

Kronologija hrvatskih vladara u 9. i 10. stoljeću

U ovom radu autor predlaže novu kronologiju hrvatskih vladara u 9. i 10. stoljeću na temelju drugačije interpretacije povijesnih izvora, a ponajprije Porfirogenetova djela „De administrando imperio“. Ključna teza iznesena u članku jest da se 31. poglavlje DAI odnosi na 9. stoljeće, čime se određeni hrvatski vladari koji su se do sada obično smještali u 10. stoljeće, sada trebaju smjestiti u 9. stoljeće. Nadalje, drugačija kronologija nužno je dovela do toga da se određeni događaji (poput rata Hrvata i Bugara u 10. stoljeću), koje smo do sada vezali uz jednog vladara, sada vežu uz drugog.

Ključne riječi: *kronologija, 9. i 10. stoljeće, srednjovjekovna Hrvatska, De administrando imperio.*

Chronology of Croatian rulers in the 9th and 10th centuries

This paper presents a novel perspective on the chronology of Croatian rulers in the 9th and 10th centuries, which is based on a different and fresh interpretation of historical sources, with a primary focus on Porphyrogenitus' notable work "De Administrando Imperio." The pivotal thesis presented in this work posits that Chapter 31 of "De Administrando Imperio" pertains to the 9th century. Consequently, this suggests to place certain Croatian rulers, traditionally assigned to the 10th century, now into the 9th century. As a result, our revised chronology prompts a re-evaluation of specific events (such as the Croatian-Bulgarian war in the 10th century), which we have associated with one ruler so far, but now link to another ruler instead.

Keywords: *chronology, 9th and 10th centuries, medieval Croatia, De Administrando Imperio*

1. UVOD

Postojeći povijesni izvori za razdoblje 9. i 10. stoljeća ne daju nam mogućnost da s potpunom sigurnošću iznesemo kronologiju hrvatskih vladara.¹ U današnjoj povijesnoj znanosti prevladava Šišićeva kronologija² koju je predložio 1914. te uklopio u širi povijesni kontekst u svom kapitalnom djelu *Povijest Hrvata u vrijeme narodnih vladara*.³ Iako je Šišićevo mišljenje preživjelo kao relevantno više od čitavoga stoljeća, ono nije jedino, stoga ne možemo govoriti da u znanosti postoji suglasje oko pitanja kronologije hrvatskih vladara tijekom prije navedenih stoljeća.

Na promišljanje o ovoj temi potakli su me članak Predraga Komatine *O hronologiji hrvatskih vladara u 31. glavi spisa De administrando imperio*⁴ te članak Jakova Stipšića *Tragom jedne bilješke Ivana Luciusa o jednoj vladarskoj ispravi*.⁵ Smatram da ova dva članka bacaju drugačije svjetlo na kronologiju hrvatskih vladara u 9. i 10. stoljeću. Iako su zaključci iz navedenih članaka po mojem mišljenju pogrešni (o čemu će biti više riječi kasnije), novo interpretiranje postojećih izvora i sama argumentacija od iznimne su koristi i mogu nas odvesti na pravi put kad je u pitanju ova problematika.

Temeljna je zadaća u ovom radu dati prijedlog nove kronologije hrvatskih vladara u 9. i 10. stoljeću i objasniti zašto su druge kronologije, ponajprije ona Šišićeva, teško održive. Smatram da je potrebno objasniti zašto je odabrano razdoblje 9. i 10. stoljeća kao vremenski okvir. Kronologiju hrvatskih vladara u 9. stoljeću započet ću s knezom Mislavom iz jednostavnog razloga – većina povjesničara ne dovodi u sumnju činjenicu da je on bio vladar koji se smatrao Hrvatom. Dio povjesničara⁶ smatra da je on bio prvi hrvatski vladar misleći pritom da se vladari prije njega (Borna, Vladislav) ne mogu

1. INTRODUCTION

The available historical sources pertaining to the 9th and 10th centuries do not provide us with the opportunity of establishing an unequivocal chronology of Croatian rulers.¹ In contemporary historical science, the prevailing chronology is the one by Šišić,² proposed in 1914 and incorporated into a broader historical context in his seminal work *Povijest Hrvata u vrijeme narodnih vladara* (The history of Croats in the time of national rulers).³ While Šišić's chronology has remained influential for over a century, it is not the only one, and thus, we cannot claim that there is a consensus within the scientific community regarding the chronology of Croatian rulers during earlier said centuries.

My interest in this topic was sparked by Predrag Komatina's paper *O hronologiji hrvatskih vladara u 31. glavi spisa De Administrando Imperio*⁴ (On the chronology of Croatian rulers in Chapter 31 of *De Administrando Imperio*) and Jakov Stipšić's work *Tragom jedne bilješke Ivana Luciusa o jednoj vladarskoj ispravi*⁵ (Tracing a note by Ivan Lucius about a ruler's document). Though I disagree with the conclusions from these papers (which I will address later), the reinterpretation of existing sources and the argumentation itself offer valuable insights and may guide us in the right direction regarding this issue.

The main objective of this work is to propose a new chronology for Croatian rulers in the 9th and 10th centuries and elucidate why other chronologies, particularly Šišić's, are challenging to adhere to. I believe it's also important to clarify why I've chosen the 9th and 10th centuries as the timeframe under consideration. The chronology of Croatian rulers in the 9th century starts with Duke Mislav for a simple reason: most historians do not dispute the fact that he was a ruler who considered himself Croa-

¹ Želim naglasiti da je ovo proširena verzija mog diplomskog rada te su u ovu verziju unesene određene promjene zahvaljujući korisnim savjetima i opaskama Nevena Budaka, Trpimira Vedriša i Luke Špoljarića. Posebno želim zahvatiti mojem mentoru, profesoru Budaku, na razumijevanju i uvažavanju mojih teza te na poticaju i savjetima tijekom pisanja rada.

² Šišić 1914b, str. 1-93.

³ Šišić 1990.

⁴ Komatina 2010, str. 83-105.

⁵ Stipšić 1969, str. 75-96.

⁶ Budak 2018, str. 108-109, 169-170; Bilogrivić 2016, str. 152; Džino 2010, str. 188-189; Džino 2021, str. 175-176.

¹ I would like to emphasize that this is an expanded version of my master's thesis, and certain changes have been incorporated into this version thanks to valuable advice and comments from Neven Budak, Trpimir Vedriš and Luka Špoljarić. I especially want to express my gratitude to my mentor, Professor Budak, for understanding and respecting my theses, as well as for his encouragement and advice during the writing process.

² Šišić 1914b, pp. 1-93.

³ Šišić 1990.

⁴ Komatina 2010, pp. 83-105.

⁵ Stipšić 1969, pp. 75-96.

smatrati Hrvatima⁷. S druge pak strane, određeni povjesničari, poput Ančića⁸, neupitno ih smatraju Hrvatima iako se u izvorima spominju pod drugim imenom (Guduskani). Zbog različitih interpretacija u radu neću se baviti pitanjem jesu li Borna i Vladislav hrvatski vladari jer bi to zauzelo previše prostora i odvelo ovaj rad u nekom drugom smjeru.

Reinterpretacijom kronologije došao sam do zaključka da je potrebno određene događaje (primjerice rat Hrvata i Bugara u 10. stoljeću) koji su se vezivali uz jednog vladara (Tomislav) sada vezati uz drugog vladara (Mihael Krešimir II.). Zbog te problematike bit će navedeni svi politički događaji koji se mogu vezati uz određenog vladara kako bi se u potpunosti mogla shvatiti kronologija koju u ovom radu donosim, ali i kako bismo možda reinterpretirali moć koju je određeni vladar imao te kakav je status uživao u međunarodnom okruženju tog razdoblja.

2. PREGLED HISTORIOGRAFIJE

Franjo Rački je za ovu temu važan zato što je prvi povjesničar koji je u svome članku iz 1871., u kojemu se poziva na pismo pape Ivana X. iz 925. u kojemu Tomislava naziva *rex Croatorum*, Tomislava nazvao kraljem. Rački pravilno primjećuje kako je Toma Arhiđakon napisao da je knez Tomislav vladao 914., dok papa u pismu iz 925. Tomislava naziva kraljem.⁹ Dodatni doprinos kronologiji vladara 10. stoljeća dao je bugarski povjesničar Marin Stojanov Drinov, koji je tri vladara koja spominje Konstantin Porfirogenet (Trpimir, Krešimir i Miroslav) smjestio u 10. stoljeće, a Trpimira je izjednačio s Tomislavom. Rački je prihvatio Drinovljevo mišljenje da te vladare treba smještati u 10. stoljeće, no smatrao je da su Tomislav i Trpimir dvije različite osobe, što je samo po sebi značilo da su postojala dva Trpimira, jedan vladar iz 9. stoljeća te jedan vladar iz 10. stoljeća.¹⁰ Činilo se da je pitanje 10. stoljeća riješeno.

S riješenim 10. stoljećem Rački je u svome kapitalnom djelu *Nutarnje stanje Hrvatske prije XII. stoljeća*, koje je u časopisu *Rad JAZU* objavljivao između 1884. i 1893., iznio cjelovitu kronologiju hrvatskih vladara 9. i 10. stoljeća. U 9. stoljeću nakon Mislava, za kojeg se zna da je vladao 839., vladaju Trpimir, Domagoj, Zdeslav, Branimir i Mu-

tian. Some historians⁶ believe that he was the first Croatian ruler, arguing that rulers preceding him (Borna, Vladislav) cannot be regarded as Croats.⁷ On the other hand, certain historians, like Ančić,⁸ unquestionably consider them Croats, even though they are mentioned in historical sources under different names (Guduscans). Due to these different interpretations, I will refrain from delving into the question of whether Borna and Vladislav were Croatian rulers, as it would take up considerable space and divert this work in another direction.

Through the reinterpretation of the chronology, I have arrived at the conclusion that certain events (such as the war between Croats and Bulgarians in the 10th century) previously associated with one ruler (Tomislav) should now be linked to another ruler (Michael Krešimir II). Because of the complexity of this issue, all political events that can be attributed to a specific ruler will be mentioned here to fully understand the chronology presented in this work and potentially re-evaluate the authority held by a specific ruler and the status he enjoyed in the international context of that era.

2. HISTORIOGRAPHICAL OVERVIEW

Franjo Rački plays a crucial role here because he was the first historian to refer to Tomislav as a king in his work from 1871, citing a letter from Pope John X from 925, in which Tomislav was designated as *rex Croatorum*. Rački correctly noted that Thomas the Archdeacon stated that Duke Tomislav ruled in 914, while the Pope, in his letter from 925, referred to Tomislav as a king.⁹ Another contribution to the chronology of 10th-century rulers was provided by Bulgarian historian Marin Stojanov Drinov, who placed three rulers mentioned by Constantine Porphyrogenitus (Trpimir, Krešimir and Miroslav) in the 10th century, equating Trpimir with Tomislav. Rački accepted Drinov's viewpoint that these rulers belonged in the 10th century but also believed that Tomislav and Trpimir were two different historical figures, implying the existence of two Trpimirs, one ruler from the 9th century and one from the 10th cen-

⁷ Gračanin 2012, str. 58-61; Curta 2006, str. 135.

⁸ Ančić 1998, str. 27-41.

⁹ Rački 1998, str. 39-41.

¹⁰ Šišić 1914b, str. 14.

⁶ Budak 2018, pp. 108-109, 169-170; Bilogrivić 2016, p. 152; Džino 2010, pp. 188-189; Džino 2021, pp. 175-176.

⁷ Gračanin 2012, pp. 58-61; Curta 2006, p. 135.

⁸ Ančić 1998, pp. 27-41.

⁹ Rački 1998, pp. 39-41.

timir. U 10. stoljeću slijedi Tomislav, prvi hrvatski kralj, a njega je naslijedio Trpimir kojega je naslijedio njegov sin Krešimir. Zatim vlada Krešimirov sin Miroslav kojega nasljeđuje njegov sin Držislav.¹¹ Kao što vidimo, u ovoj kronologiji nedostaje Mihael Krešimir II., ali to treba pripisati činjenici da tada još nije bio otkriven nadgrobni natpis kraljice Jelene.

Zanimljiv prijedlog dao je Rački smjestivši kneza Višeslava između Mutimira i Tomislava. Svoju je tezu temeljio na stilskom povezivanju pisma na Višeslavovoj krstionici s Branimirovim natpisom u Muću te je svećenika Ivana, koji se spominje na krstionici, povezo s Ivanom koji se spominje u prepisci pape Ivana VIII. i Branimira.¹² Luka Jelić smatra da je Višeslav vladao „polovinom IX. vijeka“,¹³ dok Ferdo Šišić Višeslava smješta na kraj 8., odnosno na početak 9. stoljeća.¹⁴ Stjepan Gunjača smatrao je da Višeslava treba smjestiti između Vladislava i Mislava¹⁵, a takvo je razmišljanje podržao Vladimir Posavec, pokušavši ga potkrijepiti tadašnjim povijesnim okolnostima.¹⁶

Rački je bio prvi koji je istaknuo postojanje Trpimira II., no njegovo razmišljanje u hrvatskoj historiografiji isprva nije zaživjelo. Tako primjerice Tadija Smičiklas u prvom dijelu svoje *Poviesti hrvatske* uopće ne spominje Trpimira II., a kronologija vladara je sljedeća: Mojslav (838. – 850.), Trpimir (850. – 864.), Domagoj (864. – 876.), Zdeslav (877. – 879.), Branimir (879. – 892.), Mutimir (892. – o. 900.), Tomislav (o. 900. – o. 930.), Krešimir I. (o. 930. – 945.), Miroslav (945. – 949.), Pribina (o. 950. – ?) i Držislav (970. – 1000.).¹⁷ Kao što se može iščitati, Smičiklas je Tomislavovu vladavinu pomakao na sam početak 10. stoljeća. Nadalje, kako tada povjesničarima nije bio poznat natpis kraljice Jelene, Smičiklas je prazninu između Miroslava i Držislava popunio Pribinom, za kojega piše da je najvjerojatnije uzeo kraljevski naslov.¹⁸ Možda je ovakva Smičiklasova kronologija bila inspirirana Drinovljevim mišljenjem da vladari koje Porfirogenet spominje pripadaju 10. stoljeću, no da Tomislava i Trpimira treba identificirati kao jednu osobu.

10th century.¹⁰ It seemed that the issue of the 10th century had been resolved.

With the 10th-century issue resolved, Rački, in his seminal work *Nutarnje stanje Hrvatske prije XII. stoljeća* (The internal situation of Croatia before the 12th century), published in the *Journal of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts* between 1884 and 1893, presented a comprehensive chronology of Croatian rulers in the 9th and 10th centuries. In the 9th century, Mislav, who is known to have ruled in 839, was succeeded by Trpimir, Domagoj, Zdeslav, Branimir and Mutimir. In the 10th century, Tomislav, the first Croatian king, was succeeded by Trpimir, who in turn was followed by his son Krešimir. Then Krešimir's son Miroslav ascended to power, followed by his son Držislav.¹¹ As we can see in this chronology, Michael Krešimir II is missing, but this can be attributed to the fact that Queen Jelena's tombstone had not yet been discovered at that time.

Rački proposed an intriguing idea by placing Duke Višeslav between Mutimir and Tomislav. He based his thesis on the stylistic resemblance between the inscriptions on Višeslav's baptistery and Branimir's inscription in Muć, and he linked priest John, mentioned on the baptistery, to the John referenced in the correspondence between Pope John VIII and Branimir.¹² Luka Jelić believes that Višeslav ruled “in the mid-9th century,”¹³ while Ferdo Šišić placed Višeslav at the end of the 8th or the beginning of the 9th century respectively.¹⁴ Stjepan Gunjača believed that Višeslav should be placed between Vladislav and Mislav,¹⁵ a perspective supported by Vladimir Posavec, who sought to substantiate it with the historical circumstances of that time.¹⁶

Rački was the first to bring attention to the existence of Trpimir II. However, his ideas initially did not gain much acceptance in Croatian historiography. For instance, in the first part of his *Poviesti hrvatske* (History of Croatia), Tadija Smičiklas did not mention Trpimir II at all. He presented the following chronology of rulers: Mojslav (838 - 850), Trpimir (850 - 864), Domagoj (864 - 876), Zdeslav

¹¹ Rački 2009, str. 23; 200-223.

¹² Rački 1877, str. 376-377.

¹³ Jelić 1902, str. 104.

¹⁴ Šišić 1914b, str. 46.

¹⁵ Gunjača 1973, str. 137-141.

¹⁶ Posavec 1996, str. 17-32.

¹⁷ Smičiklas 1882, str. 178-237.

¹⁸ Isto, str. 227.

¹⁰ Šišić 1914b, p. 14.

¹¹ Rački 2009, pp. 23; 200-223.

¹² Rački 1877, pp. 376-377.

¹³ Jelić 1902, p. 104.

¹⁴ Šišić 1914b, p. 46.

¹⁵ Gunjača 1973, pp. 137-141.

¹⁶ Posavec 1996, pp. 17-32.

Mišljenje Vjekoslava Klaića razlikuje se od Smičiklasova kada govorimo o godinama kada je pojedini vladar vladao, no kronologija vladara gotovo je neizmijenjena. Ona je sljedeća: Mislav (835. – 845.), Trpimir (845. – 864.), Domagoj (864. – 876.), Inoslav (876. – 878.), Zdeslav (878. – 879.), Branimir (879. – 892.), Muncimir (892. – o. 910.), Tomislav (o. 910. – 928.), Krešimir I. (o. 930. – o. 945.), Miroslav (o. 945. – 949.), Pribina (o. 950. – 970.), Držislav (970. – o. 1000.).¹⁹

Zanimljivo je spominjanje kneza Inoslava, odnosno Iljka, fantomskoga vladara koji je nastao kao rezultat krivoga čitanja Dandolove kronike. Primjericice Iljka je među hrvatske vladare ubrajao i Ferdo Šišić.²⁰ Sve je nedoumice praktično riješio srpski povjesničar Mihailo Dinić, koji je 1938. g. zaključio da je prerađivač Dandolove kronike „u nerazumijevanju od adverbna načinio ime i dao mu odgovarajuću latinski oblik Yllicus“.²¹ Tako se nakon 1940-ih teško može naći povjesničar koji fantomskoga Iljka svrstava među hrvatske vladare.

Godine 1898. don Frane Bulić u Solinu je otkrio ostatke nadgrobna natpisa kraljice Jelene (†976.) te je natpis uspio djelomično restaurirati. On je bacio sasvim novo svjetlo na kronologiju hrvatskih vladara jer se u njemu spominju kraljevi Mihael i Stjepan, a Jelena je bila žena tada pokojnoga kralja Mihaela i majka kralja Stjepana.²²

Otkriće Jelenina natpisa navelo je Gavru Manojlovića da predloži svoju kronologiju hrvatskih vladara u 9. i 10. stoljeću. Vladare koje spominje Porfirogenet smjestio je u 9. stoljeće te smatra da nakon mirnih vladavina Trpimira i Krešimira dolazi do Pribinina svrgavanja Miroslava. Nakon Miroslava redom dolaze: Domagoj, Zdeslav, Branimir i Muncimir. Zanimljivost je što Manojlović nije kršćanska imena s Jelenina epitafa (Mihael i Stjepan) pripisao nekom od poznatih hrvatskih vladara, već je smatrao da su Mihael i Stjepan zasebni vladari. Tako u 10. stoljeće Manojlović smješta sljedeće hrvatske vladare: Tomislav, Mihael, Stjepan, Krešimir Stariji i Držislav.²³ U modernoj historiografiji Manojlovićevo je mišljenje o smještaju Porfirogenetovih vladara u 9. stoljeće prihvatio Tibor Živko-

(877 - 879), Branimir (879 - 892), Mutimir (892 - around 900), Tomislav (around 900 - around 930), Krešimir I (around 930 - 945), Miroslav (945 - 949), Pribina (around 950 - ?) and Držislav (970 - 1000).¹⁷ As can be seen, Smičiklas shifted Tomislav's reign to the very beginning of the 10th century. Furthermore, since the inscription of Queen Jelena was not known to historians at that time, Smičiklas filled the gap between Miroslav and Držislav with Pribina, whom he believed most likely assumed the royal title.¹⁸ Such a chronology might have been influenced by Drinov's view that the rulers mentioned by Porphyrogenitus belonged to the 10th century, suggesting that Tomislav and Trpimir should be identified as the same person.

Vjekoslav Klaić's perspective differs from Smičiklas regarding the years each ruler reigned, yet the chronology of the rulers remains mostly unchanged. It is as follows: Mislav (835 - 845), Trpimir (845 - 864), Domagoj (864 - 876), Inoslav (876 - 878), Zdeslav (878 - 879), Branimir (879 - 892), Muncimir (892 - around 910), Tomislav (around 910 - 928), Krešimir I (around 930 - around 945), Miroslav (around 945 - 949), Pribina (around 950 - 970) and Držislav (970 - around 1000).¹⁹

Worth noting is the mention of Duke Inoslav or Iljko respectively, a phantom ruler created due to a misreading of Dandolo's chronicle. For instance, Ferdo Šišić also included Iljko among Croatian rulers.²⁰ However, all these historical uncertainties were practically resolved by the Serbian historian Mihailo Dinić, who concluded in 1938 that the editor of Dandolo's chronicle "misinterpreted an adverb as a name and gave it the corresponding Latin form Yllicus."²¹ Consequently, since the 1940s, it's rare to find a historian who includes the phantom Iljko among Croatian rulers.

In 1898, priest Frane Bulić discovered the remains of Queen Jelena's tombstone inscription (†976) in Solin and managed to partially restore the text. This discovery shed new light on the chronology of Croatian rulers, as it mentioned Kings Michael and Stephen, as well as Jelena as the wife of the then late King Michael and the mother of King Stephen.²²

¹⁹ Klaić 1972b, str. 73-121.

²⁰ Šišić 1914b, str. 10.

²¹ Dinić 1938, str. 77-86.

²² Šišić 1914b, str. 49; 14.

²³ Manojlović 1902, str. 101-102.

¹⁷ Smičiklas 1882, pp. 178-237.

¹⁸ Idem, p. 227.

¹⁹ Klaić 1972b, pp. 73-121.

²⁰ Šišić 1914b, p. 10.

²¹ Dinić 1938, pp. 77-86.

²² Šišić 1914b, p. 49; 14.

vić²⁴ iako je isprva smatrao da ti vladari pripadaju 10. stoljeću.²⁵

Sve nedoumice oko kronologije hrvatskih vladara pokušao je otkloniti Ferdo Šišić u svome iscrpnom članku iz 1914. Šišić u članku rješava dvije nedoumice – u koje stoljeće treba smjestiti Konstantinove vladare Trpimira, Krešimira i Miroslava te kako identificirati tko su vladari Mihael i Stjepan koji se spominju na Jeleninu nadgrobnome natpisu.

Šišić je Trpimira, Krešimira i Miroslava smjestio u 10. stoljeće te ih naveo kao Tomislavove nasljednike, a važna karika u tome bio je Pribina, koji se u Darovnici za Diklo spominje kao ban iz 10. stoljeća, a isto tako ga spominje i Konstantin Porfirogenet.²⁶ Nadalje Šišić na temelju Mletačke kronike koja se pripisuje Ivanu Đakonu i Mutimirove isprave iz 892. g. zaključuje da su Zdeslav i Mutimir bili Trpimirovi sinovi te da time u 9. stoljeću „nema mjesta“ za još dva vladara (Krešimir i Miroslav).²⁷

Šišić je ispravno riješio nedoumicu oko kraljeva Mihaela i Stjepana navodeći da su hrvatski vladari imali kršćansko i narodno ime, a kao primjere je naveo Petra Krešimira i Dmitra Zvonimira. On rješava problem tako da ime Stjepan veže uz Držislava, dok ime Mihael veže uz njegova oca Krešimira II.²⁸ Na Jeleninu natpisu jasno se može iščitati da je ona umrla 976. te je taj podatak Šišić povezao s dostupnim izvorima koji jasno pokazuju da je u to vrijeme Hrvatskom vladao Držislav.

Šišićev je članak među vladare uvrstio i Mihaela Krešimira II. Kao što smo mogli vidjeti u radovima nastalim prije Šišićeva (Rački, Smičiklas, Klaić), Krešimir II. obično se nigdje ne spominje, a izvori koji su navodili da je Držislav sin Krešimira, tumačili su se na način da su povjesničari pod imenom Krešimir vidjeli Krešimira I., onoga vladara koji je naslijedio Tomislava (prema mišljenju Drinova, Smičiklasa i Klaića), odnosno Trpimira (prema mišljenju Račkoga).

U konačnici, Šišićeva predložena kronologija hrvatskih vladara²⁹ bila je sljedeća: Mislav (o. 830. – o. 845.), Trpimir I. (o. 845. – 863.), Domagoj (863./864. – 876.), Iljko (876. – 878.), Zdeslav

The discovery of Jelena's inscription led Gavro Manojlović to propose his own chronology of Croatian rulers in the 9th and 10th centuries. He placed the rulers mentioned by Porphyrogenitus in the 9th century, suggesting that after the peaceful reigns of Trpimir and Krešimir, Pribina overthrew Miroslav as the ruler. Miroslav was succeeded by Domagoj, Zdeslav, Branimir and Muncimir. Interestingly, Manojlović did not attribute the Christian names from Jelena's epitaph (Michael and Stephen) to any of the known Croatian rulers but considered Michael and Stephen to be different rulers. Thus, Manojlović placed the following Croatian rulers in the 10th century: Tomislav, Michael, Stephen, Krešimir the Elder and Držislav.²³ In modern historiography, Tibor Živković²⁴ accepted Manojlović's opinion on placing the rulers mentioned by Porphyrogenitus in the 9th century, although he initially thought they belonged to the 10th century.²⁵

In his comprehensive work from 1914, Ferdo Šišić attempted to resolve all doubts regarding the chronology of Croatian rulers. Šišić resolved two uncertainties in his work: in which century should Constantine's rulers Trpimir, Krešimir and Miroslav be placed and how to identify the rulers Michael and Stephen mentioned in Jelena's tombstone inscription.

Šišić placed Trpimir, Krešimir and Miroslav in the 10th century, considering them as successors to Tomislav, with Pribina playing a crucial role in this, as he was mentioned in the deed of donation for Diklo as a 10th-century ban, i.e. the same title Constantine Porphyrogenitus used for him.²⁶ Šišić also deduced, based on the Venetian chronicle attributed to John the Deacon and Mutimir's document from 892, that Zdeslav and Mutimir were Trpimir's sons, leaving "no room" for two additional rulers (Krešimir and Miroslav) in the 9th century.²⁷

Šišić also correctly resolved the question regarding King Michael and King Stephen, stating that Croatian rulers had both Christian and common names, and, as examples, he cited Peter Krešimir and Dmitar Zvonimir. Namely, he solved the problem by associating the name Stephen with Držislav

²⁴ Živković 2012, bilj. 209 i 212.

²⁵ Živković 2008, str. 193; 1999.

²⁶ Šišić 1914b, str. 17.

²⁷ Isto, str. 8-11.

²⁸ Isto, str. 49; 64-65.

²⁹ Šišić se u svom članku bavi i kronologijom vladara u 11. stoljeću, no ovdje su navedeni samo vladari 9. i 10. stoljeća.

²³ Manojlović 1902, pp. 101-102.

²⁴ Živković 2012, fn. 209 and 212.

²⁵ Živković 2008, p. 193; 1999.

²⁶ Šišić 1914b, p. 17.

²⁷ Idem, pp. 8-11.

(878. – 879.), Branimir (879. – 892.), Muncimir (892. – o. 914.), Tomislav (o. 914. – o. 928.), Trpimir II. (o. 928. – o. 935.), Krešimir I. (o. 935. – 945.), Miroslav (945. – 949.), Mihael Krešimir II. (949. – o. 970.), Stjepan I. Držislav (o. 970. – o. 995.), Svetoslav (o. 995. – 1000.).³⁰

Šišićeva razmišljanja o hrvatskome ranom srednjem vijeku sabrana su u njegovu najvećemu djelu *Povijest Hrvata u vrijeme narodnih vladara*³¹. Dugo je vremena ova monografija bila temeljno djelo hrvatskoga ranosrednjovjekovlja te je autor bio neupitni autoritet za navedeno razdoblje.

Godine 1925., kada se slavila 1000. obljetnica Hrvatskoga Kraljevstva i kada je objavljeno Šišićevo kapitalno djelo, Vjekoslav Klaić je dao novi prijedlog kronologije 9. i 10. stoljeća na temelju novog tumačenja *De administrando imperio* u kojemu je iznio svoju tezu o dva Krešimira. Naime, on je smatrao da Krešimir koji je sin Trpimira te Krešimir koji je otac Miroslava nisu jedna osoba. Tako je, prema Klaićevu mišljenju, Trpimira³² oko 852. g. naslijedio njegov sin Krešimir I., koji je vladao do 864., a Tomislava je 928. g. naslijedio Krešimir II. i vladao je do 945. g.³³ Ipak, ovaj prijedlog kronologije nije u historiografiji ozbiljnije zaživio.

Iz razdoblja Drugoga svjetskog rata vrijedi istaknuti dvije knjige Grge Novaka iz 1944. o prošlosti Dalmacije, koje je *Golden marketing* objedinio i 2001. izdao pod nazivom *Prošlost Dalmacije*.³⁴ Iako se autor bavi poviješću Dalmacije od neolitika do modernoga razdoblja, vrijedi istaknuti da je njegova kronologija hrvatskih vladara u 9. i 10. stoljeću identična Šišićevoj, osim već prije spomenutoga kneza Iljka, kojega je historiografija odbacila.³⁵

Godine 1972. Stjepan Antoljak predložio je kronologiju hrvatskih vladara koja se kosi sa svim dostupnim povijesnim izvorima. U svome se radu bavi prijepisom isprave Mihaela Krešimira II. koja je datirana u 950., a navodi se da je sastavljena u dvadeset i četvrtoj godini njegova vladanja, što bi značilo da je njegova vladavina počela 926. godine. Antoljak je, analizirajući ispravu, zaključio da je ona autentična.³⁶ Ponukan svojim zaključkom o auten-

and the name Michael with his father Krešimir II.²⁸ It is evident from Jelena's inscription that she died in 976, and Šišić connected this date to the available sources, which indicate that Držislav ruled Croatia at that time.

