

Ivana KOMATINA
Institute of History Belgrade
Knez Mihailova 36/II, Belgrade, Serbia
ivana.komatina@iib.ac.rs

PERCEPTION OF ROMAN CATHOLICS IN 13TH-CENTURY SERBIAN HAGIOGRAPHIES: FROM FELLOW CHRISTIANS TO HERETICS

Abstract: The paper examines the attitude towards the Latins and the Roman Church in the Nemanjićs' state as presented in 13th-century Serbian hagiographies. The fact that the Serbian state was the only medieval Balkan state in which the jurisdictions of two canonically recognized churches, the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox Church, were intertwined in that region made this attitude more complex. The narrative presented in these hagiographies, taking into account the function of the genre itself, clearly indicates that the formation of a negative image of the Roman Catholic Church and the Latins was the consequence of the conclusion of the Union of Lyon and the Orthodox world's resistance to it.

Keywords: Roman Church, Orthodox Church, jurisdiction, Latins, Serbian Kingdom, Archbishopric, Council of Žiča, Union of Lyon.

Ecclesiastical circumstances in Serbian lands at the time of the first Nemanjićs

In the mid-12th century the rule of the Byzantine emperor Manuel I Komnenos in the territory of the Serbian principalities was absolute.¹ He replaced the Serbian grand župans at his own will, and thus around 1165, the family of the progenitor of the Nemanjić dynasty – Stefan Nemanja – came to power.² However, in the ecclesiastical sense, the supremacy, i.e.

¹ J. FERLUGA, *Vizantiska uprava u Dalmaciji*, Beograd 1957, 130–137; I. KOMATINA, *Crkva i država u srpskim zemljama od XII do XIII veka*, Beograd 2016, 51–56.

² *Ioannis Cinnami epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum*, ed. A. MEINEKE, Bonnæ 1836, 101–113, 203–204, 212–215; S. PIRIVATRIĆ, Prilog

the spiritual dominance of the Orthodox, Byzantine Church embodied in the head of the Archbishopric of Ohrid, existed only in the interior of Serbia, while in the littoral principalities (Dioclea, Travunia, Zahumlje and Neretva) the papal spiritual supremacy, embodied in the archbishop of Ragusa, was unquestionable.³

However, it was precisely at the time when Stefan Nemanja became grand župan in 1166, and then consolidated his position in 1168, that the first ecclesiastical changes were noticed in the Littoral, in the area of the Archbishopric of Ragusa.⁴ Namely, already in 1167, the bishops of Antivari and Dulcigno rejected the obedience to the archbishop of Ragusa, wherefore the pope immediately reprimanded them.⁵ However, these important church events in the area of Upper Dalmatia had nothing to do

hronologiji početka Nemanjine vlasti, *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta* (=ZRVJ) 29–30 (1991) 125–136.

³ In the confirmation letters of the popes from 1142, 1153, 1158, it is stated that Zahumlje, Serbia, Travunia and the cities of Cattaro, i.e. Rose, Budua, Antivari, Skodra, Drivasto and Pulat, are under their authority, *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae* (=CD) II, ed. T. SMIČIKLAS, Zagrabiae 1904, 52, 70, 85; Cattaro, however was subordinated to the Archbishopric of Bari since the early 11th century. *Codice diplomatico Barese* I, edd. G. B. NITTO DE ROSSI, F. NITTI DI VITO, Bari 1897, 95; I. KOMATINA, *Crkva i država*, 196.

⁴ Stefan Nemanja, the youngest among the brothers, took power between April and August 1166, instead of the eldest brother Tihomir. When the brothers attacked Nemanja in 1168, emperor Manuel I Komnenos helped them first by sending a military detachment, only to later join the battle, but the Serbian-Byzantine coalition failed, and Nemanja remained in power, S. PIRIVATRIĆ, Byzantine-Hungarian relations in 1162–1167 and the deposition of Serbian grand župan Desa, *Byzanz und das Abendland III. Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia*, Budapest 2015, 158–166; IDEM, Prilog hronologiji početka Nemanjine vlasti, 130–131; I. KOMATINA, I obnovi dedovinu svoju i bolje je utvrdi Stefan Nemanja i Stefan Prvovenčani i uobličavanje srpske državnosti, *Stefan Prvovenčani i njegovo doba*, ur. A. RASTOVIĆ, I. KOMATINA, Beograd 2020, 40–41; STEFAN PRVOVENČANI, *Sabrana dela*, prir. LJ. JUHAS-GEORGIEVSKA – T. JOVANOVIĆ, Beograd 1999, 21–33.

⁵ The pope called the clergy of Antivari and Dulcigno not to obey their bishops until they restore obedience to the mentioned archbishop. Also, the pope once again confirmed jurisdiction over the territory of the littoral Serbian principalities to the Ragusa archbishop, and also sent letters to the bishops not to reject submission to the Ragusa, i.e. the Roman Church, CD II, 109–114, See in detail, I. KOMATINA, *Crkva i država*, 197–200.

Also, pope Alexander III sent a letter to the bishop of Arbania in late 1167, in which he wrote that he received news from his cardinal that he wanted to renounce the Greek rite, since the bishop of Arbania was subordinate to the Metropolitanate of Drač, and that he considered such decision of the bishop of Arbania highly desirable, CD II, 110–11; I. KOMATINA, *Crkva i država*, 199–200.

with Nemanja's coming to power. The stepping out of the two bishops from the area of Dioclea and their refusal to obey the Roman Church had an exclusively ecclesiastical basis, and that act was based on the old desire of the bishopric of Antivari – by relying on the Archbishopric of Split, which operated in the area of Lower Dalmatia – to “renew” its “old archbishopric right” over the bishoprics in Upper Dalmatia, against the rights of the Archbishopric of Ragusa. The stepping out of the bishop of Antivari Gregory against Nemanja in the 1180s and his address to Split was inspired by the same desire.⁶ Also, Nemanja's attack on the city of Ragusa in 1184/1185 had exclusively conquering pretensions and did not affect his attitude towards the Roman Catholics.⁷

At that time, the popes more or less protected the rights of the Archbishopric of Ragusa. However, when, after Nemanja's death in 1199, tensions grew between his two sons, Stefan, the heir to the grand župan throne, and Vukan, the first-born son, the bishoprics of the Roman Catholic Church in Upper Dalmatia became an instrument of struggle of dissatisfied Vukan who intended to exercise political power through independent church politics. Namely, grand knez and župan Vukan supported the aspirations of the new bishop of Antivari, and at the Council in Antivari in the spring of 1199, the Archbishopric of Antivari was established.⁸

Vukan, it can be said, relied on the newly ordained archbishop of Antivari and on the traditions of the “Kingdom of Dioclea” exclusively for the purpose of exercising political power.⁹ The authority of grand

⁶ I. RAVIĆ, Pismo barskog episkopa Grgura splitskom kanoniku Gvalteriju, *Stari srpski arhiv* 10 (2011) 183–190.

⁷ It is confirmed by the fact that in the peace treaty concluded on 27 September 1186, the position of the church is not mentioned in a single word, N. PORČIĆ, *Dokumenti srpskih srednjovekovnih vladara u dubrovačkim zbirkama. Doba Nemanjića*, Beograd 2017, 129–131.

⁸ On the falsified charters on the establishment of the Archbishopric of Antivari from 1067 and 1089, see I. KOMATINA, *Crkva i država*, 132–133, 140–145; At the same time, the papal “lack of information” at that moment in connection with the mentioned events gave rise to one of the longest disputes within the Roman Catholic Church between the newly created Archbishopric of Antivari and the then-jurisdictional Archbishopric of Ragusa, the end of which, although in favour of Antivari, would only be seen after a little more than five decades. On the decades-long dispute between the Archbishoprics of Antivari and Ragusa, I. KOMATINA, *Crkva i država*, 300–334.

