

## INTRODUCTION

Archdeacon Thomas of Split, one of the most interesting persons of medieval Croatia and an active participant in many events of the contemporary public, political and particularly ecclesiastical life of his native Split in the thirteenth century, would today be hardly known had he not written the *Historia Salonitana* (henceforth: HS). This work was first published and was given that name by Iohannes Lucius (Lučić) (1604–79), the father of modern Croatian historiography, in 1666.<sup>1</sup> With Lucius' *editio princeps* Thomas' work became a part of the corpus of European medieval literature: examples from it were already included in the first edition of Du Cange's *Glossarium* in 1678.<sup>2</sup>

### THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE HS

There are several medieval codices containing the HS, and also some more recent ones, which are still relevant for establishing their filiation. The seminal study on them is still that

<sup>1</sup> Iohannes Lucius, *De regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae libri sex* (Amsterdam: Blaeu, 1666), pp. 310–70.

<sup>2</sup> Charles du Fresne dominus Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, 3 vols. (Paris: no publ., 1678).

of Isidor Kršnjavi,<sup>3</sup> recently corrected and augmented by Olga Perić.<sup>4</sup>

Most scholars agreed that the oldest extant manuscript is the one written in Beneventan minuscule on parchment, known as the Codex Spalatensis (henceforth: **S**).<sup>5</sup> It is kept in the Archive of the Chapter of Split (KAS 623 B). The text is divided into 49 chapters, and as the manuscript does not end with the usual *explicit* it was considered unfinished. Of the original 122 folia in the codex, several folia are now missing (fols. 1, 19, 24, 33–5, 40, 72, 99, 100–2). Thomas' work ends on fol. 120v. On the same folio is added a more recent note on Thomas' authorship, the year of his death and the place of his funeral.<sup>6</sup> On fol. 121r there are several interesting notes written in a Humanist script, such as the year of the destruction of Salona (as CCCCCCXXXVIII) and the year of the translation of SS. Duimus and Anastasius (as MCIII). On fol. 121v is the text of the so-called *Pacta conventa* in a later hand.<sup>7</sup> There are also

<sup>3</sup> Isidor Kršnjavi, "Prilozi historiji salonitani Tome arcidjakona Spljetskoga" [Contribution to the *Salonitan History* of Archdeacon Thomas of Split], *Vjestnik kr. hrvatsko-slavonsko-dalmatinskog Zemaljskog arkiva* 2 (1900): 129–69. See also Isidor Kršnjavi, *Zur Historia Salonitana des Thomas Archidiaconus von Spaleto. Studie I–V* (Zagreb: no publ., 1900).

<sup>4</sup> Toma Arhidakon, *Historia Salonitana: povijest salonitanskih i splitskih prvosvećenika Thomae Archidiaconi Historia Salonitanorum atque Spalatinarum pontificum*, ed. by Olga Perić and Mirjana Matijević Sokol, with a study by Radoslav Katičić (Split: Književni krug, 2003) (henceforth: Toma), pp. v–xxi.

<sup>5</sup> For more, see Toma, pp. v–vii.

<sup>6</sup> *Memoriale bonę memorię domini Thome archidiaconi Spalatensis, qui floruit circa annum Domini MCCLXVI et sepultus est in ecclesia sancti Francisci Fratrum conuentualium*.

<sup>7</sup> The *Pacta conventa* is a short historical treaty describing the settlement between King Coloman and the Croatian nobility and his election as the king of Croatia. It was compiled most probably during the second half of the fourteenth

other later notes on the margins of this codex, written in different hands, from the period from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century.

There were different opinions about this codex. Kerubin Šegvić considered it to be the original.<sup>8</sup> This opinion was opposed by Stjepan Gunjača, who based his argument on the fact that in his capacity as a notary Thomas used Carolino-Gothic script and not Beneventan minuscule.<sup>9</sup> Contrary to that opinion, Virginia Brown, based on her own palaeographical analysis of S, according to which the manuscript displays general characteristics of the Beneventana of the Split and Trogir area and that it may be dated to the second half of the thirteenth century, that is, in Thomas' lifetime, proposed that it might have been written under the author's supervision or even by Thomas himself.<sup>10</sup> Philological analysis of corrections in the text by Olga Perić supports that opinion.<sup>11</sup> At any rate, S is certainly the oldest extant version of Thomas' work, and is thus used as the basis for this edition.

century. In the nineteenth century it became the object of heated debate between Hungarian and Croatian historians and politicians, because the issue of its authenticity was at that time considered as relevant for the political status of Croatia in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. For more, see Edgar Hösch, Karl Nehring and Holm Sundhausen (eds.), *Lexikon zur Geschichte Südosteuropas* (Vienna–Cologne–Weimar: Böhlau, 2004), p. 510.

<sup>8</sup> Kerubin Šegvić, *Toma Splićanin, državnik i pisac 1200.–1268*. [Thomas of Split, statesman and writer 1200–68] (Zagreb: no publ., 1927), p. 123. See also Idem, "Tommaso Arcidiacono [di Spalato] : il suo tempo e la sua opera," *Bullettino di archeologia e storia Dalmata* 37 (1914), Suppl. 1.

<sup>9</sup> Stjepan Gunjača, *Ispravci i dopune starijoj hrvatskoj historiji* [Corrections and additions to the earlier Croatian history] 1 (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1973), pp. 13–21.

<sup>10</sup> Virginia Brown, "Tommaso Arcidiacono, Historia Salonitana," *Tesori della Croazia restaurati da Venetian Heritage Inc.* (Venice: Edizioni Multigraf, 2001), pp. 166–7.

<sup>11</sup> Toma, pp. xvii–xix.

From the point of view of aesthetics, the nicest medieval manuscript of Thomas' work is that in the *Codex Traguriensis* (henceforth: T), kept today in the Széchényi National Library in Budapest (Codices Latini medii aevi 440).<sup>12</sup> It originally belonged to the Archiepiscopal Library in Split, where it was seen and described by Daniele Farlati: ... *inter quos vel antiquitate vel pulchritudine litterarum Gothicarum illud facile praestat, quod asservatur in Archivio Archiepiscopali Spalatensi*.<sup>13</sup> It was described also in Franjo Rački's report of his research in Dalmatian archives and libraries; at that time it belonged to the library of the Garagnin-Fanfogna family in Trogir, where it was transferred by Archbishop John Luke Garagnin.<sup>14</sup> In 1903 Ivan Dominik Fanfogna sold it to the Hungarian historian Lajos Thallóczy for the library of the Society of St. Stephen (Szt. István Társulat) in Budapest. Some time later, under unknown circumstances, the manuscript came to the library of the Hungarian National Museum and from there to its present home. Historians disagree about the exact dating of T, but they all place it in the period between the late 1380s and the fifteenth century.<sup>15</sup> As it is particularly nicely illustrated, the manuscript received attention also from historians of art.<sup>16</sup> The manuscript is written in literary Gothic script of the Bologna type. That

<sup>12</sup> See Emma Bartoniek, *Codices manu scripti Latini* 1 (Budapest: National Museum of Hungary, 1940), pp. 395–7; Toma, pp. vii–viii.

<sup>13</sup> Daniele Farlati, *Illyricum sacrum* 3 (Venice: Coleti, 1765), p. 283.

<sup>14</sup> Franjo Rački, "Iztraživanja u pismarah i knjižnicah dalmatinskih" [Research in Dalmatian archives and libraries], *Rad JAZU* 26 (1874): 175.

<sup>15</sup> Miho Barada, "Skup splitskih povijesnih izvora" [The group of Spalatin historical sources], *Nastavni vjesnik* 49 (1940–1): 88; Idem, "Postanak hrvatskog plemstva" [Origin of Croatian nobility], *Časopis za hrvatsku povijest* 1 (1943) 3: 202–3; Duško Kečkemet, "Ilustracije budimpeštanskog kodeksa arhidakona Tome" [Illuminations of the Budapest codex of Thomas the Archdeacon], in Ivan Erceg *et al.* (eds), *Gunjačin zbornik* [Gunjača Festschrift] (Zagreb: Veselin Masleša, 1980), pp. 173–80, here 174; Bartoniek, *Codices*, pp. 395–7.