In his article, Šišić also included Mihael Krešimir II as one of the rulers. Papers on this topic prior to Šišić (written by Rački, Smičiklas, and Klaić) clearly show that Krešimir II is usually not mentioned anywhere. When sources did reference Držislav as the son of Krešimir, they were often interpreted by historians as referring to Krešimir I, the ruler who succeeded Tomislav (according to Drinov, Smičiklas and Klaić) or Trpimir (according to Rački).

Ultimately, Šišić's proposed chronology of Croatian rulers²⁹ was as follows: Mislav (around 830 - around 845), Trpimir I (around 845 - 863), Domagoj (863/864 - 876), Iljko (876 - 878), Zdeslav (878 - 879), Branimir (879 - 892), Muncimir (892 - around 914), Tomislav (around 914 - around 928), Trpimir II (around 928 - around 935), Krešimir I (around 935 - 945), Miroslav (945 - 949), Mihael Krešimir II (949 - around 970), Stephen I Držislav (around 970 - around 995), and Svetoslav (around 995 - 1000).³⁰

Šišić's views and thoughts about the Croatian Early Middle Ages are compiled in his seminal work *Povijest Hrvata u vrijeme narodnih vladara*³¹ (History of the Croats in the time of Croatian rulers). For a long time, this monograph served as a cornerstone in the study of the Croatian Early Middle Ages, and Šišić was widely regarded as an authority on this period.

In 1925, on the occasion of the 1000th anniversary of the Croatian Kingdom and the publication of Šišić's groundbreaking work, Vjekoslav Klaić presented a new chronology for the 9th and 10th centuries. Klaić's proposal was based on a fresh interpretation of *De Administrando Imperio*, where he argued for the existence of two Krešimirs. He believed that Krešimir, the son of Trpimir, and Krešimir, the father of Miroslav, were not the same person. According to Klaić, Trpimir³² was succeed-

³⁰ Šišić 1914b, str. 87.

³¹ Šišić 1990, str. 317-363; 376-474.

³² Klaić smatra da je Porfirogenetov Trpimir istovjetan hrvatskom knezu Trpimiru kojeg poznaju povijesni izvori u 9. stoljeću.

³³ Klaić 1925, str. 212-214.

³⁴ Novak 2001.

³⁵ Isto, str. 79-86.

³⁶ Antoljak 1972, str. 71-73.

²⁸ Idem, pp. 49; 64.-65.

²⁹ Šišić, in his paper, deals with the chronology of 11th-century rulers, but here only the rulers of the 9th and 10th centuries are listed.

³⁰ Šišić 1914b, p. 87.

³¹ Šišić 1990, pp. 317-363; 376-474.

³² Klaić believes that the Trpimir mentioned by Porphy-

tičnosti isprave, Antoljak je predložio novu kronologiju hrvatskih vladara u 10. stoljeću, no stvorio je kronologiju u kojoj je pokušao poštovati Šišićev zaključak da su Trpimir, Krešimir i Miroslav, koje spominje Porfirogenet, vladari 10. stoljeća. Porfirogenetova Krešimira izjednačio je s Mihaelom Krešimirom te je njegova kronologija vladara 10. stoljeća izgledala ovako: Tomislav³⁷ (o. 910. – o. 920.), Trpimir (o. 920. – 925./926.), Mihael Krešimir I. (926. – o. 954.), Miroslav (o. 954. – 958./959.), Stjepan Držislav (nakon 960.).³⁸ Antoljakova kronologija, koja je u očitoj suprotnosti s dostupnim povijesnim izvorima³⁹, nikada nije ozbiljnije razmatrana u historiografskim krugovima.

Osim nekoliko drugačijih mišljenja hrvatska je historiografija do danas uglavnom ostala na Šišićevim postavkama uz manje ispravke (knez Iljko) pa tako kronologiju koju je predložio Šišić pronalazimo u prvome svesku *Historije naroda Jugoslavije*⁴⁰ te u tekstovima Nade Klaić⁴¹, Nevena Budaka⁴², Ive Goldsteina⁴³ i Tomislava Raukara⁴⁴, a u novije vrijeme primjerice Ante Birina⁴⁵.

Najnoviji prijedlog kronologije hrvatskih vladara u 9. i 10. stoljeću, koji je u opreci sa Šišićevim mišljenjem, iznio je 2010. Predrag Komatina, koji je predložio smještanje Porfirogenetovih vladara u 9. stoljeće i prvu četvrtinu 10. stoljeća. Smatrao je da Porfirogenetova Trpimira treba poistovjetiti s knezom Trpimirom iz 9. stoljeća, ali se protivi smještanju Krešimirove i Miroslavove vladavine odmah nakon Trpimirove te ih smješta između Mutimira i Tomislava, a to objašnjava činjenicom da između 895. i 925. g. nema podataka o vladarima u Hrvatskoj (pri tome ne vjeruje podatku Tome Arhiđakona o vladavini Tomislava 914. g.) te smatra da se ta praznina može popuniti s navedena dva vladara.⁴⁶ Nažalost, Komatina ne predlaže tko bi onda vladao nakon Tomislava.

ed by his son Krešimir around 852, who ruled until 864, while Tomislav was succeeded by Krešimir II in 928, who reigned until 945.³³ However, Klaić's proposed chronology did not gain significant acceptance in historiography.

Books worth mentioning from the period of World War II are Grga Novak's two publications on the history of Dalmatia from 1944, which Golden Marketing later compiled and published in 2001 under the title *Prošlost Dalmacije* (Dalmatia's Past).³⁴ While Novak's research spans the history of Dalmatia from the Neolithic period to the modern era, it's noteworthy that his chronology of Croatian rulers in the 9th and 10th centuries is identical to the one established by Šišić, with the exception of the previously mentioned Duke Iljko, who has been rejected by historiography.³⁵

In 1972, Stjepan Antoljak introduced a chronology of Croatian rulers that boldly contested established historical accounts. His work centred on the transcription of a document of Michael Krešimir II dating back to 950, stating that it was written in the twenty-fourth year of his reign, implying a commencement of his reign in 926. Antoljak, after a meticulous examination of this document, concluded that it was authentic.³⁶ Encouraged by his findings regarding its authenticity, Antoljak proposed a new chronology of Croatian rulers in the 10th century, in which he attempted to adhere to Šišić's conclusion that Trpimir, Krešimir and Miroslav, as referenced by Porphyrogenitus, were indeed rulers of the 10th century. He equated the one Krešimir mentioned by Porphyrogenitus with Michael Krešimir, so his chronology of 10th-century rulers was as follows: Tomislav³⁷ (around 910- around 920), Trpimir (around 920-925/926), Michael Krešimir I (926-around 954), Miroslav (around 954-958/959), Stephen Držislav (after 960).³⁸ Antoljak's chronology, which is in obvious contradiction with available historical sources,³⁹ has never been seriously considered in historiographic circles.

³⁷ Antoljak pretpostavlja da Splitski crkveni sabor nije održan 925., nego 915. g.

³⁸ Antoljak 1972, str. 75-95.

³⁹ Očigledan primjer je Tomislav, koji se spominje u papinom pismu iz 925., a Antoljak navodi da je on umro oko 920. godine.

⁴⁰ Historija naroda Jugoslavije I, str. 185-197.

⁴¹ Klaić 1975, str. 221-334.

⁴² Budak 1994, str. 202-207; Budak 2020, str. 263-276.

⁴³ Goldstein 1995, str. 197-203; 253-304; 332-343.

⁴⁴ Raukar 1997, str. 26-42.

⁴⁵ Birin 2015, str. 45-58.

⁴⁶ Komatina 2010, str. 94-98; 102.

rogenitus is identical to the Croatian Duke Trpimir known from historical sources in the 9th century.

³³ Klaić 1925, pp. 212-214.

³⁴ Novak 2001.

³⁵ Idem, pp. 79-86.

³⁶ Antoljak 1972, pp. 71-73.

³⁷ Antoljak assumes that the Church Council of Split did not take place in 925 but in 915.

³⁸ Antoljak 1972, pp. 75-95.

³⁹ An evident example is Tomislav, mentioned in the letter by the Pope from 925, while Antoljak states that he died around 920.

Njegovo je mišljenje argumentirano pobio Neven Budak, prigovorivši da je Komatina olako odbacio vijest Tome Arhiđakona o vladavini Tomislava 914. g. te da zanemaruje Darovnicu za Diklo u kojoj se spominje da je ban Pribina bio suvremenik Mihaela Krešimira II., a to je, prema Budakovu mišljenju, isti onaj ban kojega Porphyrogenet spominje kao ubojicu Miroslava.⁴⁷ Ključna osoba u ovome je problemu ban Pribina. Budući da između 895. i 925. g. nema spomen nikakva Pribine, Komatinina je kronologija teško održiva.

3. MISLAV I TRPIMIR

Prvi knez za kojega se većina povijesne znanosti slaže da se definitivno može smatrati hrvatskim vladarom, bio je Mislav. Izvori nam dopuštaju da uz vladavinu kneza Mislava vežemo samo jednu godinu. Krajem 830-ih godina Hrvatska se našla u ratu s Venecijom, koji je rezultirao mirom 839. između dužda Petra Tradenika (836. - 864.) i kneza Mislava, o čemu piše Ivan Đakon.⁴⁸ Dakle sve što znamo o Mislavu jest da je vladao 839. i da je ratovao s Mlečanima. O početku njegove vladavine možemo samo nagađati. To je moglo biti oko 830. ili oko 835. Sve ostaje na razini pretpostavke, no možda možemo dovesti u vezu raspad Furlanske markgrofovije s političkim promjenama na istočno-jadranskoj obali koje su dovele do dolaska Mislava na vlast.

Mislava je na hrvatskome prijestolju naslijedio Trpimir. Tradicionalno se početak njegove vladavine smještao oko 845., no u novije vrijeme oživljeni su neki stariji prijedlozi datacije Trpimirove darovnice, koji smještaju početak njegove vladavine nešto ranije. Trpimirova je darovnica, između ostalog, poznata jer se na njoj javlja najstariji spomen hrvatskoga imena. Osim toga ona je zanimljiva i po tome što Trpimir svoju vlast izvodi iz Božje pomoći⁴⁹, a ne carske milosti.⁵⁰ Budući da je darovnica do

Except for a few differing opinions, Croatian historiography has largely remained faithful to Šišić's propositions, albeit with minor adjustments (Duke Iljko), thus having Šišić's proposed chronology included in the first volume of *Historije naroda Jugoslavije*⁴⁰ (History of the people of Yugoslavia) and in the works of Nada Klaić⁴¹, Neven Budak⁴², Ivo Goldstein⁴³ and Tomislav Raukar⁴⁴, and more recently, in the works of Ante Birin.⁴⁵

The most recent proposal for the chronology of Croatian rulers in the 9th and 10th centuries, and one that directly challenges Šišić's viewpoints, was introduced in 2010 by Predrag Komatina. He proposed to date the rulers mentioned by Porphyrogenitus to the 9th century and the first quarter of the 10th century. He believed that Porphyrogenitus's Trpimir should be identified with the 9th-century Duke Trpimir. However, Komatina disagreed with placing Krešimir's and Miroslav's reign immediately after Trpimir's reign, opting instead to position them between Mutimir and Tomislav. The reason for doing so, he explained in the lack of information about the rulers in Croatia between 895 and 925 (while also doubting the information provided by Thomas the Archdeacon about Tomislav's rule in 914), so he believed that this gap could be filled with these two rulers.⁴⁶ Unfortunately, Komatina did not propose who might have succeeded Tomislav.

Neven Budak countered his opinion, arguing that Komatina too easily dismissed Thomas the Archdeacon's information about Tomislav's rule in 914 and overlooked the deed of donation for Diklo, which mentions that Ban Pribina was a contemporary of Michael Krešimir II. According to Budak, this is the same ban whom Porphyrogenitus named as the murderer of Miroslav.⁴⁷ The key figure in this issue is Ban Pribina. Given the absence of any mention of Pribina between 895 and 925, Komatina's proposed chronology faces substantial historical challenges.

⁴⁷ Budak 2020, str. 263-264.

⁴⁸ Ivan Đakon, 19; Rački 1877, str. 335-336; Klaić 1972a, str. 19.

⁴⁹ O *iuventus munere divino* postoje i tumačenja da se ono odnosi na čin osnivanja samostana. O tome je govorio Goran Bilogrivić na VI. kongresu hrvatskih povjesničara. Iako se u zborniku sažetaka i rasporeda rada ne može pronaći Bilogrivićeva konkretna argumentacija, jedan od urednika VI. kongresa, Tomislav Galović, potvrdio mi je u prepisci elektroničkom poštom da je Bilogrivić uistinu ponudio drugačije tumačenje *iuventus munere divino*.

⁵⁰ CD 1, str. 3-8.

⁴⁰ Historija naroda Jugoslavije I, pp. 185-197.

⁴¹ Klaić 1975, pp. 221-334.

⁴² Budak 1994, pp. 202-207; Budak 2020, pp. 263-276.

⁴³ Goldstein 1995, pp. 197-203; 253-304; 332-343.

⁴⁴ Raukar 1997, pp. 26-42.

⁴⁵ Birin 2015, pp. 45-58.

⁴⁶ Komatina 2010, pp. 94-98; 102.

⁴⁷ Budak 2020, pp. 263-264.

nas došla u prijepisu, a ne u originalu, o njezinoj autentičnosti postoje različita mišljenja, no možemo reći kako je u znanosti prihvaćeno da se velik dio isprave smatra vjerodostojnim⁵¹, ali za neke dijelove isprave je očito da su umetnuti (primjerice dio o darovanju crkve sv. Jurja na Putalju).⁵²

U darovnici formula datacije glasi: *Regnante in Italia piisimo Lothario Francorum rege, per indictionem XV sub die IIII Nonis Martii*. Trpimirova darovnica datirana je po eri vladara i XV. indikcijom.⁵³ Prvi koji je ponudio prijedlog datacije bio je Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski, koji je ispravu datirao u 837. godinu.⁵⁴ No u historiografiji je sve donekadno bila neupitna datacija Franje Račkoga, koji je prigovorio da je Kukuljević zanemario spominjanje Mislava 839. te je na temelju indikcije datirao darovnicu u 852. godinu.⁵⁵

Mišljenje Račkoga u pitanje je doveo Lujo Margetić, koji je primijetio da je Rački ignorirao podatak o Lotaraovoj vladavini. Naime u ispravi je Lotar spomenut kao vladar Italije (*Regnante in Italia*), što je on postao 840., a 844. g. postao je car te je od tada u Italiji vladao Lotarov sin Ludovik II. Nakon što je dao okruniti svoga sina za kralja Italije, Lotar se nikada više nije nazivao italjskim kraljem te stoga Margetić smatra da se darovnicu treba smjestiti između 840. i 843. g.⁵⁶ Margetić ju je kasnije poblizhe datirao sa 2. veljače 840., uzevši u obzir podatke iz *Historia Salonitana* Tome Arhiđakona⁵⁷, no nakon nekoga vremena ispravio je svoju dataciju u 4. ožujka 840.⁵⁸ jer je u svome prethodnom prijedlogu slučajno zamijenio ožujak veljačom.

Svoj doprinos raspravi dala je i Mirjana Matijević Sokol, koja je, slijedeći Margetićevu argumentaciju o ranijoj dataciji darovnice, predložila da za datum nastanka ove isprave treba uzeti 4. ožujka 841. jer je u njoj Lotar naveden kao franački kralj (*Francorum rege*), što je on postao nakon 20. lipnja 840., kada je umro njegov otac Ludovik Pobožni. Iz toga autorica zaključuje kako je teško zamisliti da bi se u ispravi Lotaru davala titula koju tada nije posjedovao pa je stoga Margetićeva datacija nešto preuranjena.⁵⁹

⁵¹ Matijević Sokol 2014, str. 85-86.

⁵² Perić 1984, str. 168-169.

⁵³ Matijević Sokol 2014, str. 86.

⁵⁴ Kukuljević Sakcinski 1872, str. 207-216.

⁵⁵ Rački 1877, str. 3-6.

⁵⁶ Margetić 1993, str. 47-51.

⁵⁷ Margetić 1995, str. 20.

⁵⁸ Margetić 2000, str. 7-8.

⁵⁹ Matijević Sokol 2014, str. 88-89.

3. MISLAV AND TRPIMIR

The first Croatian duke widely acknowledged by most historians as a definitively Croatian ruler was Mislav. Based upon historical sources, there is only one single year that can be associated with Mislav's reign. Namely, in the late 830s, Croatia was engaged in a war with Venice, resulting in a peace treaty in 839 between Doge Pietro Tradonico (836 - 864) and Duke Mislav, as recorded by John the Deacon.⁴⁸ Thus, all we know about Mislav is that he ruled in 839 and was at war with the Venetians. The exact beginning of his rule is speculative, possibly around 830 or 835, and while it remains a matter of conjecture, it might be possible to link the dissolution of the March of Friuli with the political changes on the eastern Adriatic coast that eventually led to Mislav's ascent to power.

Trpimir succeeded Mislav on the Croatian throne. Traditionally, his rule was believed to have begun around 845. However more recently, proposals regarding an older dating of Trpimir's deed of donation have been revived, suggesting an earlier beginning of his reign. This deed is, inter alia, known as the earliest record mentioning the Croatian name and also quite interesting for the fact that Trpimir derived his authority by the grace of God,⁴⁹ rather than the mercy and favour of the emperor.⁵⁰ Though said charter has not been preserved in its original form but rather in the form of a transcript written some time later, and while there are debates about its authenticity, a substantial portion of it is generally accepted as credible,⁵¹ despite the fact that some sections, like the part concerning the donation of the church of St. George on Putalj, appear to have been added subsequently.⁵²

⁴⁸ John the Deacon, 19; Rački 1877, pp. 335-336; Klaić 1972a, p. 19.

⁴⁹ There are also interpretations regarding *iuvatus munere divino*, which suggest that it refers to the act of the founding of a monastery. Goran Bilogrivić discussed this at the VI. Congress of Croatian Historians. Although Bilogrivić's specific arguments cannot be found in the abstracts and programme of the congress, one of the editors, Tomislav Galović, confirmed in our email correspondence that Bilogrivić did indeed provide a different interpretation of *iuvatus munere divino*.

⁵⁰ CD 1, pp. 3-8.

⁵¹ Matijević Sokol 2014, pp. 85-86.

⁵² Perić 1984, pp. 168-169.

Čini mi se da je Margetić dao prilično uvjerljive argumente zašto se Trpimirova darovnica treba datirati ranije, a ne 852. godinom, kako je predlagao Rački. Usvajanjem mišljenja Margetića, a i Matijević Sokol, dolazimo do zaključka da je Trpimirova darovnica zapravo prvi spomen kneza Trpimira. Isto tako to bi značilo i da se prvi sigurni spomen Hrvata kao naroda pomiče iz 852. u o. 840. godinu.⁶⁰ Za problematiku ovoga rada nije toliko važno treba li darovnicu datirati u 840. ili 841. g., no ovakva datacija daje nam za pravo smjestiti početak Trpimirove vladavine već u 840. godinu ili možda čak u 839. godinu, kada imamo posljednji spomen Mislava kao vladara.

Iz Trpimirova vremena ostao nam je sačuvan ulomak lijeve strane zabata oltarne pregrade u crkvi u Rižinicama kod Solina na kojemu je isklesan natpis u kojemu se spominje Trpimirovo ime (*pro dvce Trepime[ro...]*). Sam ulomak nije moguće preciznije datirati te se okvirno datira u razdoblje vladavine kneza Trpimira.⁶¹

Saski benediktinac Gottschalk iz Orbaisa, koji je, čini se, 846. i 847. godine⁶² boravio na Trpimirovu dvoru, izvještava o sukobu Trpimira, kojega naziva *rex Sclavorum*, i „naroda Grka i njihova namjesnika“.⁶³ U isto vrijeme dogodilo se slavenško pljačkanje tvrđave Caorle oko 846., što je neke⁶⁴ navelo na razmišljanje da je taj događaj povezan s ratom Trpimira i „naroda Grka“ jer je tada Venecija bila podčinjena Bizantu, no potrebno je reći da Gottschalk nikada Mlečane ne naziva Greima.

Gottschalkov izvještaj posljednji je izvor koji možemo datirati, a u kojemu se izrijeком spominje Trpimir. Kasniji izvještaji o sukobu Hrvata i Bugara obično se pripisuju Trpimirovoj vladavini. Tibor Živković smatra da se ovaj rat dogodio 853. ili 854. te ga povezuje s ratom Bugara i Franaka koji je u to vrijeme izbio.⁶⁵ Budući da posljednji spomen Trpimira vežemo uz 864. i 847. godinu, smatram da je oko 850. završila Trpimirova vladavina, a za takvo mišljenje potporu nalazim u drugačijem razmišljanju o vremenskoj smještau podataka iz 31. poglavlja *De administrando imperio*. U idućemu poglavlju dat ću svoje mišljenje o događajima poslije

The formula regarding the dating in the charter reads as follows: “*Regnante in Italia piissimo Lothario Francorum rege, per indictionem XV sub die IIII Nonis Martii.*” Trpimir’s charter is dated based on the era of the ruler and the XV. indiction.⁵³ The first to propose a date was Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski, who suggested the year 837.⁵⁴ However, until recently, the historical consensus had been in favour of Franjo Rački’s dating. Rački objected to Kukuljević’s dating, arguing that he had overlooked the mention of Mislav in 839, and proposed dating it to 852 based on the indiction.⁵⁵

Lujo Margetić later challenged Franjo Rački’s view, pointing out that Rački had disregarded information about Lothar’s reign. In the charter, Lothar is referred to as the ruler of Italy (*Regnante in Italia*), a title he assumed in 840. When he became emperor in 844, his son Louis II took over the reign of Italy from then on. After having his son crowned as the King of Italy, Lothar never again referred to himself as the king of Italy. Margetić thus suggested that the charter should be dated between 840 and 843.⁵⁶ He proposed a more precise dating, i.e. 2nd February 840, based on information from the *Historia Salonitana* by Thomas the Archdeacon.⁵⁷ However, after some time, he corrected his dating to 4th March 840,⁵⁸ as he had mistakenly confused February with March in his previous proposal.

Mirjana Matijević Sokol also contributed to the debate, following Margetić’s argument for an earlier dating of the charter. She suggested that the date should be 4th March 841, as Lothar is referred to as the Frankish king (*Francorum rege*) in it, a title he acquired after 20th June 840, when his father Louis the Pious died. From this, Sokol concluded that it is unlikely that Lothar would have been given a title in the document, he did not possess at the time, making Margetić’s dating somewhat premature.⁵⁹

It seems to me that Margetić presented quite convincing arguments for dating Trpimir’s charter earlier than 852, as proposed by Rački. By adopting Margetić’s and Matijević Sokol’s views, it can be concluded that Trpimir’s charter is, in fact, the first mention of Duke Trpimir. This would also mean

⁶⁰ Budak 2018, str. 169-170.

⁶¹ Delonga 1996, str. 128.

⁶² Budak 2018, str. 170; Birin 2015, str. 46-47; Goldstein 2015, str. 201.

⁶³ Katić 1932, str. 410-411; Klaić 1972a, str. 22.

⁶⁴ Birin 2015, str. 47.

⁶⁵ Živković 2012, str. 130-131.

⁵³ Matijević Sokol 2014, p. 86.

⁵⁴ Kukuljević Sakcinski 1872, pp. 207-216.

⁵⁵ Rački 1877, pp. 3-6.

⁵⁶ Margetić 1993, pp. 47-51.

⁵⁷ Margetić 1995, p. 20.

⁵⁸ Margetić 2000, pp. 7-8.

⁵⁹ Matijević Sokol 2014, pp. 88-89.

Trpimirove smrti te o kronološkome smještanju tri hrvatska vladara koja spominje Konstantin Porfirogenet.

4. TKO NAKON TRPIMIRA?

Kao što je u prijašnjemu poglavlju spomenuto, do kraja vladavine kneza Trpimira došlo je oko 850. godine. Ključno pitanje na koje ću u ovome poglavlju pokušati dati odgovor jest – tko dolazi nakon Trpimira? U historiografiji se Trpimirova vladavina obično protezala sve do 864., kada je na vlast došao Domagoj. No je li to doista bilo tako? Odgovor na to pitanje daje *De administrando imperio* bizantskoga cara Konstantina VII. Porfirogeneta (913. – 959.).

Za hrvatsku povijest najvažnija su poglavlja 29., 30. i 31.⁶⁶ Ipak, među njima treba napraviti jasnu razliku. Poglavlje 31. dio je *Spisa o Hrvatima i Srbima*⁶⁷, koje čine poglavlja 31. – 36. i u kojima se prikazuju pojedinosti o narodima koji su zaposjeli nekadašnji rimski teritorij uz naglasak na to da su oni „od davnina“ podložni bizantskom caru.⁶⁸ Što se tiče 29. poglavlja, njegov središnji dio (priča o Bazilijevoj intervenciji na istočnojadranskoj obali) naknadno je umetnut, što je zaključio John Bagnell Bury, a početni i završni dio napisani su kada i *Spis o Hrvatima i Srbima*.⁶⁹ Poglavlje 30. bitno odskače od ostalih navedenih te u njemu nema tvrdnje o bizantskoj nadmoći, već se kroz poglavlje, kako Ančić smatra, provlači narativ o „hrvatskoj samostalnosti“. Ono je nastalo naknadno, vrlo vjerojatno nakon Porfirogenetove smrti te ga u tom svjetlu treba promatrati.⁷⁰ Za kronologiju hrvatskih vladara svakako je najvažnije 31. poglavlje. Pitanje na koje također treba odgovoriti jest – odnose li se ondje izneseni podaci na događaje iz 9. ili iz 10. stoljeća?

that the first definite mention of the Croats as a people is moved from 852 to around 840.⁶⁰ In terms of the subject-matter of this paper, it is not so important whether the charter should be dated to 840 or 841, but rather the fact that such dating allows us to place the beginning of Trpimir's rule in 840 or possibly even in 839 when we have the last mention of Mislav as a ruler.

From the time of Trpimir, a fragment of the left side of the altar screen in the church in Rižinice near Solin has been preserved. This fragment bears an inscription with Trpimir's name (*pro dvce Trepi-me[ro...]*) and while it's not possible to date this fragment more precisely, it's generally attributed to the time of Duke Trpimir's reign.⁶¹

A Saxon Benedictine named Gottschalk of Orbais, who seems to have stayed at Trpimir's court in 846 and 847,⁶² reported a conflict involving Trpimir, whom he referred to as *rex Sclavorum*, and the “people of Greeks and their patrician.”⁶³ Around the same time, there was a Slavic raid on the fortress of Caorle in approximately 846, which led some⁶⁴ to speculate that this event might be connected to the war between Trpimir and the ‘Greek people’ because Venice was under Byzantine rule at that time. However, it's essential to note that Gottschalk never referred to the Venetians as Greeks.

Gottschalk's report is the last datable source that explicitly mentions Trpimir. Later reports about the conflict between the Croats and the Bulgarians are usually attributed to Trpimir's reign. Tibor Živković suggests that this war occurred in 853 or 854 and was associated with the war between the Bulgarians and the Franks that broke out at the same time.⁶⁵ Given that the last mention of Trpimir is associated with the years 864 and 847, I believe that Trpimir's reign likely ended around 850. This view finds support in a different interpretation of the chronological placement of data in Chapter 31 of *De Administrando Imperio*. In the following chapter, I will present my view on the events that followed Trpimir's reign and the chronological placement of the three Croatian rulers mentioned by Constantine Porphyrogenitus.

⁶⁰ Budak 2018, pp. 169-170.

⁶¹ Delonga 1996, p. 128.

⁶² Budak 2018, p. 170; Birin 2015, pp. 46-47; Goldstein 2015, p. 201.

⁶³ Katić 1932, pp. 410-411; Klaić 1972a, p. 22.

⁶⁴ Birin 2015, p. 47.

⁶⁵ Živković 2012, pp. 130-131.

⁶⁶ Upitno je Konstantinovo autorstvo svih poglavlja od 29. do 36. Budući da pitanje autorstva nije toliko relevantno za problem kronologije hrvatskih vladara, time se u ovom radu neću baviti. O tome postoje različita mišljenja, a ja ću navesti samo neke od brojnih radova. Bury 1906, str. 556-561; Jenkins *et al.* 1962, str. 97-101; Ančić 2010, str. 133-151; Živković 2010, str. 117-131.

⁶⁷ Ovdje se ne radi o nekakvoj zasebnoj cjelini unutar *DAI*, ali dio historiografije smatra da su poglavlja 31. – 36. nastala iz pera istog autora te ih naziva *Spis o Hrvatima i Srbima* radi boljeg razumijevanja djela.

⁶⁸ Ančić 2010, str. 136-138; 142-147.

⁶⁹ Lončar 2010, str. 113-114.

⁷⁰ Ančić 2010, str. 142-147.

U 31. poglavlju spominju se tri hrvatska vladara – arhonti Trpimir, Krešimir i Miroslav. U njemu piše:

„Nakon mnogo godina, u dneve Trpimira arhonta, otca arhonta Krešimira, dodje iz Francije, koja leži između Hrvatske i Venecije, muž neki vrlo pobožan, Martin imenom, vanjštinom svjetovnjak, za koga i sami Hrvati vele, da je mnoga čudesa učinio.“⁷¹

(...)

