after the WWII. As a result, a number of monographs on this topic were published.[5]

The Slavs took the stage of the old continent at the time when there was not much peace in Europe. The Roman Empire experienced its massive decline during the 4th century despite it had always been a great power before. To the east of the Roman Empire, around 370 AD, a nomadic nation of the Huns conquered the Alans who used to be settled in the region to the west of the Don River. Since that time, the Huns were moving westwards while followed by other tribes. In 375 AD, the Huns conquered the Ostrogoths who then moved away and settled in the Danube basin region ("Podunajsko"). This was the beginning of the Migration Period. It was winter around the turn of 469/470 when the Ostrogoths managed to cross the frozen Danube. The Huns under the leadership of well-known Attila gradually seized control of a great part of Europe that used to be controlled by the Roman Empire which eventually fell in 476. The Migration Period ended in 568 when the Lombards settled in Italy under pressure from the Avars. Generally, the situation in Europe at the end of the Migration Period was as follows: in the eastern part of the Roman Empire a new great power, Byzantium, came after; the Visigoths established their empire on the Iberian Peninsula; the Burgundians settled in the Rhone and the Seine basin, the Alemani inhabited south-western Germany and southern Switzerland with the Bavarians settled to their east, central Germany was inhabited by the Thuringians and north-western Germany by the Saxons. The Franks ruled the area around Belgium, north-eastern France and neighbouring regions. Having conquered neighbouring tribes, the Franks gradually became leading power in Western Europe. On the other hand, the Slavs gradually took control over Central, Southeast and Eastern Europe.[6]

---

kulturních starožitností slovanských. Díl III. Sv. 1. (Praha : Nákladem Bursíka a Kohouta, 1921). Lubor Niederle, *Slovanské starožitnosti: Oddíl kulturní. Život starých Slovanů. Základy kulturních starožitností slovanských. Díl III. Sv. 2.* (Praha : Nákladem Bursíka a Kohouta, 1925).

[5] For an overview of the most relevant works see Peter Ivanič, *Západní Slovania v ranom stredoveku: História – kultúra – hospodárstvo – náboženstvo* (Nitra: UKF, 2011), 10–18.

[6] More on the fall of the Roman Empire see Jozef Česka, *Zánik antického světa* (Praha: Vyšehrad, 2000). Later works on the Migration Period were published by Jarmila Bednaříková, *Sťehování narodů. 1. vydání* (Praha: Vyšehrad, 2003). Peter Bystrický, *Sťa-*

Origin and ethnogenesis of the Slavs

Even today, neither ethnogenesis nor determination of the Slavs' homeland is fully explained. There are a number of scientific disciplines involved in the process of solving the issue – above all archaeology, history, ethnography, philology and anthropology.[7] Based on the current knowledge it can be stated that the process of ethnogenesis is a complex phenomenon. There are a number of theories today which Zdeněk Měřínsky put together into five groups:

- Autochtonic theory – it is assumed that the Slavs were representatives of older cultures already known from the prehistoric times, mainly the Bronze Age Urnfield culture
- Biological continuum – it is presupposed that Neolithic farmers gradually assimilated and adopted various cultural aspects to slavonize themselves in later periods
- Migration theory – assumes that the Western Slavs settled in our region after a one-off movement
- Penetration theory – is based on the assumption that the Slavs were moving to our region gradually
- Colonisation theory – is based on the assumption that the Slavs came intentionally as the colonists of the Germans or the Avars.[8]

---

hovanie národov (454 – 568) – Ostrogóti, Gepidi, Longobardi a Slovania. (Bratislava: Historický ústav SAV, 2008). Roger Collins, *Evropa raného středověku 300 – 1000* (Praha: Vyšehrad, 2005). Malcolm Todd, *Die Zeit der Völkerwanderung.* (Stuttgart: Konrad Theiss Verlag GmbH, 2002). More on the Huns see Edward Arthur Thompson, *Hunové* (Praha: Lidové noviny, 1999). Peter Podolan, "Pôvod Hunov a ich príchod do Európy," *Studia Mediaevalia et Antiqua 8* (2004): 38–57. More on the Germanic tribes in the Migration Period and in the Early Middle Ages see Malcolm Todd, *Germáni* (Praha: Lidové noviny, 1999). More on the history of the Lombards see Karin Priester, *Geschichte der Langobraden. Gesellschaft – Kultur – Alltagsleben* (Stuttgart : Konrad Theiss Verlag GmbH, 2004). More on the history of the Franks in the Migration Period and in the Early Middle Ages see Jarmila Bednaříková, *Frankové a Evropa.* (Praha: Vyšehrad, 2009). Edward James, *Frankové* (Praha: Lidové noviny, 1997).

[7] Jerzy Nalepa, "O pierwotnych siedzibach Słowian w świetle nowszych badań archeologicznych, lingwistycznych i historycznych," *Slavia Antiqua 48* (2007): 11–96. Jerzy Nalepa, "O pierwotnych siedzibach Słowian w świetle nowszych badań archeologicznych, lingwistycznych i historycznych. Część II.," *Slavia Antiqua 50* (2009): 23–200. Adam Mesiarkin, "Prehľad pohľadov na etnogenézu Slovanov: Hľadanie pravlasti jazykovedou a archeológiou," *Historia Nova 2* (2011): 9–27.

[8] Zdeněk Měřínský, *České země od příchodu Slovanů po Velkou Moravu I.*(Praha: Libri, 2000), 37. For a detailed overview of theoretical approaches see Jan Eisner,

In the current research the autochtonic and the migration (allochtonic) theory have gained most followers. Though within them, the opinion is not united. Pavol Jozef Šafárik is considered the founder of the autochtonic (Danube) theory. In his work *Slovanské starožitnosti* he based his theoretical concept on a record in Povesti dávnych liet (Ancient legends) where it is stated that Paul the Apostle used to preach in Illyricum where the Slavs were originally settled down. In this text, Illyricum was understood as a region in the Middle Ages Kingdom of Hungary with neighbouring lands of the Danube basin. Šafárik assumed that the chronicler who wrote that particular part of the text was influenced by folk interpretation, i.e. national legends and songs.[9] In Slovakia, Alexander Avenarius[10] worked further on this hypothesis. Even Russian linguist and historian Oleg Nikolajevič Trubačov followed the theory that the Slavs' homeland could be found in Central Europe with the Danube being its central part. Trubačov based his hypothesis on research and linguistic analysis of onomastic material collected in the Danube area.[11] Lubor Niederle criticised Šafárik's hypothesis assuming that the record in **Povesti dávnych liet** (Ancient legends) is only fiction of the author.[12] Following written sources he assumed that the original settlement of the Slavs was situated to the north of the Carpathian Mountains and the Black Sea.[13] According to another autochtonic theory, the homeland of the Slavs is to be found somewhere between the Vistula and the Oder. Polish researchers Leon Kozłowski, Józef Kostrzewski, Konrad Jażdżewski are representatives of the theory which puts the origins of the Slavs to the period of the Lusatian culture; that is to the Bronze Age.[14] Among Czech researchers, this theory followed for instance Jan Eisner, Jan Filip and Josef Ladislav Píč.[15] Lech Leciejewicz

---

Rukověť slovanské archeologie (Praha: Academia, 1966), 21–83. Zdeněk Klanica, *Počátky slovanského osídlení našich zemí* (Praha: Academia, 1986), 14–48.

[9] Šafárik, *Slowanské starožitnosti: Oddíl dějepisný*, 187–196.

[10] Alexander Avenarius, "Začiatky Slovanov na strednom Dunaji. Autochtonistická teória vo svetle súčasného bádania," *Historický časopis 40* (1992): 1–16.

[11] Oleg Nikolajevič Trubačev, *Etnogenez i kuľtura drevnejších Slavian* (Moskva: Nauka, 2002).

[12] Niederle, *Slovanské starožitnosti: Původ a počátky národa slovanského. Díl I. Sv. 1*, 11.

[13] Niederle, *Slovanské starožitnosti: Původ a počátky národa slovanského. Díl I. Sv. 1*, 14.

[14] See Andrzej Buko, *Archeologia Polski wczesnośredniowiecznej: Odkrycia – hipotezy – interpretacje* (Warszawa: Trio, 2005), 65.

[15] See Eisner, *Rukověť slovanské archeologie*, 40–47. See the list of literature.

takes the position that the original inhabitants of the region where the Lusatian culture was rooted left the land after this type of culture ceased to exist in order to find other opportunities for development. In the following periods the La Tène and the Przeworsk culture had the greatest influence on them.[16]

Followers of the allochtonic theory consider today's Ukraine and partly Belarus the homeland of the Slavs. Between the 3rd century BC and the 2nd century AD, there was the Zarubintsky culture in the region along Dnieper basin, Prypiat region and in Belarus. It still carried some aspects of the fading Kiev type that was to be located in the region along the Dniester and at the river Desna between the 2nd and the 4th century AD. The representatives of the Chernyakhov culture of the period between the 2nd and the 5th century AD were settled in the land spreading from the Lower Danube up to the Dniester. In the 2nd century AD, the already mentioned Przeworsk culture was settled in the land between rivers Odra and Burg and later moved to the Dniester and to the south of the Tisza basin. However, there have been discussions concerning the ethnicity of these cultures. Even though, there are hypotheses which hold the Slavs or at least a part of them to be the representatives of these cultures.[17] Around the mid-5th century new archaeological cultures appeared in the above-mentioned regions and now are definitely related to the Slavs. These cultures were the Kolocin culture (also the Kolocin-Tusemlja type) at the Upper Dnieper, along the Upper Dvina basin and at the Desna River, than the Prague-Korchak culture situated between the Dnieper and eastern slopes of the Carpathian Mountains. To its south, in the region from the Seversky Donets River, Central Dnieper and South Bug to the Dniester and in the region between the Seret and the Prut, there were settlements of the Penkovka culture.[18] There are Polish researchers who point out that there was a decline in population in the area of Przeworsk (southern and central Poland) and Wielbark culture settlements (east of the Vistula) at the turn of the 4th and the 5th century. This land was later settled by the Slavs. Among the most prominent Polish representatives of the allochtonic theory are Kazimierz God-

---

[16] Lech Leciejewicz, *Nowa postac swiata: Narodziny sredniowiecznej cywilizacji europejskiej* (Wrocław: Funna, 2000).

[17] See Měřínský, *České země od příchodu Slovanů po Velkou Moravu I*, 39–43. Marie Bláhová, *Jan Frolík and Naďa Profantová, Velké dějiny zemí Koruny české: Svazek I. Do roku 1197* (Praha – Litomyšl: Paseka, 1999), 146–147.

[18] See Měřínský, *České země od příchodu Slovanů po Velkou Moravu I*, 45–50. Bláhová, *Frolík and Profantová, Velké dějiny*, 147.

łowski[19] and Michał Parczewski[20]. Slovak and Czech archaeologists take the position that the Slavs moved to the lands of Bohemia, Moravia, Slovakia and Lower Austria.[21]

Early records in written sources

Written accounts are very important sources of information on the Early Slavs. Here, they used to be mentioned as the Venedi, the Veneti, the Antes or the Sclavenes. The first records on the so called Venedi or Veneti from the land between the Vistula and the Baltic Sea appeared already in the 1st and the 2nd century AD as being mentioned by Roman writers Plinius the Elder, Ptolemy and Tacitus. Gaius Plinius the Elder (around 23 – 79 AD) in his fourth volume *Naturalis historiae* wrote that this tribe settled between the Vistula and Germanic tribes.[22]

---

[19] See his works on the topic: Kazimierz Godłowski, *Pierwotne siedziby Slowian: Wybór pism pod redakcja Michala Parczewskiego* (Kraków: Instytut Archeologii Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2000).

[20] Michał Parczewski, *Najstarsza faza kultury wczesnosłowiańskej w Polsce* (Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1988). Michał Parczewski, *Początki kultury wczesnosłowiańskej w Polsce: Krytyka i datowanie żródeł archeologicznych* (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy Imienia Ossolińskich, 1988). Michał Parczewski, *Die Anfänge der frühslawischen Kultur in Polen* (Wien : Österreichische Gesellschaft für Ur – und Frühgeschichte, 1993).

[21] See Beranová, *Slované* (Praha: Libri, 2000). Bláhová, *Frolík and Profantová, Velké dějiny*, 144–149. Gabriel Fusek, *Slovensko vo včasnoslovanskom období* (Nitra: AÚ SAV, 1994). Gabriel Fusek, "Frühe Slawen im Mitteldonaugebiet," in *Kulturwandel in Mitteleuropa: Langobarden – Awaren – Slawen*, ed. Jan Bemmann and Michael Schmauder, (Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, 2008), 645–656. Gabriel Fusek and Jozef Zábojník, "Príspevok do diskusie o počiatkoch slovanského osídlenia Slovenska," *Slovenská archeológia, 51* (2003): 319– 340. Luděk Galuška, *Velká Morava* (Brno: Moravské zemské muzeum Brno, 1991). Luděk Galuška, *Uherské Hradiště – Sady – Křesťanské centrum říše velkomoravské* (Brno: Moravské zemské muzeum – Nadace Litera, 1996). Luděk Galuška, *Slované – doteky předků: O životě na Moravě 6. – 10. století* (Brno: Moravské zemské muzeum Brno – obec Modrá – Krajská knihovna Františka Bartoše, 2004). Měřínský, České země od příchodu Slovanů po Velkou Moravu I. Naďa Profantová, "Die frühslawische Besiedlung Böhmens und archäologische Spuren der Kontakte zum früh – und mittelawarischen sowie merowingischen Kulturkreis," in *Kulturwandel in Mitteleuropa: Langobarden – Awaren – Slawen*, ed. Jan Bemmann and Michael Schmauder, (Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, 2008), 619 – 644. Dušan Třeštík, "Příchod prvních Slovanů do Českých zemí v letech 510 –535," *Český časopis historický 94* (1996): 245–280. Jiří Zeman, "K problematice časně slovanské kultury ve střední Evropě," *Památky Archeologické 70* (1979): 113–130.

[22] Gaius Plinius the Elder refers to them as Venedi. Gaius Plinius Secundus, *Naturalis historia,* IV. 97. More on this issue see Leonid A. Gindin, Sergej A. Ivanov and

Publius Cornelius Tacitus (around 55 – 120 AD) in his work *Germania* sets the land of the tribe somewhere between the Lower Danube and the Baltic.[23] Claudius Ptolemy (100 – 170) in the third volume of his work *Cosmographia* entitled *Geographia* stated that the tribe was settled to the west of the Vistula and on northern slopes of the Carpathian Arch while reaching the Lower Danube land.[24] Researchers, however, prefer the opinion that the Venedi (or Veneti) are not to be seen as the Slavs. Actual written records which clearly support the existence of the Slavs originate from Byzantine writer Jordanes. Jordanes in his 6th century work *De origine actibusque Getarum* mentions the Slavs – the Venedi who are divided into a number of tribes. The best-known were the Sclavenes and the Antes. According to his descriptions, the Sclavanes lived to the north of today's Drnov and Osijek, in the east they reached the Dniester River and in the north the Carpathians. Southern border of their settlement was probably the region where the Drava River flows into the Danube. According to Jordanes, the chief of the Ostrogoths Ermanaric initiated fights against the Slavs (Ermanaric ruled in the last quarter of the 4th century).[25] Procopius of Caesarea (the 6th century) wrote in his sixth book *De bello Gotico* that the Heruli nation moved from the Central Danube basin region to the north and that this movement happened in the year 512. Their journey led through all Slavic (Σκλαβηνών) nations and desert lands. Following this record, it is assumed that at that time the Slavs did not occupied all the later locations. Procopius further mentions struggles for the throne of the Lombards in the 6th century. Risiulf was one of the candidates for the throne but was killed while staying at Germanic tribe of the Varni. Though, his son Hildigis fled to the Slavs only to fight them with success later while supported by the Gepids. After declared armistice, he was likely to be handed over to the king of the Lombards Audion and had to flee to the

---

Gennadij G. Litavrin, *Svod drevnějšich pismennych izvěstij o slavjanach.* (Corpus testimoniorum vetustissimorum ad historiam slavicam pertinentium). Tom 1 (1 – 4 vv.) (Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura RAN, 1994), 18–36.

[23] Publius Cornelius Tacitus refers to them as Venethi. Publius Cornelius Tacitus, *Germania,* 46. More on this issue see Gindin, Ivanov and Litavrin, *Svod drevnějšich*, 37–45.

[24] Claudius Ptolemy uses the terms Οὐενέδαι (Ouenedai). Ptolemaeus, *Cosmographia* III, 5, 7 – 10. More on this issue see Gindin, Ivanov and Litavrin, *Svod drevnějšich*, 46–62.

[25] Jordanes uses the terms Venethi, Antes, Sclaveni. Jordanes, *Getica*, 34 – 35, 119. More on this issue see Gindin, Ivanov and Litavrin, *Svod drevnějšich*, 98–169.

Slavs again.[26] The 6th century work *Strategikon* which could have been written by Byzantine Emperor Maurice (also Pseudo-Maurice) describes war tactics of the Slavs (Σκλάβοι, Αυται).[27] A gravestone of Martin of Tours, who died in 397, dates back to the year 580 and carries a notice on tribes that had been Christianized by the bishop. The list includes the Slavs too *(Sclavus)*.[28]

Slavs in archaeological sources

Archaeological sources are the richest source of information on the Slavs. One of the oldest archaeological artefacts related to the Slavs in Central Europe is the Prague-type pottery culture, also known as the Prague culture. Based on written sources, the Sclavenes are considered representatives of this culture. In 1940, Czech archaeologist Ivan Borovský published already known artefacts of undecorated vessels with a bulge in its upper part and called the collection the Prague type claiming it to be the oldest Slavic pottery in Central Europe. The theory was proved by other archaeological excavations and research. Based on the current state of knowledge it can be stated that the early Slavs settled in lowlands near river basins. Such regions were suitable for agricultural growth and breeding. The Prague-type pottery culture has been found in the whole area. It was originally present to the east of the Carpathians up to the Dnieper River. Here it is known as Korchak type or the Prague-Korchak type pottery. Gradually, together with the Penkovka culture it spread to the Lower Danube area and bordered on it in the south and in the east. In the west it covered the land up to the Elbe in eastern Germany and its representatives settled in the areas of what is today known as Slovakia, Bohemia, Moravia, Poland, Sub-Carpathian Ruthenia, partly Hungary, Lower Austria and north-eastern Romania (Transylvania). In the south, the excavated artefacts reach Limes Romanus and the so called Sarmatians' Walls from the Roman Period. This culture is assumed to spread into the Eastern-Alps region and western Balkan. Central Danube area might have been inhabited by the Slavs coming from three directions. The first wave came through southern Poland and hence the Slavs are supposed to have inhabited today's Slovakia, southern Mo-

---

[26] More on this issue see Gindin, Ivanov and Litavrin, *Svod drevnějšich*, 170–250. Třeštík, "Příchod prvních Slovanů," 267–280.

[27] More on this issue see Gindin, Ivanov and Litavrin, *Svod drevnějšich*, 364–393.

[28] Peter Ratkoš, *Pramene k dejinám Veľkej Moravy* (Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SAV, 1968), 60.

ravia and neighbouring regions after having crossed the Carpathian passes. The second wave came from the south along Danube basin. Heading from the east the Slavs got to the north-eastern part of the Great Hungarian Plain and Transylvania (a part of today's Romania). Slavic groups may have arrived from the south-east later on within the Avar tribal groups which reached the area in 568.[29]

Slovakia

A group of Slovak researchers introduced after 1990 the theory of autochtonic origin of the Slavs along the Central Danube.[30] However, there are still those who advocate that the Slavs actually moved into this area. Gabriel Fusek in his works analysed archaeological fragments found in Slovakia and neighbouring regions and based his research on written sources too. He assumes that the Slavs came to our land moving from the north-east and north-west of the Carpathian basin through various passes and dated this movement back to the 70's of the 5th century. Gabriel Fusek supports his point by typological match of the pottery and assumed migration source land, which was south-eastern Poland and western Ukraine, and the extinction of Germanic cultures. The researcher introduced a relative chronology of the Early-Slavic Period including three main periods as dated back to the turn of the 5th and the 6th

---

[29] Gabriel Fusek and Jozef Zábojník, "Príspevok do diskusie o počiatkoch slovanského osídlenia Slovenska," *Slovenská archeológia 51* (2003): 329–340. Měřínský, *České země od příchodu Slovanů po Velkou Moravu I*, 45–50. Oleg Michajlovič Prichodnjuk, *Archeologični pamjatki serednogo Pridniprovja VI – IX st. n.e.* (Kiiv: Naukova dumka, 1980). Valentin Vasilievič Sedov, *Slavjane v drevnosti* (Moskva: Institut archeologii RAN, 1994). Valentin Vasilievič Sedov, *Slavjane v rannem srednevekovje.* (Moskva: Institut archeologii RAN, 1995). Valentin Vasilievič Sedov, *Slavjane: Istoriko – archeologičeskoe issledovanie* (Moskva: Jazykislav. kuľtury 2002). Rather sceptical point of view as regards the Prague-type pottery from Bohemia and Moravia and its relation to the Slavs is held by Florin Curta. See Florin Curta, "Utváření Slovanů (se zvláštním zřetelem k Čechám a Moravě)," *Archeologické rozhledy 60* (2008): 643–694.

[30] Consider Alexander Avenarius, "Začiatky Slovanov na strednom Dunaji: Autochtonistická teória vo svetle súčasného bádania," *Historický časopis 40* (1992): 1–16. Dušan Čaplovič, *Včasnostredoveké osídlenie Slovenska* (Bratislava: Academic Electronic Press, 1998). Bohuslav Chropovský, "Niekoľko poznámok k problematike pravlasti Slovanov," *Studia Archaeologica Slovaca Mediaevalia 1* (1998): 37–42. Bohuslav Chropovský, "Some problems of the ethnogenesis of the Slavs and of the settlement process of the Central Danubian Slovens – Slovaks in the 6th and 7th century," in *Slovaks in the Central Danubian Region in the 6th to 11th century*, (Bratislava: Slovenské národné múzeum, 2000), 45–65. Pavol Mačala, *Etnogenéza Slovanov v archeológii* (Košice: Slovo, 1995).

century until the end of the 7th century and the last one dated back to the pre-Great Moravian Period. The earliest and proved Slavic settlements in Slovakia were found in Žilina, Lakšárska Nová Ves, Ludanice-Mýtna Nová Ves, Nitra etc. Based on the current knowledge, the early Slavs could have settled in fertile basins, mostly in south-eastern Slovakia. Among early Slavic discoveries can be listed those found in Záhorie region. Recently, the first sites were found in eastern Slovakia too (Nižná Myšla-Alalameneva, Ždaňa).[31]

Bohemia and Moravia

Today, Czech researchers unanimously agree on the hypothesis that the Slavs actually moved to Bohemia and Moravia. The Lombards were settled in the land of Bohemia even in the second half of the 5th century and possibly at the beginning of the 6th century. The Slavs from Moravia probably settled here not earlier than after the Lombards had left. However, researchers do not hold uniform theories on the period when the Slavs came to our land. A group of them believes that the movements took place in the first third of the 6th century (Dušan Třestík) while the others tend to prefer the last third of the 6th century (Michal Lutovský, Eduard Droberjar, Rastislav Korený).[32] Early-Slavic artefacts are well supported mainly in central and north-western Bohemia. The Prague-type pottery culture is found spread mainly in regions Prague-Slanec, Kolín, Pardubice, Jičín, Litoměřice, in the central Ohře River basin and in the region of Bílina. Fewer fragments representing this culture were found in western Bohemia. Settlements in eastern Bohemia still remain problematic und unclear. The Slavs used to settle areas with the most suitable climatic conditions, i.e. in the altitudes not higher than 400 meters above sea level and in the areas near river basins. Archaeologists examined mainly following locations: Březno near Louny, Roz-

---

[31] Fusek, *Slovensko vo včasnoslovanskom období.* Gabriel Fusek, "Frühe Slawen im Mitteldonaugebiet," in *Kulturwandel in Mitteleuropa. Langobarden – Awaren – Slawen*, ed. Jan Bemmann and Michael Schmauder, (Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, 2008), 645–656. Fusek and Zábojník, "Príspevok do diskusie," 319–340.

[32] For an overwiev see Magdalena Beranová and Michal Lutovský, *Slované v Čechách: Archeologie 6. – 12. století* (Praha: Libri, 2009), 20–21. Eduard Droberjar, *Věk barbarů.* (Praha – Litomyšl: Ladislav Horáček – Paseka, 2005), 201–209. Rastislav Korený, "Čechy v 6. století. K problému konce germánskeho osídlení Čech," *Archeologie ve středních Čechách 9* (2005): 459–522. Třeštík, "Příchod prvních Slovanů," 245–280.

toky near Prague, Prague-Bohnice, Prague-Čimice, Prague-Bubeneč, Jenišov Újezd and Turnov.[33]

Southern Moravia between Znojmo and the Lower-Moravian Vale, the region around Brno and the Svratka River basin were inhabited by the Lombards even in the first half of the 6th century who later moved to Pannonia and then in 568 to southern Italy. Neither archaeological nor written sources support the idea of the Slavs and the Lombards living together. Luděk Galuška assumes that the early Slavs came to the land around central Moravia River through the White Carpathians from the area around central Vah River in today's Slovakia. As far as this region is concerned, settlements are found for instance in Ostrožská Nová Ves, Polešovce or in Uherský Ostroh. Settlements can be traced along Moravia basin to the area of today's Olomouc. Luděk Galuška believes these movements might have taken place at the beginning or in the first two or even three decades of the 6th century. Moravia was finally inhabited by the Slavs in the second half of the 6th century and in the following periods. The Slavs were able to settle in its southern part not earlier than after the Lombards had left.[34] Zdeněk Měřínsky has a similar opinion on this issue.[35]

Poland

It used to be assumed that there was a culture community settled along the basins of rivers Oder and Vistula from the Late Roman period until the Early Middle Ages. The Przeworsk culture was considered an early Slavic culture. Today, there is an assumption that it carried aspects of Germanic culture. There were various ethnic groups in Poland at the beginning of the Middle Ages. West-Baltic tribes and the ancestors of the Prussians settled to the west of the Vistula mouth. According to Kazimierz Godłowski, the Slavs inhabited the land along the Oder and the Vistula around the half of the 5th century and they appeared to the east of the Central Vistula basin already in the early 5th century. In this period there still were some traces of the original population in the polish

---

[33] For more on this issue see Beranová and Lutovský, *Slované v Čechách*, 19–32, Naďa Profantová, Martin Kuna, Dalibor Moravec and Libuše Haišmanová, "Časne slovanské osídlení Čech," in *Počátky raného středověku v Čechách (The onset of the Early Middle Ages in Bohemia)*, ed. Martin Kuna and Naďa Profantová, et al. (Praha: Archeologický ústav AV ČR, 2005), 73–89. The list of locations of the Prague-type pottery culture in Bohemia can be found in Profantová, "Die frühslawische Besiedlung Böhmens," 619–644.

[34] Galuška, *Slované – doteky předků*, 13–15. See the list of literature.

[35] Měřínský, *České země od příchodu Slovanů po Velkou Moravu I*, 57–59.

Małopolska and Wielkopolska provinces, Silesia and right-bank Masovia. At the beginning of the 6th century the original inhabitants were still settled in some regions of Central Poland and Pomerania.[36] Settlements of the Slavs in Masovia date back to the second half of the 6th century.[37] The Slavs inhabited the region of Pomerania and Pojezierze already in the 7th century.[38] The same might have happened in the Chełmno-Dobrzyń region.[39] However, archaeologists did not manage to find evidence that the aboriginal inhabitants shared the land with the Slavs.[40] The Slavic peoples who settled in today's Poland were representatives of the Prague-type pottery culture. Within various regions there were differences regarding material culture.[41] Based on Marek Dulinicz's assumption, the Slavs from the Vistula, the Odra and the Elbe in the 6th and the 7th century were not very active and they might have settled here in later periods.[42]

Austria

In the Late Antiquity, western Part of today's Austria was included in Roman provinces of Raetia and Noricum. Lower Austria together with Burgenland belonged to the province of Pannonia superior (during the reign of the Emperor Diocletian from 284 to 305 called Pannonia prima). This land was inhabited by the Boths, the Heruli and the Rugians. These tribes came here during the Migration Period and were followed by the Lombards at the end of the 5th century. The Avars ruled over the area in the period after 568. Eastern parts of Raetia and western parts of Noricum were under control of the Bavarii at the end of the 6th century and at the beginning of the 7th century.[43] The eldest artefacts which give evidence of the Slavs' presence were found in cremation

---

[36] Godłowski, *Pierwotne siedziby Słowian*,134–168. Parczewski, *Die Anfänge*, 139.

[37] Maria Miśkiewiczowa, *Mazowsze płockie we wczesnym średniowieczu* (Warszawa: Wydawanictvo Uniwersytetu, 1981), 26.

[38] Jerzy Olczak, *Formy osadnictwa na pojezierzu zachodniopomorskim we wczesnym sredniowieczu* (Torun: Uniwersytet Mikolaja Kopernika, 1991), 9.

[39] Wojciech Chudziak, *Zasiedlenie strefy chełmińsko – dobrzyńskiej we wczesnym średniowieczu (VI – XI wiek)* (Torun: Uniwersytet Mikolaja Kopernika, 1996), 24–25.

[40] Parczewski, *Die Anfänge*, 139.

[41] Parczewski, *Die Anfänge*, 140–141.

[42] Marek Dulinicz, *Ksztaltowanie sie Slowianszczyzny Pólnocno – Zachodniej: Studium archeologiczne* (Warszawa: Institut Archeologii i Etnologii PAN, 2001), 210–212.

[43] Erik Szeimat, "Zum archäologischen Bild der frühen Slawen in Österreich. Mit fragen zur etnischen Bestimmung karolingerzeitlicher Gräbelfelder im Ostalpenraum," in *Slovenija in sosednje dežele med antiko in karolinško dobo. Začetki slovenske etnogeneze I.* (Ljubljana: Narodni muzej, 2000), 508–509.

graves around Hohenau an der March[44] and Poysdorf.[45] Somewhat younger is the grave artefact from the site near Stein an der Donau.[46] Settlement artefacts were found for instance in Unterrohrbach and Mannersdorf an der March.[47] All these sites are situated in the north of the Danube. Jarmila Justová used to underline the relation between the sites from Hohenau an der March, Poysdorf and the earliest wave of the Slavs that might have entered southern Moravia and south-western Slovakia in the 6th century.[48] Erik Szeimat dates early-Slavic pottery found in Austria back to the second half of the 6th and 7th century. The presence of the Prague-type pottery was so far proved in a number of sites. Considering the character of the artefacts it is assumed that there was no massive occupation within migration movements. Erik Szeimat believes the Slavs might have moved here as a part of Avars' military operations in this region who had a great influence on aboriginal Roman population.[49]

Germany

Joachim Herrmann supposed the area along central Havel basin and lower Spree basin to be settled by the Slavs in the second half of the 6th century.[50] Nowadays it is considered that Slavic settlement activity in the land along the Elbe and the Saale started around 600 or at the beginning of the 7th century. Coastal regions of Mecklenburg and Pomerania were probably inhabited not earlier than in the second half of the 7th century. The Slavs got to the land of eastern Holstein even later, i.e. after 700.[51] Problematic issue is a relationship between Germanic inhabitants and the Slavs. The problem lies in distinguishing artefacts of undecorated vessels made in hand by Germanic inhabitants in the 6th century

---

[44] Jarmila Justová, *Dolnorakouské Podunají v raném středověku* (Praha: Academia, 1990), 238.

[45] Justová, *Dolnorakouské Podunají*, 247.

[46] Justová, *Dolnorakouské Podunají*, 251–252.

[47] Měřínský, *České země od příchodu Slovanů po Velkou Moravu I*, 59–60. Erik Szeimat, "Zum archäologischen Bild," 512.

[48] Justová, *Dolnorakouské Podunají*, 41.

[49] Szeimat, "Zum archäologischen Bild," 516–522.

[50] Joachimed Herrmann et al., *Die Slawen in Deutschland: Geschichte und Kultur der slawischen Stämme westlich von Oder und Neiße vom 6. bis 12. Jahrhundert. Ein Handbuch* (Berlin: Akademie – Verlag, 1970), 23.

[51] Sebastian Brather, *Archäologie der westlichen Slawen: Siedlung, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft im früh – und hochmittelalterlichen Ostmitteleuropa* (Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2001), 61. Marek Dulinicz, *Frühe Slawen im Gebiet zwischen unterer Weichsel und Elbe* (Neumünster: Wachholtz Verlag, 2006), 253, 259.

from those of the 7th century Slavs.[52] It is now proved that there was a decline in Germanic settlements in the regions situated to the east of the Saale in the 6th century. Eastern Thuringia between the Saale and the Elbe was first inhabited by the Slavs in the last third of the 6th century.[53] The presence of the Prague-type pottery was proved in the sites around the Elbe (e.g. Dessau-Mosigkau). The region around historical province of Lower Lusatia was settled by the representatives of the Sukow group, also called Sukow-Szeligi group. These cultures differ mostly in the shape of vessels, floor plans of their buildings (in the area of the Sukow-Szeligi group the floor plan holes have a longitudinal-oval shape).[54] Michał Parczewski underlines the possibility that the Sukow-Szeligi group might have followed the Prague-type culture. Felix Biermann is much of the same opinion.[55] The next wave of the Slavs was tradition-ally put into the 7th century. According to earlier theories, the Tornow group was believed to occur in Lower Lusatia, i.e. in the region of the Sukow-Szeligi group, and the Rüssen group was assumed to settle in the land along the Elbe. The Rüssen group was named after pottery which was decorated with small waves and referred to as Rüssen type. In the recent periods, however, such chronology regarding artefacts related to the above-mentioned groups as being traditionally dated back to the 7th century is challenged and the artefacts are believed to belong to later centuries.[56]

Hungary

Currently there is only a little known about settlements in today's Hungary. The lack of knowledge and information is surely caused by the state of research in this field. In the region of Beech Mountains, re-searchers excavated an object with hand-made pottery. The settlement dates back to the 8th or 9th century.[57] Artefacts of Prague-type pottery

---

[52]Brather, *Archäologie der westlichen Slawen*, 62.

[53] Berthold Schmidt, "Thüringen – Franken – Sachsen – Slawen. Gesselschaftliche Veränderungen vom 6. bis 8. Jahrhndert in Mitteldeutschland," *Jahresschrift für Mitteldeutsche Vorgeschichte 75* (1992): 313–323.

[54] Felix Biermann, *Slawische Besiedlung zwischen Elbe, Neisse und Lubsza: Archäologische Studien zum Siedlungswesen und zur Sachkultur des frühen und hohen Mittelalters. Ergebnisse und Materialien zum DFG – Projekt "Germanen – Slawen – Deutsche"* (Bonn: Verlag Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, 2000), 33–36.

[55]Biermann, *Slawische Besiedlung,* 35–36. Parczewski, *Die Anfänge,* 125–128.

[56]Biermann, *Slawische Besiedlung*, 33–35.

[57] Károly Mesterházy, "Awaren, Slawen und Ungarn im Bükkgebirge," in *Central Europe in 8th – 10th centuries. International Scientific conference, Bratislava October 2 – 4, 1995* (Bratislava: Ministry of Culture of the Slovak Republic, 1997), 70.

were found in south-western Hungary and around Balaton region and date back to the beginning or the first half of the 7th century (Szepetnek-Bánfapuszta, Balatonmagyaród-Hidvégpuszta, Nagyrécse, Eszteregnye).[58] An evidence of a settlement was found in Kisvárd located in north-eastern Hungary.[59] Vessels similar to the Prague type were sometimes used as urns in Pókaszepetk burial ground situated north-east of Zalaegerszeg.[60]

Translate: Ján Želonka

---

[58]Měřínský, "České země od příchodu Slovanů po Velkou Moravu I, 61. Béla Miklós Szőke, "7. és 9. századi településmaradványok Nagykaniszán," *Zalai Múzeum 4* (1992): 129–167.

[59] Eszter Istvánovits, "Korai szláv települes maradványai Kisvárda határában," *Jósa András Múzeum Évkönyve, 43* (2001):165–183.

[60] Béla Miklós Szőke, "Das archäologische Bild der Slawen in Südwestungarn," in *Slovenija in sosednje dežele med antiko in karolinško dobo. Začetki slovenske etnogeneze I.* (Ljubljana: Narodni muzej, 2000), 479–482.

Peter IVANIČ

WESTERN SLAVS IN THE 6th AND 7th CENTURY[61]

- s u m m a r y-

During the early Middle Ages the European continent became a theatre of important historical changes. Large areas in Middle, South-eastern and Eastern Europe gained during this period predominantly Slavic ethnical character. The history of the Slavs during the Early Middle Ages was treated in the works of contemporary medieval authors. This paper present the image of the West Slavs based on the written and archaeological sources in the 6th and 7th century.

Mitko B. PANOV

Institute of National History
- Skopje

RECONSTRUCTING 7th CENTURY MACEDONIA: SOME NEGLECTED ASPECTS OF THE *MIRACLES OF ST.DEMETRIUS*

The two Books of the *Miracles of St. Demetrius* are considered as one of the most important sources for the reconstruction of the Dark Age Balkans. They are the only surviving testimony of the attacks of the Sclavenes and Avars on Thessalonica. What is more, the Book II of the Miracles of St. Demetrius contains rare contemporary accounts for the period after Heraclius' reign. The Miracles of St. Demetrius are generally associated with the issue of the Slavic settlement in Macedonia and the Balkans, which was a matter of long debate among the scholars.[1]

---

[1] The dominant opinion among the scholars was that the settlement of the Slavs in Macedonia and the Balkans occurred by the 580s. See, Фрањо Баришић, *Чуда Димитрија Солунског као историски извори* (Београд, 1953); Стјепан Антолјак, *Средновековна Македонија* I (Скопје, 1985); Бранко Панов, *Средновековна Македонија* I (Скопје, 1985), and more recently, Paul M. Bardford, *The Early Slavs: Culture and Society in Early Medieval Eastern Europe* (Cornell University Press, New York, 2001, 60-63; Ирена Стефоска, *Словените на почвата на Македонија* (Скопје, 2002); Zbigniew Kobylinski, "The Slavs", *The New Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. 1, c. 500-c.700*, ed. P. Fouracre (Cambridge, 2005), 524-546; Милан Бошкоски, *Скопје и скопската област од VI до крајот на XIV век* (Скопје, 2009), 57-72; Peter Sarris, *Empires of Faith: The fall of Rome to the Rise of Islam, 500-700* (Oxford, 2011), 181-182. The present author of this article, formerly automatically accepted this interpretation, proceeded from the traditional historiography and uncritical use of the historical sources that involved the Miracles of St. Demetrius (Mitko B. Panov, "On the Slav Colonization and the Ethnic Changes in Macedonia by the End of the 6th and the First Half of the 7th Century", *Balcanica Posnaniensia*, 11–12 (2001), 23–33).

However, starting with the seminal work of Florin Curta, recent studies have challenged the traditional interpretation of the Slavic settlement in the Balkans, based upon the critical analysis of the sources that comprise the Miracles of St. Demetrius as well. It seems that lately scholars are more inclined towards the opinion that the first indication of the Slavic settlement in the Balkans can be found only in the period of Heraclius' early years of accession to power.[2] It is the critical analysis of the Miracles of St. Demetrius that provide a basis for this interpretation.

Nevertheless, the main question arises - if there was no settlement of Sclavenes before 610, how did a multitude of Sclavene tribes establish themselves in the surrounding area of Thessalonica in only a few years period? Furthermore, if the anonymous author of the Book II of the Miracles of St. Demetrius is to be believed, they were not only differentiated by their name controlling a certain territory in the hinterland of Thessalonica, but they were also well organised and even managed to acquire unification and achieve an alliance under a sole leader (ἔξαρχος) Chatzon. In addition, modern scholars without reservation accept the impression of the anonymous author that at that time the separate Sclavene tribes were a familiar presence and that the citizens could distinguish them. Furthermore, the prominent citizens of Thessalonica even established close connections with the Sclavene leader Hatzon. All this took place in few years' time and in an extremely hostile environment, as the second homily of the Book II of the *Miracles* is presenting. This article is an attempt to shed certain light on these and other questions that are neglected and derive from the re-reading of the two Books of the Miracles of St. Demetrius.

F. Curta has rightly put forward the question of when did the multitude of Sclavene tribes, mentioned in the Book II of the Miracles of

---

[2] For the first indication of the settlement in the Balkans in the reign of Heraclius, see more recently Тибор Живковић, *Јужни Словени под византиском влашћу, 600-1025*, друго издање (Београд, 2007), 125-135; Florin Curta, *The Making of the Slavs, History and Arceology of the Lower Danube Region, c. 500-700* (Cambridge, New York, 2001), 113-114; idem, *Southestern Europe in the Middle Ages 500-1250* (Cambridge, 2006), 58-59. Michael Whitby, *The Emperor Maurice and his Historian* (Oxford, 1988), 113, 184-185, argued that the there is no proof in the sources of the infiltration of Slavs into Macedonia in the 580s. Peter Heather, *Empires and Barbarians: The Fall of Rome and the Birth of Europe* (Oxford University Press, 2010), 401-402, argued that the initial Slavic settlement in the 580s certainly occurred but they "were swallowed up by Maurices counterattacks" and that after 614 the decisive moment of the settlement of the Slavs occurred in the Balkans.

St. Demetrius, settle in the vicinity of Thessalonica, since they were not there in 610. He noticed that it was impossible to tell with precision when did those tribes settle in this region, but argued that "it cannot have been earlier than the reign of Heraclius". Since the main aim of the Sclavene tribes besieging Thessalonica in 615/6 was to "settle with their families" after the conquest of the city, Curta argued that "they were not coming from afar", i.e. were coming from the hinterland of Thessalonica. That would explain how the prisoners taken after the siege could return to Thessalonica carrying the booty taken by the Sclavenes from the inhabitants of the city. However, Curta did not give a definite answer to the question on how no less than five Sclavene tribes managed to establish themselves in the hinterland of Thessalonica in such a short period of time, even though he critically addressed the Book II of the *Miracles* challenging the notion of the capability of those tribes to perpetrate the large-scale devastation of the most of the Balkans and even parts of Asia.[3]

To address this complex issue, we should look back into the textual context of the Book I of the *Miracles*, written by Archbishop John precisely at the time when the siege of Thessalonica in 615/6 occurred, that is in the second decade of the 7th century. John registered the first attack of the 'Sklavini' (Σκλαβίνων) on the city of Thessalonica in 584, informing of a "not so great a barbarian army" which "we counted to be about 5,000".[4] The attack on Thessalonica in 584, though having a character of a military organisation undertaken by a certain group of warriors 'Sklavini' on their own, was most probably in some kind of coordination with the Avar incursions that were being carried out at the same time in Hellas. That is also confirmed by the accounts by *Evagrius* and *Michael the Syrian* who point to the Avar incursions in Hellas in the early 580s, which implies a coordinated military action.[5] It is credible that in this period some military groups were directly

---

[3] Miracula II. 1. 179. Curta, *Making of the Slavs,* 107-108*; Idem, "*Still waiting for the barbarians? The making of the Slavs in 'Dark-Age' Greece." In Neglected Barbarians.* Edited by Florin Curta (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 462-464.

[4] Paul Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils des Miracles de saint Démétrius,* Vol. 1: Le texte (Paris, 1979), I. 12.112.

[5] *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*, trans. M. Whitby (Liverpool, 2000), VI.10; *Chronique de Michel le Syrien Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche*, ed. J-B Chabot, T. I-III (Paris, 1899), X. 21. On the Avars as participants in the attacks in Hellas, M. Whitby, *The Emperor Maurice and his Historian* (Oxford, 1988), 110; Curta, *Making of the Slavs*, 94-95

subordinated to the Avars, while certain groups named by John as the 'Sklavini' acted in coordination but independently, as was the case with the attack on Thessalonica in 584.

In any case, the one-day-attack on Thessalonica in 584 did not have the capacity to threaten the city more seriously, due to the limited number of enemy warriors, as well as the quick mobilisation of the citizens.[6] What remains unnoticed by the modern scholars is the fact that John, while stating that the enemy warriors which attacked Thessalonica in 584 was the "chosen flower" of the "nation of Sklavini" (τῶν Σκλαβίνων ἔθνους), felt it necessary to clarify that in fact that is what "is said" (ὡς εἴρηται).[7] Such dissociation is an illustrative indication that John, as well as the citizens themselves, was unable to specifically identify the attacking warriors who directly threatened the city for the first time. John's distancing from his own identification of the attackers as being the 'Sklavini' by pointing out that "it is said", even though he was referring to the event that he personally witnessed is a clear indication that there were no groups of enemy warriors that were settled in the vicinity of Thessalonica in that period, nor was the city previously directly threatened by any 'Sklavini'. Otherwise, John as an eyewitness would have been certain in the identification of the attackers and would have shared the same perception with the citizens who were his main audience. In that respect, what is indicative is that John himself mentions that the people of Thessalonica could distinguish "certain sounds of the barbarian cry" from afar.[8] Hence, it is understandable why John, except at one instance in the beginning where he refers to what "is said" to name the attackers as being 'Sklavini', used the term 'barbarians' to refer to the enemy warriors consistently throughout the following text where he elaborates on the attack. That John could not distinguish the enemy warriors, additionally attest his explanation that the relatively small number of the enemy warriors, was due to the fact that "they would not have attack so suddenly so large city, if they did not overtook

---

[6] Баришић, *Чуда,* 49-55. For the different dating of this campaign, see the commentary by О. В. Иванова, "Чудеса св. Димитрия Солунского", in *Свод древнейших* письменных известий о славянах, т. II (Москва, 1995), 182; Живковић, *Јужни Словени,* 361, n. 479. F. Curta, *Making of the Slavs*, 92–93, n. 67, who decidedly rejects the suggested dating by Lemerle for the year 604 AD. (Paul Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils des Miracles de Saint Démétrius,* Vol. 2: Commentaire (Paris, 1981), 40. 69, 72).

[7] *Miracula* I. 12.108.

[8] *Miracula* I. 12.112.

in power and audacity those who sometime in the past battled against the city".[9] This explanation is hardly of a person who was able to assess that the attackers were a professional soldiers, the "chosen flower", but rather reflect his consistent tendency to give the attack a greater dimension.

In light of the fact that John, as well as the citizens, was unable to specifically identify the attackers, he evidently resorted to the use of the specific term 'Sklavini' (Σκλαβίνων) that was probably created in Constantinople in the beginning of the 7th century, in addition to the usual terms 'Σκλαβηνων' or shortened version 'Σκλάβοι' to refer to the military groups of barbarians coming from the northern side of the Danube river. If one takes into account that in describing the attack on Thessalonica, which followed two years later in 586, John used the term "Sklaviniai" (Σκλαβινιῶν) for the first time for the attacking warriors, it appears that by using the term "Sklavini" (Σκλαβίνων) he was in fact pointing to the unknown group of warriors coming from the barbarian land - 'Sklaviniai' located on the other side of the Danube.[10] In general, the available contemporary sources do not report of any settling of Sclavenes in Macedonia as a consequence of this campaign. The account of *John of Ephesus* on the campaign of the "accursed people of the Sklavenoi" (Sqlw'nyw) who, starting from 581 for four years in a row, had "overran the whole of Hellas, and the regions surrounding Thessalonica, and all Thrace, and captured the cities, and took numerous forts, and devastated and burnt, and reduced the people to slavery, and

---

[9] *Miracula* I. 12.107-8.

[10] *Miracula* I. 13.117-118. Paul Lemerle in his critical edition of *Miracles*, amended the word "Sklabiniîn" with "Sklabhnîn", arguing that "Sklabiniîn" contained in the oldest manuscript Vaticanus graecus 797 from the 10th century is a corrupted form of "Sklabhnîn". His amendation is based upon the later 12th century Greek manuscript 1517 in the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale. See, Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils,* I, 134.14. Генадий Литаврин, *Византия и Славяне* (Санкт Петербург, 1999), 520-522, criticises the interpretation by Lemerle, advocating the position that the *Miracles of St. Demetrios* actually contains the first and oldest mention of the term "Sklaviniai". See also, Антолјак, *Средновековна Македонија,* I (Скопје, 1985), 127-128. Recently, Evangelos Chrysos, "Settlements of Slavs and Byzantine sovereignty in the Balkans", *Byzantina Mediterranea. Festschrift fur Johannes Koder zum 65. Geburtstag*. Belke, Klaus, Ewald Kislinger, Andreas Kulzer, and Maria Stassinopoulou (Vienna: Bohlau, 2007), 123-135 accepted the interpretation of Lemerle, arguing that the term 'Sklaviniai' appears "in no greek source of the sixth or the seventh century". See also, Florin Curta, "Sklaviniai and ethnic adjectives: a clarification." *Byzantion Nea Hellás* 30 (2011): 87-88, who argued that the first mention of the term "Sklaviniai" is contained in the work of Theophylact Simocatta.

made themselves masters of the whole country, and settled in it by main force, and dwelt in it as though it had been their own without fear", does not imply settling of groups of Slavs. This account rather points to the existence of constant military threat at the time, that also influenced a perception of a continuing presence of enemies which included the Avars, accompanied with Byzantium's incapability to respond efficiently to such a challenge.[11] It created an impression for John of Ephesus that in fact the Sclavenes remained in the land as if it was theirs, notwithstanding the fact that at that time the Avars were carrying out their invasions on Hellas.[12] Thus, the accounts in the Book I of the Miracles of St. Demetrius and of John of Ephesus can not be taken as an indication of a settlement, since the Sclavene warriors engaged in the campaigns returned in 584, as they had done before, to their homes on the other side of the Danube, taking with them the spoils they had triumphantly obtained.