<sup>16</sup> Besides Kečkemet (as above), see also Ljubo Karaman, "Buvinove vratnice i drveni kor splitske katedrale" [The cathedral gates of Buvina and the wooden choir of Split Cathedral], *Rad HAZU* 275 (1942): 1–96.

codex is also a miscellany (*collectaneum*) consisting of several texts, among them the *Pacta conventa*, other Spalatin histories and a list of kings of Hungary.

Three manuscripts of the HS are kept in the *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana* (henceforth: BAV). The most important among them is certainly a medieval one, usually referred to as “the Vatican manuscript” (MS Vat. Lat. 7019) (henceforth: V).<sup>17</sup> It is written on paper in Gothic cursive minuscule. It was for a long time considered the oldest extant copy, written not long after Thomas’ death.<sup>18</sup> However, based on the study of paper and watermarks, Kršnjavi established that it was written in the second half of the fourteenth century.<sup>19</sup> It is copied from S, but the text of the HS is organized in 51 chapters, because the copyists divided chapters XX and XXXV into two. The remaining two manuscripts kept in BAV are from the early modern period.<sup>20</sup>

A medieval manuscript is kept also in the National and University Library in Zagreb (MS R 3311) (henceforth: Z).<sup>21</sup> This is a paper codex written in cursive by two hands (the first from the fifteenth and the second from the seventeenth century). It is apparently a copy from the *Codex Spalatensis*, because they had

<sup>17</sup> See Toma, pp. x–xi.

<sup>18</sup> That opinion was already held by Lucius (*antiquissimum exemplum Historiae Salonitanae*); cf. Johannes Lucius (Lučić), *Inscriptiones Dalmaticae* (Venetiis: Curti, 1673), pp. 72–3. It was maintained until the 1880s or early 1890s, when the *Codex Spalatensis* was discovered. For more details, see Šegvić, *Toma Splićanin*, p. 130.

<sup>19</sup> Kršnjavi, “Prilozi,” 131; cf. Toma, p. x.

<sup>20</sup> The first is the manuscript Vat. Lat. 6958 from the sixteenth or the seventeenth century, donated to the library by Johannes Lucius (Lučić) (*ex dono Lucii*), the other is the so-called Urbinate manuscript (signature Urb. Lat. 910) written in seventeenth- or eighteenth-century cursive.

<sup>21</sup> See Toma, pp. viii–ix.

the same characteristic ending: “... *fecit se consepelire domini Crescentio ante fores ecclesie. Finis.*”, followed by the text of the *Pacta conventa*.<sup>22</sup>

Besides the four medieval manuscripts mentioned above, there is also a codex written in fifteenth-century cursive in the Biblioteca Marciana in Venice (Cl. IX, cod. LXXV, MSS latini 3290) (henceforth: **M**).<sup>23</sup> There are several later copies in the Archive of the Chapter of Split,<sup>24</sup> the Archive of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts<sup>25</sup> and the State Archive of Dubrovnik.<sup>26</sup>

Regarding the filiation of medieval manuscripts of the HS, the recent analysis of Olga Perić established that **S** was the basis for all medieval copies (**T**, **V**, **M**, **Z**). All later manuscripts originate in **T** and **V**, while **M** and **Z** apparently did not influence any later copy.<sup>27</sup>

## EDITIONS

As mentioned above, the first edition of the HS was prepared by Johannes Lucius, among other sources appended as *Rerum Dalmaticarum Scriptores* to his major work *De regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae libri sex*, published in Amsterdam in 1666. In this edition the text of the HS was based on **V** and a manuscript, no

<sup>22</sup> In the same library there is also a manuscript written in sixteenth-century cursive (signature: R 5720).

<sup>23</sup> See Toma, pp. IX–X.

<sup>24</sup> In the Archive of the Chapter of Split there are two manuscripts, one from the seventeenth (KAS 534) and one from the eighteenth century (KAS 672); see Toma, pp. XI–XII.

<sup>25</sup> There is one sixteenth-century manuscript (I d 22) and one from the seventeenth or the eighteenth century (II b 155); see Toma, pp. XII–XIII.

<sup>26</sup> It is an eighteenth-century manuscript (I–10, 402); see Toma, p. XIII.

<sup>27</sup> For a *stemma*, see Toma, pp. XIX–XXI.

longer extant, belonging to the seventeenth-century Spalatin patrician Peter Cindro (who, in turn, made his copy from both V and T).<sup>28</sup> Lucius' work, including the HS, was reprinted in 1748 as the third volume of Johann Georg Schwandtner's series *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum, Dalmaticarum, Croaticarum et Slavonicarum*, with only minor orthographic changes.<sup>29</sup>

Lucius' and Schwandtner's publications enabled the work of the archdeacon to be included, at least partially, in other source collections. Daniele Farlati used these editions extensively, but he also made an effort to study the manuscripts, particularly T. As he was fully confident of Thomas' statements, he included almost all the HS in the form of extensive quotations in his *Illyricum sacrum*.<sup>30</sup> Parts of Thomas' work related to the Salonitan martyrs and St. Rainer were reprinted from Lucius' edition in the *Acta Sanctorum* (April 11: *De sanctis Martyribus Dalmatis*<sup>31</sup> and August 4: *Sanctus Raynerius*<sup>32</sup>). Besides these publications, the parts regarding the Mongol incursion (chapters 36–9) and a selection from chapters 16–35 and 40–9 were published in vol. 29 of the *Scriptores* series of *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* by Lothar von Heinemann, who edited it exclusively on

<sup>28</sup> Some corrections to this printed edition, including those related to the HS, were later published by Lucius under the title *Ad historiam Thomae Archidiaconi Spalatensis et memoriam Episcoporum Salonitanae Ecclesiae* in the second edition of his work from 1668 (on ff. 5v–6r) and some further ones in his work *Inscriptiones Dalmaticae* in 1673.

<sup>29</sup> Johann Georg Schwandtner, *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum, Dalmaticarum, Croaticarum et Slavonicarum* 3 (Vienna: Kraus, 1748), pp. 532–636.

<sup>30</sup> See above, n. 13. Thomas' quotations are particularly numerous in the volumes regarding the history of the archbishoprics of Salona (vols. 1–2) and Split (vol. 3) and Spalatin suffragan bishoprics (vol. 4), but some can be also found in vols. 5–7, containing the histories of other Dalmatian archbishoprics and bishoprics.

<sup>31</sup> *Acta Sanctorum. Editio novissima*, ed. by Jean Baptiste Carnandet, vol. 11 (Paris–Rome: Palmé, 1866).

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 35 (1867).

the basis of V (which he erroneously believed to be the *codex unicus*).<sup>33</sup>

Until recently, the edition closest to a critical one, and used as the standard, was the one prepared by Franjo Rački and posthumously published in 1894 (by Tadija Smičiklas but based exclusively on Rački's manuscript).<sup>34</sup> Rački did not succeed in giving it its final form, particularly regarding the critical apparatus and auxiliary remarks that would explain his ideas on the stemma of the codices. The *variae lectiones* were not regularly added, and, in spite of the fact that according to the introductory note the basis for the edition was S, even for the basic text Rački combined different manuscripts, using sometimes one and sometimes another, according to what seemed to be best to him. Rački's edition greatly surpasses all previous ones, especially because he added a great number of useful critical annotations, pointing to Thomas' sources and other data for corroborating his theses.<sup>35</sup>

The new critical edition, the one used as the basis for this translation, was published in 2003, in two volumes. The first volume

<sup>33</sup> Lothar von Heinemann, "Ex rerum Ungaricarum scriptoribus saec. XIII," in *Monumenta Germaniae historica. Scriptores* 29, ed. by Georg Waitz *et al.* (Hannover: Hahne, 1892). See James Ross Sweeney, "Thomas of Spalato and the Mongols: a Thirteenth-Century Dalmatian View of Mongol Customs," *Florilegium* 2 (1980): 171–2.