„Veliku takovu moć i množinu naroda imaše Hrvatska do arhonta Krasimera (Krešimira, op. L. Đ.). Pošto ovaj umre, a sin njegov Miroslav vladavši 4 godine, od ruke bana Pribunje (Pribine, op. a.) pogibe, i u zemlji nasto raskol i razdor veliki, umanj se broj i konjaništva i pješadije i sagena i kondura, što ih imahu Hrvati. Danas imade sagena 30, male i velike kondure, i konjaništvo i pješadije.“⁷²

Ključna postavka 31. poglavlja, koja pomaže da se dođe do konačnoga zaključka, jest da su podaci u njemu izneseni kronološkim redom, što je 1962. u svojoj velikoj studiji zaključila skupina autora.⁷³ Autori kritiziraju starije hrvatske povjesničare i njihovu konstrukciju da je postojao Trpimir II. Oni navode da je Porfirogenetov Trpimir istovjetan knezu Trpimiru poznatome iz izvora i da se priča o Martinu treba vezati uz vladavinu Trpimira. Nadalje autori prihvaćaju tezu Vjekoslava Klaića o dva Krešimira i u skladu s njome razrješavaju problematiku navedenog poglavlja.⁷⁴ Ipak, s Klaićevom se tezom ne slaže Milenko Lončar, koji je u svome doktorskom radu, analiziravši između ostaloga i 31. poglavlje, istaknuo da se u ovome poglavlju na dva mjesta spominje arhont Krešimir, ali autor poglavlja ne navodi da se radi o dvije različite osobe, što sugerira da se ovdje radi o jednoj osobi.⁷⁵

U istome se poglavlju nalazi i jedan odlomak o sukobu Hrvata i Bugara o kojemu se u historiografiji jako puno raspravljalo. U odlomku stoji:

„Arhon pako Hrvatske podvrgnut je od početka, to jest od vlade cara Heraklija kao podanik caru romajskomu, i nigda nije bio podložen arhontu Bugarske. Ali niti Bugarin nije zaratio Hrvatima, osim bugarskoga arhonta Mihajla Borisa koji je došao i zaratio im, nu nemogući ništa opraviti, sklopi mir,

4. WHO SUCCEEDED TRPIMIR?

As mentioned in the previous chapter, Duke Trpimir's rule came to an end around 850. The key question I'll attempt to answer in this chapter is 'Who succeeded Trpimir?' In historiography, Trpimir's rule is usually extended until 864 when Domagoj came to power. But was this really the case? The answer to this question is provided by *De Administrando Imperio* by the Byzantine Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (913 – 959).

The most important chapters regarding Croatian history are 29, 30 and 31.⁶⁶ However, it is important to make a clear distinction between them. Chapter 31 is part of the *Record on Croats and Serbs*,⁶⁷ encompassing chapters 31 - 36. These chapters provide detailed insights into the peoples who inhabited the former Roman territory, emphasizing that they had been under the rule of the Byzantine Emperor "since ancient times".⁶⁸ As for Chapter 29, John Bagnell Bury has concluded that its central part (the story of Basil's intervention on the eastern Adriatic coast) was inserted later, while the initial and final parts were written at the same time as the *Record on Croats and Serbs*.⁶⁹ Chapter 30 notably differs from the others, as it does not assert Byzantine supremacy, but instead, as Ančić believes, conveys a narrative of 'Croatian independence.' It was written later, most likely after the death of Porphyrogenitus, and should be viewed in that context.⁷⁰ Chapter 31 is certainly the most important one in terms of the chronology of Croatian rulers. Another question that needs to be answered is whether the data presented in that chapter refers to events from the 9th or 10th century?

Chapter 31 mentions three Croatian rulers - the archons Trpimir, Krešimir and Miroslav. It reads:

⁶⁶ Constantine's authorship of all chapters from 29 to 36 is questionable, but since the question of authorship is not so relevant to the issue of the chronology of Croatian rulers, I will not address it in my work. Various opinions exist on this matter, and I will only mention some of the numerous works: Bury 1906, pp. 556-561; Jenkins et al. 1962, pp. 97-101; Ančić 2010, pp. 133-151; Živković 2010, pp. 117-131.

⁶⁷ This does not represent a separate unit within *DAI*, but part of historiography considers chapters 31-36 to be the work of the same author, referring to them as the *Record on Croats and Serbs* for a better understanding of the work.

⁶⁸ Ančić 2010, pp. 136-138; 142-147.

⁶⁹ Lončar 2010, pp. 113-114.

⁷⁰ Ančić 2010, pp. 142-147.

⁷¹ *DAI*, str. 82.

⁷² Isto, str. 83.

⁷³ Jenkins et al. 1962.

⁷⁴ Isto, str. 127-128.

⁷⁵ Lončar 2002, str. 469.

obdarivši se međusobno prijateljski sa Hrvatima. Ali Hrvati nisu nigda plaćali Bugarima danak, tek što su se oboje u znak prijateljstva međusobno darovima počastili.⁷⁶

Navedeni odlomak stvorio je problem za povjesničare koji su smještali Trpimira, Krešimira i Miroslava nakon Tomislava zato što bi se onda u tome odlomku trebao spominjati i pohod Simeonova vojskovođe Alogobotura na Hrvatsku. Tu zavrzlamu pokušao je razriješiti Ljudmil Hauptmann koji je smatrao da se izvještaj o odnosu Hrvata i Bugara temelji na hrvatskome izvoru iz oko godine 924., prije Alogoboturova pohoda. Nadalje on smatra da bi se sljedeći odlomci o snazi Hrvatske i o Krešimiru, Miroslavu i Pribini trebali datirati nakon Tomislava.⁷⁷ Uzevši u obzir Lončarovo mišljenje o spominjanju Krešimira u ovome poglavlju, Hauptmannovu tezu treba odbaciti.

Budući da je prethodno zaključeno kako su odlomci u poglavlju izneseni kronološkim redom, onda ih tako treba i analizirati. Povijesna ličnost koja se u ovome poglavlju spominje i koju neupitno možemo smjestiti u određeno razdoblje, bugarski je vladar Mihael Boris (852. – 889.). Prije opisa odnosa Hrvata i Bugara u tekstu je opisana misija Martina „u dneve Trpimira arhonta, otca arhonta Krešimira“.⁷⁸ Kronološki gledano prvo je vladao Trpimir, u čije se vrijeme dogodila Martinova misija, zatim se dogodio napad Bugara na Hrvate, a nakon toga se donose detaljniji podaci o tadašnjoj Hrvatskoj (popis gradova, vojna snaga itd.). Poglavlje završava opisom događaja nakon smrti Krešimira, za kojega Lončar smatra da je istovjetan Krešimiru s početka poglavlja, te opisom stanja u „Velikoj Hrvatskoj“.⁷⁹ Mišljenja sam da nam u navedenom odlomku nekoliko stvari odaje da se ovdje radi o opisu stanja u Hrvatskoj u 9. stoljeću. Prvo je spomen Mihaela Borisa za kojega znamo da je bugarski vladar iz 9. stoljeća. Nadalje važno je i spominjanje Krešimira nakon opisa odnosa Hrvata i Bugara. To je važno iz razloga što je isti taj Krešimir sin Trpimira koji se spominje prije Mihaela Borisa i rata Hrvata i Bugara. Nije nevažno spomenuti i da samo nespominjanje Alogoboturova pohoda, koji je definitivno važan događaj u hrvatskoj ranosrednjovjekovnoj povijesti, odaje da se podaci iz 31. poglavlja trebaju vezati uz 9. stoljeće.

“After many years, during the days of Archon Terpimer, the father of Archon Krasimeris, there came from Francia that lies between Croatia and Venice a man called Martin, of the utmost piety though clad in the garb of a layman, whom these same Croats declare to have wrought abundant miracles.”⁷¹

(...)

“This great power and multitude of men Croatia possessed until the time of prince Krasimer (Krešimir, *author's note*). But when he was dead and his son Miroslav, after ruling four years, was made away with by the ban Pribounias (Pribina, *author's note*), and quarrels and numerous dissensions broke out in the country, the horse and foot and galleys and cutters of the Croat dominion were diminished. And now it has 30 galleys, and cutter large and small, and horse and foot.”⁷²

The pivotal point in Chapter 31, which helps lead to a final conclusion, is that the data presented in it is provided in chronological order, as concluded by a group of authors in their extensive study back in 1962.⁷³ The authors criticized older Croatian historians and their assertion that Trpimir II existed. They argued that Porphyrogenitus' Trpimir is, in fact, the same historical figure as Duke Trpimir, who is well-documented in historical sources. Moreover, they argued that the narrative surrounding Martin should be closely intertwined with the reign of Trpimir. Furthermore, the authors accepted Vjekoslav Klaić's theory of two Krešimirs and, in line with it, resolved the issues discussed in this particular chapter.⁷⁴ However, Milenko Lončar disagrees with Klaić's theory. In his doctoral thesis, after analysing Chapter 31 and other pertinent material, he pointed out that in this chapter, Archon Krešimir is mentioned in two places, but the chapter's author does not specify that these are two different individuals, suggesting that it refers to the same person.⁷⁵

In the same chapter, there is a paragraph about the conflict between the Croats and the Bulgarians, a topic that has been the subject of extensive historiographical debate. The passage reads as follows:

⁷⁶ DAI, str. 82.

⁷⁷ Hauptmann 1925, str. 165-187.

⁷⁸ DAI, str. 82.

⁷⁹ Isto, str. 82-83.

⁷¹ DAI, p. 82.

⁷² Idem, p. 83.

⁷³ Jenkins et al. 1962.

⁷⁴ Idem, pp. 127-128.

⁷⁵ Lončar 2002, p. 469.

Kako bi se dodatno osnažila argumentacija o smještanju podataka iz 31. poglavlja u 9. stoljeće, potrebno je uzeti u obzir tadašnje političke okolnosti te podatke iz 32. poglavlja. Bizant je za vladavine cara Bazilija I. ponovno postao aktivan na istočnojadranskoj obali. Godine 867. bizantska je flota okončala arapsku opsadu Dubrovnika, 870. bizantske su snage napale slavenske utvrde (nije precizirano kome su te utvrde pripadale), a vrhunac aktivnosti bio je postavljanje Zdeslava na hrvatsko prijestolje 878. godine. Ipak, Zdeslav je zbačen već iduće godine, a Bazilije je krenuo putem blaže politike prema slavenskim vladarima u zaleđu. To je rezultiralo nalogom bizantskim gradovima u Dalmaciji da novac, umjesto bizantskome strategu, počnu isplaćivati slavenskim vladarima.⁸⁰ Nakon ublažavanja Bazilijeve politike istočnojadranska obala više nije u neposrednome fokusu Bizanta praktično sve do vladavine Ivana I. Cimiska (969. - 976.) i Bazilija II.⁸¹ (976. - 1025.).

S druge strane Srbi su od sredine 9. stoljeća te tijekom prve polovice 10. stoljeća gotovo konstantno u središtu sukoba Bugarske i Bizanta.⁸² Shodno tomu ne treba se čuditi da se u 32. poglavlju⁸³, koje je namijenjeno Srbima, spominju i događaji iz 10. stoljeća. Budući da je Srbija neprekidno bila u fokusu bizantske politike te da su se tijekom desetljeća na bizantskome dvoru nalazili razni pretendenti na srpsko prijestolje, koji su carevima zasigurno prenosili svoje viđenje srpske političke situacije, sasvim je logično da je Porfirogenet puno bolje upoznat sa srpskom situacijom te stoga u 32. poglavlju nalazimo suvremenije podatke u odnosu na 31. poglavlje.

Usporedimo li srpsku situaciju s hrvatskom, možemo reći da nakon epizode sa Zdeslavom bizantski dvor gotovo čitavo stoljeće nema posredniji kontakt s važnijim čimbenicima u Hrvatskoj. Budući da do carskoga dvora nisu mogli doći neki iznimno detaljni podaci o stanju u Hrvatskoj, kao što je slučaj sa Srbima, onda se ne treba čuditi što u 31. poglavlju ne možemo pronaći vijesti iz 10. stoljeća. Moguće je da se podaci koji se prenose u 31. poglavlju temelje na nekom bizantskome izvoru nastalome na temelju Zdeslavova iskaza za vrijeme njegova bo-

“The prince of Croatia has from the beginning, that is, ever since the reign of Heraclius the emperor, been in servitude and submission to the emperor of the Romans, and was never made subject to the prince of Bulgaria. Nor has the Bulgarian ever gone to war with the Croats, except when Michael Boris, prince of Bulgaria, went and fought them and, unable to make any headway, concluded peace with them, and made presents to the Croats and received presents from the Croats. But never yet have these Croats paid tribute to the Bulgarians, although the two have often made presents to one another in the way of friendship.”⁷⁶

The paragraph in question created a problem for historians who placed Trpimir, Krešimir and Miroslav in the timeline after Tomislav due to the fact that said paragraph should then have also mentioned the military campaign of Alogobotur, Simeon’s military commander, against Croatia in this context. Ljudmil Hauptmann tried to resolve this issue. He believed that the account of Croatian-Bulgarian relations was based on a Croatian source from around 924, i.e. before Alogobotur’s campaign. Hauptmann also proposed that the subsequent passages about Croatia’s power and about Krešimir, Miroslav and Pribina should be dated after Tomislav.⁷⁷ However, considering Lončar’s opinion regarding the mention of Krešimir in this chapter, Hauptmann’s thesis should be rejected.

Given the prior conclusion that the paragraphs within the chapter are presented in a chronological order, it would be advisable to analyse them accordingly. The historical figure, who is mentioned in this chapter and can without doubt be placed to a specific period, is the Bulgarian ruler Michael Boris (852 to 889). Before the description of the relations between the Croats and the Bulgarians, the text describes Martin’s mission “in the days of Archon Terpimer, the father of Archon Krasimeris.”⁷⁸ Chronologically speaking, one can state that first was the reign of Trpimir, during which Martin’s mission took place, and then the Bulgarian attack on the Croats occurred. After that, the text provides a more detailed overview of the state of Croatia at that time, including a list of cities, its military strength and other relevant information. The chapter concludes with a description of events following

⁸⁰ DAI, str. 80.

⁸¹ Brojni su povjesničari pisali o vezama Hrvatske i Bizanta za vrijeme Tomislava, no o tome nešto više u poglavlju 5.1.

⁸² Vedriš 2015, str. 591.

⁸³ DAI, str. 83-88.

⁷⁶ DAI, p. 82.

⁷⁷ Hauptmann 1925, pp. 165-187.

⁷⁸ DAI, p. 82.

ravka u Konstantinopolu. Naime u tekstu se može iščitati narativ koji bi odgovarao Zdeslavu, a to je da je za vrijeme Trpimira i njegovih potomaka bilo sve „idealno“ (uspješna misija „muža vrlo pobožnog“ Martina te velika vojna snaga Hrvatske), dok nakon smrti Miroslava „u zemlji nasto raskol i razdor veliki, umanji se broj i konjaništva i pješadije i sagena i kondura, što ih imahu“.⁸⁴ Zdeslavu, kao Trpimirovu potomku, zasigurno je odgovaralo prikazati da je moć hrvatske kneževine bitno opala nakon što su članovi njegove dinastije svrgnuti s prijestolja. Uostalom, još je Bury ustvrdio da je priča o Martinovoj misiji morala doći od nekog hrvatskog izvora, a to je svakako mogao biti Zdeslav.⁸⁵

Konstantin i/ili njegovi suradnici ne bi imali ništa protiv uvrštavanja takva narativa u svoje djelo. Štoviše, pogledamo li 29. poglavlje, njima je bilo u interesu uvrstiti takvo pripovijedanje jer se na taj način indirektno veliča Konstantinov predak Bazilije I. U njemu stoji:

„Za vlade pako hristoljubivoga cara Basilija, poslaše poklisare, tražeći i moleći, da pokrste one, koji su medju njima nekršteni, pa da budu kao i negda podvrgnuti romajskom carstvu. Saslušavši ih blaženi i slavni car, izašalje carskoga čovjeka (bazilika) sa jerejima i pokrsti sve one, koji bijahu medj rečenim narodima još nekršteni. I nakon što ih dade pokrstiti, postavi im za vladare one, koje su sami htjeli i izabrali iz roda, koji su oni štovali i voljeli. Od onoga pako vremena pa sve do danas postaju njihovi arhonti iz vlastitih plemena, a ne iz drugih.“⁸⁶

Ako navedeni odlomak shvatimo na način na koji su na bizantskom dvoru željeli da se vidi prošlost provincije Dalmacije, onda je situacija jasnija. Bazilije je bio *velikodušan* te je u Hrvatskoj i ostalim istočnojadranskim sklavinijama postavio vladare „koje su sami htjeli“ i koje su „oni štovali i voljeli“. U takvo pisanje savršeno se uklapa postavljanje Zdeslava na hrvatsko prijestolje 878. godine. Ovakvo se pisanje nadovezuje na 31. poglavlje, u kojemu se ističe da je hrvatska politička i vojna moć opala nakon smrti Miroslava i Pribinine pobune, a onda je Bazilije, kako piše u 29. poglavlju, uslišao želje Hrvata, zbacio „zle“ vladare (Domagojeve sinove, op. a.) i postavio im za vladara čovjeka kojeg su oni „htjeli“ (a zapravo ga je želio Bizant i Bazilije).

the death of Krešimir, who Lončar believes is the same Krešimir mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, and a description of the situation in “Great Croatia.”⁷⁹ I believe that several things in said passage indicate that this is a description of the state of Croatia in the 9th century. First, there is the mention of Michael Boris, who we know was a Bulgarian ruler from the 9th century. Additionally, the mention of Krešimir after the description of Croatian-Bulgarian relations is significant, as this Krešimir is the son of Trpimir, who is mentioned before Michael Boris and the war between Croats and Bulgarians. It’s also worth mentioning that the absence of any mention of Alogobotur’s campaign, which is undoubtedly an important event in Croatian early medieval history, suggests that the data in Chapter 31 should be associated with the 9th century.

To further strengthen the argument for placing the data in Chapter 31 to the 9th century, it is necessary to consider the political context of that time and the information presented in Chapter 32. During the reign of Emperor Basil I, the Byzantine Empire reasserted its influence along the eastern Adriatic coast. In 867, the Byzantine fleet successfully ended the Arab siege of Dubrovnik, and in 870, Byzantine forces launched attacks on Slavic fortresses (though it is not specified to whom these fortresses belonged). These activities reached their peak when Zdeslav was proclaimed the ruler of Croatia in 878. However, Zdeslav was overthrown the following year, and Basil adopted a more conciliatory approach in his policy towards the Slavic rulers in the hinterland. This led to Byzantine cities in Dalmatia being instructed to pay tribute to Slavic rulers instead of the Byzantine strategos.⁸⁰ After Basil’s shift in policy, the eastern Adriatic coast ceased to be the primary focus of Byzantine attention until the reign of John I Tzimiskes (969 - 976) and Basil II (976 - 1025).⁸¹

On the other hand, the Serbs were almost constantly at the centre of conflict between Bulgaria and Byzantium from the mid-9th century and through the first half of the 10th century.⁸² Consequently, it’s not surprising that events from the 10th century are

⁷⁹ Idem, pp. 82-83.

⁸⁰ DAI, p. 80.

⁸¹ Many historians have written about the relations between Croatia and Byzantium during the reign of Tomislav, but more on that in chapter 5.1.

⁸² Vedriš 2015, p. 591.

⁸⁴ Isto, str. 82-83.

⁸⁵ Bury 1906, str. 557.

⁸⁶ DAI, str. 64-65.

U 32. poglavlju nalazimo podatke iz 10. stoljeća koji se odnose na Hrvatsku, no oni su jako općeni- ti. Spominje se sljedeće: „Tada se Zaharije uplaši i pobježe u Hrvatsku i u to sad doba podju ratom ovi Bugari pod Alogoboturom na Hrvatsku, i svi budu tamo pogubljeni od Hrvata.“⁸⁷ Očito bizantskom dvoru nisu poznati detaljniji podaci o stanju u Hrvatskoj te se iz tog razloga ne spominje kamo je Zaharije pobjegao te tko je porazio Alogobotura. Nepoznavanjem detaljne situacije u 10. stoljeću možemo objasniti zašto se u 31. poglavlju Konstantin i/ili njegovi suradnici ograničavaju samo na događaje 9. stoljeća u Hrvatskoj i ne donose primjerice podat- tak o pobjedi Hrvata nad Alogoboturom, iako nam je iz 32. poglavlja jasno da su bili upoznati s tim događajem.

Teza da su se događaji iz 31. poglavlja dogodili u 9. stoljeću, za sobom donosi i druge posljedice, a to je da su i informacije o naseljenim gradovima u Hrvatskoj te o hrvatskoj vojnoj snazi isto tako iz 9. stoljeća. U poglavlju se navodi da Hrvatska ima sljedeće naseljene gradove: Nin, Biograd, Veli- cin, Skradin, Hlijevno, Stup, Knin, Kori, Klobuk.⁸⁸ Smatram da su gradovi koji se navode u poglavlju samo dodatni dokaz o tome da se 31. poglavlje u- istinu odnosi na 9. stoljeće. Pogledamo li geografski smještaj tih gradova, uočljivo je da se oni nalaze u jezgri prostora na kojem je nastala hrvatska kneže- vina. Znamo da se u kasnijem razdoblju Hrvatska širila na sjever, a u prvoj četvrtini 10. stoljeća proši- rila se i na Sisak⁸⁹, a to zaključujemo prema spisima Splitskoga crkvenog sabora iz 928. godine.⁹⁰ No ne spominje se nijedno naselje koje se nalazi na samo- me sjeveru bivše rimske provincije Dalmacije ili u Donjoj Panoniji, a kojim su hrvatski vladari ovlada- li krajem 9. i početkom 10. stoljeća. Shodno tomu čini mi se da popis gradova održava prostor kojim su hrvatski vladari vladali sredinom 9. stoljeća.

4.1. KREŠIMIR I. I MIROSLAV

Zašto Krešimira I. i Miroslava odmah smještati nakon Trpimira? Komatina smatra da ova dva vla- dara treba smjestiti između Mutimira i Tomislava koristeći se argumentom da je između 852.⁹¹ i 864. prošlo premalo godina da se izmijene na prijestolju

referenced in Chapter 32,⁸³ which is dedicated to the Serbs. Since Serbia remained in the continuous focus of Byzantine policy and various claimants to the Serbian throne were present at the Byzantine court over the decades, who undoubtedly conveyed their view of the Serbian political situation to the emperors, it is quite logical that Porphyrogenitus possessed a much deeper understanding of the Ser- bian situation, resulting in more contemporary data being found in Chapter 32 in comparison to Chapter 31.

When comparing the Serbian situation to the Croatian one, it's evident that after the episode in- volving Zdeslav, the Byzantine court had almost no direct contact with significant factors in Croatia for nearly a century. Since more detailed information about the state in Croatia could not reach the im- perial court, as was the case with the Serbs, it is not surprising that we cannot find information from the 10th century in Chapter 31. It is possible that the data conveyed in Chapter 31 is based on some Byz- antine source created on Zdeslav's accounts during his stay in Constantinople. Namely, a narrative can be discerned in the text that would have suited Zde- slav's interests, painting the time of Trpimir and his descendants as "ideal" (the successful mission of "a man called Martin, of the utmost piety" and the great military strength of Croatia), while after the death of Miroslav, "quarrels and numerous dissen- sions broke out in the country, the horse and foot and galleys and cutters of the Croat dominion were diminished".⁸⁴ Zdeslav, as a descendant of Trpimir, certainly had an interest in presenting the image that the power of the Croatian principality signifi- cantly declined after the members of his dynasty were removed from the throne. Moreover, it's worth noting that Bury already argued that the account of Martin's mission must have originated from a Cro- atian source, and Zdeslav could very well have been that source.⁸⁵

Constantine and/or his associates wouldn't have opposed incorporating such a narrative into their work. In fact, this would align with their interests and indirectly celebrate Constantine's ancestor, Basil I, as highlighted in Chapter 29, which states the following:

⁸⁷ Isto, str. 87.

⁸⁸ Isto, str. 82.

⁸⁹ Budak 1994, str. 30; Gračanin 2011, str. 200-202.

⁹⁰ Rački 1877, str. 195; CD 1, str. 37.

⁹¹ Komatina datira Trpimirovu darovnicu u 852. godinu.

⁸³ DAI, pp. 83-88.

⁸⁴ Idem, pp. 82-83.

⁸⁵ Bury 1906, p. 557.

otac, sin i unuk te da se uz to još dogode neredi u Hrvatskoj do kojih je doveo Pribina.⁹² Međutim Milenko Lončar dobro primjećuje da postoje takvi primjeri u Bizantu. Naime između smrti Konstantina V. Kopronima (775.) i početka vladavine njegova unuka Konstantina VI. (780.) prošlo je samo pet godina, dok je između smrti Mihaela II. (829.) i dolaska na prijestolje njegova unuka Mihaela III. (842.) prošlo trinaest godina.⁹³ Uzevši u obzir Lončarovu opasku, smatram da je moguće smjestiti vladavinu Krešimira I. i Miroslava između o. 850. i 864. godine.

Moje je mišljenje da je upravo Pribina ključan u smještanju Krešimira I. i Miroslava odmah nakon Trpimira. U historiografiji je puno poznatiji ban Pribina iz razdoblja Mihaela Krešimira II., no često se zaboravlja da imamo spomen Pribine u 9. stoljeću u Čedadskom evangelijaru⁹⁴. U navedenom evangelijaru na petome je listu upisano *domno Tripimiro*.⁹⁵ Na istome listu, ali na drugome mjestu i drugom rukom, upisan je niz imena, među kojima je i ime Pribina (*bribina terpimer. petrus. maria dragouid*).⁹⁶ Šišić nije bio siguran radi li se o hrvatskome vladaru Trpimiru, no smatram da odgovor na to pitanje daje spomen Petra uz Trpimirovo ime jer se na dvadeset i trećemu listu spominje: ... *presila. petrus filius domno tripemero*.⁹⁷ Dakle imamo Petra čije je ime odmah uz Trpimirovo te kasnije imamo spomen Petra, sina Trpimirova. S obzirom na navedeno smatram da se može s određenom sigurnošću ustvrditi kako su osobe spomenute uz Pribinu hrvatski knez Trpimir i njegov sin Petar. Također je zanimljivo što se ime Pribina spominje ispred imena hrvatskoga vladara. Ne znamo govori li nam ovo nešto više o moći koju je posjedovao Pribina ili

“But in the time of Basil, the Christ-loving emperor, they sent diplomatic agents, begging and praying him that those of them who were unbaptized might receive baptism and that they might be, as they had originally been, subject to the empire of the Romans. And that glorious emperor, of blessed memory, gave ear to them and sent out an imperial agent and priests with him and baptized all of them that were unbaptized of the aforesaid nations, and after baptizing them he then appointed for them princes with whom they themselves approved and choose, from the family which they themselves loved and favoured. And from that day to this their princes come from these same families, and from no other.”⁸⁶

If we examine the given passage in the manner intended by the Byzantine court to depict the history of the Dalmatian province, a clearer picture emerges. Basil I showed his *generosity* by appointing rulers in Croatia and other eastern Adriatic sclaviniae “with whom they themselves approved and choose” and “they themselves loved and favoured.” Hence, the appointment of Zdeslav to the Croatian throne in 878 perfectly fits into such a narrative. This narrative is also followed up in Chapter 31, which emphasizes the decline in Croatian political and military power after the death of Miroslav and Pribina’s rebellion. Then, as stated in Chapter 29, Basil met the wishes of the Croats, overthrew the “evil” rulers (the sons of Domagoj, *author’s note*), and appointed a ruler that they “approved and choose” (although he was actually the one Byzantium and Basil wanted).

Chapter 32 provides information on the 10th century related to Croatia, but it is quite general. It mentions the following: “Then Zacharias took fright and fled to Croatia... Now, at the same time these Bulgarians under Alogobotour entered Croatia to make war, and there they were all slain by the Croats.”⁸⁷ Evidently, the Byzantine court possessed limited knowledge of the specific circumstances within Croatia, which explains why it doesn’t specify where Zacharias fled to or who defeated Alogobotour. The lack of comprehensive insights into the 10th-century situation might explain why, in Chapter 31, Constantine and his associates restricted their focus to 9th-century events in Croatia, omitting thereby details like the Croats’ triumph over

⁹² Komatina 2010, str. 94-98.

⁹³ Lončar 2010, str. 110.

⁹⁴ Tibor Živković izjednačio je Pribinu koji se spominje u *DAI* s franačkim vazalom Pribinom, nitranskim, a kasnije knezom Donje Panonije (Živković, *De Conversione Croatorum et Serborum*, 132-135.), no ostaje činjenica da na Čedadskom evangelijaru Pribina, koji se spominje uz Trpimira, ne nosi nikakav naslov, pa tako ni *dux*. Također, smatram da Živković daje preveliku ulogu Francima u njihovim odnosima s hrvatskom kneževinom tijekom 850-ih i 860-ih i na temelju toga bez veće argumentacije izjednačuje Porfirogenetova Pribinu s franačkim vazalom Pribinom te smatra da je odigrao presudnu ulogu u borbi za hrvatsko prijestolje.

⁹⁵ Šišić 1914b, str. 6; Klaić 1972a, str. 22-23.

⁹⁶ Šišić 1914b, str. 6; Klaić 1972a, str. 22-23.

⁹⁷ Šišić 1914b, str. 6; Klaić 1972a, str. 22-23.

⁸⁶ *DAI*, pp. 64-65.

⁸⁷ *Idem*, p. 87.

se, kako Marino Kumir smatra, ovdje možda radi o tome da je Pribina hodočastio i u Trpimirovo ime te je iz tog razloga prvo napisano ime hodočasnika, a zatim Trpimirovo i njegova sina Petra.⁹⁸ Uzevši u obzir podatke iz Čedadskoga evangelijara i *De administrando imperio* može se zaključiti da je Pribina bio visoko pozicionirani hrvatski velikaš u vrijeme Trpimira i njegovih neposrednih nasljednika – Krešimira i Miroslava.

Smatram da je Krešimir I. naslijedio Trpimira na prijestolju negdje oko 850. godine. Jedine podatke o njegovoj vladavini crpimo iz Porfirogenetova djela. Dojam je da je upravo Krešimir važna figura 31. poglavlja jer se Trpimir navodi kao otac Krešimira, dok se Miroslav navodi kao Krešimirov sin („(...) u dneve Trpimira arhonta, otca arhonta Krešimira(...)“ te „(...) sin njegov (Krešimirov, op. L. Đ.) Miroslav vladavši 4 godine (...)“⁹⁹). Može se reći da se u poglavlju radi jasna vremenska razlika između onoga što se dogodilo prije Krešimira i onoga nakon Krešimira te je stoga moguće da se, iako se izrijekom ne navodi, podaci o sukobu s Bugarima, broju gradova u Hrvatskoj te o hrvatskoj vojnoj snazi odnose na razdoblje Krešimirove vladavine.