Shortly after, in 586, Macedonia was again directly threatened by incursions of the Avars and their subordinate military groups from the 'Sklaviniai' (τῶν Σκλαβινιῶν) coming from across the Danube. According to the Book I of the Miracles of St. Demetrius, as this large army crossed the Danube, it directly set out towards the city of Thessalonica with the intent to conquer it. The Archbishop of Thessalonica, John, writes about "the greatest war of all" that the city had ever faced and "the greatest Miracle" undertaken by St. Demetrius. What is indicative is that in describing this attack too, John uses the same formulation for identifying the attackers, starting his explanation with the words "it is said" (λέγεται) that the leader of the Avars at the time, saw that of all the cities in the entire Illyricum, Thessalonica was in the "heart of the Emperor" and that if it were to "suddenly suffer destruction", that would hurt him the most. Furthermore, the Archbishop reports that led by the motive to take his revenge on the Emperor, the Avar Khagan had "called unto him the entire faithless and beastly tribe of the Sklaviniai" (τῶν Σκλαβινιῶν θηριώδη φυλήν), the people that was completely subordinated to him" and after including other Avars as well, "ordered them all to set out against the God-protected

---

[11] *Iohannis Ephesini historiae ecclesiasticae pars tertia*, ed. *E. W. Brooks*, CSCO (Louvain, 1936), VI 25; *Свод древнейших* письменных известий о славянах, т. II (Москва, 1995), 279-280.
[12] Curta, *Making of the Slavs*, 48–50 credibly shows that in Constantinople, the desolations in Hellas were in fact attributed to the Avars and not to the Slavs.

Thessalonica".[13] In the week-long siege from both land and sea, which started on 22nd September 586, various siege devices were used which further points to a previously planned action, and a tried and tested military strategy of the Avars, who were already acquainted with the techniques of laying siege.[14] Having in mind the reported absence of the Prefect of Illyricum at the time of the siege, it becomes clear that this campaign had a surprising character and was a part of a comprehensive military strategy of the Avars in realising their offensive attacks on the Balkans.[15] The absence of the Thessalonica elite from the city is also registered, which suggests that the defence was exclusively in the hands of the self-organised citizens, under the leadership of the Archbishop at the time, Eusebius. This situation illustrates the preparedness of the citizens for emergency mobilisation, but also that there were no indications that would suggest a direct threat to the city. If there had been a continued threat to the city, the political and civil elite certainly would not have left Thessalonica.

After week-long unsuccessful attempts to penetrate the defence of the city, the joint army of the Avars and the warriors from the 'Sklaviniai' gave up the siege and withdrew. The reason for the victory over the 'barbarians' who withdrew in panic, according to John, was the "bravery of the Macedonians" (τοῖς Μακεδόσιν) – the "protectors" of the city, encouraged by St Demetrius and God himself.[16]
In analysing the character of the attack itself, it is indicative that the Archbishop of Thessalonica cites the estimates of the "observers" (καταληφθείσης) in concluding that the number of the enemy who laid siege to Thessalonica was 100.000, or "somewhat less or a lot more". John's dissociation as regards the number of attackers, as opposed to the attack from 584, for which he personally noted the concrete number, as well as the present disparity in estimates, points to the evident exaggeration of the threat.[17] This conclusion comes from placing the

---

[13] *Miracula* I. 13.117-118. For the date of the siege, see Баришић, *Чуда*, 49-55; Иванова, "Чудеса", 182; Curta, *Making of the Slavs,* 92-94.

[14] On the Avars being familiar with the techniques of laying siege, M. Whitby, *Emperor Maurice*, 118-119.

[15] Theophylact Simocatta (I. 8. 10-11) also registers the military engagement of the Avars in Thrace in 586, the time of which coincided with the attack on Thessalonica. See, M. Whitby, *Emperor Maurice,* 147; Curta, *Making of the Slavs,* 97-98; Живковић, *Јужни Словени*, 130-133.

[16] *Miracula* I. 14. 148; I. 13.116.

[17] *Miracula* I. 13. 117-118.

attack in the context of Byzantine imperial policy, i.e. from presenting Thessalonica as a kind of "heart of the Emperor". In other words, John tendentiously tried to raise the moral of the citizens of Thessalonica by creating an image that the destiny of the Empire itself depended on the survival of their city.

Notwithstanding John's tendency to evidently exaggerate the threat from the siege, the military potential of the gathered enemy army, both in the sense of numbers and organisation, had a much more serious character than the separate attack of the warriors of the 'Sklavini' in 584. It is indicative that, as opposed to the previous attack, the military potential in the siege of 586 was due to the immediate organisation on the part of the Avar Khagan, which covered both the presence of the Avars in the army and the command over them. In that respect, John's suggestion that the citizens saw for the first time a barbarian army "so close as to besiege the city" undoubtedly points to the different character of the siege in comparison to the siege that happened two years before. Perhaps with this fact John referred to the novelty concerning the greater numbers of the army and the talks about the Avar warriors who, together with the subordinated warriors from the 'Sklaviniai' and the other barbarians, had besieged the city, as opposed to the attack of 584.[18] In any case, this fact further testifies as to John's and the citizen's insecurity regarding the specific identification of the enemy warriors that besieged the city.

Analysis of the *Miracles* reveals another aspect that has been neglected by the scholars. Namely, besides John reporting that the enemy had never before been seen from so up close as to besiege the city, he also concludes that "most of the citizens, except those that were listed in the military registers, did not even recognise their appearance".[19] This fact further implies that John, as well as the citizens themselves, was unable to specifically identify the attackers. Even in the noticeably invented story of the "large number of the enemy" that allegedly deserted after the unsuccessful siege and entering the town communicated with the citizens, John did not identify them, but labeled

---

[18] Curta, *Making of the Slavs,* 54, who points to the dominance of the Avar presence in the besieging army. M. Whitby, *The Emperor Maurice*, 147, postulates that the Avar campaign in Thrace coincided with the attack on Thessalonica, which was most likely the reason why the citizens of Thessalonica were convinced that the siege was carried out on the orders of the Avar Khagan.

[19] *Miracula* I. 13. 121.

them as "enemies".[20] It is probable that the naming of the new enemies was also based on the information from those citizens that were engaged in the Byzantine military service, who used the specific terms created in Constantinople for designating the main enemies at the beginning of the 7th century – the Avars and the 'Sklavini' who were coming from the 'Sklaviniai' on the other side of the Danube. In that respect, it is understandable why in the two cases when he uses the terms 'Sklavini' and 'Sklaviniai' in describing the warriors that attacked Thessalonica in 584 and 586, John felt it necessary to dissociate himself and call upon the fact that "it is said". That entails that the archbishop linked this attack with the general perception of the circumstances in Byzantium at the time and therefore used the specific terminology applied for the enemy warriors. Further in the text, as was the case with the first siege, John consistently used the terms 'barbarians', 'tribe' or 'enemies' thus avoiding the specific identification of the warriors in the siege. It is indicative that John, in the part of the *Miracles* that precedes the description of the siege, elaborates his intent to write about "how the barbarian people, in large numbers, attacked the God-protected city of the people of Thessalonica". The same tendency is also present in the use of the terms "barbarian cry" or "barbarian voice", which are not accompanied with a concrete identification.

The specific term 'Sklaviniai' (Σκλαβινιῶν), used for the first time by John for the identification of the barbarians on the left side of the Danube region that were in subordination to the Avars, opens up yet another perspective. This term in its singular form 'Sklavinia' (Σκλλαυηνίας), was used by *Theophylact Simocatta* writing in the second quarter of the 7th century for denoting the particular barbarian lands north of the river Danube the Byzantine troops were engaged against in 602.[21] Thus John actually used the specific terms 'Sklavini' and 'Sklaviniai' that circulated among the soldiers and the administration that were present in Thessalonica at the time of the writing of the *Miracula*. With the terminology 'Sklavini' and

---

[20] *Miracula* I. 12. 159-160.
[21]   Curta, "Sklaviniai and ethnic adjectives", 89-94, argued that the specific use of the term 'Sklavinia' by Theophylact "is nothing more than a narrative device, the role of which is to focus his audience's attention upon a particular part of the barbarian lands north of the river Danube", contra Chrysos, "Settlements of Slavs", 125-126, who claimed that the term should be interpreted as an adjective "Slavic", not of 'Sklavinia', in accordance with his thesis that the term 'Sklavinia' is not attested in any Greek source of the sixth or the seventh century.

'Sklaviniai', John was obviously referring to what was being "said" at the time, i.e. that the barbarians – the 'Sklavini' – were coming from a certain territory 'Sklaviniai' on the northern side of the Danube river. The fact that John used the terms 'Sklavini' and 'Sklaviniai' only once in the text substantiates that he was unable to identify the attackers. With it he pointed to what it was being said at the time about the enemy warriors being 'Sklavini', namely, those who were coming from 'Sklaviniai', which was a specific term for the territory that was controlled by the barbarians on the northern side of the Danube at the time when he was writing.

John's reservation as to identifying the enemy warriors attacking Thessalonica in 584 and 586, gets another dimension if one takes into consideration the fact that he compiled the first book of the *Miracles* in the second decade of the 7th century and personally witnessed the third siege by the 'Sklavini' and the fourth jointly with the Avars. Whether it means that John was unable to specifically identify the enemies that also attacked Thessalonica in the second decade of the 7th century remains an open issue. John's reticence in describing the two sieges does not preclude the possibility of the same perception at the time he was compiling the work. What also remains an open issue is the question why John did not describe the sieges of the second decade of the 7th century as well, though he personally witnessed these events. In any case, John had no reservations whatsoever in sharing his personal and general perception, at the time, for the group identification of the citizens of Thessalonica as being Macedonians, depicting them as protectors of the city together with St Demetrius.[22] At the same time, it is characteristic that John also uses the formulations "whole of Macedonia" (ὅλῃ τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ) and "all Macedonians" (τοὺς Μακεδόνας ἅπαντας) in suggesting the entire population in Macedonia.[23] This further corroborates that one cannot speak of any Slavs settling at the time when the first two sieges on Thessalonica occurred. This conclusion is also supported by the writings of the Archbishop John who stresses the fact that after removing the siege of Thessalonica in 586, the cavalry units of the citizens that had been sent in reconnaissance concluded that there were no barbarian troops in the vicinity of the city, which had apparently passed a "large distance"

---

[22] *Miracula* I. 14.148; I. 13.116.
[23] *Miracula*, I.13.116.

during a single night.[24] The rapid stabilisation of the conditions in 590's illustrated in the Papal correspondence further points to the absence of enemy troops after their retreat to the other side of the Danube.[25] That there were no new settlers within Macedonia in this period is also confirmed, in addition to the Papal correspondence and the immediate accounts contained in the *Miracles*, with the focus of the military campaigns of the Byzantine Emperor Maurice which, after 592, was turned towards the north of the Danube.[26] Maurice's military manoeuvre proved to be quite effective and resulted in the absence of registered incursions and attacks of the Sclavenes on the Balkans and in Macedonia. These factors had an influence on the preservation of a stable situation in Macedonia in the first decade of the 7th century, which is also confirmed by Heraclius's passing through the city of Thessalonica in 610 during the civil war with Phocas.[27]

The forcible deposition of the Emperor Maurice in 602 by Phocas (602–610) was an introduction into an anarchic period for Byzantium, which resulted in a gradual collapse of the defence at the Danube limes.[28] However, at the time of the reign of Phocas there were no registered incursions of the Sclavenes or the Avars on the Balkans.[29] The attacks of the Sclavenes on the Balkans were renewed in the first years of the reign of Emperor Heraclius (610–641). Using the full engagement of Heraclius at the renewed eastern front against Persia, which had the effect of neglecting the defence of the Balkan region, in 610 AD certain military groups, identified in the Byzantine sources as 'Sclavenes' (Sklavenoi, Sklavini, Sklaboi), started gradually to establish themselves in the region of the Balkans and in Macedonia. What is characteristic regarding the territory of Macedonia, that is the territory in

---

[24] *Miracula* I.13.164-165.

[25] Gregorii I papae *registrum epistolarum*, ed. P. *Ewald* and *LM Hartmann*, 2 vol. *MGH* Epp. i, ii, *Berlin 1887-99*), *Ep*. I. 43; III. 6-7; IX. 68. M. Whitby, *Emperor Maurice,* 112-116

[26] *Theopylact Simocatta*, Trans. Mary and Michael Whitby (Oxford, 1986), VII 15. 12-14; VIII 6.1. F. Curta, *Making of the Slavs,* 99-107.

[27] W. E. Kaegi, *Heraclius : Emperor of Byzantium* (Cambridge, 2003), 45-46.

[28] An account of the Armenian chronicler Sebeos implies that the Byzantine defence positions on the Danube were maintained in the first years of Phocas's reign, Sebeos. *Historia*, trans. R. Bedrosian (New York, 1985), 80. See: Curta, *Making of the Slavs,* 106-108; Живковић, *Јужни Словени,* 126-129. J. Haldon, *Byzantium in the seventh century* (Cambridge, 1997), 37, is of the opposite opinion and believes that after the rebellion of Phocas there was a collapse of the defence on the Danube.

[29] Баришић, *Чуда,* 66-73; Curta, *Making of the Slavs,* 336-337.

the hinterland of Thessalonica, is that the barbarian groups and the territories controlled by the "others" in 7th and 8th century were generally identified in the direct authentic accounts by the specific terms 'Sklavini' (*Miracles of St. Demetrius*) or in the later accounts with 'Sklavinia/i' (*Theophanes*).[30]

The anonymous author of the second book of the *Miracles of St Demetrius* registered the attack on Thessalonica from the "nation of Sklavini" (τῶν Σκλαβίνων ἔθνους) carried out in 615/6.[31] In contrast to Archbishop John, the anonymous author did not express any reservations when identifying the attackers as being the 'Sklavini' (Σκλαβίνων). At the same time, it is indicative that besides the group identification of the enemy troops with the specific term 'Sklavini' (Σκλαβίνων), the anonymous author differentiated, for the first time regarding this siege, specific groups of tribes, listing them by name as Drugubites, Sagudates, Belegezites, Baiunetes and Berzetes.[32] However, the fact that he wrote from a chronological distance of about 70 years, advances several unobserved aspects.

The authentic reconstruction of the siege of Thessalonica in 615/6 shows that the troops of the 'Sklavini' were led by Chatzon. The identification of Chatzon as a leader, i.e. the "exarch of the Sklavini" (Σκλαβίνων ἔξαρχος) and as the main initiator and executor of the siege of Thessalonica itself, suggests some higher degree of military organisation aimed at conquering the city. What followed in 616 was a

---

[30] It is indicative that anonymous author of the Miracles rarely used the term 'Σκλάβων', in contrast to the usual term 'Sklavini' (Σκλαβίνων). He used the term 'Σκλάβοι' only in general and unspecific form, when writing about some warriors who attacked the city in boats (Miracula, II. 1. 189), for those living in the huts (Miracula II. 5. 289); for those living by the river Strymon (Miracula II. 4. 243), for those speaking the language of the Slavs (Miracula II. 5. 291), or those endangering the "Keramisians" in boats (Miracula II. 5.302). The only adjective "Slavic" if we are to accept the critical edition of Lemerle is used to describe the "Slavic boats." (Miracula, II. 1. 185). This tendency shows that the term 'Σκλάβοι' was actually applied stereotypically by the anonymous author. Archbishop John never used the term 'Σκλάβοι'.

[31] The majority of scholars agree that the siege occurred in the first years of Heraclius reign. Баришић, *Чуда,* 86-95, dated this siege in 616, while Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils,* II, 91-94, dated the siege to 615.

[32] *Miracula* II. 1. 179-180. For more details on the location of these Slavic tribes, see: Олга В. Иванова, Г. Г. Литаврин, „Славяне и Византия", in *Раннефеодальные государства на Балканах, VI-XII вв.* (Москва, 1985), 57 ff; Панов, *Средновековна Македонија,* III, 1 ff.

direct attack on Thessalonica from both land and sea, which was still mostly concentrated on the side of the sea. And again Thessalonica remained unconquered, and the citizens even managed to capture the leader Chatzon himself. The anonymous author of the *Miracles* also reveals the episode that prominent people in the city had been hiding Chatzon from the citizens "for some kind of benefit and with ill intentions", which gives an impression of the complex character of the attack that was also based on a formerly established communication with the Thessalonica elite. Still, Chatzon was found and stoned to death by the enraged women of Thessalonica.[33]

Isidore of Seville concludes that in this period the 'Sclavi' had taken Hellas from Byzantium, which points to a serious threat to the Byzantine positions on the Balkans that echoed in Spain.[34] However, it is difficult to imagine that the desolations on the territory of "whole Thessaly and the surrounding islands, as well as the Aegean islands, and apart them the Cyclades islands, and whole Achaea, Epirus, the larger part of Illyricum and parts of Asia" had been caused by separate groups of the 'Sklavini' – the Drugubites, Sagudates, Belegezites, Baiunetes and Berzetes, as the anonymous author of the *Miracles* tried to present it.[35] It is much more plausible that the author tried to portray the siege of Thessalonica, which seems to have had a local character, in a broader context with the rest of the campaigns on the Balkans that were taking place at the same time, and for which he probably gained insight from the administrative documents.[36] That was undoubtedly necessary in terms of ascribing a greater dimension to the attack so as to create a perception regarding the greatness of the victory of the citizens under the protection of St Demetrius. The anonymous author followed, no doubt, the tendency that John had, since this attack took place during the time he was the Archbishop, to exaggerate the threat and with it to enlarge the victory and increase the moral of the citizens.

What is indicative is the fact that John, even though witnessing this attack in 615/6 as well as the next one in 618, nevertheless stated that the siege of 586 had been "the greatest war" that Thessalonica "had ever faced". If that was the case, then it follows that the siege in 615/16,

---

[33] *Miracula* II. 1.181-194.

[34] Isidore Seville. *Historia Gothorum Wandalorum Sueborum*. Ed. Theodor Mommsen. *MGH AA* 11. Chronica Minora (Berlin, 1894), 120.

[35] *Miracula* II. 1. 179.

[36] Curta, *The Making of the Slavs,* 107-108.

as well the following one in 618, were of a significantly lesser extent than the siege that took place 30 years before. This conclusion would mean that the anonymous author, writing from a chronological distance of about 70 years later, inserted certain elements in the text in order to give the attack a greater dimension, even though it had had a local character. In fact, this assumption is suggested by the rapid failure of the siege. If the said differentiated groups of tribes had had such a capacity as to threaten the broader territory of the Balkans and parts of Asia, as the anonymous author tried to present it, they certainly would not have given up the siege after just seven days, and then ask the Avars for help after the failure of the attack on Thessalonica.

As regards this siege, the intention of the warriors who brought with them their families "to establish them in the city after its conquest" is mentioned in the *Miracles* for the first time.[37] This remark by the anonymous author is generally explained by the modern scholars with the possibility that several Sclavene tribes had set up in some parts of the territory of Macedonia, concentrating their settlements around Thessalonica. However, it is hard to believe that the settling of the multitude groups of the Sclavene tribes in the vicinity of Thessalonica occurred in such a short period of time after the year 610 which, if the anonymous author of the *Miracles* is to be believed, was followed by their differentiation and concrete naming (known to the citizens), which reached a certain degree of military–political organisation led by the exarch Chatzon. It is more plausible that a longer period of time than a few years was undoubtedly needed for this kind of social and political differentiation among the separate groups of the 'Sklavini'.[38] Hence, it is more likely that the anonymous author, writing from a chronological distance of more than six decades later and with the intent to introduce more clarity for his auditorium, inserted certain elements from the time when he was compiling the Book II of the *Miracles*, as it is much more credible that separate groups of the 'Sklavini', led by their leaders, were formed, differentiated and familiar to the citizens of Thessalonica by that time. That would mean that the anonymous author had, in fact, inserted in the text the later names of the groups of 'Sklavini' known as

---

[37] *Miracula* II 1.179.

[38] P. Heather, *Empires and Barbarians*, 403, 423, argued that from one of the episodes of the Miracles of St. Demetrius "it emerges that several Slavic groups were settled in the vicinity of the city by about 670, a point confirmed by later events".

Drugubites, Sagudates, Belegezites, Baiunetes, and Berzetes, and presented them as participants in the siege on Thessalonica in 615/6. In that respect, it is indicative that the anonymous author, in listing the separate names of different groups of the 'Sklavini', had brought them in historical and geographical context with the extensive attacks on the Balkans that occurred in the second decade of the 7th century. The purpose of inserting the names of later formed groups of the 'Sklavini' and framing it in the specific historical events on the Balkans in the second decade of the 7th century was to give the siege of Thessalonica a greater dimension, but which in reality was of a local character.[39] The fact that Chatzon was not identified as the leader of one of the separately listed groups of tribes but was presented only as the exarch of the undefined 'Sklavini', speaks in support of this supposition as well. In fact, the anonymous author of the *Miracles* thought necessary to clarify that it was an 'attack by the Sklavini, or more correctly by Chatzon' that occurred at the time of Archbishop John.[40] Another indicator which confirms this supposition is the fact that in describing the following attack that took place in 618, as well as the events that occurred before the seventh decade of the 7th century, the anonymous author no longer lists by name any one group previously mentioned, but uses the general term 'Sklavini'.

For the purpose of clarifying the situation in Macedonia at that time, one should also take into consideration the character of the writings by the anonymous author who, like the Archbishop John, did not intent to create some kind of a historical work for a wider audience. The two Books of the *Miracles* were designed solely for the citizens of Thessalonica, and entire parts of them were in the form of homilies that were read in religious services. Hence, the present tendency for exaggerating the character and seriousness of the attacks in order to glorify the success of the citizens also becomes clear. In that respect, the reason why the anonymous author inserted the later names of the separate groups of tribes from the second half of the 7th century, which were most probably not yet formed and not corresponded with the time that the siege had occurred, namely in 615/16, can be explained as well.

---

[39] That there was a tendency to exaggerate this attack, which was in fact of a local character, by placing it into a wider context of the attacks at that time see: Curta, *Making of the Slavs*, 53–54 who also points out to the fact that if there had been a more serious dimension to the attack, it certainly would have been registered in other Byzantine authors as well.

[40] *Miracula* II. 2.195.

It was done with the aim to make the historical events more understandable for the citizens of Thessalonica themselves, as they were his immediate audience, since they occurred more than 60 years before the time when the anonymous writer was compiling his work.

If the supposition for the insertion of later names in historical framing and geographical defining of the groups of 'Sklavini' in the vicinity of Thessalonica by the anonymous author of the *Miracles* is accepted, it would bring both the process of gradual forming and differentiation of separate groups registered in the sources as the 'Sklavini/ai' in Macedonia and the attainment of a higher degree of political organisation to a more realistic time frame, as was the case with the 670s when the title of the "King of the Rynchines" (Ῥυγχίνων ῾ρεγός) and kings of the Drugubites was registered. It would have taken a longer period of time than a few years for this process. In any case, what is certain is that in 615/6 Chatzon distinguished himself as a popular leader among the warriors of the 'Sklavini' who were attacking the city, which of course was due to the promise that after conquering it, they could settle in the city together with their families.[41] Whether the plan for settling in the city can be taken as a certain indicator for the existence of any group of Sclavenes, already settled in the vicinity of Thessalonica, is another issue. Even more so the anonymous author was writing about events that occurred seventy or so years before. As opposed to this dilemma, what is certain is that the existence of a plan to settle together with their families suggests that in the second decade of the 7th century the warriors identified with the term 'Sklavini' did not necessarily come from afar, as was the case with the earlier attacks when they were coming from across the Danube with the sole purpose of taking spoils. It is probable that Chatzon was indeed a popular leader of certain Sclavene group of warriors, which brought with them their families with the aim of conquering Thessalonica, and consequently settled in the vicinity of the city.[42] But it is hard to believe that the siege was a result of the tribal union of the already settled multitude of Sclavene tribes differentiated by their name, as the anonymous author

---

[41] On the rise of the leaders of the Slavs as representatives of the collective interest and responsibility, see : Curta, *Making of the Slavs*, 325-336.

[42] Живковић, *Јужни Словени под византиском влашћу,* 134-135, argued that it was a Slavic group, which after crossing the Danube river, decided to settle themselves. However, he accepted without reservation the notion of the anonymous author of the existence of the several Sclavene tribes already in that period.

presented. At any rate, the anonymous author of the *Miracles*, following the same terminology as John, was usually using the specific formulation 'Sklavini' (Σκλαβίνων) to generally identify the barbarian enemies threatening Thessalonica that were different from the Avars.

The fact that the siege failed immediately after the elimination of Chatzon further points to the absence of a more serious level of organisation of the 'Sklavini'. The failure in the siege of Thessalonica, due to the evident lack of military capacity, quantity and proper organisation for taking the city, as it is stated in the *Miracles*, led the 'Sklavini' to ask the Avar Khagan for help offering him alliance. The outcome of the negotiations was the military and logistical assistance provided by the Avars, whose army also included the warriors of the 'Sklavini' from across the Danube that were subordinated to the Avar Khagan.[43] The extensive land and sea siege of Thessalonica that took place in 618 and was carried out by the Avars and troops of the 'Sklavini', unfolded over the course of 33 days. However, the strong resistance by the citizens, the supplies of wheat and different kinds of food, as well as the open flow from sea, were the factors that determined the failure of that siege too. The crucial thing for the failure of the attack was nevertheless the withdrawal of the Avars after reaching an agreement with the citizens of Thessalonica that probably included certain compensation. What is indicative in this case is that, in contrast to the previous siege from 615/6, the anonymous author of the *Miracles* did not name the separate groups of the 'Sklavini', nor did he mention that they had any leader. On the contrary, the text gives the impression that the Avar leaders were the ones who organised the attack, commanded the army and negotiated with the citizens of Thessalonica.

It is indisputable that for organising the siege, which included entering into alliance with the Avars, what was necessary was an appropriate level of organisation of the warriors identified as the 'Sklavini'. It certainly required a leader as a representative of their interests, as was the case with the leader Chatzon. Nevertheless, one cannot say that in this period there was a higher degree of military and political organising among the 'Sklavini' nor a tendency for their political mobilisation, as was the case with the subsequent siege of Thessalonica in the 670s by different 'Sklavini' groups, for which a direct military intervention from Byzantium was necessary.

---

[43] *Miracula* II. 2.197–8.

Generally speaking, the character and the outcome of the sieges in 615/6 and 618 AD corroborate that the 'Sklavini' did not have the capacity to take over Thessalonica on their own. At the same time, after this attack on Thessalonica, it became clear that the Avars and the Sclavenes had different strategic conceptions in realising their plans on the Balkans. The failure in conquering Constantinople in 626 marked the beginning of a gradual weakening of the Avar Khaganate's power. This resulted in a new essential change in the constellations on the Balkans, considering that the Avars were the main driving force behind the military campaigns in this region.

The analysis of the written accounts shows that the Avar Khaganate was the mobilising factor for the military campaigns of the warrior groups of the 'Sklavini' providing the necessary military potential and organisation in the attacks on Thessalonica in 586 and 618. That the Avars and their subjugated warriors from the 'Sklaviniai' beyond the Danube and other groups of barbarians provided the numbers for the attacks is shown by the comparison with the lesser military capacity of the independent attacks of the 'Sklavini' in 584 and 615/6. On the other hand, it is indicative that the circumstances in Macedonia towards the end of the 6th and the first decades of the 7th century were, in a way, in direct correlation with the military planning of the Avar Khaganate. Namely, the rise in power of the Avar Khaganate corresponds with the military mobilisation of the 'Sklavini' which resulted in four sieges on the city of Thessalonica in the period of 584–618, the most serious of which were evidently carried out in a joint effort, i.e. with the direct participation of, organised by and under the command of the Avars, and the participation of warriors from the "Sklaviniai". Conversely, the gradual decline of the Avar Khaganate after 626 coincides with the peaceful period established in Macedonia after 618 that lasted several decades, when the absence of military actions or clashes of any kind on Macedonian territory is noticeable in the sources. How much the anonymous author of the Book II of the *Miracles* was capable to make the distinction between the enemies 'Sklavini' and Avars, remains an open question. So much so because even Archbishop John himself, who witnessed the events at the time, expressed serious reservations in the concrete identification of the enemy warriors. In any case, both authors resorted to the use of the terms 'Sklavini' and Avars in identifying the main enemies of Byzantium at the time. At the same time it is noticeable that the anonymous author continued to use the specific term 'Sklavini' but, in contrast to John, did not use the term 'Sklaviniai'. Does this mean that the anonymous author did not make a

difference between the 'Sklavini' and the 'Sklaviniai'? Or, perhaps, it was his way of indicating the different geographical defining of the immediate threat by the enemies at the time when he was compiling his work, in the sense of the first meaning of the term 'Sklaviniai' used for denoting the barbarian lands beyond the Danube. It can not be excluded that in the perception of the anonymous author, 'Sklavini' and 'Sklavinia/i' were synonyms denoting the "others" who, led by their leaders, had gradually secured control over certain territories in the hinterland of Thessalonica by 670s and directly opposed their own interests to the interests of the citizens of Thessalonica and Byzantium.

After 618 there is a lack of authentic accounts on attacks by the 'Sklavini' or the Avars in Macedonia, which corresponds to the time when Byzantium withdrew its troops from the Balkans. Numismatic finds confirm that at around 620 AD there was a general withdrawal of the Byzantine troops from the Balkans. However, recent research additionally shows that the numismatic hoards in this period should not be linked to the "Slavic" tide and mass colonization, but rather treated as an indicator for the presence of the Byzantine troops, that disappeared after their general retreat from the Balkans.[44] That suggests that the gradual process of the formation of new military-political groups identified by the Byzantine sources as the "Sklavini/ai" in Macedonia did not take place in conditions of a continued conflict and general destruction by the new groups of immigrants, but in an immediate peaceful coexistence and interaction with the indigenous population in Macedonia and the Byzantine authorities. This conclusion is also supported by the latest studies which point to the need to revise the idea so far of some kind of mass "Slavic" flood or planned colonisation of the Balkans, in favour of chaotic movements of smaller groups.[45]

It was only in the 630s that the *Miracles* registered the incidental intention of the 'Sklavini' to penetrate the city after the earthquake which caused damage to a part of the inner walls. According to the anonymous author, this intention remained unrealised after the 'Sklavini', while approaching the city, realised that its defence was not

---

[44] Curta, *Southeastern Europe,* 74-75, who suggests that the numismatic hoards should not be interpreted as being the consequence of Slav invasions but as an indicator of the presence of Byzantine troops and the accumulated wealth. With the general retreat of the army in ca 620, the numismatic hoards disappeared as well.

[45] Curta, *Making of the Slavs;* Daniel Dzino, *Becoming Slav, Becoming Croat: Identity transformation in Post-Roman and Early Medieval Dalmatia* (Brill, 2010), 211-212; Timothy Gregory, *A History of Byzantium* (Blackwell, 2005), 168-170.

affected and "returned in fear, accomplishing nothing".[46] It is indicative that in describing this concrete miracle, the anonymous author did not mention any tribe by name, nor did he classify the 'Sklavini' as "our neighbours", explaining only that they were "near us". This episode additionally shows that one cannot speak of some multitude of tribes settling in the vicinity of the city. The names of the Sclavene tribes appeared again only in the 670s when the anonymous author was writing as an eyewitness, describing the Thessalonica siege that occurred as a result of the liquidation of the king of the Rhynchines, Prebondos. Presenting the siege undertaken by Rhynchines, Drugubites, Sagudates and Strymonians, the anonymous author explicitly noted that "in short, those were the things which no one from our generation did not hear, nor saw, and for the majority of them even until now we could not say their names".[47] What is more indicative is that in the introduction to the episode of the incursion of the *Sermesianoi*, the anonymous author recalls the previous chapters, referring to the "Sklavini, or more correctly the so called Hatzon".[48] It is apparent that even in this passage he did not mention any tribes by name, but used the general term 'Sklavini' and the leader Hatzon to refer to the attacks on Thessalonica that occurred during the second decade of the 7th century.

      The reasonable interpretation of the neglected aspects of the *Miracles* would be that the establishment of the certain groups termed in the *Miracles* as 'Sklavini' in the vicinity of Thessalonica was a gradual process, which took place after 610, in parallel with the general withdrawal of the Byzantine troops from the Balkans. It is hard to assume that already in 615/16 in the vicinity of Thessalonica a multitude of Sclavene tribes existed, differentiated by their name and controlling specific territory, or even more, obtaining tribal unity in attacking Thessalonica. It is more probable that certain immigrant warrior group led by the 'Big-men' Hatzon attacked the city, bringing with them their families. The process of the social and political differentiation that led to the establishment of the several Sclavene tribes mentioned in the Book II of the Miracules of St. Demetrius, that was accompanied with their concrete naming and association with the specific territory, most probably occurred during a longer period, not of a several years as one could understand from the uncritical reading of Miracles. The fact that

---

[46] *Miracula* II. 3. 216-229.
[47] *Miracula* II. 5. 288.
[48] *Miracula* II. 2. 196; II. 5.284.

Archbishop John was not able to recognize the enemy warriors even though he was writing in the second decade of the 7th century is an additional argument in favor of this conclusion. The anonymous author twice referred to the leader Hatzon and 'Sklavini', while presenting the sieges from the second decade of the 7th century to his generation. He explicitly remarked their status as "neighbors" only when describing the events that occurred in 670s, thus making the difference with the first half of the 7th century. It is more probable that the anonymous writer referring to the siege of 615/6 made insertion in the text of the Book II of Miracles, placing the later names of the Sclavene tribes that were established by the 670s and were of familiar presence, i.e. "neighbors", with the aim of making the events more understandable and receptive to the citizens. Since he was describing more extensive geographical area that included Thessaly, Cyclades, Achaia, Epirus and large part of Illyricum with the aim of demonstrating the larger scale of the local event, the author of the Book II of the Miracles thought convenient to mention the later names of the tribes as taking part of the siege, that included Baiunites or Belegezites, who were inhabiting the areas further away of Thessalonica in the time of his writing. Those tribes were most probably formed during a longer process, certainly by the 670s, as were the other tribes mentioned in the Miracles – Drugubites, Sagudates, Berzetes. This supposition could give an explanation to the dilemma among scholars of whether Belegezites and Baiunites, moved from their previous settlement from the vicinity of Thessalonica in Thessaly or Epirus. They did not move given that they were established there later, not in the second decade of the 7th century. The available evidence on the first presence of Sklaviniai in the mid-600s and the second half of the 7th century around Thessalonica and Constantinople corresponds to this general picture.[49] What is more, the analysis of the Book II of the

---

[49] The opinion that the "Sklaviniai" in the vicinity of Thessalonica were already established by the 6th century maintained by Ф. Баришић, *Чуда,* 52 and Lemerle, *Les Plus Anciens Recueils,* II*, 71-72*, does not have confirmation in the sources. Recently, Б. Ристовски, "Првобитното име на Самуиловото царство било Склавинија", *Македонскиот идентитет низ историјата,* ed. Т. Чепреганов et al. (Скопје, 2010), 67-68, even claims that it is "undisputed fact that Sklaviniai as statehood subjects are formed only in the borders of Byzantium and precisely on the territory of Macedonia". What we can be certain is that by the mid-600 and the 670s the 'Sklaviniai' were registered by Theophanes in the environs of Constantinople and Thessalonica. The recent studies provide a altered picture from the traditional notion about the settlement of the Slavs in the Balkans proceeded from the critical analysis of the written sources and the

Miracles of St. Demetrius reveals that the process of the establishment of groups of Sclavene tribes in southern Macedonia by the 670s did not take place in conditions of a continued conflict and general destruction, but in an immediate peaceful coexistence and interaction with the indigenous population in Macedonia and the Byzantine authorities. From the reading of *Miracles* one gets the impression that the leaders such as Hatzon and Prebondos, obtained their authority, among other because of their ability to contact with the prominent citizens and Byzantine authorities in Thessalonica.[50]

Thus, the re-reading of the Miracles reveals a different picture in the reconstruction of seventh century Macedonia, namely the surrounding area of Thessalonica and the Strymon valley. What happened in the other parts of Macedonia, i.e the territory of present-day Republic of Macedonia, we cannot tell with certainty since there are no direct accounts contained in the *Miracles* and *Theophanes*. This question is getting more complex with the claim of the anonymous author of the Book II of the *Miracle of St. Demetrius* noting that the army of the group "Sermisianoi" led by Kouber in 680/81, after crossing the Danube "came into our lands and conquered the Keramisian plain" that is the plain around the present day Bitola.[51] Whether the term "our lands" means that Byzantium maintained authority in this part of Macedonia, is impossible to tell. What is more, there are no direct archaeological findings that will confirm Slavic presence.[52] However that is another issue that can be only clarified by future archeological findings, which also concerns other neglected aspects raised from the re-reading of the *Miracles of St. Demetrius*.

---

available archaeological data. For Dalmatia and Croatia, see: See, Dzino, *Becoming Slav,* 92-117; For northern and eastern Adriatic region, see Florin Curta, "The early Slavs in the northern and eastern Adriatic region: a critical approach." *Archeologia Medievale* 37 (2010), 303-325; For Greece, see Curta, "Still waiting for the barbarians", 403-478.

[50] One can only speculate that Prebondos was "a mere commander of a Slavic military unit employed by the imperial army", as is recently argued by Adam Izdebski, "The Slavs political institutions and the Byzantine policies (c.a. 530-650), *Byzantinoslavica* 1-2 (2011), 61-64.

[51] *Miracula* II. 5.288.

[52] И. Микулчиќ, *Средновековни градови и тврдини во Македонија* (Скопје, 1996), 26-28; Heather, *Empires and Barbarians*, 423-424.

Митко Панов

РЕКОНСТРУИРАЈЌИ ЈА МАКЕДОНИЈА ВО VII ВЕК: НЕКОИ ЗАНЕМАРЕНИ АСПЕКТИ ВО *ЧУДАТА НА СВ. ДИМИТРИЈ СОЛУНСКИ*

- р е з и м е -

Анализата на одредени занемарени аспекти од двете збирки на *Чудата на Св. Димитрија* открива дека појавата и формирањето на групите словенски племиња околу Солун бил постапен процес, кој се одивал во периодот по 610 г., паралелно со генералното повлекување на византиските војски од Балканот. Традиционалното гледиште на истражувачите се заснова на претпоставката дека во 615 г. во околината на Солун веќе егзистирале повеќе словенски племиња, кои биле диференцирани според нивното име и контролирале одредена територија, или уште повеќе, постигнале ниво на заемно племенско обединување во нападот на градот. Меѓутоа, критичката анализа на *Чудата* укажува дека процесот на социјална и на политичка диференцијација, што довело до формирање на повеќе словенски племиња споменати во *Втората збирка на Чудата*, најверојатно се случил во подолг временски период, сигурно до 70-тите години, а не во втората деценија на VII век. Во тој контекст, анонимниот автор веројатно ги вметнал подоцнежните имиња на племињата Драгувити, Сагудати, Велегезити, Вајунити, Берзити со цел да ги направи поприемливи за граѓаните историските настани и географскиот опсег опишани во врска со опсадата во 615/6 г. Врамувањето во поширок историски и географски простор било во функција на давањето поголема димензија на опсадата, која, реално, имала локален карактер. Анализата на *Втората книга на Чудата* открива и друг аспект, имено дека процесот на формирање на групите „Склавини" во јужна Македонија до 70-тите години од VII век не се одвивал во услови на континуиран конфликт и генерална деструкција, туку во непосредна интеракција со домородното население во Македонија и византиските власти.

Dragan GJALEVSKI

Institute of National History
– Skopje

THE TAGMATA AND THE BYZANTINE BALKAN RE-CONQUISTA
(Middle of Eight middle of Ninth Century)

For the Byzantine Empire the seventh century represented a period of transition. The struggle for survival which in the beginning was waged against Sassanid Persia and later the Arabs, forced the Byzantine government in an effort to oppose this external aggression more successfully to start a comprehensive state reform, including in this process also its military forces. The establishment of the *themata* led to disappearance of the role that the *praesental* army possessed, which was at the same time an elite striking force and a personal army of the Byzantine emperor. After the structural changes made in the seventh century the *Opsikion* army emerged as the only military force in the Balkans. Until the first half of eight century its assignment was the protection of the imperial territories in southern Thrace and the city of Constantinople.[1] But this type of structural setting of the Byzantine military system didn't give the desired reliability and stability. Between the end of the seventh and the first half of the eight century Byzantine Empire was subjected to strong attacks from the Arabs, and in 680 Byzantium finally lost the territories in Northern Thrace to the new aggressive adversary in the Balkans, the Bulgars.[2] Along with this external threat, there was some

---

[1] The *Opsikion* army probably was a successor of the *praesental* army, reorganized in 622 during the reign of Heraclius (610-641). For more details on its role during the seventh and early eight century in: John F. Haldon, *Byzantine Pretorians: An Administrative, Institutional and Social survey of the Opsikion and Tagmata c.580-900*, (Bonn: Poikila Byzantina 3, 1984), 172-173, 175-176, 196-197.

[2] More on the Arab sieges of Constantinople and Byzantine defeat by the Bulgars see: *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor, Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284-813*, Cyril Mango and Roger Scott trans., (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997),

internal insecurity in the Byzantine state.[3] This suggests that the role which was entrusted to the *Opsikion* army to be a guardian of the imperial power was betrayed. The rebellion of Artavazdos that began in 741 against the Emperor Constantine V (741-775) was the last of several revolts that occurred during the first half of the eight century where the *Opsikion* army and its commander had the central role.[4]

After this last rebellion the Emperor Constantine V began a partial reform of its armed forces. He made two significant changes. First was the partition of *thema Opsikion*,[5] which reduced the military and political influence of its military commander. The second change, highly significant for the Byzantine foreign and domestic policy, was the establishment of new imperial elite forces known as *tagmata*. These were the *scholai* and *exkoubitoi*, descendants of the old guardian units from the sixth century, *scholae* and *excubitores*.[6] At the same time the Emperor formed an elite palace guard consisting of two separate units - the first in charge for the security of the Great Palace, the second for the manning of its walls.[7] The establishment of *tagmata* resolved the problems that the central government faced. The first was the necessity of creating a military force that would defend the imperial against the provincial interests, while the second problem was the need for a more effective army than it existed at the moment. By the end of the eight and

---

354, 395-398, 415-421. Also: Warren Treadgold, *History of the Byzantine state and Society*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), 325-326, 328-329, 347-349.; Георгије Острогорски, *Историја Византије*, (Београд: Просвета, 1969), 138-140, 165.

[3] Treadgold, *History of the Byzantine state*, 337-345.; Острогорски, *Историја*, 153-154, 162-165.

[4] Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 415-421. About the role of the *Opsikion* in these rebelions: Haldon, *Byzantine Pretorians*, 205-210.; Warren Treadgold, *Byzantium and Its Army 284-1081*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), 28.

[5] Constantino Porphyroghenito, *De Thematibus*, *Book I*, 5-6., Andrea Pertusi trans., (Citta del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticano, 1952), 130-135. See also: Haldon, *Byzantine Pretorians*, 209, 216.; Walter E. Kaegi Jr., *Byzantine Military Unrest* (*471-843*), (Amsterdam: A. M. Hakkert Publisher, 1981), 237.; Treadgold, *Byzantium and its Army*, 28.

[6] Haldon, *Byzantine Pretorians*, 228-229, 341.

[7] More on the *noumera* in: John Haldon, *Byzantine Pretorians*, 256-266.; Warren Treadgold, "Notes on the Numbers and Organization of the Ninth-Century Byzantine Army", *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 21*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1980), 277. Also: John B. Bury, *The Imperial Administrative System in the Ninth Century With a Revised Text of the Kleitorologion of Philotheos*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1911), 65.

early ninth century the empress Irene (797-802) and her successor Nicephorus I (802-811) formed additional *tagma*, which further increased the political and military security of the Byzantine rulers.[8]

There are several theories concerning the size of these elite units. The reason for this is the confusion found in the works of Ibn Khurradadhbĭh, Ibn al-Fakĭh and Khudāma, Arab geographers who are the only ones that provide detailed information about the strength of the *tagmata*.[9] J. B. Bury, A. Toynbee and lately J. Haldon, do not agree that the size totaled about 4,000 or 6,000 soldiers for each unit, and assume that they did not possessed so many soldiers in their ranks. They base their view on the information found in the work of Constantine VII Porphirogenitus (913-959), *De Ceremoniis*. Constantine informs about the preparations made during the forthcoming military campaign of 949 on Crete, where the number of elite units who were enlisted was much lower than the ones attested by Ibn Khurradadhbĭh and Khudāma. The document reports that for the Cretan expedition a total of 647 soldiers from the *scholai* were levied, *exkoubitoi* around 700, while *hikanatoi* 456 soldiers.[10] J. B. Bury and J. Haldon initially assumed that this was

---

[8] For *vigla/arithmos* and the term *vigilia* see: Haldon, *Byzantine Pretorians*, 293.; Bury, *Imperial Administrative System*, 60-61.; Treadgold, *History of the Byzantine state*, 359. For the *hikanatoi*: *Sacrorum Consiliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio XI, XVI*, ed. Gian D. Mansi, (Florentiæ, 1765), 213.; Bury, *Imperial Administrative System*, 63.; Warren Treadgold, *The Byzantine Revival 780-842*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988), 162. For the *optimatoi*: Haldon, *Byzantine Pretorians*, 224-226.

[9] For the works of Ibn Khurradadhbĭh and Khudāma in: ed. and trans. M. J. de Groeje, *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum VI*, (Bruxelles: E. J. Brill, 1889), 81-82, 196-199. According to J. Haldon, when Khudāma compiled his work he probably used an older source, possibly Al-Jarmi, who would seem had access to Byzantine official documents that originated from the period between 786 and 809. See: John F. Haldon, "Kudāma ibn Dja'far and the Garrison of Constantinople", *Byzantion* 48, (Bruxelles, 1978), 78-90. W. Treadgold comes to the same conclusion. See: Warren Treadgold, "Remarks on the Work of Al-Jarmi on Byzantium", *Byzantinoslavica XLIV*, (Prague, 1983), 205-212.

[10] Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Cerimoniis Aulae Byzantinae*, ed. I. I. Reiskii, *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, (Bonnae, 1829), 666. See also: Bury, *Imperial Administrative System*, 54.; Haldon, *Byzantine Pretorians*, 276-282. and John F. Haldon, *Warfare, State and Society in the Byzantine World 565-1204*, (London: UCL Press, 1999), 102.; Arnold Toynbee, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus and His World*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), 286-287.

actually the total strength of these military forces. Later, J. Haldon left this question open but suggests that they were nevertheless small units.[11]

Unlike them, W. Tredgold puts forth another theory. He accepts the information given by Khudāma as accurate and indicates the confused description of the *tagmata* by Ibn Khurradadhbǐh.[12] According to him, this question would still remain open if the information presented by Khudāma could not be confirmed with another source, the *Kletorologion* of Philotheus. W. Tredgold points out the fact that the number of senior officers from the elite units of *scholai*, *exkoubitoi*, *vigla*, *hikanatoi* and *noumera* who together with the junior officers attended the imperial banquets held in the Great Palace on the twelfth day after Christmas totaled 204 for each *tagma*. According to his opinion, this was the exact number of officers required for the normal functioning of an elite squad of 4,000 soldiers, which indicates that Khudāma was accurate and the strength of these military units haven't changed between 839/842 and 899.[13]

An additional argument in favor of W. Tredgold's theory is also the Byzantine military strategy according to which, the central government during the formation of the expeditionary army recruited detachments from different *themata*, while at the same time paying attention not to completely undermine their defensive power. A typical example for this is the preparation for the already mentioned Cretan campaign of 949 in which the detachments of the *scholai* and *exkoubitoi* stationed in Bithynia were not enlisted.[14] The principle of selecting

---

[11] John F. Haldon, "Strategies of Defence, Problems of Security: the Garrisons of Constantinople in the Middle Byzantine Period", *Constantinople and its Hinterland*, ed. Cyril Mango and Gilbert Dagron, (Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1995), 149.

[12] Treadgold, "Notes on the Numbers, 273.

[13] Nicolas Oikonomides, *Les Listes De Préséance Byzantines des IX et XI Siécles*, (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1972), 170-175, 182. About W. Treadgold's theory see: Treadgold, "Notes on the Numbers", 273-275. and Warren Treadgold, "Standardized numbers in the Byzantine Army", *War in History* Vol. 12, (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 2005), 5-6. For the relevance of Khudāma's view: Treadgold, "Remarks on the Work of Al-Jarmi", 209.

[14] The detachment of the *scholai* and *exkoubitoi* recruited for the Cretan campaign was from soldiers billeted in the *themata* of Thrace and Macedonia. See in: *De Cerimoniis*, 666.4-8. However, it should be noted that the transfer of troops from the *themata* for the purposes of major expeditions was completed only when Byzantium had signed a peace treaty with one of its neighbors. The Balkan expedition of Staurakios in 783 was carried out after a peace treaty was made with the Arabs: Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 456. More about the Byzantine principle of levying soldiers from several

military units for the upcoming campaign probably depended upon the military tasks that were assigned to each of the thematic armies during their establishment,[15] a strategic concept that was also valid for the *tagmata*. All previously mentioned arguments suggest that the elite squads witnessed in *De Cerimoniis* who were enrolled as part of the forthcoming expedition to Crete in 949 actually didn't present the entire unit, but rather only a small detachment of the total manpower that the *tagmata* had at their disposal, which according to Khudāma numbered to 4,000 troops each.