<sup>34</sup> Thomas Archidiaconus. *Historia Salonitana*, ed. by Franjo Rački, *Monumenta spectantia historiam Slavorum meridionalium* 26, *Scriptores* 3 (Zagreb: JAZU, 1894) (henceforth: Rački, *Thomas*). As a *curiosum* it may be noted that Rački's edition is reprinted in full in the Supplement to vol. 16 (1988) of *Atti e Memorie della Società Dalmata di Storia Patria* of Venice; see A. Cocci, "Venezia e il medioadriatico nella 'Historia Salonitanorum pontificum atque Spalatensium' (1245–1251) di Tommaso da Spalato l'arcidiacono," *Clio* 34 (1998) 3: 368, n. 9.

<sup>35</sup> Rački was familiar also with the historical work entitled the *Historia Salonitana maior*, which was based on the HS (see below, pp. XLV–XLVI), and published certain parts of it as footnotes. For example, he published the acts of Salonitan and Spalatin synods of the sixth and the tenth centuries (Rački, *Thomas*, 12–8, 36–41).

contains a critical edition of the Latin text, and a Croatian translation with critical historical notes, and studies on manuscripts as well as on Thomas and his work. The second is a facsimile edition of the *Codex Spalatensis*. The Latin text was edited by Olga Perić based on S, and all other extant manuscripts were included as *variae lectiones*.<sup>36</sup>

Besides these editions, there were some partial or complete translations. Some early chapters of the HS were published in Italian translation in 1843.<sup>37</sup> A translation of the entire work in Italian, based on Rački's edition, was undertaken by P. Fontana, and its text appeared serially in *Archivio storico per la Dalmazia*.<sup>38</sup> Károly Szabó published a Hungarian translation of the chapters concerning the Mongols (chapters 36–9) from the Lucius–Schwandtner edition.<sup>39</sup> In German, there is a translation of the chapters concerning the Mongols by Hans-Gerd Göckenjan and James Ross Sweeney.<sup>40</sup> Recently, an online partial translation of the HS was prepared by Ludwig Steindorff, based on Rački's edition.<sup>41</sup> The first Croatian translation of the

<sup>36</sup> Toma (as above, n. 4).

<sup>37</sup> A. Barbiani and G. Cadorin, *Tommaso Arcidiacono della Chiesa di Spalato: Notizie di Salona, antica città della Dalmazia* (Venice, 1843). See Cocci, "Venezia e il medioadriatico," 368, n. 9.

<sup>38</sup> P. Fontana, "Tommaso Arcidiacono di Spalato, Storia dei vescovi salonitani e spalatini," *Archivio Storico per la Dalmazia* 27 (1939): 161–2; 28 (1939), 163–8; 29 (1940), 169–77. See also Cocci, "Venezia e il medioadriatico," 368, n. 9.

<sup>39</sup> "Tamás spalatói esperes '*Historia Salonitana*'-jaból a tatárjárás története (37–40 fejezet)," *Magyarország történetének forrásai*, I, 2, Budapest, 1861, 57–84. Since the author was following Lucius and Schwandtner, the numeration of the chapters in the article differs from the one later used by Rački and in this edition.

<sup>40</sup> Thomas von Spalato, "Geschichte der Bischöfe von Salona und Spalato vom hl. Domnius bis auf Rogerius (+ 1266) (cap. 36–9)," in *Der Mongolensturm* (Graz: Styria Verlag, 1985, Ungarns Geschichtsschreiber, 3), pp. 225–70.

<sup>41</sup> <http://www.oeg.uni-kiel.de/Mat-Veranst/thomas.htm> Chapters 3–4, 8–14, 18, 21 and 33–5 are translated in full and chapters 7, 17, 24, 26 and 31–2 only partially.

entire work was by Vladimir Rismondo and published twice: in 1960 and 1977.<sup>42</sup> The interest of Russian and Ukrainian historians in “Foma Splitskii” started as early as the nineteenth century. The first to translate the entire work was A. Krasovskij, whose text appeared serially in *Trudi Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii* in 1876 and 1877;<sup>43</sup> this edition is now a bibliographical rarity. Some chapters of Thomas’ work in Russian translation were published also in 1978,<sup>44</sup> while a modern translation of the entire text with an introductory study and critical notes by Olga A. Akimova appeared in 1997.<sup>45</sup>

## THE AUTHOR

Thomas’ biography can be reconstructed from both his work (directly and indirectly) and other data. Even though the primary purpose of the HS was to describe the development of Spalatin ecclesiastical organization until his own time, with an emphasis on the events in which he personally participated, the last eighteen chapters contain many elements of an autobiography (or rather biography, because Thomas always speaks about himself in the third person).

<sup>42</sup> Toma Arhidakon, *Kronika*, Izdanja Muzeja grada Splita 8 (Split: Muzej grada Splita, 1960); Toma Arhidakon, *Kronika* (Split: Čakavski sabor, 1977).

<sup>43</sup> A. Krasovskij, “Istoriia salonskikh i spletskikh episkopov Fomi arkhidiakona Splitskogo,” *Trudi Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii*, Kiev, 1876, t. 3, 557–622; t. 4, 73–117; t. 5, 703–47; 1877, t. 1, 504–49.

<sup>44</sup> Foma Splitskij, *Istorija arkhiepiskopov Saloni i Splita, Otrivki*, ed. by M. V. Berdonosov and A. E. Moskalenko (Moscow: Uchebno-metod. posobie, 1978), pp. 49–58.

<sup>45</sup> Foma Splitskij, *Istorija arkhiepiskopov Saloni i Splita*, ed. by Olga A. Akimova (Moscow: Institut slavianovedeniia i balkanistiki, 1997). The Latin text of this edition, based on Rački’s edition, was prepared by A. I. Solopov (pp. 231–319).

<sup>46</sup> Farlati, *Illyricum sacrum* 3, p. 258.

<sup>47</sup> Šegvić, *Toma Splicićanin*, pp. 42–3.

Older scholarship had different opinions regarding Thomas' origin, both social and ethnic. From Farlati<sup>46</sup> to Kerubin Šegvić,<sup>47</sup> he was seen as a member of an urban noble (patrician) family of Split. Farlati's sources for that statement are not known, but Šegvić reasoned that only a cleric from a noble family might strive for such high positions within the ecclesiastical hierarchy and play such an important role in the public life of the city as Thomas did. Franjo Rački, relying strictly on extant sources, laconically stated that Thomas' family is not known.<sup>48</sup> The ethnic element in the discussion was introduced at the very beginning of the twentieth century by Kršnjavi, who described Thomas as someone who hated Croats and Hungarians, and explained this by the fact that Thomas was "a Latin, who prided himself on it" and whose writing was highly influenced by his political allegiances.<sup>49</sup> Kršnjavi's way of reasoning is unfortunately still alive among the historians, as anachronistic as it may be.<sup>50</sup> A new element, this time social, was introduced by Nada Klaić, who explained Thomas' animosity towards the hinterland as a centuries-long (and in Dalmatia still existing) antagonism between the city and its rural surroundings, conceding at the same time that Thomas might even have been a Croat.<sup>51</sup>

<sup>48</sup> Franjo Rački, "Ocjena starijih izvora za hrvatsku i srbsku poviest srednjega vieka" [Evaluation of older sources for Croatian and Serbian history of the Middle Ages], *Književnik* 1 (1864): 358–88.

<sup>49</sup> Kršnjavi, "Prilozi historiji salonitani," p. 147. It is noteworthy that Kršnjavi himself was a politician of pro-Hungarian political stance, which sometimes influenced his writings.

<sup>50</sup> See, for example, the otherwise valuable study of Lujo Margetić, "Historia Salonitana i Historia Salonitana Maior—neka pitanja" [*Historia Salonitana* and *Historia Salonitana maior*—certain issues], *Historijski zbornik* 47 (1994) 1: 1–36.

<sup>51</sup> Nada Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata u ranom srednjem vijeku* [A history of the Croats in the Early Middle Ages] (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1971), p. 23; Idem, *Povijest Hrvata u razvijenom srednjem vijeku* [A history of the Croats in the High Middle Ages] (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1976), p. 208.