⁹ Đ. BUBALO, Titule Vukana Nemanjića i tradicija dukljanskog kraljevstva, *Durđevi stupovi i Budimljanska eparhija*, ur. B. TODIĆ, Berane – Beograd 2011, 79–94; I. KOMATINA, Veliko kraljevstvo od prva: krunisanje Stefana Nemanjića i “tradicija Dukljanskog kraljevstva”, *Istorijski časopis* 65 (2018) 55–82; On the thesis

župan Stefan was inviolable in Serbia in the narrower sense and in the littoral principalities, but as the sources testify, he did not get involved in the conflicts between the two Roman Catholic jurisdictions.¹⁰ His practical policy is visible in almost every move he made, including in his attitude towards the Roman Catholics. The marriage with Anna, a princess from the distinguished Roman Catholic Venetian family of Dandolo, concluded no later than mid-1217, as well as the acceptance of the royal crown from Rome, sent by pope Honorius III shortly after the wedding, after almost twenty years of striving for that ruling status, could be observed within the framework of such policy.¹¹ Therefore, his tolerant and benevolent attitude towards the Roman Catholics and Latins is unquestionable, as well as his wholehearted support for the activities of his brother Sava regarding the establishment of an autocephalous Archbishopric of Serbia. Sava, after returning from Nicaea, where he obtained the rank of archbishopric for the Serbian Church in 1218/1219 and organized the newly established at a council in the Žiča monastery in Serbia, whose ktetor was king Stefan himself. It consisted of twelve bishoprics, including the Archbishopric in Žiča, with as many as two of them (Zeta and Ston) located in the territory where the Church of Ragusa, i.e. Antivari was already active.¹²

that Vukan was crowned as the king of Dioclea, N. PORČIĆ, Vukan Nemanjić – Krunisani i miropomazani kralj?, *Stefan Prvovenčani i njegovo doba*, ur. A. RASTOVIĆ, I. KOMATINA, Beograd 2020, 63–82. Although in the area of Dioclea Vukan wholeheartedly supported the Roman Catholic Church, in the short period when he was enthroned on the grand župan throne, he manifested a distinctly Orthodox church orientation, Đ. TRIFUNOVIĆ, Zapis starca Simeona na Vukanovom jevandjelju, *Prilozi za književnost jezik, istoriju i folklor* (=Prilozi za KJIF) 67 (2001) 63–85; SVETI SAVA, *Sabrana dela*, izd. T. JOVANOVIĆ 1998, 184–188; LJ. MAKSIMOVIĆ, O godini prenosa Nemanjinih moštiju u Srbiju, *ZRVI* 24–25 (1986) 437–444.

¹⁰ Đ. BUBALO, Da li su kralj Stefan Prvovenčani i njegov sin Radoslav bili savladari?, *ZRVI* 46 (2009) 201–227.

¹¹ Of course, Venetian doge Andrea Dandolo recorded in his Chronicle that Stefan renounced Orthodoxy when marrying Anna for the sake of the crown, which certainly does not correspond to historical facts, *Andreae Danduli Venetorum Ducis Chronicon Venetum, a pontificatu S. Marci ad Annum usque MCCCXXXIX*, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores XII*, ed. L. A. MURATORI, Milano 1778, 287; I. KOMATINA, Ana Dandolo – prva srpska kraljica?, *Zbornik Matice srpske za istoriju* 89 (2014) 7–20.

¹² I. KOMATINA, *Crkva i država*, 247–299; S. PIRIVATRIĆ, Kriza vizantijskog sveta i postanak kraljevstva i autokefalne arhiepiskopije svih srpskih i pomorskih zemalja, *Kraljevstvo i arhiepiskopija u srpskim i pomorskim zemljama Nemanjića*, ur. LJ. MAKSIMOVIĆ, S. PIRIVATRIĆ, 107–146.

We briefly pointed out some of the most significant events in the Serbian history of the first Nemanjićs – the elevation to the rank of a kingdom in 1217 and the establishment of the Serbian Archbishopric in 1218/1219, and the church policy of Nemanja and his sons, which was apparently fully tolerant towards Latin population. However, the outlined ecclesiastical and political circumstances in the area of Serbian lands also found their place in Serbian hagiographies of the 13th century, which, it seems to us, provide a different perception of those important events. The goal of our research is to highlight them and to try to give an answer as to why the very context of important events in Serbian history changed in these narrative accounts solely because of the change in attitudes towards the Latins and Roman Catholics, as well as to try to determine what influenced that change. Their uniqueness and immense importance in terms of the historical context lies in the fact that their compilers were: the first Serbian archbishop Sava and the first Serbian king Stefan the First-Crowned, who, each in their own style, wrote the *Life of St Simeon*, their father – the founder of the Nemanjić dynasty, Stefan Nemanja. Apart from the mentioned hagiographies created in the first decades of the 13th century, we will use hagiographies created owing to distinguished Chilandar monks Domentijan and Teodosije. Namely, we will consider the relationship between Domentijan's and Teodosije' *Life of St Sava*, indicating the temporal proximity of these texts, composed in the middle, i.e. the last decades of the 13th century. We will also shed light on the *Life of St Simeon* that Domentijan compiled a little more than half a century after the death of the founder of the Serbian dynasty.¹³

Life of St Simeon by St Sava

Sava Nemanjić compiled the *Life of St Simeon* in 1207/1208, as the introductory chapter for the Typikon of the Studenica monastery. It should be emphasized that it is not a comprehensive hagiography, but a

¹³ The particularity of the above Serbian hagiographies is that they are considered by prominent historians and literary historians as “old Serbian biographies”, S. VULOVIĆ, *Iz stare srpske književnosti. Po nešto o biografijama srpskim XIII veka, Godišnjica Nikole Čupića 7* (1885) 87–135; D. BOGDANOVIĆ, *Stara srpska biblioteka, Letopis Matice srpske* 408 (1971) 405–432; R. MARINKOVIĆ, *Vladarske biografije iz vremena Nemanjića, Prilozi za KJIF* 44, 1–2 (1978) 3–20. Namely, in addition to containing important historical data, often their role was to create the cult of rulers who were not proclaimed saints, and among them there are those for whom the *Lives* were compiled, and who did not even respect church norms during their lives, Đ. TRIFUNOVIĆ, *Azbučnik srpskih srednjovekovnih pojmova*, Beograd 1974, 46–78.

ktetor's – the so-called prologue life. Such an assertion immediately suggests that the emphasize is on the monastic life of the progenitor of the Nemanjić dynasty, Stefan Nemanja – monk Simeon. Therefore, the role of the *Life* was primarily to glorify the ktetor of the Studenica monastery, as Sava himself states: "...We did not write about his rule and the state in the order of what we heard and saw, so as not to multiply the words...".¹⁴ Therefore, the greatest attention was devoted to the construction of the Studenica monastery, Nemanja's taking of monastic vows and going to the Holy Mountain and erecting, i.e. restoring the Chilandar monastery, with the most important political achievements of his reign being presented quite concisely. However, though having devised his work in such way, Sava made important observations about the attitude towards the Roman Catholics and Latins, both during Nemanja's young age and after the fateful year of 1204. Thus, on the final pages of the ktetor's life, Sava recapitulates Nemanja's life "from birth". It is there that we come across the following significant lines: "...His birth was in Zeta, in Ribnica, where he received the holy baptism... When the infant was brought over here, the bishop of the church of the Holy Apostles took him and prayed over the child and anointed him with myrrh, and he received the second baptism. Sava added: "...this was wonderful with this man... as an infant, he received two baptisms, and again, when he received the angelic vows, he was given the small and the great one... And upon his dormition, his most venerable body was buried twice..."¹⁵