Tibor Živković, koji se slagao sa smještanjem Krešimira i Miroslava u 9. stoljeće, smatrao je da je Krešimirovo kršćansko ime bilo Petar, što temelji na prije spomenutom Čedadskom evangelijaru, u kojemu se spominje *petrus filius domno tripemero*.¹⁰⁰ Ovakvo razmišljanje moglo bi imati potporu u činjenici što je ime tadašnjega splitskog nadbiskupa bilo Petar, a iz Trpimirove darovnice¹⁰¹ jasno je vidljivo da je Trpimir gajio dobre odnose sa Splitskom nadbiskupijom. Osim toga Trpimir naziva splitskog nadbiskupa „ljubljenim kumom“¹⁰² (*dilectus compater*), što nam daje još jedan dokaz o bliskosti Trpimira i Petra. Lako je moguće da je Trpimirov ili Krešimirov kršteni kum bio upravo Petar te je Krešimir dobio kršćansko ime po „ljubljenom kumu“.

Možda je iz toga vremena i prvi poznati spomen neke hrvatske vladarice. Na istome listu Čedadskog evangelijara, u kojemu je dva puta spomenut Trpimir, nalazimo spomen imena Petar zajedno s imenom Mutimira.¹⁰³ Iako ne možemo biti sigurni da

Alogobotur, even though Chapter 32 confirms their awareness of this event.

The thesis that the events described in Chapter 31 happened in the 9th century has other consequences as well, particularly regarding information about the populated cities in Croatia and Croatian military strength, which also seems to be rooted in the 9th century. The chapter states that Croatia has the following populated cities: Nin, Biograd, Velicin, Skradin, Hlijevno, Stup, Knin, Kori, Klobuk.⁸⁸ I believe that the cities mentioned in the chapter are additional evidence that Chapter 31 indeed refers to the 9th century. If we look at the geographical location of these cities, it is evident that they are located in the core area where the Croatian principality originated. While we know of Croatia's later expansion to the north, and its expansion to Sisak in the first quarter of the 10th century,⁸⁹ as indicated by the records from the Church Council in Split from 928,⁹⁰ there is no mention of any of the settlements situated in the far north of the former Roman province of Dalmatia or in Lower Pannonia, territories that Croatian rulers had conquered towards the end of the 9th and the beginning of the 10th century. Therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that the list of cities reflects the region governed by Croatian rulers during the mid-9th century.

4.1. KREŠIMIR I AND MIROSLAV

Why should Krešimir I and Miroslav be placed immediately after Trpimir? Komatina believes that these two rulers should be placed between Mutimir and Tomislav by arguing that the period from 852⁹¹ to 864 was insufficient time for the succession on the throne from father to son and then to grandson, especially when taking into account the turmoils that Pribina caused in Croatia.⁹² However, Milenko Lončar rightly points out that similar rapid successions occurred in the Byzantine Empire. For instance, there was only a five-year gap between the death of Constantine V Copronymus (775) and the beginning of the reign of his grandson Constantine VI (780). Similarly, thirteen years passed between the death of Michael II (829) and the accession

⁹⁸ Kumir 2017, str. 58; bilj. 39.

⁹⁹ DAI, str. 82.

¹⁰⁰ Živković 2012, str. 132.

¹⁰¹ CD 1, str. 3-8.

¹⁰² Isto, str. 4.

¹⁰³ Kumir 2017, str. 59.

⁸⁸ Idem, p. 82.

⁸⁹ Budak 1994, p. 30; Gračanin 2011, pp. 200-202.

⁹⁰ Rački 1877, p. 195; CD 1, p. 37.

⁹¹ Komatina dates the deed of donation of Trpimir to the year 852.

⁹² Komatina 2010, pp. 94-98.

se ovdje radi o Trpimirovu sinu Petru, takvu mogućnost ne možemo odbaciti, pogotovo uzmemo li u obzir stranicu na kojoj se ova dva imena nalaze. Možda se može pomisliti da se ovdje radi o Petrovoj majci koja je sa svojim sinom bila na hodočašću, a tome bi u prilog išla i činjenica da se Trpimirov treći sin zvao Mutimir, koji je ime mogao dobiti po svojoj majci.

U *De administrando imperio* nalazimo podatak da je Miroslav vladao četiri godine.¹⁰⁴ Na temelju toga smatram da bi Miroslavovu vladavinu trebalo staviti u razdoblje od 860., kada bi prema ovome prijedlogu kronologije umro Krešimir I., do 864., kada na vlast dolazi Domagoj (u to se vrijeme Domagoj počinje javljati i u izvorima), koji se na prijestolje popeo nakon pobune bana Pribine, koja je u konačnici rezultirala smrću kneza Miroslava.

Događaji koji su uslijedili između 864. i 879. godine jasno nam daju do znanja da je u Hrvatskoj vladala nestabilnost, što se manifestiralo na razne načine, ponajprije u intenzivnim borbama za prijestolje unutar kneževine. Smatram da je to još jedan razlog zašto bi Krešimira I. i Miroslava trebalo smještati nakon Trpimirove vladavine. Naime Miroslavova vladavina i pobuna bana Pribine savršeno se uklapaju u okolnosti u kojima se Hrvatska nalazila u drugoj polovici 9. stoljeća.

4.2. DOMAGOJ, ZDESLAV, BRANIMIR I MUTIMIR

Sačuvani povijesni izvori su nam, nasreću, skloni kada je riječ o razdoblju od o. 860. do o. 895. te na temelju njih možemo bez većih problema rekonstruirati kronologiju hrvatskih vladara u tom razdoblju.

Početak Domagojeve vladavine treba staviti u 864., kada je, prema mome mišljenju, došlo do ubojstva Miroslava. Nemamo nikakvih podataka o eventualnoj povezanosti bana Pribine i novoga kneza Domagoja, no može se pomisliti da je Pribina utjecao na Domagojev dolazak na prijestolje te da je zadržao svoj moćni položaj unutar kneževine.

Da je u Hrvatskoj doista bila nesređena situacija, svjedoči činjenica da je 865. mletački dužd Urso Particijak (864. – 881.) napao Hrvatsku te se čini da je njegov pohod bio uspješan jer je knez Domagoj morao zatražiti primirje te predati taoce kao jam-

of his grandson Michael III (842) to the throne.⁹³ Taking Lončar's observations into consideration, I believe that the reigns of Krešimir I and Miroslav could be placed within the timeframe of around 850 to 864.

In my opinion, Pribina is crucial for placing Krešimir I and Miroslav immediately after Trpimir. While Ban Pribina from the era of Michael Krešimir II is better known in historiography, it's often overlooked that we have a reference to Pribina in the 9th century, in the Gospel of Cividale.⁹⁴ Namely, the name *domno Tripimiro* is mentioned on the fifth folium in said Gospel.⁹⁵ On the same folium, but in a different place and handwriting, a list of names includes the name Pribina (*bribina terpimer: petrus. maria dragouid*).⁹⁶ Šišić expressed uncertainty about whether this referred to the Croatian ruler Trpimir, but I argue that the mention of Peter alongside Trpimir's name on the twenty-third folium provides clarity:

... *presila. petrus filius domno tripemero*.⁹⁷ Consequently, we find Peter's name immediately next to Trpimir's name, and later there is the reference to Peter, the son of Trpimir. Based on this, it's reasonable to assert that the individuals mentioned alongside Pribina are Croatian Duke Trpimir and his son Peter. It's also interesting that the name Pribina is mentioned before the name of the Croatian ruler. We cannot definitively determine whether this tells us something about the power Pribina held or if, as Marino Kumir suggests, it's plausible that Pribina made a pilgrimage also in Trpimir's name, offering an explanation for why the pilgrim's name was written first, followed by Trpimir's and his son Peter's.⁹⁸ Considering the information from the Gospel

⁹³ Lončar 2010, p. 110.

⁹⁴ Tibor Živković equates Pribina mentioned in DAI with the Frankish vassal Pribina, the Prince of Nitra and later of Lower Pannonia (Živković, *De Conversione Croatorum et Serborum*, 132-135.). However, it remains a fact that in the Gospel of Cividale, Pribina, mentioned alongside Trpimir, bears no title, including *dux*. I also believe that Živković attributes too much importance to the Franks in their relations with the Croatian principality during the 850s and 860s. Based on this, he equates Porphyrogenitus' Pribina with the Frankish vassal Pribina and believes he played a crucial role in the struggle for the Croatian throne.

⁹⁵ Šišić 1914b, p. 6; Klaić 1972a, pp. 22-23.

⁹⁶ Šišić 1914b, p. 6; Klaić 1972a, pp. 22-23.

⁹⁷ Šišić 1914b, p. 6; Klaić 1972a, pp. 22-23.

⁹⁸ Kumir 2017, p. 58; fn. 39.

¹⁰⁴ DAI, str. 83.

stvo mira.¹⁰⁵ Bio je to prvi mletački pohod nakon petnaestak godina, a teško je zamisliti da bi se Urso Particijak odlučio na pohod da je u Hrvatskoj bila sređena situacija. Isto tako Domagojev poraz na neki način potvrđuju i vijesti iz *De administrando imperio* o smanjenoj hrvatskoj vojnoj snazi nakon smrti Miroslava.¹⁰⁶

Tijekom Domagojeve vladavine došlo je do arapskoga jačanja na Jadranu, što je zabrinulo Franačku i Bizant. Domagoj je kao vazal cara Ludovika II. (855. – 875.) sudjelovao u opsadi Barija, koji je 871. uspješno zauzet.¹⁰⁷ Zanimljivu vijest nalazimo u 29. poglavlju *De administrando imperio*, a to je da su Hrvate i ostale istočnojadranske slavenske skupine na južnoitalsku obalu brodovima prevezli Dubrovčani.¹⁰⁸

Dok je Domagoj sudjelovao u opsadi Barija, Hrvatsku je zadesila osvetnička bizantska kaznena ekspedicija, koja je, između ostaloga, napala i hrvatski teritorij na istočnojadranskoj obali. Povod je bilo gusarsko zarobljavanje papinskih poslanika koji su se 870. vraćali s crkvenog sabora u Konstantinopolu.¹⁰⁹ Taj bizantski potez rezultirao je prekidom savezništva između Ludovika II. i Bazilija I.¹¹⁰

Fokus Domagojeve vanjske politike bio je usmjeren prema Veneciji. Poticao je gusarenje na istočnojadranskoj obali (koje je štetilo Mlečanima), o čemu svjedoči pismo pape Ivana VIII. (872. – 882.) u kojemu poziva „slavnog kneza“ Domagoja da primiri svoje podanike¹¹¹, što mu je u kasnijemu mletačkom sjećanju donijelo naziv „najgori knez Slavena“ (*pessimus Sclavorum dux*).¹¹² Također oko 875. hrvatsko je brodogradništvo napalo istarske gradove Umag, Sipar, Novigrad i Rovinj te se približilo mletačkome teritoriju, što je izazvalo reakciju dužda Ursa Particijaka, koji je porazio Hrvate, a potom je sklopljen i mir.¹¹³

Domagoj je bio vrlo aktivan na međunarodnom planu, no čini se da prilike unutar same kneževi-

of Cividale and *De Administrando Imperio*, it's reasonable to conclude that Pribina was a high-ranking Croatian noble during the time of Trpimir and his immediate successors – Krešimir and Miroslav.

I believe that Krešimir I succeeded Trpimir on the throne around the year 850. The only information we have about his reign is derived from the work of Porphyrogenitus. In Chapter 31, it gives the impression that Krešimir is a significant figure in that chapter because Trpimir is mentioned as the father of Krešimir, while Miroslav is mentioned as Krešimir's son (“(...) in the days of Archon Terpimer, the father of Archon Krasimeris (...) “and” (...) his son (Krešimir's, *author's note*) Miroslav, after ruling four years (...)”).⁹⁹ It can be said that there is a clear chronological distinction between what happened before Krešimir and after Krešimir. Therefore, it is possible that, although not explicitly mentioned, the information about the conflict with the Bulgarians, the number of cities in Croatia and the Croatian military strength may relate to the period of Krešimir's rule.

Tibor Živković, who agreed with placing Krešimir and Miroslav in the 9th century, believed that Krešimir's Christian name was Peter, based on the aforementioned Gospel of Cividale, which mentions *petrus filius domno tripemero*.¹⁰⁰ This idea could be supported by the fact that the name of the Archbishop of Split at that time was Peter, while Trpimir's deed of donation¹⁰¹ clearly shows that Trpimir maintained good relations with the Archbishopric of Split. Furthermore, Trpimir referred to the Archbishop of Split as his “beloved godfather”¹⁰² (*dilectus compater*), giving us another piece of evidence of the closeness between Trpimir and Peter. It is quite possible that Trpimir's or Krešimir's godfather was indeed Peter, and Krešimir received his Christian name after his “beloved godfather.”

We might even have the first known mention of a female Croatian ruler from that time. On the same folium from the Gospel of Cividale, where Trpimir is mentioned twice, we have the name Peter mentioned together with the name Mutimira.¹⁰³ Although we cannot be certain this refers to Trpimir's son Peter, we can't dismiss such a possibility, espe-

¹⁰⁵ Ivan Đakon, str. 130; Rački 1877, str. 364; Klaić 1972a, str. 24.

¹⁰⁶ DAI, str. 83.

¹⁰⁷ Birin 2015, str. 48.

¹⁰⁸ DAI, str. 67-69; Klaić 1972a, str. 23-24.

¹⁰⁹ Rački 1877, str. 361-362.

¹¹⁰ Budak 2018, str. 131.

¹¹¹ Rački 1877, str. 6; Šišić 1914a, str. 201-202; CD 1, str. 11-12; Klaić 1972a, str. 26.

¹¹² Ivan Đakon, str. 138; Rački 1877, str. 366; Klaić 1972a, str. 25.

¹¹³ Birin 2015, str. 49; Goldstein 1995, str. 255-256.

⁹⁹ DAI, p. 82.

¹⁰⁰ Živković 2012, p. 132.

¹⁰¹ CD 1, pp. 3-8.

¹⁰² Idem, p. 4.

¹⁰³ Kumir 2017, p. 59.

ne nikada nije uspio stabilizirati do kraja. Godine 874. ili 875. došlo je do urote unutar Hrvatske protiv kneza Domagoja. Vjerojatno je da su u tu urotu bili uključeni Trpimirovi potomci, a možda i sam Bizant, što sugerira kasnije bizantsko djelovanje u slučaju kneza Zdeslava. Urota je otkrivena, a zavjerenici su okrutno kažnjeni.¹¹⁴

Domagoj je umro oko 876., a naslijedili su ga njegovi sinovi. Njihova se imena ne znaju, no njihova je vladavina potrajala tek dvije godine, kada se Zdeslav, pod bizantskim sponzorstvom, vratio iz Konstantinopola i „prigrabio kneževinu Slavena i potjerao sinove kneza Domagoja u progonstvo“.¹¹⁵

Ustoličenje Zdeslava na hrvatsko prijestolje bilo je vrhunac istočnojadranske politike Bazilija I. Zanimljiva je i vijest koju donosi Ivan Đakon, a to je da je Zdeslav potjerao Domagojeve sinove u progonstvo, a nije ih ubio. Na ovom primjeru vidimo drugačiju praksu kada su u pitanju borbe za prijestolje. Domagoj je svoje neprijatelje ubijao, dok je Zdeslav svoje najveće konkurente za prijestolje, Domagojeve sinove, odlučio samo prognati.

Ivan Đakon, kada donosi vijest o Zdeslavovu preuzimanju kneževine, navodi da je on „iz roda Trpimirova“ (*Tibimiri ex progenie*).¹¹⁶ Riječ *progenies* u ovome kontekstu označava izravno potomstvo, dakle sina ili unuka.¹¹⁷ Najvjerojatnije je da je Zdeslav bio Trpimirov sin, a to zaključujemo na temelju kasnije Mutimirove isprave, o čemu će više riječi biti kasnije.

Iz vremena kratke Zdeslavove vladavine imamo njemu upućeno pismo pape Ivana VIII. U pismu ga papa moli da njegovu poslaniku, koji putuje Mihaelu Borisu u Bugarsku, omogući hranu, vodu i siguran prolaz.¹¹⁸ Zdeslav se stavio pod okrilje patrijarha u Konstantinopolu, no njegova vladavina okončana je već 879., kada se u Hrvatskoj dogodio još jedan prevrat na prijestolju. Zdeslav je ubijen, a „neki Slaven imenom Branimir“ postao je novi hrvatski vladar.¹¹⁹

cially when considering the folium on which these two names are listed. It's also conceivable that this could be Peter's mother, accompanying her son on the pilgrimage. This is further supported by the fact that Trpimir's third son was Mutimir, a name which he might have received after his mother.

In *De Administrando Imperio*, it is noted that Miroslav ruled for four years.¹⁰⁴ Based on this, it seems reasonable to place Miroslav's reign from 860, when, according to this proposed chronology, Krešimir I died, to 864 when Domagoj came to power (Domagoj begins to appear in sources around this time), following a rebellion led by Ban Pribina, which ultimately resulted in Duke Miroslav's death.

The events that occurred later on between 864 and 879 indicate that Croatia was plagued by instability, which manifested in various ways, with the most significant being intense struggles for the throne within the principality. I believe that this is yet another compelling reason to place Krešimir I and Miroslav after Trpimir's reign. Miroslav's rule and the rebellion of Ban Pribina perfectly fit the circumstances in which Croatia found itself in the second half of the 9th century.

4.2. DOMAGOJ, ZDESLAV, BRANIMIR AND MUTIMIR

Fortunately, we have well-preserved historical sources for the period between around 860 and approximately 895, enabling us to reconstruct the chronology of Croatian rulers during this period with relative ease.

Domagoj's rule began in 864, when, in my opinion, the assassination of Miroslav happened. Although there's no evidence whatsoever that could possibly link Ban Pribina to the new Duke Domagoj, it can be assumed that Pribina influenced Domagoj's ascension to the throne and maintained his influential position within the principality.

The turbulent state of affairs in Croatia at that time becomes evident through historical events. In 865, the Venetian Doge Orso I Participazio (864 – 881) launched an attack on Croatia, and it appears to have been a successful campaign since Duke Domagoj had to seek a truce and offer hostages as a guarantee of peace.¹⁰⁵ This was the first Venetian

¹¹⁴ Šišić 1914a, str. 201-202; CD 1, str. 10.

¹¹⁵ Ivan Đakon, str. 140; Rački 1877, str. 373; Klaić 1972a, str. 26.

¹¹⁶ Ivan Đakon, str. 140; Rački 1877, str. 373; Klaić 1972a, str. 26.

¹¹⁷ Šišić 1914b, str. 8-9.

¹¹⁸ Rački 1877, str. 7; Šišić 1914a, str. 202; CD 1, str. 12; Klaić 1972a, str. 26.

¹¹⁹ Ivan Đakon, str. 142; Rački 1877, str. 374; Klaić 1972a, str. 27-28.

¹⁰⁴ DAI, p. 83.

¹⁰⁵ John the Deacon, p. 130; Rački 1877, p. 364; Klaić 1972a, p. 24.

Branimir je vrlo brzo poništio Zdeslavovo priklanjanje Konstantinopolu, o čemu svjedoče papinska pisma iz 879. godine. Papa Ivan VIII. dana 7. lipnja 879. uputio je pismo Branimiru, u kojemu ga obavještava da je blagoslovio njega i njegov narod.¹²⁰ Istoga dana papa je uputio posebno pismo „svim časnim svećenicima i svemu narodu“, u kojemu je naglasio svoje zadovoljstvo zbog njihova povratka pod rimsku jurisdikciju.¹²¹ Također, upućeno je i pismo ninskome biskupu Teodoziju kojim je potvrđeno njegovo biskupsko mjesto te ga je papa upozorio da se biskupska čast može potvrditi samo u Rimu.¹²²

Iz Branimirova vremena datira i prvi pokušaj crkvenoga ujedinjenja prostora hrvatske kneževine i dalmatinskih gradova. Godine 886. ili 867. umro je splitski nadbiskup Marin, što je pokušao iskoristiti ninski biskup Teodozije, koji je prihvatio ponudenu upražnjenu splitsku stolicu, no nije se želio odreći Ninske biskupije. Teodozije je papi Stjepanu V. (885. – 891.) tvrdio da je tim činom obnovio Saloničansku metropoliju, a papa ga je pozvao da u Rim dođe po palij. Ipak, navedeni Teodozijev čin nije ostavio nikakve trajnije posljedice jer su se nakon njegove smrti odvojeno birali ninski biskup, odnosno splitski nadbiskup.¹²³

O intenzivnoj graditeljskoj djelatnosti tijekom Branimirove vladavine svjedoči šest kamenih natpisa, pronađenih u Šopotu, Ninu, Muću, Ždrapnju, Otresu i Lepurima, na kojima se spominje njegovo ime. Možda je najvažniji onaj iz Šopota zato što se na njemu spominje *Branimiro comes, dux Cruatorvm*.¹²⁴

Branimir je prvi hrvatski vladar nakon Trpimira i njegova sina Petra (Krešimira) čije je ime zaobilježeno u Čedadskom evangelijaru. Uz njega se spominje i njegova žena Maruša.¹²⁵ Možda nam ova činjenica svjedoči da je prvi put nakon Krešimira I. nastupilo relativno mirno razdoblje u Hrvatskoj te se stoga Branimir slobodno mogao odvažiti poći na hodočašće bez bojazni da mu se iza leđa nešto sprema.

campaign in approximately fifteen years, and it's hard to imagine that Orso I Participazio would have undertaken it had the situation in Croatia been stable. Domagoj's defeat, to some extent, confirms the information in *De Administrando Imperio* about the diminished Croatian military strength after Miroslav's death.¹⁰⁶

During Domagoj's rule, the Arab presence in the Adriatic region grew stronger, causing concern among the Franks and Byzantines. Domagoj, as a vassal of Emperor Louis II (855 – 875), participated in the siege of Bari, which was successfully captured in 871.¹⁰⁷ An interesting piece of information is found in Chapter 29 of *De Administrando Imperio*, which mentions that the Croats and other Slavic groups from the eastern Adriatic coast were transported to the southern Italian coast by the people of Dubrovnik.¹⁰⁸

While Domagoj was involved in the siege of Bari, a retaliatory Byzantine punitive expedition targeted Croatia, including an attack on Croatian territories along the eastern Adriatic coast. This action was prompted by pirates who captured papal envoys returning from the Church Council in Constantinople in 870¹⁰⁹ and eventually led to the dissolution of the alliance between Louis II and Basil I.¹¹⁰

The focus of Domagoj's foreign policy primarily revolved around Venice. He encouraged piracy along the eastern Adriatic coast (which harmed the Venetians), as evidenced by a letter from Pope John VIII (872 – 882), who implored “Duke Domagoj the Famous” to pacify his subjects.¹¹¹ This association later earned him the moniker “the worst duke of the Slavs” (*pessimus Sclavorum dux*) in Venetian's chronicles.¹¹² Moreover, around 875, Croatian ships raided the Istrian towns of Umag, Sipar, Novigrad and Rovinj and hence approached Venetian territory, which prompted a response from Doge Orso I Participazio, who defeated the Croats, leading to the establishment of peace.¹¹³

¹²⁰ Rački 1877, str. 8-9; Šišić 1914a, str. 202-203; CD 1, str. 14-15.

¹²¹ Rački 1877, str. 9-10.; Šišić 1914a, str. 205; CD 1, str. 13

¹²² Rački 1877, str. 12; Šišić 1914a, str. 204; CD 1, str. 15-16.

¹²³ Budak 2018, str. 153-154.

¹²⁴ Delonga 1996, str. 166-167.

¹²⁵ Kumir 2017, str. 60.

¹⁰⁶ DAI, p. 83.

¹⁰⁷ Birin 2015, p. 48.

¹⁰⁸ DAI, pp. 67-69; Klaić 1972a, pp. 23-24.

¹⁰⁹ Rački 1877, pp. 361-362.

¹¹⁰ Budak 2018, p. 131.

¹¹¹ Rački 1877, p. 6; Šišić 1914a, pp. 201-202; CD 1, pp. 11-12; Klaić 1972a, p. 26.

¹¹² John the Deacon, p. 138; Rački 1877, p. 366; Klaić 1972a, p. 25.

¹¹³ Birin 2015, p. 49; Goldstein 1995, pp. 255-256.

Ne može se točno odrediti kada je Branimirova vladavina završila. Ono što znamo jest da je njegov zadnji spomen iz 888., kada saznajemo da je crkva sv. Marije u Muću podignuta u vrijeme kneza Branimira¹²⁶. Dakle možemo pretpostaviti da Branimirova vladavina završava negdje oko 890.

Branimira je na prijestolju naslijedio Mutimir. Nemoguće je reći je li do prijenosa vlasti došlo mirnim putem zato što nam postojeći izvori o tome ništa ne govore. Mutimirovo ime prvi se put javlja u ispravi 892., kada on rješava spor oko crkve sv. Jurja u Putalju između Splitske nadbiskupije i Ninske biskupije. U toj ispravi Mutimir navodi da „sjedi na očinskom prijestolju“ (*residente paterno solio*) i kako je ta crkva darovana Splitskoj nadbiskupiji „od moga oca“ (*a patre meo*).¹²⁷ Šišić ispravno primjećuje da se tu Mutimir poziva na Trpimirovu darovnicu te zaključuje da je Mutimir Trpimirov sin, a samim time je razriješen misterij Zdeslava, za kojega se spominje da je „iz roda Trpimirova“ (*Tibimiri ex progenie*)¹²⁸. Na temelju ove isprave može se zaključiti da riječ *progenies*, koja označava izravnog potomka, znači da je Zdeslav bio Trpimirov sin.¹²⁹ Ipak, istaknuo bih opasku Nevena Budaka, koji je dobro zamijetio da je problematično to što se u navedenoj ispravi Mutimir poziva na Trpimirovu darovnicu kojom je Trpimir navodno darovao crkvu sv. Jurja na Putalju Splitskoj nadbiskupiji, a znamo da je upravo dio o darovanju crkve naknadno umetnut u Trpimirovu darovnicu. Samim time postavlja se pitanje autentičnosti Mutimirove isprave i koliko je vjerodostojno što u njoj piše, između ostalog, da Mutimir sjedi „na očinskom prijestolju“.¹³⁰

Ta nam isprava, ukoliko je uzmemo kao vjerodostojnu, znatno pomaže u rekonstrukciji Trpimirova roda. Trpimir je imao tri sina: Petra Krešimira, Zdeslava i Mutimira. Naslijedio ga je najstariji sin Krešimir I., a njega njegov sin Miroslav. Miroslav očito nije imao sinova te su stoga preostali samo Zdeslav i Mutimir koji su mogli polagati pravo na hrvatsko prijestolje na temelju toga što su Trpimirovi potomci.

Kao što možemo pretpostaviti, Miroslav je naslijedio svog oca Krešimira I. unatoč činjenici što su na životu još uvijek bili Krešimirova braća Zde-

Domagoj was a highly active figure on the international stage, but it appears that he never succeeded in fully stabilizing the situation within the principality itself. In 874 or 875, a conspiracy against Duke Domagoj was plotted within Croatia, in which most likely Trpimir's descendants were involved. There's even a possibility of Byzantine involvement, as their later actions with Duke Zdeslav suggest. The conspiracy was eventually uncovered, leading to severe punishment for the conspirators.¹¹⁴

Domagoj died around 876 and was succeeded by his sons. Although we don't have their names on record, their rule lasted only two years. During this time, Zdeslav, backed by the Byzantines, returned from Constantinople and “seized the principality of Slavs and drove Duke Domagoj's sons into exile”.¹¹⁵

Zdeslav's ascension to the throne was the culmination of Basil I's eastern Adriatic policy. An interesting piece of information from this period comes from John the Deacon, who reported that Zdeslav had driven Domagoj's sons into exile but did not kill them. This illustrates a different approach to the struggle for the throne, as Domagoj had a practice of killing his enemies, while Zdeslav chose to only exile the most significant contenders, i.e. Domagoj's sons.

In his report on Zdeslav's assumption of power over the principality, John the Deacon also mentioned that Zdeslav was from the “Trpimirović dynasty” (*Tibimiri ex progenie*).¹¹⁶ The word *progenies* in this context means direct offspring, that is, son or grandson.¹¹⁷ Zdeslav was most likely the son of Trpimir, as we conclude this based on the later document from Mutimir, which will be addressed in more detail later in the text.

During Zdeslav's brief rule, a letter addressed to him from Pope John VIII is noteworthy. In this letter, the Pope requested Zdeslav's assistance in providing food, water and safe passage to the Pope's envoy, who was traveling to Michael Boris in Bulgaria.¹¹⁸ Zdeslav put himself under the patronage of the patriarch of Constantinople, but his reign was

¹¹⁴ Šišić 1914a, pp. 201-202; CD 1, p. 10.

¹¹⁵ John the Deacon, p. 140; Rački 1877, p. 373; Klaić 1972a, p. 26.

¹¹⁶ John the Deacon, p. 140; Rački 1877, p. 373; Klaić 1972a, p. 26.

¹¹⁷ Šišić 1914b, p. 8-9.

¹¹⁸ Rački 1877, p. 7; Šišić 1914a, p. 202; CD 1, p. 12; Klaić 1972a, p. 26.

¹²⁶ Delonga 1996, str. 120.

¹²⁷ Rački 1877, str. 14-17; Šišić 1914a, str. 195-197.

¹²⁸ Ivan Đakon, str. 140.

¹²⁹ Šišić 1914b, str. 11.

¹³⁰ Zahvaljujem Nevenu Budaku na usmenoj primjedbi.

slav i Mutimir. Možda na tom primjeru možemo vidjeti da su Trpimir i Krešimir I. pokušali implementirati načelo primogeniture, prema kojem prijestolje nasljeđuje najstariji sin. Takve slučajeve nalazimo u Bizantskome Carstvu, u kojemu je, u mirnodopskim uvjetima, najčešće najstariji sin nasljeđivao svoga oca na prijestolju.¹³¹ Naravno, ovdje se ne radi o institucionaliziranom načinu prijenosa vlasti, nego samo o prevladavajućoj praksi.