Thomas was born in 1200 or 1201,<sup>52</sup> and his funerary monument records that he died on May 8, 1268. He was buried in the Franciscan church of Split. The slab has no other decoration than the inscription in Latin verses expressing Thomas' proximity to Franciscan views.<sup>53</sup>

Since during Thomas' childhood and youth the school of Master Treguanus flourished in Split, Thomas may have acquired his first education and directions for further learning in contact with him and Archbishop Bernard (1200–17). The pontificate of Archbishop Bernard, and the time of Treguanus' teaching of grammar in Split and afterwards serving as archdeacon and finally the bishop of Trogir (1206–54), marked an active period of cultural life in both cities. Despite unsettled political events, the age witnessed extraordinary masterpieces of Romanesque artistic expressions, both pictorial and architectural (Masters Buvina, Otto and Radovan).<sup>54</sup> Thomas testifies about the role of both prelates in these processes.<sup>55</sup> He speaks about them with particular respect and admiration. Both of them were from Italy: Bernard from Peruggia, Treguanus from Florence. Before becoming archbishop, Bernard was a teacher of the king of Hungary. He was also a scholar, who—according to Thomas—spent thirty years in Bologna. Treguanus came to Split

<sup>52</sup> Thomas himself stated in chapter 31 of the HS that he was elected as archdeacon in 1230 (*anno domini millesimo ducentesimo tricesimo*) and that this was in his thirtieth year (*tricesimo etatis sue anno*); however, since the exact dating of any of these events is not known, he may have been born in 1200 or 1201.

<sup>53</sup> The slab still exists, but the inscription is now hardly readable. However, Kerubin Šegvić transcribed it in the 1920s (*Toma Splićanin*, p. 120):

*Doctrinam, Christe, docet Archidiaconus iste / Thomas, hanc tenuit, moribus et docuit: / Mundum sperne, fuge viciū, carnem preme, luge / pro vite fruge, lubrica lucra fuge. / Spaletumque dedit ortum, quo vita recedit. / Dum mors succedit vite, mea gloria cedit. / Hic me vermis edit, sic iuri mortis obedit, / Corpus quod ledit, animamve qui sibi credit. / A. D. MCCLXVIII, mense Madii, octavo die intrante.*

<sup>54</sup> For more information and relevant literature, see MMS, pp. 27–32.

<sup>55</sup> See below, ch. 23–4.

at Bernard's call. In 1203, he rewrote "The Life of St. John, the Bishop of Trogir,"<sup>56</sup> and his role in the building of the portal of Trogir's cathedral is commemorated by an inscription on the portal itself.<sup>57</sup> The atmosphere created by these two men must have impressed young Thomas, directing him to go for further education to one of the most prestigious institutions of learning of the time—Bologna.

At that time Bologna was in the first place a center of legal studies. The choice of Bologna was thus significant for Thomas' activity after the return to his native city, at that time torn apart by different external and internal tensions. As an attentive observer, Thomas had learned much from the political events and social processes of that time in Italian cities. He witnessed the struggle of the communes against popes and emperors, struggles among the cities themselves, the creation of new systems of government in cities that were influenced by new social and economic conditions, but also the struggle between papal and imperial power. He also witnessed the beginnings of the new mendicant orders: in Bologna he listened to a sermon of St. Francis.<sup>58</sup> During his stay in Bologna, Thomas might have become acquainted with several

<sup>56</sup> "Život svetoga Ivana Trogirskoga" [The Life of St. John of Trogir], ed. by Milan Ivanišević, in Vedran Gligo and Hrvoje Morović (eds.), *Legende i kronike* [Readings on the saints and chronicles] (Split: Čakavski sabor, 1977), pp. 59–121.

<sup>57</sup> The inscription still exists: ... ANNO MILLENO DUCENO BISQUE UICENO PRESULE TUSCANO FLORIS EX URBE TREGUANO... See Josip Stošić, *Trogirska katedrala i njezin zapadni portal* [The cathedral of Trogir and its western portal], and Ivo Babić (ed.), *Majstor Radovan i njegovo doba. Zbornik radova međunarodnog znanstvenog skupa održanog u Trogiru 26–30. rujna 1990. godine* [Master Radovan and his time. Proceedings of the international scholarly conference held in Trogir 26–30 September 1990] (Trogir: Muzej grada Trogira, 1994), p. 84.

<sup>58</sup> See below, ch. 26. It is, in fact, the first place in the chronicle where Thomas mentions himself and the only place where he refers to himself in the first person: from chapter 31 onwards he constantly refers to his activity, but always in the third person.

men of scholarship and politics, such as Petrus de Vinea,<sup>59</sup> John of Viterbo<sup>60</sup> and Paul of Dalmatia (Ungarus),<sup>61</sup> but also Roger, later the archbishop of Split, to whom he was a close cooperator as archdeacon.<sup>62</sup> Thomas would apply all the experiences received there to his political activity after his return to Split, and he would also include them in the HS.<sup>63</sup>

Contemporary records from the medieval archives of Split and Trogir attest that Thomas was a notary public in Split from 1227 to 1232,<sup>64</sup> at first as a clerk and after 1230 as archdeacon. Thomas does not write about this period of his life in the HS. Still, from other sources it is evident that he succeeded the Spalatin notary Sabatius in this office. Only one charter that he wrote is extant in its original form, two others in later copies. Diplomatic analysis

<sup>59</sup> Petrus de Vinea, died 1249, was one of the most prominent counselors of Emperor Frederick II. His epistolary was influential on the development of Latin prose. See Jakov Stipišić, “Zagrebački rukopis epistolara Petra de Vineis” [Zagreb manuscript of the Epistolary of Petrus de Vinea], *Zbornik Historijskog instituta JAZU* 4 (1961): 405–21.

<sup>60</sup> John of Viterbo, a *podestà* of Florence, wrote the *Liber de regimine civitatum* around 1228. This manual apparently influenced Thomas’ attempt at establishing the Regimen Latinorum in Split and his description of Gargano’s administration.

<sup>61</sup> Paul of Dalmatia or Ungarus (ca. 1190–1255) was professor of law in Bologna and the first provincial of the Dominicans in Hungary and Croatia. See Stjepan Krasić, “‘Fr. Paulus Hungarus seu ut alii volunt, Dalmata O.P.’ Jedna zanimljiva ličnost iz XIII st.” [‘Fr. Paulus Hungarus seu ut alii volunt, Dalmata O.P.’ An interesting thirteenth-century personality], *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 4 (1978) 7–8: 131–56.

<sup>62</sup> For more on Roger, see Franz Babinger, “Maestro Ruggiero delle Puglie re-latore prepoliano sui Tatai,” in Roberto Almagia *et al.* (eds.), *Nel 7. centenario della nascita di Marco Polo* (Venice: Istituto veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti, 1955), pp. 51–61.

<sup>63</sup> The application of models studied there was relatively easy, since the situation of Split, where encroachments of both the king of Hungary and neighboring Croatian magnates, on the one hand, and internal dissension, on the other, created a potential and a real danger for the development of communal independence, was quite similar to that of Italian communes.

<sup>64</sup> CD 3: 267, 301, 365.

shows that he still used the old formula of *completio* (*complevi*), that he combined elements of *carta* and *noticia*, and that he introduced in Split the custom that the *signum notarii* should become a permanent element of diplomatic formulae of corroboration. Thomas' performance of his duties as notary shows the influence of his studies in Bologna, where he probably studied besides Roman law also the *ars notaria*, which just at that time had become a permanent part of the curriculum.<sup>65</sup> Thomas' good knowledge of notarial customs and practices is also visible in his history, where his diplomatic skills are evident in his use of diplomatic material as a historical source.<sup>66</sup>

While retelling his election as archdeacon, Thomas emphasizes with pride the fact that it was performed in complete concord (*in summa concordia*) in the thirtieth year of his life. It is with this event that Thomas' ascendancy in the ecclesiastical hierarchy starts, as well as his role in everything happening in Split. Consequently, from that point on, he also becomes one of the protagonists of the HS.<sup>67</sup>

Soon after the election, evidently because of his reforming zeal and loyalty to the pope, Thomas came into conflict with Archbishop Guncel (1220–42). He himself dedicated large sections of his work to these stormy events. It seems that they directed all his later actions, which brought him ups and downs on the scale of social hierarchy, public acceptance and rejection. Although he won the first conflict with the archbishop both morally and formally, the latter still remained in office, and relations among them never became cordial. Another of Thomas' victories, this time over the political factions within the commune and neighboring magnates

<sup>65</sup> Jakov Stipišić, "Razvoj splitske notarske kancelarije" [Development of the notarial chancery of Split], *Zbornik Historijskog instituta JAZU* 1 (1954): 117–9.