So, Sava informs us that Stefan Nemanja was born in Zeta, i.e. Dioeclea, which, as we pointed out, at the time of his birth was under strong Byzantine influence, and spiritually under the jurisdiction of the Archbishopric of Ragusa.¹⁶ In Zeta, in Ribnica, Nemanja was baptized according to the Latin rite, and he was chrismated (since according to Christian teaching, baptism is performed only once) in the church of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, which is located in Ras, today near Novi Pazar. After this news, Sava emphasizes in an illustrative way that such Nemanja's

¹⁴ "... О ВЛАДЫЧЬСТВЕЪ КО ЕГО И ДРЪЖАВЪ НЕ ИСПИСАХОМЪ ЕГО ПО РЕДОУ ТАЖЕ СЛЫШАХОМЪ И ВНАДЪХОМЪ ОУДИНОЖЕНІА РАДН СЛОВОЕСЪ", SVETI SAVA, *Sabrana dela*, 154.

¹⁵ SVETI SAVA, *Sabrana dela*, 189.

¹⁶ On the year of Nemanja's birth, J. LEŠNY, Stefan Zawida, syn Urosza I – ojcem Stefana Nemanji, *Roczniki Historyczne* 54 (1988) 63–74; S. PIRIVATRIĆ, Prilog hronologiji početka Nemanjine vlasti, 129, 134; N. PORČIĆ, Jedan zanemarení pristup pitanju hronologije rođenja Stefana Nemanje, *Stefan Nemanja – Prepodobni Simeon Mirotočivi*, ur. M. RADUJKO, Beograd – Berane 2016, 63–73, with older literature.

Christian path was wonderful, and adds that his life was marked by duality: baptism, i.e. baptism and chrismation, two monastic degrees, i.e. the small and great schema in a single day, and the funeral, because initially, as is known, his body was buried in Chilandar, and then translated to Studenica. Therefore, at the time when Sava compiled the ktetor's *Life of St Simeon* in Studenica, only three to four years after the fateful year of 1204, the attitude towards the Roman Catholics, i.e. the Latin rite was tolerant.

A few lines earlier, Sava informs us about the conquest of Constantinople by the Latins: „...and I spent eight years there (in Chilandar – *author's note*) and there were many commotions, because the Latins passed through and occupied Constantinople, the former Greek land, and came even to us, entering the holy place. So there was a big commotion...”¹⁷ Apart from the news that the Latins had reached the Holy Mountain, where there was a “big commotion”, Sava does not add any information about that turmoil. In this regard, his report is truly terse, and at times it seems that he brings that information incidentally, because he immediately shifts to the “commotion” in Serbia. Namely, Sava received an epistle from his brother, grand župan Stefan, which describes in detail the commotion in Serbia, i.e. the troubles that the grand župan had with their older brother Vukan. In his desire to reconcile the quarrelling brothers, Sava, as is known, left the Holy Mountain in 1207 and on that occasion translated the relics of Simeon-Nemanja to Serbia, to his “designated grave” in Studenica.¹⁸ Although the news about the commotion on the Holy Mountain is very scarce, it must be admitted that not even the slightest degree of Sava's aversion to the Latins can be deduced from it. The fact that the Latins caused the upheaval is indisputable, but Sava, in describing those political events, does not seem to give a personal impression. After returning from Nicaea to Serbia in 1218/1219, archbishop Sava stayed on Mount Athos, and later in Thessaloniki, where, according to his hagiographer, he “...copied many books on the law and on correction of faith, which his catholic church needed...” and in those words the *Za-*

¹⁷ SVETI SAVA, *Sabrana dela*, 185. When the Latins seized the Holy Mountain in 1205, already the following year cardinal Benedict, as the legate of pope Innocent III, made the decision to place the Holy Mountain under the authority of the Latin bishop of Sebaste. Since the position of the Athonites was unbearable, they addressed the Latin emperor and received his own protection, while the Apostolic See, i.e. the pope later placed them under his protection, M. ŽIVOJINOVIĆ, *Sveta Gora u doba Latinskog carstva*, *ZRVI* 17 (1976) 77–91.

¹⁸ SVETI SAVA, *Sabrana dela*, 184–188; LJ. MAKSIMOVIĆ, *O godini prenosu*, 437–444.

konopravilo of St Sava or the *Serbian Nomocanon* is recognized.¹⁹ Unfortunately, Sava's autograph of *Zakonopravilo* has not been preserved, and the oldest preserved transcript is the so-called Ilovica transcript from 1262.²⁰ In that oldest extant transcript of *Zakonopravilo*, Roman Catholics are not designated as one of "numerous heresies", but in that section, babuns (Bogomils), but also followers of Muhammad's teaching and Jews, are mentioned. In the Ilovica transcript of the *Zakonopravilo*, we also encounter only the shortcomings of the Roman Catholic doctrine compare to the Orthodox one, but Roman Catholics are still not classified as heretics, whom we define as those who present teachings about religious dogmas that differ from the teachings of the canonically recognized churches – the Orthodox and Roman Catholic. If we presume that Sava's autograph was also in an approximate form, Sava's attitude towards the Latins in the *Life*, which apparently did not change much even after the establishment of the Serbian Archbishopric, is not surprising.

Life of St Simeon by Stefan the First-Crowned

A similar attitude towards the Latins, i.e. the Roman Catholics, as we saw in the *Life of St Simeon* by St Sava, is also seen in the *Life of St Simeon*, which was written by his successor on the throne Stefan the First-Crowned. It is assumed that he compiled the *Life* in the period between 1208 and 1216.²¹ For Nemanja, it is recorded that he was born in Dioclea, "in the place called Ribnica". Stefan adds that Nemanja "...received Latin baptism in the temple..." there, but unfortunately he

¹⁹ A. SOLOVJEV, Svetosavski Nomokanon i njegovi prepisi, *Bratstvo* 26 (1932) 21–43; M. PETROVIĆ, *O Zakonopravilu ili Nomokanonu Svetoga Save*, Beograd 1990, 5–7; S. TROICKI, Crkvenopolitička ideologija Svetosavske Krmčije, *Glas Srpske akademije nauka* 212 (1953) 155–199.

²⁰ In scholarship, the question of the origin of Sava's *Zakonopravilo* has not yet been resolved, i.e. it is not known which model Sava used in Thessaloniki and whether it was his autonomous compilation at all, *Leksikon srpskog srednjeg veka*, ur. S. ĆIRKOVIĆ, R. MIHALJČIĆ, Beograd 1999, 446–449 (Nomokanon); There are also eight more preserved manuscripts of the Serbian recension created in the period from the 13th to the 17th century. It should be noted that there is also the Morača transcript from 1651, which can be said, judging by the record, to have been created on the basis of the transcript of the bishop of Budimlja Theofil from 1252, which unfortunately has not been found to this day, N. DUČIĆ, Krmčija Moračka, *Glas Srpskog učenog društva* 8 (1877) 34–134.