Osim u ispravi iz 892., Mutimir se spominje i na kamenom arhitravu oltarne pregrade iz crkve sv. Luke u Uzdojlu. Njegova je vladarska titula na tom arhitravu *princeps*.¹³² Nadalje na temelju *De administrando imperio* saznajemo nešto više o Mutimirovoj vanjskoj politici. U 32. poglavlju važne su nam tri rečenice: „Godinu dana zatim izašavši iz Hrvatske prepominjani Petar, sin Gojnikov, iztjera iz vlade bratića svoga Pribislava i njegova dva brata (Branu i Stjepana, op. L. Đ.), te on preuzme vladu. Oni pako umaknu i udju u Hrvatsku. Tri godine zatim dodje Bran, da zavojšti Petra, ali ovaj ga svlada, ulovi i oslijepi.“¹³³ Na temelju navedenoga možemo zaključiti da je Mutimir budnim okom pratio događanja u borbama za srpsko prijestolje te je podupirao različite strane u tim sukobima.

Zbog manjka izvora nemoguće je odrediti kada je Mutimirova vladavina završila, no obično se kraj njegove vladavine stavlja negdje između 905. i 910. godine. To se temelji na činjenici da se njegov nasljednik, Tomislav, prvi put spominje 914. pa se pretpostavlja da je Mutimir umro nešto ranije.¹³⁴

5. DESETO STOLJEĆE

5.1. TOMISLAV

Prva godina u kojoj se spominje Tomislav je 914. Toma Arhidakon u svojoj *Historia Salonitana* navodi da je „Ivan bio nadbiskup (splitski, op. a.) godine Gospodnje devetsto četrnaeste u doba kneza Tomislava.“¹³⁵ Pretpostavlja se da je Tomislavova vladavina započela nešto ranije, oko 910.

Tomislava se spominje i u kontekstu sukoba s Ugarima, koji su 895. ušli u Panonsku nizinu i za-

cut short in 879 by yet another coup within Croatia. Zdeslav was killed, and a “certain Slav of the name Branimir” became the new Croatian ruler.¹¹⁹

Branimir quickly revoked Zdeslav’s allegiance to Constantinople, as evidenced by papal letters from 879. On 7th June 879, Pope John VIII sent a letter to Branimir, informing him that he had blessed Branimir and his people.¹²⁰ On the same day, the Pope sent a special letter to “all honourable priests and all the people,” expressing his satisfaction with their return to Roman jurisdiction.¹²¹ A letter was also sent to Bishop Theodosius of Nin, confirming his episcopal position and cautioning him that the episcopal honour could only be confirmed in Rome.¹²²

The first attempt to ecclesiastically unify the territory of the Croatian principality and the Dalmatian cities took place during Branimir’s rule. In 886 or 867, when Archbishop Marin of Split died, bishop Theodosius of Nin attempted to use this opportunity by accepting the vacant seat of the archbishop of Split. At the same time however, he refused to give up the Diocese of Nin and argued to Pope Stephen V (885 - 891) that by doing so, he had effectively restored the metropolis of Salona. The Pope invited Theodosius to Rome to receive the pallium. However, Theodosius’s actions did not result in lasting changes, as, after his death, the bishop of Nin and the archbishop of Split continued to be elected independently.¹²³

Intense construction activities during Branimir’s rule are evidenced by the discovery of six stone inscriptions in Šopot, Nin, Muć, Ždrapanj, Otres and Lepuri, all of which bear his name. Perhaps the most important one is the Šopot inscription because it mentions *Branimiro comes, dux Cruatorvm*.¹²⁴

Branimir is the first Croatian ruler, after Trpimir and his son Peter (Krešimir), whose name is, along with the name of his wife Maruša, recorded in the Gospel of Cividale.¹²⁵ This fact may indicate that, for the first time since Krešimir I, a relative-

¹³¹ Najbolje primjere takve prakse nasljeđivanja nalazimo za vrijeme Heraklijeve dinastije (610. – 695./711.), odnosno makedonske dinastije (867. – 1056.). Više o tome u: Ostrogorski 2002, str. 46-76; 112-166.

¹³² Delonga 1996, str. 156-157; Šišić 1914a, str. 124.

¹³³ DAI, str. 86; Rački 1877, str. 375-376.

¹³⁴ HS, str. 53-55.

¹³⁵ HS, str. 53-55; Klaić 1972a, str. 38.

¹¹⁹ John the Deacon, p. 142; Rački 1877, p. 374; Klaić 1972a, pp. 27-28.

¹²⁰ Rački 1877, pp. 8-9; Šišić 1914a, pp. 202-203; CD 1, pp. 14-15.

¹²¹ Rački 1877, pp. 9-10.; Šišić 1914a, p. 205; CD 1, p. 13

¹²² Rački 1877, p. 12; Šišić 1914a, p. 204; CD 1, pp. 15-16.

¹²³ Budak 2018, pp. 153-154.

¹²⁴ Delonga 1996, pp. 166-167.

¹²⁵ Kumir 2017, p. 60.

počeli svoje pljačkaške pohode širom Europe. U *Kraljevstvu Slavena* navodi se da je „Tomislav, hrabar mladić i snažan ratnik, vodio s njime (Atilom, koji se navodi kao kralj Ugara, op. L. Đ.) mnoge borbe i uvijek ga natjerao u bijeg“.¹³⁶ U historiografiji se obično smatra da se u ovoj vijesti nalaze zrnici povijesne istine o borbama Tomislava i Ugara.

Podaci izneseni u *Kraljevstvu Slavena* kao i činjenica da je nakon ukinuća Ninske biskupije 928. Grguru Ninskom bilo ponuđeno da preuzme jedno ispražnjeno biskupsko mjesto, među kojima je bilo i ono Sisačke biskupije (teško je zamisliti da bi mu bilo ponuđeno biskupsko mjesto izvan hrvatskih granica), navelo je povjesničare na zaključak da se za vrijeme Tomislava Hrvatska proširila na sjever. Starija historiografija smatrala je da je Tomislav proširio svoju vlast sve do Drave¹³⁷, no u novije vrijeme prevladava mišljenje da je Tomislav proširio Hrvatsku do Siska i okolice¹³⁸. Postoje i teze da Tomislav uopće nije proširio svoju vlast na sjever¹³⁹, kao i da se hrvatsko proširenje na sjever dogodilo još u 9. stoljeću¹⁴⁰, no takva razmišljanja trenutno nisu prevladavajuća u historiografiji.

Tomislav je prvi hrvatski vladar koji se u papiškim spisima oslovljava s *rex*. U pismu iz 925. papa Ivan X. (914. – 928.) Tomislava naziva „kraljem Hrvata“ (*rex Croatorum*).¹⁴¹ Nije poznato kada je Tomislav uzeo kraljevski naslov i je li se uopće okrunio, no zasigurno je kao vladar morao nešto značajno napraviti što bi ga nagnalo da uzme kraljevsku titulu (ako ju je uzeo). Možda se može pomisliti i da je papa smatrao kako ga treba tako titulirati iako nije imao nikakvih saznanja je li Tomislav uistinu *rex*. Ako je Tomislav uistinu uzeo kraljevsku titulu, moguće je da je pobjeda nad Ugarima bila okidač za to, budući da su ugarske provale i pljačke bile velik problem, koji nisu mogli riješiti ni moćni vladari od Tomislava.

Posljednji spomen Tomislava je na Splitskom crkvenom saboru 925. godine. U zaključcima Sabora spominje se kao „konzul u pokrajini Hrvata i u krajevima Dalmacije“.¹⁴² Inicijativa za sazivanje

ly peaceful period prevailed in Croatia, allowing Branimir to embark on a pilgrimage without fear of hidden threats and plots against him.

While the exact end of Branimir’s reign remains elusive, the last documented reference to him dates back to 888 and mentions the construction of the Church of St. Mary in Muć during the time of Duke Branimir.¹²⁶ Therefore, it can be assumed that Branimir’s rule ended around 890.

Mutimir succeeded Branimir on the throne, but historical sources offer no clarity on whether this transition of power was peaceful or not. Mutimir’s name surfaces for the first time in a document from 892, wherein he arbitrated a dispute concerning the Church of St. George in Putalj between the Archdiocese of Split and the Diocese of Nin. In this document, Mutimir states that he “sits on his father’s throne” (*residente paterno solio*) and that the church had been a gift to the Archdiocese of Split “by my father” (*a patre meo*).¹²⁷ Notably, Šišić correctly identified that Mutimir was referencing Trpimir’s deed of donation, thereby establishing Mutimir as Trpimir’s son and resolving the mystery surrounding Zdeslav, who was described as one belonging to the “Trpimirović dynasty” (*Tibimiri ex progenie*).¹²⁸ Based on this document, it can be inferred that the word *progenies*, which signifies a direct descendant, indicates that Zdeslav was Trpimir’s son.¹²⁹ However, I would like to point out the remark made by Neven Budak, who correctly observed that the problematic aspect in this document lies in Mutimir’s reference to Trpimir’s deed of donation with which Trpimir allegedly donated the Church of St. George on Putalj to the Archdiocese of Split, while we know that it was precisely the part about the donation of the church that was subsequently inserted into Trpimir’s deed. This certainly raises questions about the authenticity of Mutimir’s document and how credible it is when it states, among other things, that Mutimir “sits on his father’s throne.”¹³⁰

If we accept the document’s authenticity, it provides invaluable insights into the reconstruction of the Trpimirović dynasty. Trpimir had three sons: Peter Krešimir, Zdeslav and Mutimir. The eldest

¹³⁶ LjPD, str. 57-58; Klaić 1972a, str. 29.

¹³⁷ Smičiklas 1882, str. 215-217; Klaić 1972b, str. 98-101; Klaić 1975, str. 277.

¹³⁸ Budak 1994, str. 30; Gračanin 2011, str. 200-202.

¹³⁹ Goldstein 1995, str. 282; 285.

¹⁴⁰ Budak 2018, str. 182-183; Birin 2015, str. 53.

¹⁴¹ HSM, str. 96; CD 1, str. 34; Šišić 1914a, str. 216; Klaić 1972a, str. 31.

¹⁴² HSM, str. 98; CD 1, str. 32; Klaić 1972a, str. 30.

¹²⁶ Delonga 1996, p. 120.

¹²⁷ Rački 1877, pp. 14-17; Šišić 1914a, pp. 195-197.

¹²⁸ John the Deacon, p. 140.

¹²⁹ Šišić 1914b, p. 11.

¹³⁰ I thank Neven Budak for his verbal comment.

Sabora došla je od Tomislava, zahumskoga kneza Mihaela Viševića¹⁴³ i dalmatinskih biskupa, koji su željeli odrediti koja će nadbiskupija, odnosno biskupija imati primat u novoj crkvenoj pokrajini, koja se prostirala na području dalmatinskih gradova i Hrvatskoga Kraljevstva. Papa Ivan X. udovoljio je njihovu zahtjevu za sazivanjem Sabora, no želio je da glavna svrha Sabora bude dogovor kako suzbiti bogoslužje na slavenskome jeziku.¹⁴⁴

Papinim željama unatoč, na Saboru je ponajviše pažnje posvećeno primatu u novoj crkvenoj pokrajini. Glavni kandidati bili su splitski nadbiskup Ivan, koji se pozivao na tradiciju Salonitanske metropolije, ninski biskup Grgur i zadarski biskup Formin. Sabor je zaključio da će splitski nadbiskup postati metropolit crkvene pokrajine s objašnjenjem da splitska nadbiskupija „ima prvenstvo nad svim crkvama ove pokrajine“ (*inter omnes ecclesias prouinciae huius primatum habeat*) jer se ondje nalaze kosti sv. Dujma.¹⁴⁵

Dokumenti sa Splitskog crkvenog sabora historiografiju su doveli u nedoumicu oko Tomislavove vlasti nad dalmatinskim gradovima. Činjenica je da se na Splitskome crkvenom saboru 925. spominju samo hrvatski kralj i zahumski knez, a nitko od bizantskih predstavnika.¹⁴⁶ Mišljenja povjesničara bila su različita. Najstarija hrvatska historiografija je bez pogovora prihvaćala tezu o hrvatskoj vlasti u dalmatinskim gradovima.¹⁴⁷ U drugoj polovici 20. stoljeća došlo je do promjene te je dio historiografije negirao bilo kakvu Tomislavovu vlast nad dalmatinskim gradovima¹⁴⁸, no danas se ipak smatra da je morao postojati neki oblik hrvatske vlasti ondje jer je teško zamisliti da bi se stvarala nova crkvena pokrajina, a da se na tom prostoru nalaze dvije odvojene političke jedinice.¹⁴⁹

Jedna od teza koje je iznijela starija historiografija, a opstala je više-manje do danas, jest da je savezništvo Tomislava s Bizantom protiv Bugara

son, Krešimir I, succeeded him, who was then succeeded by his son Miroslav. The latter evidently had no sons, leaving only Zdeslav and Mutimir as potential claimants to the Croatian throne based on their descent from Trpimir.

We can assume that Miroslav succeeded his father Krešimir I, even though Krešimir's brothers, Zdeslav and Mutimir, were still alive. This may suggest that Trpimir and Krešimir I attempted to implement the principle of primogeniture, where the eldest son inherits the throne. Such cases were not uncommon in the Byzantine Empire where, in times of peace, the eldest son often succeeded his father on the throne.¹³¹ It's important to note that this was not a formalized system of power transfer but a prevailing practice.

Apart from the document from 892, there's another noteworthy reference to Mutimir, inscribed on the stone architrave of the altar screen in the Church of St. Luke in Uzdolje. Here, he bears the royal title of *princeps*.¹³² Furthermore, the historical account found in *De Administrando Imperio* sheds light on Mutimir's foreign policy. In Chapter 32, there are three important sentences: „Now, after one year the aforesaid Peter, son of Goinikos, came out of Croatia and expelled from the rule his cousin Pribeslav and his two brothers (Branos and Stephen, *author's note*), and himself succeeded to the rule, and they fled away and entered Croatia. Three years later Branos came to fight Peter and was defeated and captured by him, and blinded.”¹³³ From this narrative, it becomes evident that Mutimir vigilantly observed the power struggles for the Serbian throne and lent support to various factions engaged in these conflicts.

Due to the scarcity of historical sources, it is impossible to determine the exact end of Mutimir's rule, but it is generally placed somewhere between 905 and 910. This is based on the fact that his successor, Tomislav, is first mentioned in 914, implying that Mutimir likely died a few years prior to this event.¹³⁴

¹⁴³ Postoji tumačenje da je Mihael Višević zapravo vladao područjem Neretve, a temelji se na izjednačavanju Neretvana i Humljana. Vidi više: Ančić 2011, 217-278.

¹⁴⁴ Birin 2015, str. 54.

¹⁴⁵ Rački 1877, str. 190-191; HSM, str. 99; CD 1, str. 31; Šišić 1914a, str. 218; Klaić 1972a, str. 33.

¹⁴⁶ Budak 2018, str. 224.

¹⁴⁷ Klaić 1972b, str. 98-101; Šišić 1990, str. 413.

¹⁴⁸ Klaić 1975, str. 291; Goldstein 1985, str. 35-37; Goldstein 1995, 277-278.

¹⁴⁹ Budak 2018, str. 224; Birin 2015, str. 54; Raukar 1997, str. 38; Curta 2006, str. 196.

¹³¹ The best examples of such practices are from the time of the Heraclian dynasty (610 - 695/711) and the Macedonian dynasty (867 - 1056). More on this in: Ostrogorski 2002, pp. 46-76; 112-166.

¹³² Delonga 1996, pp. 156-157; Šišić 1914a, p. 124.

¹³³ DAI, p. 86; Rački 1877, pp. 375-376.

¹³⁴ HS, pp. 53-55.

dovelo do bizantskoga prepuštanja dalmatinskih gradova na upravu Tomislavu. Ipak, smatram da se teško može govoriti o bilo kakvome savezništvu između Hrvatskoga Kraljevstva i Bizanta. Primjerice u *De administrando imperio* Tomislav se uopće ne spominje, a teško je zamisliti da se jedan značajan bizantski saveznik, kako se u historiografiji tvrdi za Tomislava, izostavlja iz poglavlja u kojima se piše o Hrvatskoj. Nadalje, kako sam naveo u prošlim poglavljima, odlomci o Hrvatskoj odnose se na 9. stoljeće zato što na carskome dvoru nisu pobliže upoznati sa situacijom na hrvatskome prostoru, a zasigurno bi s njom bili bolje upoznati da im je Tomislav zaista bio saveznik (kao što je to primjerice bio Zdeslav). Također, u *De administrando imperio* spominju se srpski vladari iz 10. stoljeća skloni Bizantu¹⁵⁰, kao i Mihael Višević, zahumski knez kojega se u djelu naziva antipatom i patricijem¹⁵¹. Dakle na carskome su dvoru jako dobro znali tko su njihovi saveznici te stoga valja zaključiti da nespominjanje Tomislava sugerira kako on to nije bio. No ako Tomislav nije bio bizantski saveznik, onda se treba zapitati na koji su način dalmatinski gradovi došli pod njegovu upravu. Prije svega, potrebno je razumjeti bizantski položaj u prvoj polovici 10. stoljeća i činjenicu da je bizantska Dalmacija bila na periferiji Carstva.

Godine 913. bizantski car Aleksandar (912. – 913.) odbio je platiti godišnji danak bugarskome vladaru Simeonu (893. – 927.), čime je prekršio mir iz 897. godine. Uskoro je bugarska vojska bila pred Konstantinopolom, što je označilo početak novoga bizantsko-bugarskoga rata, koji je potrajao sve do 927. godine.¹⁵² Tijekom rata Bizant je pretrpio težak poraz kod rijeke Ahelaj 917. te je Simeon nekoliko puta dolazio pred zidine Konstantinopola. Bizant je diplomatskim putem pokušavao pridobiti na svoju stranu Pečenege, Srbe i Mađare, no pregovori su često završavali neuspješno ili je Simeon vojnim akcijama sprječavao mogućnost dogovora (o čemu govori primjer svrgavanja srpskoga vladara Petra).¹⁵³

Nadalje, Carstvo je prolazilo i kroz unutarnje probleme. Nakon smrti cara Aleksandra na prijestolje je godine 913. došao osmogodišnji Konstantin VII. Porfirogenet, u čije su ime vladali njegova majka Zoe i patrijarh Nikola Mistik. U idućih nekoliko

5. 10th CENTURY

5.1. TOMISLAV

The first historical reference to Tomislav dates back to the year 914. Thomas the Archdeacon, in his work *Historia Salonitana*, notes that “John held the position of archbishop (of Split, *author’s note*) in the year of our Lord nine hundred and fourteen during the reign of Duke Tomislav.”¹³⁵ It is widely assumed that Tomislav’s rule began slightly earlier, around 910.

Tomislav is also mentioned in the context of conflicts with the Hungarians, who entered the Pannonian Plain in 895 and initiated a series of plundering raids across Europe. In *Kraljevstvo Slavena* (Kingdom of the Slavs), it is stated that “Tomislav, a courageous young man and a formidable warrior, engaged in numerous battles against him (Attila, who is referred to as the king of the Hungarians, *author’s note*), consistently driving him to retreat.”¹³⁶ This account is generally accepted in historiography as containing elements of historical accuracy about Tomislav’s confrontations with the Hungarians.

Information presented in *Kraljevstvo Slavena*, along with the fact that, after the abolishment of the Diocese of Nin in 928, Gregory of Nin was offered the vacant position as a bishop, including that of the Diocese of Sisak (it is unlikely that he would be offered the position of a bishop outside Croatian territory), has led scholars to conclude that Croatia expanded northwards during Tomislav’s reign. While earlier historiography posited that Tomislav extended his rule as far as the Drava River,¹³⁷ the more recent opinion prevails that Tomislav’s expansion covered Sisak and its vicinity.¹³⁸ However, some theories contest whether Tomislav ever expanded his authority northward¹³⁹, but also that the Croatian territorial expansion to the north might have occurred as early as the 9th century.¹⁴⁰ Nevertheless, these viewpoints do not currently prevail in historiography.

Tomislav was the first Croatian ruler, who was addressed as “*rex*” in papal documents. In a letter dating to 925, Pope John X (914 - 928) acknowl-

¹³⁵ HS, pp. 53-55; Klaić 1972a, p. 38.

¹³⁶ LjPD, pp. 57-58; Klaić 1972a, p. 29.

¹³⁷ Smičiklas 1882, pp. 215-217; Klaić 1972b, pp. 98-101; Klaić 1975, p. 277.

¹³⁸ Budak 1994, p. 30; Gračanin 2011, pp. 200-202.

¹³⁹ Goldstein 1995, pp. 282; 285.

¹⁴⁰ Budak 2018, pp. 182-183; Birin 2015, p. 53.

¹⁵⁰ DAI, str. 86-88.

¹⁵¹ Isto, str. 89.

¹⁵² Curta 2006, str. 225; Shepard 1999, str. 573-574.

¹⁵³ Curta 2006, str. 225-227; Shepard 1999, str. 574-580.

godina Bizant je postao poprište žestoke borbe oko skrbništva nad mladim Konstantinom, a konačnu je pobjedu odnio Roman I. Lakapen (920. – 944.), koji je 919. svrgnuo Zoe i Nikolu Mistika te je 920. okrunjen za cara i time *de facto* postao car koji zapravo donosi odluke dok se Konstantina držalo po strani te on nije imao stvaran utjecaj.¹⁵⁴

Sve su te okolnosti u Bizantu mogle nagnati dalmatinske gradove na samostalnu akciju, što ne bi bilo prvi put. Naime 805. dalmatinski su gradovi Karlu Velikome (768. – 814.) poslali svoje poslanike, zadarskoga duksa Pavla i biskupa Donata, te su mu iskazali vjernost. Bizant je pokrajinu vratio pod svoju vlast vojnom intervencijom iduće godine.¹⁵⁵ Nadalje, u *De administrando imperio* navodi se da su se dalmatinski gradovi osamostalili za cara Mihaela II. (820. – 829.).¹⁵⁶ Ipak, teško je povjerovati u potpunu samostalnost dalmatinskih gradova tijekom tog razdoblja. Međutim navedena dva izvora svjedoče nam da se u bizantskoj Dalmaciji znalo donositi odluke mimo carske volje.

Iako je Bazilije I. nakratko ponovno uspostavio bizantsku dominaciju na istočnojadranskoj obali, može se reći da je on u konačnici nepovratno gurnuo dalmatinske gradove u proces integracije s hrvatskim zaleđem tako što im je zapovjedio da novac koji su do tada davali strategu, sada počnu davati slavenskim vladarima (među njima i hrvatskome) u zaleđu. Takva je zapovijed pospješila interakciju obale i zaleđa, a vrlo su brzo novonastale odnose pokušali iskoristiti Hrvati u zaleđu. Ninski biskup, a kasnije i splitski nadbiskup Teodozije pokušao je objediniti svoju Ninsku biskupiju i Splitsku nadbiskupiju u jednu metropoliju, tvrdeći da obnavlja salonitansku Crkvu. Za kraj, indikativno je i to da se u oporuci priora Andrije iz 918. godine¹⁵⁷ ne spominju predstavnici bizantske vlasti.

Smatram da je proces približavanja dalmatinskih gradova i hrvatske vlasti, započet Bazilijevom odlukom o davanju novca slavenskim vladarima, kulminirao s Tomislavom. Gradovi su bili suočeni s činjenicom da su potpuno zanemareni od strane Carstva, koje je imalo velike unutarnje i vanjske probleme. S jedne je strane uvijek postojala mogućnost bugarskoga upada, a s druge je strane sjećanje na arapske pljačkaške pohode još uvijek bilo svjež

edged Tomislav as the “king of the Croats” (*rex Croatorum*).¹⁴¹ Although the exact timing of Tomislav’s assumption of the royal title, or whether he was formally crowned at all, remains unknown, it is evident that he must have achieved something of great significance as a ruler to prompt him to adopt the royal title (if indeed he did). It is also possible that the pope may have chosen to address him as such regardless of the fact that he lacked conclusive evidence of Tomislav being indeed a “*rex*”. It could have been Tomislav’s victory over the Hungarians that led to Tomislav assuming the royal title (if he indeed did), because the Hungarian incursions and raids represented a significant problem that even more potent rulers before Tomislav struggled to resolve.

The last time Tomislav is mentioned is in the context of the Church Council of Split in the year 925. Within the council’s deliberations, he is identified as the “consul in the province of the Croats and in the regions of Dalmatia.”¹⁴² The initiative to convene this council came from Tomislav, the Duke of Zahumlje Michael Višević¹⁴³ and the Dalmatian bishops. They sought to determine which archdiocese or diocese would hold primacy in the newly established ecclesiastical province, encompassing the territories of Dalmatian cities and the Kingdom of Croatia. While Pope John X granted their request to convene the council, his primary concern was reaching an agreement on how to suppress the use of the Slavic language in religious worship.¹⁴⁴

Despite the Pope’s wishes, the church council focused primarily on the primacy in the new ecclesiastical province. The main candidates were Archbishop John of Split, who appealed to the tradition of the metropolis of Salona, Bishop Gregory of Nin and Bishop Formin of Zadar. The synod concluded that Archbishop John of Split would become the metropolitan of the ecclesiastical province, explaining that the Archdiocese of Split “has precedence over all the churches of this province” (*inter omnes ecclesias prouinciae huius primatum habeat*) be-

¹⁵⁴ Shepard 2008, str. 503-506.

¹⁵⁵ Goldstein 1992, str. 153; Gračanin 2015, str. 504-506.

¹⁵⁶ DAI, str. 64.

¹⁵⁷ CD 1, str. 25-28.

¹⁴¹ HSM, p. 96; CD 1, p. 34; Šišić 1914a, p. 216; Klaić 1972a, p. 31.

¹⁴² HSM, p. 98; CD 1, p. 32; Klaić 1972a, p. 30.

¹⁴³ There is an interpretation that Michael Višević actually ruled the Neretva region, which is based on equating the people of Neretva and Hum. See also: Ančić 2011, 217-278.

¹⁴⁴ Birin 2015, p. 54.

te se nije mogla zanemariti mogućnost da se oni ponove. U takvoj situaciji nije nemoguće zamisliti da su se dalmatinski gradovi obratili Tomislavu da ih stavi pod svoju zaštitu. Želim naglasiti da izostanak bizantske političke prisutnosti početkom 10. stoljeća nikako ne znači da su veze Hrvatske i Bizanta u potpunosti prekinute.

S novim prijedlogom kronologije hrvatskih vladara koji donosi ovaj rad smatram da se može pretpostaviti čija je supruga bila kraljica Domaslava, čije je ime otkriveno na ulomcima natpisa pronađenoga u crkvi sv. Vida u Klisu. Povijesno-filološkom analizom došlo se do zaključka da se natpis treba datirati u prvu polovicu 10. stoljeća, no nije se sa sigurnošću moglo reći čija je supruga bila kraljica Domaslava.¹⁵⁸ Iako je na samome početku 10. stoljeća vladao Mutimir, on se nije koristio titulom *rex*, a iz natpisa je jasno vidljivo da je Domaslava kraljica (*regina*), stoga ona nikako ne može biti njegova supruga. Budući da ovaj rad smješta Krešimira I. i Miroslava u 9., a ne u 10. stoljeće, a znamo da se žena Mihaela Krešimira zvala Jelena, moguće je pomisliti da je Domaslava mogla biti Tomislavova supruga.

Tomislavova vladavina završila je 926., a to se može zaključiti na temelju isprave Krešimira II.¹⁵⁹, koja je u povijesnoj znanosti bila kamen spoticanja, no u idućemu poglavlju pokušat ću razjasniti zašto se (barem) datum i intitulacija mogu uzeti kao vjerodostojni.

5.2. MIHAEL KREŠIMIR II.

Kako bismo mogli definirati početak vladavine Mihaela Krešimira II., potrebno je uzeti u obzir ispravu iz 950., koja je izazvala žestoku raspravu između Jakova Stipišića i Stjepana Antoljaka¹⁶⁰. Za

¹⁵⁸ Budak 2011, str. 317-320.

¹⁵⁹ CD 1, str. 39-42.

¹⁶⁰ Isprva Stipišić (Stipišić 1969, 75-96) detaljno analizira ispravu i iznosi koji dijelovi isprave mogu biti autentični, a koji su falsificirani na temelju isprava kasnijih hrvatskih vladara iz 11. stoljeća. Antoljak (Antoljak 1972, 41-116.) je na Stipišićev članak replicirao vlastitim, u kojem je prilično žestoko napao Stipišića i zaključio da je isprava autentična. Rasprava je završena Stipišićevim člankom iz 1973. (Stipišić 1973, 89-97), u kojem autor, čini se prilično revoltiran Antoljakovim člankom, odbacuje ovu ispravu kao falsifikat, pri tome zanemarujući neke vlastite zaključke do kojih je došao u svom prethodnom članku. Moj cilj nije utvrditi koji su dijelovi isprave autentični ili falsificirani, nego utvrditi mogu li nam datum i intitulacija

cause the bones of Saint Domnius that lie there.¹⁴⁵

The records from the Church Council of Split have left historians uncertain about Tomislav's authority over Dalmatian cities. Notably, the synod of 925 only mentions the Croatian king and the duke of Zahumlje, with no representation from Byzantium.¹⁴⁶ The opinions of historians were different regarding this aspect. The earliest Croatian historiography unreservedly embraced the idea of Croatian authority over Dalmatian cities.¹⁴⁷ However, there was a change in the second half of the 20th century with some historians refuting any claim of Tomislav's control over these cities.¹⁴⁸ Nowadays, it is widely considered that some form of Croatian authority must have existed there, because it is difficult to imagine that a new ecclesiastical province would have been established while having two separate political entities in the same area.¹⁴⁹

One prevailing theory from older historiography, which has persisted more or less until today, suggests that Tomislav's alliance with Byzantium against the Bulgarians led to the Byzantine ceding of Dalmatian cities to Tomislav's rule. Yet, I think it is difficult to characterize this as an alliance between the Kingdom of Croatia and Byzantium. Notably, *De Administrando Imperio* omits any mention of Tomislav, making it difficult to believe that a significant Byzantine ally, as Tomislav is claimed to have been in historiography, would be excluded from chapters about Croatia. Furthermore, as I mentioned in previous chapters, the passages about Croatia relate to the 9th century, because the imperial court was not well acquainted with the situation in the Croatian territory. If Tomislav was indeed an ally (as was the case with Zdeslav), one would expect that they would have certainly had this kind of knowledge. Additionally, *De Administrando Imperio* mentions Serbian rulers from the 10th century who were inclined towards Byzantium,¹⁵⁰ as was Michael Višević, the duke of Zahumlje, who was mentioned as an *anthypathos* and *patrician* there.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁵ Rački 1877, pp. 190-191; HSM, pp. 99; CD 1, p. 31; Šišić 1914a, p. 218; Klaić 1972a, p. 33.