<sup>66</sup> For more, see Mirjana Matijević Sokol, "Starohrvatski Solin u Kronici Tome Arhiđakona" [Early Medieval Solin in the *Chronicle* of Thomas the Archdeacon], *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* 85 (1992): 83–90.

<sup>67</sup> See below, ch. 31.

interested in obtaining the position of counts in Split, was the introduction of the model of Latin government in 1239. Thomas was instrumental in the election of the first *podestà*, Gargano de Arscindis of Ancona, who held the office for three continuous years from 1239 to 1242. According to Thomas' description, that period was a time of order in the city, particularly important for the codification of city legal norms and customs. It is most likely that this project was carried out under Thomas' influence and probably with his direct participation, because he was both versed in legal theory and well acquainted with local legal practice and customs, although he does not say so explicitly. In all respects, Gargano's governance was, at least as Thomas presents it, successful, thus justifying Thomas' involvement in secular matters.<sup>68</sup>

In spite of that, further development did not lead to the success that Thomas expected. Although the death of Archbishop Guncel opened a window of opportunity for him, the departure of Gargano de Arscindis, the Mongol invasion and tensions between Split and King Béla IV (or, rather, Queen Mary)<sup>69</sup> hindered his election as archbishop.<sup>70</sup> He was rejected as such both by the court and, above all, by the Spalatin laity.<sup>71</sup> This was probably a moment that influenced his decision to use his education for the defense of his own person, by including the justification of his actions in his work, giving to it personal and sometimes rather subjective overtones.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>68</sup> See below, ch. 33–6.

<sup>69</sup> See MMS, pp. 290–302. Thomas was a staunch opponent of everything coming from the royal court, but not because it was Hungarian, as has been implied in scholarship, but because he considered it detrimental to communal interests.

<sup>70</sup> See below, ch. 44–5.

<sup>71</sup> In the ecclesiastical sphere, Thomas was a zealous supporter of views rejecting any involvement of the laity in ecclesiastical matters (this negative attitude being common among the educated clergy of that time), and was thus constantly in conflict with locals and neighboring nobility interested in having their say in ecclesiastical matters.

<sup>72</sup> Thomas defines himself as *amator iustitie et nequitie detestator* (ch. 31), while his evaluations of many of his contemporaries and events are less flattering.

Although deeply hurt, Thomas withdrew neither from communal nor from ecclesiastical policy. Thus, he was several times Spalatin envoy to the royal court (in 1244 and 1261) and he represented the chapter of Split in litigation regarding some property with the monastery of St. Stephen in Split, as well as acting as an ecclesiastical arbiter in several lawsuits, particularly in the one between Bishop Treguanus of Trogir and Archpriest Stanimir of Šibenik.<sup>73</sup> Together with the famous Franciscan preacher Gerard of Modena and his companions Paul and Andrew, he participated in peacemaking between Split and Trogir, and several times performed delicate missions for Pope Innocent IV (1254–61).<sup>74</sup> After the death of Archbishop Roger (1250–66), whom he respected more than his immediate predecessors, he, himself relatively old, withdrew from public life and apparently dedicated himself to finishing his historical work.

## THE LATIN OF THE HS

The Latin language of the HS is good medieval Latin, which unites several layers: Classical Latin, Late Classical and Christian Latin, and certain aspects of local, Dalmatian, Latinity, with the usual departures from Classical Latin in certain aspects, which were in Thomas' time already established as norms. Thus, regarding orthography, Thomas is, for example, consistent in his monophthongisation, writing of sibilized *-ti* and epentetic *-p-*. Some of the orthographic characteristics are in their foundation Romanisms, as would be expected regarding

<sup>73</sup> On the last events there is no reference in the HS. For more, see Danko Zelić, "Arhidakon Toma i Šibenik, *Historia i res gestae*" [Archdeacon Thomas and Šibenik: *Historia* and *res gestae*], in Mirjana Matijević Sokol and Olga Perić, *Toma Arhidakon i njegovo doba. Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 25–27. rujna 2000. godine u Splitu* [Archdeacon Thomas and his time. Proceedings of the scholarly conference held 25–27 September 2000 in Split], Biblioteka Knjiga Mediterana 35 (Split: Književni krug, 2004), pp. 197–234.

<sup>74</sup> MMS, pp. 41–2.

Thomas' origin in the bilingual milieu of Split and the influence of his education in Bologna.<sup>75</sup>

Similar conclusions can be drawn also regarding the morpho-syntaxis of the HS. Morphosyntactic departures from the Classical norm are visible in the use of synthetically formed complex passive forms, the use of gerunds instead of participles, the switch from the *accusativus cum infinitivo* to declarative sentences with the copula *quod*, and the use of the subjunctive, which is inconsistent and uncertain. However, the HS shows also certain syntactic peculiarities. One of them is the domination of parataxis over hypotaxis, that is, of independent clauses over dependent ones, probably because of Biblical influences. For parataxis is characteristically a series of independent clauses starting with the copula (*et ...*) and with verbs at the beginning of a sentence, as well as the frequent use of present participles, dependent participles instead of the *ablativus absolutus*, and so on. Dependent clauses (temporal, consecutive, causal, conditional and comparative) are basically structured on the system of Classical Latin, with only some slight departures in the use of the subjunctive, but the sentences are usually shorter.<sup>76</sup>

The vocabulary of the HS also falls within similar parameters. The Christian lexical corpus is evident through Graecisms that

<sup>75</sup> For a detailed discussion of characteristics of Thomas' Latin orthography, see further Olja Perić, "Neke jezične osobitosti djela 'Historia Salonitana'" [Some linguistic peculiarities of the *Historia Salonitana*], *Živa antika* 32 (1982): 93–103, and Olga Perić, *Jezik i stilske osobitosti u djelu Tome Arhidakona* [The language and stylistic characteristics of the work of Thomas the Archdeacon] (Zagreb: Faculty of Arts, unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, 1989), p. 22.

<sup>76</sup> For these characteristics, see further the following: Olja Perić, "Složeni pasivni oblici u djelu 'Historia Salonitana'" [Complex passive forms in the *Historia Salonitana*], *Živa antika* 30 (1980): 113–8; Idem, "O morfosintaksi srednjovjekovnog latinskog u djelu Tome Arhidakona splitskog" [Regarding the morpho-syntaxis of medieval Latin in the work of Archdeacon Thomas of Split], *Suvremena lingvistika* 21–22 (1980–1): 3–18; Perić, *Jezik*, pp. 23–46.

became the common property of Christian Latinity (such as *ecclesia*, *presbyter*, and so on), neologisms created on the basis of the Bible (*zelus*, *zelare*), loan words from the Classical repertory, but with new Christian meaning (*gentilitas* = heathenism, *informatio* = teaching, *pontifex* = bishop, pope, *carnalis* = secular, and so on). Thomas is also using characteristic medieval forms, such as adjectives formed with *-bilis* and adverbs with *-biliter*. In these cases the overwhelming influence of the Vulgate and other Christian writers, which formed the educational foundation for the author, is also visible.<sup>77</sup>

## AIMS, GENRE, STYLE AND METHODS

Thomas' aim was to write a history of the church of Split in order to prove that it was legally and justly the heir of the metropolitan rights of Salona and to glorify its past, but also to justify his own politics. Because of the fact that there were these two reasons for writing, the HS has a somewhat two-fold character, that of a historical work—while discussing the older period—and that of memoirs—while discussing the one in which he personally participated in the public events.

This ambiguity of the HS is also reflected in the definition of its genre: whether it should be described as a “chronicle” or a “history.” According to the usage of medieval writers, the introductory sentence gives both the title and the definition of the text: *Incipit historia Salonitanorum atque Spalatinorum pontificum*.<sup>78</sup> Thus, Thomas himself chose the word *historia* for his narration of past events, along the lines defined by Isidore, the author whom Thomas knew and several times quoted in his

<sup>77</sup> Perić, Jezik, pp. 47–124.