²¹ On the time of the compilation of Stefan's *Life*: R. Marinković, Istorija nastanka Života gospodina Simeona od svetoga Save, *Sava Nemanjić–Sveti Sava. Istorija i predanje*, ur. V. ĐURIĆ, 201–213.

does not specify in which,²² and that he “...received the second baptism from the hands of bishops and archbishops in the middle of the Serbian land, in the temple of the holy, all-glorious and supreme apostles Peter and Paul...”.²³ In fact, Stefan Nemanja was chrismated on that occasion, as his second son and hagiographer Sava records, since double baptism was impossible at the time.²⁴ Stefan’s view of why it happened in such way is also important, as he states that “...there were also (sic!) Latin priests in the country...”, and that everything happened according to the “will of God”.²⁵ Later, when describing the council against heretics convened by Simeon (Nemanja) between 1172 and 1182, Stefan does not refer to the Latins as heretics in a single word. In fact, he does not actually designate the heresy, but calls it “thrice-accursed and hateful” and it is clear that he talks about the Bogomils whom, following the lines of the *Life*, Nemanja punished cruelly.²⁶

We also learn from the *Life* that Nemanja bestowed gifts on Roman Catholic churches even outside his state, primarily the Basilica of St Peter and Paul in Rome, as well as the church of St Nicholas in Bari.²⁷ It is not known what kind of gifts were meant, or whether the placement of Nemanja’s court in the littoral town of Cattaro in 1186 had anything to do with the later association of the Serbian kings with the church of St Nicholas in Bari since the bishopric of Cattaro was under the jurisdiction of the Archbishopric in Bari. This is also, it seems to us, the last piece of information from the above hagiography that could indicate Nemanja’s attitude towards the Roman Catholics.

Stefan then presents the political relations of his time through a catalogue of miracles, in which his protector and defender of the Serbian state was none other than his father St Simeon, whereby he also ends the hagiography. His work is void of any intolerance towards the Latins except in the political sense, in places where he describes threats of war and conflicts with Hungarian king Andrew II and Latin emperor Henry of

²² STEFAN PRVOVENČANI, *Sabrana dela*, 18.

²³ STEFAN PRVOVENČANI, *Sabrana dela*, 18–20.

²⁴ SVETI SAVA, *Sabrana dela*, 188–190.

²⁵ STEFAN PRVOVENČANI, *Sabrana dela*, 18–20.

²⁶ I. KOMATINA, Istorijaska podloga čuda Sv. Simeona u Žitiju Simeonom od Stefana Prvovenčanog, *ZRVI* 51 (2014) 111–134.

²⁷ STEFAN PRVOVENČANI, *Sabrana dela*, 43; According to the place in Stefan’s *Life*, it is assumed that the donations were made before 1186 and that they are contemporary with the construction of Studenica, B. MILJKOVIĆ, Nemanjići i Sveti Nikola u Bariju, *ZRVI* 54 (2017) 275–292, 276–277, nap. 7; S. PIRIVATRIĆ, Hronologija i istorijski kontekst podizanja manastira Studenice, *Zograf* 39 (2015) 47–56.

Flanders.²⁸ Unfortunately, the last described events in the hagiography belong to the time before his marriage to the western noblewoman Anna Dandolo and his coronation with the crown sent by pope Honorius III through his legate from Rome.²⁹ Diplomatic and narrative sources clearly indicate his non-exclusive attitude towards the Roman Catholic Church, like the one shown by his father Nemanja and brother Sava. Nevertheless, historiography will forever lament for that direct testimony about his marriage to Anna, the obtainment of the royal rank and the establishment of the Serbian Archbishopric, which the king-historian could have provided.

Life of St. Sava and St Simeon by Domentijan and Life of St Sava by Teodosije

In the mid-13th century, more precisely in 1253/1254,³⁰ Sava's disciple Domentijan compiled the *Life of St Sava*, and in 1264 the *Life of St Simeon*. Although he wrote them on the Holy Mountain, as Sava's disciple he was involved in shaping the Serbian state and church. His *Life of St Sava* is considered a first-rate source, and when it is stripped of the accumulated epithets that characterize its unique style, we often arrive at reliable and objective historical material.³¹ Along with both *Lives*, Domentijan compiled a record about the date of their composition, while the note on the composition of the *Life of St Simeon* also contains the only references to the Latins. Therefore, we will first refer to those data, and then focus on the *Life of St Sava* that contains more diverse data.

Namely, at the end of the *Life of St Simeon* Domentijan states that he wrote the lines during "...the reign of the pious Greek emperor kyr Michael Palaeologus, in the third year, when he took Constantinople from the Latins and when he ruled over the eastern lands and the western ones...";³² but apart from this, unfortunately, his text does not mention other key moments of Byzantine, Balkan, or Serbian history in which the immediate relationship with the Latins, i.e. Roman Catholics is shown.

²⁸ I. KOMATINA, *Istorijska podloga čuda*, 127–129.

²⁹ STEFAN PRVOVENČANI, *Sabrana dela*, 98–106; I. KOMATINA, *Ana Dandolo*, 7–20; EADEM, *Veliko kraljevstvo od prva*, 15–32.

³⁰ I. ŠPADIJER, *Svetogorska baština*, Beograd 2014, 43–48 with the argument that the *Life* dates to 1253/1254 instead of 1242/1243.

³¹ S. STANOJEVIĆ, *Izvori Nemanjinih biografija*, *Letopis Matice srpske* 182 (1895) 99–105, 102–105; S. ČIRKOVIĆ, *Domentijanova prospografija*, *ZRVI* 45 (2008) 141–154; I. KOMATINA, *Kralj Stefan Uroš I Veliki i njegov vek*, Beograd 2021, 207–208; EADEM, *Crkva i država*, 257–300; EADEM, *Veliko kraljevstvo od prva*, 15–32.

³² DOMENTIAN, *Životi Svetoga Save i Svetoga Simeona*, prev. L. MIRKOVIĆ, Beograd 1938, 318–319.

The mention of Michael VIII with the epithet of the pious Greek emperor is fully understandable, and since the *Life of St Simeon* was compiled in 1264, i.e. before the conclusion of the Union of Lyon, from the stated lines we cannot more thoroughly consider Domentijan's attitude to the emperor-uniat and the circumstances in the Byzantine Church of that time.³³ So, although his *Life of St Simeon* is extensive as it spans the period from birth to death and Simeon's proclamation as a myrrh-gusher, it does not mention Nemanja's baptism or the news that the Holy Mountain, on which he wrote the *Life*, was ravaged by the Latins half a century earlier, which is surprising since, when compiling the *Life of St Simeon*, he certainly relied on the *Life* that Sava and Stefan wrote about their father.³⁴ Since in the *Life of St Simeon* by Domentijan we find almost no additional news, as we have pointed out, we will focus on Domentijan's *Life of St Sava*, to which we will, with reason, join the analysis of the *Life of St Sava* compiled by Teodosije.

Namely, the last one in chronological terms, important for our topic of the perception of the other, in our case Roman Catholics, is the *Life of St Sava* compiled by Teodosije. As recently established, this Chilandar monk compiled the *Life of St Sava* most probably in the last decades of the 13th century, and its extensive title states that "it was *told* by Domentijan and *written* by Teodosije".³⁵ Such a statement also created numerous doubts in the observation of the relationship between Domentijan and Teodosije, and it is interpreted in two ways – spoken, i.e. written by Domentijan, and (again) written by Teodosije or literally that it was told, i.e. that Domentijan orally told Teodosije, who wrote (composed) the hagiography, which is taken as a more probable thesis.³⁶ It is possible

³³ In somewhat later writings by archbishop Danilo II, we come across a slightly more direct attitude to Michael VIII, and in the *Life of King Milutin* he notes: "...this Palaiologos, having renounced the Christian faith, took the Latin faith", *Životi kraljeva i arhiepiskopa srpskih*, napisao arhiepiskop Danilo II, izd. Đ. DANIČIĆ, Zagreb 1866 110. Even archbishop Danilo II does not record the first name of emperor Michael, which indicates the attitude of the Serbian community in the 14th century towards the Union signed by the emperor.