¹⁴⁶ Budak 2018, p. 224.

¹⁴⁷ Klaić 1972b, pp. 98-101; Šišić 1990, p. 413.

¹⁴⁸ Klaić 1975, p. 291; Goldstein 1985, pp. 35-37; Goldstein 1995, 277-278.

¹⁴⁹ Budak 2018, p. 224; Birin 2015, p. 54; Raukar 1997, p. 38; Curta 2006, p. 196.

¹⁵⁰ DAI, pp. 86-88.

¹⁵¹ Idem, p. 89.

ovaj su rad jedini relevantni dijelovi isprave datum i intitulacija (uz invokaciju). Ondje stoji: „U ime svetoga i nedjeljivoga Trojstva. Godine Gospodnjega utjelovljenja devetstotina i pedesete, indikcije dvanaeste. Ja, Krešimir, milošću Božjom kralj Hrvata i Dalmatinaca, sjedeći na očinskom tronu Kristovim darom u dvadeset i četvrtoj godini svoga kraljevanja...“¹⁶¹ (*In nomine sancte et indiuidue trinitatis Anno dominice incarnationis DCCCCL indictione XII. Ego Cresimirus, dei gratia Croathorum atque Dalmatinorum rex, uicesimo quarto regni mei anno residens in paterno Christi munere solio...*)¹⁶².

Ono u čemu se slažu i Stipišić i Antoljak jest da indikcija nikako ne odgovara 950. godini¹⁶³, no Antoljak ističe kako je lako moguće da je došlo do pogreške prilikom prepisivanja isprave, što je rezultiralo pogrešno napisanom indikcijom.¹⁶⁴ Stipišićev dodatni prigovor je da 950. ne odgovara tvrdnji u ispravi da je Krešimir u dvadesetčetvrtoj godini svoje vladavine¹⁶⁵. Stipišićeva opaska temelji se na Šišićevoj kronologiji hrvatskih vladara, prema kojoj Mihael Krešimir počinje vladati 949., a ne na sadržajnoj analizi isprave.

Iako u samoj ispravi postoje i elementi koji govore u prilog njezinoj autentičnosti kao i oni koji idu u prilog tome da je falsifikat, ja bih se zadržao na datumu isprave, koja je jako važna za kronologiju koja se iznosi u ovome radu. U svrhu toga bih citirao Nadu Klaić, koja je voljela olako isprave proglašavati falsifikatima, a koja je napisala: „Kod svih tih, na žalost, mnogobrojnih falsifikata, najvažniji su za nas podaci o vladarima jer ni jedan falsifikat nije išao tako daleko da je izmislio hrvatskoga vladara. Stoga i možemo bez ustručavanja upotrijebiti iz darovnica podatke o vladarima jer oni nisu bili predmet falsificiranja.“¹⁶⁶

Ovakav zaključak Nade Klaić može se primijeniti i na prije spomenutu ispravu. Znamo da je Ivan Lučić vjerodostojno prepisao Krešimirovu ispravu na temelju prijepisa iz 1397. godine¹⁶⁷, što nas navodi na zaključak da je prijepis ove isprave, bila ona autentična ili ne, nastao tijekom razvijenoga sred-

This suggests that the imperial court was well-acquainted with their allies, and the omission of Tomislav hints at him not being one after all. However, if Tomislav was not a Byzantine ally, then one must wonder how the Dalmatian cities came under his rule. First and foremost, it is necessary to understand the Byzantine position in the first half of the 10th century and the fact that Byzantine Dalmatia was on the periphery of the Empire.

In 913, Byzantine Emperor Alexander (912–913) refused to pay the annual tribute to the Bulgarian ruler Simeon (893–927), violating the peace agreement from 897. Consequently, the Bulgarian army reached Constantinople soon after, initiating a new Byzantine-Bulgarian war that lasted until 927.¹⁵² During this war, Byzantium suffered a significant defeat at the Battle of Achelous in 917, and Simeon managed to arrive at the walls of Constantinople several times. Despite the Byzantine diplomatic attempts to secure support from the Pechenegs, Serbs and Hungarians, negotiations often failed, or Simeon succeeded to prevent these possible agreements through military actions (as evidenced by the example of the overthrow of the Serbian ruler Peter).¹⁵³

The Byzantine Empire was facing both external and internal challenges. After the death of Emperor Alexander, eight-year-old Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus ascended to the throne in 913. Yet, his mother Zoe and Patriarch Nicholas Mystikos ruled on his behalf. In the following years, Byzantium became the battleground for a fierce struggle over the guardianship of young Constantine, with Roman I. Lekapenos (920–944) emerging victorious in 919, when he succeeded to overthrow Zoe and Nicholas Mystikos. He was crowned emperor in 920, becoming the *de facto* emperor, while Constantine remained on the sidelines with little real influence.¹⁵⁴

All these circumstances in Byzantium could have prompted Dalmatian cities to take independent action, a scenario not unprecedented in their history. Namely, in 805, Dalmatian cities sent their envoys dux Paulus of Zadar and Bishop Donatus to Charlemagne (768–814), pledging their allegiance. The Byzantines regained control of the region through military intervention the following year.¹⁵⁵ Additionally, it is stated in *De Administrando Impe-*

isprave pomoći u novom spoznavanju hrvatske prošlosti u 10. stoljeću.

¹⁶¹ Ivanišević 2008, str. 118.

¹⁶² CD 1, str. 40.

¹⁶³ Stipišić 1969, str. 80; Antoljak 1972, str. 72.

¹⁶⁴ Antoljak 1972, str. 72.

¹⁶⁵ Stipišić 1969, str. 80.

¹⁶⁶ Klaić 1975, str. 354-355.

¹⁶⁷ Stipišić 1969, str. 77-78.

¹⁵² Curta 2006, p. 225; Shepard 1999, pp. 573-574.

¹⁵³ Curta 2006, pp. 225-227; Shepard 1999, pp. 574-580.

¹⁵⁴ Shepard 2008, pp. 503-506.

¹⁵⁵ Goldstein 1992, p. 153; Gračanin 2015, pp. 504-506.

njeg vijeka. Isto tako znamo da je u razvijenome srednjem vijeku, konkretno u 13. stoljeću, postojalo sjećanje na Krešimira II.¹⁶⁸ Ne smijemo zanemariti da su postojala i *Gesta Krešimira II.*, koja su vrlo lako mogla biti očuvana i poznata u razvijenome srednjem vijeku, pa i u 14. stoljeću, te su mogla biti korištena tijekom sastavljanja raznih isprava, pa tako i ove; ovakvo razmišljanje, međutim, treba ipak zadržati na razini obične pretpostavke. Ipak, uzevši sve u obzir, smatram da se datum ove isprave može uzeti kao autentičan. Za takvo je mišljenje nebitno je li isprava autentična ili nije jer ako ona jest autentična, onda je i datum sam po sebi autentičan. Ako se radi o falsifikatu, onda se postavlja pitanje zašto bi falsifikator upotrebljavao krivu godinu vladavine vladara na kojeg je možda postojalo sjećanje u tome razdoblju, a potencijalno je postojao i detaljniji zapis o njegovoj vladavini, te na taj način na prvom koraku upropastio svoj rad. Štoviše, u samoj ispravi, koja je datirana u 950., vrlo se precizno navodi da je Krešimir u dvadeset i četvrtoj godini svoje vladavine. Smatram da potencijalni falsifikator ne bi dao tako precizne podatke o godini vladavine ako nije bio siguran i/ili nije imao podatak o vremenu Krešimirove vladavine. U sljedećim odlomcima pokušat ću i na temelju analize povijesnih izvora i događaja pokazati da se datum naveden u Krešimirovoj ispravi može uzeti kao vjerodostojan.

Prema prije navedenoj ispravi vladavina Mihaela Krešimira II. započinje 926. Znamo da je posljednji spomen Tomislava 925., a isto tako je u prethodnim poglavljima zaključeno da vladari koje se tradicionalno smješta u razdoblje između Tomislava i Krešimira II. ne pripadaju 10. stoljeću. Konkretno, Trpimir II. nikada nije postojao, dok Krešimira I. i Miroslava treba stavljati između kneza Trpimira i Domagoja.

Izvori za koje smatram kako daju potvrdu da je Mihael Krešimir II. počeo vladati 926. su *Annales Barenses* i *Annales Lupi Protospatharii*. U *Annales Barenses* navodi se: „Godine 928. Ove godine zauze Mihael, kralj Slavena, grad Sipont u mjesecu srpnju, na dan Svete Felicite, ponedjeljak, indikcije petnaeste“ (*Anno 928. Hoc anno comprehendit Michael rex Sclavorum ciuitatem Sipontum mense julio, die sancte Felicitatis, secunda feria, indictione quintadecima*)¹⁶⁹, dok se u *Annales Lupi Protospatharii* spominje isti događaj samo dvije godine ranije: „Godine 926. Indikcije 14. Ove godine zau-

rio that Dalmatian cities became independent during the reign of Emperor Michael II (820–829).¹⁵⁶ However, it is hard to believe that the Dalmatian cities had complete autonomy during that period. Yet, these two sources testify that decisions were sometimes made in Byzantine Dalmatia which were not in line with the Emperor’s directives.

Although Basil I briefly re-established Byzantine dominance on the eastern Adriatic coast, it can be said that he essentially pushed Dalmatian cities irreversibly towards the process of integration with the Croatian hinterland. Basil’s directive to redirect the money, previously given to the strategos, to Slavic rulers (including Croatian ones) in the hinterland initiated a process that accelerated the interaction between the coast and hinterland. Soon after, the Croats in the hinterland used these newly established relations to take advantage. The Bishop of Nin, and later also the Archbishop of Split, Theodosius, tried to unify the Diocese of Nin and the Archdiocese of Split into a single metropolis, claiming to revive the Church of Salona. Lastly, it’s noteworthy that there is no mention of the representatives of Byzantine authority in the will of Prior Andrew from 918.¹⁵⁷

I believe the process of Dalmatian cities becoming closer with the Croatian rule, initiated by Basil’s decision to give money to Slavic rulers, culminated with Tomislav. The cities faced complete neglect by an Empire that was struggling with internal and external problems. On one side, there was the constant threat of Bulgarian invasions, and on the other, the memory of Arab raids was still fresh, raising concerns that it could possibly happen again. In such a situation, it’s plausible that Dalmatian cities turned to Tomislav to place them under his protection. It’s important to note that the absence of Byzantine political presence in the early 10th century doesn’t mean that ties between Croatia and Byzantium were completely severed.

With the introduction of a fresh chronology for Croatian rulers in this study, I believe it can be assumed whose wife Queen Domaslava was, whose name was inscribed on the fragments, discovered at the Church of St. Vitus in Klis. A historical-philological analysis suggests dating the inscription to the first half of the 10th century, but it could not be definitively determined whose wife Queen Do-

¹⁶⁸ HS, str. 80-81.

¹⁶⁹ Churchill 1979, str. 116.

¹⁵⁶ DAI, p. 64.

¹⁵⁷ CD 1, pp. 25-28.

ze Mihael Slaven Sipont u mjesecu srpnju (*Anno 926. Indictione 14. Hoc anno comprehendit Michael sclavaus Sipontum mense julii*).¹⁷⁰ Churchill uzima 926. kao ispravnu godinu kada se dogodio napad na Sipont.¹⁷¹

U historiografiji se smatra da se iza „Mihaela, kralja Slavena“, odnosno „Mihaela Slavena“ krije zahumski knez Mihael Višević, no smatram da se tu ne radi o njemu. Znamo naime da je Sipont u to vrijeme bio pod vlasti Bizanta te se stoga postavlja pitanje – zašto bi Mihael Višević, koji se spominje kao bizantski antipat i patricij¹⁷², napao bizantski posjed? Osim toga Mihaela se naslovljava titulom *rex*, koju nije posjedovao, a godinu dana prije je na Splitskome crkvenom saboru zabilježen kao *dux*. Postoje i tumačenja da tada Sipont nije bio u rukama Bizanta, nego Langobarda¹⁷³, što bi moglo ići u prilog tezi da se iza „Mihaela Slavena“ ipak krije Mihael Višević, ali ne i nužno. Međutim ako bismo i prihvatili tezu da se ipak radi o Mihaelu Viševiću, to bi nas onda dovelo do još jednoga problema, a to je zahumska mornarica. Naime, nigdje ranosrednjovjekovni izvori ne odaju da bi Zahumlje imalo mornaricu koja bi bila sposobna za napad na grad u južnoj Italiji. S druge strane, znamo da je Hrvatska bila mornarički sposobna izvesti takav pothvat, a imamo primjere da je Hrvatska već u 9. stoljeću imala respektabilnu mornaricu.

Nadalje Viševiću se često pripisuje savezništvo sa Simeonom, a onda se i pohod na Sipont dovodio u kontekst toga navodnog savezništva. Za tu se tezu koristi tekst iz 32. poglavlja *De administrando imperio*:

„Ali u doba poslije carovanja gospodina Leona, dodje tadašnji strateg drački, protospatarij Leon Rabduh – potom dobije čast magistra i logoteta droma, - u Paganiju, kojom tada vladaše arhont Srblije, da na stanku s istim arhontom Petrom vijeća o nekoj službi i osnovi. Nenavideći¹⁷⁴ to Mihajlo arhont Zahumljana, javi Simeonu arhontu bugarskome, da car romajski miti arhonta Petra, da zajedno sa Turcima udari na Bugarsku; a desio se u ono doba boj na Ahelom između Romajaca i Bugara.“¹⁷⁵

maslava was.¹⁵⁸ Although Mutimir ruled at the beginning of the 10th century, he did not use the title *rex*. The inscription on the other hand clearly reveals that Domaslava was a queen (*regina*) and hence she couldn't have been his wife. Since this work places Kresimir I and Miroslav in the 9th and not the 10th century, coupled with our knowledge that Michael Kresimir's wife was named Jelena, it becomes plausible to speculate that Domaslava might have been Tomislav's wife.

Tomislav's reign ended in 926, as deduced from the charter of Kresimir II.¹⁵⁹ This charter, initially contentious in historical science, will be explained in the following chapter, where I aim to clarify why the date and titulation, at the very least, can be deemed credible.

5.2. MICHAEL KREŠIMIR II

To determine the beginning of Michael Krešimir II's reign, one must take into account the document from 950 that sparked a heated dispute between Jakov Stipišić and Stjepan Antoljak.¹⁶⁰ However, for the purpose of this paper, we will focus only on the document's date and title (along with the invocation). The document states: “In the name of the holy and indivisible Trinity. In the year of the Lord's incarnation nine hundred and fiftieth, in the twelfth indiction. I, Krešimir, by the grace of God, king of Croats and Dalmatians, sitting on the paternal throne by the gift of Christ in the twenty-fourth year of my reign...”¹⁶¹ (*In nomine sante et indiuidue trinitatis Anno dominice incarnationis DCCCCI indictione XII. Ego Cresimirus, dei gratia Croat-*

¹⁵⁸ Budak 2011, pp. 317-320.

¹⁵⁹ CD 1, pp. 39-42.

¹⁶⁰ Initially, Stipišić (Stipišić 1969, 75-96) thoroughly analysed the document and presented which parts of the document may be authentic and which may be falsified based on documents from later Croatian rulers from the 11th century. Antoljak (Antoljak 1972, 41-116.) replied to Stipišić's article with his own, in which he strongly criticized Stipišić and concluded that the document is authentic. The debate ended with Stipišić's paper in 1973 (Stipišić 1973, 89-97.), in which the author, seemingly quite upset with Antoljak's article, dismissed this document as a falsification, ignoring some of his own conclusions from his previous work. My goal is not to determine which parts of the document are authentic or falsified, but to determine whether the date and intitulation of the document can help us gain new insights into Croatian history in the 10th century.

¹⁶¹ Ivanišević 2008, p. 118.

¹⁷⁰ Isto, str. 126.

¹⁷¹ Isto, str. 201-202.

¹⁷² DAI, str. 89.

¹⁷³ Churchill 1979, str. 201-202.

¹⁷⁴ Na engleskom jeziku prevedeno kao „his jelaousy aroused by this“, što bi doslovno značilo „njegova ljubomora izazvana time“, no u kontekstu ovog teksta može se prevesti i kao „radi ljubomore“ (DAI, str. 275).

¹⁷⁵ DAI, str. 86.

Iz navedenoga teksta teško se može zaključiti da je on bio bugarski saveznik, već je sve napravio, kako se navodi, „radi ljubomore“. Srpski su vladari, između ostaloga, polagali pravo i na Zahumlje, o čemu svjedoči upravo *De administrando imperio*. Takva politika srpskih vladara nikako nije mogla odgovarati Mihaelu Viševiću, koji je, možda, iskoristio ovu priliku i pokušao se riješiti vlastitog neprijatelja. Ovdje se ponajprije radi o, kako mi se čini, lošim odnosima zahumskoga i srpskoga vladara, a ne o Mihaelovu savezništvu sa Simeonom ili neprijateljstvu prema Bizantu. Uostalom, da je Višević isprva bio bugarski saveznik, a potom se okrenuo Bizantu, kako se u historiografiji sugerira, Konstantin Porfirogenet zasigurno ne bi propustio uvrstiti takvu informaciju u svoje djelo. Primjerice, kada se opisuju previranja na srpskome prijestolju u 32. poglavlju, ističe se da Zaharija, nakon što je zavladao Srbijom, „spominjući se dobročinstva romajnskoga roda, mahom se diže protiv Bugara, ne hoteći nikako njima biti podređen, nego voleći da mu gospoduje car romajski“. ¹⁷⁶ Na ovome primjeru vidimo da se ne propušta svaki povoljni događaj iskoristiti za uzdizanje Carstva. Stoga bi car-pisac svakako uvrstio i obrat u politici Mihaela Viševića da se on uistinu dogodio. Shodno tomu treba odbaciti mogućnost da je zahumski vladar bio bugarski saveznik koji je napao bizantski posjed u južnoj Italiji. Akciju u južnoj Italiji svakako treba pripisati hrvatskome kralju.

Pohod na Sipont svakako treba staviti u kontekst tadašnjih događanja u južnoj Italiji. Zašto bi hrvatski kralj napao bizantski posjed? U vrijeme napada na Sipont Bizant je bio u ratu s Landulfom, kapuanskim i beneventanskim vladarom, te Guaimarom II., knezom Salerna. ¹⁷⁷ Možemo samo pretpostaviti radi li se ovdje o pljačkaškome pohodu hrvatskoga kralja koji je želio iskoristiti bizantske probleme u južnoj Italiji ili nam ovaj pohod možda govori nešto o vezama Hrvatske i langobardskih država u Italiji.

Podatke o Krešimiru II. možda nam krije Ivan Đakon, koji piše da je „Mihael, knez Slavena“ zarobio Petra, sina mletačkoga dužda Ursa II. Particijaka (912. – 932.) dok je prolazio kroz „krajeve Hrvata“ i predao ga Simeonu. ¹⁷⁸ Historiografija,

horum atque Dalmatinorum rex, uicesimo quarto regni mei anno residens in paterno Christi munere solio...). ¹⁶²

Both Stipišić and Antoljak concur that the indiction unequivocally does not align with the year 950. ¹⁶³ However, Antoljak points out that it is quite possible that an error may have occurred during the transcription of the document, leading to the miswritten indiction. ¹⁶⁴ Stipišić's additional objection is that the year 950 contradicts the claim in the document that Krešimir is in the twenty-fourth year of his rule. ¹⁶⁵ He bases his objection on Šišić's chronology of Croatian rulers, according to which Michael Krešimir began to rule in 949, rather than on a substantive analysis of the document's content.

While the document itself presents elements that could support both authenticity and forgery, my emphasis rests on the document's date, which is very important for the chronology presented in this work. In this context, I cite Nada Klaić, known for promptly designating documents as falsifications, who wrote the following: “In all these, unfortunately, numerous falsifications, the most important element for us are the data about the rulers, because no falsification went so far as to invent a Croatian ruler. Therefore, we can use data about the rulers from charters without hesitation, because they were not the subject of falsification.” ¹⁶⁶

Nada Klaić's conclusion can also be applied to the aforementioned document. We know that Ivan Lučić faithfully copied Krešimir's document based on a transcript from 1397. ¹⁶⁷ This leads to the conclusion that the transcript of this document, irrespective of its authenticity, originated during the High Middle Ages. We also know that there were memories of Krešimir II in the High Middle Ages, specifically in the 13th century. ¹⁶⁸ Notably, one should also not ignore the fact that the *Gesta* of Krešimir II existed, which may have been preserved and known during this period and even in the 14th century, potentially being used in the composition of various documents, including the one in question. However, we should still keep this kind of thinking just at the level of a general assumption.

¹⁶² CD 1, p. 40.

¹⁶³ Stipišić 1969, p. 80; Antoljak 1972, p. 72.

¹⁶⁴ Antoljak 1972, p. 72.

¹⁶⁵ Stipišić 1969, p. 80.

¹⁶⁶ Klaić 1975, pp. 354-355.

¹⁶⁷ Stipišić 1969, pp. 77-78.

¹⁶⁸ HS, pp. 80-81.

¹⁷⁶ Isto, str. 87.

¹⁷⁷ Nikolić Jakus 2015, str. 569.

¹⁷⁸ *Qui dum Chroatorum fines rediens transire vellet, a Michaele Sclavorum duce fraude deceptus, omni-*

kao i u slučaju napada na Sipont, u ovome Mihaelu obično vidi Mihaela Viševića. No postavlja se pitanje – što bi zahumski knez radio na hrvatskome teritoriju? Hrvatska je historiografija to obično objašnjavala tezom da je Mihael Višević bio vazal hrvatskoga vladara. Ipak, smatram kako je moguće da se i iza ovoga Mihaela krije Mihael Krešimir II. Vijest koju donosi Ivan Đakon smješta se u 912. ili 913., a pretpostavljamo da je u to vrijeme na vlasti u Hrvatskoj bio knez Tomislav¹⁷⁹. Moguće je da je Mihael, kojeg se naziva *duxom*, u to vrijeme bio Tomislavov suvladar. To ne bi bio prvi slučaj da se u Hrvatskoj uz vladara javlja i suvladar. Još u 9. stoljeću zabilježeno je da su nakon Domagoja vladali njegovi sinovi, čija nam imena nisu poznata.¹⁸⁰ U drugoj polovici 10. stoljeća je uz Držislava suvladar bio njegov sin Svetoslav.¹⁸¹ U 11. stoljeću imamo primjere Krešimira III. i njegova suvladara Gojslava¹⁸² te Petra Krešimira IV. i Zvonimira¹⁸³. Kao što se može vidjeti, postoje slučajevi u kojima su braća zajedno nasljeđivala vlast, tako da je moguće da su Krešimir II. i Tomislav bili suvladari prije nego što je Krešimir samostalno stupio na prijestolje. Smatram kako je izglednije da je na hrvatskome teritoriju mletačkoga dužda zarobio visokopozicionirani hrvatski dužnosnik, a ne vladar susjedne zemlje. Ipak, ostavio bih navedenu interpretaciju otvorenom, jer u nedostatku izvora sve ostaje na razini pretpostavke.

Ako bi se početak vladavine Krešimira II. smjestio u 926., time bi se neki važni događaji, koji su se obično vezali uz Tomislavovu vladavinu, zapravo dogodili za kraljevanja Mihaela Krešimira II. Prvi je događaj pobjeda nad Bugarima na čelu s njihovim vojskovođom Alogoboturom 926., a drugi je Splitski crkveni sabor 928., na kojemu je konačno riješeno pitanje prvenstva u novoj crkvenoj pokrajini koja se prostirala kroz Hrvatsku i Dalmaciju te je ukinuta Ninska biskupija.¹⁸⁴ Krešimirovo se ime ne spominje izrijekom, već se samo spominje *Chroa-*

busque bonis privatus atque Vulgarico regi, Simeoni nomine, exilii pena transmissus est. (Ivan Đakon, str. 150.)

¹⁷⁹ Tomislav se prvi put spominje 914., no obično se pretpostavlja da je na prijestolje stupio koju godinu ranije.

¹⁸⁰ Ivan Đakon, str. 140; Rački 1877, str. 373; Klaić 1972a, str. 26.

¹⁸¹ Šišić 1914a, str. 126; Klaić 1972a, str. 47; Delonga 1996, str. 108.

¹⁸² Birin 2015, str. 58-59.

¹⁸³ Rački 1877, str. 80; 95; Klaić 1972a, str. 66.

¹⁸⁴ Rački 1877, str. 194-195; HSM, str. 104; Šišić 1914a, str. 221-223; CD 1, str. 36-38; Klaić 1972a, str. 35-36.

Nevertheless, given these considerations, I believe that the date of this document can be deemed authentic. For such an opinion, it is irrelevant whether the document itself is authentic or not, because if it is authentic, then the date itself is authentic. If it is a forgery, then the question arises as to why the forger would use the wrong year of the ruler's reign, who might have been even remembered during that period and for whom a detailed record of his reign potentially existed. Such a misstep would undermine the forger's work from the outset. In addition, in the document itself, dated to 950, it is very precisely stated that Krešimir is in the twenty-fourth year of his reign. I believe that a potential forger would not provide such precise information about the year of the reign if he was not sure and/or did not have information about the time of Krešimir's rule. In the following paragraphs, I will try, based on the analysis of historical sources and events, to show that the date given in Krešimir's document can be considered credible.

Based on the aforementioned document, the reign of Michael Krešimir II started in 926, while the last mention of Tomislav that is known to us is in 925. As concluded in previous chapters, the rulers who are traditionally placed between Tomislav and Krešimir II do not belong to the 10th century. Specifically, Trpimir II never existed, while Krešimir I and Miroslav should be placed between Duke Trpimir and Duke Domagoj.

Both, the *Annales Barenses* and *Annales Lupi Protospatharii*, I consider credible sources that confirm Michael Krešimir's II beginning of rule in 926. In the *Annales Barenses*, it is stated: "In the year 928, Michael, the king of the Slavs, captured the city of Sipontum in July, on the day of Saint Felicitas, Monday, the fifteenth indiction" (*Anno 928. Hoc anno comprehendit Michael rex Sclauorum ciuitatem Sipontum mense julio, die sancte Felicitatis, secunda feria, indictione quintadecima*).¹⁶⁹ The same event is mentioned in the *Annales Lupi Protospatharii*, but two years earlier: "In the year 926. Indiction 14. This year, Michael the Slav captured Sipontum in July" (*Anno 926. Indictione 14. Hoc anno comprehendit Michael sclauus Sipontum mense julii*).¹⁷⁰ Churchill considers 926 as the correct year when the attack on Sipontum took place.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁹ Churchill 1979, p. 116.

¹⁷⁰ Idem, p. 126.

¹⁷¹ Idem, pp. 201-202.

*torum princeps*¹⁸⁵, no s obzirom na godinu održavanja Sabora, smatram da se tu radi o njemu.

Zanimljiva je činjenica da se uz Krešimira u prije spomenutoj ispravi veže naziv „kralj Hrvata i Dalmatinaca“ (*Croathorum atque Dalmatinorum rex*)¹⁸⁶. Zbog sumnje u autentičnost isprave ostaje upitno je li on doista imao tu titulu. No ipak možemo s određenom dozom sigurnosti reći da je Krešimir nastavio s politikom prema dalmatinskim gradovima koju je započeo Tomislav. Da je hrvatski vladar tada uistinu imao vlast nad dalmatinskim gradovima, svjedoči nam Darovnica za Diklo Petra Krešimira IV., u kojoj se navodi da je Krešimir II. darovao zadarskome samostanu sv. Krševana zemljište u Diklu, koje je bilo dijelom zadarskoga gradskoga agera.¹⁸⁷ Teško je zamisliti da bi hrvatski vladar mogao darovati zemljište dalmatinskih gradova ako nije imao vlast nad njima.¹⁸⁸

U *Kraljevstvu Slavena* spominje se Krešimir, koji je ratovao zajedno sa svojim ujakom i opustošio Uskoplje i Luku i Plevu, a nakon što je bosanski ban pred njim pobjegao u Ugarsku, navodi se: „Potom zauzme Krešimir cijelu Bosnu i vladaše njome. A kad umre otac njegove majke, zavlada Bijelom Hrvatskom.“¹⁸⁹ Budući da se u idućoj vijesti u *Kraljevstvu Slavena* navodi da „u to vrijeme umre bugarski car imenom Petar“¹⁹⁰, vremenski se zauzimanje Bosne u navedenome djelu uistinu poklapa s vladavinom Mihaela Krešimira II. Međutim *Kraljevstvo Slavena* iznimno je nepouzdan izvor za rani srednji vijek te stoga ovu vijest ne možemo uzimati kao dokaz Krešimirova zauzimanja Bosne, ali svakako je možemo iskoristiti kao dokaz da je postojalo određeno sjećanje na njega i u narednim stoljećima.