<sup>78</sup> The first folio is missing in S. All other manuscripts use the terms *historia* or *istoria* for describing the HS, while T has *ystoria seu coronica*. It is generally considered to be an addition of the copyist.

own work.<sup>79</sup> However, regarding its content, that is, the main protagonists, the HS would be best placed in the literary category of *gesta episcoporum*, where the history of an ecclesiastical institution is presented through the description of the activity of persons who were at its head.<sup>80</sup>

Thomas was apparently well acquainted with the rules for writing this kind of medieval literature, and tried to follow them deliberately.<sup>81</sup> One of the more important rules for such a genre was that it should be written based on the works from Classical Antiquity and early Christian writers, on the one hand, and archival sources, on the other. However, another requirement—that of straightforward development of the story—was not fully accomplished in the HS. Thus, the *narratio rei gestae* very frequently develops into two parallel and intertwined lines. Still, Thomas was evidently aware of that, and whenever he “deviated” from the main theme—that is, from narrating the activity of the Spalatin pontifices—he always came back to it with expressions such as *ad propositum redeamus*, where *propositum* meant the main thread, that is, the rhetorical thesis.

However, unlike most of the *gesta*, the HS was written in the Late Middle Ages, when other stylistic forms also existed and became dominant. That they influenced Thomas as a writer is particularly visible in the second half of the HS, when he is describing events of his own times and he takes far more liberties in composing the text. This is particularly seen in the intentional moralizing and using of the both distant and recent past

<sup>79</sup> *Historia* is for Isidore “*narratio rei gestae, per quam ea, quae in praeterito facta sunt, dinoscuntur.*” (*Etym.* 1,41) [Toma, p. 387].

<sup>80</sup> On this literary genre, see the following: Michel Sot, *Gesta episcoporum, gesta abbatum* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1981); Patrick J. Geary, *Phantoms of Remembrance, Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millennium* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), p. 96 *et passim*.

<sup>81</sup> Among the authors who wrote *gesta*, Thomas was apparently acquainted with the work of Adam of Bremen (see below, p. 36, n. 1) and the *Liber pontificalis*, which he uses in the HS (see below, ch. 4, p. 21, n. 7 and ch. 8, p. 44, n. 2).

for the justification of his own ideas, characteristic for twelfth- and thirteenth-century writers.<sup>82</sup>

Another reason for Thomas' mixing of genres is contained in the fact that the HS covers a long time period and discusses the development of the Spalatin church from Christian Antiquity to the times contemporary to Thomas; thus, his approach to the writing of specific segments clearly could not be the same throughout. There may be distinguished three main parts of the HS. In the first part, that is, the Salonitan period of ecclesiastical organization, Thomas is reconstructing events based on those writers whom medieval authors recognized as an integral part of their own culture. The second part, that is, the early period of ecclesiastical organization in Split, is discussed mainly in the form of the memorial record (*libri traditionum*), based on diplomatic evidence (mostly charters and papal letters). The third period, that is, the period more or less contemporary to Thomas, was partly written on the basis of oral tradition still living through the account of his older contemporaries and partly written from his own memories, with a strong autobiographical bias.

Regarding Thomas' stylistics, they are mostly based on two main sources: Isidore of Seville and the Bible. The importance of both of them is implicit in the HS. Isidore is, in fact, the first author mentioned in the HS, in the very first sentence of the work, by which Thomas acknowledged his role as the keeper of all contemporary knowledge. As to the Bible, in Thomas's case there is even a direct reference to a specific copy: "a whole Bible together with commentaries and glosses" brought to Split by Archbishop Ugrinus from his studies in Paris, which Thomas might have been using himself.<sup>83</sup>

<sup>82</sup> For these characteristics of historiography contemporary to Thomas, see Robert N. Swanson, *The Twelfth-Century Renaissance* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), pp. 54–65, esp. pp. 57–8.

<sup>83</sup> See below, ch. 45, p. 357.

The style of the Vulgate, primarily aimed at making people acquainted with Christian doctrine, and also that of the encyclopedic work of Isidore, were good stylistic paragons for the HS, which both by its topic and principal genre (*gesta*) fitted into a similar ideological concept. Thomas' stylistics were also determined by the rules and conventions of rhetoric. It is evident from the rhetorical instruments (*flores, colores rhetorici*) prescribed by the *ars dictaminis* in numerous manuals, a number of which Thomas frequently used. Thus, he used different kinds of repetition of various syntactical units (sentences, words and their parts, voices), as one of the most important rhetorical figures for acquiring greater expressiveness. The first of such cases was the use of alliteration (*coadunato capitulo et clero ecclesie*) and assonance (*statimque attoniti naute confusis clamoribus ad armamenta velorum manus accurunt apponere annitentes ...*); there is also anaphora, with antithesis (*Alii erant nimis timidi, alii plus equo securi*) or with gradation, but also independently. A very frequent figure is homeoteleuton (*spectaculum miserabilium mulierum crines lacerantium*), usually combined with other figures to strengthen effects of antithesis, parallelism, rhyme, and so on, then polyptoton (*nec pater inquirebat filium neque filius patrem, uxor non respiciebat maritum, nec maritus uxorem*), synonymy (*vir constans et intrepidus, fortis et bellax, circumspectus et providus, providus et discretus, tristis et merens, astutus et calidus*), hyperbaton (*multis lacessitus iniuriis*), figura etymologica (*pacem facere, factamque fideliter observare*), and so on.<sup>84</sup> Through the wide repertory of such rhetorical figures, the effect of rhyming was achieved, and there were, moreover, emphasized characteristics of Thomas' bipolar understanding of the world, based on the juxtaposition of good and evil, Christ and Satan, light and darkness, and so on.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>84</sup> See Perić, Jezik, pp. 125–44.

<sup>85</sup> Such a style was exactly in Thomas' time defined as the fourth style for writing (*genus mixtum sive compositum*) or the so-called Isidorian style. The rhyme achieved by the aforementioned repetitiveness of parts of words, words, sentences and so on, by its simplicity resembles the works of Isidore and those

This conflict of two principles was also a means for Thomas to establish cause and effect also by use of other instruments, the most important of them being the parallelisms from the literature in which he was educated, in the first place the Bible. This can be particularly well demonstrated with the example of his description of the fall of Salona. The city before the catastrophe is depicted almost as a recurrence of Sodom and Gomorrah, as well as of Babylon, through the destruction of which there ends the old order, so that the new order may be established the new one in a new place, all this in a sequence rooted in cause and effect. Venus (*improba Venus*) as sublimated allegory of Sodom and Gomorrah, that is, the reason for downfall, was a frequent figure of medieval literature, symbolizing frivolity, sexuality, fornication and all the other aspects of perverted life. On the other hand, Biblical instruments of the Apocalypse—comets, eclipses of the sun and the moon,<sup>86</sup> and so on—figure in the HS portending the Mongol incursion, which is, although to a lesser degree than was the case with some other contemporary authors, in itself perceived as the beginning of the end of the world. However, in Thomas' case it might be not only a general reflection, but also an allusion to the failure of both the communal experiment and his own failure to become the archbishop, which were both results of a series of unfavorable circumstances triggered by that incursion.

Another motif borrowed from the Biblical repertory is that of the good shepherd tending his flock, used primarily for Jesus Christ.<sup>87</sup> Thomas applies this allegory to the archbishops of

---

written in this style, as opposed to the works of the authors who followed the system of rules embodied in the *cursus*. However, Thomas' choice of this style is not usual, because chronicles, histories, hagiographical and similar works were generally written in the so-called *sermo simplex*, while Thomas' prose belongs to a higher and more developed stylistic system. For more, see Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), pp. 148–54.

<sup>86</sup> Rev. 6: 12–3.

<sup>87</sup> John 10–1, 14 *et passim*.

Split, but also to secular princes, showing in that manner also his own attitude towards them. Thus, Archbishop Lawrence is a *bonus pastor*, and Archbishop Crescentius is a *pastor ydoneus*, while Guncel is not so: ... *quia non ut pastor bonus, qui animam solam ponit pro ovibus suis, sed insidianti lupo opponeret, sed ...* The Mongols are successful in their military onslaught, particularly because the Hungarians are like sheep without a shepherd (... *quasi gregem sine pastore ...*).