³⁴ S. STANOJEVIĆ, *Izvori Nemanjinih biografija*, 102–105; *Istorija srpskog naroda u srednjem veku*, I, ur. S. ČIRKOVIĆ, Beograd 1981, 337–338 (D. BOGDANOVIĆ).

³⁵ Ž. JANKOVIĆ, Prilog datovanju Domentijanovog dela, *Godišnjak Srpske pravoslavne crkve* 70/1 (1989) 17–18; I. ŠPADIJER, Hronološki okviri književnog rada Teodosija Hilandaraca, *Prilozi za KJIF* 76 (2010) 3–15.

³⁶ When the distinguished Serbian philologist Đura Daničić first published Teodosije's *Life of St Sava* in the mid-19th century, he published it under Domentijan's name, since at that time the only transcript of Teodosije's work known to him

that Teodosije was at one time a contemporary of Sava's disciple Domentijan, and that he directly listened to his testimonies, and hence the modesty that he "just wrote down" what Domentijan "said".³⁷ Since the composition of Domentijan's and Teodosije's *Life of St Sava* is similar, with both Chilandar monks writing within a relatively short chronological frame, while in the first part of the paper we presented the most significant moments of Serbian political and ecclesiastical history of the 13th century, we will simultaneously follow their news about those events, compare and analyze them, in order to provide a complete picture of the attitude towards the Latins and Roman Catholics.

The first interesting news in that context, presented by both Sava's hagiographers, Domentijan and Teodosije, refers to the description of Sava's stay with the "Constantinopolitan emperor kyr Theodore Laskaris", i.e. in Nicaea, where he aimed to obtain the autonomy for the Serbian Church, and the later description of Stefan's coronation as the first Serbian king.³⁸ With such an order of events, they in fact assigned the first Serbian archbishop Sava an important role to crown his brother Stefan as the first Serbian king at the council convened "in the great archbishopric", i.e. the Žiča monastery, the seat of the newly founded Serbian Archbishopric. However, although both hagiographers show a tendency to celebrate Sava's works, the somewhat older biographer, Domentijan, compared to the younger hagiographer Teodosije, offers a somewhat different view of the reasons for the establishment of the Serbian Archbishopric and Stefan's coronation, obviously under the influence of different theological views. Namely, Domentijan states that Sava addressed emperor Theodore I Laskaris because it was "pitiful and sad" that his country "does not have its own archbishop", including many other countries around his "fatherland, in the area of his state", "that are not advanced in divine correction". The statement about the necessity of "divine correction" certainly refers to the establishment of an Orthodox church organisation in the area of the principalities of Dioclea, Travunia and Zahumlje, which were also part of Sava's fatherland, but in which, as we have seen,

had only the part "told by Domentijan" in the title, which confused the distinguished philologist, I. ŠPADIJER, *Svetogorska baština*, 52–53, n. 110.

³⁷ I. ŠPADIJER, *Svetogorska baština*, 53–54; EADEM, Hronološki okviri, 14–15.

³⁸ It should be noted that both hagiographers tendentiously place the establishment of the Serbian Archbishopric (1218/1219) in the period before the coronation of Stefan as king, which, as diplomatic and other sources unambiguously confirm, took place in 1217, so that, among other things, the first Serbian archbishop Sava would play the important role to crown his brother Stefan as king.

the Roman Catholic Church, embodied in mutually conflicting Archbishops of Ragusa and Antivari, was active until the establishment of the Serbian Archbishopric.

Unlike him, Teodosije states a different reason for addressing the emperor, saying that Sava and Simeon (Nemanja) “drove out the heresy of evil faith from the land of the people” (their, *author’s note*), that the “Orthodox faith grows and spreads”, and that Sava pointed out to the emperor that “the only thing missing” is that the Serbs have their own archbishop.³⁹ Therefore, apart from the fact that both hagiographers emphasize the need for the Serbian state to get an archbishop, Teodosije, unlike Domentijan, assumes that there is no disunity of the Serbian lands in the ecclesiastical aspect, but that in the Serbian medieval state the Orthodox faith was indubitably the only dominant religion in the Serbian medieval principalities, which certainly does not reflect the historical moment he writes about.

The two hagiographers had a different understanding of the church circumstances in Serbia in the 1220s also when describing the Great Anti-Heretical Council convened by Sava in Žiča after he returned to Serbia and consecrated the bishops. At the Council, according to Domentijan, Sava established the true faith, which implied the confession of the Holy Trinity, non-denial of the two natures, veneration of the Holy Cross, the holy vessels and the “holy church”, veneration of icons, i.e. the “image of the Most Holy Theotokos”, and all the “seven ecumenical councils”. Moreover, “the devil has invented many heresies in different times and years and planted in the ecumene the tares of the evil faith through lawless leaders of heresies who serve the devil to convert and sully the true faith, whom we curse, and with them those who invented evil commandments, and we abhor every unholy heresy”.⁴⁰ Then, after speaking about the true faith, Domentijan writes that Sava chose his disciple, the newly appointed bishop Methodius, and sent him to Rome “to the praiseworthy apostles Peter and Paul and to the great co-holder of the throne of the saints, the pope of the great Roman state, to give a blessing according to their holiness so that they also bless his fatherland and crown with their grace the faithful co-holder of the throne (i.e. Stefan) of his fatherland; and having written an epistle to the great co-holder of the throne of the holy and glorious apostles, the pope, and confessing to him the unconcealed grace by which he was crowned by God and begging him to send

³⁹ DOMENTIЈAN, *Žitije Sv. Save*, 194–196; TEODOSIJE HILANDARAC, *Život Svetoga Save*, izd. Đ. DANIČIĆ, prir. Đ. TRIFUNOVIĆ, Beograd 1973, 126.

⁴⁰ DOMENTIЈAN, *Žitije Sv. Save*, 224–246.

him blessing from the holy apostles and from him alone the blessed crown, to crown his brother to the kingdom according to the first fatherhood of their kingdom”. Domentijan then describes the ceremony of crowning Stefan as the first Serbian king, which was performed by archbishop Sava.⁴¹ In the St Petersburg manuscript of Domentijan’s *Life of St Sava* it is stated that the first Serbian archbishop sent an expensive vigil lamp for the tomb of the Holy Apostle Peter in Rome.⁴²

Teodosije, on the other hand, places Stefan’s coronation on the first day of the anti-heretical council, which, according to him, took place on the feast of Christ the Saviour, in the monastery Žiča built by Stefan.⁴³ On the second day of the council, Sava delivered a sermon on the “true faith”, in which he reminded that Saint Simeon (Nemanja) planted Orthodoxy, but “...God has blessed us to water what our father planted...”, adding the quote that “...Paul planted the seed, Apollos watered the plant, but it was God who made the plant grow...”.⁴⁴ Then he decided to preach about heresies like Paul, the “great ecumenical teacher”, pleading with the present people and nobles not to “..conceal the god-hating heresy...”.⁴⁵ After reading the Gospel, they began to establish the “divine Orthodox faith”, which implied the acceptance of “...all the holy councils of the holy fathers...”, veneration of icons and “...the human incarnation of Christ, the Word of God and the Father...”, the Theotokos, the sacred

⁴¹ DOMENTIЈAN, *Žitije Sv. Save*, 248–252; S. MARJANOVIĆ-DUŠANIĆ, Srpski uspon na kraljevstvo: Tumačenja i značenja obreda krunisanja, *Kraljevstvo i arhiepiskopija u srpskim i pomorskim zemljama Nemanjića*, ur. Lj. MAKSIMOVIĆ, S. PIRIVATRIĆ, 147–186.