Zanimljivo je da je Krešimir II. radio na izgrađivanju slike o samome sebi, zajedno sa suprugom Jelenom, još za vrijeme svoje vladavine te je na simboličan način želio prikazati da njegova vladavina označava početak nove dinastije, novoga vremena, bez obzira na rodbinski odnos s prošlim vladarima (u ispravi iz 950. Krešimir navodi da sjedi na „očinskom prijestolju“)¹⁹¹. O tome je podrobnije pisao

In historiography, it is believed that “Michael, the king of Slavs” or “Michael, the Slav” refers to Duke Michael Višević of Zahumlje, which I personally doubt. Namely, Sipontum was under Byzantine rule at that time, raising the question of why would Michael Višević, mentioned as a Byzantine antypathos and patrician,¹⁷² attack a Byzantine estate. Additionally, Michael is being called *rex* here, a title which he did not possess, while a year earlier he is referred to as *dux* at the Church Council of Split. Some historians even suggest that Sipontum might have been under Lombard rather than Byzantine control,¹⁷³ supporting the argument that “Michael, the Slav” might indeed be Michael Višević, though this interpretation must also not necessarily be correct. However, even if we accept the hypothesis that it is Michael Višević, it raises another issue, namely the navy of Zahumlje. There are no medieval sources indicating that Zahumlje had a navy capable of attacking a city in southern Italy. In contrast, evidence suggests that Croatia had a significant maritime force already in the 9th century and hence was capable to launch such an attack.

Moreover, Višević is often associated with an alliance with Simeon, thus putting this raid on Sipontum also in context with this assumed alliance. Chapter 32 of *De Administrando Imperio* is used to support this claim.

“Now, after the time that this lord Leo had reigned, the then military governor at Dyrrachium, the protospatharius Leo Rhabduchos, who was afterwards honoured with the rank of magister and office of foreign minister, arrived in Paganía, which was at that time under the control of the prince of Serbia, in order to advise and confer with this same prince Peter upon some service and affair. Michael, prince of the Zachlumi, his jealousy aroused by this,¹⁷⁴ sent information to Symeon, prince of Bulgaria, that the emperor of the Romans was bribing prince Peter to take the Turks with him and go upon Bulgaria. It was at that time when the battle of Achelo had taken place between the Romans and the Bulgarians.”¹⁷⁵

¹⁸⁵ Rački 1877, str. 195; Klaić 1972a, str. 36.

¹⁸⁶ CD 1, str. 40.

¹⁸⁷ CD 1, str. 44; 105-106; Šišić 1914a, str. 248-251; Klaić 1972a, str. 56.

¹⁸⁸ Budak 2018, str. 224-225.

¹⁸⁹ LjPD, str. 73.

¹⁹⁰ Isto, str. 73.

¹⁹¹ CD 1, str. 40.

¹⁷² DAI, p. 89.

¹⁷³ Churchill 1979, pp. 201-202.

¹⁷⁴ The English translation is „his jealousy aroused by this“, but in the context of this text it can also be translated as “out of jealousy“ (DAI, pp. 275.).

¹⁷⁵ DAI, p. 86.

Neven Budak¹⁹², koji smatra da je kraljica Jelena izgradila novi kraljevski mauzolej na Otoku kod Solina kao simbol novoga početka. Prema njegovu mišljenju simbolička razina bila je jasna, mauzolej se nalazio blizu ruševina antičke Salone, gdje su se nalazili brojni kršćanski mučenici te blizu Splita, sjedišta nadbiskupije koja se pozivala na tradiciju Salone i bila je središte crkvene pokrajine.¹⁹³ Na ovakvo tumačenje nadodao bih i da se možda na ovaj postupak može gledati i kao na posljedicu sve većeg približavanja hrvatskoga vladara dalmatinskim gradovima.

Petar Krešimir IV. u Darovnici za Diklo jasno ističe da je određene potrebne podatke za svoju darovnicu pronašao u *Gesta Krešimira II.*¹⁹⁴ Nemoguće je utvrditi jesu li *Gesta* nastala za ili nakon Krešimirove vladavine, no jasno svjedoči o njegovoj važnosti u sklopu hrvatskoga ranosrednjovjekovlja. Također Petar Krešimir IV. u darovnici navodi sve svoje pretke, a genealogija počinje upravo s Mihaelom Krešimirom II., što je svakako indikativno.¹⁹⁵ Nadalje, sjećanje na njega nije bilo ograničeno samo na rani srednji vijek, već se nastavilo i u razvijenom srednjemu vijeku, a o tome svjedoči Toma Arhiđakon, koji, pišući svoje djelo u 13. stoljeću, Krešimira naziva *magnificus uir Cresimirus*.¹⁹⁶

Budak iznosi i zanimljivu tezu da je Krešimir uzeo kršćansko ime Mihael, čime se poistovjetio s arkandelom ratnikom koji je pobijedio zmaja, simbol zla. Autor je navedeno povezao s pobjedom u građanskome ratu protiv Miroslava¹⁹⁷, pri tome se služeći poznatom Šišićevom kronologijom. Budući da se u ovome radu jasno naglašava da je Miroslav vladar 9. stoljeća, možda se može pomisliti da je Krešimir II. uzeo kršćansko ime Mihael nakon pobjede nad Bugarima, koji su za dobar dio jugoistočne Europe zasigurno bili „simbol zla“ pa samim time možda i za Hrvate.

Toma Arhiđakon spominje Držislava kao vladara 970. godine.¹⁹⁸ Iz toga se može pretpostaviti da je Krešimir umro oko 965. godine. Krešimir je imao prilično dug život s obzirom da je možda vladao od 926. do o. 965., a ako uzmemo u obzir i interpreta-

Based upon the provided text, it is challenging to conclude that he was a Bulgarian ally, instead, his actions are attributed to motives driven “out of jealousy.” Notably, Serbian rulers, among other things, claimed rights to Zahumlje, as evidenced by *De Administrando Imperio*. Such a policy of Serbian rulers could not suit Michael Višević, who possibly took advantage of this opportunity to get rid of his own enemy. Primarily, it seems to me that this concerned the strained relations between the rulers of Zahumlje and Serbia, rather than Michael’s alliance with Simeon or enmity towards Byzantium. Moreover, if Višević initially allied with Bulgaria and later shifted allegiance to Byzantium, as historiography suggests, it’s unlikely that Constantine Porphyrogenitus would omit such crucial information in his work. For instance, in describing the turmoil on the Serbian throne in Chapter 32, the focus is on Zaharija, who, after assuming power over Serbia, “being mindful of the benefits of the emperor of the Romans, he broke with the Bulgarians, being not at all wishful to be subjected to them, but rather that the emperor of the Romans should be his master.”¹⁷⁶ This example clearly shows that every favourable event was seized to elevate the Empire. Therefore, if a shift in Michael Višević’s policy had indeed occurred, the emperor-writer would likely have documented it. Accordingly, the possibility that the ruler of Zahumlje was a Bulgarian ally who attacked Byzantine territory in southern Italy should be rejected. The action in southern Italy should certainly be attributed to the Croatian king.

The campaign against Sipontum should certainly be placed in the context of the events in southern Italy at that time. Why would the Croatian king attack Byzantine territory? At the time of the attack on Sipontum, Byzantium was at war with Landulf, the ruler of Capua and Benevento, and Guaimar II, the prince of Salerno.¹⁷⁷ We can only speculate whether this was a plundering expedition by the Croatian king who wanted to exploit Byzantine problems in southern Italy or alternatively, it might shed light on the relationships between Croatia and the small Lombard states in Italy.

John the Deacon might provide information about Krešimir II who wrote that “Michael, duke of the Slavs,” captured Pietro, the son of the Venetian doge Orso II Participazio (912-932), while passing

¹⁹² Budak 2020, str. 263-276.

¹⁹³ Isto, str. 273.

¹⁹⁴ CD 1, str. 105-106; Šišić 1914a, str. 248-251; Klaić 1972a, str. 56.

¹⁹⁵ Budak 2020, str. 272.

¹⁹⁶ HS, str. 80-81.

¹⁹⁷ Budak 2020, str. 271.

¹⁹⁸ HS, str. 54-55.

¹⁷⁶ Idem, p. 87.

¹⁷⁷ Nikolić Jakus 2015, p. 569.

ciju da se podaci Ivana Đakona o „Mihaelu, knezu Slavena“, koji zarobljava sina mletačkog dužda, datiraju u 912./913., onda je njegov život bio prilično dugačak. No rani srednji vijek poznaje vladare koji su dugo vladali, a istaknuo bih nekolicinu: franački kralj, kasnije car Karlo Veliki (768. – 814.), bugarski vladar Mihael Boris (852. – 889.), bizantski car Bazilije II. (976. – 1025.), francuski kralj Robert II. Pobožni (996. – 1031.) i ugarski knez, poslije kralj Stjepan I. (997. – 1038.).

5.3. STJEPAN I. DRŽISLAV

Kao što je prije spomenuto, Držislav je na prijestolje zasjeo negdje o. 965., nakon smrti Mihaela Krešimira II. Iz Jelenina epitafa saznajemo da je Krešimir bio Držislavov otac jer ondje piše da je Jelena „žena kralja Mihaela i majka kralja Stjepana“.¹⁹⁹

Toma Arhidakon navodi da su iza Držislava svi njegovi nasljednici koristili titulu kraljeva Dalmacije i Hrvatske te da su im bizantski carevi slali oznake kraljevske vlasti uz dodjeljivanje naslova eparha i patricija.²⁰⁰ Taj nam podatak možda svjedoči da je Držislav želio regulirati odnose s Bizantskim Carstvom i formalizirati hrvatsku vlast nad dalmatinskim gradovima. Znamo da su i njegovi prethodnici nad njima imali vlast, no za takvo što nisu imali blagoslov carskoga dvora u Konstantinopolu. Držislav je očito iskoristio bizantsku zauzetost u ratu s Bugarskom te je postigao sporazum po kojemu je carski dvor Držislavu priznao titulu kralja Hrvatske i Dalmacije, a zauzvrat je Držislav prihvatio titulu eparha koja je u carskoj hijerarhiji označavala upravitelja pokrajine. Time je *de iure* hrvatski kralj bio podložan bizantskom caru, no *de facto* je on samostalno upravljao svojim kraljevstvom i pri tome mu je priznata vlast nad dalmatinskim gradovima. Na taj su način obje strane bile zadovoljene.

Uz to je Bizant Držislavu poslao znakove kraljevske vlasti, zbog čega je vrlo vjerojatno da je to razlog zašto je Držislav uzeo kršćansko ime Stjepan, koje znači „ovjenčani“. Taj događaj se zasigurno zbija prije 976. godine²⁰¹ jer se u Jeleninu epitafu navodi da je Jelena „majka kralja Stjepana“,²⁰² što znači da je Držislav sebi već nadjenao to ime.

through the “lands of the Croats” and handed him over to Simeon.¹⁷⁸ Historiography, as in the case of the attack on Sipontum, commonly identifies this Michael as Michael Višević. However, the question arises: what would the ruler of Zahumlje be doing on Croatian territory? While Croatian historiography usually explained this by claiming that Michael Višević was a vassal of the Croatian ruler, I believe it is possible that Michael Krešimir II is the actual figure referred to in this case. This incident, John the Deacon mentioned, is dated to 912 or 913, assuming that at that time, duke Tomislav was in power in Croatia.¹⁷⁹ It’s conceivable that Michael, referred to as a *dux*, was Tomislav’s co-ruler at that time. This would not be the first case in Croatia where a co-ruler appeared alongside the ruler. Namely, already in the 9th century, it was recorded that Domagoj was succeeded by his sons on the throne, whose names, however, are not known.¹⁸⁰ In the second half of the 10th century, Držislav’s co-ruler was his son Svetoslav.¹⁸¹ In the 11th century, we have examples of Krešimir III and his co-ruler Gojslav¹⁸² and Peter Krešimir IV and Zvonimir.¹⁸³ This shows that there had been cases where brothers jointly inherited power, so it is possible that Krešimir II and Tomislav were co-rulers before Krešimir ascended the throne alone. I consider it more likely that a high-ranking Croatian official, rather than the ruler of a neighbouring country, captured the Venetian doge on Croatian territory. However, given the lack of concrete sources, this interpretation remains speculative.

If the beginning of Krešimir II’s reign is dated to 926, then some significant events, traditionally associated with Tomislav’s rule, would actually fall within the era of Michael Krešimir II. The first notable event was the triumph over the Bulgarians, led by their military leader Alogobotur, in 926. The

¹⁷⁸ *Qui dum Chroatorum fines rediens transire vellet, a Michaele Sclavorum duce fraude deceptus, omnibusque bonis privatus atque Vulgarico regi, Simeoni nomine, exilii pena transmissus est.* (John the Deacon, pp. 150.)

¹⁷⁹ Tomislav is first mentioned in 914, but it is usually assumed that he ascended to the throne a few years earlier.

¹⁸⁰ John the Deacon, p. 140; Rački 1877, p. 373; Klaić 1972a, p. 26.

¹⁸¹ Šišić 1914a, p. 126; Klaić 1972a, p. 47; Delonga 1996, p. 108.

¹⁸² Birin 2015, pp. 58-59.

¹⁸³ Rački 1877, pp. 80; 95; Klaić 1972a, p. 66.

¹⁹⁹ ... *Helena famosa que fuit ux[o]r Mihaeli regi mater[que] Stephani r[egis]...* (Delonga 1996, 131; 134).

²⁰⁰ HS, str. 54-55.

²⁰¹ O tome više u: Budak 2018, str. 225-226.

²⁰² Delonga 1996, str. 131; 134.

Čini se da je Držislav za svoga života imenovao svoga suvladara i nasljednika. O tome svjedoči natpis s pluteja oltarne pregrade u Kapitulu kod Knina. Natpis glasi: [...Svetos]CLV DVX HROATOR[um] IN TE[m]PVS DIRZISCLV DVCE[m] MAGNV[m].²⁰³

Iz natpisa se svakako može zaključiti da je Držislav imenovao svoga najstarijeg sina Svetoslava za suvladara te je time želio riješiti pitanje nasljeđivanja prijestolja nakon svoje smrti. Izvori nam ne govore kada je Držislav umro, no pretpostavlja se da je to bilo o. 995., što zaključujemo na temelju kasnijih događaja (Samuilov pohod na Dalmaciju te rat između Svetoslava i njegove braće).

6. ZAKLJUČAK

Unatoč uvriježenu mišljenju u historiografiji da je pitanje kronologije hrvatskih vladara u 9. i 10. stoljeću riješeno Šišićevim člankom iz 1914., smatram da je njegova predložena kronologija nastala na krivim pretpostavkama (krivo datiranje podataka iz 31. poglavlja *De administrando imperio* te nepoznavanje isprave Krešimira II. datirane u 950.).

Kronologiju započinjem knezom Mislavom zato što je on prvi vladar za kojeg postoji više-manje historiografski konsenzus da je bio hrvatski vladar. On se jedino spominje u kontekstu događaja iz 839. pa je jako teško odrediti početak njegove vladavine, no možda možemo povezati dolazak Mislava na prijestolje s političkim promjenama izazvanim raspadom Furlanske markgrofovije.

Mislava je na prijestolju naslijedio knez Trpimir o. 840. godine. Iako je tradicionalna historiografija smještala početak njegove vladavine oko 845., smatram da argumente za raniji početak Trpimirove vladavine daje drugačija datacija Trpimirove darovnice koju je predložio Lujo Margetić (i dodatno argumentirala Mirjana Matijević Sokol). Margetić je uočio probleme u dataciji koju je predložio Franjo Rački i naglasio da je Rački ignorirao spomen Lotara kao vladara Italije. Upravo na temelju spomena Lotara, koji je Italijom vladao od 840. do 844., Margetić je datirao prije spomenutu darovnicu u 840. (Matijević Sokol je datira u 841.). Margetićeve argumente smatram prilično uvjerljivima pa zato mislim da je Trpimirova vladavina započela 840. godine. Uz Trpimirovu vladavinu vezemo borbu s „narodom Grka“ te boravak benediktinca

other one was the Church Council of Split in 928, during which the issue of primacy over the new ecclesiastical province spanning Croatia and Dalmatia was finally resolved, and the Diocese of Nin was abolished.¹⁸⁴ Krešimir's name is not explicitly mentioned, instead the term *Chroatorum princeps* is used.¹⁸⁵ However, given the year of the council, it is reasonable to attribute it to Krešimir II.

Intriguingly, said document associates Krešimir with the title “king of the Croats and Dalmatians” (*Croathorum atque Dalmatinorum rex*).¹⁸⁶ Due to doubts about the authenticity of the document, it remains questionable whether he truly held this title. However, we can reasonably assert that Krešimir continued the policy towards Dalmatian cities initiated by Tomislav. Evidence of Croatian rule over Dalmatian cities is found in Peter Krešimir's IV deed of donation for Diklo, which states that Krešimir II granted land in Diklo to the monastery of St. Chrysogonus in Zadar, which was part of the urban territory of Zadar.¹⁸⁷ This act implies Krešimir's authority over Dalmatian cities, as it seems unlikely for a Croatian ruler to donate land belonging to these cities without having control over them.¹⁸⁸

A Krešimir is mentioned in the *Kingdom of the Slavs*, who waged war alongside his uncle and destroyed Uskoplje, Luka and Pleva. After the Bosnian ban fled from him to Hungary, “Krešimir took over entire Bosnia and ruled over it. And when the father of his mother died, he ruled over White Croatia.”¹⁸⁹ Since the next piece of information in the *Kingdom of the Slavs* mentions “and in that time, the Bulgarian emperor named Peter died”¹⁹⁰, the timing of the conquest of Bosnia in this work indeed corresponds to the rule of Michael Krešimir II. While the *Kingdom of the Slavs* is an extremely unreliable source for the Early Middle Ages, the information cannot be considered as evidence of Krešimir's conquest of Bosnia, but rather used as evidence that there were some memories of him in the subsequent centuries.

¹⁸⁴ Rački 1877, pp. 194-195.; HSM, p. 104; Šišić 1914a, pp. 221-223; CD 1, pp. 36-38; Klaić 1972a, pp. 35-36.

¹⁸⁵ Rački 1877, p. 195; Klaić 1972a, p. 36.

¹⁸⁶ CD 1, p. 40.

¹⁸⁷ CD 1, pp. 44; 105-106; Šišić 1914a, pp. 248-251; Klaić 1972a, p. 56.

¹⁸⁸ Budak 2018, pp. 224-225.

¹⁸⁹ LjPD, p. 73.

¹⁹⁰ Idem, p. 73.

²⁰³ Isto, 108; Šišić 1914a, str. 126; Klaić 1972a, str. 47.

Gottschalka na njegovu dvoru oko 846. ili 847. godine.

Poglavlje 31. djela *De administrando imperio* navodi tri hrvatska vladara – Trpimira, Krešimira i Miroslava, a u historiografiji se u prošlosti raspravljalo pripadaju li 9. ili 10. stoljeću, no Šišićeva smještanje tih vladara u 10. stoljeće uz priloženu argumentaciju naišlo je na odobravanje hrvatske historiografije i do danas se Šišićeva kronologija smatra relevantnom. Ipak, smatram da se navedena tri vladara ipak trebaju smjestiti u 9. stoljeće. S obzirom na zaključak skupine autora u komentarijima na *DAI* – da se podaci u poglavlju trebaju promatrati kronološki, na takav način treba pristupiti i 31. poglavlju. Povijesna osoba koja se spominje u navedenom poglavlju, a nesumnjivo pripada 9. stoljeću, jest bugarski vladar Mihael Boris. U poglavlju se spominje rat Hrvata i Bugara u njegovo vrijeme. Nadalje prije toga rata spominje se misija franačkoga opata Martina u doba Trpimira. Iz drugih povijesnih izvora znamo da je Trpimir vladao u godinama prije dolaska Mihaela Borisa na vlast. Također srpski povjesničar Komatina smatra da se misija opata Martina puno bolje uklapa u ambijent 9. nego 10. stoljeća. Shodno tomu Trpimira koji se spominje u 31. poglavlju treba izjednačiti s hrvatskim knezom Trpimirom koji je nama poznat iz drugih izvora.

Smatram da se i Krešimira i Miroslava također treba staviti u 9. stoljeće, a to odaje sam autor poglavlja kada navodi da je Trpimir, čija se vladavina spominje prije rata Hrvata i Bugara u doba Mihaela Borisa, Krešimirov otac, a Miroslav Krešimirov sin. Iako je Vjekoslav Klaić svojedobno iznio tezu da se ovdje zapravo radi o dva Krešimira, Milenko Lončar u svojoj je doktorskoj disertaciji jasno naglasio kako autor poglavlja ničim ne odaje da se ovdje radi o dva Krešimira te da se shodno tomu ovdje radi o istoj osobi. Osim toga spominjanje sukoba unutar Hrvatske sasvim odgovara okolnostima u kojima se Hrvatska nalazila u 9. stoljeću jer znamo da su tada na sceni stalne borbe za prijestolje, od vladavine Domagoja pa zapravo sve do vladavine Mutimira.

Kao još jedan argument da se podaci iz 31. poglavlja odnose na 9. stoljeće, možemo uzeti i činjenicu da se u njemu ne spominje pobjeda Hrvata nad Bugarima koje je predvodio Alogobotur, a iz 32. poglavlja jasno je da su na carskome dvoru bili upoznati s tim događajem. Smatram da se izostavljanje tog podatka treba pripisati tome što carski dvor nije

An interesting fact is also that Krešimir II, together with his wife Jelena, was actively shaping his image during his reign, symbolically portraying it as the beginning of a new dynasty and era, regardless of his familial relationship with previous rulers (in the document from 950, Krešimir stated that he sits on the “paternal throne”).¹⁹¹ Neven Budak¹⁹² has written in more detail about this, suggesting that Queen Jelena built a new royal mausoleum on Otok near Solin as a symbol of the new beginning. According to his opinion, the symbolism in this act was evident; the mausoleum was located near the ruins of ancient Salona and thus its numerous Christian martyrs, but also near Split, the seat of the archdiocese that invoked the tradition of Salona and the centre of the ecclesiastical province.¹⁹³ In addition to this interpretation, one could add that this action potentially also indicated closer ties between the Croatian ruler and Dalmatian cities.

Peter Krešimir IV explicitly mentioned finding information for his deed of donation for Diklo in the *Gesta* of Krešimir II.¹⁹⁴ Although it's unclear if the *Gesta* was written during or after Krešimir's rule, it is clearly a testimony of his significance in early medieval Croatia. Peter Krešimir IV's also named all his ancestors in the deed, and the genealogy begins precisely with Michael Krešimir II, which is certainly indicative.¹⁹⁵ Furthermore, the memory of him was not limited to the Early Middle Ages but continued into the High Middle Ages, as evidenced by Thomas the Archdeacon, who referred to Krešimir as *magnificus uir Cresimirus* in his work from the 13th century.¹⁹⁶

An intriguing proposition by Budak suggests that Krešimir adopted the Christian name Michael, identifying himself with the archangel warrior who defeated the dragon, a symbol of evil. The author connected this with the victory in the civil war against Miroslav,¹⁹⁷ using the well-known chronology of Šišić. Since it is clearly emphasized in this work that Miroslav ruled in the 9th century, it may be thought that Krešimir II took the Christian name Michael after the victory over the Bulgarians, who

¹⁹¹ CD 1, p. 40.

¹⁹² Budak 2020, pp. 263-276.

¹⁹³ Idem, p. 273.

¹⁹⁴ CD 1, pp. 105-106; Šišić 1914a, pp. 248-251; Klaić 1972a, p. 56.

¹⁹⁵ Budak 2020, p. 272.

¹⁹⁶ HS, pp. 80-81.

¹⁹⁷ Budak 2020, p. 271.

imao iscrpne informacije o Hrvatskoj u 10. stoljeću pa su stoga podaci o Hrvatskoj u 31. poglavlju ograničeni samo na 9. stoljeće. Uostalom, Hrvatska nije imala nikakve bliske veze s Bizantom gotovo čitavo stoljeće, od svrgavanja kneza Zdeslava pa do vladavine kralja Držislava. Potrebno je spomenuti i zaključak Johna Bagnella Buryja, koji je naveo da je informacija o misiji opata Martina morala doći od nekog hrvatskog izvora, a ne treba isključiti da je taj izvor mogao biti Zdeslav.

Možemo pretpostaviti da je veliki utjecaj na oblikovanje 31. poglavlja imao Zdeslavov boravak u Konstantinopolu, tijekom kojega su se na carsko-me dvoru bilježile informacije koje im je Zdeslav davao o Hrvatskoj, a te je informacije kasnije mogao upotrijebiti Konstantin Porfirogenet i/ili drugi koji su sudjelovali u pisanju *De administrando imperio*. U 31. poglavlju možda možemo iščitati i elemente tih Zdeslavovih informacija koje bi on zasigurno prikazao u obliku koji je njemu odgovarao. Tako je za vrijeme vladavine pripadnika Zdeslavove obitelji sve bilo „idealno“ (misija opata Martina, pobjeda nad Bugarima, velika vojna moć), a nakon što je njegova obitelj svrgnuta, više ništa nije bilo dobro (pad vojne moći).

Kao još jedan argument za smještanje Krešimira i Miroslava u 9. stoljeće uzeo bih spomen Pribine u Čedadskom evangelijaru. Iz 31. poglavlja znamo da je ban Pribina ubio Miroslava, no taj Pribina obično se povezivao s banom iz 10. stoljeća koji se spominje u Darovnici za Diklo Petra Krešimira IV., ali nitko do sada nije pomislio da se ovdje možda radi o Pribini koji je spomenut u Čedadskom evangelijaru. On se spominje na petome listu te su uz njegovo ime navedena i imena Trpimira te Petra. Ako uzmemo u obzir da je na istome listu, ali zasebno, napisano *domno Tripimiro* te na dvadeset i trećem listu nalazimo spomen Petra, sina gospodina Trpimira, onda smatram da se ovdje može s određenom sigurnošću reći da su Trpimir i Petar, zapisani uz Pribinino ime, uistinu hrvatski knez Trpimir i njegov sin Petar, što bi značilo da je Pribina, koji se spominje u 31. poglavlju *De administrando imperio*, bio zapravo hrvatski dužnosnik iz 9. stoljeća.

Poglavlje 31. odaje dojam da je središnja ličnost toga poglavlja Krešimir. Čini se da se događaji izneseni ondje mogu podijeliti na razdoblje prije Krešimira, tj. „u dneve Trpimira arhonta, oca arhonta Krešimira“, na razdoblje Krešimirove vladavine (iako se izrijeком ne navodi da su se neki

were undoubtedly a “symbol of evil” for much of south-eastern Europe, and possibly for the Croats.

Thomas the Archdeacon mentioned Držislav as a ruler in 970,¹⁹⁸ implying that Krešimir died around 965. With regard to the fact that he might have ruled from 926 to around 965, one could say that Krešimir had a fairly long life. But if we also take into account the interpretation that the information from John the Deacon about “Michael, duke of the Slavs,” who captured the son of the Venetian doge, dates back to 912/913, one can say that he really led a quite long life. In the context of the Early Middle Ages, there were also others who ruled for a long period of time, such as: the Frankish king, later Emperor Charlemagne (768 - 814), Bulgarian ruler Michael Boris (852 - 889), Byzantine Emperor Basil II (976 - 1025), French king Robert II the Pious (996 - 1031), and the Hungarian prince, later King Stephen I (997 - 1038).

5.3. STEPHEN I DRŽISLAV

As previously noted, Držislav ascended the throne around 965, following the death of Michael Krešimir II. Information gleaned from Jelena’s epitaph reveals Krešimir as Držislav’s father, explicitly stating Jelena as the “wife of King Michael and mother of King Stephen.”¹⁹⁹

Thomas the Archdeacon reported that all of Držislav’s successors adopted the titles of kings of Dalmatia and Croatia. Byzantine emperors, in a gesture of recognition, sent them symbols of royal authority and bestowed them the titles of eparch and patrician.²⁰⁰ This information suggests Držislav’s intent to adjust the relations with the Byzantine Empire and formalize Croatian dominance over Dalmatian cities. We know that his predecessors also wielded power over them, but they lacked the imperial court’s endorsement in Constantinople. Držislav evidently took advantage of Byzantine engagement in their war with Bulgaria and reached an agreement in which the imperial court recognized Držislav’s title as the king of Croatia and Dalmatia, and in return, Držislav embraced the title of eparch, signifying his role as the province’s administrator in the imperial hierarchy. This arrangement made

¹⁹⁸ HS, pp. 54-55.

¹⁹⁹ ... *Helena famosa que fui* t ux[o]r Mihaeli regi mater[que] Stephani r[egis]... (Delonga 1996, 131; 134.)

²⁰⁰ HS, pp. 54-55.

dogadaji dogodili za njegove vladavine) te na razdoblje nakon Krešimira za vrijeme kada je vladao „sin njegov Miroslav“. Uzevši u obzir podatak o ratu Hrvata i Bugara, koji se spominje u središnjemu dijelu poglavlja za koje smatram da se odnosi na razdoblje vladavine Krešimira te uzevši u obzir da se izrijekom spominje da se taj rat dogodio u vrijeme bugarskoga vladara Mihaela Borisa, smatram da je Trpimir umro oko 850., uoči početka vladavine Mihaela Borisa s kojim se borio Trpimirov nasljednik Krešimir. Također moramo uzeti u obzir i tezu Tibora Živkovića oko Krešimirova kršćanskoga imena. On je smatrao da je njegovo kršćansko ime bilo Petar, što je temeljio na podacima iz Čedadskog evangelijara, u kojemu se spominje Trpimirov sin Petar. Na tu bih tezu nadodao i činjenicu da je Trpimir bio blizak sa splitskom Crkvom, čiji je nadbiskup nosio ime Petar te ga Trpimir u svojoj darovnici naziva „ljubljenim kumom“. Stoga je lako moguće da je Krešimirovo kršćansko ime uistinu bilo Petar, a koje je dobio po splitskome nadbiskupu.

U 31. poglavlju nalazimo podatak da je Miroslav vladao četiri godine. Kao što je prije navedeno, vladare 31. poglavlja treba smještati u 9. stoljeće, a onda samim time moramo uzeti u obzir i druge izvore o hrvatskim vladarima iz tog vremena. Ako znamo da se Domagoj prvi put spominje oko 864. te tome dodamo podatak da je Miroslavova vladavina trajala četiri godine, smatram da se Miroslavova vladavina treba smjestiti između 860. i 864., što bi značilo da je Krešimir I. umro 860. godine.