A characteristic of Thomas' style that mostly shows the influence of Classical Antiquity is his use of fictitious speeches by heroes addressing their soldiers before battles and encouraging them to fight. Pictures used in the whole content of such speeches are *loci communes* of Classical Latin and Greek literature, because for a hero it is desirable and expected to have also a spiritual component, partly expressed exactly through his rhetorical skills, modeled on Classical heroes such as Nestor and Ulysses. Thus, the speech of the one-eyed warrior leading the Spalatins in the fight against the men of Cetina is an introduction to their victory. The speech in itself is rather timeless, resembling Caesar's speeches held in front of his army during the Civil War, as well as speeches of other commanders of the Civil War.<sup>88</sup> Of a similar timeless type is also the speech of the Mongol leader Batu, while the speech of Stephen, the Spalatin commander on Brač, encouraging his companions to fight an enemy more experienced in military matters, has a very explicit Christian character emphasizing reliance on the help of God and St. Domnius, but also their fighting for the just cause in the defense of Christianity.

Thomas also uses several other figures as both stylistic and cognitive means. Thus, he combines allegory with analogy, relying in the first place on the Classical repertory. The image of Cadmus, a Greek king who was transformed into a snake (*serpens*) and who settled in Dalmatia, who became a most cruel

<sup>88</sup> Caesar, *De bello civili* I, cap. 85; II, cap. 31–2; III, cap. 6.

pirate (*pirata sevissimus*) and as a slithering serpent (*lubricus angvis*) attacks the weak, thus becomes a prefiguration of the pirate Osor, who escaped captivity like a slippery eel (*angvilla lubrica*).

Another figure, etymologizing as a way of thinking,<sup>89</sup> is also present in the HS. Thomas is thus etymologizing while explaining geographical names (*Adria*, *Spalatum*) and personal ones (*Fuscus*), but also while explaining fate on the basis of names (as in the story of the Mongols and Pest) conforming to the dictum of Hildebert of Lavardin *Nomen enim verum dat definitio rerum*.<sup>90</sup>

Another method which is for Thomas both stylistic and cognitive is his use of homonymy and homophony. Thus, individuals of the same or similar names are frequently conflated, but sometimes also divided into several; such was the case with Domnius and Domnio. John of Ravenna is basically created on the basis of several other archbishops named John. However, it remains unclear how much these cases are the result of deliberate mystification of anything that Thomas did not want to explain clearly, and how much they were just erroneous conclusions resulting from his sincere attempts to reconstruct the past event.

## THE HS AS A SOURCE FOR HISTORICAL DATA

Older scholarship, starting with Johannes Lucius, completely trusted the HS as a historical source, taking Thomas' statements at more or less face value. Such an attitude, typical for time, disregards both the *causa scribendi* and the conventions of medieval history writing. Thomas wrote the HS for a major purpose—the proof of his church's ancient rights and of his

<sup>89</sup> See Curtius, *European Literature*, pp. 495–500.

<sup>90</sup> Quoted by Curtius, *European Literature*, p. 498.

own politics, as mentioned above—and his work was to a great extent defined by the genre of *gesta episcoporum*, to say nothing of his own personal preferences. Thus, the value of his data for establishing historical facts depends on these aspects as well as on the methods that he applied to writing history.

The first chapters, borrowed from older narrative sources, say, of course, nothing on the early history of Dalmatia, but rather of the author's access to authorities, maybe of local beliefs about ancient times (occasionally built around remnants of the past, such as ruins or speculations on names). There are, however, exceptions also in the early chapters, such as the history of Archbishops Natalis and Maxim of Salona, written on the basis of the correspondence of Pope Gregory the Great, apparently known to Thomas, but better known from other sources.

The data on the downfall of Salona and the early settlement of the Croats are also without relevance for the events themselves. They are basically the result of Thomas' construction, based on different sources, not least on Biblical parallels, as mentioned above. On the other hand, many elements of the early medieval history of Split and Croatia are compiled from charters held in Thomas' time in the archiepiscopal archive of Split. Since many of them still exist, Thomas' summary of them can be checked by means of reference to the originals, and he proves to be a rather reliable witness. Consequently, the details of those few now lost but mentioned in the HS are valuable additions to our knowledge of the period. True, he regarded quite a few as authentic, which modern scholarship demonstrated to be forgeries, but he may not have known that.

The last eighteen chapters, describing events contemporary to Thomas, including those of an autobiographical character, describe a great number of events and their details, which are not known from any other narrative. A good part of these data can also be corroborated, at least by inference, through other

documents, and they seem to be—as far as the interests and biases of the author permitted—faithfully recorded. Most of them refer to the ecclesiastical and urban history of Split and its neighborhood, but the reports on the Fourth and the Fifth Crusade and, above all, on the Mongol invasion of 1241–2, are based on personal experience or on eyewitness reports. While the lively details of inner-city conflicts and skirmishes in the region allow the reader to imagine the scenes “as if being there” (obviously told to Thomas by participants), the description of the Tatars is a characteristic mixture of topical perceptions of “the other” and reports of victims of their cruelty (among whom his own archbishop, Roger, described his sufferings in a moving lament).<sup>91</sup>

## THE HS AND ITS READERS

The reception and influence of the HS on local historiography were ambivalent. On the one hand, there was no continuator of his work or, at least, no follower who would resemble Thomas in literary skills. There were two historians in fourteenth-century Split, Micha Madii de Barbazanis<sup>92</sup> and the so-called A Cutheis,<sup>93</sup> but their works do not show any direct influence of the HS either in composition, in content or in style. On the other hand, the HS left traces in different kinds of writings and on different levels. There is no doubt that the so-called *Pacta conventa* was created relying on chapter 17 (*Qualiter Hungari ceperunt dominium Dalmatie et Chroatie*) of the HS, which may

<sup>91</sup> Rogerius, *Carmen miserabile super destructione regni Hungarie temporibus Bele IV regis per Tartaros facta*, ed. by László Juhász, in *SRA* 2: 543–88.

<sup>92</sup> Micha Madii de Barbazanis, *Historia de gestis Romanorum imperatorum et summorum pontificum*, in Lucius (Lučić), *De regno*, pp. 371–80; Idem, in Schwandtner, *Scriptores*, p. 653.

<sup>93</sup> A Cutheis, *Summa historiarum tabula a Cutheis de gestis civium Spalatinarum sive Spalatensium in Dalmatia...*, in Lucius, *De regno*, pp. 381–6; Idem, in Schwandtner, *Scriptores*, pp. 654–61.

be seen from the fact that certain sentences are directly taken from this chapter. Besides that, the oldest exemplar of the *Pacta conventa* is precisely the one written in the *Codex Traguriensis* (T) of the HS and as an appendix to Thomas' history.<sup>94</sup> In a similar way, chapter 21 (*De Raynerio archiepiscopo*) was the model for the compiler of St. Rainer's Croatian vernacular *vita*, the main parts of which are almost verbatim translations of Thomas' text.<sup>95</sup> The same chapter was apparently known to Master George of Dalmatia in the fifteenth century, when he made the relief with the depiction of the saint's martyrdom.<sup>96</sup>

A peculiar case regarding the impact of the HS is that of a work related to it usually called *Historia Salonitana maior*. It was discovered by Farlati (who also gave it its name) in the Archive of the Congregation De propaganda fide in Rome. Farlati also gave it a detailed description.<sup>97</sup> The work is known in several copies in the archives and libraries of Rome, Split and Vienna, the aforementioned one being the oldest among them. It closely follows the text of Thomas' work until 1185, but is important because in it are included transcripts of otherwise unknown documents for the earliest period of Croatian history, such as the acts of tenth-century Spalatin synods.<sup>98</sup> The majority of scholars maintained that the manuscript was made later, in the sixteenth century.<sup>99</sup> Even if it is not an immediate copy of

<sup>94</sup> For the text of the *Pacta conventa*, see CD 2, doc. 5, pp. 8–9. See also above, n. 7.

<sup>95</sup> "Život svetoga Arnira," ed. by Cvito Fisković, in Vedran Gligo and Hrvoje Morović (eds.), *Legende i kronike* [Readings on the saints and chronicles] (Split: Čakavski sabor, 1977), pp. 123–47.