⁴² V. JAGIĆ, Opisi i izvodi iz nekoliko južnoslovenskih rukopisa, *Starine JAZU* 5 (1873) 8–21, 15; B. MILJKOVIĆ, Nemanjići i Sveti Nikola u Bariju, 277. „To the pope of the great Roman state, having given a blessing worthy of honour, and the praise to the saints, the very honourable vigil lamp created with God-minded reason, sculpted with the most illuminated imagination, and designed with beautiful colours, which to this day stands near the tomb of the praiseworthy apostles Peter and Paul”, DOMENTIЈAN, *Život Svetoga Save i Svetoga Simeona*, prev. L. MIRKOVIĆ, prir. R. MARINKOVIĆ, Beograd 1988, 136, nap. 1. It was also noted that soon after the establishment of the Serbian Archbishopric, king Stefan the First-Crowned bestowed gifts on the Roman Catholic monastery of the Holy Theotokos in Mljet, STEFAN PRVOVENČANI, *Sabrana dela*, 125–128.

⁴³ TEODOSIJE HILANDARAC, *Život Svetoga Save*, 144–145.

⁴⁴ TEODOSIJE HILANDARAC, *Život Svetoga Save*, 146–147.

⁴⁵ TEODOSIJE HILANDARAC, *Život Svetoga Save*, 148; M. IVANOVIĆ, Vlastela u vreme vladavine kralja Stefana Prvovenčanog, *Stefan Prvovenčani i njegovo doba*, ur. A. RASTOVIĆ, I. KOMATINA, Beograd 2020, 119–136.

tree, the holy mysteries, the church and church vessels, and "...we curse all the heretics and all their evil heresy...".⁴⁶ On the third day of the Council, he called those gathered to the Archbishopric, "...and those who confessed heresy, he kept with him at the church and questioned them carefully in private...". Having cursed the heresy they professed, he commanded those unbaptised to keep the days of the catechumens by staying clean, and thus commanded them to be baptised. Having also cursed their evil heresy, he commanded those who were baptised in the Latin heresy – after they confessed the true faith and after the prayer was read over the holy myrrh – that all their senses be anointed with that "...holy myrrh so that they be faithful with us".⁴⁷ Apart from the baptism of those who were in the "Latin heresy", those who lived with women "without blessing and prayer" were also married. According to Teodosije, even after the Council, Sava went around "the entire country of his people, establishing and teaching them the faith of Orthodoxy, and imparting on them virtues and good customs, leading them through confession to repentance "...those in heresy, states Teodosije, he taught to return to the catholic apostolic church", and whoever is strengthened... in God-hating heresies, after cursing them with dishonour they banished him from their entire country...".⁴⁸

Domentijan and Teodosije undoubtedly provide a different overview of important events in Serbian history, primarily in relation to the Roman Catholic Church. As we have seen, Teodosije gives different reasons compared to Domentijan for the establishment of the Serbian Archbishopric, where his overtly Orthodox attitude is immediately noticeable, as he ignores the existence of the Roman Catholic Church in the territory of Serbian lands. When they describe the great anti-heretical council, a noticeable difference is that Domentijan uses the term "true faith", contrary to Teodosije, who uses the term "Orthodox faith" for the first time in Serbian sources. However, in the texts of both hagiographers, the heresy is equally condemned, which Domentijan does not name, while Teodosije calls it the "God-hating heresy". In that place, both of Sava's hagiographers imply the Bogomil heresy, well-known in the Balkans. Namely, Bogomils do not venerate the Holy Trinity and the Theotokos, they reject the sacraments, icons and crosses. Also, "the tares of evil faith" and "God-hating heresy" were common expressions used to denote the Bogomil

⁴⁶ TEODOSIJE HILANDARAC, *Život Svetoga Save*, 149–150.

⁴⁷ TEODOSIJE HILANDARAC, *Život Svetoga Save*, 150–152.

⁴⁸ TEODOSIJE HILANDARAC, *Život Svetoga Save*, 151–152.

heresy.⁴⁹ In Serbia of Sava's time, the heresy was not as strong as at the time of his father, Simeon Nemanja, who mercilessly dealt with the "thrice-accursed heresy", which is why the intervention of the state authorities was not needed, but Sava, nonetheless, convened the council out of precaution.⁵⁰ Teodosije states that some at the council renounced the heresy, but despite the condemnation of unbaptized heretics, among those who had to be re-baptized, Teodosije, unlike Domentijan, also mentions those who "were baptized in the Latin heresy", but who according to him had to be anointed.⁵¹

Therefore, Teodosije clearly distinguishes the *true heresy* from the *Latin heresy*, i.e. unlike Domentijan, he labels Roman Catholics as heretics.⁵² The next noticeable difference in the attitude towards Roman Catholics in the texts of these hagiographers is the description of Stefan's coronation. Domentijan does not deny that the crown arrived from Rome, while Teodosije does not mention the origin of the crown, but associates the entire ceremony with the Žiča monastery and archbishop Sava, i.e. he describes it entirely in the Orthodox spirit.⁵³

There are several other striking examples of the perception and attitude towards the Roman Catholics in the texts of the hagiographers Domentijan and Teodosije. Namely, when describing the *Great Anti-Heretical Council* or the *Žiča Council*, Domentijan states that "the Most Merciful and Loving God, having immeasurable mercy towards the human race... sent the holy apostles into the world... but as they did not reach us, our fathers, hearing the truth of their words, believed".⁵⁴ That place is significantly changed in Teodosije's text as he states that Christ sent the

⁴⁹ A. SOLOVJEV, Svedočanstva pravoslavnih izvora o bogomilstvu na Balkanu, *Godišnjak* 5 (1953) 1–103, pp. 40–44; I. KOMATINA, *Crkva i država*, 164–178.

⁵⁰ Heresy could have arrived in Serbia at that time from Bulgaria or Bosnia. The fact that precisely in 1221, after almost two decades of silence, news about the Bosnian heretics again came to light, indicates that the heresy threatened from neighbouring Bosnia rather than from Bulgaria, I. KOMATINA, *Crkva i država*, 294.

⁵¹ The claim that the council was against the Roman Catholic faith is made by M. PETROVIĆ, Sveti Sava na Žičkom saboru 1221. godine i latinska jeres, *Istorijski časopis* 45–46 (2000) 11–30, pp. 11–20.

⁵² On the anti-Latin attitude of Theodosius, B. MILJKOVIĆ, *Žitija Svetog Save kao izvori za istoriju srednjovekovne umetnosti*, Beograd 2008, 142; I. ŠPADIJER, Hronološki okvir, 12–15.

⁵³ B. TODIĆ, O vremenu i razlozima pisanja Teodosijeveg Žitija Sv. Save, *Prilozi za KJIF* 83 (2017) 3–19.