Another relevant fact can be noticed in the sources regarding the issue about the size of the *tagmata*. Theophanes in his *Chronicle* indicates that early in his reign the emperor Leo IV had "...*increased the tagmata*."[16] If we reject the assumption that he established a new elite squad (sources testify that these types of military units were created only after his reign), then it can be concluded that Theophanes actually

---

different themes for the requirements of the military campaigns see in: Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 358, 366, 376, 447, 490.; For the Cretan campaign: *De Cerimoniis*, 664.4.-667.11. The Byzantine army that Theoktistos led against the Sklavinias on Peloponnesus was made up of soldiers from the *themata* of Thrace and Macedonia, as well as from other western (Balkan) *themata*. See: Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, ed. Gyula Moravcsik and trans. Romilly J. H. Jenkins, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, Vol. I, (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1967), 50.9-16. For the campaign of Michael I (811-813) against the Bulgarian khan Krum (803-814) in: Leonis Grammatici, *Chronographia*, 336.16-22., ed. Immanuelis Bekkeri, (*Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae,* (Bonnae, 1842). More about the size of the imperial army between the end of the sixth and the beginning of the tenth century in: *Das Strategikon des Maurikios*, ed. George T. Dennis, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae Vol. XVII*, (Wien, 1981), III.8-10.; *The Taktika of Leo VI*, ed. and transl. George T. Dennis, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae Vol. XLIX*, (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 2010), IV.47, IV.71, XVIII.147. See also in: John F. Haldon, *Byzantium at War AD 600-1453*, (Osprey Publishing LTD, 2003), 56-57.; Toynbee, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus*, 288-289.

[15] Theophanes Continuatus in his work reports about the military tasks that were assigned to the two *strategoi* of Thrace and Macedonia. He testifies that during the first half of the ninth century a law existed under which "...*the commanders of Thrace and Macedonia, when there was peace with the Bulgarians, they* [had a duty] *to share the danger and to fight alongside the eastern armies...*" This indicates that their primary military assignment was the security of the imperial possessions in the Balkans. See in: *Teophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*, ed. Immanuelis Bekkeri, *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae,* (Bonnae, 1838), 181.16-18. За бугарски превод во: *Гръцки извори за Българската История,* Том V, (София: БАН, 1964), 118.

[16] Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 449.

reports an increase in the number of troops in the already existing *tagmata*. This brings us to another essential problem. If the emperor Leo IV had increased these units, then what was the strength of each of the elite units prior to completion of this process, i.e. at the time of their establishment? If we assume that according to Khudāma the size of these units at the beginning of their formation amounted to 4,000 troops, and if the Byzantine emperor Leo IV had increased the *tagmata*, then during the first half of the ninth century they should have more troops than the number given by this Arab geographer. Furthermore, if this is the case, then for these elite units to have about 4,000 soldiers in its ranks in the period between 839/842 and 899, the central government should previously reduce their size. But not a single source informs of decreasing the number of troops in the already existing *tagmata*. They only testify about the formation of additional units of this rank (*vigla*, *hikanatoi* and the temporary elite unit of *phoideratoi*).[17] This brings us to the assumption of J. B. Bury, accepted by A. Toynbee and J. Haldon according to whom, when Constantine V created the units *scholai* and *exkoubitores* they had fewer troops than the number presented by Khudāma, or 4,000 soldiers for each *tagma*. But this doesn't suggest that the theory of W. Tredgold is not correct and that the *tagmata* didn't have that much soldiers. In fact, Khudāma's testimony of the elite units strength, the theory that he probably used an older source whose author seems to have access to various Byzantine official documents that originated from the period between the 80's of the eight and the first decade of the ninth century,[18] as well as the information in the *Chronicle* of Theophanes, are all facts which indicates that during the time of Leo IV the already existing *tagmata* were "*increased*" with additional troops, so after the completion of this procedure they had in their ranks 4,000 soldiers each.

However, it remains unknown how many soldiers the elite units had before their "*increase*". The sources do not provide any information that would directly give an answer to this question. Yet even from those that are available, a certain hypothesis with some rough estimates can be provided. What can be noticed from them is that for a better organization of the imperial army, as for an increased financial efficiency of the state, until the end of the ninth century the Byzantine government used round

---

[17] For the *phoideratoi*: Haldon, *Byzantine Pretorians*, 246-250.
[18] Haldon, "Kudāma ibn Dja'far and the Garrison of Constantinople", 84.; Treadgold, "Remarks on the Work of Al-Jarmi", 205-212.

numbers for the billeting of military forces throughout the *themata*.[19] The sources suggest that for this purpose the administration probably used the army detachment *droungos*, which in the official documents numbered 1,000 soldiers. When some reorganization was done, whether it was a partition of *thema* or increase of troops in a *thema*, W. Tredgold assumes that this was implemented according to the size of this military unit.[20] He estimates that during the second half of the eight century for the Byzantine state army of about two *droungoi*, or 2,000 soldiers, was a bare minimum that satisfied the security needs of the western *themata*. This army size was probably sufficient for some of the thematic armies to maintain the imperial power in the region, but also to execute specific defensive assignments if necessary.[21] Because of some similarity with the thematic armies in its command structure, as well as in the internal structural organization of its basic unit, the *bandon*, probably the same principle could also be applied to the *tagmata*.[22] In that context it may be assumed that even among the elite units the strength of two *droungoi*, or 2,000 soldiers, probably was the minimal military power with which they could form the core of the future imperial expeditionary forces, or be able to carry out independently some smaller military missions.[23] This unit size would in fact allow the central government some flexibility in the implementation of its foreign and domestic policy. To be more precise, it would allow the Byzantine emperor in case of catastrophic defeat and a greater loss of life in the ranks of the *tagmata* during some expeditions, to have in reserve enough members from these elite units who could than respond to future tasks (ensuring the political

---

[19] For more details about the strength of the thematic armies and the use of round numbers for their stationing see: Groeje, *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum VI*, 84, 196-199.

[20] By the end of tenth century the distribution of military forces across the themes, the partition of the major themes in to smaller, as well as its reinforcement with new soldiers, was carried out according to the size of the unit *droungos*. See in: Treadgold, *Byzantium and its Army*, 64-70, 105-106, 111. For the use of round numbers in the byzantine administration: Treadgold, "Standardized numbers", 1-14.

[21] According to the assumption of W. Tredgold in 773 the smallest armies numbered around 2,000 soldiers and were situated in the *themata* of Hellas, Cibyrrhaeot and Sicily. See: Treadgold, *Byzantium and its Army*, 67.

[22] Ibid, 102.

[23] Treadgold, *History of the Byzantine state*, 359.; Mark Whittow, *The Making of Byzantium 600-1025*, (Berkley: University of California Press, 1996), 168.; Haldon, *Byzantine Pretorians*, 229, 234.; Haldon, "Strategies of Defence, Problems of Security", 149.

security of its imperial authority, as well as performing new offensive campaigns[24]), until a conscription or a transfer of troops from the thematic armies was carried out which would replenish the empty posts in the *tagmata*.

The formation of these new elite units towards the middle of the eight century led to some logistical problems. Because the *scholai* and *exkoubitoi* no longer presented a palatine guard, but elite units with estimated 2,000 soldiers each, the question about their billeting emerged. During the reign of Constantine V its highly plausible that they were based inside the capitol, because the written sources reports that in this period some of the churches and monasteries in Constantinople were used as barracks for "*...the soldiers who shared his* [iconoclastic] *opinions.*"[25] That these were the *tagmata* testifies Theophanes Confessor in his *Chronicle* according to whom, the elite units at the time of empress Irene publicly stood behind the iconoclasm and prevented her attempt to organize a church council in 786 that should condemned this teaching and restore the veneration of icons.[26] Because of their opposition, which was directed against her political and religious agenda, the empress Irene afterwards transfered the elite units *scholai* and *exkoubitoi* outside Constantinople and billeted them through the *themata* of Thrace and Macedonia, as well as in Bithynia in Asia Minor, where they remained stationed.[27]

Initially created only to limit the power of the commander of *Opsikion*, and to provide adequate protection for the Emperor against possible future rebellions from the provincial potentates, these elite troops exceeded its basic function. Made up of professional soldiers (unlike the seasonal thematic soldiers) under the direct control of the

---

[24] In the ascent of Michael I as new Byzantine emperor, and in the battles that Byzantium fought against the Bulgarians after 811, „*...the remaining contingents...*" of the *tagmata* were also participating. See: Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 493, 501.

[25] Theophanes in his Chronicle testifies that the monasteries of Dalmatos, Kallistratos, Dios and Maximinius were given to the army. See in: Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 443. He also informs about the existence of the city *tagmata* during the reign of Leo IV. Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 449. According to J. Haldon probably part of these elite units were stationed in the city or in the uninhabited area between the Theodosian walls and the old wall of Constantine. For more details: Haldon, "Strategies of Defence, Problems of Security", 153-154.

[26] Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 461.

[27] *De Cerimoniis*, 655. See also: Haldon, "Strategies of Defence, Problems of Security", 153.; Haldon, *Byzantine Pretorians*, 308.; Toynbee, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus*, 286.

ruler, well trained and probably paid on a monthly basis, equipped with the best weapons and armor, the *tagmata* have given the Byzantine emperors much greater security.[28] Capable of recruiting a strong army without significantly cutting the defense capabilities of the thematic armies stationed throughout the Balkans and in Asia Minor, the Byzantines managed in the following period not only to strengthen, but gradually extend the boundaries of their Empire.

The Byzantine military strategy in the Balkans from the middle of the seventh until the middle of the eight century was determined by several factors: the constant warfare on the eastern frontier against the Arabs which led to two major sieges of Constantinople, and the Bulgarian threat that appeared on the Balkan Peninsula after the establishment of their state in Northern Thrace in 680. Also, the frequent outbreak of plague until her last appearance in 747-748 had a considerable impact on the available human resources, important for the financial and military power of the Empire.[29] Since there was a great possibility of being attacked from several sides at once, while possessing limited resources, the military and strategic concept of the Byzantine state was actually a tactic of retaining the military threat through attrition of the enemy and defense of the remaining imperial possessions. The Byzantine expeditions in the Balkans which were directed towards the Bulgars and the *Sklaviniai* were not annually. In fact the sources testify that between these campaigns a period of several years or even decades of Byzantine military passivity can be seen.[30] The *themata* of Thrace and

---

[28] About the method of payment of the elite units see: Haldon, *Byzantine Pretorians*, 308-309, 313-314.; Nicolas Oikonomides, "The Role of the Byzantine State in the Economy", *The Economic History of Byzantium*, ed. Angeliki E. Laiou, (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 2002), 1013-1014.; Toynbee, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus*, 284. For the military equipment: Haldon, *Byzantine Pretorians*, 318-323.; Treadgold, *Byzantium and its Army*, 125.

[29] About the plague of 749 see: Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 423.; Nicephori Patriarchae Constantinopolitani, *Breviarium Historicum*, Cyril Mango trans., *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, Vol. XIII, (Dumbarton Oaks, 1990), 67-68. More on the influence of the epidemics in: Lester K. Little, ed., *Plague and the End of Antiquity: The Pandemic of 541-750*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 104.

[30] For the campaign of emperor Constans II (641-668) see: Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 347.; Andrew Louth, "The Byzantine Empire in the seventh century", in *The New Cambridge Medieval History Vol. I c.500-700*, ed. Paul Fouracre, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 299.; Бранко Панов ред, *Историја на Македонскиот Народ*, Том I, (Скопје, 2000), 298.; For the campaign of emperor Constantine IV (668-685) see: Acti S. Demetrii II, *Грчки извори за Българската История*, Том III, (София: БАН, 1960), 157.; See also: Митко Б. Панов,

Hellas, established in the Balkans by the end of the seventh century, did not possess enough military strength that would allow them to undertake large-scale operations directed towards the reintegration of the Balkan regions inhabited by Slavs and Bulgars. They were created for one purpose only, to defend the remaining Byzantine possessions in the Balkan Peninsula.[31] The sources testify that these two newly established thematic armies had no capacity to act independently against the enemy on the battlefield. In case of an enemy attack these thematic forces only had an obligation to shelter the population and to secure the cities, fortresses and important crossing points at their territory. Afterwards, according to the established Byzantine warfare tactics they should constantly hinder and harass the opposing army, rendering impossible their free movement to pillage and gather food and fodder, important for supporting the soldiers and their horses, giving thus sufficient time for the central government to raise an army that would successfully defeat the enemy.[32]

The Byzantine military activity on the Balkan Peninsula from the middle of the eight century significantly differs from the previous period and corresponds with the establishment of the *tagmata*. Instead of just

---

„Македонија и Словените од средината на VI до средината на IX век", *Историја на македонскиот народ*, Тодор Чепреганов уред., (Скопје, 2008), 86.; For the expedition of Justinian II (685-695/705-711) in 687 see: Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 364.; Mango, *Nicephori Patriarchae*, 38.; Georgius Monachus, *Грьцки извори за Българската История*, Том IV, (София: БАН, 1961), 47.; Тибор Живковић, *Јужни Словени под византиском влашћу 600-1025*, (Београд, 2007), 158.; Treadgold, *History of the Byzantine state*, 332-333.; For the Bulgarian campaign of Justinian II in 707 see: Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 376.; Mango, *Nicephori Patriarchae*, 43.; Georgius Monachus, *ИБИ/ГИБИ*, Том IV, 48-49.

[31] About the establishment of *thema* Thrace see: Ralph-Johannes Lilie, "Trakien" und "Thrakesion", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*, herausgegeben von H. Hunger, 26. Band, (Wien: Der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1997), 28-34.; Treadgold, *History of the Byzantine state*, 329-330.; For the formation of *thema* Hellas: Георгије Острогорски, „Постанак тема Хелада и Пелопонез", *Из византиске историје и просопографије*, (Београд: Просвета, 1968), 142-143.; Treadgold, *History of the Byzantine state*, 332.; Toynbee, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus*, 265-266.

[32] The Byzantines repeatedly used guerrilla warfare tactics, which consisted of sheltering the local population and the destruction of crops, as well as constant skirmishes and harassment of the enemy. Dennis, *Taktika,* XVII.76-80, XVIII.126-127, XVIII.134.; See also *On Skirmishing* in: *Three Byzantine Military Treatises*, ed. and trans. George T. Dennis, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, Vol. XXV, (Washington D.C., 1985). A short overview of these defensive tactics in: Haldon, *Warfare, State and Society*, 177-180.

occasional display of military power, Byzantium began long and aggressive war against the Bulgarian state that lasted nearly two decades, in which a total of nine expeditions were executed. However, the Byzantine military activities were not confined only to the Bulgars. The imperial army intervened in Macedonia where managed to subdue the local *Sklaviniai*, who recognized the Byzantine supremacy nominally,[33] as well as on the eastern frontier against the Arabs.[34] It can be noted from the sources that immediately after the establishment of *tagmata* the Byzantine Empire demonstrated intensified offensive activity in the Balkans with a high degree of efficiency of its military forces, and that's only a few years after the last major outbreak of plague which according to the words of Patriarch Nicephorus "... *fell upon the Imperial City and the surrounding lands*."[35] They also testify that despite the occasional high losses in human power during this long Byzantine-Bulgar War, whether in the course of battles or because of certain bad weather conditions, the imperial army could quickly regroup and start another offensive expedition.[36]

In comparison with the previous period, the improvement in efficiency that can be seen in the imperial army during the second half of the eight century cannot be justified with any fundamental changes in the Byzantine military strategy, tactical activity, or the size of the expeditionary army and its formation deployment before the battle. In fact, the Byzantine military commanders at the time of Constantine V used in their battles against the enemy identical military formations and battlefield tactics as their predecessors from the seventh century. The surviving military manuals like the *Strategikon* of Maurice (584-602) and *Taktika* of Leo the Wise (886-912), composed before and after the eight century do not display between themselves some radical deviations and substantial change in the Byzantine military-strategic concept.

---

[33] Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 430. For this campaign see: Живковић, *Јужни Словени*, 161-2.; Бранко Панов ред., *Историја на Македонскиот Народ*, 306.; Treadgold, *History of the Byzantine state*, 363.

[34] Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, p.445.; Острогорски, *Историја Византије*, 175. For a brief survey on the Byzantine-Arab warfare in: *The Cambridge History of The Byzantine Empire c.500-1492*, ed. Jonathan Shepard, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 255-256.

[35] Mango, *Nicephori Patriarchae*, 67.

[36] For more details about the byzantine military activities during the reign of Constantine V: Mango, *Nicephori Patriarchae*, 73-82.; Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 431-438.

128

JOURNAL OF HISTORY   year. XLVII, N° 1, 2012

Actually, from their content it can be concluded that the *Taktika* is in a way a repetition, reformulation and adaptation of the *Strategikon* according to the conditions that existed at the end of the ninth century. The same is noticed in the other Byzantine military treatises like *De re Militari*, *De Velitatione* or the manuals from the time of Nicephorus II Phocas (963-969).[37] These manuals inform that the Byzantine strategy was not about waging a pitch battle against the enemy. They suggest that the Byzantines should always try to avoid it, or to reduce it to a bare minimum. The author of the *Strategikon* actually advises the military commanders to use various military skills and tactics, and suggests to defeat the enemy "*...by deceit, by raids, or by hunger.* " He further recommends that they should constantly use their "*...tactical and strategically skills...*" and to avoid as much as possible a direct confrontation,[38] or in another word to wage against their enemies a typical defensive war of attrition.

If there wasn't any significant change in the military strategy and tactics during the second half of the eight century, then the reasons for the increased Byzantine presence in the Balkans should be looked somewhere else, that is in the reform of Constantine V and the establishment of the new elite units. Consisting of professional soldiers or mercenaries, with better military skills than the seasonal thematic forces, stationed first at Constantinople and then across the *themata* of Thrace and Macedonia, the *tagmata* probably elevated the preparedness of the Byzantine army on a much higher level, thus allowing not only for

---

[37] For *De Re Militari* and *De Velitatione* in: Dennis, *Three Byzantine Military Treatises*.; For the military manuals of Nicephorus II Phocas in: *Sowing The Dragons Teeth: Byzantine Warfare in the Tenth Century*, Eric McGeer trans., (Dumbarton Oaks, 2008). However it should be noted that although they used the theoretical strategies listed in the military manuals, the Byzantine commanders were flexible and practical, and very often used *ad-hoc* tactics that were not mentioned as a possible solution in some of these treatises. Such advice is given not only by Nicephorus II, but by Kekaumenos: *Советы и рассказы Кекавмена*, Генадиј Г. Литаврин ед., (Москва, 1972), 142.

[38] Dennis, *Maurice's Strategikon*, prooemium, VIII.2.4.; Walter E. Kaegi jr., *Some Thoughts on Byzantine Military Strategy*, (Brookline: Hellenic College Press, 1983), 8. This byzantine strategy of avoiding a pitch battle with the enemy is also testified by Theophanes. See in: Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 432. But despite this established strategy the sources inform us that the Byzantine armies still fought regular battles on the battlefield. See: George T. Dennis, "The Byzantines in Battle", ed. Kostas Tsiknakis, *Byzantium at War (9th-12th c.)*, (Athens: The National Hellenic Research Foundation, 1997), 165-178.

its rapid and effective deployment on the field, but also for an increased military engagement throughout the Balkans. Until their formation in the middle of the eight century the military power of Byzantium in the Balkan Peninsula was almost symbolic. The Thracian army who had been separated from the *Opsikion* army in 680 probably numbered about 6,000 soldiers; its goal was to provide greater security for the Thracian region and the city of Constantinople. Together with *thema* of Hellas, established several years later in the region of Attica and Boeotia with an army that numbered about 2,000 soldiers, it can be noticed that by the end of the seventh century the Byzantine Empire had deployed in the Balkans a total of 8,000 troops. Unfortunately, this did not present more than 10% of the overall army potential of the Empire in that given period.[39]

These two thematic armies stationed in the Balkans were not large and powerful enough to resist the enemy on their own. They were also stationed too far away from each other to operate together. The creation of the elite units of *scholai* and *exkoubitoi*, around 2,000 troops each, had changed this situation.[40] Not only they have increased the overall number of Byzantine forces in the Balkans, so that by the middle of the eight century together with the thematic forces most likely numbered about 12,000 soldiers, but stationed it the capitol and militarily experienced by the long years of constant warfare against the Bulgars, the *tagmata* have become a crucial factor for the Byzantine military power in the Balkan Peninsula. Also, unlike the thematic armies these units were directly subordinated to the Byzantine emperor and immediately available for the implementation of his political agenda. The increase of the *scholai* and *exkoubitoi* with 2,000 soldiers each at the time of Emperor Leo IV, so that the number of Byzantine forces in the Balkans reached about 16,000 troops, further strengthened the military presence on its territory, and also subsequently increased the awareness among the Byzantine rulers that there was an opportunity to start with the reintegration of the previously lost imperial territories.[41]

---

[39] According to W. Tredgold and J. Haldon the imperial army during this period numbered around 80,000 soldiers: Treadgold, *Byzantium and its Army*, 64, 66-67. and John F. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century: The Transformation of a Culture*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 239.

[40] We're not enlisting here the elite guard unit *noumera* made of two tagmas of 2,000 soldiers, because their duty was the safety of the Great Palace and its walls.

[41] Whether this was a carefully planned policy of the Byzantine government or an immediate *ad-hoc* decision is difficult to say, mostly because of absence of any

The first significant step can be seen in the military expedition of Staurakios in 783, as well as in the campaign of the empress Irene and her son Constantine VI during the next year which in fact presented some sort of display of the Byzantine military power throughout the Thracian region.[42]

Several years after this expedition the empress Irene established a new elite unit named *vigla* that was responsible for her security. Since the sources reports that it was billeted in Constantinople and took part in the military campaigns as a detachment responsible for the safety of the army commander and the military camp,[43] it can be concluded that with its formation the military forces in the Balkans increased by an additional 4,000 soldiers. But at the same time a part of the *scholai* and *exkoubitoi*, possibly half of them, were dislocated to Bithynia in Asia Minor, so that the number of troops located on the territory of the Balkan Peninsula remained unchanged, or about 16,000 members of the Byzantine military forces. The increased military presence, as well as the human resources that would seem didn't lacked in the Empire during this period,[44] allowed the Byzantine rulers to establish between the end of the eight and the beginning of the ninth century several new *themata* in the

evidence in the sources that would indicate existence of a long-term Byzantine strategy. More details about this question in: Edward N. Luttwak, *The Grand Strategy of the Byzantine Empire*, (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2009).

[42] For the campaign of Staurakios see: Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 456-457. For W. Treadgold this was an easy campaign. See: Treadgold, *The Byzantine Revival*, 71-72. According to T. Živkovič, this was a well-planned expedition. See: Tibor Živkovič, "The Date of the Creation of the Theme of Peloponnese", (*Byzantina Symmeikta 13*, 1999), 150. For the campaign of Irene and Constantine VI and its different interpretations by the scholars see: Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 457. And: Живковић, *Јужни Словени*, 162.; *Историја на Македонскиот Народ*, 307.; Lilie, "Trakien" und "Thrakesion", 41.; Ralph-Johannes Lilie, *Byzanz unter Eirene und Konstantin VI (780-802)*, (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996), 172-174.

[43] See in: *Three Treatises on Imperial Military Expeditions*, John F. Haldon ed. and trans., *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae* Vol. XXVIII, (Wien, 1990), C.420-435. Theophanes informs that the commander of the *vigla* died in the campaign of 811 which suggest that this *tagma* was frequently an active participant of the military expeditions. See: Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 491.

[44] The reason why the Byzantine Empire probably hasn't felt a shortage of human resources was the disappearance of the plague and the systematical plan of colonization that Emperor Constantine V and his heir Leo IV have implemented in Thrace. More about the influence of the epidemics in the Byzantine Empire see: Little, *Plague and the End of Antiquity*, 99-118. About the theory that the epidemics didn't have tremendous negative influence in the Byzantine state see: Whittow, *Making of Byzantium*, 66-68.

Balkans. They were *thema* Macedonia which encompassed the western regions of Thrace, *thema* Peloponnese located on the eponymous peninsula, *themata* Cephallenia and Thessalonika, and probably *thema* Strymon.[45]

In accordance with the policy of its predecessors, emperor Nicephorus I continued to increase the Byzantine military presence in the Balkans. For that purpose he established a new elite unit in Constantinople, the *hikanatoi*, which numbered 4,000 soldiers, bringing the number of the *tagmata* billeted in the Balkans at about 12,000 troops. The creation of several new *themata* with 2,000 soldiers each, except the *thema* of Macedonia, which possessed an army of 3,000 soldiers (probably 9000 during 809),[46] as well as the formation of a new elite

---

[45] *Thema* Macedonia was probably established during 790. See: Dragan Gjalevski, "Some Observations about the Establishment of thema Macedonia", *ГИНИ*, 54, бр.1-2, (Скопје, 2010), 45-56. According to P. Koledarov it was created somewhere between 797 and 802: Петар С. Коледаров, „Образуване на тема „Македония" в Тракия", *Известија на Института за Историја*, Том 21, (София: Българска Академия на Науките, 1970), 221-223. W. Treadgold assumes that that it was formed in 789: Treadgold, *Byzantine Revival*, 92-93, 100, n.114. *Thema* Peloponnese was probably established during the period between 784 and 809. For more details see: Георгије Острогорски, „Постанак тема Хелада и Пелопонез", *Из византиске историје и просопографије*, (Београд: Просвета, 1968), 149-153.; Romilly J. H. Jenkins, *Byzantium: The Imperial Centuries AD 610-1071*, (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1987), 122.; Živkovič, "The Date of the Creation of the Theme of Peloponnese", 153-154.; Treadgold, *Byzantine Revival*, 160. Thema Cephallenia was formed in 809 at the latest. See: Острогорски, „Постанак тема Хелада и Пелопонез", 153-154, n. 50.; Tibor Živkovič, "Uspenskij's Taktikon and the Theme of Dalmatia", (*Byzantina Symmeikta 17*, 2005), 58, 76-77.; Димитрије Оболенски, *Византијски Комонвелт*, (Београд: Просвета, 1996), 95.; Treadgold, *Byzantine Revival*, 161, 166. There are several opinions about the creation of *thema* Thessalonika according to which it was established during the first half of the IX century, i.e. somewhere between 809 and 836. Острогорски, „Постанак тема Хелада и Пелопонез", 154, n.55.; Toynbee, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus*, 269.; Оболенски, *Византијски Комонвелт*, 95.; Živkovič, "Uspenskij's Taktikon and the Theme of Dalmatia", 62, 85.; Treadgold, *Byzantine Revival*, 161. The letter of Michael II (820-829) send to Louis the Pious (814-840) presents a proof that this *thema* existed before 824 and that it was created by 809 at the latest. See in: *Византиски извори за историју народа Југославије*, Том I, (Београд, 1955), 251, n.5. For *thema* Strymon see: Živkovič, "Uspenskij's Taktikon and the Theme of Dalmatia", 62-64.; Острогорски, „Постанак тема Хелада и Пелопонез", 155.; Оболенски, *Византијски Комонвелт*, 96.

[46] Theophanes informs that in 809 Krum conquered Serdica and executed the whole army contingent in the city, who numbered about 6,000 soldiers. It is highly possible that this military garrison was under the command of the strategos of *thema* Mace-

unit, allowed the number of Byzantine forces in charge of the security of the imperial territories in the Balkans to increase to around 28,000, or 34,000 soldiers in the year 809.[47] However, the defeat of the imperial army in the region of Strymon, as well as the conquest and destruction of Serdica in 809 by the Bulgarian khan Krum, slightly diminished the Byzantine military presence in the Balkans and warned Nicephorus I that before starting any kind of extensive strategy of expansion, first the previously conquered territories should be consolidated.[48]

Unfortunately, the catastrophic defeat of the Byzantines in 811 by the Bulgars where the bulk of the imperial army was killed (among the fallen victims was the emperor Nicephorus I),[49] lead to an abrupt halt in the Byzantine policy of reintegration. This event not only inflicted a significant blow to the imperial military prestige, but the sources suggest that together with the change of the imperial government that was carried out during the same year, allowed the military and political initiative in the Balkans to pass from the Byzantines to the Bulgars. However, the sources also suggest that despite the ravaging and free movement of Krum's army throughout the *themata* of Thrace and Macedonia,[50] the division of the military system on *tagmata* and *themata*, together with the transfer of additional troops from Asia Minor, allowed the Byzantines in the early years after the defeat of Nicephorus I to hold some balance against the Bulgars and even to won several battles. Among them was the victory of 816, highly important for the

---

donia. Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 485.; See: Treadgold, *Byzantine Revival*, 149.; Treadgold, *History of the Byzantine state*, 426-427.

[47] W. Treadgold, *Byzantium and its Army*, 66-68.

[48] For that purpose Nicephorus I made a transfer of population from Asia Minor settling them through the already conquered *Sklaviniai*. About this population transfers see: Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 486. Also: Treadgold, *Byzantine Revival*, 136-137, 149-150, 160-164. Parts of them were settled in the region of Strymon and in the city of Philippi. Панов, *Историја на Македонскиот Народ*, 309. For the colonization of Peloponnesus: Moravcsik and Jenkins, *DAI*, 49.

[49] Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 490-491.; Georgius Monachus, *ИБИГИБИ*, Том IV, 54.; Иван Божилов и Васил Гюзелев уред., *История на средновековна България VII-XIV век*, Том I, (Софија: Анубис, 1999), 128-130.; Острогорски, *Историја Византије*, 200.; According to W. Treadgold Nicephorus I levied around 70,000 soldiers. For the battle: Treadgold, *Byzantine Revival*, 170-174.

[50] The Life of Nicethas Medicium most vividly describes the situation in Thrace after 811 when the Bulgars have gained great freedom of movement throughout its territory. According to the author of this work, the Curator of the imperial estates Mangana Zacharias was captured in Thrace by the Bulgars during the collection of the state taxes. Божилов и Гюзелев, *История на средновековна България VII-XIV век*, 144.

signing of the Byzantine-Bulgarian peace treaty between Leo V (813-820) and Omurtag (814-831). With this agreement Byzantium returned under its rule most of the territories from the *themata* of Thrace and Macedonia.[51]

The signed peace treaty allowed the Byzantine Empire to consolidate its ranks and to rebuild the military forces in the Balkans lost not only during the long years of fighting with the Bulgars, but also during the rebellion of Thomas the Slav. After the small setback in the second and third decade of the ninth century, the Byzantine position strengthened during the reign of Michael II and his son Theophilus (829-842). This was a period when despite the several military defeats from the Arabs in Sicily and Crete, Byzantium once again has taken the initiative in the Balkans and succeeded to impose its authority on the Macedonian *Sklaviniai* (although only temporary to some of them) who may have been acting independently.[52] During their rule *thema* Dyrrhachium[53] was established, situated on the western coast of the

---

[51] Although the Byzantines were badly defeated by the Bulgarian army several times, it can be noted that the indecision, poor coordination and the high level of anxiety among the military commanders significantly reduced the combat effectiveness of the imperial army. See in: Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 500-503. For the increased endurance of the Byzantine military system at the beginning of the ninth century witness also the victory on the eastern frontier against the Arabs: Mango and Scott, *Theophanes*, 497. For the assumption of W. Treadgold about the prompt recruitment of soldiers in the vacant ranks in the *tagmata* and the thematic armies see: Treadgold, *Byzantine Revival*, 180-181. For the Bulgar defeat in 816 see: John Skylitzes, *A Synopsis of Byzantine History 811-1057*, John Wortley trans., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 15-16. About this peace treaty in: Васил Златарски, *История на Българската държава през средните векове, Том I, Част 1,* (София, 2002), 299-304.

[52] Constantine VII Porphirogenitus in *De Cerimoniis* testifies about several revolts in the region of Thessalonica against the byzantine rule, indicating that these *Sklaviniai* probably recognized the power of the Byzantine emperor. *De Cerimoniis*, 634.11-14., 635.3. The Life of St. Gregory Decapolitus reports that during 836-837 in the region of Thessalonica a rebellion was started by an Exarch of one of the surrounding *Sklaviniai*, but was defeated afterwards. For more details see: Vita Gregorii Decapolitani, *ИБИГИБИ*, Том IV, 38-39.; the hagiographical works of life of St. Methodius also informs that the *Sklaviniai* have come under the supreme authority of the byzantine emperor. According to them he was appointed as *archon* in a certain Slavic region for about 10 years. See in: *Сведоштва за Кирил и Методиј*, прев. Радмила Угриновска-Скаловска и Љубинка Басотова, (Скопје, 1989), 58.; Бранко Панов, *Македонија низ историјата*, (Скопје, 1999), 40.

[53] About the establishment of this byzantine *thema* see: Острогорски, „Постанак тема Хелада и Пелопонез", 154.; Оболенски, *Византијски Комонвелт*, 95.; Živkovič, "Uspenskij's Taktikon and the Theme of Dalmatia", 62, 81, 84, n.76.; W. Tredgold as-

Adriatic Sea, so that the number of Byzantine forces increased by an additional 2,000 soldiers.[54] Another military reinforcement of the Byzantine forces stationed in the Balkan Peninsula occurred during 840. Theophilus to each of the *themata* of Macedonia and Thrace assigned additional 2,000 soldiers, part of the Khurramite contingents, so that by the middle of the ninth century the Byzantine military presence in the Balkans increased to 4,000 new troops.[55] By the end of his reign the Byzantine Empire deployed across the Balkan *themata* about 20,000 troops, while in and around Constantinople, as well as through the *themata* of Thrace and Macedonia, were billeted some 12,000 out of 16,000 members of the *tagmata* ready to assist these thematic armies. That was a total of 32,000 soldiers stationed in the Balkans in charge for the security of the imperial domains, an increase of approximately four times compared to the middle of the eight century before the establishment of the *tagmata*. These forces probably constituted more than 25% of the overall military power that the Byzantine emperor had at his disposal in the moment.

Towards the middle of the ninth century the first stage of the Byzantine reoccupation of the previously lost imperial territory in the Balkans ended. All the territories south of Debeltus, Adrianopolis, Philippoupolis, Thessalonica and Mount Pindus, and the coastal areas south of the city Dyrrhachium, found themselves under the authority of the Byzantine emperor. The exceptional role that the *tagmata* had during this process of reintegration was by the middle of the ninth century fully recognized by the Byzantines. The higher military prowess of the *tagmata* in relation to the seasonal thematic units has resulted in their acceptance by the central government as the main striking force of the imperial army. For this purpose a new centralized command was established, led by the *domestikos* of the *scholai*, which by the middle of the tenth century was divided in two, Eastern and Western. Although in this period the thematic units still held great importance for the Byzantine Empire, the *tagmata* however were the ones who took the central role in the offensive campaigns carried out by the Byzantine emperors from the middle of the tenth until the middle of the eleventh

---

sumes that *thema* Dyrrhachium was formed by the emperor Theophilus: Treadgold, *Byzantine Revival*, 317.

[54] Treadgold, *Byzantium and its Army*, 66.

[55] For the enlargement of the thematic armies with the Khurramite units and their billeting see: Treadgold,
Byzantium and its Army, 67-69.; Treadgold, *Byzantine Revival*, 314-317.

century, which in fact presents the apogee of the Byzantine military power.

Драган ЃАЛЕВСКИ

ТАГМАТА И ВИЗАНТИСКАТА РЕКОНКВИСТА НА БАЛКАНОТ
(средина на VII – средина на IX век)

- р е з и м е -

Византиската воена активност на Балканот од средината на VIII век значително се разликува од претходниот период и соодветствува со воспоставувањето на *тагматите*. Создадени да обезбедат адекватна заштита за императорот против можни идни побуни од провинциските моќници, тие ја надминале својата основна функција. Стационирани во Константинопол, но и низ темите Тракија и Македонија, овие елитни единици станале клучен фактор за остварување на византиските интереси на Балканот. Улогата што ја имале *тагматите* во текот на реинтеграцијата на балканските територии била целосно препознаена од Византијците кон средината на IX век, што резултирало со тоа тие да бидат прифатени како главна ударна сила на империјалната армија.

Катица ТРАЈКОВА

Институт за македонски јазик „Крсте Мисирков" – Скопје

ЗА КНИЖЕВНИТЕ ШКОЛИ ВО СРЕДНОВЕКОВНА МАКЕДОНИЈА

Македонско средновековно книжевно наследство, кое сведочи за една долга и богата културна традиција што се создавала со векови, се реализирало преку формирање книжевни школи, центри и скрипториуми. Во нив се одвивале разновидни активности: книжевни, просветни, научно-сознајни и идејно-творечки. Во книжевните школи, кои опфаќале поширок територијален простор, се градело единство на јазичните, правописните, стилските и на структурно-текстолошките карактеристики, создавајќи книжевна традиција поврзана со дејноста на препишувачите и нивните дела. Книжевните центри најчесто се идентификуваат со дејноста во манастирите, црквите каде што се реализирала понагласена продуктивност на книжевно-творечкиот процес, каде што се негувала и се чувала ракописната книга, се истакнувале поширки и продлабочени развојни карактеристки, а организираноста се засновала на специјални калиграфски и други повисоки форми на училишта. Скрипториумот, пак, претставувал дел од книжевниот центар, кој егзистирал како самостојна средина за пишувачка или за преведувачка дејност.[1]

Во средновековниот период Македонија била истакнат црковно-религиозен и културен центар на чиишто простори се формирале повеќе книжевни центри и скрипториуми. Според историските податоци, нивното создавање се поврзува со мисионерската дејност на св. Кирил и Методиј, реализатори на словенската духовна и културна традиција. Познато е дека браќата

---

[1] Илија Велев, *Проникнувања на традицијата и континуитетот* (Скопје: Институт за македонска литература, 2000), 45–46.

ја создале првата словенска азбука и извршиле превод на краткиот апракос. Тогаш за првпат е фиксиран во книжевна форма најстариот јазик на сите Словени во чија основа бил вграден говорот на македонските Словени од Солунско.

Историските податоци посочуваат дека формирањето на Охридската школа се поврзува со дејноста на св. Климент и Наум Охридски, носители на основните идеи на своите учители Кирил и Методиј. Нивното искуство во Моравската мисија не било само во служба на мисионерската дејност во согласност со тогашната византиска практика туку значело и нивно збогатување со нови духовни содржини. Суштината на дејноста на Климент и Наум е поврзување на мисионерската дејност со новите идеи за рамноправно вклучување на новите христијани во една универзална христијанска заедница преку создавање сопствен литургиски јазик и сопствена литература, и самостоен културен напредок и културен идентитет, создавајќи нова етапа во развојот на сесловенската писменост. Охридската книжевна школа се засновувала врз традициите на изворните идеи од Моравската мисија, што, всушност, значело создавање на една препознатлива традиција, чие влијание ќе се чувствува врз оформувањето на јазичниот израз на македонската писменост низ целото средновековие.

Како што споменавме, Охридската книжевна школа се карактеризира со особености што се типични за црковната, просветната и книжевната дејност на Климент и Наум Охридски. Тие се занимавале со разновидна книжевна дејност. Покрај препишувачката и преводната дејност, пишувале и оригинални состави по образец на византиската поетика, а просветителската дејност ја вршеле преку богослужбите.[2]

Според изворите, книжевниците од Охридската книжевна школа биле мошне активни како пишувачи на ракописни книги што биле потребни за извршување на богослужбата. Во скрипториумите се напишани стотици црковни книги, кои имаат карактеристични палеографски, графиски, орнаментолошки, текстолошки, литературни и јазични обележја за оваа школа. Во овој центар се негувала поголема приврзаност кон кирилометодиевската традиција, што значи конзервативност и архаичност на јазикот на текстовите. Кај ракописите се следи зачувување на текстуалната структура на

---

[2] Петар Х. Илиевски, *Појава и развој на писмото со посебен осврт кон почетоците на словенската писменост* (Скопје: МАНУ, 2001), 262.

преводите, употреба на двоеров правопис, честа вокализација на големиот ер во текот на редакцискиот период, присуство на поархаична лексика, вклучувајќи ги и бројните стари грцизми, специфичности во графиските, фонетските и граматичките својства на ракописите.[3] Во ова школа се користела глаголицата, како најпрепознатлив нејзин белег, речиси два века, а нејзини траги се среќаваат во кирилските ракописи од 13 и од 14 век. Сето ова зборува за еден изграден однос кон јазичната норма на наследениот писмен јазик и писмена култура што се базира врз почитта кон традицијата.

Во литерарната дејност на оваа школа исто така се видливи основните принципи на Великоморавската школа изразени преку стремежот кон создавање функционално и стилски адекватен литерарен израз, со зачувување на естетските квалитети на оригиналот, почитувајќи ја точноста и разбирливоста на преводот. Се јавува релативно слободен однос кон грчкиот оригинал, пренесувањето на содржината е во согласност со согледбата за неопходноста христијанската поука да биде пренесена на достапен јазик.[4]

Кога се зборува за традициите на Охридската школа, секогаш треба да се земе предвид континуитетот на една литерарна дејност во еден подолг временски период, кој содржи одредени заеднички јазични и литерарни црти и има заедничка културна програма што ја обединува дејноста на повеќе скрипториуми, манастирски училишта и цркви што гравитирале кон охридскиот духовен и културен центар. Во времето на Климент и Наум веќе била создадена богата литература. Биле преведени сите литургиски книги што се користеле за вршење богослужба, целата Библија, патристички текстови, потребни правни прирачници. Со писмената традиција од оваа школа се поврзуваат повеќе ракописи. Секако неизбежни извори се најстарите канонски глаголски текстови со библиска содржина, односно евангелијата, на пр. Асемановото изборно евангелие од втората половина на 10 век, потоа Синајскиот псалтир и Синајскиот требник од 11 век. Од кирилските текстови ќе ги споменеме: Битолскиот триод, посен триод од 12 век;

---

[3] Блаже Конески, „Охридска книжовна школа", во *Климент Охридски. Студии* (Скопје: 1986, 22–23).

[4] Зденка Рибарова, „Охридските традиции во развојот на македонската црковнословенска писменост", во *Предавања на XXV меѓународен семинар за македонски јазик, литература и култура, Охрид, 21. VIII –4. IX 1992* (Скопје: Универзитет „Св. Кирил и Методиј", Скопје, 1993), 54.

Охридскиот апостол, краток изборен апостол од крајот на 12 век; Македонското евангелие на поп Јован, краток апракос од втората половина на 13 век; Болоњскиот псалтир со коментар од почетокот на 13 век; Кичевскиот октоих од средината на 13 век и др.

Дејноста на Охридската школа е позната и по богатата литерарна дејност, преводна и оригинална. Мошне корисни пода-тоци за преведувачката дејност во Охридската школа се среќаваат во Опширното житие за Климент (напишано од Теофилакт), според кое се вели дека Климент превел од грчки на словенски јазик дел од цветниот триод.

Во врска со оригиналните книжевни творби, несомнено треба да се спомене Климент, автор на голем број поучни и пофални слова, кои се карактеризираат со едноставност на изразот и стилот, наменети за основна христијанска поука на верниците, потоа хагиографски и химнографски текстови. Дел од овие творби, како, на пр.. Претпразнични трипеснеци за раѓањето Христово, Општа служба за светители и Канон за празникот „Полагање риза и појасот на Богородица“ го содржат авторскиот потпис, додека други творби, пак, му се припишуваат врз основа на стилските одлики.

Скрипторска дејност била раширена и во северна Маке-донија, особено во 13 и во 14 век. Во многубројните цркви и манастири, под влијание на охридскиот духовен центар, се развила богата книжевна дејност позната како Кратовско-Лесновска книжевна школа. Во овој културен центар се развила мошне богата активност преку која се согледува вкрстување на Охридската школа со српската рецензија на црковнословенскиот јазик.

Во почетокот на 13 век во североисточна Македонија се менувале бугарската, византиската, српската власт сѐ до доаѓањето на османлиите. За разлика од охридската книжевна дејност за која е карактеристично, како што споменавме, негувањето на глаголската писмена традиција и настанувањето на најзначајните ракописи од старословенскиот период, во Кратовско-Лесновскиот книжевен центар, во кој се негувале текстолошките, јазичните и правописните карактеристики на една поширока територија, настанале ракописи што со своите карактеристики дале обележје на една цела епоха од историјата на македонскиот јазик. Имено, мошне интересна тема за проучување од лингвистички аспект претставува контактот на овие ракописи со српската варијанта на црковнословенскиот јазик, што настанал како резултат на промените во општествено-политичкиот

живот во Македонија во тоа време. Во ракописите од оваа школа се одразиле развојните текови на посочената српска варијанта на црковнословенскиот јазик, најпрво преку рашкиот, а потоа преку ресавскиот правопис. Ракописите од оваа школа со своите карактеристични обележја претставуваат редакциска врска меѓу старословенските текстови од 12 век и текстовите од подоцнежниот црковнословенски период.[5]

Според истражувачите на оваа ракописна школа, првите книжевни творби од Леновскиот книжевен центар се поврзуваат со периодот кога бил изграден Лесновскиот манастир и кога се составиле првите текстуални варијанти на житието и на службата за пустиножителот св. Гаврил Лесновски.[6] Богатото книжевно наследство од овој центар се карактеризира со своевидни правописно-јазични и текстуално-структурни специфичности. Имено, врските со Русија преку Света Гора влијаеле во ракописите што се препишувале во овој центар да се јавуваат текстуални варијанти специфични за руското ракописно наследство, како на пример прологите, Станиславов, Лесновски-Ковачевиќев и Белградски пролог, од старата редакција на Констатин Мокисиски, и полните апракосни евангелија од М'стиславовиот тип. Од богатата книжевна дејност од Кратово и Кратовско ги бележиме: Хлудовиот триод, посен и цветен триод од крајот на 13 век; Струмичкиот апостол, краток изборен апостол од втората половина на 13 век; Радомировото евангелие, полн апракос од втората половина на 13 век; Добрејшовото евангелие, четвороевангелие од почеток на 13 век; Деканскиот псалтир, литургиски псалтир со молитви од крајот на 13 век; Карпинското евангелие, полн апракос од крајот на 13 век; Карпинскиот апостол, полн изборен апостол од почеток на 14 век; Кратовското евангелие, четвороевангелие од средината на 14 век; Лесновскиот паренезис од 1353 г. и др.

За ракописите од Кратовско-Лесновската книжевна школа се карактеристични повеќе одлики. Повеќеслојната структура на ракописите укажува на фактот дека во овие ракописи доаѓа до вкрстување на она што било поставено како литерарна норма и

---

[5] Кита Бицевска, „Традиционални особености во ракописите од Кратовско-Лесновскиот книжевен центар“, во *Светите Климент и Наум Охридски и придонесот на Охридскиот духовен центар за словенската просвета и култура, Прилози од научен собир одржан на 13–15 септември 1993* (Скопје: МАНУ, 1995), 155.

[6] Велев, *Проникнувања на традицијата*, 59.

говорните особености на пишувачот. Од правописните и фонетс-
ките карактеристики се бележат: едноеров правопис, односно
употреба само на малиот ер, се следи поограничена замена на
носовките, ретка или сосем отсутна вокализација на големиот ер,
замена на ь со а по с, х, замена на ѣ со оу, присуство на српско
јазично влијание во подоцнежните текстови, особена кај оние што
се датирани од 14 век, кај кои се следи постепена замена на
традиционалната македонска ортографија со правописни системи
од српски тип.

Појавата на средновековните книжевни центри има мошне
значајна улога во градењето на континуитетот на македонската
книжевност. Во нив се развивале книжевните, структурните и
стилските тенденции, кои на средновековната книжевност ѝ даваат
еден препознатлив белег олицетворен преку кириलометодиевската
традиција и нејзиниот континуитет. Македонската средновековна
книжевност опфаќа широк дијапазон на ракописи со разновидна
содржина, почнувајќи од библиските книги, потоа апокрифната
литература, хагиографии, белетристичка проза, историографии,
правни дела. За проучувачите на јазичните карактеристики на
ракописите, особено се значајни оние ракописи што тематски се
најстари сочувани текстови и кои по својата структура го
претставуваат најстариот редакциски тип текстови. Голем дел од
овие ракописи се монографски обработени од истакнати
македониски и странски слависти, притоа потенцирајќи го
значењето на јазичните карактеристики препознатливи за
охридската и кратовско-лесновската книжевна традиција.

Иако голем дел од македонското ракописно наследство е
зачувано само фрагментарно, сепак она што е зачувано дава јасна
слика за карактерот на литерарно-нормативната, просветната и
културната дејност на книжевните школи и многубројните
скрипторски центри.

Katica TRAJKOVA

ON LITERARY SCHOOLS IN MEDIEVAL MACEDONIA

- s u m m a r y -

Macedonian medieval literary heritage, which testifies to a long and rich cultural tradition, was created in the literary schools, centers and scriptoria. The unity of language, spelling, style, as well as structural and textual characteristics was built here, creating literary tradition with the activity of transcribers and their works. Literary works in Old Church Slavonic were developed within two literary schools, the Ohrid School and the Kratovo-Lesnovo School.

Typical characteristic of the Ohrid Literary School is nurturing of Glagolitic written tradition; the manuscripts retained textual structure of the translations, usage of ꙁ and ь, common vocalization of ꙁ>o, archaic vocabulary including numerous old Hellenisms, specifics in the graphic, phonetic and grammatical properties of the manuscripts.

Typical characteristic of the Kratovo-Lesnovo School is multifaceted structure of the manuscripts which indicates that in these manuscripts there is an intersection of literary norm with the speech features of the writer. The following spelling and phonetic features are noted: usage of just ꙁ or ь, more limited usage of the nasals, replacement of ѕ with а after ц, х, replacement of ѵ with ou and intensive Serbian presence in the later texts.