<sup>96</sup> "Život svetoga Arnira," p. 127. For the photographs of the relief, see Cvito Fisković, *Juraj Dalmatinac* [George of Dalmatia] (Zagreb: Zora, 1963), tab. 58–60.

<sup>97</sup> Farlati, *Illyricum sacrum* 1, pp. 319–20; 2, pp. 161–77; 3, p. 283.

<sup>98</sup> The critical edition of this work is that of Nada Klaić, *Historia Salonitana maior* (Belgrade: SANU, 1967).

<sup>99</sup> For more details, see MMS, pp. 11–24.

Thomas' work, it is clearly derivative of it and thus testifies to the popularity of the HS in sixteenth-century Dalmatia.<sup>100</sup>

The HS was also used by Andrea Dandolo for his *Chronicon Venetum*.<sup>101</sup>

Taking it into account that several *codices* of the HS are now known, it may be concluded that Thomas' work was relatively well known in the cultural circles of central Dalmatia, most certainly in Šibenik, in the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries. The influence of the HS is visible in several places of the work *De situ Illyriae et civitate Sibenici* of George Šižgorić, a humanist of Šibenik (1420–1509), although he does not acknowledge it in this work.<sup>102</sup> In similar manner the influence of the HS may be seen in the work *De situ orae Illyrici* of the humanist Paladio Fusco of Padua (1450–1520), who spent a number of years in Dalmatia (in Šibenik, Trogir and Zadar).<sup>103</sup> He apparently used

<sup>100</sup> Stjepan Gunjača, in his: "Historia Salonitana Maior," *Rad JAZU* 283 (1951): 175–243, created confusion by considering this work to be a copy of Thomas' concept, but Nada Klaić, in her "Način na koji je nastajalo djelo Historia Salonitana Maior" [How the historical work *Historia Salonitana Maior* was created], *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* 72–73 (1979): 171–98, and Margetić in "Historia Salonitana," 1–36 rejected the hypothesis. However, historians were less united regarding the value of interpolated documents and their evaluation. Thus, some totally rejected them as later fabrications, while the majority have accepted them as trustworthy to a greater or lesser extent. For the first opinion, see I. Lucius, *Inscriptiones Dalmaticae*, 73, and Ivo Babić, "Split'ske uspomene na salonitanske kršćanske starine" [Split's memoirs on Salonitan Christian Antiquity], *Vjesnik za arheologiju u historiju dalmatinsku* 85 (1992): 15, 35–6. For the second one, the analysis of Franjo Rački is still characteristic. See Franjo Rački, *Documenta historiae chroaticae periodum antiquam illustrantia* (Zagreb: JAZU, 1877), p. 197.

<sup>101</sup> *Chronicon Venetum*, in Lodovico Antonio Muratori (ed.), *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, 12 (Milan, 1728), pp. 264–5.

<sup>102</sup> Juraj Šižgorić Šibenčanin, *O smještaju Ilirije i o gradu Šibeniku* [Regarding the position of Illyria and the city of Šibenik], ed. by Veljko Gortan (Šibenik: Muzej grada Šibenika, 1981).

<sup>103</sup> Paladije Fusco, *Opis obale Ilirika* [Description of the coast of Illyria], ed. by Bruna Kuntić-Makvić and Miroslav Kurelac (Zagreb: Latina & Graeca, 1990).

the HS even more extensively than Šižgorić did. Thomas was apparently used also by Louis Crijević Tuberon (Tubero), a humanist from Dubrovnik, in his *Commentarii de temporibus suis*; his description of the Mongol invasion is in parts an almost verbatim rendering of the HS.<sup>104</sup>

The first author who directly acknowledged that he used Thomas was the Dominican Vincent Pribojević of Hvar. In his speech *Oratione de origine successibusque Slauorum Phari habita MDXXV*, Pribojević refers to Thomas (whom he calls Thomas Spalatinus) and his work (styled as *De euersione Salonarum*); however, the data that he takes from the HS are rather associative and carelessly used.<sup>105</sup> The historian Mauro Orbini of Dubrovnik also used Thomas' data, but he apparently took them from Pribojević's speech and not directly.<sup>106</sup>

However, the situation profoundly changed after Lucius' *editio princeps* of 1666. With that, the HS became the intellectual property of historians, philologists, and literary scholars everywhere.

## THE PRESENT EDITION

As usual in this series, this volume contains (always on the left-hand page) the best available Latin text, published recently by Olga Perić and Mirjana Matijević Sokol.<sup>107</sup> Some minor mis-

<sup>104</sup> Ludovicus Tubero Dalmata, *Commentarii de temporibus suis*, ed. by Vlado Rezar (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2001), p. 63. Cf. Ludovik Crijević Tuberon, *Komentari o mojem vremenu* [Commentaries on my time], ed. by Vlado Rezar (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2001), p. xxxviii.

<sup>105</sup> Vinko Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i zgodama Slavena* [Regarding the origin and the events happening to the Slavs], ed. by Grga Novak and Veljko Gortan (Split: Književni krug, 1991), pp. 50, 64, 108, 124.

<sup>106</sup> Mauro Orbini, *Il Regno de gli Slavi* (Pesaro: Concordia, 1601).

<sup>107</sup> See above, n. 4.

takes of that edition have been tacitly corrected. Textual comments have not been taken over; those interested in variants and other philological comments should consult the aforementioned critical edition.

The English translation of the *Historia* (always on the right-hand page) was started decades ago by James Ross Sweeney, who also added notes to a few parts, but his ill health prevented him from completing the planned annotated English version. His draft was transcribed and its gaps filled by Krisztina Fügedi from the Department of Medieval Studies, CEU, under the guidance of Frank Schaer, Series Editor, who then carefully edited and completed the translation. Final copyediting was done in cooperation with Damir Karbić of the Institute of History of the Croatian Academy of Sciences.

The translation aims, as always in CEMT, at a well readable, enjoyable and informative version, without sacrificing much from the author's style. In this case this was not a particularly difficult task, because Thomas' narrative is nicely straightforward, and wherever he is opaque, he may well have wished to remain equivocal. The text becomes occasionally hard to understand when he is making recourse to authorities, mainly to Classics, for better or worse.

Rendering certain details (mainly legal-institutional ones) of the *Historia* into modern English posed the same problems as those in previous volumes of CEMT. Beyond the "usual" problems of translating a medieval Latin text (this time written by someone for whom Latin was close to his mother tongue) into modern English, this narrative refers to a region where institutions and customs—described in Latin, which was the prevailing language of literacy—were in many respects different from those of the British Isles, whence the names for them have to be borrowed. This applies mainly to secular and ecclesiastical office-holders, such as *comes* (count), *archidiaconus* (arch-

deacon), and so on. We alert the reader to the problems connected to them in the notes. Another recurrent problem is the translation of proper names, both of persons and geographical features. First names, if an English equivalent exists, are Anglicized; otherwise, the usual vernacular (Croatian, Hungarian, Italian, etc.) form is used. Geographical features—both in the text and on the maps—follow the present-day usage, as they would appear in a modern atlas, and a Gazetteer is added (pp. 403–4) listing the different variants.

Many of the annotations go back to Sweeney's manuscript or to the notes of the Croatian translation by Matijević Sokol. They were, however, extensively augmented (mainly by Karbić and Schaer) especially with those readers in mind who may not be familiar with the details of the history of the region. References to recent results of historical, philological, and archaeological study were also added. Nevertheless, the notes do not intend to offer a history of Split and its area (to say nothing of the wider context of the *Historia*), nor do they contain all the titles from the extensive scholarship in languages not widely read, such as Croatian or Hungarian. Readers familiar with these will be able to find ample literature in the respective national and regional bibliographies and historical studies.<sup>108</sup>

For the translation and annotation we have often consulted with profit the recent Russian translation by Olga Akimova.<sup>109</sup> The maps were designed by Damir Karbić and Péter Banyó, the indices were compiled by Robert Kourekić (CEU). The typography is the expert work of Péter Tamási and his team. To them and the CEU Press, for accepting this volume into the CEMT series, the editor-translators are most grateful.

<sup>108</sup> For these, see, for example, the bibliography in both Toma (as n. 4) and MMS.

<sup>109</sup> See n. 45, above.