⁵⁴ DOMENTIJAN, *Žitije Sv. Save*, 228; B. TODIĆ, Istorizovanju vere u Srba radi odbrane crkvene autokefalije, *Crkvene studije* 16/2 (2019) 15–28, p. 19.

apostles into the world to teach all peoples, and the apostles "...taught and baptised people in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, each in his own country where he was appointed by God..."⁵⁵ Also, Teodosije states that "...many of the saints after the apostles... preached the gospel like the apostles..."⁵⁶ Therefore, unlike Domentijan, Teodosije does not deny that the apostles reached the Serbian land and that their work was continued by the holy fathers, certainly Simeon and Sava. In the continuation of the description of the *Council of Žiča*, Teodosije cites the merits of apostle Paul, but actually only in the *Praise to Saint Simeon and Saint Sava* does he reveal which apostle he meant in the *Life* of Sava, and says "...he sent Crescens and Titus... across Dalmatia... as apostles we shamelessly call you, you have taken upon yourselves the apostolic works. Because they preached the gospel in our land, plucked up the deception like chaff, chased away heresies like wolves, destroyed their altars like contempt, elevated the church as the heavens, gathered people through orthodoxy like a flock, brought saints like shepherds, rooted out the weeds of beans like thorns and planted the vine of the pious one..."⁵⁷ Thus, Paul's disciple Titus, one of the seventy apostles, preached in Dalmatia, by which Teodosije certainly means the Serbian land.⁵⁸

Before we look at the possible reason why Teodosije's *Life of St Sava* was written in an evidently anti-Latin spirit compared to Domentijan, as well as earlier writings created thanks to Sava and Stefan the First-Crowned, we will cite another striking example of a different attitude towards the Roman Catholics. Namely, after the Hungarian king's strong protest regarding Stefan's coronation, the Serbian state sent archbishop Sava to dissuade the king in order to establish peace with the Hungarians.⁵⁹

⁵⁵ TEODOSIJE HILANDARAC, *Život Svetoga Save*, 145–146.

⁵⁶ TEODOSIJE HILANDARAC, *Život Svetoga Save*, 145–146.

⁵⁷ „БОЛЬША И ТИТА, ПРЪВЪКЕ ПРИШЪДШАГО, ПОСЛЪДН ДАЛЪМАТЪН ТАВНСТА СЕ. ТАКО АП(О)-С(ТО)ЛЬСКАИА ДЪЛАННА НА ВЪ СТЕКОШЕ СЕ. ТАКОЖЕ БО (ОНН ЕВ(А)Г(Е)ЛАНЪ ВЪ НАС(Ъ) ПРОПОВЪДАСТЕ НСТРЪЮГОСТЕ ПРЪЛАСТЪ, ТАКО ПЛЪВЕЛЫ. ПОГНАСТЕ КЕСЫ, ТАКО ВЛЪКЫ, РАЗОРНСТЕ ЖРЪТЬВЫШТА НЪ, ТАКО ДРЪЗНОСТЪ. ЦР(Ъ)КВЫ ТАКО Н(Е)Б(Е)СА ВЪ ВЫСОТОУ ВЪЗДВЫГОСТ. СЪВЪКОУПНСТЕ ПРАВОСЛАВЫЕМЪ ЛЮДН ТАКО СТАДО С(ВЕ)Т(Ы)ТЕЛЪ ВЪВЕДОСТЕ ТАКО ПАСТИРЕ КОРЪННА ГРЪХОВЪ, ТАКО ТРЪННИ НСКОРЪННСТЕ И ЛОЗОУ БЛАГОВЪРЪНА НАСАДНСТЕ...”, Т. JOVANOVIĆ, *Pohvala Svetome Simeonu i Svetome Savi Teodosija Hilandarca*, *Književna istorija* 5/20 (1973) 703–778, pp. 752–753; B. TODIĆ, *Istorizovanje vere u Srba*, 19.

⁵⁸ B. TODIĆ, *Istorizovanje vere u Srba*, 19.

⁵⁹ Of course, the hagiographers describe that event after the Great Anti-Heretical Council in Žiča (1220/1221), although Stefan was actually crowned in 1217, because, as we pointed out, Sava's hagiographers focused on emphasizing that he was crowned in Žiča owing to Sava's efforts.

During the meeting with the Hungarian king, archbishop Sava performed a miracle, which is actually an introduction to the story of the “conversion of the Hungarian king” for both of Sava’s hagiographers.⁶⁰ It is interesting that Sava’s hagiographers do not mention the name of the Hungarian king, which is not surprising considering that their writings contain very few personal names and titles. It is clear that each doubtless refers to Hungarian king Andrew II (1205–1235).⁶¹ When the Hungarian king saw Sava’s miracle, Domentijan states: “...bowing down, he prostrated before his feet, begging him to pray to God for him and calling him his spiritual father...”. His Holiness (Sava) made a prayer for him and the king confessed his sins to him, imploring him to tell him a word about his salvation and “...this truly God-loving king (Hungarian) became similar to the capture of Paul just as Christ our Lord captured the persecutor of all the saints...” (i.e. Paul, *author’s note*).⁶² Relying on Domentijan, Teodosije writes in his own style about the Hungarian king: “...instructed by the Saint (Sava), he renounced the heresy and the Latin faith that he professed and all the evil and shameful heresies that the holy, catholic and apostolic church renounced and the holy and ecumenical councils condemned and that he condemned and renounced, and promised to keep the faith of Orthodoxy as the saint taught him...”.⁶³

Thus, Teodosije’s distinctly anti-Latin attitude is again noticeable, where in another place in Teodosije’s text it is stated for Roman Catholics that they are a *Latin heresy*, in contrast to Domentijan, who instead of Orthodoxy uses the term “holy faith” after expounding the teaching about the Holy Trinity, which the Hungarian king accepted. His attitude, unlike that of Teodosije, is imbued with respect of the Roman Catholics throughout his work.⁶⁴

A striking negative change towards the Roman Catholics in the state of the Nemanjić dynasty is noticeable only from the late 13th century and has an undoubted basis in the political and church events of that time. The political and ecclesiastical event that caused changes and upheavals

⁶⁰ DOMENTIJAN, *Žitije Sv. Save*, 252–258; TEODOSIJE HILANDARAC, *Život Svetoga Save*, 152–161.

⁶¹ ĆIRKOVIĆ, *Domentijanova prospografija*, 141–155.

⁶² DOMENTIJAN, *Žitije Sv. Save*, 258, 266–268.

⁶³ TEODOSIJE HILANDARAC, *Život Svetoga Save*, 160.

⁶⁴ Although there are no other historical sources that can confirm or refute the assertions of hagiographers, there is no doubt that the legend about the conversion of the Hungarian ruler to Orthodoxy was inspired by the tradition about the former Hungarian Orthodoxy.

in the entire Christian world, in Constantinople, the Balkan countries, and on the Holy Mountain where Teodosije composed the hagiography, was the *Union of Lyon*.⁶⁵ At the council convened in Lyon in 1272–1274, the union between the Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches was achieved, under the auspices of Byzantine emperor Michael VIII and pope Gregory X. The Byzantine emperor aimed to prevent Charles of Anjou, the Sicilian king, from conquering Constantinople and restoring the Latin Empire, while the pope took such a position because of the interests of his church, primarily hoping that he would thus protect the Holy Land from the infidels, the Mamluks of Egypt. However, as is well known, that act of the Byzantine emperor was strongly resisted – by the anti-Uniate movement in the Orthodox world, above all in Constantinople, where patriarch Joseph was deposed.⁶⁶ Due to his Uniate attitude, in all likelihood, Serbian archbishop Danilo I was also deposed, and the ardent supporter of king Uroš I, archbishop Joanikije was appointed in his place.⁶⁷ Great resistance to the conclusion of the Union also emerged on the Holy Mountain, where, for the sake of reminder, Teodosije lived and wrote. Namely, although the accounts of the abuse of monks by the army of emperor Michael VIII, which are described in the synaxaria from the 14th to the 18th century, are replete with many untrue details, there is no doubt that the resistance to the Union among the Athonites, as well as among the inhabitants of Constantinople, was strong, and that they were also the target of violent measures.⁶⁸ This can be seen first of all in the

⁶⁵ B. MILJKOVIĆ, *Žitija Svetog Save*, 141–143; I. ŠPADIJER, *Svetogorska baština*, 51–72; B. TODIĆ, O vremenu i razlozima pisanja Teodosijejevog Žitija Sv. Save, 3–19.