Andrew P. ROACH

University of Glasgow

Maja ANGELOVSKA-PANOVA

Institute of National History - Skopje

PUNISHMENT OF HERETICS: COMPARISONS AND CONTRASTS BETWEEN WESTERN AND EASTERN CHRISTIANITY IN THE MIDDLE AGES*

There is much to be learned from the way in which a society seeks to limit the choices of its members, particularly in the contentious field of religion. Medieval Europe is a good case in point, because at first sight the ideological blanket of 'Christendom' thrown over the continent disguises both the diversity of belief and the responses to that diversity. Theoretically the medieval Christian Church was a monopoly based on exclusive interpretation of the Bible through the works of the Church fathers and the legislation of Councils. On the ground the Church was a patchwork of competing monasteries, parish churches and shrines, while the defining moment which seemed to guarantee its monopolistic status, its adoption as state religion by the Roman empire had evolved into a number of fluctuating relationships with a variety of secular entities from city communes to kings and emperors. Given that there has been much study of the treatment of religious dissidents in the West, stemming from its eventual institutionalization as 'the Inquisition', there has been surprisingly little comparison of the punishment of heretics across the continent, all the more so considering that the divide between 'Catholic' and 'Orthodox' was by no means

decisive for much of the period and that both confessions drew from a common heritage.[1]

That heritage was both religious and legal: the Church in late Antiquity faced significant challenges from Manichaeans and Donatists and against them was assembled a body of Roman law dependant on the codes issued by Theodosius (408-50) and Justinian (527-65).[2] It was only at this point that eastern and western traditions diverged. Whereas the relatively strong centralized government in Constantinople continued to enforce a degree of religious uniformity, notably during the ebb and flow of the iconoclast controversy, in the West the relative decline of centralized institutions allowed a degree of local autonomy. In Byzantium and the West however, there were few signs of organized heresy possibly because in both regions the Church remained relatively distant from the laity. This situation changed between the tenth and fourteenth centuries with the emergence of the Bogomil heresy in the East and the Cathars and other dissidents in the West. The aim of this article is a comparison of the ways in which diversity was turned into deviance and how the material and spiritual consequences of individuals' and comunities' religious choices were better defined. Two rather different models of religious authority emerge in the process.

The first relevant source on punishing heretics within the period is the letter by Patriarch Theophylact from Constantinople (933-956) sent to the Bulgarian Tsar Peter (927-969). The letter contains data pertaining to the specific request made by Tsar Peter regarding how to

---

*The authors wish to thank Dr. Jonathan Shepard, Prof.Dr. Antonio Rigo and Dr. Stuart Airlie for their helpful suggestions and comments on earlier drafts of this article.

[1] For the West see below nn. 33, 64. For the East see Averil Cameron, 'Enforcing Orthodoxy in Byzantium', *Discipline and Diversity,* eds. Kate Cooper and Jeremy Gregory (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007) Dimiter G. Angelov, 'Power and Subversion in Byzantium: approaches and frameworks' in Dimiter. Angelov (ed.), *Subversion in Byzantium* (forthcoming 2012); Andrew P. Roach, 'Bogomils' in D. Jones, *Censorship: a world encyclopedia* (London: Fitzroy, Dearborn, 2001), 3 vols. Vol.1, 258-9. One recent comparative study is Angeliki Konstantakopoulou , 'Repentant or dead: East and West attitudes towards late-medieval heretics', *Средновековна християнска Европа: Изток и Запад ценности, традиции, општуване* (Гутенберг, 2002), 456-74.

[2] For measures against heresy in late Antiquity see Elizabeth A. Clark, *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity* (Princeton University Press, 1999); Averil Cameron, 'The violence of orthodoxy' in *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity,* ed. Eduard. Iricinschi and Holger.M. Zellentin (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 112.

treat the heretics, which scholars have usually identified as Bogomils, when punishing them. Patriarch Theophylact lists three categories to be used in determining the appropriate treatment for repentant heretics: firstly, those who taught doctrines alien to those of the church, if they repented could be rebaptized in accordance with Canon 19 of the Council of Nicaea (325).[3] Secondly, those who were led astray by the former and were seduced, not by weakness, but by their own simplicity and guilelessness, were to be confirmed like children. Those in the third rank, who neither taught nor learnt nor participated, but in ignorance had unsuspectingly united with the heretics because they appeared ascetics and good and religious men, and who perhaps had spent some time with them to hear more completely about the heresy, were to be taken back into the Church after 'separating' (ἀφορισθέντες) them for four months to ensure their conversion was genuine, which perhaps implies a formal penitential procedure.[4] Taken as a whole, two features clearly stand out from Theophylact's advice: firstly, he implies that a significant number of the heretics are from within the Church: priests who taught heretical doctrine are to lose their status, but other priests who showed an interest in the heretics are not. Secondly, Theophylact distinguished what Peter could do, from what he ought to do and in doing so revealed much about the initial Byzantine mindset in dealing with heresy. The patriarch stated that the laws of a Christian state prescribed death for the unrepentant, but that it was not right, nor fitting for the Church's reputation, nor for the patriarch's that they should be enforced and that the chance of repentance should be given. As Wazo of Liège was to do in the West a century later (see below), he advocated spiritual penalties.

The chief of these was the anathema, the most severe form of excommunication, but not irreversible. Theophylact tempered his punishment to the situation. Even more importantly from a Byzantine point of view, Bulgaria was distant and the heretics described had low social status and presented no serious danger for the Empire; Theophylact could afford a relaxed stance in accordance with the current

---

[3] Norman P. Tanner, *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2 vols. (Georgetown: University Press. 1990), vol.1, 15.

[4] Ivan Dujčev, 'L'epistola sui Bogomili del patriarca Costantinopolitano Teofilato' in his *Medioevo Bizantino-Slavo*, 3 vols. (Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 1965), vol. 1, 311-15. It is translated in *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World*, ed. Janet.Hamilton and Bernard Hamilton (Manchester University Press), 98-102.

policy of *oikonomia*.[5] The anathema as a form of punishment was more spiritual in character and it was intended to have a psychological and didactic influence on the individual. It was used in both East and West: Theophylact's words find echoes in canon 3 of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215. But whereas in the East it was left as a warning to the recipient that they were beyond the law and that potentially any coercive action from any source was licit, in the West it was increasingly the prelude to a defined procedure.

Matters were different when heresy was identified closer to home, as it was in the reign of Alexios Komnenos (1081-1118) Two illustrative examples are the case of John Italos[6], a leading intellectual and founder of the study of dialectics and history of philosophy in Constantinople who believed in metempsychosis, but ridiculed icons, and the case of Patriarch Eustathios Garidas (1081-84), who was intrigued by Italos's philosophical theology and exegesis. Italos's teaching was anathematized at the synod of 1082 and Eustathios was forced to resign two years later when a mob arrived at the Church of Hagia Sophia.[7] The emperor took a personal interest in the prosecution of the first by appointing his brother to investigate and may have also have been behind the fall of the second who was seen as too close to his political rivals. These early actions may have been as much about announcing a change of political climate as about eliminating threats to the faith.[8] A far more potent threat was identified in the early years of the twelfth century. Anna Komnena stated that "word of Bogomilism was spreading everywhere and the evil like a fire destroyed many souls." The monk Basil, who had "12 students he calls Apostles" was the dominant personality in spreading the "Bogomil atheism."[9] It was no coincidence that Alexios I Komnenos "put aside a great deal of his

---

[5]   Konstantakopoulou, 'Repentant or dead', 458; Маја Ангеловска-Панова, *Богомилството во духовната култура на Македониј а* (Аз-Буки, Институт за старословенска култура, 2004), 26.

[6] Николай Цв. Кочев, *Християнски философи във Византия V-XI век* (София 2005), 167-181.

[7] Maja Angelovska-Panova, "Food, Drink and Heresy"*, Proceeding of the International Congress on Traditional Culture-Link in the Integration of the Region* (Mostar, 2011), 26.

[8] Angelov, 'Power and Subversion'.

[9] Annae Comnenae, *Alexiadis*, lib. XV, 8 ed. J. Schopen-A. Reifferscheid (Bonn, 1839), 351-352. Trans. as *The Alexiad of Anna Comnena* by E. R. A. Sewter (London: Penguin, 1969), 496-99.

concerns in the East and West, and directed his attention towards spiritual concerns".[10] As Jonathan Shepard has pointed out: "The role of guardian of religious orthodoxy was axiomatic of any *basileus*. Yet Alexios went to extraordinary lengths to establish a personal reputation for himself as the castigator of religious error". [11]

Alexios's strategy involved the pretence that he was inclining to heresy and eventually persuading Basil to explain his full teaching. It is not clear whether Alexios's ruse was accompanied by repressive measures with the aim of identifying other leaders and annihilating the heresy completely. It is safe to say only that the actions undertaken by Alexios I Komnenos were considered part of his imperial duty to protect his subjects from religious deviance. Alexios's tactics which lacked recent precedent in Byzantine experience do suggest that he was influenced by older penalties laid down for treason. Anna Komnena stresses that Alexios was dealing with the enemy within by reference to Basil's influence 'in the greatest houses' and in some ways there are similarities with the treatment of Arnold of Brescia in Rome by Adrian IV some fifty years later, not least because in both cases the heresiarch was personally known to the emperor and pope respectively. In both cases the secular and religious arms of government moved in close co-operation to deal with an intimate enemy. Anna relates how Alexios called an assembly of leading secular and religious officials to condemn Basil's teaching and he then employed both burning and imprisonment as a penalty for Basil and his supporters. It would be useful to know more details about the 'prison of maximum security' in which the heretics languished for a long time until their death, to gauge Byzantine commitment to long term punitive imprisonment which does seem to prefigure inquisition practice in the West.[12]   Before Alexios's final decision to send them to the stake, he offered Basil and the rest of the heretics the chance to convert to Orthodoxy. As the *Alexiad* put it: "To-day two pyres shall be built, and by one a cross will be fixed in the ground. Then you are given a choice. All those who want to die today in the Christian faith should separate themselves from the others and approach the pyre with the cross, while those who adhere to the Bogomil

---

[10] Ibidem.

[11] Jonathan Shepard, "Hard on heretics, light on Latins: the balancing-act of Alexios I Komnenos" *Travaux et Mémoires 16, Mélanges Cécile Morrison.* (Paris: Association des Amis du Centre d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance 2010) 765,

[12] *Alex.* lib. XV, 8; Sewter, 500, 502, 504.

heresy shall be thrown on the other. It is better for those who are Christians to die than to live and be persecuted as if they were Bogomils, and outrage the consciences of many. Go then, and let each of you approach which pyre he chooses"[13].

Basil displayed conspicuous bravery and spiritual strength, a man "ready to step into fire and die a thousand times over, and not renounce his faith". Despite her antagonism towards Bogomilism, Anna Komnena could not remain indifferent to Basil's heroism. "He," she wrote, "could not be made to waver, he was a true Bogomil." These dramatic events culminated with the act of execution itself. The decision to burn Basil's cloak first may be attributable to the executioners' nervousness at creating a potential martyr. What is not in doubt is that compared with previous heretics, Basil was treated not just as a dangerous religious preacher but also as a conspirator against the emperor and state security.[14]

By actually burning heretics Alexios employed the powers which Theophylact had advised were available to rulers faced with heresy, but that they should not use. Burning had a long history by the twelfth century and was a punishment used for crimes against the social order. In the classical age it still had associations with sacrificial offerings to the gods. It was used as a punishment for a range of crimes including homosexuality, slaves plotting against their masters, sacrilege, military desertion, arson, coin forgery and particularly, treason.[15] By contrast, heresy was not an offence specifically punishable by burning, although it

---

[13] *Alex.,* lib. XV, 9; Hamilton, *Christian Dualist Heresies*, 178.

[14] Димитар Ангелов, *Богомилството* (София, 1993), 320.

[15] Eva Cantarella, *I supplizi capitali in Grecia e a Roma* (Milan: Rizzoli, 1991), 223 (homosexuality), 236-7 (expiatory sacrifice). *Corpus Iuris Civile: Digesta* ed. Theodor Mommsen, 16th edn. (Berlin: Weidmann, 1954). The following are from Lib.48. Sacrilege 13,7 (page 858) ; deserters 19 [De Poenis],8, 2 (865); slaves [petty treason] 19, 28, 11 (868); arsonists 19, 28, 12 (868); Title 4 (844) (treason; no specific penalty, but equated with sacrilege). *Theodosiani Libri XVI cum constitutionibus sirmondianis*, ed, Theodor Mommsen and Paulus Krueger, 2 vols. (Berlin: Weidmann, 1954). Coin forgers, vol. 1[2] , Lib. 9, 21, 5 (431); Heretics Lib. 16, 5 (the main penalties are fines, exile and confiscation of property. More extreme was branding and for slaves, forced labour). See also M. Bévenot, 'The inquisition and its antecedents, III', *Heythrop Journal,* 8 (1967), 60. However, the *Codex Iustinianus*, ed. Paulus Krueger (Berlin: Weidmann, 1959), 1, 5, 8 (52) citing a decree of 455 urges an unspecified death penalty for teachers of heresy and then adds that their books should be burnt 'ut facinorosae perversitatis vestigia ipsa flammis ambusta depereant.'which would seem suggestive at the least.

was a capital crime. By burning Basil and his followers Alexios seems to have achieved that conflation of heresy with treason achieved in the West by Pope Innocent III in 1199 through *Vergentis in senium*.[16]

Alexios did not confine himself to repression. He also undertook didactic measures. He mobilised priests from the church of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople who were to teach the people about the true faith and warn them of the repercussions of involvement in heresy.[17]   His actions can be summarized as being effective and occasionally militant – he exercised his authority through the patriarchs and bishops, and used the synod for sentencing people to prison and, when the crisis demanded, to burning at the stake.

Discoveries of alleged Bogomils continued throughout the following century, especially during the reign of the Emperor Manuel I Komnenos (1143–1180) who was himself intrigued by the teaching. However, after he overcame the temptation and returned to Orthodoxy, he gave an order "to purge the whole flock of all that Bogomil heresy and those that abide by the holy dogmatists from their heart, let them be a part of the chosen flock, and those that do not ... let them be driven far away from the Orthodox flock".[18] The excommunication of individuals from the society was not the only punishment that Manuel had undertaken against the heretics. Theodore Balsamon, the canon lawyer, reported that a number of Bogomils were burned at the stake.[19] He also stated that "whole villages and fortresses" were inhabited by heretic Bogomils.[20] However, Hugh Eteriano, the Italian theologian based in Constantinople, thought that Manuel was not doing enough and his *Contra Patarenos* included a plea to the emperor to root heretics out by hanging and fire, punishments

---

[16] Walter Ullmann, 'The significance of Innocent III's decretal "Vergentis" in *Etudes d'histoire du droit canonique dédiées à Gabriel le Bras*, 2 vols. (Paris: Sirey, 1965), vol.1, 729-41.

[17] Hamilton, *Christian Dualist Heresies*, 39: Andrew.P.Roach, *The Devil's World. Heresy and Society, 1100-1300* (Harlow: Longman, 2005), 64.

[18] Добрила Миловска, Јован Таковски, *Македонската житијна литература IX-XVIII,* (Скопје,1996), 137.

[19] Milan Loos, *Dualist Heresy in the Middle Ages,* (Praha, 1974), 98-99.

[20] Dimitri Obolensky, *The Bogomils: a study in Balkan neo-manichaeism* (Cambridge: University Press, 1948)*,* 229. See also Peter Petkoff, 'Heresy, Orthodoxy and the interaction between canon and civil law in Theodore Balsamon's canon and civil law in Theodore Balsamon's Commentaries in Andrew.P. Roach and James R.Simpson (eds.), *Heresy and the limits of Orthodoxy in medieval and modern perspectives* (forthcoming 2013).

reminiscent of those inflicted on Arnold of Brescia.[21] The beginning of the thirteenth century saw action taken against the Bogomils in Bulgaria. In a synod held in 1211 in Trnovo on the initiative of the Bulgarian Tsar Boril (1207–1218), presented himself as "incited by divine motives" in his fight against the heretics. However, Boril confined himself to the use of anathemas such as: "And to all those who support that heresy, to their customs, their nightly gatherings and sacraments and their useless teaching, as well as to those who accompany them, anathema," or: "To those who reject and mock the Communion with the holy body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and also reject the entire Sacrament done by Jesus Christ our Lord for our own salvation, anathema."[22] Boril's aim was a comprehensive statement of who was and was not part of his political community. Besides heretics, he anathematized those who aided thieves, robbers and murderers and those who made spells and picked fruit on midsummer day, reminiscent of pagan ritual.[23]

In the Western Balkans in Serbia, Stefan Nemanja also legislated rigorous action to suppress heresy. Around 1180 he convened a synod in which the heretics were accused of "blaspheming the Holy Spirit", of "dividing the indivisible divinity, as the mindless Arius used to speak" and of "serving the apostate from the glory of God, the very Satan himself".[24] The leader of the group of heretics, generally taken to be Bogomils, had his tongue cut out. His followers were executed or exiled and their books were publicly burnt.[25] There are strands of imperial thought in the way that the ruler safeguarded the spiritual welfare of his subjects and also an awareness of the methods of propagation of heresy through speech and writing. Although powerful enough to order executions Nemanja also made the symbolic gesture, using burning, but not of people, probably a conscious imitation of Justinian's legislation against heretics.[26] His son, Sava, the archbishop of Peć, changed tactics

---

[21] Hugh Eteriano, *Contra Patarenos*, eds. Bernard Hamilton, Janet Hamilton and Sarah Hamilton, (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 155,177.   Yuri Stoyanov, *The Other God,* (Yale University Press, 2000), 182.

[22] *Борилов Синодик* издание и превод Иван. Божилов,, Анна-Мария Тотоманова, Иван Биларски, (София, 2010); (English translation, 337-377). 122, 125, 344, 345.

[23] *Борилов Синодик*, 122,146, 344, 351,

[24] Драгољуб Драгојловић, Вера Антиќ, *Богомилството во средновековната изворна граѓа.*(Скопје, 1978), 117.

[25] Andrew P.Roach, "The Competition for Souls: Sava of Serbia and Consumer Choice in Religion in the Thirteenth Century Balkans". *Гласник на ИНИ*, год.50, бр.1 (2006), 152.

[26] See above n.14.

completely at the synod in Žiča in 1221. Penitent heretics, both Bogomil and Latin were to be enticed back into the Church through baptism and confirmation respectively, even through gifts for the nobility. Sava's "exarchs" preached the Orthodox faith and only obstinate heretics were to be driven from their lands (and the lands presumably confiscated). In its leniency it provides a distinctive approach to heresy, perhaps even harking back to Theophylact, but the structure of action being taken at the behest and under the control of a churchman looks to have Western precedents, notably Fourth Lateran itself, while   expulsion and confiscation of lands resembles the tactics used in the Albigensian Crusade in southern France. Sava's role as a charismatic preacher to mixed audiences also resembles the approach of his contemporaries, Dominic or Francis of Assisi in the West".[27]

There is relatively little further evidence for almost a hundred years until the legislation of Stefan Dušan (1331-1355), who ruled over Serbia and much of the Western Balkans. In order to strengthen his rule, Stefan Dušan summoned an assembly in Skopje in 1349 where the law Code which bears his name was adopted. It represented a synthesis of Byzantine legal experience and Serbian common law and several clauses dealt with penalties for heretics: "If any heretic be found to live among the Christians, let him be branded on the face..." or, " who so utters (perhaps only in the sense of discussing) a heretical ('babun') word, if he be noble, let him pay 100 perpers, and if he be a commoner, let him pay twelve perpers and be beaten with sticks." [28]   As so often, Dušan innovated even as he sought imperial precedents. Fines for heresy had little precedent in the Byzantine world and those that Dušan set out were considerable. The quasi-imperial nature of the penalties is entirely in keeping with Dušan's ambitions and has clear Roman precedents from Theodosius and Justinian. [29] As ever with Dušan's code, questions remain as to whether his measures were enforceable or whether that was even his intention. There are no further records of him taking action against heresy.

Bogomil religious ideas may also have infiltrated Mount Athos - the cradle of monasticism within the Orthodox world in the fourteenth

---

[27] Roach,'Competition', 152-3.
[28] *Законик цара Сефана Душана, књ.1 Струшки и атонски рукопис.*уредник Мехмед Беговић (Београд 1975), 184. English translation. Malcolm Burr, 'The Code of Stephan Dushan',, *Slavonic and east European Review*, 28 (1949), 198-217, 516-39. Arts. 10, 85. Cf. Fines, *Codex*, 1, 5, 8 (52).
[29] *Libri Theodosiani*, 16,5,21 (862); *Codex*, 1, 5, 8 (52).

century. Church authorities reported to the Holy Synod that there were Bogomils who repudiated the cults of the icons, baptism and the Eucharist.[30] Their presence may have been due to the nun Irina of Salonica, whose preaching attracted a number of monks from Mount Athos according to the Life of Saint Theodosius of Trnovo. Bogomilism is said to have been present on the holy mountain for three years, and the monk heretics were discovered, anathematized and exiled, and so most of them went to Constantinople, Salonica and Ber.[31]

The analysis of the relevant source materials suggests that the actions of the Orthodox church aimed at a number of goals which were not always compatible. There seems real confusion in dealing with a systematic challenge to Church doctrine and organization, so that Theophylact's strategy seemed inadequate and that of Alexios Komnenos and Stefan Nemanja heavy handed and perhaps counter-productive. Unlike the West, the Byzantine world did not have to "re-discover" Roman law it was in force throughout the period, yet it was in fact relatively little used and gave rise to nothing like the elaborate machinery of enforcement which evolved within Catholicism. Another way of looking at the strategy is that Orthodox rulers and churchmen sought to deny influence to heresy. They maintained the purity of the centre, whether it was Constantinople, Athos or Skopje and took action when dissent was discovered there, but they were relatively relaxed about enforcement of conformity in more remote regions.

In the legislation which has come down to us from the Orthodox sphere punishment is more prominent than penance, but that may be related to the sources. Clerics who followed Theophylact's advice to reconcile heretics may not have left records. What has survived is usually legislation with all its unanswered questions of enforcement and compliance. Rulers could, of course, issue decrees against heresy to enhance their reputations whether or not it was an actual threat, however the pattern of activity against the Bogomils may reflect the history of the sect itself, originating in the tenth century reaching a peak in the twelfth and then dying back, in a way typical of many monastic movements in the middle ages.[32]

---

[30] *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World*, 52, 283

[31] Obolensky, *Bogomils*, 256.

[32] Konstantakopoulou, 'Repentant or dead'*,* 472.

There is a noticeable similarity in the treatment of heretics in East and West in the centuries before 1215.[33] Although, both sections of Christendom inherited some precedents from Roman measures against heresy there was considerable room for improvisation. At first, the initiative for punishment was taken up by the secular authority. Contemporary with the request for how to treat Bogomils in Bulgaria, was the episode of the learned grammarian, Vilgardus of Ravenna. The sole report is from Rodulfus Glaber who states that Vilgard was condemned by Peter, archbishop of Ravenna (927-71).   Having been rather vague about the sentence and who carried it out, Glaber emphasizes that there were others throughout Italy who also perished by swords or fires. He adds that others emerged from Sardinia to corrupt some in Spain, but that they were also exterminated by 'catholic men.' The strong temptation from the evasiveness of the chronicler and the prominence of Italian bishops is to conclude that violent punishments were ordered by the bishops themselves.[34]

Some fifty years later in the late 1020s, an Italian archbishop once again played an important part in the suppression of heresy. Both Glaber and Landulf report the heretics of Monforte in the district of Turin. They too were burnt: Glaber stated that this was the work of Ulric-Manfred, marquess of Turin and his brother, Alric, bishop of Asti in conjunction with other nobles and bishops after they had failed to recall the heretics from their madness. Landulf Senior, the chronicler of Milan, put the emphasis on Aribert, archbishop of Milan, who discovered the heretics while checking up on his suffragans. Again there is an attempt by Aribert and his clergy to reason the heretics out of their beliefs. Stronger measures were taken by the leading laity of the city, probably prominent nobles. In a move which foreshadowed Alexios' treatment of Basil in that burning was used as an incentive to repent, they erected a large pyre opposite a cross and gave the heretics the choice of embracing the faith 'which the whole world believes' or being burnt. Some took up the offer, others leapt into the flames. Here the chronicler carefully distances the archbishop from this action, saying that he was unwilling. However, the

---

[33] For early punishments for heresy in the West see Henry C. Lea, *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, 3 vols. (London: Sampson, 1887) vol.1, ch.2; Henri Maisonneuve, *Etudes sur les origines de l'inquisition* (2nd edn., Paris: Vrin, 1960); Robert I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2nd edn. 2007) , 11-26.
[34] *Rodulfi Glabri Historiarum Libri Quinque*, ed. and trans. John France (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), 92-3.

warrior archbishop was not a squeamish man and there is no clue as to what alternative strategy he might have had in mind.[35] Scholarly opinion on the death penalty for heretics is still broadly that of G.G. Coulton who proposed that 'the first executions for heresy were more or less informal, inflicted either by lynch-law or by some zealous king or noble who took the matter into his own hand….in fact we sometimes find clerics moderating the zeal of others.'[36] Given the prominence of bishops in Italian civil society clerics this judgment is worth re-examination.

North of the Alps the state looks to have taken a more assertive stance. In the notorious Orléans case of 1022 Robert the Pious of France burnt a number of clerics for heresy. The bishop, Odalric, played his part by exhuming and throwing away to somewhere inaccessible the body of another who had been dead for three years. Research has shown that the case was as much about political rivalry as about religious belief, yet it was the first time heretics had been burnt by the state in the West since the days of the Roman empire. The "state" was capable of more impulsive vengeance and the queen put out the eye of her former confessor, Stephen.[37]

The obvious way to explain why burning was the most appropriate punishment is with reference to Roman law in which there was growing interest in the eleventh century. It took its place among a number of factors influencing the choice of punishments. Glaber

---

[35] 'Quod cum civitatis huius maiores laici comperissent, rogo mirabili accenso, cruce Domini ab altera parte erecta, Heriberto nolente, illis omnibus eductis lex talis est data, ut si vellent omni perfidia abiecta crucem adorarent, et fidem quam universus orbis tenet confiterentur, salvi essent; sin autem, vivi flammarum globos arsuri intrarent. Et factum est, ut aliqui ad crucem Domini venientes et ipsam confitentes fidem catholicam, salvi facti sunt: et multi manibus ante vultus missis inter flammas exilierunt, et misere morientes in miseros cineres redacti sunt.' *Landulphi Senioris Mediolanensis Historiae*, ed. Alessandro Cutolo : *Rerum Italicarum Scriptorum*, vol. IV pt.2 (Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli, 1942), 69.

[36] George G. Coulton, *The Death-Penalty for Heresy from 1184 to 1921 A.D.* (London: Simpkin, Marshall. Hamilton, Kent and Co., 1924), 2. Unfortunately, the authors were not able to consult S. Ragg, *Ketzer und Recht* (Hannover: Hahnsche, 2006).

[37] *Rodulfi Glabri*, ed. France, 138-51; Adhémar of Chabannes, *Chronicon*, ed. Jules Chavanon, (Paris: A. Picard, 1897), 184-5; *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Père de Chartres*, ed. M. Guérard (Paris: Crapelet, 1840), I, 109-15. See also Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: popular movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation* (Oxford: Blackwell, 3ʳᵈ edn., 2002), 14-21 with full bibliography and Robert I. Moore, *The War on Heresy: faith and power in medieval Europe* (London: Profile, 2012), 13-36.

recorded other examples of burning, notably in the famine of 1032.   A man who had sold cooked human flesh in the centre of Tournus in Burgundy suffered this fate as did another man desperate enough to dig up and eat the flesh after it had been buried. In the same year the Count of Macon burnt the man who had killed and eaten forty-eight travelers not far from the city of Macon itself.[38]   There is the impression that crimes against the natural order, not necessarily well defined, were also punishable by fire. Far from regularizing the crime of heresy, burning exoticised it.[39]

Eleventh century society seems to have had reservations about this punishment. Chroniclers go to some lengths to avoid admitting that churchmen had authorized the practice. The only other case of burning for heresy in the eleventh century, that of Ramihrd of Esquerchin, burnt at Cambrai in late 1076 or early 1077 was attributed to 'certain officials of the bishop and many others.' Pope Gregory VII, though furious with the town and also the bishop for persecuting a supposed preacher against simony went no further than blaming the 'Cameracenses'. Again it is tempting to conclude that this may well have been the action of the bishop himself and, insofar as he was an imperial appointment at the height of the Emperor Henry IV's conflict with the pope, the bishop or his officials may have had treason in mind when they burnt Ramihrd, but neither Gregory or the chronicler from whom we have the story, writing in the 1130s, wanted to admit it.[40]   Even the cases at Orléans had chroniclers looking for reasons why these heretics might be exceptional. Adhémar had included a series of fires in churches and monasteries in his entry previous to the discussions of heresy at Orléans. They were linked to a sword shaped comet which had appeared one summer and one fire at least was followed by the deposition of an abbot for simony.[41]

---

[38] *Rodulfi Glabri*, ed. France, 188-91.

[39] Compare this with a century later. Chrétien de Troyes had a servant threatened with burning for betraying her mistress. This seems to have far more of the overtones of treason or petty treason used in the later middle ages and which encompassed heresy 'Yvain' in *Arthurian Romances*, trans. W.W. Comfort (London: Dent, 1914), 227-8, 237.

[40] 'Quidam…de ministris episcopi et alii multi deducentes eum in quoddam tugurium inducunt, et non reluctantem….admoto igne cum tugurio combusserunt.' *Chronicon S. Andreae castri cameracensi,* ed. L.C. Bethmann, *MGH, Scriptores*, VII (Hannover: Hahn, 1846), 540.

[41] 'His temporibus cometes velut ensis latior et longior contra septentrionem apparuit pluribus aestivis noctibus, et per Galliam et Italiam e vestigio civitates, castella et monasteria igne cremate sunt plura.'

Fires from heaven as punishment for sins were followed by earthly fires consuming heretics. Another source for the Orléans burnings alleged that the heretics burnt the babies born of their immoral liaisons, using the ashes of them as a sacrament. The author, writing in the 1070s and building on a hint of immoral practice given by Adhémar, implicitly justified burning the heretics on the grounds that they had burnt children, although he admitted that the allegation had been made against ancient pagans. [42]

The most considered response to the threat of heresy came from Wazo, bishop of Liège, who was consulted about "Manichaeans" in the diocese of Châlons in the mid 1040s. Wazo specifically argued against the death penalty for heresy, both on the basis that it was for God to judge (using the analogy of the parable of the wheat and the tares, Matthew 13: 29-30) and because bishops had not received secular authority and therefore were enjoined by God, 'not to do unto death, but to quicken unto life.' He also recognized the possibility of indiscriminate slaughter that could result. Instead, spiritual penalties were to be applied. The heretics should be deprived of Catholic communion and it was 'officially and publicly announced' to all others to shun the sect for 'He that toucheth pitch shall be defiled with it' Sirach/Ecclesiasticus 13:1. Elsewhere in the letter Wazo perhaps hints at stronger measures. The one manifest characteristic of the heretics is their vegetarianism. Wazo proposed offering them a choice of concurring with the Catholic interpretation that the prohibition, 'Thou shalt not kill' refers only to mankind, or be deprived of the use of bread, vegetables and other things of this sort. Wazo could be proposing a penitential fast or starvation into submission. However, it is clear by implication that some of the bishops who were consulting him were in favour of stronger action and that the intervention of the emperor, a notable religious reformer, was a possibility actively considered. [43]

Relations were not good between Wazo and Henry III, but there is possibly a trace of the bishop's influence in the dealings with heretics at Goslar in 1051. There are also signs of a procedure. The heretics were

---

Adhémar, *Chronicon*, 184

[42] Ex quo spurcissimo concubitu infans generatus, octava die, in medio eorum copioso igne accenso, piabatur per ignem, more antiquorum paganorum, et sic in igne cremabatur. *Cartulaire de Saint-Père*, 112.

[43] *Herigeri et Anselmi gesta episcoporum Leodiensium*, II, 62-4 *MGH SS* VII, 226-8. Translated in Walter Wakefield and Austin P. Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969), 89-93.

presented to the emperor by Godfrey, the duke of Lorraine, having also had an audience with an unnamed bishop who asked them to kill a chicken, possibly in line with Wazo's advice on defining attitudes to meat. After excommunication, the emperor sentenced them to hang. The choice of sentence may have been the result of the heretics' low social status, but it could also be a downgrading of heresy as a crime. The hanged man was left for all to see, an example to others, but it did not symbolise an offence any worse than murder or robbery. The body was not annihilated as with burning and perhaps the punishment was not automatically accompanied by disinheritance of family.[44]

In the early decades of the twelfth century there are few cases of heretics being burnt. Travellers to Constantinople would have been aware of Alexios Komnenos's use of the stake against Basil and his followers and the more educated may have noticed the imperial commissioned trained priests attached to the cathedral of Hagia Sophia in 1107 to preach to the population. By contrast, action against dissenters in the West really did take on an *ad hoc* and unofficial character. Tanchelm of Antwerp was hit over the head by a priest, Peter of Bruys was pushed into his own bonfire of crosses by an enraged mob and Henry of Le Mans was vainly pursued into Languedoc by Bernard of Clairvaux after a succession of arrangements had failed to keep him within the embrace of the Church.[45] The exception is reported by Guibert of Nogent at Soissons in 1114 and there is the familiar embarrassment at the burning itself. As the clerics dither, the *populus* drag the heretics out of gaol and burn them. Guibert already has his justification ready; not only is the heresy, a 'cancer' which must be stopped from spreading, but the heretics also burn live children whose ashes are turned into a sacrament.[46]

There were good reasons why judicial burning was often felt to be inappropriate. In terms of public order even the more choreographed

---

[44] *MGH SS*, VII, 228. Florike Egmond, 'Execution, dissection, pain and infamy- a morphological investigation' in *Bodily Extremities:preoccupations with the Human Body in early modern European Culture,* eds. Florike Egmond and Rob Zwijnenberg (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 100, 103-07. Herimannus Augiensis reports that, '*consensu cunctorum*, ne heretica scabies latius serpens plures inficeret, in patibulo suspendi iussit.' (my italics). This suggests some further assembly or at least consultation. *Chronicon*, ed. G. Pertz, *MGH SS* V (Hannover: Hahn, 1844), 130.

[45] Lambert, *Medieval Heresy*, 57-9 (Tanchelm), 54-6 (Peter of Bruys) and 52-4 (Henry of Le Mans).

[46] Paul Archambault, *A Monk's Confession: the memoirs of Guibert de Nogent* (Pennsylvania: State University Press, 1996), 196, 198.

160

JOURNAL OF HISTORY   year. XLVII, N° 1, 2012

punishments of the thirteenth century had the potential to go wrong. In most eleventh century accounts, the tension is almost palpable when the writer starts to mention 'the people'.   In this way Alexios's treatment of heretics in Constantinople seems more sophisticated with the emperor's mercy shown to Basil's followers defusing the difficult problem of the penitent heretic who has earned the crowd's sympathy.

On other levels too, burning was an awkward solution to the problem of religious dissent.   Churchmen were forbidden to shed blood and as has been seen, in both East and West there was still an important body of opinion which saw the heretic as a soul to be saved by penance, rather than a criminal to be expunged.   The last issue was only resolved by Western theologians gradually drawing a distinction between the penance levied for the good of the individual's soul, that is the penitential forum, and the punishment due for damage to the Church, the judicial forum.   In this latter sphere preventing the spread of sinful behavior was of great importance.   The distinction was not made until quite late in the twelfth century and does not refer to heresy as such, but it must have been in the minds of Peter the Chanter and the other inventive Paris masters who developed the idea.[47]

By the mid-twelfth century there is also evidence that some were following the emphasis drawn from Roman law which concentrated on punishing enablers and protectors of heretics, thereby avoiding burning charismatic preachers.   When a group of 'Publicani' entered England in the first half of the 1160s the government took action by imprisoning them, calling an episcopal synod at Oxford and then when they refused to repent, branding them, publicly flogging them, driving them out of the city and forbidding anyone to give them shelter.   According to one report at least, they all died in the cold of an English winter.[48]   The council's actions were enshrined in statute in the Assize of Clarendon clause 21 of which also forbade anyone from receiving any of the sect of renegades ('aliquem de secta illorum renegatorum') excommunicated and branded at Oxford.   The penalty was that the receiver would be at the king's mercy and then departed from Roman precedent in that 'the house in which they dwelt would be carried outside the village and

---

[47] Raphael Eckert, 'Peine judiciaire, penitence et salut entre droit canonique et théologie (xiiᵉ s.- début du xiiiᵉ s.), *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 4 (2011), 504-08.

[48] P.Biller, 'William of Newburgh and the Cathar mission to England' in *Life and Thought in the Northern Church, c.1100-c.1700; essays in Honour of Claire Cross*, ed. D. Wood (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1999), 11-30.

burnt.'[49]   There are obvious overtones of purification after disease and also a very public act of condemnation.   Henry II's government was insecure in the midst of the Becket crisis, but could stand comparison with Byzantium in terms of centralized power and it looked for a comprehensive solution.   The prohibition against giving shelter echoes the treatment of any 'stranger' 'wanderer' or 'unknown person' in clause 15 of the assize and there is an attempt at enforcement through individual oath swearing by both royal and baronial officials. Although there is no evidence this was ever carried out, the arrangements had been put in place should the crisis recur.

The punishment of the heretics themselves, while not lenient, again avoided the outright confrontation of the flaming pyre.   Public flogging was a feature of formal penance as well as a punishment. Branding was more punitive and had precedents both in Anglo-Saxon law as well as also being included in Roman legislation.[50]

The influences on Henry's government may have come from across the Channel. Gilbert Foliot, who was bishop of London by 1166, had attended the 1148 Council of Reims which imprisoned, rather than executed, the heretical, preacher, Eon de l'Etoile , but burnt several of his 'followers', probably those who had protected him initially.[51]   Nine years later a further Council of Reims urged expulsion and branding for the followers of heresiarchs and perpetual imprisonment for leaders as well as seizure of goods.[52]

There is a contrast with the letter of Everwin of Steinfeld recording the presence and punishment of heretics at Cologne in 1145. The account is significant for a number of reasons, not least because one group claimed connections with "Greece", generally interpreted as a link to the Byzantine Bogomils. However, the procedure outlined harked back to earlier Western precedents. An arrest was followed by an initial audience with the archbishop and (presumably secular) nobles. A further

---

[49] *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, ed. William Stubbs, 4 vols. (London: Longmans, 1869), vol.2, cv.

[50] Charles. P. Jones, '*Stigma*: Tattooing and branding in Graeco-Roman antiquity', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 77 (1987), 139-55 and see above n.14. For confiscation of property see, for example, *Codex Iustinianus*, 1, 5, 8.

[51] Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 143, 145-6, 685 n.11. William of Newburgh, *The History of English Affairs*, ed. and trans. P. G. Walsh and M. J. Kennedy (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1988), 92-3.

[52] Jovani D.Mansi, S*acrorum Conciliorum Nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. 21 (Venice: Zatta, 1776), col.843. Henceforth 'Mansi, *Concilia*'

audience with clerics, who tried to reason them out of their beliefs was brought to an end after three days by 'the people' who seized them and carried them off to be burned. As usual, it is tempting to believe that the zeal shown was not as spontaneous as Everwin would like us to believe.[53]   There is no such hesitancy in the account of the burning of Arnold of Brescia in 1155 in Otto of Freising's *Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*.   The bishop of Freising briskly records the just condemnation of Arnold in his absence by his fellow churchmen and his arrest in Tuscany. 'He was held for trial by the prince [presumably Frederick himself] and finally was brought to the pyre by the prefect of the City [Rome].' In fact, Arnold seems to have been hanged then burnt, reinforcing the idea that despite the fact that Arnold's ashes were scattered on the Tiber to prevent veneration by the people, Arnold seems to have been punished for treason as much as heresy.[54] His fate was the result of a deal between Barbarossa and Pope Adrian IV. Barbarossa was to be crowned emperor by the pope; in return Adrian IV was to receive imperial help against his enemies in Rome.   This was the historical moment where western practices resembled those of the East. The brief alliance of Adrian and Barbarossa created something like the caesaropapist state in Constantinople. Combined with the legal knowledge of advisers like Roland Bandinelli, the master of Bologna and future pope Alexander III it is highly likely that there was an influential change in the attitude to the Church's sanction of burning heretics. Indeed, the moment was prolonged just enough to allow some possible exchange of notes on how to deal with heretics with ambassadors from Manuel Komnenos, who was briefly on good terms with both emperor and pope.[55]

Certainly the change in atmosphere was felt in Cologne. Writing in the early thirteenth century, Caesarius of Heisterbach describes a smooth procedure when giving his account of how further heretics were arrested there in 1163:

'The heretics who were seized, having been examined and convicted by literate men, were condemned by secular judgment.'

---

[53] Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 129 (Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistolae*, no.472, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 182, cols.676-80).

[54] Brenda Bolton and Anne Duggan (eds.), *Adrian IV, the English Pope (1154-59)*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 238-9. Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia*, (Cambridge: University Press, 1931), 157, 219-20.

[55] Bolton and Duggan, *Adrian IV*, 240-1

The result of this was the burning of several heretics together, outside the town, near the cemetery of the Jews.[56]
In areas without strong central government, ecclesiastical authorities were more hesitant. Heretics arrested at Vézelay in France in 1167 were detained for over two months. They were questioned by clerics before two of them ended up undergoing trial by water in front of an assembly in the local monastery. The abbot took the trouble to write to the English legal scholar Herbert of Bosham, asking for advice as to what was the correct punishment. Herbert was no friend of monarchy, as he was currently in exile with his master, Thomas Becket, but in this matter his advice was that because churchmen could not take life or limb, the matter was for the local authority or better still, the king of France and 'public powers', even if the heretics were (as Herbert implied) clerics. However, the abbot preferred the advice of the assembly of leading churchmen and unnamed laity.   The unequivocal answer came, 'comburantur, comburantur'.   Seven were burnt, but one, after the abbot's intervention, was banished after a public flogging, reminiscent of the procedure at Oxford the previous year. From Hugh of Poitiers' account it would appear that the abbot burnt the heretics on his own authority.[57] The conclusion must be that Louis VII's government was not considered strong enough to undertake such responsibilities.

In both East and West by the mid twelfth century the authorities reacted to the perceived threat of heresy with growing confidence. Certainly action against heresy could only take place in conditions of political security which was present in both Byzantium and the West in the middle decades of the century and which declined in the eastern Empire after the death of Manuel Komnenos.   Where there was a difficult relationship between religious and secular powers ecclesiastical authorities had to be more cautious, and rely on preaching, as is evidenced by archbishop Galdino in Milan in the 1160s.[58] The presence of Frederick Barbarossa at the Council of Verona in 1184 was therefore a resumption of the relationship of 1155, albeit in very changed political circumstances.   Both Pope and emperor were happy to impose

---

[56] 'Haeretici sunt comprehensi qui a literatis viris examinati et vidi per iudicium seculare damnati sunt.' Caesarius Heisterbacensis, *Dialogus Miraculorum*, ed. J. Strange (Cologne: Heberle, 1851), vol.1, 299.
[57] *Monumenta Vizeliacensia* ed. R.B.C. Huygens (Turnhout: Brepols, 1976), 606-07 and see Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 248-9, 725 n.9. *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 190 (Paris: Garnier, 1893), col. 1463. Herbert rejects exile as a penalty.
[58] Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 151.

punishments based on the interlocking of heresy with treason and this was quite similar to the position of the emperors and patriarchs of the East.   The divergence came in the thirteenth century with the development of measurable penances for heresy in the West. The Orthodox Church was also interested in reconciling heretics short of burning, but chose quite a different route.

The full majesty of imperial defence of the faith in the West was articulated more, but used less.   Frederick I's participation at the Council of Verona in 1184 signalled the willingness of secular authority to intervene in what was until then seen as a largely spiritual crime. However, the legislation which resulted, *Ad abolendam* was produced by Pope Lucius III. In the anti-heresy clauses of his law code of 1231, the *Liber Augustalis* or *Constitutions of Melfi* Frederick II took direct responsibility for his subjects' spiritual welfare in a manner reminiscent of eastern emperors.   Obstinate heretics were to be burnt alive, the goods of the condemned were to be confiscated and the memories of such heretics were to be condemned even after their death.[59] Turning to those who sheltered, believed in or were accomplices of the heretics or who favoured them in any way, Frederick ordered perpetual banishment and the confiscation of goods.   Even their children were to suffer perpetual infamy unless they redeemed themselves by denouncing someone else, which went beyond Roman precedent as. Justinian only required children to prove their orthodoxy to recover their inheritance. [60] Just how far Frederick meant this legislation to reach is uncertain. He had the *Constitutions* translated into Greek, probably to reach Greek

---

[59] *Die Konstitutionen Friedrichs II für das Königreich Sizilien*, ed. Wolfgang Stürner (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1996), 151-2. Trans. James M. Powell, *The 'Liber Augustalis'* (New York, Syracuse University Press, 1971), 9.

[60] Patarenorum receptatores, credentes et complices et quocumque modo fautores, qui, ut a pena alios

possint eximere, de se velut improvidi non formidant, publicatis bonis omnibus relegandos in

perpetuum esse censemus. Ipsorum filii ad honores aliquos nullatenus admittantur, sed infamie perpetue nota laborent, ut nec in testes in causis, a quibus repelluntur infames, aliquatenus admittantur.

Si tamen aliquis de filiis fautorum vel receptatorum huiusmodi detexerit aliquem Patarenum, de cuius

perfidia manifeste probatur, in fidei premium, quam agnovit, fame pristine de imperiali clementia

restitutionis in integrum beneficium consequatur. *Die Konstitutionen*, 151-2, Powell, *Liber*, 10.

speaking subjects in Calabria.[61]   While the *Constitutions* brilliantly stated the point of view of imperial authority there is no evidence that the strictures on heresy were ever enforced.

The driving force in eliminating competition for souls in the West was the Church itself. It achieved its goals through a combination of better education of the laity, penances designed to reconcile the sinner to the community and punishments designed to exclude the perpetrator and act as an example to others.   Inquisitorial procedure was first outlined at Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 (canon 3), but Innocent III was more circumspect about punishments.   While the handing over of condemned heretics to the secular authorities implied that burning was the expected punishment, even for clerics who were to be degraded first, Innocent was more precise than his predecessors about ancillary punishments, such as that the goods of condemned laymen be confiscated and that the churches of convicted clerics should lose the heretic's stipend.   Innocent also addressed the problem of those only suspected of heresy. They were to be anathematized unless they proved their innocence by purgation, having regard for the reasons of suspicion and the character of the person. Branding or a mark of infamy was to be applied. The force of the punishment was clear: 'until they have made appropriate satisfaction, let them be avoided by all'. [62]   Innocent went noticeably further than Boril, Sava or even Dušan and decreed that rulers who neglected to help in the extirpation of heresy could be deposed by his own vassals and the land settled by those who would keep it 'in the purity of the faith', and he had already enacted this policy in respect of the lands of the Count of Toulouse through the Albigensian Crusade. Remarkably, given the emphasis on confession in the council's legislation, Fourth Lateran says little about penance in general and nothing about penance for heretics.

A system of penance for heresy was established in the thirteenth century drawing on a variety of sources. Firstly there was the spiritual example of respected men such as Francis of Assisi and particularly Dominic of Calaruega who was active in the heretical stronghold of southern France, secondly there was the example of monastic life, especially the rule of Benedict as interpreted by the Cistercians which both contained disciplinary penances and could be seen as a work of

---

[61]   *Codex Iustinianus*, 1,5,4 for confiscation of goods, 1,5,8 for exile. Mario Ascheri, *I diritti del medioevo italiano: secoli xi-xv* (Rome: Carocci, 2005), 182.
[62]   Tanner, *Decrees,* vol.1, 233.

penance in itself. Finally, there was Roman law with its wide array of punishments which fell short of taking lives. These three sources overlapped, forming a common heritage for the churchmen designated to carry out the inquiries or *inquisitiones* prescribed at the Fourth Lateran Council. In the first instance these were bishops, but after 1231 they were predominantly Dominican friars, often highly educated and trained preachers and they became the first inquisitors.[63]

Early attempts at burning on a larger scale than had been attempted thus far in the West proved counter-productive. The accused were often seen sympathetically by the crowd and the lay power was often alienated by the resulting violence. When operations resumed in the 1240s a more calibrated approach was taken with inquisitors imposing a series of penances, often quite punitive in nature, but designed to reintegrate eventually the penitent into the community.[64]

The major difference between East and West in terms of sources is the existence of the western inquisitors' administrative records, comprising the statements of heretical believers or *credentes* and less commonly the penances assigned to them. Although these documents must be read cautiously, they offer the invaluable opportunity to get away from chronicles and legislation and look at how alleged supporters of heretical groups were dealt with on a routine level.[65] Inquisitors took the major themes of the punitive legislation of the twelfth century and produced penitential variants. Instead of banishment and exile there was now pilgrimage, either to local shrines or more distant ones, such as Rome, Canterbury, Jerusalem or Compostella. Timetables were imposed and documents had to be produced as proof of completion. Local pilgrimages were considered especially suitable for women.[66] Another

---

[63] Recent influential work on the inquisition includes C. C. Ames, *Righteous Persecution: Inquisition, Dominicans and Christianityin the Middle Ages* (Pennsylvania: University Press, 2009) Karen Sullivan, *The Inner Lives of medieval Inquisitors* (Chicago: University Press, 2011)..

[64] All these are examined in more detail in Andrew Roach, 'Penance and the making of the inquisition in Languedoc', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 52:3 (2001), 409-33 where there is a survey of older literature. Sarah Hamilton, *The Practice of Penance, 900-1050* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2001) is the most important subsequent publication.

[65] The best guide to the production of these documents and the resultant difficulties for the historian is John H. Arnold, *Inquisition and Power: Catharism and the confessing subject in medieval Languedoc* (Pennsylvania: University Press, 2001)

[66] Roach, 'Penance', 417. In terms of severity it is comparable to the seven years of penitential pilgrimage enjoined on a clerk who has fathered a child; Penitential of

common penance, exclusively assigned to men was to be sent to Constantinople for a period of time to aid the ailing Latin Empire, presumably with military service. There is plenty of evidence of western heretics based in Constantinople, but it was clearly not an issue for the inquisitors of the early 1240s.[67] There was a clear danger that the penitent would lose his life and the sentence ranked followers of heresy with fire raisers who had been assigned similar sentences in Jerusalem or Spain in the legislation of the Council of Reims of 1148.[68]

Exile was also behind the expansion of judicial imprisonment initiated by the inquisitors. Imprisonment was thought peculiarly appropriate for heretics in that it enjoined upon them a quasi-monastic life, while preventing them from spreading their infectious beliefs.[69] It is tempting to see a possible link with eastern believers in the spiritual benefits of prison like John Climacus, but recent research has shown that a far stronger influence was enthusiasm for the newly rediscovered Novels of Justinian, especially *Nov.* 131.14 which condemned clerical administrators who sold or gave church goods to heretics. This corresponded with the lay supporters of heresy who gave food and hospitality to Cathar *perfecti*. Justinian's legislation from 545 ordered deprivation of Holy Communion for a year and imprisonment in a monastery. Its place within a series of measures designed to tackle moral issues such as lay adultery and clerical corruption (gambling, false testimony etc) suggests that the emperor saw such imprisonment as a penitential act. This hypothesis is corroborated by the emperor's enthusiasm for monasticism as an opportunity for correction, having legislated earlier on monastic discipline. It was rare in late Roman times, but Gregory the Great had used it for some penitents in sixth century Byzantine Italy.[70]   However, it is important to emphasize that

---

Columban in *Medieval Handbooks of Penance*, ed. and trans. John T. McNeill and Helena M. Gamer (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), 252.