Zahvaljujući postojećim izvorima, situacija na hrvatskome prijestolju između 864. i o. 895. prilično nam je jasna. Domagoj je vladao od 864. do oko 876. te su ga naslijedili njegovi sinovi koje je 878. svrgnuo Zdeslav. Njegova je vladavina bila vrlo kratka te je već iduće godine bio ubijen, a na prijestolje je zasjeo Branimir. Zadnji spomen Branimira vezan je uz 888., a prvi je spomen Mutimira iz 892., zbog čega ne možemo sa sigurnošću reći kada je Branimirova vladavina završila i je li prijenos vlasti bio miran, ali negdje o. 890. došlo je do uspona Mutimira na vlast.

Između spomena Mutimira 892. i Tomislava 914. uočavamo „prazninu“ od dvadeset i dvije godine, tijekom kojih nema nikakva spomena o događanjima u Hrvatskoj. Za Tomislava možemo pretpostaviti da je na prijestolje došao nešto prije 914., oko 910. Tradicionalna hrvatska historiografija je uz Tomislava vezala savezništvo s Bizantom i

the Croatian king *de jure* a subject to the Byzantine emperor, yet *de facto*, he autonomously governed his kingdom, while having his authority accepted over Dalmatian cities. The satisfaction of both parties was thus ensured.

Furthermore, Byzantium sent royal insignia to Držislav, likely explaining why Držislav adopted the Christian name Stephen, which means “crowned.” This event certainly occurred before 976²⁰¹ because Jelena’s epitaph mentions her as the “mother of King Stephen,”²⁰² indicating that Držislav had already taken on that name.

It appears that Držislav, during his lifetime, designated a co-ruler and successor. This is evident from an inscription on the pluteus of the altar screen in Kapitul near Knin, which reads: [...Svetos]CLV DVX HROATOR[um] IN TE[m]PVS DIRZISCLV DVCE[m] MAGN[um].²⁰³

The inscription clearly indicates that Držislav appointed his eldest son Svetoslav as co-ruler, intending to resolve the issue of the throne’s succession after his death. Although the exact date of Držislav’s death is not known from sources, it is not assumed to be around 995, which we conclude based on later events (Samuel’s campaign in Dalmatia and the war between Svetoslav and his brothers).

6. CONCLUSION

Despite the prevailing opinion in historiography that the issue of the chronology of Croatian rulers in the 9th and 10th centuries was resolved by Šišić’s work from 1914, I believe that his proposed chronology was based on incorrect assumptions (incorrect dating of data from Chapter 31 of *De Administrando Imperio* and ignorance of the document of Krešimir II dated to 950).

I start the chronology with Duke Mislav as he was the first ruler for whom there is a more or less historiographic consensus that he was a Croatian ruler. He is only mentioned in the context of events from 839, making it challenging to determine the beginning of his rule. However, we may connect Mislav’s accession to the throne with the political changes that were caused by the collapse of the March of Friuli.

²⁰¹ For more information, see: Budak 2018, pp. 225-226.

²⁰² Delonga 1996, pp. 131; 134.

²⁰³ Idem, 108; Šišić 1914a, p. 126; Klaić 1972a, p. 47.

pobjedu nad Alogoboturom, no smatram da to nije bilo tako.

O eventualnome savezništvu Hrvatske i Bizanta nema nikakvih podataka u dostupnim izvorima. Tomislavova vlast nad dalmatinskim gradovima, za koju pretpostavljamo da je postojala na temelju njegova sudjelovanja na splitskim crkvenim saborima, mogla je biti rezultat samoinicijativne politike dalmatinskih gradova, koju su oni znali iskazivati u 9. stoljeću kada je carska vlast bila slabija. Okolnosti u kojima se nalazio Bizant početkom 10. stoljeća (rat s Bugarima, unutarnje borbe za prijestolje, arapske pljačke) upravo nam ukazuju na mogućnost da su dalmatinski gradovi opet djelovali samostalno i stavili se pod zaštitu hrvatskog vladara.

Posljednji spomen Tomislava zabilježen je 925., kad se u pismu pape Ivana X. spominje kao „kralj Hrvata“, te na splitskim crkvenim saborima, gdje je sudjelovao na stvaranju jedinstvene crkvene pokrajine za Hrvatsku i Dalmaciju. Tomislav je umro 926., a to temeljim na ispravi Krešimira II. iz 950. godine.

Prije navedena isprava govori da je Krešimir II. godine 950. bio u „dvadeset i četvrtoj godini“ svoje vladavine, što bi značilo da je ona započela 926. godine. Pitanjem autentičnosti te isprave bave se samo tri rada – dva Stipišićeva i jedan Antoljakov, no smatram da je najrelevantniji prvi Stipišićev rad o toj temi, onaj iz 1969. godine. Antoljakov i drugi Stipišićev rad obiluju međusobnim sukobima i optužbama te je tu, ipak, znanost u drugome planu. U svome prvom radu Stipišić je iznio argumente i za i protiv autentičnosti isprave.

Za pitanje kronologije svakako je najvažniji datum isprave. Mišljenja sam da se on može smatrati pouzdanim jer ne vidim razlog da neki eventualni falsifikator, koji je živio u razvijenome srednjem vijeku, precizira početak vladavine Krešimira II. („u dvadeset i četvrtoj godini svoga kraljevanja“), a da prethodno nije bio upoznat s tim podatkom. Smatram da se i iz drugih dostupnih povijesnih izvora može vidjeti da je datum isprave točan.

Kao dodatni argument u prilog tezi da početak Krešimirove vladavine treba smjestiti u 926. godinu su *Annales Barenses* i *Annales Lupi Protospatharii*. Navedena dva izvora spominju pohod nekog „Mihaela Slavena“, odnosno „Mihaela, kralja Slavena“ na Sipont. Historiografija obično u ovome Mihaelu vidi zahumskog kneza Mihaela Viševića. No zašto bi bizantski patricij i antipat napao bizantski posjed

Duke Trpimir succeeded Mislav around 840. Although traditional historiography placed the beginning of his rule around 845, I believe that a different dating of Trpimir’s deed of donation proposed by Lujo Margetić (and further argued by Mirjana Matijević Sokol) provides arguments for an earlier beginning of Trpimir’s reign. Margetić identified problems in the dating proposed by Franjo Rački and emphasized that Rački ignored the mention of Lothar as the ruler of Italy. Based on the mention of Lothar, who ruled Italy from 840 to 844, Margetić dated the aforementioned deed to 840 (Matijević Sokol dates it to 841). I find Margetić’s arguments quite convincing, so I believe that Trpimir’s rule began in 840. With the reign of Trpimir, we also associate the conflict with the “Greek people” and the presence of the Benedictine Gottschalk at his court around 846 or 847.

Chapter 31 of *De Administrando Imperio* introduces three Croatian rulers—Trpimir, Krešimir and Miroslav. Historiography debated in the past whether they belonged to the 9th or 10th century, but Šišić’s placement of these rulers in the 10th century, supported by his arguments, gained approval in Croatian historiography, and Šišić’s chronology is still considered relevant today. However, I believe that these three rulers should be placed in the 9th century. Considering the conclusion of the group of authors in their comments on *DAI*—that the data in the chapter should be considered chronologically, the same approach should be taken to Chapter 31. The historical figure mentioned in that chapter, undoubtedly belonging to the 9th century, is the Bulgarian ruler Michael Boris. The chapter mentions the war between Croats and Bulgarians in his time. Before said war, the mission of the Frankish abbot Martin is mentioned during Trpimir’s reign. From other historical sources, we know that Trpimir ruled in the years before Michael Boris came to power. Furthermore, the Serbian historian Komatina believes that the mission of abbot Martin fits much better into the circumstances of the 9th century than the 10th century. Accordingly, Trpimir mentioned in Chapter 31 should be equated with the Croatian Duke Trpimir known from other sources.

I believe that both Krešimir and Miroslav should be placed in the 9th century, a deduction supported by the chapter’s author himself. The author notes that Trpimir, whose reign predates the conflict between the Croats and Bulgarians during the era of

u južnoj Italiji? Također smatram da Zahumlje nije imalo mornaričke kapacitete za takav pohod, dok je hrvatski kralj svakako mogao napasti južnoitalski bizantski posjed.

O Mihaelu Krešimiru postoji moguće svjedočanstvo i u *Kronici* Ivana Đakona, koji spominje da je „Mihael, knez Slavena“ zarobio sina mletačkog dužda i predao ga bugarskome vladaru Simeonu. Taj se događaj smješta u 912./913. godinu, kada je hrvatski vladar bio Tomislav, što navodi na razmišljanje da je Mihael tada bio njegov suvladar, a vrlo je čest slučaj u hrvatskom ranosrednjovjekovlju da uz vladare postoje i suvladari. Kao i u slučaju napada na Sipont i ovdje historiografija smatra da se radi o Mihaelu Viševiću. Ne mislim da takvu interpretaciju treba u potpunosti odbaciti, ali bih ostavio mogućnost da se u ovome slučaju ne radi o Viševiću, nego o Mihaelu Krešimiru zato što je u izvoru navedeno da se taj događaj zbio „u krajevima Hrvata“. Zbog nedostatka povijesnih izvora ovaj događaj ostaje podložan raznim interpretacijama.

U skladu s novim tumačenjem događaji koji su se obično pripisivali Tomislavu (sudjelovanje na Splitskom crkvenom saboru 928. i pobjeda nad Bugarima) trebaju se pripisati kralju Mihaelu Krešimiru II. Krešimirova vladavina završila je negdje oko 965., što zaključujemo na temelju toga što je kralj Držislav prvi put spomenut 970. godine.

Držislav je bio prvi hrvatski vladar za kojeg znamo da je okrunjen jer je dobio znakove kraljevske vlasti iz Bizanta te je shodno tomu sebi nadjenao i ime Stjepan. Držislavova vladavina završila je oko 995., što temeljimo na spoznaji da je na samome kraju 10. stoljeća uslijedio rat između Držislavovih sinova.

U konačnici, moja predložena kronologija hrvatskih vladara u 9. i 10. stoljeću je sljedeća:

- Mislav (o. 830. – 840.)
- Trpimir (o. 840. – o. 850.)
- Petar Krešimir I. (o. 850. – 860.)
- Miroslav (860. – 864.)
- Domagoj (864. – 876.)
- Domagojevi sinovi (876. – 878.)
- Zdeslav (878. – 879.)
- Branimir (879. – o. 890.)
- Mutimir (o. 890. – o. 910.)
- Tomislav (o. 910. – 926.)
- Mihael Krešimir II. (926. – o. 965.)
- Stjepan I. Držislav (o. 965. – o. 995.)

Michael Boris, is Krešimir's father, and Miroslav is Krešimir's son. Although Vjekoslav Klaić once proposed the idea that there were actually two Krešimirs, Milenko Lončar, in his doctoral dissertation, emphasized that the chapter's author provided no indication that there were two Krešimirs; therefore, it is reasonable to assume that it refers to the same person. Additionally, the mention of conflicts within Croatia aligns with the circumstances of the 9th century, as constant struggles for the throne were ongoing at that time, i.e. from Domagoj's rule all the way to Mutimir's reign.

Another argument for dating the information in Chapter 31 to the 9th century could also be the omission of the mention of the victory of the Croats over the Bulgarians led by Alogobotur. A fact not mentioned in Chapter 31 but known to the imperial court, as evident from Chapter 32. I believe that excluding this information could be attributed to the imperial court's lack of comprehensive information about Croatia in the 10th century, limiting the information provided in Chapter 31 to the 9th century. Moreover, Croatia had almost no close ties with Byzantium for nearly a century, from the overthrow of Duke Zdeslav to the rule of King Držislav. Worth mentioning is also John Bagnell Bury's conclusion that the information about the mission of abbot Martin must have come from a Croatian source, and it's plausible that Zdeslav could have been that source.

We can assume that Zdeslav's stay in Constantinople greatly influenced the creation of Chapter 31. During this time, the imperial court recorded information provided by Zdeslav about Croatia, which Constantin Porphyrogenitus and/or others involved in writing *De Administrando Imperio* could have used later. In Chapter 31, we might find elements of Zdeslav's information that he certainly would have presented in a way that suited him. Hence, during the rule of members of Zdeslav's family, everything was "ideal" (abbot Martin's mission, victory over the Bulgarians, great military power), but after his family was overthrown, nothing was good anymore (a decline in military power).

Another argument in favour of placing Krešimir and Miroslav in the 9th century derives from the mention of Pribina in the Gospel of Cividale. We know from Chapter 31 that Ban Pribina killed Miroslav, but usually this Pribina is associated with the 10th-century ban mentioned in the deed of donation for Diklo by Peter Krešimir IV. However, no one

has considered that this might be the same Pribina mentioned in the Gospel of Cividale. On the fifth folium, Pribina is mentioned along with the names Trpimir and Peter. Considering that *domno Tripimiro* is mentioned on the same folium, but in a different place, and so is Peter, the son of Trpimir on the twenty-third folium, it seems reasonably certain that Trpimir and Peter, written next to Pribina's name, are indeed the Croatian Duke Trpimir and his son Peter. This would imply that the Pribina mentioned in Chapter 31 of *De Administrando Imperio* was actually a Croatian official from the 9th century.

Chapter 31 conveys the impression that Krešimir is the central figure of this chapter. The events described therein can be categorized into three periods: before Krešimir, i.e. "in the days of Archon Terpimer, the father of Archon Krasimeris", the era of Krešimir's rule (though the text doesn't explicitly state that certain events occurred during his reign), and the post-Krešimir period, during the rule of "his son Miroslav". Given the mention of the war between Croats and Bulgarians, a topic covered in the central part of the chapter and I believe to pertain to Krešimir's reign, it's plausible that Trpimir died around 850, prior to the beginning of Michael Boris's rule, against whom Trpimir's successor, Krešimir, waged war. Notably, Tibor Živković's thesis on Krešimir's Christian name as Peter should also be taken into consideration. He argued that his Christian name was Peter, based on information from the Gospel of Cividale, which mentions Trpimir's son Peter. Another fact supporting the thesis is the connection between Trpimir and the church of Split, the archbishop of which bore the name Peter, and Trpimir referred to him as the "beloved godfather." Therefore, it is quite possible that Krešimir's Christian name was indeed Peter, and he was named after the archbishop of Split.

In Chapter 31, there is a statement that Miroslav ruled for four years. As mentioned earlier, the rulers of Chapter 31 should be placed in the 9th century, and we must consider other sources on Croatian rulers from that time. If we know that Domagoj is first mentioned around 864, and Miroslav's rule lasted four years, it implies Miroslav's reign spanned between 860 and 864, signifying Krešimir I's death in 860.

Thanks to existing sources, the situation on the Croatian throne between 864 and around 895 is relatively clear. Domagoj's rule lasted from 864 to

around 876 and he was succeeded by his sons. They were overthrown by Zdeslav in 878, whose reign was very brief due to the fact that he was killed the following year, with Branimir taking the throne. The last mention of Branimir is linked to 888, and the first mention of Mutimir is in 892. Therefore, we cannot precisely determine when Branimir's rule ended and if it was a peaceful transition of power, but around 890, Mutimir rose to power.

Between the mention of Mutimir in 892 and Tomislav in 914, there exists a "gap" of twenty-two years without any historical accounts regarding Croatia. In terms of Tomislav, we assume his ascension to the throne slightly before 914, around 910. Traditional Croatian historiography associated Tomislav with an alliance with Byzantium and the victory over Alogobotur, but I believe that this was not the case.

There are no available historical sources that confirm a possible alliance between Croatia and Byzantium. Tomislav's control over Dalmatian cities, inferred from his participation in the Church Councils of Split, might have been the result of the independent policy of those cities, which they tended to pursue in the 9th century when imperial authority was weaker. The circumstances of the Byzantine Empire in the early 10th century (war with the Bulgarians, internal struggles for the throne, Arab raids) suggest that the Dalmatian cities once again acted autonomously, seeking protection from the Croatian ruler.

The last mention of Tomislav was recorded in 925, when he was mentioned in the letter of Pope John X as the "King of the Croats" and at the Church Councils of Split, where he participated in the establishment of a united ecclesiastical province for Croatia and Dalmatia. Tomislav died in 926, which I base on a document from Krešimir II in 950.

This document states that Krešimir II was 950 in the "in the twenty-fourth year" of his reign, suggesting that his rule began in 926. Regarding the authenticity of this document, there are only three papers dealing with this subject- two by Stipišić and one by Antoljak. I consider Stipišić's first paper from 1969 the most relevant one on this topic. While Antoljak's study and the second one from Stipišić are filled with conflicts and accusations and the scientific work only comes second therein, Stipišić's first work presents arguments both for and against the authenticity of the document.

In terms of chronology, the most important indicator is clearly the date of this document, which I consider a reliable data, as it seems unlikely that a possible falsifier, who lived in the High Middle Ages, would specify the beginning of Krešimir II's rule ("in the twenty-fourth year of his reign") without previously being aware of this information. I believe that other available historical sources also clearly show that the date of the document is correct.

Another argument corroborating the thesis of Krešimir's beginning of rule in 926 are *Annales Baresenses* and *Annales Lupi Protospatharii*, which mention the military campaign of "Michael, the Slav" or "Michael, king of the Slavs" against Sipontum. Historiography usually identifies this Michael with Duke Mihael Višević of Zahumlje, but why would a Byzantine antihypathos and patrician attack a Byzantine estate in southern Italy? I also believe that Zahumlje had no navy capable to carry out such a campaign, while the Croatian king on the other hand could have indeed carried out such an attack on Byzantine estates in southern Italy.

A possible testimony of Michael Krešimir appears in the Chronicle of John the Deacon, where it says that "Michael, duke of the Slavs" captured the son of the Venetian doge and handed him over to the Bulgarian ruler Simeon. This event is dated to 912/913, when Tomislav was the Croatian ruler, suggesting that Michael was his co-ruler, a common occurrence in early medieval Croatia. Like the attack on Sipontum, historiography generally attributes this event also to Michael Višević. I don't think this interpretation should be completely dismissed, but I would leave open the possibility that in this case, it was not Višević but Michael Krešimir, especially since the source mentions that the event occurred "in the lands of the Croats." Due to the lack of historical sources, this event remains open to various interpretations.

According to this new interpretation, events typically attributed to Tomislav (participation in the Council of Split in 928 and victory over the Bulgarians), should be associated with King Michael Krešimir II. Krešimir's rule ended around 965, as inferred from the first mention of King Držislav in 970.

Držislav was the first Croatian ruler known to have been crowned, because he received the royal insignia from Byzantium and hence took the name

Stephen accordingly. Držislav's rule ended around 995, which we base on the knowledge that there was a war between Držislav's sons at the end of the 10th century.

In conclusion, my proposed chronology of Croatian rulers in the 9th and 10th centuries is as follows:

- Mislav (around 830 – 840)
- Trpimir (around 840 – around 850)
- Peter Krešimir I (around 850 – 860)
- Miroslav (860 – 864)
- Domagoj (864 – 876)
- Domagoj's sons (876 – 878)
- Zdeslav (878 – 879)
- Branimir (879 – around 890)
- Mutimir (around 890 – around 910)
- Tomislav (around 910 – 926)
- Michael Krešimir II (926 – around 965)
- Stephen I. Držislav (around 965 – around 995)

Literatura / Bibliography

Ančić 1998

M. Ančić, Od karolinškog dužnosnika do hrvatskog vladara: Hrvati i karolinško carstvo u prvoj polovici IX. stoljeća, *Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru* 40, Zadar 1998, 27-41.

Ančić 2010

M. Ančić, Zamišljanje tradicije: Vrijeme i okolnosti postanka 30. glave djela *De administrando imperio*, *RADOVI – Zavod za hrvatsku povijest* 42, Zagreb 2010, 133-151.

Ančić 2011

M. Ančić, Ranosrednjovjekovni Neretvani ili Humljani: Tragom zabune koju je prouzročilo djelo *De administrando imperio*, *Hum i Hercegovina kroz povijest I*, Zagreb 2011, 217-278.

Antoljak 1972

S. Antoljak, Značaj i važnost isprave kralja Krešimira I za hrvatsku povijest X stoljeća, *Radovi. Razdio historije, arheologije i historije umjetnosti* 10 (4), Zadar 1972, 41-116.

Birin 2015

A. Birin, Pregled političke povijesti Hrvata u ranome srednjem vijeku, *Nova zrak u europskom svjetlu – hrvatske zemlje u ranome srednjem vijeku*, Zagreb 2015, 37-72.

Budak 1994

N. Budak, *Prva stoljeća Hrvatske*, Zagreb 1994.

Budak 2011

N. Budak, O novopronađenom natpisu s imenom kraljice Domaslave iz crkve sv. Vida na Klisu, *Historijski zbornik* 64 (2), Zagreb 2011, 317-320.

Budak 2014

N. Budak, Hrvatska i Bizant u 10. stoljeću, *Tabula: časopis Filozofskog Fakulteta, Sveučilište Jurja Dobrile u Puli* 12, Pula 2014, 51-63.

Budak 2018

N. Budak, *Hrvatska povijest od 550. do 1100.*, Zagreb 2018.

Budak 2020

N. Budak, Queen Helen nad King Michael: The Beginning of a New Dynasty?, *Aspice Hunc Opus Mirum: Zbornik povodom sedamdesetog rođendana Nikole Jakšića*, Zadar, Zagreb i Motovun 2020, 263-276.

Bury 1906

J.B. Bury, The treatise *De administrando imperio*, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 15 (2), Leipzig 1906, 517-577.

Bilogriović 2016

G. Bilogrivić, *Etnički identiteti u ranosrednjovjekovnoj Hrvatskoj – materijalni i pisani izvori*, doktorska disertacija, Zagreb 2016.

Curta 2006

F. Curta, *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Ages 500-1250*, Cambridge 2006.

Delonga 1996

V. Delonga, *Latinski epigrafički spomenici u ranosrednjovjekovnoj hrvatskoj*, Split 1996.

Dinić 1938

M. Dinić, O hrvatskom knezu Iljku, *Jugoslavenski historijski časopis* 4 (1-2), 1938, 77-86.

Džino 2010

D. Džino, *Becoming Slav, Becoming Croat: Identity Transformations in Post-Roman and Early Medieval Dalmatia*, Leiden i Boston 2010.

Džino 2021

D. Džino, *From Justinian to Branimir: the Making of the Middle Ages in Dalmatia*, New York 2021.

Goldstein 1985

I. Goldstein, O Tomislavu i njegovom vremenu, *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu* 18 (1), Zagreb 1985, 23-55.

Goldstein 1992

I. Goldstein, *Bizant na Jadranu. Bizant na Jadranu od Justinijana I. do Bazilija I.*, Zagreb 1992.

Goldstein 1995

I. Goldstein, *Hrvatski rani srednji vijek*, Zagreb 1995.

Gračanin 2011

H. Gračanin, *Južna Panonija u kasnoj antici i ranom srednjovjekovlju (od konca 4. do konca 11. stoljeća)*, Zagreb 2011.

Gračanin 2012

H. Gračanin, Guduskani – Gačani: promišljanja o etnonimu Gačani i horonimu Gacka u svjetlu ranosrednjovjekovnih narativa i suvremenih historiografskih tumačenja, *Gacka u srednjem vijeku. Zbornik radova*, Zagreb i Otočac 2012, 49-68.

Gračanin 2015

H. Gračanin, Bizant na hrvatskom prostoru u ranome srednjem vijeku, *Nova zraka u europskom svjetlu – hrvatske zemlje u ranome srednjem vijeku*, Zagreb 2015, 495-516.

Gunjača 1973

S. Gunjača, *Ispravci i dopune starijoj hrvatskoj historiji II*, Zagreb 1973.

Hauptmann 1925

Lj. Hauptmann, Koje su sile hrvatske povijesti odlučivale u vrijeme narodne dinastije, *Zbornik kralja Tomislava u spomen tisućgodišnjice Hrvatskog kraljevstva*, Zagreb 1925, 165-187.

Historija naroda Jugoslavije I.

Historija naroda Jugoslavije I, Zagreb 1953.

Novak 2001

G. Novak, *Prošlost Dalmacije*, Zagreb 2001

Ivanišević 2008

M. Ivanišević, Otok hrvatskog vladara, *Tusculum: časopis za solinske teme* 1 (1), Solin 2008., 109-124.

Jelić 1902

L. Jelić, Spomenici grada Nina, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 6 (1), Zagreb 1902, 103-116.

Jenkins et al. 1962

R.J.H. Jenkins et al., *Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De administrando imperio, II. Commentary*, London 1962.

Katić 1932

L. Katić, Saksonac Gottschalk na dvoru kneza Trpimira, *Bogoslovska smotra* 20 (4), Zagreb 1932, 403-432.

Klaić 1975

N. Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata u ranom srednjem vijeku*, Zagreb 1975.

Klaić 1925

V. Klaić, Prilozi hrvatskoj istoriji za narodnih vladara, *Zbornik kralja Tomislava u spomen tisućgodišnjice Hrvatskoga kraljevstva*, Zagreb, 1925.

Klaić 1972b

V. Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata: od najstarijih vremena do svršetka XIX. stoljeća. Knjiga prva*, Zagreb 1972.

Komatina 2010

P. Komatina, O hronologiji hrvatskih vladara u 31.

glavi spisa *De administrando imperio*, *Radovi: Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu* 42 (1), Zagreb 2010, 83-105.

Kumir 2017

M. Kumir, For the Salvation of One's Soul: Piety, Status and Memory in the Dalmatian Duchy (c. 812-850), *Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU* 23, Budimpešta 2017, 48-60.

Kukuljević Sakcinski 1872

I. Kukuljević Sakcinski, U koju godinu pada darovna listina Trpimirova, *Društvo za pověstnicu jugoslavensku* 11, Zagreb 1872, 207-216.

Lončar 2002

M. Lončar, *Filološka analiza Porfirogenetovih vijesti o Hrvatima*, doktorska disertacija, Zadar 2002.

Lončar 2010

M. Lončar, Vremenski nesklad između odlomaka 31. poglavlja *De administrando imperio*, *Radovi: Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu* 42 (1), Zagreb 2010, 107-116.

Manojlović 1902

G. Manojlović, Jadransko pomorje IX. stoljeća: u svjetlu istočno-rimske (bizantinske) povijesti. Dio prvi, *Rad Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 150, Zagreb 1902, 1-102.

Margetić 1993

L. Margetić, Bilješke uz Trpimirovu ispravu (CD I, 3-8), *Zbornik radova Pravnog fakulteta u Splitu* 30 (1), Split 1993, 47-51.

Margetić 1995

L. Margetić, *Historia Salonitana i Historia Salonitana Maior – neka pitanja*, *Historijski zbornik* 47/1994 (1), Zagreb 1995, 1-36.

Margetić 2000

L. Margetić, O nekim pitanjima starije hrvatske povijest, *Starine Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 61, Zagreb 2000, 1-20.

Matijević Sokol 2014

M. Matijević Sokol, *Studia Diplomatica: Rasprave i prinosi iz hrvatske diplomatike*, Zagreb 2014.

Nikolić Jakus 2015

Z. Nikolić Jakus, Južna Italija, *Nova zraka u europskom svjetlu – hrvatske zemlje u ranome srednjem vijeku*, Zagreb 2015, 563-580.

Ostrogorski 2002

G. Ostrogorski, *Povijest Bizanta 324 – 1453*, Zagreb 2002.

Perić 1984

O. Perić, Jezični slojevi Trpimirove isprave, *Živa antika* 34, Skopje 1984, 165-170.

Posavec 1996

V. Posavec, Krstionica kneza Višeslava i njegovo mjesto u kronologiji hrvatskih vladara, *Historijski zbornik XLIX*, Zagreb 1996, 17-32.

Rački 1998

F. Rački, Kada i kako se preobrazi hrvatska kneževina u kraljevinu, *Prvi hrvatski kralj Tomislav: ususret trećem tisućljeću*, Zagreb 1998, 39-50.

Rački 2009

F. Rački, *Nutarnje stanje Hrvatske prije XII. stoljeća*, Zagreb 2009.

Raukar 1997

T. Raukar, *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje: prostor, ljudi, ideje*, Zagreb 1997.

Shepard 1999

J. Shepard, Bulgaria: the other Balkan 'empire', *The New Cambridge Medieval History III, c. 900 – c. 1024*, Cambridge 1999, 567-585.

Shepard 2008

J. Shepard, Equilibrium to expansion (886-1025), *The Cambridge History of the Byzantine Empire c. 500 – 1492*, Cambridge 2008, 493-536.

Smičiklas 1882

T. Smičiklas, *Povijest hrvatska. Dio I, Od najstarijih vremena do godine 1526. / po vrelih napisao Tade Smičiklas*, Zagreb 1882.

Šišić 1914a

F. Šišić, *Priručnik izvora hrvatske historije*, Zagreb, 1914.

Stipišić 1969

J. Stipišić, Tragom jedne bilješke Ivana Luciusa o jednoj vladarskoj ispravi, *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 6, Zagreb 1969, 75-96.

Stipišić 1973

J. Stipišić, Metodologija jedne insinacije, *Dometi: kultura – književnost – društvena pitanja* 6 (7-8), Rijeka 1973, 89-97.

Šišić 1914b

F. Šišić, Genealoški prilozi o hrvatskoj narodnoj dinastiji, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 13 (1), Zagreb 1914, 1-93.

Šišić 1990

F. Šišić, *Povijest Hrvata u vrijeme narodnih vladara*, Zagreb 1990, pretisak Zagreb 1925.

Vedriš 2015

T. Vedriš, Balkanske sklavinije i Bugarska, *Nova zraka u europskom svjetlu – hrvatske zemlje u ranome srednjem vijeku*, Zagreb 2015, 581-608.

Živković 2008

T. Živković, *Forging Unity – The South Slavs Between East and West, 550-1150*, Beograd 2008.

Živković 2010

T. Živković, Constantine Porphyrogenitus' Source on the Earliest History of the Croats and Serbs, *RADOVI – Zavod za hrvatsku povijest* 42, Zagreb 2010, 117-131.

Živković 2012

T. Živković, *De Conversione Croatorum et Serborum: a lost source*, Beograd 2012.