⁶⁶ G. OSTROGORSKI, *Istorija Vizantije*, Beograd 1959² (reprint), 427–433; M. ANTONOVIĆ, Srbi i Lionska unija: neuspeo pokušaj približavanja, *950 godina od Velikog raskola (1054) i 800 godina od pada Carigrada u ruke krstaša (1204)*, Beograd 2005, 113–131, pp. 115–117.

⁶⁷ DANILO II, *Životi kraljeva i arhiepiskopa srpskih*, 275, 287. In a short biographical note, it is stated that Danilo I was deposed “because of some fault”, but it is not stated which. However, the cooperation of king Uroš with Charles of Anjou and the inclination to the anti-Byzantine coalition, as well as the election and appointment of Joanikije, a loyal supporter of king Uroš, to the position of archbishop indicate that the fault attributed to Danilo I, which is not even mentioned in the very short hagiographical note, was in all probability his pro-Uniate attitude, B. TODIĆ, *Apostol Andreja i srpski arhiepiskopi na freskama Sopoćana, Treća jugoslovenska konferencija vizantologa*, ur. LJ. MAKSIMOVIĆ, N. RADOŠEVIĆ, E. RADULOVIĆ, Beograd – Kruševac 2002, 361–379, pp. 369–378; KOMATINA, *Kralj Stefan Uroš I*, 250–256.

⁶⁸ In the Athonite monasteries of Pantokratoros, Dionysiou, Vatopedi, Lavra, Iviron, Panteleimonos and Protaton on Mount Athos there are manuscripts of synaxaria that testify to the cruelty of the Latinophiles at the time of Michael VIII, that

answer to emperor Michael VIII in the so-called “faith-professing letter” to the emperor’s prostraga, where clear reasons for rejecting the Union are stated, as well as in the Venetian memorandum, and finally in the manuscripts of George Pachymeres.⁶⁹ Even though the Union of Lyon failed, the negative attitude towards the Latins and the Roman Catholic Church grew even stronger among the Orthodox, and it became clear that the tensions that arose in 1204 did not diminish, but on the contrary.

Given all the above, it can be concluded that the fall of Constantinople to the Latins in 1204, although perceived as one of the tragic events in the then and later Byzantine writings, which further distanced the already divided Christian ecumene, is not presented as so fateful in Serbian medieval hagiographies. The image of the Latins, and along them the Roman Catholic Church in the works of Nemanja’s sons Stefan, the first Serbian king, Sava, the first Serbian archbishop, as well as Sava’s disciple Domentijan, seems far more objective and less coloured by negative tones, in contrast to Teodosije, whose text fully conveys the new attitude towards the Roman Catholics, as he even calls them heretics, undoubtedly reflecting the negative attitude of the Orthodox world towards the *Union of Lyon*. As scholarship has recently established with convincing arguments that Teodosije’s *Life of St Sava* was composed in the ninth decade of the 13th century, contrary to the previous views that his literary activity took place exclusively in the first decades of the 14th century, such dating seems to provide an immediate answer to the question as to why Teodosije’s *Life of St Sava*, unlike Domentijan’s, is coloured by a distinctly anti-Latin attitude.⁷⁰ Such dating also offers the answer as to why only thirty years after Domentijan, Sava’s disciple, wrote the *Life of St Sava*, Teodosije had the need to change the narrative about extremely important events from Serbian history and Sava’s life, and fashion the discourse in a completely Orthodox spirit.

were created in the period from the 14th to the 18th century, M. ŽIVOJINOVIĆ, *Sveta Gora i Lionska unija*, *ZRVI* 18 (1978) 141–154, p. 147, the author also referred to earlier research on the mentioned manuscripts and presented a brief outline of the contents of one Greek and one Slavic synaxarion and critically analysed the news. Živojinović also pointed to a series of acts by which emperor Michael VIII confirmed the privileges of the Athonite monks, underlining that there were punishments undertaken by the then Byzantine government, certainly under the influence of emperor Michael VIII, both in the Byzantine Empire and on the Holy Mountain, M. ŽIVOJINOVIĆ, *Sveta Gora i Lionska unija*, 141–153.

⁶⁹ M. ŽIVOJINOVIĆ, *Sveta Gora i Lionska unija*, 147, f. 27.

⁷⁰ I. ŠPADIJER, *Hronološki okviri književnog rada Teodosija*, 3–15.

Ивана Коматина

**ПЕРЦЕПЦИЈА РИМОКАТОЛИКА
У СРПСКИМ ХАГИОГРАФИЈАМА XIII ВЕКА:
ОД ХРИШЋАНА ДО ЈЕРЕТИКА**

Резиме

У раду смо најпре указали на неке од најзначајнијих догађаја српске историје првих Немањића – уздизање на ранг краљевине 1217. и оснивање Српске архиепископије 1218/1219. године, те црквену политику Немање и његових синова очигледно посве толерентну према римокатоличком становништву. Међутим, изложене црквене и политичке прилике на простору српских земаља нашле су своје место и у српским хагиографијама XIII века које, чини нам се, пружају различиту перцепцију тих важних догађаја. У *Житију Светог Симеона* које је написао његов најмлађи син Сава нисмо уочили ни најмању меру негативног става према Латинима. У најстаријем сачуванм препису Савиног *Законоправила* тзв. Иловичком препису из 1262. године, такође, не наилазимо на сврставање римокатолика међу „многбројне јереси“. Уколико допустимо да је у приближном облику био и Савин аутограф онда не изненађује Савин однос према Латинима у *Житију*, који се, очигледно, није умногоме променио ни након успостављања Српске архиепископије. Сличан однос према Латинима, односно римокатолицима, какав смо уочили у *Житију Светог Симеона* од Светог Саве уочавамо и у *Житију Светог Симеона* које је написао његов наследник на престолу и први српски крунисани краљ Стефан Првовенчани. Дипломатички и наративни извори јасно указују његов неискључив однос према римокатоличкој цркви, попут оног који је испољавао његов отац Немања, те брат Сава. Последње, у хронолошком смислу, од интереса за нашу тему перцепције другог, у нашем случају римокатолика, јесу *Житија Светог Саве* која су саставили хиландарски монаси Доментијан, односно Теодосије. Упоређивањем наратива два поменута *Житија* јасно се уочава да Доментијан, који *Житије Св. Саве* саставља средином XIII века, несумњиво пружа другачији осврт на важне догађаје српске историје, пре свега у односу према римокатоличкој цркви, у односу на Теодосија који саставља *Житије Св. Саве* у претпоследњој деценији XIII века. Упечатљива негативна промена према римокатолицима у држави Немањића имала је, несумњиво, упориште у политичким и црквеним догађајима тог времена, пре свега у *Лионској унији*. Наиме, на сабору који је одржан у Лиону 1272–1274. године дошло је до уније између православне и римокатоличке цркве, што је створило велики антиунијатски покрет у православном свету, пре свега у Цариграду, али и на

Светој Гори. Управо недавно утврђено време настанка *Житија Светог Саве* од Теодосија пружа, чини се, и непосредан одговор на питање зашто је Теодосијево *Житије*, за разлику од Доментијановог, обојено изразито антилатинским ставом, иако су, подестимо се, оба *Житија* састављана на Светој Гори, те је понудило и одговор зашто је само тридесет година након што је Доментијан саставио *Житије* Теодосије имао потребу да измени наратив о изузетно важним догађајима из српске историје и Савиног живота и заогрне га у потпуно православни дух.

Кључне речи: Римска црква, Православна црква, јурисдикција, Латини, Српско краљевство, архиепископија, сабор у Жичи, Лионска унија.

Чланак примљен: 15. септембра 2023.

Чланак Прихваћен: 2. новембра 2023.