[67] Rainerius Saccone, 'Summa', trans. in Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 337.

[68] Mansi, *Concilia*, vol.21, col.711, canon XV.

[69] Roach, 'Penance', 425-31

[70] Julia Hillner, 'Monastic Imprisonment in Justinian's Novels', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 15:2 (2007), 209-10, 226-7. R. Schoell (ed.) *Corpus Iuris Civilis:*vol.3 *Novellae*, CXXXI: 14 (662-3) (Berlin, 1895). Julia Hillner, 'Gregory the Great's "prisons": monastic confinement in early Byzantine Italy', *Journal of early Christian Studies*, 19:3 (2011), 433-71. See also Jean Dunbabin, *Captivity and Imprisonment in Medieval Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002)

inquisition prisons were innovative in that they were purpose built and were primarily places of punishment.

The other principle was that of the branding or stigmatizing of heretics seen at Oxford and in the legislation of Fourth Lateran. It found its parallel in cross-wearing which again had penitential connections (notably crusaders), but was adapted by inquisitors in both France and Italy. There was an attempt to enforce a kind of social ostracism through the wearing of bright yellow crosses on the breast and shoulders. Anyone seen consorting with such a penitent automatically became suspect themselves. Yet there was also an inclusive element to this in that an extensive programme of church attendance and listening to preaching was also enjoined. The cross wearing was generally for a relatively short time, from one to three years.[71]

In practice, the power of the inquisitors was nothing like so systematic and each inquisition had to negotiate its way to its goals. Given has identified individual and collective resistance to inquisitors as well as the structural constraints of the society in which they moved.[72] Dossat has shown how competing jurisdictions and papal interference could change or annul penances imposed by inquisitors, especially imprisonment and cross wearing.[73] In his study of penances imposed at Montauban in 1241 Jörg Feuchter has shown how many sentenced to cross wearing removed them after a few months or completed only a few of their penitential pilgrimages. His analysis of civic archival sources shows that most of the penitents were drawn from fifteen consular families and his very plausible hypothesis is that the penances were commuted because of the instigation of an act of collective piety, namely the construction of a proper parish church for the town.[74] Even prison was relatively unstructured and very susceptible to corruption, with relatively free communication between prisoners and a steady stream of outside visitors.[75]

One penance which was treated with suspicion by inquisitors was the fine or monetary penance. As has been seen, this is in contrast to the

---

[71] Roach, 'Penance', 422-5.

[72] James Given, *Inquisition and Medieval Society* (New York, 1997)

[73] Yves Dossat, 'Université et inquisition à Toulouse: la fondation du collège Saint-Raimond (1250)', in his *Eglise et hérésie en France au XIIIe siècle*, (London, 1982), XXVII, 231-2.

[74] Jorg Feuchter, 'Le pouvoir de l'inquisition à travers ses peines; le cas de Montauban (1241)' in G. Audisio (ed.) *Inquisition et pouvoir*, (Aix-en-Provence, 2004), 235-56.

[75] Given, *Inquisition*, 79-84.

monetary tariffs for heresy expounded in Dušan's Serbian law code of the mid fourteenth century.   Western thought was against 'money penances'(*pecuniariis paenitentiis*) because inquisitors could be compromised by demanding money and also that to fine heretics looked too much like a policy of 'tax and tolerate'. There was a clear departure from Roman legal precedent here. However, sums levied for 'the upkeep of the poor' or 'upkeep of a priest' had a long pedigree. Where the charity was not assigned the suspicion is that this was one way of defraying the considerable expenses of investigating heresy, as was the confiscation of goods and land that accompanied the more severe penalties.[76]

Finally, there were burnings.   These were carried out by the secular government at the behest of churchmen.   Bernard Gui, the monstrous inquisitor portrayed in Umberto Eco's *Name of the Rose* burnt just thirty of the 471 Cathars he sentenced in his fifteen year career or 6.4%. Between 1249 and 1257 just 21 heretics in southern France were handed over to the secular arm. The sentence was used sparingly and pyres were heavily policed.   This did not mean that burning had no impact when it was used with regularity in relatively small communities with a network of contacts. Occasionally, there was the theatrical horror of a mass punishment; Bernard Gui consigned seventeen to the flames together on 5 April 1310. Reminders of the threat came through the conviction and ceremonial burning of the bones of already deceased heretics.   However, such punishments were always volatile events. When one convicted heretic in Bologna repented at the stake, but was refused communion, a riot ensued, similar to those early in the Inquisition's history at Toulouse and Albi.[77]

In conclusion, a comparison of eastern and western punishments and penances for heretics displays a degree of common ground. On both sides of Europe churches faced the dilemma of how to deal with direct challenges to their religious authority while fulfilling their duty to care for souls.   At first, both sides turned to the secular state following Roman precedents, but in the early decades of the thirteenth century the Roman Church developed its own independent measures by treating the interiority of heresy through penance. Rulers and churchmen in the East

---

[76] Roach, 'Penance', 419-22. Roach, *Devil's World*, 133. Cf. penalties for thieves in Penitential of Columban, *Medieval Handbooks,* Gamer and McNeill, 255.

[77] Roach, *Devil's World*, 138-9, 211. Given, *Inquisition*, 70-1.

went some way down that road, but in the end preferred to stress heresy as a matter for policing rather than pastoral care.

Andrew P. ROACH
Maja ANGELOVSKA-PANOVA

PUNISHMENT OF HERETICS: COMPARISONS AND
CONTRASTS BETWEEN WESTERN AND EASTERN
CHRISTIANITY IN THE MIDDLE AGES

- s u m m a r y-

This paper, as the title suggests, examines the penalties church authorities imposed on heretics (mainly Bogomils and Cathars) in the 'Orthodox' and 'Catholic' spheres of Christendom from the tenth to the thirteenth century.

In Western Europe and the Byzantine empire organised religious dissent was something of a novelty and both sides had to improvise. A common body of Roman law existed in both east and west, enjoining enforcement of religious orthodoxy on the secular power. However, there was also significant body of ecclesiastical opinion which held that spiritual penalties were the best treatment for heretics depending on the level of commitment to the sect and burning was a punishment used for exotic crimes. The use of the pyre by Alexios Komnenos in Constantinople in the early twelfth century marked the start of a relatively short period when imperial defence of orthodoxy was strictly enforced.

Subsequent rulers in both the Byzantine empire and its successor states in the Balkans deployed severe legislation, but in practice tended to allow churchmen to deal with religious dissent. By contrast in the West, although churchmen were uneasy with state's interference in spiritual matters, by the thirteenth century they had managed to secure the state's co-operation in identifying, arresting and punishing heretics as well as devising a system of variegated penances for heresy as a component of pastoral care. The real contrast between east and west is the scope of ambition. Whereas eastern rulers and churchmen sought to keep major sources of spirituality unpolluted with heresy, the western church had policies to eradicate unorthodox belief and practice completely.

Драган ЗАЈКОВСКИ

Институт за национална
историја – Скопје

ЦРКОВНАТА ХИЕРАРХИЈА НА ОХРИДСКАТА ПАТРИЈАРШИЈА ВО ВРЕМЕТО НА САМУИЛОВАТА ДРЖАВА

Создавањето на Самуиловата држава во 969, односно во 976 год.,[1] меѓу другото, подразбирало и организирање црковен живот, односно Црква. Поради скудноста од изворни сведоштва, отсуствуваат прецизни одговори на голем број прашања поврзани со најраната историја на оваа црковна организација, позната како Охридска патријаршија (подоцна архиепископија). Оттука, дел од нив сѐ уште остануваат отворени за научна дискусија. Меѓу нив е прашањето за нејзината ерархија во времето на Самуиловата држава, кое е предмет на нашиот интерес.

---

[1] Самуиловата држава, во литературата позната и под терминот средновековна македонска држава, ја основале четворицата браќа, комитопулите Давид, Мојсеј, Арон и Самуил. Тие во 969 год. ја отфрлиле бугарската власт и се осамостоиле во југозападна Македонија, поставувајќи ги темелите на државата. Нејзиното јадро го сочинувале Охридско-преспанската област и Пелагонија, со престолнина во Преспа, подоцна во Охрид. Во почетокот била организирана самостојна власт, а од 971 до 976 год. браќата-комитопули ја признавале врховната византиска власт. По смртта на царот Јован I Цимиски (969–976) кренале востание, ја отфрлиле византиската власт и повторно започнале да владеат самостојно. По загинувањето на Давид и Мојсеј, а потоа и по убиството на Арон, единствен владетел останал Самуил. Бранко Панов и др., *Историја на македонскиот народ,* том I (Скопје: Институт за национална историја – Скопје, 2000), 357-362; Милан Бошкоски, *Великанитe на македонскиот среден век,* книга 1 (Скопје: Македонска реч, 2007), 42-52; Стјепан Антољак, *Средновековна Македонија*, том I (Скопје: Мисла, 1985), 635-662).

174

JOURNAL OF HISTORY   year. XLVII, N° 1, 2012

До денес се зачувани неколку книжевни извори кои содржат податоци за првите поглавари на Охридската патријаршија. Меѓу нив ги издвојуваме:

– *Кратката историја на Јован Скилица,* вклучително и дополнувањата кон истата од страна на Михаил Деволски;

– *Диканжовиот список на бугарските архиепископи*;

– трите грамоти на византискиот цар Василиј II (976-1025) за правата на Охридската архиепископија;

– двете житија на свети Јован Владимир: *Краткото (грчко) и Пространото (словенско)*;

– *Летописот на попот Дукљанин* [2] и

– *Хрониката на Јован Зонара*.

Врз основа на нивна споредбена анализа можеме да заклучиме дека по детронизирањето на бугарскиот цар Борис II (969/970–971), Византија на идентичен начин постапила и со бугарскиот (доростолскиот) патријарх.[3] Имено, податоците содржани во *Диканжовиот список* од XII век упатуваат на претпоставката дека на Бугарската црква целосно ѝ била одземена самостојноста. Ваквата теза ја аргументираме со делот од споменатиот извор во кој се вели дека доростолскиот патријарх Дамјан бил „симнат од Јован Цимискиј".[4]

Во прилог на изнесената теза се и податоците за селидбата на доростолскиот патријарх содржани во втората грамота на царот Василиј II за правата на Охридската архиепископија, издадена во 1020 година. Во неа, меѓу другото, се вели дека по ликвидирањето на бугарската држава, поглаварите на Бугарската црква со седиште

---

[2] Летописот на попот Дукљанин, со наслов на оргиналот *Regnum Sclavorum*, е познат уште и како Барски родослов. *Ljetopis popa Dukljanina,* priredio, uvod i komentar, Vladimir Mošin (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1950), 55; Љубинка Басотова, „Летописот на поп Дукљанин како извор за македонската средновековна историја", во *Споменици за средновековнатта историја на Македонија,* том V, ред. Владимир Мошин (Прилеп: Архив на Македонија, 1988), 205.

[3] Првото седиште на Бугарската црква било во Плиска, па потоа во Велики Преслав, за на крајот да се премести во Дрстр (Доростол).

[4] „...καθηρέθη παρὰ Ἰωάνον Τζιμισχῆ". Jean Darrouzès, ed. *Notitia episcopatuum ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae: text critique, introduction et notes* (Paris: Institut Etudes Byzantines, 1981), 105; *Извори за българската история, Гръцки извори за българската история,* том VII, съставили и редактирали, Иван Дуйчев и др. (София: Българска академия на науките, 1967), 109-110 (во понатамошниот текст ИБИГИБИ VII).

во Доростол се преместувале од едно место во друго, „еден во Тријадица, друг во Воден и Меглен, и најпосле ние го најдовме сегашниот архиепископ во Охрид".[5]

Внимателно разгледувајќи ги споменатите епископии каде што била изведена селидбата забележуваме дека патријархот Дамјан се селел на запад, во областите под власта на комитопулите, надвор од досегот на византиска политичка власт. Станува збор за епископии кои не ја признале јурисдикцијата на Константино-полската патријаршија, а кои претходно влегувале во диецезата на доростолскиот патријарх. Ова, воедно, нè упатува на претпостав-ката дека комитопулите можеби настојувале да го искористат авторитетот на доростолскиот патријарх во плановите за орга-низирање самостојна црковна организација на територијата под нивна власт.

Од сведоштвото содржано во *Диканжовиот список* дозна-ваме дека по смртта на Дамјан, за нов црковен поглавар бил избран Герман наречен Гаврил. Тој прво резидирал во Воден, потоа во Меглен, за на крајот Преспа да стане негова столица и седиште на новата црковна организација во Самуиловата држава.[6] Токму затоа, во овој период наведената црква ја препознаваме како Преспанска архиепископија, која по преместувањето на седиштето во Охрид, го

---

[5]„...τοῦ μὲν εἰς Τριάδιτζαν τοῦ δὲ ἐν τοῖς Βοδενοῖς καὶ ἐν τοῖς Μογλαίνοις, εἶθ᾽ ὁ ὕτως ἐν τῇ Ἀρχίδα τὸν νῦν εὕρομεν ἀρχιεπίσκοπον". *Извори за българската история, Гръцки извори за българската история,* том VI, съставили и редактирали, Иван Дуйчев и др. (София: Българска академия на науките, 1964), 45 (во понатамошниот текст ИБИГИБИ VI); сп. Йордан Иванов, *Български старини из Македония* (София: Българска академия на науките, 1970), 557; Срђан Пириватић, *Самоилова држава: Обим и карактер* (Београд: Византолошки институт Српске академије науке и уметности, 1997), 153; Милан Бошкоски, „Улогата на св. Климент во зацврстувањето на апостолицитетот на Охридската архиепископија во времето на цар Самоил", *Македонско наследство* бр. 17 (2001), 28-29.
[6] Daruzes, *Notitia episcoparum*, 105; *Дюканжовъ списъкъ* во Иванов, Български старини, 566; *ИБИГИБИ VII*, 109; сп. Бошкоски, „Улогата на Св. Климент", 29-30; Јован Белчовски, *Охридската архиепископија: од основањето до паѓањето на Македонија под турска власт* (Скопје: Православен богословски факултет „Климент Охридски" Скопје, 1997), 90-91. М. Бошкоски хиротинијата на Герман (Гаврил) во Воден ја датира пред 980 година. Милан Бошкоски, „Прашањето на патронатот на црквата во времето на македонската средновековна држава (969 - 1018)" во Зборник од Првата научна средба по повод патрониот празник на НУБ „Свети Климент Охридски" – Скопје одржана во Скопје на 7.12.2007 г., 40 – 41).

менува називот и станува Охридска. Оттука и архиерејот Герман (Гаврил) се смета за прв поглавар на Преспанската (Охридската) архиепископија (патријаршија).

Според преданието од локалното население, првпат забележано кај Ј. Иванов, поглаварот Герман (Гаврил) бил погребан во црквата во денешното преспанско село Герман, кое по него го добило името.[7] Меѓутоа фактот дека станува збор за народно кажување кое е дел од оралната историја во Преспа и Преспанско, а притоа истото не е поткрепено со археолошки и книжевни извори, ги прави мошне несигурни податоците од преданието.[8]

Диканжовиот список е сведоштво дека поглаварот Герман (Гаврил) бил наследен од Филип, кој архиерејувал со градот Охрид.[9] Токму овој податок упатува на заклучокот дека веќе во времето на поглаварот Филип, црковното седиште од Преспа било преместено во Охрид.[10] Воедно претпоставуваме дека тоа е периодот кога Црквата во Самуиловата држава се издигнала во ранг на патријаршија.

Она што е предмет на полемика во врска со патријархот Филип е прашањето за датирањето на неговото раководење со

---

[7] Според Б. Прокиќ, поглаварот Герман, наречен Гаврил, починал околу 990 година. Божидар Прокић, „Постанак охридског патријархата“, *Глас Српске краљевске академије* бр. 90 (Нови Сад: 1912), 230.

[8] Во црквата во с. Герман се најдени два натписа на грчки јазик датирани во 1743 година. Во нив како ктитор се споменува константинополскиот патријарх Герман. Според мислењето на Ј. Иванов, направен е превид во идентификацијата. Тој смета дека не станува збор за константинополскиот патријарх Герман I (713–730), туку за истоимениот прв поглавар на Охридската (Преспанската) архиепископија – патријаршија. Јордан Иванов, „Цар Самуиловата столица в Преспа“, *Историко-археологически бележки, Известия на Българското археологическо дружество,* кн. I (София: 1910), 60-62.

[9] „… Φίλιππος ἐν Λυϲηνίδη τῆ πάλαι μὲν Σασσαρίπη προσαγορευομένη νῦν δὲ᾽ Αηρίδη …“. Daruzes, *Notitia episcopatum*, 105; сп. *ИБИГИБИ VII*, 109; Иванов, *Дюканжовъ списъкъ*, 566.

[10] Според Б. Прокиќ седиштето на Црквата било пренесено од Преспа во Охрид околу 990 година. Прокић, „Постанак охридског патријархата“, 230-232). Наспроти ова, С. Пириватиќ смета тоа се случило најрано во 992/3, а најдоцна во есента 1015 година. Пириватић, *Самоилова држава*, 155- 156. Б. Панов ја изнесува тезата дека тоа најверојатно се случило во почетокот на XI век, кога царот Василиј II почнал речиси секоја година да навлегува на македонска територија. Бранко Панов, *Средновековна Македонија*, том III (Скопје: Мисла, 1985), 726.

Охридската патријаршија. Ова се должи на фактот што освен во *Диканжовиот список*, за патријархот Филип нема други пишани изворни податоци. Токму затоа се изнесени различни мислења: Б. Прокиќ[11] смета дека Филип бил поглавар на Охридската патријаршија од 990 до 1015 год., а, пак, И. Снегаров[12] ја нуди хронолошката рамка од 1000 до 1015 год. Она што со сигурност се знае е дека во 1016 год. патријархот Филип повеќе не се наоѓал на чело на Охридската патријаршија. Сведоштвото за ова е содржано во *Кратката историја на Јован Скилица,* каде што авторот, пишувајќи за деталите околу убиството на зетскиот владетел Јован Владимир, го споменува името на архиепископот Давид како учесник во заверата;[13] Михаил Деволски во дополнувањата кон текстот на Скилица наместо името на архиепископот Давид го пишува она на архиерејот Јован.[14]

Следниот на списокот охридски патријарси кој се искачил на црковниот трон по смртта на поглаварот Филип бил Јован. Изворите сведочат дека станува збор за личност која потекнувала од селото Агноандника кај Дебар. По замонашувањето станал игумен на манастирот Света Богородица во близината на Дебар, од каде што потоа, најверојатно во 1016 год., бил избран за охридски патријарх.[15] Тој се споменува и во првата повелба на Василиј II издадена на Охридската архиепископија во 1019 год. Имено, овој охридски патријарх, по паѓањето на Самуиловата држава под

---

[11] Прокић, „Постанак охридског патријархата", 230 – 232.

[12] Иван Снегаров, *История на Охридската архиепископия*, том 1. Второ фототипно издание (София: Академично издателство, 1995), 29.

[13] Ioannis Scylitzae, *Synopsis Historarum*, rec. J.Thurn (Berlin: 1973), 38, 65 (353); *ИБИГИБИ VI*, 288; *Византиски извори за историју народа Југославије*, том III, ур., Георгије Острогорски и Јадран Ферлуга (Београд: Византолошки институт, 1966) , 117 -118 (во понатамошниот текст ВИИНЈ III). Јован Скилица, во согласност со тогашната византиска идеологија, охридските црковни поглавари во времето на Самуиловата држава ги ословува со титулата архиепископи.

[14] Bozidar Prokic, ed., *Die Zusatze in der Handschrift Des Johannes Skylitzes: Codex Vindobonensis historia graeca LXXIV* (Munchen: H.Kutzner, 1906), 32.

[15] Daruzes, *Notitia episcopatum,* 105; сп. *ИБИГИБИ VII*, 110; Иванов, *Дюканжовъ списъкъ*, 566; сп. Прокић, „Постанак охридског патријархата", 231-234; *ВИИНЈ III*, 118, ф. 134; Цветан Грозданов, „Архиепископот Јован од Дебарско и традицијата за основањето на манастирот Свети Јован Бигорски", *Зборник Манастир Свети Јован Бигорски, Културно-историско наследство на Република Македонија XXXII* (1994): 19 – 24.

византиска власт, останал на високата црковна позиција во Охрид, но во ранг на архиепископ.[16]

Извесна полемика околу наследникот на патријархот Филип предизвикува пишувањето на Јован Скилица, според кого, во периодот од 1015 до 1018 год. со црковната катедра во Охрид раководел архиепископот Давид. Византискиот хроничар на две места во својата *Кратка историја* го споменува името на Давид како архиепископ во времето на последниот цар од Самуиловата династија – Јован Владислав (1015 – 1018). Првиот пат тоа е во контекст на заговорот за убиството на зетскиот владетел Јован Владимир, маж на Самуиловата ќерка Косара,[17] а вториот пат кога во близината на Струмица, во 1018 година, се сретнал со царот Василиј II предавајќи му писмо од царицата Марија, вдовицата на Јован Владислав, во кое таа му ги нудела условите под кои би ја напуштила земјата.[18]

Сведоштвото наведено кај Скилица е аргумент во оспорувањето на тезата дека Јован бил последниот поглавар на Охридската патријаршија во времето на Самуиловата држава. Извесен број автори од крајот на XIX и првата половина на XX век, меѓу кои Е. Голубински,[19] Х. Гелцер[20] и И. Снегаров,[21] а од современите С. Антољак[22] и Ј. Белчовски,[23] сметаат дека Давид, а не Јован, е последениот охридски патријарх, детрониран од Василиј II. Тие како аргумент го земаат и пишувањето на Јован Зонара кој, исто како Скилица, го наведува името на архиепископот Давид во контекст на неговата средба со Василиј II кај Струмица и

---

[16] *ИБИГИБИ VI*, 40 - 44; сп. Снегаров, *Охридската архиепископија 1*, 55 – 57; Иванов, *Български старини*, 550 – 555.

[17] Scylitzae, *Synopsis*, 38, 65 - 85 (353 - 354); *ИБИГИБИ VI*, 288; *ВИИНЈ III*, 117 - 118.

[18] Scylitzae, *Synopsis*, 41, 75-80 (357-358); *ИБИГИБИ VI*, 290-291; *ВИИНЈ III*, 124-125; сп. Бранко Панов и др., *Историја на Македонскиот народ I,* 399; Стјепан Антољак, *Средновековна Македонија I*, 685; Белчовски, *Охридската архиепископија*, 98-99; Милан Бошкоски, *Скопје и скопската област од VI до крајот на XIV век* (Скопје: Македонска реч, 2009), 122.

[19] Евгений Евсигнеевич Голубинский**,** *Краткий очерк истории Православных церквей болгарской, сербской и румынской или молдо-валашской* (Москва: 1871), 30.

[20] Hainrich Gelzer, *Der Patriarchat von Achrida* (Leibzig: 1902), 8.

[21] Снегаров, *Охридската архиепископија 1*, 55-57, 29-31.

[22] Антољак, *Средновековна Македонија I*, 684.

[23] Белчовски, *Охридската архиепископија*, 100-102.

предавањето на писмото од царицата Марија.[24] Меѓутоа, ако внимателно го погледнеме текстот на Зонара, ќе забележиме дека тој го користи Скилица како основен извор. Оттука, поради второстепеноста, неговото кажување не може да се смета за веродостојно.

Ние сметаме дека одговорот на ова прашање е во дополнувањата на Михаил Деволски кон *Кратката историја на Јован Скилица*.[25] Имено, работите целосно се менуваат доколку имаме предвид дека на двете места каде што Скилица го споменува Давид, деволскиот епископ Михаил интервенира со исправки и го пишува името на „Ιωάννου του ἀρηιερέως".[26] Веродостојноста на споменатите исправки дополнително добива на тежина ако се има предвид дека Михаил бил деволски епископ и оттука имал увид во епископските списоци и другите документи од архивите на Охридската архиепископија. Не е исклучено тој да користел заеднички извор со авторот на Диканжовиот список каде што, како што кажавме, фигурира Јован како наследник на Филип. Не сомневајќи се во веродостојноста на исправките на Михаил Деволски, го застапуваме ставот дека во периодот од околу 1016 до 1018 год. на чело на Охридската патријаршија се наоѓал патријархот Јован, за потоа да биде симнат во ранг на архиепископ и оставен да раководи со новоуредената Охридска архиепис-копија.[27]

Следната личност од највисоката хиерархија на Охридската патријаршија чија историчност, исто така, е предмет на полемика е поглаварот Николај Чудесни. Сведоштво за него има во *Краткото житие на свети Јован Владимир* и во списокот *Светии кај бугарскиот народ,* кој е додаден во зографската бугарска

---

[24] Ioannes Zonaras, „Annales" во *Patrologiae cursus completus, series Graecae, tomus CXXXIV*, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris: 1866), III, 5 (col. 549); сп. *ИБИГИБИ VII*, 189.

[25] Prokic, *Die Zusatze*, 25. Според Б. Прокиќ, овие дополнувања на М. Деволски датираат од 24 април 1118 година.

[26] Scylitzae, *Synopsis*, 24, 55; 41, 75-80 (342; 357-358); Prokic, *Die Zusatze*, 32; 38 (32; 33).

[27] Михаил Деволски во дополнувањата кон текстот на Скилица соопштува дека охридскиот црковен поглавар бил дел од триумфалната поворка на Василиј II која влегла во Константинопол во 1018/19 година. Притоа, тој не го наведува името на поглаварот. Prokic, *Die Zusatze*, 56 (35).

историја.[28] Индикативен е фактот што Николај Чудесни не е споменат во ниту еден друг извор освен во горенаведените, кои се од подоцнежен датум. Тој не е наведен ниту кај Скилица, ниту во дополнувањата на Михаил Деволски, го нема во *Диканжовиот список*, а за него молчат и *Пространото (словенско) житие на Св. Јован Владимир, Летописот на попот Дукљанин* и повелбите на Василиј II. Сепак, и покрај ова, извесен број автори не се сомневаат во неговата историчност и го наведуваат веднаш по поглаварот Герман (Гаврил). Отсуството на неговото име во првостепените извори за Охридската патријаршија тие го објаснуваат со претпоставката дека Николај Чудесни кусо време бил на чело на Црквата.[29]

Она на што сметаме дека треба да се внимава при разгледувањето на прашањето за историчноста на Николај Чудесни се три моменти: 1) датирањето на *Краткото житие на св. Јован Владимир*; 2) утврдување, барем приближно, на изворите што ги користел неговиот автор при пишувањето и 3) анализа на точноста на другите историски податоци содржани во него. Наведеното е со цел да се утврди автентичноста на споменатото житие како историски извор.

Денес со сигурност се знае дека автор на *Краткото житие на св. Јован Владимир* напишано на грчки јазик е китијскиот,[30] а подоцна драчки митрополит Козма. Тој во периодот од 1682 до 1685 год. бил игумен на манастирот Свети Јован Владимир во Елбасан, а извесен период бил местобљустител и настојник на Охридската архиепископија.[31] Се претпоставува дека додека ја извршувал функцијата игумен на манастирот Свети Јован

---

[28] „Пролошко житие на св. Јован Владимир" во *Москополски зборник: Пролошки житија на светците*, превод и коментари Христо Мелоски (Скопје: Догер 1996), 171-185; сп. Иванов, *Български старини*, 175.

[29] Снегаров, *Охридската архиепископија 1*, 27-29; Белчовски, *Охридската архиепископија*, 96-97.

[30] Китија е старото име на Ларнака на Кипар.

[31] Козма на должноста местобљустител и настојник на Охридската архиепископија дошол во 1685 година, на која останал најверојатно до 1693 година. Gelzer, *Der Patriarchat von Achrida*, 52; Иван Снегаров, *История на Охридската архиепископия*, том 2. Второ фототипно издание (София: Академично издателство, 1995), 224.

Владимир во Елбасан, го напишал житието на светецот.[32] Во него се вели дека Јован Владимир бил воспитан од охридскиот архиепископ свети Николај (ἁγίον Νικόλαον). Тоа е, всушност, неговото прво спомeнување во историските извори.[33] Воедно, важно е да се напомене дека, најверојатно, авторот на споменатото житие како извор користел податоци од некој постар хагиографски текст или служба во чест на светецот кои досега останале непознати. Освен тоа, воопшто не може да се исклучи ниту можноста митрополитот Козма при пишувањето да го ползувал и народното предание за животот на св. Јован Владимир, чиј култ, почнувајќи од XIII век, бил силно изразен во Елбасан и пошироката околина. Можеби од таму е различноста на одделни податоци содржани во *Краткото (грчко) житие,* од една, и *Пространото (словенско) житие на св. Јован Владимир,* од друга страна.

Во контекст на вреднувањето на автентичноста на историските податоци содржани во *Краткото житие на св. Јован Владимир,* ќе ги наведеме очигледните историски анахронизми содржани во него. Имено, уште на почетокот од хагиографскиот текст се вели дека Јован Владимир бил син на Немања, а, пак, овој син на бугарскиот цар Симеон.[34] Станува збор за очигледно непознавање на историските факти. Токму ова, погледнато во поширок контекст, упатува на внимателен пристап кон другите податоци содржани во житието. Затоа, на мислење сме дека како релевантни сведоштва треба да се земат само оние што можат да се проверат во другите извори.

Погорекажаното, а особено големата временска оддалече-ност од животот на Јован Владимир до пишувањето на неговото *Кратко житие,* како и одделните, очигледни, историски неточ-ности содржани во него, нè наведуваат на тоа да се сомневаме во автентичноста на податокот дека извесен охридски архиепископ Николај бил учител на Јован Владимир, уште повеќе што податокот

---

[32] Краткото житие, заедно со Пространото (словенско) житие и Службата на св. Јован Владимир се печатени четири пати во периодот од XVII до XIX век, и тоа првпат во 1690 година во Венеција, вторпат во 1741 година во Москополскиот зборник, третпат во 1774 година и четвртпат во 1856 година. Иван Снегаров, „Жития на народни светии писани на охридско наречие съ грцко писмо“, *Македонски прегледъ,* година I, кн. 5 и 6 (Софија: 1925), 27; „Пролошко житие на св. Јован Владимир“, 181-185.

[33] „Пролошко житие на Св. Јован Владимир“, 172, 177.

[34] „Пролошко житие на Св. Јован Владимир“, 171, 175.

за историчноста на Николај Чудесни досега не е забележан во ниту еден друг книжевен или епиграфски извор.[35]

Посредни податоци за ерархијата во Охридската патријаршија наоѓаме и во два други книжевни извори: *Летописот на попот Дукљанин* и *Пространото (словенско) житие на св. Јован Владимир*. Имено, во *Летописот на попот Дукљанин,* во делот каде што се соопштуваат деталите околу заверата за убиството на Јован Владимир, се вели дека царот Јован Владислав преку делегација составена од двајца епископи и еден монах-испосник му испратил дрвен крст на зетскиот кнез како еден вид црковна гаранција за неговата безбедност доколку дојде во Преспа.[36] Притоа, авторот не ги соопштува имињата на епископите и на испосникот. Тоа остава простор за различни толкувања во врска со нивната идентификација. Ние, во врска во ова, го исклучуваме директното учество на поглаварот на Охридската патријаршија во делегацијата бидејќи доколку тој бил дел од неа, авторот сигурно не ќе заборавел да го нагласи тоа. Најверојатно станува збор за двајца владици на Охридската црква чии имиња и епархии остануваат непознати. Тие, несомнено, уживале доверба кај својот црковен поглавар, кој, по сѐ изгледа, бил целосно запознаен со деталите на заверата. Според сведоштвото кај Скилица, архиепископот Давид му ги испратил гаранциите за безбедност на Јован Владимир;[37] Михаил Деволски во дополнувањата кон текстот наместо името на архиепископот Давид го пишува она на архиерејот Јован.[38]

Во *Летописот на попот Дукљанин* уште на две други места се споменуваат епископите на Охридската патријаршија. Првото е во контекст на чинот на погубувањето, а второто во врска со погребот на зетскиот кнез Јован Владимир.[39] За жал, ниту во овој дел од текстот не се наведени нивните имиња.[40]

---

[35] Изворите единствено сведочат за постоење на охридски архиепископ со исто име од XIV век. Снегаров, *Охридската архиепископија 1*, 340-341; Иванов, *Български старини*, 36-37.

[36] „...accersitis duobus episcopis et uno hermita, mentiendo illis maligne, fidem suam dedit crucem ligneam misitque eos ad regem". *Ljetopis*, XXXVI, 83; сп. Љубинка Басотова, „Летописот", 210.

[37] Scylitzae, *Synopsis*, 38, 65 (353); *ИБИГИБИ VI*, 288; *ВИИНЈ III*, 117-118.

[38] Prokic, *Die Zusatze*, 32 (32).

[39] *Ljetopis*, XXXVI, 84; сп. Љубинка Басотова, „Летописот", 215-216. Во овој летопис експлицитно се споменува местото *Craini* каде што бил закопан Владимир, кое, според мислењето на Љ. Басотова, треба да се идентификува со с.

Епископите, учесници во заверата против зетскиот владетел, со име не се споменати ниту во *Пространото житие на св. Јован Владимир*. Во него единствено се кажува дека царот Јован Владислав му испратил епископи на зетскиот кнез кои пред евангелијата и крстот лажно се заколнале во чесните намери на царот. Во споменатото житие дури не е наведен ниту бројот на епископите во делегацијата испратена кај Јован Владимир.[41]

Освен во книжевните, податоци за конкретни личности од црковната ерархија во времето на Самуиловата династија има и во епиграфските извори датирани во тој период. Станува збор за два натписи: едниот кирилски, датиран во 996 година, и другиот ерменски, датиран во X–XI век. Кирилскиот, во литературата познат како *Варошки натпис*, е врежан на мермерен столб од тремот на црквата Свети Архангел во месноста Варош кај Прилеп.[42] Во него се споменува смртта на, според едно расчитување – еписко- пот, а според друго - попот Андреја, во 996 година.[43] Тоа, всушност, значи дека известниот Андреја бил црковен достоинс- твеник во времето на царот Самуил чија личност не е споменета во другите, досега познати, извори.

Вториот епиграфски натпис во кој се споменува личност од ерархијата на Охридската патријаршија е т.н. *Таинствен варошки натпис* на ерменски јазик. Тој е испишан на плоча од бел мермер, најдена во 1966 година при археолошките ископувања во старата црква Свети Димитрија во Варош кај Прилеп. Според расчитувањето што го предлага Владимир Мошин, во текстот се

Крани на Преспанското Езеро. Како аргумент го цитира делот во *Летописот* каде што се вели дека Владимир бил убиен пред црквата во Преспа и закопан крај неа. Подоцна моштите биле пренесени во *Craini*, односно Крани, од каде што по третпат биле ексхумирани за да бидат закопани во манастирската црква Свети Јован Владимир крај Елбасан. Љубинка Басотова, „Летописот", 216.

[40] За претпоставените политички мотиви на царот Јован Владислав кои се однесуваат на убиството на Јован Владимир и деталите околу истото, види кај Милан Бошкоски, *Великанит*е, 184-191.

[41] „Словенско житије Јована Владимира" во *Читанка о Светоме краљу Јовану Владимиру*, саставио Епископ Николај [Велимировић], (Београд: 1925), 6.

[42] Овој натпис важи за еден од најстарите кирилски споменици пронајдени досега во Р Македонија.

[43] Иванов, *Български старини*, 26 – 28.

споменува свештеникот Атанасиј и годината 1002.[44] Она што е збунувачки е јазикот на кој е напишан. Очигледно е дека ерменскиот јазик упатува на претпоставката дека споменатиот свештеник Атанасиј бил со ерменско потекло. Можеби станува збор за припадник на ерменските колонисти, за кои не е исклучено во извесен број да ги имало и во околината на Прилеп и Прилепско каде што Атанасиј ја извршувал свештеничката должност.

Врз основа на кажаното, а водејќи се според историските извори, изведуваме заклучок дека на црковната столица на Охридската патријаршија во времето на Самуиловата држава се смениле тројца поглавари: Герман наречен Гаврил, Филип и Јован. Освен за овие три личности од највисоката црковна хиерархија на Охридската патријаршија, изворите сведочат и за имињата на двајца други црковни великодостојници, веќе споменатите Андреј и Атанасиј.

---

[44] Владимир Мошин, „Прилепско-варошкиот таинствен натпис на една античка плоча“, во *Споменици за средновековната и поновата историја на Македонија,* том IV, ред. Владимир Мошин (Скопје: Архив на Македонија, 1981), 509-513.

Dragan ZAJKOVSKI

OHRID PATRIARCHATE CHURCH HIERARCHY AT THE TIME OF SAMUEL' STATE

- s u m m a r y -

One of the least studied questions in church historiography is certainly the first stage of the Ohrid Patriarchate (Archdiocese). Without doubt, the reason is the scarcity of genuine testimonials. Therefore, precise answers to many questions related to the history of the Patriarchate at the time of Samuel's state are missing. Among them there is one that concerns the church hierarchy.

However, based on available historical sources we can conclude that the Ohrid Patriarchate at the time of Samuel's state counted three patriarchs: German named Gabriel, Philip and John. Finally, the comparative analysis of the sources questions the historicity of two other leaders: David and Nicholas The Miraculous. Sources where these church leaders are mention have full of other historical inaccuracies. Moreover, they are of later date. Those are the reasons that we categorize them as unreliable historical sources.

Above mentioned three persons of the highest ecclesiastical hierarchy of the Ohrid Patriarchate, sources attest to the names of two hierarchs of priestly rank. These are priests Andrew and Athanasius.

Dick VAN NIEKERK

Independent scholar

CROSSROADS OF BOGOMILS AND CATHARS? (12th - 13th century)

NEW LIGHT ON THE DISSIDENT "CHURCH OF THE LATINS" IN CONSTANTINOPLE*[1]

A)

An almost mysterious shroud has for a long time covered the dissident "Church of the Latins" in Constantinople in the thirteenth century. Even nowadays, few sources are available about it. It is still quite generally assumed that was the religious community for West European, gnostic Christians, who had settled in the Latin Empire as a result of the Fourth Crusade (1202-1204). However, a few studies from the last decade reveal a few other aspects of this rather unknown, dissident Latin Church and its purported predecessor in the twelfth century. This evokes a few penetrating questions that will be dealt with in this article:

What is the relationship with the Greek-speaking religious community of the Bogomils? Has the Latin church of Constantinople

---

been able to play any role in the development of Catharism in the West? What is the reason that this Latin Church does not appear in any records of the Inquisition, although its existence was known or may have been known?

This contribution has been divided in two parts: A & B. In the first part I will deal with the dissident Church in the 12th century; part B focuses on this community in the 13th century.

I

On 13 April 1204, emperor Alexios V of Byzantium had to bow his head to the supremacy and violence of the western allies during the Fourth Crusade. To the dismay of the initiator of the crusade, pope Innocent III (1198 – 1216), Constantinople fell into the hands of the crusaders after manipulations of Venice. Western rule, headed by count Baldwin IX of Flanders, took over the helm from the Byzantine emperor: the Latin Empire of Constantinople was born. The legitimate emperor, Alexios V, absconded and the Flemish count was crowned as the first Latin emperor of Constantinople on 9 May 1204: Baldwin I. At its largest, the Latin Empire consisted of Bythinia (approximately current West Turkey), Thrace, the region south of the river Maritsa, including the current Bulgarian town of Plovdiv and the greater part of the current Greek mainland, except Epirus in the northwest. Most Aegean and Ionic isles came under Venetian rule. Although the Latin Empire of Constantinople ended in 1261, parts of the Peloponnese and Attica (Athens and the surrounding urbanised region) remained in western hands until the Turkish conquest of the Balkans. Venice kept the Greek isles under its control much longer.

The western "occupation" of Constantinople had already lasted for some decades when, around 1250, the Dominican heresy hunter and chief inquisitor of Lombardy, Rainerius Sacconi, recorded in his "Summa" all the sixteen Cathar and Bogomil churches known to him.[2] Of the five "overseas" (read: Bogomil) churches mentioned by him, two were found in Constantinople: "the church of the Latins" and "the church of the Greeks in the same place". In this context, in the Greek-

---

[2] Rainerius Sacconi, Summa de Catharis et Pauperibus de Lugduno, in *Un Traité néo-manichéen du XIIIe siècle,* ed. A. Dondaine (Rome 1939), 64-78. The "Summa" was translated into Dutch by Michel Gybels, Rainerius Sacconi en de Summa de Catharis, *Als Catars E – magazine 3 (2005),* 13-22.

speaking Byzantine Empire, "Latins" was a common designation of West Europeans.

In this article, I would like to focus the spotlight on the almost "forgotten" dissident Latin church of Constantinople and the roots that this community must have had in the twelfth century. This will almost naturally lead to the fascinating, yet complicated chapter about the common ground between Bogomils and Cathars.

Concrete information about a dissident Latin church in Constantinople is extremely scarce in the historical sources. Apart from the abovementioned Sacconi, only his colleague Anselm of Alessandria refers to it.

Even prominent researchers are often brief about this "church of the Latins". Obolenski [3], for instance, confined himself to a single sentence, while Stoyanov[4], a few decades later, was also very brief: "Sacchoni clearly differentiated the Constantinople Greek church, whose bishop had earlier been Nicetas, from the Ecclesia Latinorum in Constantinople which is usually viewed as a dualist order set up to minister to the Cathars in the Latin empire of Constantinople in the wake of the Fourth Crusade (1202-04)." Only Hamilton extensively deals with the essence of this dissident Latin Church and its genesis in a series of fascinating articles.[5]

Dissident community of 5000 souls

* The only further remark that Rainerius Sacconi made about the Latin church of Constantinople was that (around 1250) it counted "hardly fifty members". This should be interpreted in the sense that it had fifty perfecti or *bonshommes*. At first sight, this is not an impressive number, but in the research about Catharism this is usually multiplied by a factor a hundred to be able to approximate the size of the entire

---

[3] Obolenski, D., *The Bogomils,* Twickenham 1972, 158: "The 'Ecclesia Latinorum de Constantinopoli', which must have arisen as a result of the Fourth Crusade and the establishment of the Latin Empire of Constantinople (1204), was doubtless founded by those Cathars who had come to Byzantium with the crusading army."

[4] Stoyanov, Y., *The other God,*(New Haven and London 2000), 196-97

[5] The articles are summarised in the introduction to the work of Hugo Eteriano, *Contra Patarenos,* eds. Hamilton J., S. and B. (Leiden 2004), 1-102. In the footsteps of Hamilton, also Lambert extensively deals with "the heretical Latin Church": Lambert, M., *The Cathars,* Oxford 2000, 37.

community of souls: therefore, 5000 souls, but probably more[6]. Sacconi wrote his Summa at a moment when Catharism had already passed its peak some time ago. Some dissident churches had even wholly disappeared like that of Northern France and of Agen. During the period before 1250, more than 5000 souls may well have been members of the dissident Latin religious community.

Sacconi's treatise should be read with a critical mind. He himself mentioned that he had been a Cathar deacon for seventeen years. His treatise was also his doctoral thesis, with which he wanted to make a career within the Dominican inquisition. He therefore put his best foot forward to prove that he had dissociated from his past and did not have a hidden agenda.

* Also the second informant, Anselm of Alessandria, inquisitor of Milan and the region around Genoa, is not undisputed in historiography. He made up quite a bit and sometimes seems to confuse things. Moreover, it should be remarked that he wrote about matters that had occurred more than a century before.

In a treatise from 1266[7], this Anselm is more communicative about the Latin church than his colleague Sacconi: "Shortly afterwards, Greeks from Constantinople, which neighboured Bulgaria at a distance of approximately three days travel, went to the latter country as merchants, and because their numbers increased, they appointed on their way back to their homeland a bishop, called the bishop of the Greeks. Subsequently, French people went to Constantinople, intending to conquer land there. And they discovered this sect. As their numbers increased, they appointed a bishop who was called the *bishop of the Latins*. Next, certain people from Slavonia, that is, from the region called Bosnia, went to Constantinople as businessmen. On their way back home, they preached and, as their numbers had increased, they appointed a bishop who was called the bishop of Slavonia or of Bosnia. After some time, also the French who had gone to Constantinople, returned to their fatherland and preached and because their numbers increased, they appointed a bishop of France…"

---

[6] Hamilton B. & J., *Christian dualist heresies in the Byzantine world c. 650 - c. 1405*, (Manchester 1998), 51

[7] See: A. Dondaine, La hiérarchie cathare en Italie II : Le Tractatus de hereticis d'Anselme d'Alexandrie, *AFP (* 1950) 234-324 ; also in: Wakefield W. and Evans A., *Heresies of the High Middle Ages,*(New York, London 1969),168

If we believe and correctly interpret these often-quoted words of Anselm of Alessandria, the preaching of the Bogomil-Cathar word in Northern France ("francigene") was purportedly started by the repatriated members of the dissident Latin church in Constantinople. "Because the French in Constantinople were converted by Bulgarians, the heretics are called Bulgarians in the whole of France," he added. [8]

Who were those French; when did they arrive in Constantinople "to conquer land"? But above all: when did they begin to proclaim their dualistic religious ideas, with which they must have become acquainted within the Latin church of Constantinople, in their homeland?

Hildegard of Bingen

- It is quite generally assumed that this concerns returned French crusaders. However, this idea needs some refinement. I will come back to this later[9].

- Anselm of Alexandria is inconclusive about the exact time of this "conquering land". Many historians try to link this "conquering land" with one of the crusades. Hamilton[10] thinks of the period of the First Crusade, 1096-1099. For Wakefield & Evans, for instance, it is, beyond discussion that it refers to the Second Crusade: 1146-1147. Hamilton motivates his dating with the historical fact that the First Crusade was partly launched to reclaim parts of Asia Minor from the Turks. Subsequently, a wave of Bogomil influence came to the West with the returnees, which purportedly resulted in the genesis of the Catharisms in 1101.

Hamilton based his dating on information that Hildegard of Bingen had supplied about the beginning of the Catharisms. It appears from a report of one of her visions, written by herself – and from Hamilton's very ingenious interpretation of it – that the Catharisms began to blossom in 1083 or in 1101. 1083 cannot be combined with Anselm of Alexandria's words; 1101 can. [11]

---

[8] Dondaine, "Et quia francigene seducti fuerunt primo in Constantinopoli a bulgaris, vocant per totam Franciam hereticos bulgaros", 308

[9] Infra, p. 8

[10] Hamilton, B., "Dualist Heresy in the Latin Empire of Constantinople," in *Religious Quest and National Identity in the Balkans* , ed. Celia Hawkesworh et al.(London 2002) 69-77

[11] Hamilton, B., "Wisdom from the East", in *Heresy and Literacy, 1000-1350*, ed. P. Biller and A. Hudson, 38-61 (Cambridge 1996), 42-45 and Ph. Timko, Hildegard of Bingen against the Cathars*, The American Benedictine Review* 52 (2001): 191-205

The question remains whether the *magistra of the Rupertsberg* had sufficient knowledge about the Cathars to serve as such an important source in this context.

Although she gave little information about the teachings of the Cathars, she demonstrated in many sermons to have been eminently informed about their comings and goings. Hildegard of Bingen also seems to have known the fundamental theological counterarguments that were brought in position against the Cathars by prominent members of the ruling church: Bernardus of Clairvaux, Everwin of Steinfeld and Eckbert of Schönau.[12] It is less known that this usually irenic seer harshly described in her Cologne sermon how the heretics were put to a terrible death by the worldly powers, for which they themselves chose as "rabid wolves". "We even do not find such a harsh and repressive approach with Bernardus of Clairvaux, who never called for violently attacking heresy. He was a man who would rather like to guide the heretics back to the Church of Rome by the word and by preaching."[13]

Catharisms as a multiple phenomenon

The Bogomil expansion in the West still raises many questions. The strong influence of the Bogomils on the western heresies of the eleventh century, assumed for a long time,[14] and on the origin of the Catharisms (plural, sic!) in the twelfth century is recently strongly weakened by modern research.

A recent example of this is the fascinating and pioneering dissertation "Les Catharismes" by the French historian Pilar Jiménez. "There was a time, not so long ago, when the history of Catharism was simple and clear: Catharism was a phenomenon that came from outside and was imported from the Orient. For one historian this occurred in the beginning of the eleventh century, for another halfway the twelfth century. Characteristic of Catharism were the dualistic teachings that

---

[12] Kienzle, Beverly, "La dénoncation de l´hérésie, l´Exégèse d´Hildegarde et sa prédication contre l´hérésie" , in *Écrire l´histoire d´une hérésie, actes du Colloque Mémoire du catharisme* (Mazamet 12 et 13 mai 2007) 45

[13] Gybels, M., *Ketterijen in middeleeuws Europa, de strijd voor een eigen religieuze identiteit Heresies in mediaeval Europe, the struggle for their own religious identity,* (Zoetermeer 2011), 73

[14] For a very painstaking discussion of the influence of Bogomilism on the religious developments in the West in the eleventh century, see: Taylor, Claire, *Heresy in Medieval France, Dualism in Aquitaine and the Agenais, 1000-1249,*(Woodbridge 2005), passim

were until then unknown in the Latin world," she wrote on the back cover of her book.[15] However, on the basis of careful reading of a large collection of "documents that go back to the Carolingian period of the ninth century and that deal with the Christian society," Jiménez suggests "a genesis of the Catharisms as a multiple phenomenon that arose from western Christianity. Thus the path of a dualistic way of thinking developped, the dissident expression of which stemmed from a process of rationalisation that was at cross purposes with mediaeval Christianity."

If we summarise Jiménez incompletely: the cradle of the Catharisms did not stand in the Orient, but in the West! The Cathars continued to build mainly on thought models that had developed within Carolingian society.

* Jiménez' book signifies a new step in the research of an autonomous history of the origin of the Catharisms. Yet, the Bogomil influences – ably treated by the French historian – remain and above all the correspondences with Bogomilism. It couldn't be otherwise, because both the Catharisms as well as Bogomilism bear witness to the dualistic religious conviction that this visible world is the creation of Evil. Ultimately, both had their roots in the gnosis and in gnosticism[16] and this means that we should always take the mutual connecting lines very seriously.

I would like to adopt Jiménez' approach of Catharism as a multiple phenomenon, that has to be identified constantly according to period and circumstances. It should be noted that she hardly quotes from the articles by B. Hamilton, one of the most able advocates of the connecting line Bogomils – Cathars. The publication *Contra Patarenos* [17] from 2004, with the most complete and topical introduction about the history of the Bogomils, is even missing in her bibliography.

Let us now return to the dating of the origin of the Catharisms and the role the Bogomil "missionary activities" from Constantinople played in it. Hamilton believes that this process began around 1100, as we have seen. Couliano, who considers the Bogomils the source of and the model

---

[15] Pilar Jiménez – Sanchez, *Les Catharismes, modèles dissidents du christianisme médiéval XIIe – XIIIe siècles,* (Rennes 2008)

[16] See Van Niekerk, D., "The Bogomils, Mediaeval Gnostics or crypto-heretics?", *Glasnik 54 1-2,* 25 - 34

[17] See note 3

for the Cathars[18], ascertains that Bogomilism – and in the context of his argument, this refers to gnostic, Christian dualism[19] – was already rooted in North Italy, Provence and Central France at the beginning of the twelfth century[20]. This tunes in with our working hypothesis that the Catharisms began to develop since 1100 and has been started under influence of missionary activity from Constantinople.

Incubation period

It may be thrown in my face now that there are hardly any sources from the period 1100-1140 referring to a form of Catharism. I do absolutely not want to interpret the very peculiar document of Guibert of Nogent about the Manichaeans near Soissons (1114) as Cathar[21].

I nevertheless strongly doubt whether the beginning of Catharism should be dated in 1143. That is, when the monk and dean Everwin of Steinfeld wrote his famous, remarkably restrained letter to Bernardus of Clairvaux about the heretics of Cologne, who had so strongly impressed him. Currently, this is generally considered the first, undisputed source of Catharism.[22] If this is really true, the Catharisms have certainly spread very rapidly. Isn't it more natural that a long initial period was needed, a kind of incubation period, during which for instance the Greek texts were translated into Latin (and vice versa) in Constantinople, which could then have been used in the West during the preaching of the (dualistic) word.

A provisional conclusion crops up:

On the basis of the preceding, there is the possibility that early in the twelfth century a dissident Latin church of Constantinople must have existed, from which the impulse to the Catharisms has been given.

Years of familiarity with Greek

We move our vision to the dissident churches of the "Greeks and Latins" of Constantinople again. They may have been crucial for the

---

[18] Couliano I., *The Tree of Gnosis, Gnostic Mythology from Early Christianity to Modern Nihilism* ,(San Francisco 1992), 235

[19] Stoyanov, 389, fn 15

[20] Couliano, 214

[21] Wakefield & Evans, *Heresies,* 101-105

[22] For the content of the letter and the commentary on it, see the excellent article by Brenon, A., "La Lettre d'Evervin de Steinfeld à Bernard de Clairvaux de 1143: un document essentiel et méconnu", *Heresis 25* (1995), 7-28

translation of Greek Bogomil rituals into Latin. It is quite strange that this topic is only sporadically included in modern research.

According to Hamilton[23], the members of the Latin Church fulfilled a key role in these translations, and not only in the translations but also in the propagation of the faith in the West, by the way. He absolutely does not believe that the Bogomil/Cathar teachings were brought to the West by returning crusaders or merchants. According to him, there may have been many contacts between the West and Byzantium during the twelfth century, but it requires specialist linguistic training to translate religious texts and to convey religious knowledge. I fully agree with Hamilton: many years of inner experience and familiarity with the texts are required for an ably translation of the Bogomilian texts. Not until then will the translation do power for the reader. This training and inner experience cannot be expected of merchants, travellers or crusaders.

Moreover, their vocabulary was quite different, Hamilton argues. Only people, who stayed in the Byzantine Empire for a considerable time, were capable of developing the necessary expertise. He substantiates this statement analogously to the famous mediaeval sacred story about Barlaam and Josaphat, the translation of which into Latin was also done in Byzantium. Under the pretext of a sacred story, this was actually a description of the life of Prince Gautama the Buddha. It clearly bears the traces of Manichaeans in Asia, who were still found there until the twelfth century[24]. The text was very popular with the Occitan Cathars[25]. In the preface to this Byzantine edition of Barlaam and Josaphat[26], we can read that the translator was sixty years old and that he carried out the translation "from Greek into correct Latin *during the thirty-first year of his stay in Constantinople"*.

---

[23] Hamilton, *Wisdom from the East,* 58

[24] U. de Volder, R. Ostyn and P. Vandepitte, *Het reisverhaal van Willem van Rubroek, de Vlaamse Marco Polo: 1253-1255* (*The travel story of Willem van Rubroek, the Flemish Marco Polo: 1253-1255*), Heemkundige Kring "De Roede van Tielt" . Local History Circle "The Rod of Tielt", (Tielt 1984), 114-15

[25] Nelli, René and Lavaud, René, "Le Roman Spirituel de Barlaam et Josaphat ", in *Les Troubadours, I, (*Paris 1978) 1071-1221

[26] There is a remarkable doctoral thesis about Barlaam and Josaphat by the Belgian philosopher Marie-Madeleine A. van Ruymbeke Stey, *Au confluent du catharisme et du bogomilisme, le Barlam et Jozaphas occitan, approche culturelle et sémiologique,* Ohio 1997. She shows that research on the history and the transition from east to west of the story of Barlaam and Josaphat brings a few remarkable correspondences between Bogomilism and Catharism to light.

Only under such circumstances and after such a long familiarity with Greek, translations on that level appear to be possible.

Westernisation of Bogomilism

With this knowledge in mind, we once again look at the abovementioned text of Anselm of Alessandria about the Latins: "Subsequently, French people went to Constantinople, intending to conquer land there. And they discovered this sect. As their numbers increased, they appointed a bishop who was called the *bishop of the Latins*. […] After some time, also the French who had gone to Constantinople, returned to their fatherland and preached and because their numbers increased, they appointed a bishop of France…"
Therefore, this fragment might be read in the sense that Westerners might have lived in twelfth-century Constantinople, who were able to translate Bogomil texts into Latin and maybe Latin texts into Greek. In view of the long, necessary training, the first Cathar-Bogomil missionary activity in the West will certainly not have taken place by returned crusaders (too little linguistic training), but by members of the church of the Latins in Constantinople. If they were Westerners who had lived in Byzantium for a long time, they would certainly not have had any language problem with propagating their faith when they returned to Western Europe.

On the basis of the same fragment of Anselm of Alessandria, Malcolm Lambert[27] arrived at virtually the same conclusions. The contact in Constantinople was crucial. We may reasonably assume that Bogomilism became westernised there. Here they had natural access to the bilingual elements within the population. Here Catharism evolved from Bogomilism and the missionaries were trained who were to transmit the teachings to the West. Westerners converted Westerners! This not only enabled the emergence of a Byzantine, dualistic heresy in the West, but also explains the early, rapid successes of this heresy.

Anti-Latin sentiments

It is undisputable that there was room for a Western church of the Cathar type in twelfth-century Byzantium. Constantinople formed a multicoloured, multi-ethnic society, where over 60,000 western immigrants lived at the Golden Horn in 1181: largely Italians, but also

---

[27] Lambert, *Cathars,* 37

Venetians, Norwegians, Germans, English and French. The Greeks referred to them as "Latinoi" or Latins.

The Latins in Constantinople were mainly scientists, diplomats, priests, merchants, mercenaries and pilgrims, who had come to Byzantium and lived there for a shorter or longer period.[28] Each group had its own church at its disposal.

Emperor Manuel I Comnene implemented a policy of rapprochement to the West, mainly to the Italians who might be very useful to him in the defence of his empire. Therefore, the emperor did not put any obstacle in their path. The Venetians, for instance, who had risen to the most important trade partner of the Byzantines, had even three churches at their disposal, the people from Pisa two. Pisa, too, - the hometown of Hugo Eteriano – maintained intensive trade relations with Byzantium. Amongst other things, this was expressed by commercial privileges, exemption of customs duties and the right to their own section with chairs in the Hippodrome, a kind of skyboxes avant la lettre therefore, and in the church of Aya Sofia.

These privileges as well as the presence, often experienced as arrogant, of above all the Italians were a thorn in the flesh of the native population.[29] After emperor Manuel's death, the dissatisfaction got free rein. In 1182, this culminated in a bestial pogrom of the Orthodox population in the Italian districts of the city, during which the Roman Catholic priests and monks had to pay for it.[30] The representative of the pope, Cardinal John, was beheaded and his head was dragged on a rope through the streets by a dog.[31]

From a conversation that the former patriarch of Constantinople, Michael of Anchiale (1170-1177) had with the emperor, it becomes clear how the political top thought about it. He clearly turned against any rapprochement to the Latins and made him understand that he even preferred rapprochement to the Turks over détente with the Latins.

---

[28] Ciggaar, Krijnie N., *Western Travellers to Constantinople, The West and Byzantium, 962 – 1204: Cultural and Political Relations,* (Leiden 1996)

[29] Runciman, S. *De Goddelijke keizers (The Divine Emperors),* Bussum 1979, 96: "The inhabitants of Constantinople must have disliked these haughty Westerners, who pompously walked their streets and bazars and enriched themselves at the expense of the local merchants. When they took along their own priests and received permission to build Latin churches, their anger became even larger."

[30] D.M. Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice: a Study in Diplomatic and Cultural Relations,*(Cambridge 1992), 107

[31] Carroll, W., *The Glory of Christendom,* (Front Royal 1993), 157

Anti-Latin and pro-Turkish will prove to be a constant factor in the history of Byzantium. [32]

Patarenes

Under these precarious circumstances, it was for Westerners with dissident Christian-ascetic sympathies doubly important to keep a low profile. They knew that they were not popular and they knew that any form of heresy might be punished severely. However, the fact that there were actually heretics amongst the thousands of immigrants may be derived from the peculiar manuscript *Contra Patarenos*[33] by Hugo Eteriano, a scholar of name from Italian Pisa.

Just as his brother Leo the Tuscan, who worked as a translator at the court, Hugo was invited to Byzantium by emperor Manuel I Comnenus to advise him concerning his policy of rapprochement to the Western church[34]. Eteriano was in high esteem with emperor Manuel after the former's dominant contribution during the final debate of the Council of Constantinople in 1166[35] about the longstanding question "The Father is greater than I" [36]. To everyone's surprise, Manuel resolutely took the side of his friend Eteriano, who received the task of drafting the final text. Subsequently, it was chiselled with decorative letters on an enormous, marble plaque that was attached to the wall of the Great Church.[37]

Hugo Eteriano had heard that a group was discovered in Constantinople that secretly went its own way and operated wholly independently from the Orthodox church. In his text, he called the members of this group Patarenes, at the time the usual name for heretics in his hometown Pisa and its surroundings[38].

---

[32] Argyriou, R., "Remarques sur quelques listes grecques énumerant les hérésies latines", *Byzantinische Forschungen* 4 (1966), 9 – 30, 18,19

[33] Eteriano's treatise must have been written between 1165 and 1182, the period that he stayed as an adviser in Constantinople on the request of the emperor.

[34] Eteriano, *Contra Patarenos*

[35] Ciggaar, 202 - 3

[36] John 14:28: "If you loved me, you would have rejoiced, because I go to the Father; for the Father is greater than I."

[37] Kolbaba, Tia, Byzantine Perceptions of Latin Religious "Errors", in *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, eds. A.E. Laiou and R.P. Mottahedeh (Dumbarton Oaks 2001) 117 – 143, 138

[38] Quite a few theories abound about the origin of the name Patarenes. The most remarkable one is that of Dujcev, who thinks that the word is derived from *Pater emon*, the Greek opening words of the Lord's Prayer, because the Bogomils (and the Cathars)

* In the first part of Eteriano's description we read that the Patarenes preached in secret and criticised the clergy. According to them, this latter group lived in sin and this is why the Patarenes stated that the sacraments administered by these priests were invalid and not functional. These accusations corresponded to those of other western dissident groups, which pointed out that the laity felt uncomfortable with receiving the sacraments from priests, of whom it was known that they acted sinfully, particularly in a sexual respect. The Patarenes themselves were reluctant with regard to sexuality. Just as the Cathars, they rejected the sacrament of marriage.

* The second reproach was that the heretics preached the gospel during secret gatherings.

* The third objection of Eteriano was that they refused to swear oaths[39], similar to the Cathars. They did not accept the Old Testament or its traditional, Orthodox interpretation. They did not believe that Christ was really present in the Eucharist.

* Just like the Bogomils and the Cathars, they disliked images, the cross and the sign of the cross.

So far the accusatory observations of Eteriano.

From the second hand

On closer inspection, it is striking that the Pisa lay theologian wrote in Latin, apparently about "dissidents" who also communicated in Latin about spiritual, liturgical matters. His arguments seem a bit detached and he did not use personal experiences with or impressions of the Patarenes. This may point to two things. Either Eteriano received his information second hand, or he recognised the heresy from his own country and used the old western schemes, which was common at the time. With regard to its content, his manuscript almost literally resembles similar lists against Italian Patarenes.

He was seen as an indisputable expert. Thus the Roman Catholic clergy from Pisa asked him in a letter for advice about the problems with the heretics from this town. Amongst other things, the letter stated that the heretics rejected the resurrection from the dead, as well as the sacrifices for the deceased.

---

concentrated on it several times a day. (I. Dujcev, Compte – rendu, *Byzantinoslavica 19 (1958), 318-19*)

[39] Swearing oaths is hardly or not found with the Bogomils. Although it is in the West, and for the first time with the Cathars of Liège (1144).

It does not become clear who gave Hugo Eteriano the order for his investigation. Probably prominent noblemen of the court did so. The emperor himself as an instructor seems to me less probable in this case. The emperor would have followed no doubt the plea of the author to pronounce a severe verdict on the Patarenes: beheading or the stake! Emperor Manuel never carried out this advice, probably because of the abovementioned political situation.

For Eteriano, this has probably been the reason to return to Italy in 1182, where he offered his writing to pope Lucius III (1181-1185)[40]. The latter immediately appointed him as cardinal of the Curia. A few months later Hugo Eteriano passed away. However, there are no indications that this pope responded to Hugo Eteriano's harsh suggestion to attack the Patarenes in Constantinople. He was unable to do so, because the Inquisition did not yet exist and he did not have any authority within the Orthodox Byzantine church.

Cathars (?)

* In his anthology, Christian Dualist Heresies[41], Bernard Hamilton still calls the Patarenes of Constantinople Bogomils. But after further study of Eteriano's work – and five years later – he reached the conclusion that they were Cathars!

They cannot have been Bogomils, because Constantinople was Greek-oriented and *Contra Patarenos* was written in Latin for readers who spoke this language. And if they had been Bogomils, they would have been tracked down much sooner by the church and the worldly authorities. "Moreover," Hamilton says, "A body of anti-Bogomil theology and law already existed in the Byzantine empire." [42]
It is a drawback that Eteriano's description does not speak of a dualistic vision and that, for example, also the tradition of the Lord's Prayer is missing. For Hamilton, this is not an obstacle to continue speaking of western Cathars, who acted according to the model of the Italian Patarenes. And what is more obvious than that these Patarenes met in secret in the dissident religious community of the Latins?

---

[40] Y.Van Buyten & W. Vanderzeypen, *Katharen in Europa* (Cathars in Europe), (Castelnaudary 2009), 250
[41] Hamilton, *Heresies,* 1998
[42] This refers to the famous Panoplia Dogmatica by the monk Euthymios Zigabenos, written between 1110 and 1120. See Wickert, J., Die Panoplia Dogmatica des Euthymios Zigabenos, *Oriens Christianus* 8 (1910), 278 – 389.

* The Flemish author Willy Vanderzeypen supplies more munitions for the vision: Patarenes = Cathars. Similar to Hamilton, he also adapted his opinion after some time. In April 2009[43], he still called Eteriano's description of the group "too general and too stereotypical" to be able to qualify them as Cathar. However, a few months later, he recanted[44]: "In view of the size of the Italian population in Constantinople and the fact that primitive Cathars had settled in their hometowns Venice, Pisa and Genoa around that time, it is likely that Italian preachers or believers were present among the masses. Indeed Eteriano did not speak of dualism, and this makes identification uncertain. The teachings of duality were not properly elaborated there until the thirteenth century."

* A. Roach, too,[45] did not say more about the absence of dualistic religious ideas and did not preclude that those whom Hugo Eteriano referred to as Patarenes were those "who are called Bogomils by modern historians in the Orient and Cathars in the West." "It is possible that Hugh's heretics were members of 'the church of the Latins of Constantinople', as described by Rainerius Sacconi a century later."

Although the identification is not wholly watertight, the conclusion may be that at least one dissident religious group with a Cathar signature already existed in Constantinople during the second half of the twelfth century.

B)

The dissident "Church of the Latins" in Constantinople and its absence in the Inquisition Records
(13ᵗʰ century)

Absent from the inquisition records

We hardly know anything from the records of the Inquisition either, because the followers of this church have, remarkably, never been persecuted. Hamilton has consulted the papal archives[46] in this respect and did not find any letter that refers to persecution of dualists in the

---

[43] Y.Van Buyten & W. Vanderzeypen, *Katharen*, 250

[44] W. Vanderzeypen, e-mail message to author, December 29, 2009

[45] Roach, A., "The competition for souls : Sava of Serbia and consumer choice in religion in the thirteenth century Balkans", *Glasnik 50*,1 (2007) 1 – 34, 10, fn. 19

[46] The archives are complete since 1216

Latin Empire of Constantinople.[47] "It is true that the government under Baldwin II was weak and was afraid to track down the heretics amongst the Latin population, but that the pope did not try to intervene is surprising," Hamilton says. The fact that two important inquisitors were apparently aware of the Latin church, makes him look at those facts "with disbelief".

The idea forces itself that the pope of Rome was simply not aware of the existence of this Cathar church in Constantinople, although the Latin Empire of Constantinople came into his sphere of influence during the thirteenth century and two inquisitors reported about it! Apparently, those reports never reached the pope.

This raises questions about the mode of operation of the Inquisition. Was this the well-oiled machine as is always assumed?

Military service in Constantinople

For an answer, we must jump to the Inquisition in French Quercy, about which we know a lot of concrete details since the publication of Jean Duvernoy[48] from 2001.

The inquisitor in the Quercy, Pierre Cellan, was a Dominican and within his order, he was not unimportant. He was one the first to be converted by Dominicus in Toulouse and gave his order a significant financial injection during its initial stage. In the Quercy, he did his work as an inquisitor virtually alone. He had only the help of a secretary.[49] Cellan seems to have worked cautiously and imposed three "main sentences": going on a pilgrimage, supporting the poor and bearing crosses. However, for healthy and strong men, he had a special task in store: joining the army of the militarily rather ramshackle Latin Empire of Constantinople for two, three or even eight years!

The following example illustrates how Cellan dealt with the punishment and its motivation in 1241: "Étienne Galtier received bonshommes, accompanied them, listened to their preaching more than once, although he cannot remember how often, worshipped them several times, ate with them several times, gave them something of his

[47] Hamilton, *Dualist Heresy in the Latin Empire of Constantinople, 74*

[48] Duvernoy, Jean, *L'Inquisition en Quercy, Le registre des pénitences de Pierre Cellan 1241 – 1242,* (Castelnaud la Chapelle), 2001

[49] A. Roach, "Penance and the Making of the Inquisition in Languedoc", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 52 (2001), 409 – 433 en A. Albe, "L'hérésie Albigeoise et l'Inquisition en Quercy", *Revue de l'Histoire de l'Église de France* 1 (1910), 271 – 293, 412 – 428 en 468 - 472

possessions and believed that they were good people. He will stay in Constantinople for two years and bear crosses on his shoulders, the size of a palm leaf. He will set out this year, on the first Sunday of the Advent." [50] There was even a supporter of the Cathars in the town of Gourdon-en-Quercy, Piere de las Oleiras, who was supposed to go into exile in Constantinople for comparable "offences". Nothing was mentioned about his return in the verdict.[51]

Religious exile

A Cathar or a supporter of the Cathars sent to Constantinople by an inquisitor? But wasn't there a Cathar church?

Apparently, Cellan in the South of France knew nothing about it. Otherwise, he would not have imposed this punishment on 93 other (!) Cathars living in the Quercy. The convicted Cathars from the Quercy certainly do not seem to have met with a religious exile!

What should we think of the long journey to Constantinople? En route, they passed through regions where they may have received a warm welcome from their dualistic fellow brothers, for instance in Dalmatia, Bosnia, Macedonia and Bulgaria. Particularly if they took the well-known Via Egnatia to Constantinople – via Ohrid and Bitola –the encounters with the Bogomils there may have been like balm for their souls[52].

Inquisition in the Latin Empire?

How was it possible for the abovementioned lack of information to arise and how could it happen that the dissident Latin church of Constantinople wholly escaped the pope's repressive attention?

* The answer is probably to be found in the organisational structure of the Inquisition. The papal Inquisition was very unbureaucratic and centralist during the thirteenth century. Each inquisitor was personally responsible to the pope, but there was not a coordinating office. The result was that there was little exchange of

---

[50] Duvernoy, *Quercey,* 31
[51] Duvernoy, *Quercey*, 38, 39
[52] R. Mihajlovski, Bogomils on the Via Egnatia and in the valley of Pelagonia: the geography of a dualist movement, (in press). The article was to be published in *Heresis 2009*, the scientific magazine of the Centre d' Études Cathares in Carcassonne, but the publication has been delayed because of the regrettable dissolution, for economic reasons, of the CEC. I would like to thank Dr. Mihajlovski for granting permission to look at his article.

information and that people must have worked at cross-purposes[53]. Moreover, the papal policies – if they at all existed – were applied inadequately or were sometimes ignored due to all kinds of intrigues.

A striking example of this can be found in the relationship of pope Innocent IV to the Dominican inquisition around 1250[54]. In 1246, the pope requested the inquisitors via his legate to be a bit more lenient towards heretics, who reconciled themselves with the Roman faith. Repeated papal requests for moderation fell on deaf ears with the Dominicans.

In March 1249, the penitentiarius was ultimately personally ordered by the pope to convert, mitigate and even nullify sentences. Two inquisitors from Narbonne got a slap because of their excessive way of life. Unlike the abovementioned Pierre Celan in the Quercy[55], who had only one secretary at his disposal, the inquisition pair from Narbonne apparently provided itself with a great deal more "comforts" that were questionable.

The Dominicans[56] became furious about the papal interference: two inquisitors returned to their monastery. For more than six years, the Dominican order obstinately refused to partake of the Inquisition….

* A second reason for the lack of persecution in the occupied Latin Empire of Constantinople is to be found in the field of church politics. Since 1204, after the occupation, Rome was predominantly focused on restoring the unity with the Orthodox Church, to reclaim the Greek Church property from the Latin prelates as soon as possible and to make the Greek clergy pledge loyalty to the pope of Rome as quickly as possible.[57]

This evoked violent counter-reactions with the Orthodox clergy, who regularly spoke out very condescendingly about the Western prelates in detailed, infamous writings. One of the most remarkable pamphlets is that of the former metropolitan of Cyzicus, Constantin

---

[53] *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, third edition, eds. F.L. Cross en E.A. Livingstone , Oxford, 1997, 836 - 837

[54] For this topic, I was mainly guided by: Vanderzeypen W., Paus en Dominicanen in onmin (Pope and Dominicans at variance), *Als Catars E – magazine* 18 (2010), 47 - 51

[55] Infra, 13, fn 53

[56] Dossat, Y., *Les crises de l' Inquisition toulousaine au XIIIe siècle (1233-1273),* (Bordeaux 1959), exhibit no. 14

[57] Beck, Hans-Georg, *Vom Umgang mit Ketzern, der Glaube der kleinen Leute und die Macht der Theologen,* (München 1993), 84-85

Stilbès[58], from around 1213. Stilbès describes 104 grievances against his Western colleagues.

The irritations were so large that in Western eyes, the Bogomils were considered more devout than the Orthodox Greeks: (grievance 59) "They call the Bogomils the most religious amongst the Greeks." In other words: the Latins respected the Bogomils more than the orthodox clergy!

For the Orthodox, church authorities, this was obviously an insult with a vengeance! It seems that with Stilbès and his followers the irritations about the prelates from the West were much larger than their worries about the presence of purported heretics of Cathar type in the Latin Empire of Constantinople.

Apart from that, who would have had the energy to persecute these "heretics": the occupying forces or the Western prelates themselves? None of these possibilities seems to be obvious. In such a climate, possible papal persecution of the Cathars in the Latin Empire could absolutely not get off the ground.

It seems that the Cathars in the Latin Empire "profited" most from the occupation. During the thirteenth century, Constantinople was able to develop into a haven for western Cathars. Ironically, some of them were sent there by the Inquisition itself, as "punishment" for their support of Catharism in Western Europe!

Conclusions

- *There are strong indications that the dissident Church of the Latins in Constantinople must not only have existed during the thirteenth century, but already since the beginning of the twelfth century. During the twelfth century, the Western Patarenes (or Cathars) in Constantinople may have belonged to it. They were probably Italian merchants (Pisa, Genoa, Venice) who had taken along their Cathar bonshommes. Who else would have been able to administer the consolamentum to them?*
- *In their hometowns, these heretics of the Cathar type were referred to by the ancient Latin name of "Patarini". Obviously, this name was taken over, and was slightly graecicised.*

---

[58] Darrouzès, Jean, Le mémoire de Constantin Stilbès contre les Latins, *Revue des études byzantines,* 21 (1963), 50 – 100, 76

- *During the thirteenth century, this community was also partly nourished by Occitan Cathars who were exiled to Constantinople by the Inquisition.*
- *The small church of the Cathar westerners in Constantinople, the Latins, was able to develop undisturbed, because it was wholly overlooked by the papal persecution policy. This is also the reason why we have so little evidence about it.*
- *The "Ecclesia Latinorum" may have been an important pivotal point between Bogomils and Cathars. For instance, members of this church may have been very suitable to translate the Greek Bogomil texts into Latin, with which the Cathars were more familiar, and to take on the propagation of the true, Living Word in Western Europe.*
- *This Latin church of Constantinople still existed in 1250. Here we believe Rainerius Sacconi, who had, after all, been a Cathar deacon for 17 years. This would mean that this church must have existed for almost a century and a half.*

Some restraint is fitting with regard to these conclusions, because verifiable sources are scarce. Therefore, anyone wanting to study the relationship between Bogomils and Cathars, should in future take the dissident church of the Latins in Constantinople into consideration more explicitly. It is almost unthinkable that Bogomilism and Catharism did not have contact in this special, dissident church!

We are waiting for new sources in order to be able to write the next chapter about the crossroads of Bogomils and Cathars.

Dick VAN NIEKERK

CROSSROADS OF BOGOMILS AND CATHARS?
(12th - 13th century)

NEW LIGHT ON THE DISSIDENT "CHURCH OF THE LATINS" IN CONSTANTINOPLE[59]

- s u m m a r y-

In the historiography of Bogomils and Cathars, the so called Church of the Latins in Constantinople, was only mentioned in one breath with the other dissident community in the Byzantine capital: the Greek Bogomil Church.

Even nowadays, few sources are available about the "Ecclesia Latinorum". It is quite generally assumed that it was the religious community of the Latin Christians who, having attained true insight in Bulgaria, had settled in the Latin Empire of Constantinople (1204 – 1261).

However, it seems that this view needs to be revised. A few studies from the last decade cast another light on the dissident church of the Latins. There are ever more indications that this religious community already emerged during the twelfth century and that this church must have had strong ties with the large community of Italian merchants in Constantinople during the second half of the twelfth century.

---

[59] This text has been prepared for a communication during the 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies in Sofia, Bulgaria, August 2011. I have been fully surprised by the interest in this subject during the Congress. The long stream of e – mails which I received afterwards, especially from Lilyana Yordanova, inspired me to make some - hopefully - clarifying changes and additions in the original text.

Валентина
МИРОНСКА-
ХРИСТОВСКА

Институт за македонска
литература - Скопје

МАКЕДОНСКИОТ ИДЕНТИТЕТ И ИДЕНТИТЕТИТЕ НА БАЛКАНОТ

Во деветнаесеттиот век, поради општествено-политичките прилики, словенските, односно балканските народи колку што се обединувале толку и се разединувале. За ваквиот однос најмногу придонесувале политичките проекти: панславизмот, словенофилството, илиризмот, унијатството, идејата за Балканска федерација. Притоа наднационалните идентитети – словенство и јужнословенство – имале предност над националните идентитети кај народите (Украинец, Македонец, Србин, Хрват). Сепак, при конструирањето на идентитетот, и покрај различните влијанија, народот бил цврсто врзан за верата и јазикот, за својата автохтоност. Тоа го потврдува и примерот со проследувањето на конструирањето и развојот на македонскиот идентитет од античкото минато, средновековниот период, преку укинувањето на Охридската архиепископија (1767), поделбата на Македонија (1913), до денешното живеење. За жал грчката политика не само што го негира македонскиот идентитет туку таа има и ексклузивно право да го присвојува.

Наспрема односот на големите сили спрема Балканот како „друга Европа“[1], и самите балкански народи спрема себе имаат друг однос. Некои со својата политика се сметаат за доминантни (Грција, Бугарија, Србија, Албанија), некои ги сметаат за конфликтни (Босна и Херцеговина), а за некои Македонија не постои. Оттука и правото на западните теоретичари, кога говорат за криза на идентитетот, за

---

[1] Лори Бернард, *Балканска Европа* (Скопје: Матица македонска 2003), 5.

неговата менливост, динамичност, за балканизација, ги аплицираат своите теории врз примерот од Балканот. Па се прашувам дали е правилно да го имаат тоа право, кога „негативните“ појави во Западна Европа потоа ги аплицираат како негативни примери што како да потекнуваат од Балканот. За пример ќе го наведам терминот балканизација, кој всушност за првпат бил спомнат во New York Times во написот „Ратенау, голем индустријалец, предвидува балканизација на Европа“ (20. 12. 1918).

Дистинкцијата меѓу Западна Европа и Балканот е голема бидејќи во 19 век, при формирањето на државите и нациите, условите не биле исти. Во западноевропските земји националниот идентитет го втемелувале во тогаш формираните слободни држави од фрагментирани територии. На Балканот тоа се одвивало во комплексни политички услови, во неослободени земји, под влијание на политичките доктрини: либерализмот, национализмот и на револуционерниот национализам чиј интерес бил рушење на империите: Хабсбуршката, Отоманската и Руската, кои владееле со Балканот. Притоа империите биле составени од јадрата на нациите што опстојувале низ векови.

За тоа сведочи и фактот што во долговековниот период народите што се наоѓале под османлиската власт не го изгубиле својот идентитет, односно верата и јазикот. Пример ќе дадам со македонскиот народ, кој богослужбите ги одржувал на црковнословенски јазик. Уметниците – зографите ја продолжиле својата автентична работа, создавале творби за маченици и светци како бранители на верата на христијанството од исламот. Во народното творештво немало забрана на теми и мотиви. Во 16 век народниот јазик почнал да влегува во пишувана форма преку дамаскинарите, а потоа и преку мешаните зборници. Со овој чин на вградувањето на македонскиот народен јазик во писмената традиција започнало народното будење, националната преродба.

Токму јазикот е тој што ги обединува(л) словенските народи, а истовремено ја означувал и различноста, другоста. Во име на тоа биле пишувани граматики и речници паралелно на неколку јазици. Едните, на пример во Хрватска, паралели правеле со италијанскиот, австрискиот и унгарскиот јазик, другите, на пример во Македонија, паралели правеле со бугарскиот, српскиот, грчкиот и турскиот јазик. Со тоа биле поставени темелите на лингвистиката, компаративистиката и на балканологијата. За македонската културна историја од особено значење е *Четиријазичниот речник*

или *Речникот од четири јазика* (1802, Венеција) од Даниил Москополец напишан на грчки, албански, влашки и македонски јазик, кој е „основата на денешниот современ македонски литературен јазик" и „има сериозни претпоставки да биде важен објект на балканското јазикознание"[2].

За Балканот е карактеристично што до 19 век бил најважен верскиот идентитет. Наспрема османлискиот освојувач – муслиман идентификацијата на луѓето била христијани, каури. Православните цркви, кои биле клучни институции за еден народ и во политичка и во верска смисла, почнале да се осамостојуваат (по пат на афтокефалност) од Цариградската патријаршија: Грчката (1850), Романската (1872), Српската (1879), итн. Македонската православна црква до денешен ден не е призната од другите цркви. Одлуката од минатото во денешно време силно ја поддржува Српската православна црква. Воспоставувањето на Охридската архиепископија било во 1018 година за времето на цар Василиј II, а се смета дека нејзините корени се во Архиепископијата на Јустинијана Прима од 535 година. Пеќската архиепископија (Српската црква) била под јурисдикција на Охридската до 1219 година. Во Русија, кнезот Владимир од Киев во 988 година го прифатил византиското православие, кое било всушност воспоставено од св. Кирил и Методиј. Во 1767 г., под влијание на грчката политика и моќните фанариоти, било издејствувано ираде од султанот Мустафа III со кое било озаконето неканонското укинување на Охридската архиепископија, која била една од водечките црковни институции во Источната екумена. „Таа се карактеризирала со својата голема меѓубалканска соединувачка моќ и трпеливост меѓу народите"[3]. Таа била стожерот на словенската писменост. Во неа дејствувале св. Климент и св. Наум, учениците на св. Кирил и Методиј, кои бугарската наука исклучително ги присвојува во својата култура и историја. Но во 19 век сликата е друга. Македонскиот народ водел жестока борба за обнова на Охридската архиепископија, која била самостојна. Никој не ѝ дал

---

[2] Гане Тодоровски, *Македонската литература во XIX век* (2), *Избрани дела 7*: Белешки за првата печатена македонска книга (Скопје: Матица македонска 2007), 6.

[3] Иван Снегаров, *История на Охридската архиепископия-патриаршия*, т. 2 (София: Академично издателство Проф. Марин Дринов 1995), V.

никаква помош, туку напротив веднаш биле започнати договори за поделба на нејзините епархии меѓу Србија и Бугарија.

По укинувањето на Охридската архиепископија, Патријаршијата започнала да го воведува грчкиот јазик во богослужбите и во наставата во Македонија. Но и покрај тоа македонскиот народ го зачувал својот јазик. Тој паралелно водел борба за јазикот и за црква, бидејќи тие биле најважните чинители на идентитетот. Признавањето на православните цркви значело признавање на нацијата. Нанесениот најдиректен удар врз македонскиот идентитет го отворил македонското прашање со што започнала најдолгата борба за признавање на името, јазикот, територијата и идентитетот.

Во разрешувањето на егзистенционалното прашање на Балканот, која земја под чиј протекторат ќе потпадне, Македонија се наоѓала во неповолна ситуација. Помош не добивала од големите сили, не потпишала договор со ниедна страна за какво било заедништво, а Грција го имала моќниот политички фактор за асимилација на македонскиот народ – укинатата Охридска архиепископија. Во ваквите околности, наспрема грчката политика и туѓите пропаганди, за македонскиот народ бил прифатлив проектот на панславизмот и словенофилската идеологија. Руската православна црква требало да стане „трет Рим". Кај католичките Словени немало расположение за оваа идеја. Католичкиот панславизам постоел кај Чесите со цел да се ослободат од германската доминација. Поделени биле и интелектуалците на Балканот околу проектот на панславизмот, бидејќи едните сметале дека со прифаќањето на овој проект ќе биде прифатено покровителството на Русија и на нејзините сојузници Србија и Бугарија. Исто било и со идејата за илиризмот: дел сметале дека во него се кријат големохрватските претензии. Илиризмот бил иницииран од Људевит Гај, кој бил против германското и унгарското влијание, поради што повикувал на проучување на словенскиот јазик и историјата на јужнословенството. Во 1850 г. хрватските и српските интелектуалци потпишале договор за заеднички литературен јазик. Различните имагологии кај балканските народи го оневозможувале создавањето на единствениот и стабилен национален идентитет. Односно оние народи што ја добиле независноста имале можност слободно да го развиваат својот национален идентитет, додека неослободените народи, кои биле под разни влијанија и пропаганди, излезот го гледале и во

наднационалните идентитети. Притоа секако ја изразувале својата желба да ја зачуваат својата автохтоност, својата културна и јазична традиција.

Јазичното прашање носело договори, преговори, конфликти и полемики, поделеност меѓу интелектуалците, народот, бидејќи јазикот бил и е основа на националниот идентитет. Прашањето за македонскиот јазик во денешно време го проблематизира бугарската наука и политика. Според нив македонскиот јазик е само дијалект на бугарскиот јазик.

Во 50-тите години на 19 век постоела тенденција за создавање на заеднички „среден" јазик меѓу македонскиот и бугарскиот. Оваа тенденција била резултат на вербата во „братството", „словенството", како и на фактот што и Бугарија сè уште не била ослободена. Но до создавање на заеднички јазик не дошло бидејќи македонскиот преродбеник Партенија Зографски теоретски го поставил прашањето каков треба да биде писмениот јазик во Македонија и повел иницијатива за составување народна граматика и речник. Тој истакнал дека „нашиот јазик како што е познато се дели на две главни наречја, едното се говори во Бугарија и Тракија, а другото во Македонија" и нагласил дека славистите не го познаваат македонското наречје, „немаат за него никакво основно и определено познавање", па ја истакнал разликата меѓу двата јазика. Прво укажал на разликата во акцентот: „Македонското наречје обично сака да удри во началото на словата, а напротив другото на крајот"; а потоа се задржал уште на 13 разлики меѓу македонското и бугарското наречје[4].

Од средината на 19 век пред Балканот стоело прашањето за обединување или разединување!? Во периодот на формирањето на државите, големите сили различно ги насочиле своите интереси кон определени земји. Некои земји добиле отворена поддршка, како на пример Србија од Русија, но таа истовремено преговарала и со австриското кралство. Некои земји склучувале кралски бракови. На чело на Грција застанал католичкиот Баварец, кралот Отон. Бидејќи решавањето на романското прашање за обединувањето на Молдавија и Влашко било под силно руско влијание, романските либерали, за остварување на целта, на романскиот трон го поставиле Карл од Прусија. Кон Црна Гора силен интерес имале

---

[4] Партений Зографски, *Блъгарскы Книжици: Мисли за болгарскіи-отъ жзикъ*, чжсть I, кн. 1, (Іаннуари, 1858), 35–42.

Османлиската Империја, Русија, а подоцна и Србија, но нејзините водачи често тврделе дека се независни. Другите се наоѓале под директни управи: Војводина и Словенија од Виена; Епир, Тесалија, Босна, Херцеговина, Македонија, Тракија, Бугарија и Албанија биле под османлиска власт; Далмација била и под италијанско влијание; зоните на Воена Краина под Виена, Трансилванија под Унгарија; Хрватска и Славонија биле дел од унгарското кралство.

По ослободувањето, Грција, Србија, Романија, а потоа и Бугарија ја истакнале тенденцијата за освојување на териториите што сè уште се наоѓале под туѓа власт. Притоа тие ја нуделе својата „братска" помош. Таков однос имале Романците во унгарска Трансилванија, Србите во хабсбуршка Хрватска и во земјите под османлиска власт, Грците кон земјите што ја сочинувале Византија, Бугарија кон териториите од Санстефанскиот договор[5]. За тоа имале поддршка од големите сили. Македонија влегувала во плановите и на Србија и на Бугарија и на Грција. Ваквата политика кон Македонија трае и до денешен ден. Бугарија го негира македонскиот јазик, големосрпската политика го негира македонскиот народ, големоалбанската политика се стреми кон територијата на Македонија, додека Грција го негира македонскиот идентитет.

Во втората половина на 19 век во Македонија, покрај грчката, и бугарската и српската пропаганда започнале асимилаторска политика преку просветата. Кај македонскиот народ се засилила скепсата наспрема јужнословенството, односно панславизмот, бидејќи руските интелектуалци биле немоќни наспрема руската политика во правилното решавање на македонското прашање. Таа се спротивставувала и на идејата за унијатство со Римокатоличката црква, која од 50-тите години на 19 век била доста актуелна во Македонија. Македонскиот народ во неа гледал остварување на својата желба за самостојност односно на слоганот „Македонија на Македонците". Идејата за унијатството била масовно ширена, во 1858 г. во Солун било отворено католичко училиште, а во некои епархии, како во кукушката, била и прифатена бидејќи мисијата ветувала автономија т.е. воведување на

---

[5] Марк Мазовер, *Балканот кратка историја* (Скопје: Евро-Балкан пресс 2000), 129.

црковнословенскиот јазик во богослужбите, назначување на словенски владици и отворање училишта на мајчин јазик.[6]

Од 50-тите години на 19 век македонскиот народ сѐ повеќе верувал само во себе и во својата самостојна борба. Започнале да дејствуваат низа книжевни и револуционерни друштва како „Македонски глас“, „Македонско благотворно друштво“, „Александар Македонски“, „Таен македонски комитет“, „Словеномакедонска книжевна дружина“, „Млада македонска книжевна дружина“ со печатениот орган „Лоза“. Нејзините членови, од бугарската страна, биле наречени сепаратисти, бидејќи јасно ја искажале својата определба за самостојност. Потоа е формирана „Македонска лига“, односно Првата привремена влада, која со Уставот за идното државно устројство на Македонија од 1880 г. во член 103 истакнала дека територијата што вековито го носи името Македонија треба да создаде автономна држава на македонскиот народ и на другите националности што живеат во нејзините граници: Турци, Арнаути, Грци, Евреи, Власи, Ѓупти и други. Бил формиран и Воен штаб со свој манифест во кој на македонските синови им било порачано да не им се верува на соседите „кои како змии се вовлекоа меѓу нас и нѐ мамат за свои интереси. Здружете се сите под македонското знаме и кренете го високо, високо во борбата за слобода и своја независност. Само здружени можеме да ја сочуваме нашата мила татковина Македонија за себе и да се здобиеме со своја апсолутна автономија“[7].

Приликите на Балканот биле толку зависни од геополитичките и економските потреби на западните земји што во низата проекти ќе го наведам и планот за Балканска федерација. Планот бил инициран од страна на полскиот кнез Адам Јежи Чарториски (Adam Jerzy Czartoryski), министер за надворешни работи на Русија (1804–1806), за потребата на цар Александар I да се спротивстави на планот на Наполеон Бонапарта да ја подели Османлиската Империја и да завладее со дел од териториите. Во втората половина на 19 век, идејата за Балканска федерација за

---

[6] Валентина Миронска-Христовска, *Просветителството во Македонија* (Скопје, ИМЛ 2005), 63.
[7] Славко Димевски, Владо Поповски, Светомир Шкариќ, Михајло Апостолски, *Македонската лига и уставот за државно уредување на Македонија 1880* (Скопје, Мисла 1985), 326–327.

216

JOURNAL OF HISTORY   year. XLVII, N° 1, 2012

македонските интелектуалци била најприфатливата опција. Тие мислеле дека Македонија во неа ќе стекне автономност. Но Грција, Србија и Бугарија, идејата за големотериторијалност ја манифестирале преку планот за Балканска федерација, а во нивните планови Македонија била споменувана само во однос на тоа како ќе биде поделена. Поделбата била извршена со Букурешкиот договор во 1913 г. меѓу: Грција (50% – Егејска Македонија), Србија (38,34% – Вардарска Македонија, денешна Р. Македонија), Бугарија (9,54% – Пиринска Македонија) и Албанија (1,775)[8].

Во повеќето книги посветени на Балканот и идентитетите на Балканот, за македонскиот идентитет воопшто не се пишува или тој се врамува во контекстот на грчкиот или бугарскиот, како на пример во книгите: *Imagining the Balkans* (1997) од Марија Тодорова (Maria Todorova); *Balkan Identities Nation and Memory* (2004) во која се застапени текстови за Грција, Хрватска, Бугарија, Албанија, Косово, Турција, Романија; *Greece and the Balkans* (2003) од Димитрис Циовас (Dimitris Tziovas) и други. Во многубројните книги, пак, во кои се пишува за Македонија, во индексот на имиња македонскиот народ, македонскиот јазик и Македонската црква воопшто не се споменуваат. Нејзините културно-историски придобивки и личности се преземаат најмногу во грчката и бугарската традиција. Поради овој факт, а во контекст на темата, многу накратко ќе се обидам да дадам еден пресек на развојот на македонскиот литературен, културен идентитет, а со тоа и на националниот идентитет. Конструирањето на македонскиот идентитет влече корени уште од античкото време, од македонските цареви, од походот на Александар Македонски и името Македонија што постои со милениуми. Во денешно време грчката политика остро го негира овој факт, а со тоа го негира македонското име и идентитет и го блокира влезот на Македонија во ЕУ и НАТО. Правото на ваквиот став произлегува од мистификацијата што била направена во 19 век со биографијата на Александар Македонски. Германскиот историчар Дројзен го согледал обединувањето на грчките градови во држава во походот на Александар Македонски, и тој требало да претставува пример за обединувањето на германската земја, а во Бизмарк требало да го видат Александар, поради што таа се наоѓала речиси во секоја граѓанска библиотека и секој разбирал: Македонија била Пруска, Грција Германија, Азија

---

[8] *Сто македонски години*, редактор Јован Павловски (Скопје: МИ-АН 2004), 136.

Европа.[9] Врз основа на овој податок Хаген Шулце, бележејќи за
блокадата на Македонија од страна на Грција, истакнува дека
Грција, со претензијата таа да биде единствениот наследник на
македонското царство на Филип II и на Александар Велики, го
прави крајно сомнителен континуитетот меѓу старата Хелада и
модерната грчка држава[10]. А дистинкции меѓу Македонците и
Хелените постојат уште во говорите на Демостен против Филип.
„Зар може да биде нешто поново од тоа дека еден маж Македонец
војува со Атињаните и ги расправа работите на Хелените?“[11]
Демостен во говорите нагласувал дека делата на Филип му биле
само за слава и дека друг македонски крал не правел така, дека
неговата гарда била составена од туѓинците Македонци[12] итн.
Јуџин Борза во книгата *Во сенката на Олимп: појавата на
Македон*, користејќи низа извори, пишува за различниот етнички
идентитет на Македонците и Хелените, за македонскиот јазик како
различен од грчкиот, за македонските обичаи што биле различни од
оние на грчките градови-држави, истакнувајќи дека Македонците
како народ биле исклучувани од панхеленските фестивали на кои
било дозволувано да учествуваат само Грци итн.[13]

Потоа, со населувањето на словенските племиња на речиси
цела Македонија, „новодојденците се мешаат со староседелците,
асимилирајќи ги мошне брзо и создавајќи го со тоа идниот етнички
амалгам   на   склавините   или   македонските   Словени   т.е.
Македонците“[14]. Од тој период македонскиот идентитет бил
вградуван не само на територијата на Македонија туку и на
Балканот и пошироко. За тоа се сведоштва придобивките од
византиската цивилизација, како традицијата на словенската
писменост, на старословенскиот јазик, кој бил создаден врз основа
на старомакедонскиот јазик и кој го овозможил развојот на
литературниот и културниот идентитет на сите словенски народи,
била отворена Охридската школа, била втемелена Охридската

---

[9] Hagen Šulce, *Država i nacija u evropskoj istoriji* (Beograd: Filip Višnjić 2002), 120.

[10] Šulce, *Država*, 222.

[11] Демостен, *Говори*, превод од старогрчки Даница Чадиковска (Скопје: Култура
1995), 23.

[12] Демостен, *Говори*, 48.

[13] Јуџин Н. Борза, *Во сенката на Олимп: појавата на Македон* (Скопје: Патрија
2004), 98–108.

[14] Гане Тодоровски, *Македонија културно наследство*: Македонија – вековита и
непореклива (Скопје: Мисла 1995), 8.

архиепископија, христијанството го започнало својот поход, а во 10 век од Македонија па до Јужна Франција се проширило првото реформаторско движење – богомилството. Во средновековниот период македонскиот идентитет бил вградуван во иконата, базиликите, катедралните цркви со нивната украсна пластика, илуминираните ракописи, фреските, за кои византологот Габриел Мие, осознавајќи ја посебноста на сликарството во Македонија, го вовел поимот „македонска школа"[15].

Еден од најистакнатите зографи е Дичо Зограф, кој оставил траги во многубројни цркви во родното место – Тресонче, во Скопско, Охридско, Серско, Драмско, Врањско, Кумановско, како и во Албанија и Бугарија. Во длабините на дрвото биле изрезбани битовите сцени, свирачите на тапани и зурли, македонските ора и носии, автопортретите на мијачките копаничари со нивната репрезентативна мијачка носија, која претставува препознатливост пред светската јавност. Традицијата и обичаите на мијачката свадба на 12 јули – Петровден се зачувани до денешно време, секое лето како културна перформанса се изведува во Галичник. Меѓу многубројните специфични елементи на оваа македонска традиција е и обичајот: „*Отидовме на гробишта / и со вино, свирка и тапан / си ги поканивме мртвите / да ни дојдат на свадба, / да не се заборавиме /*"[16].

Во 19 век траги за македонскиот идентитет наоѓаме и во градителството, архитектурата, во дејноста на Андреј Дамјанов, која се смета дека претставува пример „за нова програма во архитектурата". Тој градел цркви не само во Македонија туку и во Ниш, Пирот и Смедерево (Србија), Сараево и Мостар (Босна). Тој на своето творештво му дал белег на богата имагинација и смели просторни зафати, со што ја утврдил, во своето време, доминацијата на македонската сакрална архитектура на Балканот[17].

Од исклучително значење за македонскиот идентитет е и дејноста на македонските мелографи од 19 век, кои ја продолжиле работата на Јоан Хармосин и Крстен-Калистрат Зографски во манастирите „Св. Јован Бигорски" и „Пречиста Кичевска", а кои се

---

[15] Анета Серафимова, *Македонија културно наследство*: Среден век (Скопје: Мисла 1994), 109–115.

[16] Петре Андреевски, *Тоа Тогаш*: Македонска свадба (Скопје: Табернакул 2007), 201.

[17] *Македонски деветнаесетти век 1800–1902* (Скопје: МИ-АН 2007), 29–30.

занимавале со истражување на музичката култура и компонирање врз основа на неовизантиската мелодија и современите духовни текови на нивното време[18]. Тие го следеле опусот на композиторот Јоан Кукузел од Македонија, кој во средновековната музичка продукција направил реформи познати во музичката наука како ars nova.

Македонскиот идентитет е истакнат во многубројни творби од 19 век, преку кои македонскиот народ бил повикуван на неговото славно минато, на неговото револуционерно движење, на неговиот национален идентитет. Во нив се бележело дека клетиот Македонец е опкружен со дерикожи, крвопии, врагови и мачители, од секоја страна со злоба, и дека клетиот Македонец од секоја страна е врзан со окови. Некои автори, како Никола Македонски, Димитар Македонски, во своето име го вградувале својот национален идентитет. Македонски бил и најчестиот псевдоним во периодиката. „Македонецу, оди напред, како големиот Александар, кој направил големи дела и ги покорил речиси сите царства со својата власт... Барај слобода... Време дојде, народното ни свето знаме е веќе отворено и се развива по сите височини на македонските планини...[19]

Во почетокот на 20 век Македонците секојдневно пишувале за состојбата во Македонија бидејќи ја чувствувале нејзината поделба. Димитрија Чуповски во статијата „Македонија и Македонците (Културно-историски преглед на Македонија)" (1913) истакнал дека македонската култура почнала да врши големо влијание врз словенскиот свет од времето на светите солунски браќа Кирил и Методиј од пред 1000 години; дека архитектурата од средновековниот период е дело на македонски раце и дека: „Дури и денеска архитектурата, градежништвото и трговијата на Балканскиот Полуостров – во Бугарија, Србија, Романија, Грција – се наоѓа претежно во рацете на Македонците. Тоа е вистината што никој не може да ја одречува"[20].

Во 1913 г. Македонија сепак била поделена. Настапил терор во нејзините распарчени делови, прогон и геноцид во Егејска

---

[18] Цветан Грозданов, *Манастир Свети Јован Бигорски*: Свети Јован Бигорски во историјата на културата и уметноста на Македонија (Скопје 1994), 17.

[19] Никола Македонский, *Македонски-сжлзи или Злощастна Македония* (Търново 1887), 32–79.

[20] Блаже Ристовски, *Димитрија Чуповски и македонската национална свест* (Скопје: Плус продукција, 2009), 98–99.

Македонија од страна на грчката власт за време на Грчката граѓанска војна 1946–1949 г. Низ него поминал и македонскиот академик, писателот Ташко Георгиевски, кој забележал за грчката власт, бидејќи не успеала да им ја молкне устата, да им ја набрка песната, да им напика туѓи зборови во устата, а ни со зандани да им ја зашие: „се досетуваш дека има и други методи за бришење, во буквална смисла, со бришење на самиот Човек! Не ти останува ништо друго туку да го протераш со сè неговата уста во неврат, усвит!“[21]

Нивните усти не го заборавија мајчиниот збор, туку напротив тој остана во нив. Јазикот, народните обичаи, традицијата, беа оружјето со кое македонскиот народ си го одбрани и го зачува својот идентитет, кој има посебно значење во 21 век кога повторно има радикални промени како во 19 век. Европа е под влијание на „тековната социополитичка револуција“, и сè повеќе се става акцент на општествата, на социеталниот идентитет, на социеталната безбедност, која ги штити сувереноста и идентитетот, односно точното колективно име, митот за заеднички предци и историски спомени, елементите на разликување на заедничката култура, чувството на солидарност за значајните сектори за населението[22]. Затоа е потребно во контекст на балканските идентитети да се зборува и за македонскиот идентитет, кој опстојува низ векови.

---

[21] Ташко Георгиевски, в. *Време*, бр. 1425, 19.07.2008.
[22] Оле Вевер, Бери Бузан, Мортен Келструп, Пјер Леметр, *Идентитет, миграција и новата безбедносна агенда во Европа* (Скопје: Македонски печат 2010), 52.

Валентина МИРОНСКА-ХРИСТОВСКА

MACEDONIAN IDENTITY AND IDENTITIES IN THE BALKANS

- s u m m a r y-

Identities in the Balkans have been formed within the context of different cultural, linguistic, religious and written traditions. Their creation was influenced by political projects such as: Pan-Slavism, Slavophilism, Illyrianism, Uniatism, and the Balkan Federation, which had both united and divided the peoples of the Balkans. Apart from various influences, identities were closely related to religion and language as well.

A study of the construction and dynamic development of Macedonian identity beginning from ancient history, the medieval period, through the abolition of the Ohrid Archbishopric, its division in 1913, and the aftermath of the Second World War indicates the features and specificities of Macedonian identity that distinguish it from other identities in the Balkans and have been successfully preserved to this day.

During the solving of the existential issues in the Balkans and deciding which country was to fall under whose domain, Macedonia was in a rather unfavourable position. It did not receive any help from the great powers, it had not signed any treaties with any party for a union of any kind, and Greece had a powerful political card in its hands concerning the assimilation of the Macedonian people: the abolition of the Archbishopric. In 19th century Macedonia was part of Serbian, as well as Bulgarian and Greek plans. For that since the 1850s the Macedonian people began to increasingly believe only in themselves and their independent struggle. But the politics towards Macedonia has persisted to this day. Bulgaria denies the existence of the Macedonian language, Greater-Serbian politics denies the existence of the Macedonian Church, Greater-Albanian politics lays claim on Macedonian territories, whereas Greece denies the Macedonian identity.

Language, folk customs, tradition, those were the weapons with which the Macedonian people defended and preserved its identity, particularly important in the 21st century, which has witnessed similar

radical changes as in the 19th century. Europe is under the influence of the "current socio-political revolution" and greater emphasis is placed on societies and societal identities. Social security is protecting the sovereignty and identity, that is, the correct collective name, the myth of common ancestors and historical memories, the distinctive features of shared culture, the feeling of solidarity with important segments of the population. It is therefore necessary, in the context of Balkan identities, to speak of the Macedonian identity, which has persevered for centuries.

Надежда
ЦВЕТКОВСКА

Институт за национална
историја – Скопје

ПАРЛАМЕНТАРНИТЕ ИЗБОРИ ВО ВАРДАРСКИОТ ДЕЛ НА МАКЕДОНИЈА ВО 1931 ГОДИНА

Апсолутизмот на кралот Александар, воведен со Диктатурата во 1929 година, се покажал несоодветен и на внатрешен[1] и на надворешнополитички план.[2] Како резултат на тоа, во есента, а особено кон крајот на 1931 година, под притисок на изострените класни и национални спротивности и на јавното мислење, дошло до ослабување на Диктатурата и до подобрување на општите политички услови во земјата. Кралот Александар, со цел да се извлече од создадената положба, на 3 септември 1931 година донел

[1] На внатрешен план се откривала слабоста на апсолутистичкиот режим бидејќи не биле постигнати ни внатрешниот мир ни стабилноста на династичко-централистичкиот систем. Многу знаци покажувале дека апсолутизмот го слабеел, а не го јакнел тој режим. Исто така, и сè поголемата огорченост поради репресивните мерки на режимот му сигнализирале на Дворот деке е препорачливо одговорноста за тоа да се префрли и на други фактори или барем да се подели со политичари избрани од Дворот, т.е. се наметнувала потреба за воспоставување уставен и парламентарен поредок. Тодор Стојков, „Грађанска опозиција и парламентарни избори од 8 новембра 1931 године“, *Историја XX века, Зборник радова, IV* (Београд: Институт за савремену историју, 1962), 352-356

[2] На надворешен план се покажало дека апсолутизмот бил неблагопријатен и во буржоаско-демократските влади во сојузничките земји (Франција и Англија) од една страна, а од друга, тој бил изложен и на сè поостри напади во речиси целиот демократски печат во Европа. Исто така, апсолутизмот не претставувал сигурна основа за влегување на странскиот капитал во државата. Стојков, „Грађанска опозиција“, 252-66, 303

нов Устав, со кој се предвидувало враќање на парламентарниот
живот. По донесувањето на Уставот и врз негова основа биле доне-
сени повеќе закони со кои било регулирано изборното право.[3] На 23
септември 1931 година бил објавен Указот за избор на народни
пратеници, со што изборот требало да се изврши на 8 ноември
истата година, а новоизбраното Народно собрание да се состане на
7 декември 1931 година во Белград.

Парламентарните избори во Кралството Југославија, а во тој
контекст и во Вардарска бановина[4] во чии рамки се наоѓал
вардарскиот дел на Македонија, биле спроведени по околии, кои

---

[3] На 7 септември 1931 година кралот го објавил Законот за избирачки списоци; на
10 септември 1931 година – Законот за избор на народни пратеници за Народното
собрание (со измени и дополнувања од 26 септември 1931 година); на 18
септември 1931 година – Законот за здруженија, собири и договори и на 30
септември 1931 година – Законот за избор на сенатори. В.: Prof. dr. Ferdo
Čulinović, *Dokumenti o Jugolaviji* (Zagreb, 1968), 312.

[4] Со Законот „за името и поделба на Кралството на управни подрачја“, донесен на
3 октомври 1929 година, била извршена нова административно-територијална
поделба на земјата. Кралството Југославија било поделено на 9 бановини
(наместо на 33 области), околии и општини. Оваа поделба била потврдена со
Уставот од 3 септември 1931 година. Со оваа поделба била разбиена национално-
историската структура на државата, со исклучок на Словенија и на вардарскиот
дел на Македонија, каде што негацијата на историските целини не можела да се
спроведе. Новата поделба значела поголем степен на централизација: со неа биле
обезбедени ефектите на државниот и на националниот унитаризам, т.е.
„интегралното југословенство“. Вардарска бановина, со седиште во Скопје, ја
опфаќала територијата на вардарскиот дел на Македонија, дел од Јужна Србија и
речиси цела Метохија. Белградската влада намерно ги поврзала македонските и
српските краишта во една административна единица за да може на тој начин,
меѓу другото, да го негира постоењето на македонскиот народ, односно да го
намали значењето на македонското население во државата. Вардарска бановина
била поделена на 44 околии, од кои: 29 околии припаѓале на вардарскиот дел на
Македонија (Галичка, Горнополошка, Долнополошка, Кривопаланечка,
Жеглиговска, Кратовска, Битолска, Горнодебарска, Кичевска, Прилепска, Охрид-
ска, Преспанска Струшка, Крушевска, Мариовска, Поречка, Кочанска,
Малешевска, Овчеполска, Радовишка, Царевоселска, Штипска, Велешка, Дојран-
ска, Гевгелиска, Неготинска, Кавадаречка, Струмичка и Скопска); 8 околии
припаѓале на делот од Јужна Србија (Босилградска, Јабланичка, Лесковачка,
Масуричка, Пчињска, Полјаничка, Прешевска и Власотиначка); 7 околии
припаѓале на Метохија (Гниланска, Горска, Грачаничка, Качаничка, Неродимска,
Подгорска и Шарпланинска). Надежда Цветковска, „Локалната управа во
вардарскиот дел на Македонија меѓу двете светски војни (1919-1941)“, *Историја,
год. XXXIV/XXXV/1-4* (Скопје: Сојузот на друштвата на историчарите на
Република Македонија, 1998/1999), 59-61.

биле сметани како изборни единици. Во бановините, кои имале повеќе административни околии, било извршено спојување на околиите, кои во поглед на изборот на народни пратеници се сметале како една изборна единица. Така и во Вардарска бановина биле споени следниве околии: Горнодебарска и Галичка, Гевгелиска и Дојранска, Малешевска и Царевоселска, Неготинска и Радовишка, Битолска и Мариовска, Скопска и Качаничка (сите припаѓале на вардарскиот дел на Македонија, со исклучок на Качаничка околија); Шарпланинска и Горска, Неродимска и Подгорска (кои му припаѓале на делот од Метохија).[5]

За овие парламентарни избори во Народното собрание бројот на пратеничките мандати изнесувал 306, заедно со носителот на „земската кандидатска листа“, а според поделбата на пратеничките мандати по бановини, сразмерно со бројот на жители, тој бил следниот: Дравска бановина – 25, Савска бановина – 60, Врбаска бановина – 20, Приморска бановина – 20, Дринска бановина – 37, Зетска бановина – 20, Дунавска бановина – 51, Моравска бановина – 32 и Вардарска бановина – 37, од кои 25 се однесувале само на вардарскиот дел на Македонија.[6] На изборите била истакната само една кандидатска листа, чиј носител бил генералот Петар Живковиќ, претседател на владата и министер за внатрешни работи, и истата, под број 11 605, ја одобрил белградскиот Касационен суд на 29 октомври 1931 година.[7] Со истакнувањето на Петар Живковиќ за носител на владината „земска кандидатска листа“ започнала предизборната кампања.

Комунистичката партија на Југославија (КПЈ) целосно ги бојкотирала овие избори со повик да се апстинира и во врска со тоа, и во вардарскиот дел на Македонија спроведува успешна агитација. Граѓанската опозиција[8] на овие избори апстинирала бидејќи сѐ

---

[5] *Закон о избору народних посланика за Народну скупштину од 10 септембра 1931 год., - са изменама и допунама од 26 септембра 1931 г., - и 24 марта 1933 г., Статистика избора народних посланика за Прву Југословенску Народну Скупштину одржаних 8 новембра 1931 год.* израдио Милоје М. Сокиќ (Београд, 1935), 4, 296-298.

[6] *Статистика избора народних посланика*, 3.

[7] *Статистика избора народних посланика*, 3.

[8] По воведувањето на Диктатурата (6 јануари 1929 година) биле оформени два опзициски центри: белградски и загрепски. Белградскиот опозициски центар го сочинувале делот на прваците околу Главниот одбор на Радикалната партија, дел од Раководството на Демократската партија на чело со Љуба Давидовиќ, Земјоделската партија, Југословенската муслиманска организација (ЈМО) и

уште не била организирана да истапи против владата. Со оглед на тоа што на овие парламентарни избори била истакната единствена изборна листа, изборите на тој начин добиле – како што било пишувано во повеќе наврати во странскиот печат – во извесна смисла карактер на народен референдум.

Најголем број пратенички кандидати на изборната листа на Петар Живковиќ, на територијата на Кралството Југославија, а во тој контекст и во вардарскиот дел на Македонија, биле дисиденти од пред шестојануарските политички партии. Многумина од нив веќе биле пратенички кандидати на парламентарните избори пред 6 јануари 1929 година. Доста од нив веќе биле и народни пратеници. Тие или уште порано или за време на распишувањето на изборите го напуштиле опозицискиот табор. Петар Живковиќ со задоволство ги примал во своите редови, од една страна, поради тоа што се сметало дека на тој начин ќе привлече поголем број приврзаници од поранешните политички партии да излезат на изборите, а од друга страна, за да им се покаже на политичките кругови во странство на колкаво интересирање во земјата наишле последните политички мерки на југословенските владејачки кругови.

Во составувањето на кандидатските листи се настојувало во изборните околии во што поголем број да бидат истакнати по два и повеќе кандидати. Притоа посебно се водело сметка противкандидатите во иста изборна околија да бидат припадници на старите партии, и тоа различни. Целта на оваа тактика била, пред сѐ, во тоа што поголем број избирачи да се привлечат на избирачките места. Исто така, во изборните околии со повеќе противкандидати околиските началници, по правило, форсирале само еден од нив, за да изгледа дека другите се во опозиција спрема власта. Сето тоа требало да создаде впечаток кај избирачките маси дека навистина се избира, а не само дека се гласа. За владејачките врвови било важно тоа што поголем број избирачи да излезат на избирачките места, бидејќи без оглед на тоа за кого се гласа, сите гласови, земено во целина, одделе на една – владејачката, листа.

Бидејќи на изборите се одело само со владината листа, не можело да има сомневање во поглед на прикажувањето на исходот

прваците на Словенечката људска странка (СЛС) по истапувањето на Антон Корошец од владата на Петар Живковиќ во септември 1930 година. Загрепскиот опозициски центар го претставувале, главно, Хрватската селска странка (ХСС) и Самостојната демократска странка.

од изборите. Владата имала одврзани раце и со сигурност можело да се очекува дека без оглед на вистинските резултати, ќе биде објавена импозантна цифра за бројот на оние што гласале. Се разбира дека во текот на предизборната кампања бил вложен максимален напор што поголем број гласачи навистина да излезат на избирачките места. Во тоа се ангажирале не само пратеничките кандидати туку се настојувало што поинтензивно да се ангажираат и службениците на државниот апарат, не исклучувајќи ја и жандармеријата.

Во пресрет на самите избори, Петар Живковиќ на секој избирач му упатил лично писмо со повик на 8 ноември да излезе на избирачкото место. По селата тие писма на гласачите морале да им ги предадат селските старешини, со напомена дека на 8 ноември мора да се гласа.

На „земската кандидатска листа" на генералот Петар Живковиќ, на целата територија на Кралството Југославија биле истакнати 652 кандидатски листи по околии, и тоа: во Дунавска бановина – 108, во Дравска бановина – 56, во Савска бановина – 121, во Врбаска бановина – 41, во Приморска бановина – 38, во Дринска бановина – 84, во Моравска бановина – 65, во Вардарска бановина – 85, во Зетска бановина – 51, во Белград – 3 кандидатски листи. Во Вардарска бановина од 85 кандидатски листи, 60 биле истакнати во околиите во вардарскиот дел на Македонија.[9]

Според пописот на населението од 31 март 1931 година, Кралството Југославија имало 13 930 918 жители. На денот на изборите биле запишани 3 483 349 избирачи, од кои на гласање излегле 2 342 520 гласачи, а апстинирале 1 140 829. Во Вардарска бановина имало 1 575 185 жители; запишани избирачи имало 384 184, од кои на гласање излегле 279 326 гласачи, а апстинирале 107 857. Изборите биле спроведени во 522 општини и на 714 гласачки места. Само во вардарскиот дел на Македонија имало 949 958 жители; бројот на запишани избирачи изнесувал 256 589, од кои на гласање излегле 179 230; изборите биле спроведени во 326 општини и на 450 гласачки места.[10]

Според официјалните податоци, резултатите од парламен-тарните избори одржани на 8 ноември 1931 година во околиите во вардарскиот дел на Македонија биле следните:

---

[9] *Статистика избора народних посланика*, 9.
[10] *Статистика избора народних посланика*, 9, 139-168.

1. Во **Битолска околија** изборите биле спроведени во 13 општини и на 17 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 8 928 избирачи, гласале 6 219. Од двајцата пратенички кандидати, Никола Марковиќ[11] добил 3 882, а Јован Алтипармаковиќ – 2 337 гласа.

1а. Во **Мариовска околија** изборите биле спроведени во 6 општини и на 23 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 13 190 избирачи, гласале 7 679. Од двајцата пратенички кандидати, Никола Марковиќ добил 4 953, а Јован Алтипармаковиќ – 2 726 гласа.

Со оглед на тоа што овие две околии биле споени во една изборна единица **(Битолска и Мариовска)**, за народен пратеник бил избран **Никола Марковиќ**, адвокат од Белград.

2. Во **Велешка околија** изборите биле спроведени во 28 општини и на 33 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 10 698 избирачи, гласале 7 940. Од четворицата пратенички кандидати, Александар Аксентиевиќ добил 6 244, Алексо Т. Левковиќ – 213, Томо Соврчиќ – 860 и Тодор М. Живковиќ – 643 гласа. За народен пратеник бил избран **Александар Аксентиевиќ**, пензионер од Белград.

3. Во **Горнополошка околија** изборите биле спроведени во 11 општини и на 16 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 8 489 избирачи, гласале 5 315. Од двајцата пратенички кандидати, Кадри Салиевиќ добил 2 437, а Арсо Фотириќ – 2 878 гласа. За народен пратеник бил избран **Арсо Фотириќ**, рентиер од Белград.

4. Во **Долнополошка околија** изборите биле спроведени во 20 општини и на 35 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 18 947 избирачи, гласале 12 202. Единствениот пратенички кандидат **Марко Петровиќ,** учител во пензија од Тетово, добил 12 202 гласа и **истиот** бил избран за народен пратеник.

5. Во **Галичка околија** изборите биле спроведени во 8 општини и на 9 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 4 068 избирачи, гласале 2 270. Од тројцата пратенички кандидати, д-р Томо Смилјаниќ добил 2 268 гласа; Јован В. Велиќ не добил ниту еден глас и Златко Бајрам добил 2 гласа.

5а. Во **Горнодебарска околија** изборите биле спроведени во 7 општини и на 9 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 8 910

---

[11] **Напомена:** Имињата и презимињата на лицата наведени во текстот (како кандидати за народни пратеници) се наведени според тоа како се водени од српската администрација со задолжително -*иќ*, така што и тие што биле Македонци, по сила на Законот, морале да ги променат презимињата и имињата.

избирачи, гласале 4 782. Од тројцата пратенички кандидати, д-р Томо Смилјаниќ добил 4 767, Јован В. Велиќ – 5 и Златко Бајрам – 8 гласа.

Со оглед на тоа што овие две околии биле споени во една изборна единица **(Галичка и Горнодебарска),** за народен пратеник бил избран **д-р Томо Смилјаниќ,** професор на Трговската академија во Скопје.

6. Во **Дојранска околија** изборите биле спроведени во 3 општини и на 5 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 2 515 избирачи, гласале 1 932. Од двајцата пратенички кандидати, Димитрие Р. Бешировиќ добил 1 711 гласа, а Ристо Г. Јанчиќ – 221 глас.

6а. Во **Гевгелиска околија** изборите биле спроведени во 6 општини и на 8 избирачки места. Од вкупно запишани 3 879 избирачи, гласале 3 529. Од двајцата пратенички кандидати, Димитрие Р. Бешировиќ добил 3 289, а Ристо Г. Јанчиќ – 240 гласа.

Со оглед на тоа што овие две околии биле споени во една изборна единица **(Гевгелиска и Дојранска),** за народен пратеник бил избран **Димитрие Р. Бешировиќ**, трговец од Гевгелија.

7. Во **Жеглиговска околија** изборите биле спроведени во 20 општини и на 26 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 15 514 избирачи, гласале 11 229. Од четворицата пратенички кандидати, Ќиро Маневиќ добил 222, Јован Алексиќ – 2 689, Томо Глигориевиќ – 3 504 и Јован С. Довезенски – 4 814. За народен пратеник бил избран **Јован С. Довезенски**, пензионер од Куманово.

8. Во **Кривопаланечка околија** изборите биле спроведени во 10 општини и на 16 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 9 771 избирач, гласале 7 384. Од тројцата пратенички кандидати, Божо Јокановиќ добил 155, Стаменко Стошиќ – 3 762 и Петар Мршавеловиќ – 3 467 гласа. За народен пратеник бил избран **Стаменко Стошиќ**, благајник на општина Стајевачка.

9. Во **Кичевска околија** изборите биле спроведени во 13 општини и на 16 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 8 904 избирачи, гласале 5 690. Единствениот пратенички кандидат **Ставро К. Трпковиќ**, рентиер од Белград, добил 5690 гласа и **истиот** бил избран за народен пратеник.

10. Во **Крушевска околија** изборите биле спроведени во 12 општини и на 13 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 5 974 избирачи, гласале 4 657. Од тројцата пратенички кандидати, Никола Ѓорѓевиќ добил 1 905, Стеван Ј. Радујко – 389 и Душан Антониевиќ

– 2 363 гласа. За народен пратеник бил избран **Душан Антониевиќ**, апсолвент-правник од Крушево.

11. Во **Кавадаречка околија** изборите биле спроведени во 13 општини и на14 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 6 036 избирачи, гласале 5 144. Од двајцата пратенички кандидати, Игњат Б. Стефановиќ добил 3 860, а Јован Пантиќ – 1 284 гласа. За народен пратеник бил избран **Игњат Б. Стефановиќ**, државен советник во пензија од Белград.

12. Во **Кочанска околија** изборите биле спроведени во 9 општини и на 12 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 7 297 избирачи, гласале 6 250. Од четворицата пратенички кандидати, Милан Ачеповиќ добил 1 008, Томо Ванѓеловиќ – 1 149, Милан П. Димитриевиќ – 870 и Мита Димитриевиќ – 3 178 гласа. За народен пратеник бил избран **Мита Димитриевиќ,** советник на пратениство во пензија од Белград.

13. Во **Кратовска околија** изборите биле спроведени во 9 опшини и на 10 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 4 890 избирачи, гласале 4 327. Од тројцата пратенички кандидати, Теодосие К. Лазаревиќ добил 3 882, Стеван Симиќ – 365 и Томо Ѓорѓевиќ – 80 гласа. За народен пратеник бил избран **Теодосие К. Лазаревиќ**, кафеџија од Страцин.

14. Во **Малешевска околија** изборите биле спроведени во 4 општини и на 6 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 3 506 избирачи, гласале 2 968. Од двајцата пратенички кандидати, Глигорие Ј. Димиќ добил 1 923, а Јордан М. Бабамовиќ – 1 045 гласа.

14а. Во **Царевоселска околија** изборите биле спроведени во 3 опшини и на 6 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 3 216 избирачи, гласале 2 843. Од двајцата пратенички кандидати, Глигорие Ј. Димиќ добил 702 гласа, а Јордан М. Бабамовиќ – 2 141 глас.

Со оглед на тоа што овие две општини биле споени во една изборна единица **(Малешевска и Царевоселска),** за народен пратеник бил избран **Јордан М. Бабамовиќ**, учител во пензија од Белград.

15. Во **Радовишка околија** изборите биле спроведени во 9 општини и на 12 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 4 349 избирачи, гласале 3 888. Од двајцата пратенички кандидати, Методие Ципушевиќ добил 3 147 гласа, а Тодор Стефановиќ – 741 глас.

15а. Во **Неготинска околија** изборите биле спроведени во 8 општини и на 8 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 2 839 избирачи, гласале 2 422. Од двајцата пратенички кандидати, Методие Ципушевиќ добил 1 518, а Тодор Стефановиќ – 904 гласа.

Со оглед на тоа што овие две околии беа споени во една изборна единица **(Радовишка и Неготинска),** за народен пратеник бил избран **Методие Ципушевиќ**, трговец од Радовиш.

16. Во **Охридска околија** изборите биле спроведени во 10 општини и на 14 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 8 191 избирач, гласале 5 922. Единствениот пратенички кандидат **д-р Илија Шуменковиќ,** постојан кралски делегат во Општеството на народите во пензија од Белград, добил 5 922 гласа и **истиот** бил избран за народен пратеник.

17. Во **Овчеполска околија** изборите биле спроведени во 10 општини и на 11 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 5 190 избирачи, гласале 4 407. Од двајцата пратенички кандидати, д-р Мирослав Стојадиновиќ добил 4 363, а Павле Ќелевиќ – 44 гласа. За народен пратеник бил избран **д-р Мирослав Стојадиновиќ**, прв потпретседател на општина Белград.

18. Во **Поречка околија** изборите биле спроведени во 7 општини и на 8 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 4 412 избирачи, гласале 3 188. Од тројцата пратенички кандидати, Јевти-мие Поповиќ добил 1 581 глас, Ставро С. Новаковиќ – 468 и Милан Апостоловиќ – 1 139 гласа. За народен пратеник бил избран **Јевтимие Поповиќ**, адвокат и претседател на општина од Прилеп.

19. Во **Преспанска околија** изборите биле спроведени во 7 општини и на 11 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 6 339 избирачи, 4 159. Од двајцата пратенички кандидати, Крсто Стрезовиќ добил 3 437, а Илија Димитриевиќ – 685 гласа. За народен пратеник бил избран **Крсто Стрезовиќ**, претседател на општина и бански советник од Ресен.

20. Во **Прилепска околија** изборите биле спроведени во 14 општини и на 23 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 14 973 избирачи, гласале 9 713. Од двајцата пратенички кандидати, Воислав Дамјановиќ добил 1 421 глас, а Василие Трбиќ – 8 292 гласа. За народен пратеник бил избран **Василие Трбиќ**, пензионер од Прилеп.

21. Во **Скопска околија** изборите биле спроведени во 24 општини и на 28 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 14 974 избирачи, гласале 12 161. Од петте пратенички кандидати, Вељко

В. Вељковиќ добил 4 235, Сима Траиловиќ – 1 804, Петар Трпковиќ – 706, Идриз Шаин – 3 433 и Неша Поповиќ – 1 983 гласа.

21а. Во **Качаничка околија** (која не припаѓала на вардарскиот дел на Македонија) изборите биле спроведени во 3 општини и на 4 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 2 678 избирачи, гласале 2 298. Од петте пратенички кандидати, Вељко В. Вељковиќ добил 1 282, Сима Траиловиќ – 211, Петар Трпковиќ – 117, Идриз Шаин – 658 и Неша Поповиќ – 22 гласа.

Со оглед на тоа што овие две околии биле споени во една изборна единица **(Скопска и Качаничка),** за народен пратеник бил избран **Вељко В. Вељковиќ**, инженер и претприемач од Белград.

22. Во **Струшка околија** изборите биле спроведени во 10 општини и на 14 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 7 606 избирачи, гласале 4 880. Единствениот пратенички кандидат **Петар К. Марковиќ,** адвокат од Охрид, добил 4880 гласа и **истиот** бил избран за народен пратеник. Но по неговата смрт, на негово место дошол **Зарија Крстиќ.**

23. Во **Струмичка околија** изборите биле спроведени во 6 општини и на 13 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 8672 избирачи, гласале 7 059. Од тројцата пратенички кандидати, Томо Фиданчевиќ добил 4 850, Арсение Николиќ – 35 и Мане Хаџиевиќ – 2 174 гласа. За народен пратеник бил избран **Томо Фиданчевиќ,** лекар и претседател на општина од Струмица.

24. Во **Штипска околија** изборите биле спроведени во 5 општини и на 9 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 4 553 избирачи, гласале 4 087. Единствениот пратенички кандидат **Михаило Р. Каламатиевиќ,** претседател на општина од Штип, добил 4 087 гласа и **истиот** бил избран за народен пратеник.

25. Во **град Скопје** изборите биле спроведени во 1 општина и на 4 гласачки места. Од вкупно запишани 19 000 избирачи, гласале 7 637. Од двајцата пратенички кандидати, Јован Ѓорѓевиќ добил 2 818, а Александар Буквиќ –   4 819 гласа. За народен пратеник бил избран **Александар Буквиќ**, трговец од Скопје.[12]

Народните пратеници избрани на овие парламентарни избори во вардарскиот дел на Македонија по своето занимање биле: адвокати – 3, пензионери – 3, рентиери – 2, учители во пензија – 2, професор во пензија – 1, трговци – 3, инженер – 1, лекар – 1, дипломатски чиновници – 2, член на Државниот совет – 1,

---

[12] *Статистика избора народних посланика*, 139-167.

општински управници и чиновници – 4, кафеџија – 1 и апсолвент-правник – 1. Од овие народни пратеници, 8 биле од Белград, а другите потекнувале или живееле и работеле во другите градови во вардарскиот дел на Мкедонија.[13] Овие податоци покажуваат дека социјалната структура на народните пратеници од вардарскиот дел на Македонија избрани на овие парламентарни избори не се разликувала од структурата на народните пратеници во целиот југословенски парламент. Според професијата и сталешката припадност, таа структура била многу шаренолика. Тоа биле, главно, виши (богати) социјални слоеви, режимски истомисленици, луѓе од власта или блиски до неа. Повеќето од нив не биле од македонско потекло или не живееле во вардарскиот дел на Македонија, така што и не ги познавале добро приликите на оваа територија, како и потребите на македонскиот народ.

Начинот на кој биле спроведени парламентарните избори, големата апстиненција на избирачите, фалсификувањето на изборните резултати, се разбира, не можеле да останат непознати за јавноста и за многубројните претставници на странскиот печат. Овие парламентарни избори опширно биле коментирани во голем број странски весници. Притоа, паѓа во очи фактот дека во повеќето од од тие написи, без оглед на различната политичка ориентација на одделни весници, било изразено мислењето дека југословенските владејачки кругови ниту со начинот на спроведувањето на изборите ниту со изборните резултати не успеале да го убедат надворешниот свет во тоа дека ја уживаат довербата на широките народни маси.

Сите околности: начинот на кој бил донесен Уставот и самиот негов карактер, одредбите на Изборниот закон, слабиот одѕив на избирачкото тело на парламентарните избори, реагирањето на голем дел од европскиот печат, без оглед на политичката ориентација на одделни гласила, упатуваат на заклучокот дека тактизирањето на југоловенските владејачки кругови за „напуштањето на Диктатурата“ не го предизвикале ниту во земјата ниту во странство оној ефект како што се сакало и се очекувало од страна на иницијаторите на таа политика.

За начинот на кој биле спроведени овие избори, Иван Рибар во своите *Политички записи* пишува: „...Гласањето било јавно и тоа насочено. Полицијата го направила своето. Со терор, насилство, со ветувања и со пари голем дел од избирачите биле натерани и приси-

---

[13] *Статистика избора народних посланика*, 289-294.

лени да гласаат за Петар Живковиќ". А дека на овие парламентарни избори имало фалсификати може да се види од дискусијата во подоцнежното Народно собрание. За тоа станувало збор и во Верификациониот одбор на Народното собрание.

Сето тоа покажува дека парламентарните избори спроведени во вакви услови биле обична фарса и привидна демагогија и не воделе кон вистинска ликвидација на Диктатурата и сукцесивно демократизирање на земјата.

Nadežda CVETKOVSKA

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS IN VARDAR PART OF MACEDONIA IN 1931

- s u m m a r y -

The parliamentary elections in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, and respectively in Vardar Banovina, in whose territorial frames belonged Vardar Macedonia, were held on November 8th, 1931. Several acts regarding the electoral law were adopted before the elections. Namely, voters could choose from one candidate list, headed by Petar Zivkovic, Prime Minister and Minister of Internal Affairs. CPY boycotted the elections, whilst the civil opposition abstained from voting, so that, in a sense, the elections became a sort of referendum.

Within the frame of these parliamentary elections were appointed 37 national deputies, of which 25 originated from Vardar Macedonia. They belonged to the higher social strata, allies of the regime, people in power or close to it. Most of them were not of Macedonian origin or did not live in Vardar Macedonia, therefore they were not aware of the needs of the Macedonian people. Low voter turn-out triggered by cynicism about the candidates and blatant gerrymandering made a mockery of the democratic process and led to little development of a civic culture which could have challenged the prevailing tendency to dictatorship.

Тодор ЧЕПРЕГАНОВ
Петар ТОДОРОВ

Институт за национална
историја – Скопје

ДВА ДОКУМЕНТИ ЗА СОСТОЈБАТА ВО МАКЕДОНИЈА ОД МИНИСТЕРСТВОТО ЗА НАДВОРЕШНИ РАБОТИ НА ВЕЛИКА БРИТАНИЈА ОД 1958 ГОДИНА

По Вторатa светска војна Федерална/Народна Република Македонија е новата реалност на Балканот. Сè до 1943 година големата тројка не очекува дека на крајот од војната ќе се појави нова држава на меѓународната сцена. Тие во своите разговори и договори воопшто не се осврнуваат на македонското прашање ниту како на државно ниту како на национално. Сметаат, пред сè Британците, имајќи предвид дека во Лондон се наоѓа југословенската кралска влада, дека по војната Југославија ќе остане во истите граници и со истата политичка поставеност и се залагаат за тоа. Во тие калкулации Македонија требало да биде дел од Србија, т.е. Вардарска бановина. Но реалноста на теренот не оди во прилог на калкулациите направени на зелената маса.

Македонскиот народ предводен од комунистите уште во текот на 1941 година заедно со другите народи на Југославија започнува борба против наци-фашизмот. Во текот на војната македонскиот народ ја покажува својата решеност да формира сопствена држава. И покрај фактот што не доаѓа до посакуваното обединување, сепак на дел од територијата на Македонија се создава македонска држава. Тоа се случува на 2 август 1944 година. Со тој чин, македонскиот народ, по вековните борби, иако со ограничена самостојност, се вбројува меѓу народите кои дури во средината на

XX век ги реализираат своите аспирации за формирање сопствена држава.

Постоењето на македонската држава во рамките на федеративна Југославија уште на самиот почеток е „камен на сопнување" не само во односите на големата тројка туку и во односите помеѓу балканските држави. Од големата тројка, Велика Британија е најзаинтересирана во однос на она што се случува на Балканот, а во центарот на вниманието е Македонија и искажаните претензии за обединување со преостанатите два дела. Таа политиката, заради свои интереси, ја поддржува и југословенското партиско и државно раководство. Британскиот став е многу јасен од самиот почеток – Македонија да биде во рамките на Југославија како федерална единица, и ништо повеќе од тоа. Соединетите Американски Држави целосно го поддржуваат овој став, додека Советскиот Сојуз калкулира и сака да ја држи ситуацијата неизвесна. Резолуцијата на Информбирото влијае на менување на состојбата со самиот факт што југословенската политика мора да ја напушти својата дотогашна ориентираност кон Советскиот Сојуз и да се сврти кон Западот. Несомнено дека Лондон и Вашингтон сакаат да профитираат од новонастанатата состојба. Тие сметаат дека таквата состојба може да биде искористена за „расцеп во источноевропската солидарност",[1] а Американците заклучуваат дека е добро „'Титоизмот' да продолжи да постои како ерозивна и дезинтеграциска сила во советската сфера" и дека е потребно „Тито да се одржи доволен силен" за да може да го преживее притисокот од Коминформот. Но, исто така, за нив е важно Југословените да ја „прекинат поддршката на грчките герилци". Несомнено, тие ја имаат предвид економската помош што му е неопходно потребна на Тито доколку сака да го одржи режимот. Затоа американските аналитичари се сосема во право кога во своите анализи наведуваат дека: „Тито (во соодветно време) ќе мора јасно да сфати дека Соединетите Американски Држави не се подготвени да продолжат… да му помагаат за да го зголеми степенот на југословенската економија доколку неговиот режим го поддржува востанието против слободно избраната влада, членка на ОН, која е воено поддржана од Соединетите Амери-

---

[1] PRO FO 371/72576R12455/300/92.

кански Држави. Кога Тито ќе се соочи со изборот на сопствениот витален интерес, тоа ќе го принуди да ја прекине помошта“.[2]

Како прагматичен политичар, Тито, несомнено, во ниту еден момент не бил подготвен да ја жртвува стабилноста на својот режим и територијалниот интеритет на новоформираната федерација заради обединувањето на Македонците, што се покажало веднаш по исклучувањето на Југославија од Информбирото во јуни 1948 година. Имено, соочен со опасностите од економски и од воен аспект, Јосип Броз Тито се откажува од идејата за создавање на обединета Македонија, и со тоа ја напушта борбата на грчките комунисти и на Македонците. Во таа новонастаната ситуација, основната цел на Велика Британија и на Соединетите Американски Држави била преку економска помош „Тито ’да се одржи на површина‘“,[3] што, од своја страна, барало и одредени отстапки од југословенскиот лидер, т.е. „ако Тито сè уште сака да ја добие нашата економска помош, ќе биде во негов интерес да ни даде некаква помош за возврат…Она што за возврат тој налесно може да го направи за нас, без притоа да го изгуби внатрешниот углед, е незабележано да ја повелече поддршката на грчките востаници“.[4] Како што е познато, во почетокот на мај 1949 година, со цел да се разреши ова „деликатно прашање“, во Белград е испратен Фицрој Меклин, шефот на Британската воена мисија во Југославија за време на Втората светска војна и близок пријател на Јосип Броз. Договорено е на политичките бегалци што ќе добијат азил во Југославија „во иднина да не им биде дозволено да се враќаат во Грција за да ја продолжат борбата“, но и „никаква друга помош да не им биде дадена на востаниците“.[5] Официјалното објавување на југословенската одлука за затворање на границата кон Грција следува во говорот на Тито во Пула, одржан на 10 јули 1949 година,[6] а како преттекст за ваквата одлука се обвинувањата изнесени од КПГ дека грчките владини војски ја употребуваат југословенската територија за напади врз ДАГ. По оваа одлука, за

---

[2] FRUS (1949): V, 860: Cannon to Acheson, 31/01/1949; Ibid., 867: Economoc relations Between the Unated States and Yugoslavia , Paper prepeared for the Under Secretary of State's Meeting, 14/02/1949; Ibid., 873–874: Acheson to Belgrade, 25/02/1949.
[3] PRO FO 371/72576R12455/300/92.
[4] PRO FO 371/78868 R 4224/1634/92.
[5] PRO FO 371/78716 R 4734/1051/92G.
[6] PRO FO 371/ 78448 R 717/10342/19.

Британците повеќе не постои никакво сомневање дека македонското прашање за подолго време ќе биде препуштено на заборавот.

Педесеттите години од XX век ги карактеризираат формирањето на двата спротивставени блока, Варшавскиот и НАТО, почетокот на Студената војна, нуклеарното вооружување и постојаната закана од почеток на нова војна. Во таквата констелација на сили, Македонија во рамките на федеративна социјалистичка Југославија ги формира сите национални, образовни и културни институции. Меѓутоа, на политички план, македонската елита, по отстранувањето на „сепаратистичката и антипартиската група“, е ставена под контрола на централната влада во Белград. Македонското прашање, односно положбата на македонското малцинство во Бугарија, Грција и во Албанија, е контролирано, исто така, од централната влада во Белград.

Но и покрај овој факт, во педесеттите години британската дипломатија покажува интерес за она што се случува во и околу Македонија. За време на истражувањата во Националниот архив на Велика Британија (ПРО) откривме два документа од 1958 година кои се однесуваат на Македонија. Првиот документ претставува извештај на британската амбасада во Белград испратен до Министерството за надворешни работи на Велика Британија,[7] а вториот е на француски јазик и е испратен од српската емиграција во Франција до британскиот министер за надворешни работи, Селвин Лојд. Содржински, обата се однесуваат на настаните во Македонија.

Во продолжение ги пренесуваме документите во целина, со сите јазични и интерпункциски недоследности, со цел да се запази автентичноста на оригинаниот текст.

ПИСМО ОД БРИТАНСКАТА АМБАСАДА ВО БЕЛГРАД ДО ЈУЖНИОТ ОДДЕЛ НА ФОРИН ОФИСОТ

ДОВЕРЛИВО

Британска амбасада (10327) Белград
18 октомври 1958 г.

Почитуван Оддел,

Во Вашето писмо PJ 1782/15 од 13 октомври (не е копирано за Софија или за Москва) прашавте за наш коментар во

---

[7] PRO FO 371/136893 R 10327.

однос на бугарската пропаганда насочена кон Македонците, на која „Тајмс“ ѝ ја посветува својата воведна статија од 8 октомври.

2. Како што можевте да разберете од многубројните писма што ги напишавме до Вас оваа година, Бугарите покажуваа знаци за користење на македонското прашање дури и пред отвореното нарушување на односите меѓу Југославија и другите комунистички партии во април. Уште на почетокот на март Југословените имале причина да се жалат на „големобугарскиот шовинизам“, кој се манифестирал на годишната прослава на Санстефанскиот договор (нашето писмо бр. 10327 од 11 април). Во нашето писмо бр. 2194 од 23 мај известивме за други примери од ваков карактер и во неговата архивирана телеграма бр. 21 од 23 август амбасадорот коментира дека претседателот Тито, се чини, бил на маки за да го истакне единството на југословенските народи. Но тоа продолжи и излезе од контрола во септември и ќе видите од нашите писма 2194 ’С’ од 20 септември, 4 октомври и 11 октомври дека е тешко да помине недела без некој југословенски контранапад.

3. Спорот, како што знаете, има долга историја; тој не се ограничи на некомунистичките владетели од предвоена Бугарија и Југославија. Во првите години од последната војна, борбата за контрола на македонската Комунистичка партија се водеше помеѓу југословенската и бугарската партија и е опишана на страна 78 et seq во брошурата на „Четман хаус“ за Македонија. И покрај тоа што Југословените ја добија поддршката на Коминтерната, Буга-рите преку нивниот агент Шарло-Шаторов ја имаа истата, и тоа беше со цел да се раздвижи таквата состојба; Тито ја реафирмира во писмото до македонската партија во почетокот на 1943 година политиката на југословенската партија за национална автономија во рамките на југословенската федерација. Вооружен со ветувањето за ограничено самоопределување, Вукмановиќ-Темпо, како Титов пратеник, беше во можност во текот на таа година да ја поврати контролата во корист на југословенската партија. Победата беше постигната во 1947 година со Бледскиот договор, со кој Југославија доби признавање на нејзините позиции и одредени посебни права за Пиринска Македонија преку границата. Осудата на Југославија од страна на Коминформот во 1948 година ги обезбеди Бугарите со добредојден изговор за укинување на овој договор и оттогаш нејзините напори да поттикне проблеми во однос на македонското прашање беа разумно добар барометар за состојбата на односите на Југославија со Советскиот Сојуз.

4. Можеби не е наша работа да коментираме за самата бугарска пропаганда, но гледаме копии на резимеата од софискиот печат и добиваме идеја, иако веројатно искривена, за бугарската линија од југословенските одговори. Веројатно и бугарското радио пренесува слични содржини. Се чини дека главната поента во бугарскиот случај е дека Југославија намерно ги „србизира" Македонците. И покрај тоа што самите Бугари веројатно веруваат дека Македонците се навистина Бугари по раса, историја, јазик и чувство, во нивната сегашна пропаганда тие заземаат полиберална линија, истакнувајќи дека во Бугарија секој човек е слободен да се изјаснува како Македонец ако сака; се подразбира дека некои ќе сакаат.

Југословените, од друга страна, беа со став дека Македонците се посебна раса со историја, култура и сопствен јазик и дека во федерална Југославија тие имаат целосно право да ја развијат својата посебност. Всушност, тие не се малцинство, туку конститутивна раса на федерацијата. Тие ја споредуваат оваа среќна држава со забраната на македонскиот јазик и култура во Бугарија и наводните бугарски негирања за постоењето на посебна македонска раса.

5. Картите на страница 117, 118 и 119 во томот 2 од Н. И. Д. Прирачникот за Југославија (1944) покажуваат дека етнографските факти се спорни, но во 1918 година нашите власти се приклонија кон ставот дека Македонците се различна раса. Меѓутоа, важна работа е и како Македонците се гледаат самите себеси; општо земено, сметаме дека тие сега се гледаат како различни и, конечно, дека не би сакале ниту Срби ниту Бугари да дојдат на власт во Македонија.

6. Тешко е да се оцени реакцијата во Македонија на „бугарската песна на сирената". Ако економските услови се одлучувачки, се чини дека нема сомневање дека Македонците би биле многу задоволни со својата сегашна состојба и покрај сè уште големата сиромаштија. Развојот и на индустријата и на земјоделството намерно се забрзува и прогресот е забележителен. Според југословенските извори, вкупно 229 милијарди динари (приближно 135 милиони фунти се вложени за градење) се инвестирани во периодот 1947-1957 г., многу голема сума во однос на населението (1 305 000) или област од (13 800 км^2), националниот доход на областа се зголемил на 82,1% и областа што се обработува се зголемила на 54 000 хектари. Во својата контрапропаганда Југословените посебно

место им посветуваат на овој компаративен напредок и на автоно-
мијата на Македонија, посебно ставајќи акцент на условите во
регионот пред војната. Охрабрувањето од федералната влада на
движењето за отцепувањето во Православната црква, за што инфор-
миравме во нашето писмо 1782 од 11 октомври, доаѓа делумно, со
причина, од нивната желба да се потенцира оваа автономија и да им
се даде на Македонците она што го сакаат. Се чини дека задачата на
Југословените е полесна, што се должи на фактот дека бугарските
окупациски сили во последната војна направиле многу малку за да
се покажат позитивно за локалното население.

7.   Од сето ова можеме да заклучиме дека Југословените
нема од што да се плашат од бугарската пропаганда, но силината на
нивната реакција се чини дека укажува на тоа дека тие не го делат
тој став. Меѓутоа, тие се апсурдно чувствителни и реагираат во
многу случаи на начин целосно несразмерен од постоењето на мала
причина за нерасположение.

Но ако се прифати дека Македонците се гледаат себеси како
посебна раса со посебен национален идентитет, може да се случи на
подолг рок тие да го постават барањето за поголема независност
или дури и отцепување, иако нема ништо што би можело да суге-
рира таков развој на настаните во овој момент. Бугарските барања
варираат, и се приспособуваат на потребите на моментот, меѓу
целосна анексија и формирање на своевремено независна голема
Македонија, помалку или повеќе поврзана со Бугарија. Иако нема
некакви шанси што било од ова да се реализира, Бугарите, со
своите познати негирања на македонскиот идентитет, само ја
насочуваат Југославија да ја нагласи посебноста и го поттикнуваат
македонскиот национализам и на тој начин го зголемуваат ризикот
дека Македонците нема повеќе да бидат задоволни само со локална
самоуправа. Оваа долгорочна опасност може да смета на југосло-
венската чувствителност; но во тој случај нивната реакција се чини
не е добро проценета.

8. Дали Бугарите навистина гледаат толку далеку напред, не
е наше да цениме, но за разлика од тоа и за разлика од оправданоста
на различните тврдења што се појавија, нема никакво сомневање
дека македонското прашање е корисно стапче со кое можат да се
победат југословенските ревизионисти, за кои може да се гарантира
дека ќе реагираат на пософистициран начин.

9. Mutatis mutandis, многу од горенаведеното, со големи
разлики, важи и за албанската пропаганда насочена кон албанското

малцинство во регионот на Косово – Метохија, но со таа разлика што постои посебна тенденција кај југословенската јавноста во тој поглед, и тоа дека Шиптарите се граѓани од втора класа. Официјалната политика им даде еднаквост и покраинска автономија и, како и во Македонија, постои голема програма за економски развој. Затоа, економски, не постои сомневање од која страна е подмачкан лебот на Шиптарите,[8] а трендот на илегална емиграција од Албанија во Космет покажува дека тие го знаат тоа. Но економските фактори во голема мера се ирелевантни за расните прашања и тоа може да биде показ дека албанското малцинство претставува потенцијален извор на проблеми: секако дека Југословените, исто така, се покажаа чувствителни во однос на ова и во нивната сегашна контрапропаганда го нагласуваат економскиот развој на областа и улогата што ја имаат голем дел од Шиптарите во локалната влада.

10. Испраќаме копии од ова писмо до кабинетите во Софија и во Москва.

Искрено Ваш,

КАБИНЕТ

Париз, 13 декември 1958 г.
Неговата Екселенција господинот Селвин Лојд,
министер за надворешни работи на
Велика Британија

ПАРИЗ

Господине Министре,
имам чест да Ви испратам копија од едно писмо кое нашиот Комитет му го испратил на Неговата екселенција господинот Фостер Дулс, државен секретар на САД, при неговата посета на Париз. Како што е вообичаено, сакаме да Ве информираме за нашата постапка, приложувајќи кон ова писмо една белешка за македонскиот проблем и за создавањето македонска автономна црква.

---

[8] Во оригиналот стои: Shiptar's bread is buttered.

Нашиот Комитет е убеден дека дипломатијата на Обеди-нетото Кралство не може да биде незаинтересирана за прашање кое ја поддржува советската експанзија на Балканот и во медите-ранскиот басен.

Ве молам, господине Министре, да го прифатите уверу-вањето за моите чувства на високо уважување.

Потпис
[Милорад Радовановиќ]
Претседател
М. Радовановиќ

Белешка за конституирањето на автокефална македонска црква

Откако Советите, благодарение на напредувањето на армијата на Толбухин, му ја доделувале власта на г. Тито, новата комунистичка власт презеде најдраконски мерки против црквите, особено против Српската православна[9] црква. Една од нејзините првични цели беше да го скрши религиозното и националното единство на српскиот народ.

Србите, кои на Балканот зафаќаат централна позиција, се познати по силното национално чувство, по нивните патријархални традиции и по нивната верност кон Српската православна црква. За да се разберат нивните неискоренливи чувства, потребно е да се погледне во средниот век, во времето на кралството на Немањиќите, да се спомене долгата борба против исламот, следена од вековен отпор против османлиската доминација и будењето на српската нација во модерното време.

Токму од оваа религиска и патриотска традиција Србите ја црпеле силата да се борат, дури и со нермноправно оружје, против пангерманизмот, против „стремежот кон Исток" на Хабсбурзите и Хохензолерните на Балканот. Ленин не згрешил кога го искажуваше својот страв од „српскиот национализам" и тврдеше дека треба да се „скрши неговиот ’рбетен столб'". Сталин профитира од оваа лекција и кога Коминтерната во почетокот на Втората светска војна го елаборира својот план за сеопшта

---

[9] Тука и на други места понатаму во текстот авторот на овој документ наместо општоприфатениот термин во францускиот јазик *orthodoxe* го користи терминот *pravoslave*.

болшевизација, тој во национализмот на Србите виде пречка што треба да се уништи пред целосната советска експанзија на Балканот; поради тоа воспоставувањето независна македонска држава била една од воените цели на Кремљ.

Две последователни дејства од 1941 година придонеле во слабеењето и во, на она што треба да се нарекува, распарчување на српскиот народ.

Најпрвин беше војната водена со нечуено дивјаштво од страна на силите на Оската кога, по молскавичниот „Blitzkrieg" на Хитлер, тие ја беа окупирале Југославија и ја беа поделиле нејзината територија меѓу себе и своите сателити. Создавањето на краткотрајната хрватска држава, која опфаќа повеќе од два милиона православни Срби, немаше други причини да постои освен доминирањето на нацизмот, овој неопангерманизам, и на фашизмот, нејзин соучесник. На Балканскиот Полуостров и во Источна Европа беше формирана една фантомска влада од „усташи", или хрватски фашисти, под водство на Анте Павелиќ и Андрија Артуковиќ, организаторите на убиството на кралот Александар и на претседателот Луи Барту во Марсеј, 9 октомври 1934 г.; таа владееше со сила и според методите на Гестапо; таа масакрираше околу 600 000 православни Срби, на кои треба да се додадат хрватските патриоти, т.е. лојалните на југословенската држава, и Евреите; таа сруши 289 српски цркви и манастири; таа настојуваше, со еден збор, да го реши со терор српското прашање во егзитенцијалниот простор доделен од Хитлер на Павелиќ. Освен тоа, таа ја укина Српската православна црква и формираше автокефална црква на која и го дале името „Хрватска православна црква".

Соучесниците во агресијата против Југославија го беа добиле својот надомест. Мусолиниева Италија анектира еден дел од Словенија и поголем дел од Далмација откинат од Хрватска. Унгарија на Хорти се прошири со Меѓумурје и еден дел од Војводина. Бугарија, најпосле, ја окупира српска Македонија. Така, во текот на годините на окупација, од 1941 до 1945 г., германофилската влада во Софија можеше полека да ја „бугаризира" оваа територија, да протера многу Срби, да ги изгони сите владици и голем број српски православни свештеници.

Потоа следуваше, иако Втората светска војна сè уште не беше завршена, воспоставувањето на комунистичката диктатура, преземањето на власта од страна на „народните одбори". Примену-

вајќи ги од збор до збор налозите на Ленин, владата на Тито го скрши националното, етничкото и духовното единство на србизмот, делејќи го српскиот елемент меѓу пет од шесте републики на новата „Федерација", наречена народна и демократска, плус два автономни региони (области).

Примерот на српска Македонија е карактеристичен. Иако оваа територија пред војната сочинуваше една бановина на југословенската држава, управувана според нормите на една законита децентрализација, г. Тито ја претвори во Република: на почетокот, тој им забрани на српските владици и свештеници, избркани од окупаторите, да ги повратат своите функции во епархиите и во парохиите. Потоа, тој ги задолжи своите лингвисти да го елаборираат македонскиот јазик и книжевноста. Накусо, тој ја одвои Македонија од српската целина, иако оваа земја беше основата на постоењето на српската држава во средниот век.

Комунистичката власт ги подложи патријархот Викентие Проданов и Светиот синод на страшен притисок за да ја признаат „Македонската православна црква", но залудно. Во 1956 г., комунистичката власт се обрати до патријархот на Бугарската православна црква, барајќи од него да интервенира кај патријархот Алексеј од Руската православна црква. Кога Неговото Високо преосвештенство Алексеј пристигна во Белград, тој го притиснал патријархот Викентиј да назначи на слободните епископски седишта барем прелати со македонско потекло кои живеат во Бугарија. Не успевајќи во сите овие обиди, актуелната власт на таканаречената „македонска република" свика на 5 октомври 1958 г. „Македонски црковно-народен собор". Овој Собор опфаќа членови од македонската Комунистичка партија и нивни помошници, свештени или световни лица. Одлучни да ја стават српската црква пред свршен чин, Соборот ја обнови Охридската архиепископија, избирајќи „митрополитна Македонската православна црква". Потоа Соборот одлучи дека Македонската православна црква ќе остане во „канонско единство" со Српската православна црква. Треба да се спомне дека митрополијата од Охрид во текот на историјата никогаш не беше македонска; имаше грчка црква, српска црква, бугарска црква; високите достоинственици на овие цркви, во текот на историските пресврти, ја администрираа оваа територија, толку често оспорувана меѓу Истокот и Западот; но никогаш немаше македонска црква.

И покрај изговорот за „канонско единство“, станува збор, всушност, за една политички поттикната шизма во рамките на српската црква, шизма преку која владата на Тито сака да ѝ даде на „македонската република“ религиска автокефалност соодветна на една вештачки создадена националност. Според логиката на овој план кој го распарчува српскиот народ, треба да се очекува формирање на други автокефални цркви во републиките што ја сочинуваат ФНРЈ, како Црногорска православна црква или, според моделот на пронацистичката хрватска држава, Хрватска православна црква.

Тоа само по себе подразбира дека владата на Тито не интервенирала во Македонија поради религиски цели ниту поради национални, дури и тесномакедонски. Комунистите не се националисти, иако тие знаат, во некои случаи, да го користат национализмот. Тие повеќе не се заинтересирани за администрирање на црквите, освен да ги потчинат под нивна контрола. Целите на комунизмот во Југославија, како и на другите места, се ексклузивно политички. Гледано од овој агол, делото преземено во Македонија не е еден дел од поопштиот план што се однесува на Балканот; тоа претставува прв чекор кон конституирањето на македонската држава, формирана од југословенска, грчка (егејска), бугарска Македонија, која веќе беше идеја на Ленин и која не престанала да биде главна грижа на Коминтерната на Балканскиот Полуостров. Доволно е да се погледне една карта за да се разбере дека СССР, повторно употребувајќи ги, во услуга на болшевизмот, поранешните аспирации на царизмот, сака да воспостави еден мост меѓу Бугарија и Албанија, кој ќе помогне да ја насочи одбраната на НАТО на север од источниот Медитеран, на ист начин како што египетско-сирискиот мост, создаден од Обединетата Арапска Република, настојува да ја насочи кон Југ. Создавањето на балканскиот мост побарува независност на Македонија, или нејзина автономија, на начин да ја изолира Југославија и да им го отсече на Србите патот за Солун и за Егејот.

Планот не е таен: тој беше јасно претставен од еден од главните комунистички водачи господинот Димитар Влахов, соработник на Тито и поранешен југословенски делегат во Коминтерната, во весникот „Балканска Федерација“. Во него тој ја поддржал ленинистичката теза за создавање една федерација на комунистичките републики на Балканот, подразбирајќи ја и Македонија, под врховно раководство на СССР.

Г. Тито многу порано, во Скопје на 11 октомври 1945 г., во една од своите први изјави по преземањето на власта јасно алудираше на овој план: „Има наши македонски браќа во егејска Македонија и ние не сме незаинтересирани за нивната судбина. Ние се трудиме да ги обединиме сите Македонци во една единствена земја" (во „Борба" од 12 октомври 1945 г.). Но неуспехот на комунистичката герила во Грција го обрза г. Тито привремено да се повлече од овој план и да започне нов маневар, оној на неутралност, за да ја отцепи Грција од западното сојузништво. Покрај кипарското прашање, тој сѐ уште не успеа во извршувањето на својата намера.

Разбирливо е дека Србите не му приговараат на населението на српска Македонија, која тие ја сметаат за јужна Србија, да се нарекува македонско; бидејќи јасно е дека овој регион беше силно жигосан од еден силен локален патриотизам искован во текот на долгата турска окупација. Србите се подготвени да ги прифатат сите формули на децентрализација или дури на административна автономија кои нема да му наштетат на националното единство. Тие немаат никаква забелешка за тоа што Светиот синод на Српската православна црква назначува во македонските епархии владици по потекло од српска Македонија, под услов тие да ги исполнат условите утврдени од страна на канонското право и ја потврдат својата лојалност кон југословенската држава.

Од друга страна, Србите се единствени за да се кренат против која било политика што тежнее да го ослаби не само српскиот елемент туку и цела Југославија врз посебно чувствителната точка од европскиот југоисток, која е истурена точка на западната цивилизација. Поради тоа српските емигранти од целиот свет, гласот на слободна Србија, треба да протестираат против овој нов атентат на слободата и дигнитетот на нивната национална црква, на ова дрско предизвикување од страна на безбожниот комунизам против нивните религиозни и национални традиции, за кои српска Македонија во средниот век беше славната колевка.

Todor CHEPREGANOV
Petar TODOROV

TWO DOCUMENTS ABOUT THE SITUATION IN MACEDONIA BY THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE UK FROM 1958

- s u m m a r y -

Despite the fact that the Macedonian issue was "controlled", the British diplomacy in 1950s showed interest in what was happening in and around Macedonia in relation to that matter. We present two documents from 1958 related to Macedonia. The first document is a report of the British Embassy in Belgrade sent to the Ministry of Foreign affairs of the UK, and refers to the Bulgarian propaganda against Macedonia. The second one is in French, and was sent by the Serbian emigration in France to the British Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Natasha KOTLAR-
TRAYKOVA
Liljana GUSHEVSKA

Institute of National History
– Skopje

PERCEPTION OF THE OTHER IN HISTORY TEXTBOOKS IN THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA*

1. Introduction

In our presentation we shall focus on the way the contents pertaining to the Ottoman-Turkish period were presented in the history textbooks used in secondary gymnasium schools, especially in the language and social sciences department, as part of the curriculum before the independence of the Republic of Macedonia as well as in the period after the proclamation of its independence until today. This choice was made in view of the fact that the material contained in the history textbooks used in the curriculum for these departments was the most voluminous, which was in accordance with the syllabus, and realised through the appropriate teaching aids.[1] Six history textbooks were taken into consideration, i.e. the

[1] The focus of our interest are the following textbooks: Илија Кузманоски, Димитар Мицкоски, *Историја за III клас гимназија,* општествено-јазична насока (Скопје: Издавачко претпријатие „Просветно дело", 1970); д-р Владо Картов, Илија Кузманоски, Димитар Мицкоски, Дамјан Лепчески, *Историја за III клас на гимназиите,* општа насока (Скопје: Издавачко претпријатие „Просветно дело", 1977); Димитар Мицкоски, Трпко Панговски, Милка Тодоровска, *Историја,* III клас, просветна струка (Скопје: „Просветно дело", 1986); Александар Трајановски, *Историја* за III клас гимназија (општа и јазична) (Скопје: „Просветно дело", 1993); Милан Бошковски, Силвана Сидоровска-Чуповска, Јордан Илиоски, *Историја* за II година гимназија (Скопје: Институт за

textbooks from 1970, 1977, 1986, 1993, 2002, and from 2006. We shall also focus on the linguistic means used in these textbooks that belong to the so called scientific-textbook substyle of the scientific style. At the same time, we take into account the fact that this substyle has to be in compliance with the strict requirements of the syllabuses, that is to say with the aims and tasks of the particular degree in the educational process. The textbooks and the teaching aids need to be adapted to suit the students' age, as well as the level of knowledge they had already acquired, since with this substyle the expert addresses non-experts who are supposed to gain certain knowledge in that particular field. It means that within this substyle every term first needs to be defined and explained, and the facts presented in a gradual and comprehensible manner.[2]

2. General review

It is generally accepted that the textbooks compiled up until the independence of the Republic of Macedonia were rather voluminous (there were 317 pages to the 1970 textbook,[3] and 222 pages to the 1977 textbook[4]). However, the history of the Macedonian people was addressed in the context of the history of the peoples of Yugoslavia, which means that there were no separate units dedicated solely to Macedonian history. Considering the period we shall focus on – the end of the 14th and the beginning of the 20th century – the dominating topics shall be those on the feudal social system, the European bourgeois revolutions and the creation of revolutionary movements and labour parties in the larger European countries, as well as on the uprisings of the nations on the Balkans, with a distinct overview on the ones of the peoples of Yugoslavia, etc., containing the terminology corresponding to the period in which they were created, which was, of course, in the spirit of the Marx-

национална историја, 2002); Коста Аџиевски, Виолета Ачковска, Ванчо Ѓорѓиев, *Историја* за II година реформирано гимназиско образование (Скопје: „Табернакул“, 2002); Маријан Димитријевски, Живко Степаноски, *Историја* за II година реформирано гимназиско образование (Скопје: „Македонска искра“, 2002); Милан Бошковски, Силвана Сидоровска-Чуповска, Јордан Илиоски, Наташа Котлар-Трајкова, *Историја* за II година гимназија (Скопје: „Просветно дело“, 2006).
[2] Лилјана Минова-Ѓуркова, *Стилистика на современиот македонски јазик* (Скопје: Магор, 2003), 319.
[3] It covers the period from the 17th century to World War I.
[4] This textbook covers the period from 19th century to World War I.

ist philosophy and socialist ideology. The ethnic and religious affiliations, however, were not always in the foreground; the socio-economic aspect was also underlined. Within that framework, the Ottoman feudal system was presented as rather retrograde and inhumane, and the representatives of the ruling class were always presented in a negative connotation. As regards the linguistic expression, one could not escape the impression that the descriptions were somewhat essayistic, even using expressive linguistic means characteristic for the artistic-literary style and not for the scientific-textbook style, that is to say the scientific style in its broader sense, the basic function of which is not only to convey logical information but also to prove its veracity. Its objective is to activate the logical thinking with the recipient of the text, which is why the language of these types of texts is characterised with being logical and with the presence of evidence.[5] Indeed, when it comes to the science of history, one should bear in mind that subjective and emotional elements could be found in such texts because historians use two methods of generalising – the logical method and the vivid descriptions[6].

As for the terminology, these textbooks are dominated by the terms *Turkish Empire*, *Turkish state*, or simply *Turkey*, and accordingly – *Turkish army*, *Turkish (state) authorities*, *Turkish markets*, etc., but also *(harsh) Turkish slavery*.

As regards the textbooks used in the 80s and the 90s of the previous century, one could say that they represented a bridge between the old and the new methodology and syllabus. Thus, the textbooks from 1986 and 1993 were a lot less voluminous, and not only in the number of pages, but also due to the fact that the latest textbooks at the time were abundant in illustrations, genuine pictures, drawings, maps, etc., and accompanied by contents the function of which was to draw and keep the attention of the student. The textbook from 1993 had 167 pages and was informally divided into two parts.[7] Generally speaking, the contents of this textbook was historically correct, filled with numerous data and information, though often irrelevant, about the processes and events. Although there was a tendency to avoid using stereotypes in describing and presenting the essential facts, the use of the same terminology present in

---

[5] Минова-Ѓуркова, *Стилистика,* 318.

[6] Минова-Ѓуркова, *Стилистика,* 221.

[7] The first part of this textbook refers to the general and regional history from the end of the 18th century to the beginning of the World War I, and the second part, which represents half of the total contents, is dedicated to the history of the Macedonian people and to Macedonia in the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century.

the earlier textbooks could still be noticed. In that respect, the usual dreariness and the classification of facts and concepts by name were still present, which is why this textbook was also insufficiently comprehensible. From the aspect of terminology, there was hesitation regarding the use of the terms *Turks-Osmanlis*, *Turks*, *Osmanli (Turkish) state*, etc.

The textbooks in use since 2000 until today have been conceptualised on the basis of the new syllabus for the school subject history, which was last revised in 2005. In accordance with this syllabus, one can notice greater consistency and a higher degree of scientific treatment as regards the terminology used in the new teaching aids. On the other hand, as regards the subject which is in our focus, the provisions from several bilateral agreements between the Republic of Macedonia and the Republic of Turkey have been applied, particularly those from the Protocol on Cooperation in the Area of Education of 1995, where Article 5 states:

"Both parties shall encourage the work of the respective scientific and expert institutions in objectifying the contents of school subjects in the area of social sciences.

Both parties shall encourage the cooperation and exchange of experiences in working on the comparative analysis of textbooks in the native language (Macedonian, i.e. Turkish language), history and geography."[8]

Hence, the new textbooks contain more units on Macedonian history, and are characterised by being concise, historically correct, comprehensive, and at the same time the expressiveness is appropriately dosed, depending on the particular subject. Certain remnants and stereotypical descriptions of some events and people, which will be addressed further down the article, appear only as exceptions to the rule.

As regards the dilemma in using the terms *Ottoman Empire, Turkey*, etc., we shall make a few short comments. For example, throughout the Middle Ages the state itself was referred to as *devlet-i aliye osmaniyye*, meaning 'sublime Osmanic state'. As is well known, this term comes from the founder of the dynasty, the first Sultan Osman, after whom not only the state but the whole of the dynasty as well was named as *Osmanic*, *Osmanli* or *Ottoman*. Hence, this term stayed in use throughout the whole period of the rule of this dynasty (from 1299 to 1923).[9] In

---

[8] *Службен весник на Република Македонија,* бр. 27/1995, VII.
[9] Александар Матковски, „Османска, Османлиска, Отоманска или Турска Империја", in *Гласник*, год. XXVI/1 (Институт за национална историја, 1982), 57.

view of the fact that this term did not have an ethnic indication as did the term *Turk*, which existed even before the establishment of the state, the earlier Macedonian historiography preferred and recommended the use of the term *Turkish Empire* (*Turkish state*, *the state of the Turks*). Besides the above mentioned, it was following the examples of similar usage in both the Western and the Russian historiography.[10] That is why we can find this term used in the few compilation publications of the history of the Macedonian people.[11]

In the more recent historiography, however, in order to make the distinction regarding the modern Turkish state, the use of the term Ottoman Empire was accepted, i.e. that period was called *Osmanic-Turkish* or rather – *Osmanic*. Hence, it was also accepted in the history textbooks that were in use in particular over the last decade in the Republic of Macedonia. However, terms containing the word *Turkish* vs the word Osmanli were still used side by side in certain editions.[12]

3. Comparative analysis

Further on, we shall focus on the more characteristic examples which we shall use to illustrate the presenting of the Osmanli Empire as well as the activities and the position of its representatives as regards the Macedonian people and, oftentimes, the non-Macedonian population sharing the same unfavourable standing. The history textbook from 1970 did not contain a single unit dedicated solely to the history of Macedonia. The one unit, which had only about 20 pages, was named *Social-Economic, Political, and Cultural Circumstances in Macedonia in the First Half of the 19th Century*,[13] but the lessons on Illyrian movement in Croatia and the Slovenian revival movement were also moved there. The opening lesson of this issue, under the subheading "Stagnation in Agriculture", contained the following text: "Macedonian peasants also suffered the constant plundering and terror committed by various krdzaliski gangs, made up of war deserters, janissaries and fallen Christians. The oppo-

---

[10] Матковски, „Османска, Османлиска", 58-59.

[11] *Историја на македонскиот народ*. Книга втора, Михајло Апостолски (ред.) (Скопје: Институт за национална историја, 1969); *Историја на македонскиот народ*. Том втори. *Македонија под турска власт (од XIV до крајот на XVIII век*, Александар Стојановски (ред.) (Скопје: Институт за национална историја, 1998).

[12] For example, see: Димитријевски, Степаноски, *Историја*.

[13] Кузманоски, Мицкоски, *Историја,* 79-83.

nents of the imperial and local authorities, pashas, ayans[14], and ka-jmakams[15] would often join them in order to plunder the peasants and to gain personal wealth." As an illustration for that, the example of Ali-Pasha Janinski and his fight against the feudalists from the Debar region was presented. The paragraph ended in the following sentence: "Such gangs that burned down and plundered everything could be found throughout Macedonia."[16]

The next paragraph talked about the struggle of the central authorities 'to defend from and persecute the bandits' for the purpose of which, besides the regular army, Macedonian Christians were also engaged. In that respect, the following was stated: "Thus, the Macedonian protector Kuzman Kapidan, the kerserdar[17] leader of the Turks and Macedonians, became famous for defending Ohrid and its surrounding area from the bandits from the Debar area."[18] A visible expressiveness in the expression could also be seen in the next subheading "Increase and Ethnic Changes within Cities", which began with the following sentence: "The constant robbing, taking the land from the frightened peasants, the out-rages and injustices they suffered, made the Macedonian peasants move to the cities where the safety of life was relatively greater."[19]

As for the presenting of the economic environment and the reforms in Turkey, it is a general impression that the stress was put mostly on the social moment, that is to say on presenting the peasantry as a submitted class deprived of its rights. That is why these lessons also talked about the non-Macedonian population: "The period of 15 years, the time determined for serving in the army, ripped the Turkish peasants from their families and economy for a long time."[20]

Besides the above mentioned examples, one could find other places where there were syntagmas that were potentially perplexing, to say the least, for the students. Thus, in the part on continuing the reforms made by the central authorities and on the Gyulhan Hatisherif[21] of 1839, it was

---

[14] Head of district.
[15] Governor of kaaza.
[16] Кузманоски, Мицкоски, *Историја,* 81.
[17] A military rank in the Ottoman Empire.
[18] Кузманоски, Мицкоски, *Историја,* 81.
[19] Ibidem.
[20] Ibid., 84.
[21] Sultan's edict.

said: "The carrying out of the new reforms caused resistance again with the fanaticised Turks, Muslim feudalists and other reactionary circles."[22]

The other part dedicated to Macedonian history was within the unit *Peoples of Yugoslavia from the mid-19th century to World War I*[23] where two out of seven subheadings were dedicated to Macedonia. It was usual for the events to be presented in the form of gradation. Thus, there was extensive talk about the new taxes imposed on different classes of the population during the 70s, which is depicted in the following paragraph containing, again, somewhat unusual formulations: "This harsh position of the population in the villages and the cities was also joined by natural disasters, a large scale pestilence and barren years (1874–1875). Also, there was an increase in the plundering, robbing and thieving gangs, operating mostly in the Debar and Bitola sanjaks. All of that was also added to by the said settling of the Crimean Tatars and the Cherkess and the taking of land from the Macedonian peasants."[24] Then follows a generalisation: "As an expression of dissatisfaction, and in order to protect the people from the Turkish outrages, the more daring people went into the mountains and became hajduks."[25] Almost the same formulations are found in the 1977 history textbook as well.[26]

The greatest expressiveness can be found in the parts where national uprisings were described, that is to say their consequences. Thus, we note the following: "The measures taken by the Turkish authorities became more and more energetic and harsh. The strengthened Turkish army, accompanied by bashi-bazouk,[27] left desolation all around. A large number of villagers and citizens were imprisoned, subjected to torture and convicted. Father Stojan himself, in order not to fall into the hands of the Turks, committed suicide. The frightened villagers who managed to save themselves ran into the mountains. The village Razlovci was burned to the ground. Berovski's company was ambushed and broken, and he was gravely wounded,"[28] etc. The conclusion was that the "Razlovci Uprising ended in failure" (History 1970: 218), while the textbook from 1977 said that "this uprising was suppressed" (History 1977: 120). The principle of gradation was present there as well, in that

---

[22] Кузманоски, Мицкоски, *Историја,* 85.
[23] Ibid., 206.
[24] Ibid., 217.
[25] Ibidem.
[26] Картов и др., *Историја,* 118.
[27] Irregular army.
[28] Кузманоски, Мицкоски, *Историја,* 218.

the first sentences introduced the dramatic events which were later on listed and specified. We point out the formulation 'in order not to fall into the hands of the Turks', which could be found in publications as well as in the artistic literature (instead of *the Turks*, as regards certain later periods, *the Bulgarian/German invader* etc., were used) which did not explicitly point to or name anything, but rather hinted at things (compare the previous sentence, the meaning of which is – so as not to be subjected to torture and convicted).

But because of the inept formulations, in some places even the insurgents, actually, were not presented positively, even though it was the intention of the authors to depict their heroism. In that respect, explaining why the insurgents in the Razlovci Uprising had to start the uprising earlier than planned and describing how it all had begun, the authors wrote the following: "The insurgents first set about capturing and killing the Turkish clerks and burning Sipahi defters[29] and Kodzobashi[30] tally books, in which the debts of the villagers were kept."[31] This formulation was avoided in the 1977 textbook.[32]

Here we also refer to the depiction of the Negush Uprising of 1822. In the part "Suppressing the Uprising"[33] the following was written: "The City of Negush was plundered, and then burned down. In this city, 1,300 people were slaughtered. For five days the Turkish asker[34] and bashi-bazouk... robbed, slaughtered and dishonoured. Hundreds of women and girls were sold for large amounts of money on the markets in Salonica. 120 villages were levelled to the ground and burned down, but first they were robbed. The villages Drzilovo, Bela Voda, Golichani and others, were never again rebuilt. The number of killed and captured was over 5,000 people. (...) The leaders' families, that is to say the heads of the uprising, namely Zaphyrakis, Karatasho and Gatzo, were executed by the Turks."[35] It should be pointed out that this part of the text was actually half of the total contents of that thematic unit, which means that half of it was dedicated to explicit descriptions of the actions and measures taken in order to suppress the uprising.

---

[29] A cadastral tax census carried out by the Ottoman Empire.
[30] Village elder.
[31] Кузманоски, Мицкоски, *Историја,* 218.
[32] Картов и др., *Историја,* 199.
[33] Мицкоски и др., *Историја,* 129.
[34] Army.
[35] Мицкоски и др., *Историја,* 131.

The feudal system of the Empire and its representatives were addressed in the contents of the thematic unit with the heading *Macedonia at the Beginning of the 19th Century*, bearing the subheading "Social-Economic Changes in Macedonia".[36] It contained the following: "The well known Turkish feudal Timarli Sipahis system was introduced in Macedonia too. On their feudal estates, the Sipahis led a carefree, rich and luxurious life, without being involved in the agriculture, craftsmanship, trading, etc. The Sipahis left all that to the enslaved population – the reaya. So, the reaya worked the land acquired by means of a Sultan Deed (ownership) and the land of their immediate lord – the Sipahi. That way the reaya led a kind of serfs' life without being able to leave the land given to them to work on it. The reaya ... was supposed to pay the basic Turkish taxes and charges, like the tenth (the ushur), the arach (a military tax) and other taxes, of which the tribute in blood was the hardest. The Turkish authorities took the underage healthy male children from the reaya by force, converted and trained them, turning them into the best and the bravest Turkish infantry, also known as janissaries."[37]

One of the most common stereotypes was the one involving the Karposh Uprising in 1689, especially the description of his martyrdom. In that respect, the explicit descriptions common for earlier textbooks were not avoided even in the textbook from 2002, for example: "Khan Selim Giray ordered that the rebels' leader Karposh be subjected to torture under the Stone Bridge. He was first impaled, then his body was mutilated by Tartar spears, and in the end he was cut into pieces and thrown into the river Vardar."[38]

4. Conclusions

From the above mentioned examples one can draw several general conclusions, such as:

– In all of the textbooks taken into consideration, one cannot say there was any fact-finding incorrectness, only that there was presentation of aspects which were not in the function of encouraging the logical thinking with the students, and the character of which was not educational;

– In presenting the other, here embodied in the Osmanlis, the authorities, the regular and irregular army, from the aspect of ethnic and

---

[36] Трајановски, *Историја,* 82.
[37] Ibid., 83.
[38] Бошковски и др., *Историја,* 2002, 77.

religious difference, there are long, emotionally charged and often unnecessary descriptions the character of which was not cognitive and could potentially upset the students, as well as cause unpleasant feelings and unrealistic images with the students, considering their age;

– There was also the issue of how well the texts communicated the ideas, as one of the key characteristics of the scientific style in general, in that unknown and alien words were used and, very often, archaic lexis as well (historical terms). Hence, if the textbook was not communicating well, if the level of students' previous knowledge was not taken into consideration, as well as their age, if it was written uninterestingly with no desire to draw the reader's attention to certain parts, then the whole of the weight as regards the learning of the material would fall upon the teacher;[39]

– If one takes into account that the vivid descriptions in historical texts is in the function of breaking up the rather monotonous presentation of data, and in view of the absence of other accompanying contents and the small number of illustrations and pictures, it is precisely this condition that was not met by the older textbooks, since the extracts mentioned show that, in spite of the said negativeness, these parts were also dominated by fact-finding. Contrary to them, the vivid descriptions of the new textbooks, particularly the most recent ones, is in the function of broadening the students' knowledge, and those short texts are quite wittily named as *For the Curious* or *Find out More*, *If You Want to Know More*, *Consider this, Analize the text,* etc. Though formally characterised as texts that are not mandatory in acquiring the knowledge from the particular lesson, being conceptualised like that, they still easily draw the students' attention and interest.

In contrast, we now present examples from the most recent textbooks. Regarding the aforementioned Negush Uprising and its ending, in the textbook from 2002 the following is written: "The clash between the insurgents and the army lasted more than 20 days, until the end of April 1822, when the city was taken and the uprising suppressed. The consequences of the uprising were particularly harsh for the people of this area."[40] In the same textbook, within the text on Razlovci Uprising, the end of the uprising was presented as follows: "... the Osmanli army and bashi-bazouk entered the village Razlovci and cruelly retaliated against

---

[39] Минова-Ѓуркова, *Стилистика,* 320.
[40] Бошковски и др., *Историја,* 2002, 139.

the population."[41] The same event was described in a similar way in another textbook from 2002.[42]

In the textbook from 2006, that same topic was explained in the following way: "In the course of a week, the uprising developed quite successfully. But, the Osmanli authorities took quick and decisive measures against the spreading of the uprising. On 28 May 1876 (old style) / 9 June (new style) the uprising was brutally suppressed." The following was a text which talks about the consequences of the said uprising: "The consequences of the suppressed uprising were harsh for the people who dared rise in this area. Many people were put in the Osmanli prisons. Running from retaliation and the reaction of the Osmanli authorities, a large number of families from this area left their birthplaces and forever emigrated to the neighbouring Bulgaria."[43]

There are somewhat more distinct deviations in the third textbook from 2002 which was also a subject to this review.[44] Generally speaking, it distinguishes from the others in that it contains larger and, in some places, quite unnecessary factography, as well as in the language expressions used which are closer to those contained in the textbooks from the 80s and 90s period, though it follows the concept of technical organisation and appearance characteristic for all other textbooks from 2002. As an example, we shall cite the part presenting the end of the Ilinden Uprising (named as "Suppressing the Ilinden Uprising"): "On August 13, the Osmanic army and the bashi-bazouk took Krushevo. In so doing, hundreds of people were killed, the houses were plundered and burned down, many people were tortured, and 150 lasses and women were raped. Many villages in the Bitola vilayet met a similar fate. And so they paid dearly for their attempt to gain freedom."[45]

Finally, in order for one to get a better idea of how differently textbooks from the earlier and the more recent times were conceptualised, we enclose several pages. One can notice that the pages from the older textbooks were written more densely, with rare black-and-white, often unclear, pictures, while the newer textbooks provide the students with visual aids so they can easily acquire more permanent knowledge without being burdened, notably from an ideological point of view.

---

[41] Ibid., 142.

[42] Димитријевски, Степаноски, *Историја,* 112.

[43] Бошковски и др., *Историја,* 2006, 151.

[44] Ациевски и др., *Историја,* 2002.

[45] Ibid., 172.

Natasha KOTLAR-TRAYKOVA
Liljana GUSHEVSKA

PERCEPTION OF THE OTHER IN HISTORY TEXT-BOOKS IN THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

- s u m m a r y -

This article focuses on analysing the way in which certain topics in history textbooks for high school education in Macedonian language are treated in the period following the independence of the Republic of Macedonia, with a comparative review from the previous period. The period of the Ottoman reign is taken into consideration. The tendency in newer textbooks is to describe the event in facts and accurately, but without the emphasised presence of expressive descriptions, words and expressions (*subjecting to pain/torture, impaling, gang of bandits*, etc.), which can cause negative emotions in pupils.

BOOK REVIEW

Kaneff DEEMA,
WHO OWNS THE PAST?
THE POLITICS OF TIME IN
A "MODEL" BULGARIAN
VILLAGE,
Berghahn Books 2004.

The author of this book, Deema Kaneff, is an expert on Bulgarian political and economic reorganization and policy development[1]. 'Who owns the past? The Politics of Time in a 'Model' Bulgarian Village' is an ethnography focused on the political changes undergoing in the village Talpa before and during the early transition period in Bulgaria. Talpa gives the impression of an ordinary village in north central Bulgaria, but in reality, it is a 'model village', i.e. a title given to all Bulgarian villages which could fulfill certain parameters requested by the soacialist rule at the time. Through the analysis of local-state relations, Kaneff tries to describe the role of the past in Talpa's socialist world. It is important to mention that the author lived for four years in Bulgaria in the pre and post socialist period, hence she speaks fluent Bulgarian, among other Slavic languages.

The book begins with a brief flash back of Jenny Zhivkova's[2] visit in Talpa in 2001, which represents already a great example of how the past might influence the contemporary world. Afterwards, the author returns in the past to involve us in the 'model village' celebration in Talpa. As mentioned in chapter two, this event involved almost all Talpians and village institutions such as the *Chitalishte* (the 'village cultural house'), the Party head, the TKZC (agricultural co-operative) head, the village council, the Fatherland Front head, school representatives and young schoolchildren. The reason why Talpa was

---

[1] For further information see also
http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/staff/profiles/government-society/kaneff-deema.aspx.
[2] Jenny Zhivkova is the granddaughter of the last Bulgarian socialist leader, Todor Zhivkov.

awarded with this title, as stressed out several times by the author, is the relationship between the history and the village. Kaneff explains how the villagers were devoted to the socialist system, they had one of the oldest *Chitalishte* in the area and they were proud of having the house-museum of Zhivkov's wife. Therefore, history was very important for Talpa and the Talpians. In fact, history is represented as a benchmark in every public occasion: history of the Bulgarian state, history of the village socialist institutions, history of important people and their position in history.

History, tradition and folklore embody the trilogy used by Kaneff to explain the influence of the past in the 'model' Bulgarian village. Tradition is also history, but it could be both individual and collective and expressed equally in public and private space. Chapter five and six are dedicated to traditions and they seem to be the most malicious in the book, since the author is trying to make obvious how traditions in socialist Bulgaria were still connected to Orthodox religion, taking as examples the celebration of funerals and Zarezan, a cyclic festivity in honour of Saint Triffun. Although there were some evident religious associations during these traditional practises (for instance, the recognition of afterlife or the practice of lighting candles), the majority of the villagers did not discuss traditions in public, sometimes because of fear, sometimes because of ignorance. In these chapters of the book Kaneff seeks to answer the question if traditions had in fact religious associations. Through a comparison between a typical Bulgarian and Turkish funeral, she emphasizes the distinction between religion, ethnicity and gender in the traditional practices. Nevertheless, Kaneff does not focus on the minorities in this volume as she did in the work 'When 'land' becomes 'territory'[3]. In fact, the weakness of this work is perhaps the lack of more examples about different traditions among the minorities in the village: Turks, Macedonians, Pomaks[4] and Gypsies, which in my opinion would demonstrate how religion indeed survived and was practised even during socialism.

Chapter seven and eight are devoted to folklore, the public state sponsored celebration which could best create the notion of national

---

[3] Kaneff, Deema 1998, 'When 'land' becomes 'territory': Land privatization and ethnicity in rural Bulgaria', in: S.Bridger and F.Pine (eds), *Surviving postsocialism: Local strategies and regional responses in eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union*, London – New York: Routledge, pp16-32.

[4] Islamized Slavic speaking people.

identity. Folklore in Talpa is also a synonym of nationalism. In effect it contributed to unify Talpians under the mark of 'Bulgarians'. While 'history is a way of knowing the future and present in terms of the past and tradition is a combination of past, present and future, folklore had a more decorative function, based on visual and aesthetic aspect' (page 155). Moreover folklore broke the particular religious, ethnic and gender meaning carried by traditional practises. According to the author the broad meaning of folklore could include dances, songs, music, specific food, objects and costumes. Nevertheless, the author argues taht the village of Talpa became a 'model' one mainly with the help of its history relations, whilst folkloristic activities were in fact deficient especially because of the considerable majority of older population in the village.

Kaneff's book concludes with the fall of communism in 1989. Talpa became a 'model village' in the spring of 1987, and after only two years this epithet lost completely its significance. With the collapse of communism, everything important in the previous 45 years became insignificant, useless, and a new system with new values started rising. Unfortunately this is not just Talpa's fate but it may concern all the villages under socialism, according to the author. In my opinion this volume is really useful for those who approach this topic for the first time, but also interesting for those who already have some background knowledge in history of South Eastern Europe. It is particularly unique and unusual, how the author combines some Bulgarian words throughout the book. The use of '*lelia*' or '*chicho*' (ant and uncle) before the name of the person gives the idea of closeness. Furthermore, this idea is emphasised with the photographs given in chapter two, all representing the 'model village' event. All these peculiarities give more relevance to the work and they make it more credible in the eyes of the reader.

Irena AVIROVIČ

BOOK REVIEW

Љубица Јанчева,
Народноослободителните одбори во Струмичко-Радовишкиот регион 1941-1945,
Институт за национална историја – Скопје, Скопје, 2009, 142

Монографијата на д-р Љубица Јанчева, *Народноослободителните одбори во Струмичко-Радовишкиот регион 1941-1945*, претставува осврт кон формирањето на органите на ослободителната борба во Струмичко и во Радовишко во текот на Втората светска војна, кон нивната дејност и кон нивното значење, не само како на едни од носителите на отпорот против окупаторот туку и како на основа врз која се создадени идните органи на власта во македонската држава. Монографијата, преку анализа на архивски материјали, сеќавања на современици и преку соодветна научна литература, нуди увид врз состојбите карактеристични за Струмичко-радовишкиот регион во текот на војната, кои го одределе тамошниот развој на народноослободителното движење.

Текстот, кој, инаку, е дел од магистерскиот труд на авторката, се состои од 142 страници. Содржи предговор, вовед, шест глави поделени на повеќе поглавја, резиме на македонски и на англиски јазик. Покрај тоа, во него се приложени и кратенки, библиографија, регистри на лични имиња и на географски поими.

Во предговорот е направен преглед на досегашните проучувања на ова прашање во македонската историографија. Притоа е наведено дека и покрај многубројните трудови посветени на Народноослободителната антифашистичка војна (НОАВ), на создавањето и работата на органите на борбата, односно на АСНОМ како основа на македонската државност, не е доволно проучена регионалната дејност на органите на борбата. Авторката го истакнува условното значење на изразот „народна власт“, со цел да се избегне

идеолошката едностраност присутна во историографијата, посебно карактеристична за периодот пред осамостојувањето на Република Македонија.

Воведот е посветен на состојбите по започнувањето на Априлската војна и по навлегувањето на фашистичките воени сили во вардарскиот дел на Македонија во 1941 година. Меѓу другото, тука се опфатени активностите и пропагандата на Централниот бугарски акционен комитет во периодот од окупацијата до воспоставувањето на бугарската административно-полициска власт, законските и другите мерки што бугарската држава ги спровела во окупираната територија. Тие се однесувале на нејзината административната поделба, на обидите за национална асимилација на македонскиот народ преку развиената културна и просветна дејност итн. Внимание е посветено и на развојот и на дејноста на Комунистичката партија на Југославија (КПЈ), односно на нејзиниот Покраински комитет (ПК) за Македонија. Формиран уште во 1940 година, тој во наредниот период прераснал во главен носител на организираниот отпор против окупаторската власт. Разгледани се и причините за несогласувањата меѓу тогашниот секретар на ПК на КПЈ за Македонија, Методија Шаторов, и раководството на КПЈ, кои довеле до негово сменување.

Во првата глава, „Струмичко-радовишкиот регион во 1941 година“, се опфатени спроведувањето на бугарската власт во Струмичката и во Радовишката околија и воведувањето на административниот систем, на просветно-образовните институции и на разните културно-просветни организации преку кои била вршена денационализаторската пропаганда меѓу македонското население. За да се засилат асимилаторските процеси, на местата од протераните српски колонисти биле населувани и колонисти од Бугарија,. Во прилог на зацврстувањето на контролата врз месното население, било и воведувањето полициски час, оданочувањето и теророт од страна на полицијата врз осомничените за „противдржавна“ дејност. Во истата глава се разгледани развојот и дејноста на месното партиско поверенство на КПЈ за Струмица, кое во мај 1941 година прераснало во местен комитет (МК), најмногу изразени преку организирањето демонстрации против окупаторските власти, како и активноста на Месниот комитет на КПЈ за Радовиш, формиран во ноември 1941 година. Меѓу поистакнатите членови на КПЈ се вбројуваат и Јосиф Јосифовски-Свештарот и Благој Јанков-Мучето.

Во втората глава, со наслов „Органите на борбата, никулци на новата власт во Струмичко-радовишкиот регион", предмет на проучување се органите на борбата формирани од КПЈ во текот на народноослободителното движење (НОД) и нивната дејност. Иако тие биле задолжени за обезбедување разновидна поддршка и за собирање материјална помош за потребите на НОД, со неговиот развој во понатамошниот период се зголемило и нивното значење, односно добиле одлики на органи на власта. Активностите во Струмица и во Струмичко за собирање оружје и формирање партизански одред започнале набргу по окупацијата, при што значајна улога одиграле Страшо Пинџур, кој како инструктор присуствувал во летото 1941 година, и Мирче Ацев, во чие присуство бил формиран воен комитет при МК. Но поради провала во струмичката партиска организација во летото 1942 година, пропаднале обидите за исфрлање партизански одред. Биле прекинати и врските со ПК на Македонија. Исто така, по провалата згаснала и, инаку, успешната дејност на одборот за собирање народна помош, кој бил формиран во ноември 1941 година, а бил задолжен за криење на илегалците и ширење пропаганден материјал. Забележителни биле и активностите на комисијата за работа со жените формирана во 1941 година, која во 1943 година прераснал аво Актив на жените, како и на МК на Сојузот на комунистичката младина на Југославија (СКОЈ), основан во 1941 година.

„Органите на народната власт во Струмичко-радовишкиот регион (1943-1944)", третата глава од монографијата, претставува преглед на состојбите по успесите и растежот на НОД во Македонија во 1943 година. Иако во овој регион, поради неговата стратешка важност, бугарските власти наметнале посебен режим и го оневозможиле формирањето партизански одред, како резултат на активностите на Благој Јанков, МК од Струмица ги обновил врските со ЦК на Комунистичката партија на Македонија (КПМ), формирана во 1943 година. Врз основа на директивите на ЦК, биле преземени активности за формирање одбори на власта, односно народноослободителни одбори (НОО). МК донел одлука за формирање НОО и во некои струмички села, што било реализирано во првата половина на 1944 година. Напорите за формирање и Околиски НОО пропаднале поради провалата во јули 1944 година, во која загинал Благој Јанков. Сепак, Февруарскиот поход и Пролетната офанзива, организирани од ГШ на НОВ и ПОМ и од ЦК

на КПМ, овозможиле услови за интензивирање на НОД во Источна Македонија и во Струмичко-радовишкиот регион. Како резултат на тоа, во август 1944 година бил формиран и Струмичкиот партизански одред.

Во наредната глава „Струмица и Радовиш во предвечерието на Првото заседание на АСНОМ" се разгледани регионалните активности на НОО и подготовките за свикување на АСНОМ. Со формирањето на Иницијативниот одбор (ИО) за негово свикување во есента 1943 година, започнала подготовка за избирање делегати за АСНОМ. Во март 1944 година ИО испратил упатство, а ЦК на КПМ писмо до сите НОО со директиви за нивната натамошна дејност. Изборот на делегати бил вршен на конференции на НОО. Во сообразност со територијалната поделба на Македонија, приложена во писмото на ЦК на КПМ, Струмичкиот округ избрал свои делегати за Првото заседание на АСНОМ, чии решенија биле широко прифатени од населението во Струмичко-радовишкиот регион. Во истата глава авторката посветува внимание и на завршните воени операции за ослободување на Радовиш и на Струмица.

Петтата глава, „НОО во Струмичко-радовишкиот регион од Првото заседание на АСНОМ до конечното ослободување", е посветена на завршувањето на процеот на формирање НОО во Струмичко и во Радовишко. Врз основа на новата територијалната поделба на Демократска Федерална Македонија (ДФМ) на три области, регионот влегол во Штипската област, во кој околиски НОО претставувале Штип и Струмица. Вера Ацева била овластена од Президиумот на АСНОМ да работи на обновувањето и на формирањето НОО во Штипската област. Како резултат на интензивната активност во Струмичко-радовишкиот регион била создадена мрежа на месни и општински НОО, чија задача била да собираат храна, облека, лекови како помош за населението и за војската, да ги афирмираат органите на народната власт итн.

Во последната, шеста глава, „Организација и дејност на НОО во регионот по ослободувањето", авторката детално се задржува на организациската структура, на хиерархиската поставеност и на функционирањето на НОО. НОО во Струмичко-радовишкиот регион развиле широка активност, во која биле вклучени мобилизацијата на возрасното население, обезбедувањето на јавниот ред и мир, обновата на стопанството, снабдувањето со храна, започнување на воспитно-образовниот процес итн. По

изборите за селски и за околиски НОО во март 1945 година, од 14 до 16 април било одржано Третото заседание на АСНОМ. На него, покрај преименувањето на АСНОМ во Народно собрание на ДФМ, на Президиумот во Претседателство на Народното собрание на Македонија, односно на НОО во Народни одбори, бил донесен и Закон за народна влада. Со тоа завршил процесот на конституирање на органите на државната власт и започнала нова етапа во развојот на македонската државност.

Имајќи предвид дека монографиите посветени на НОО, кога станува збор за нивното формирање, развивање и дејност во одделни делови од македонската држава се навистина ретки, *Народноослободителните одбори во Струмичко-радовишкиот регион 1941-1945* претставува значаен прилог во нивното проучување и, секако, поттик за разгледување на ова историско прашање и во другите македонски региони.

Невен РАДИЧЕВСКИ