Starohrvatska prosvjeta
III. serija – svezak/vol. 52/2025.

UDK 94(497.5)"09"
Izvorni znanstveni rad / Original scientific paper

Luka Đaković
Prvča 120
Nova Gradiška, HR-35400
ldjakov99@gmail.com

Mihael Krešimir II. (926. – o. 965.) – novi pogled na njegovu vladavinu

*U ovom radu autor na temelju druk*čijeg tumačenja povijesnih izvora s*mješta vladavinu Mihaela Krešimira II. u razdoblje od 926. do oko 965. godine, što nužno dovodi do reinterpretacije važnih događaja za ranosrednjovjekovnu povijest istočnojadranske obale, poput napada na Sipont 926. godine i hrvatsko-bugarskog rata. Osim toga, autor se bavi odnosom kralja Mihaela Krešimira II. s dalmatinskim gradovima te pitanjem simboličke važnosti antičke Salone za hrvatskog kralja.*

Ključne riječi: *Mihael Krešimir II., kronologija, rat s Bugarima, napad na Sipont, dalmatinski gradovi.*

Michael Krešimir II (926 – c. 965)- a new perspective on his reign

In this paper, the author places the reign of Michael Krešimir II within the period from 926 to approximately 965 based on a reinterpretation of the historical sources. Such a chronological adjustment necessarily requires a renewed reading of events of considerable importance for the early medieval history of the eastern Adriatic coast, including the attack on Siponto in 926 and the Croatian–Bulgarian war. In addition, the author examines the relationship between King Michael Krešimir II and the Dalmatian cities and addresses the question of the symbolic importance of ancient Salona for the Croatian king.

Keywords: *Michael Krešimir II, chronology, war with the Bulgarians, attack on Siponto, Dalmatian cities*

1. UVOD

Godine 1914. hrvatski povjesničar Ferdo Šišić svojim je člankom *Genealoški prilozi o hrvatskoj narodnoj dinastiji*[1] predložio kronologiju hrvatskih vladara u ranom srednjem vijeku koja se, uz manje ispravke (knez Iljko[2] i kralj Slavac[3]), održala do danas. Može se reći da je njegova kronologija prihvaćena u historiografiji te na Šišićeva razmišljanja nailazimo, primjerice, u radovima Nade Klaić,[4] Nevena Budaka,[5] Ive Goldsteina,[6] Tomislava Raukara[7] i Ante Birina.[8]

Prema toj kronologiji, Mihael Krešimir II. bio je hrvatski kralj od 949. do oko 970. godine.[9] Na prijestolje je došao nakon građanskog rata između njega i kralja Miroslava, u kojem je na koncu pobijedio uz pomoć bana Pribine. Ovakvo tumačenje povijesnih događaja proizišlo je iz pretpostavke da se vladari Trpimir, Krešimir i Miroslav, koji se spominju u 31. poglavlju djela *De administrando imperio*, trebaju smjestiti u 10. stoljeće, u razdoblje između Tomislava i Mihaela Krešimira II.

Krešimirova vladavina opisivana je kao razdoblje konsolidacije nakon građanskog rata u kojem je kraljevstvo izgubilo političku i vojnu moć stečenu za vrijeme kralja Tomislava.[10] Njegovu vremenu na prijestolju nije pridavan veći značaj u historiografiji sve do Nevena Budaka, koji je iznio zanimljivu i dobro argumentiranu tezu da su Mihael Krešimir II. i njegova supruga Jelena predstavljali „novi početak“ te se složio s mišljenjima Klaića i Šišića da od sredine 10. stoljeća treba govoriti o dinastiji Krešimirovića.[11]

Kao što je prethodno spomenuto, važan čimbenik u proučavanju Krešimirove vladavine jest tumačenje 31. poglavlja *DAI*-ja. Tri vladara koje spominje Porfirogenet Gavro Manojlović[12] smjestio je u 9. stoljeće, no njegovo je mišljenje ostalo prilično izolirano. U novije je vrijeme Predrag Komatina smjestio Trpimirovu vladavinu u 9. stoljeće, a

1 Šišić 1914, str. 1–93.
2 Dinić 1938, str. 77–86.
3 Budak 2018, str. 285.
4 Klaić 1975, str. 221–334.
5 Budak 1994, str. 202–207; Budak 2020, str. 263–276.
6 Goldstein 1995, str. 197–203, 253–304, 332–343.
7 Raukar 1997, str. 26–42.
8 Birin 2015, str. 45–58.
9 Šišić 1914, str. 87.
10 Šišić 1990, str. 434–437.
11 Budak 2020, str. 266–275.
12 Manojlović 1902, str. 101–102.

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1914, the Croatian historian Ferdo Šišić, in his article *Genealoški prilozi o hrvatskoj narodnoj dinastiji*[1] (Genealogical contributions on the Croatian national dynasty) proposed a chronology of the Croatian rulers of the Early Middle Ages which, with only minor corrections (Duke Iljko[2] and King Slavac[3]), has remained largely accepted to the present day. His chronology may therefore be regarded as firmly established within Croatian historiography, and Šišić's interpretations can be encountered, for example, in the work of Nada Klaić[4], Neven Budak[5], Ivo Goldstein[6], Tomislav Raukar[7] and Ante Birin[8].

According to said chronology, Michael Krešimir II was a Croatian king from 949 to approximately 970.[9] He ascended the throne after a civil war with King Miroslav, in which he ultimately prevailed with the support of Ban Pribina. Such an interpretation derives from the assumption that the rulers Trpimir, Krešimir and Miroslav, mentioned in Chapter 31 of *De Administrando Imperio*, should be placed in the 10th century, between the reigns of Tomislav and Michael Krešimir II.

Krešimir's reign has typically been characterised as a period of consolidation following civil war, during which the kingdom lost much of the political and military power it had achieved under King Tomislav.[10] Consequently, his time on the throne attracted comparatively little attention in the historiography until Neven Budak put forward the intriguing and well-argued thesis that Michael Krešimir II and his wife Jelena represented a "new beginning," and concurred with Klaić and Šišić in holding that from the mid-10th century onwards one should speak of the Krešimirović dynasty.[11]

As noted above, a key factor in any study of Krešimir's reign is the interpretation of chapter 31

1 Šišić 1914, pp. 1–93.
2 Dinić 1938, pp. 77–86.
3 Budak 2018, p. 285.
4 Klaić 1975, pp. 221–334.
5 Budak 1994, pp. 202–207; Budak 2020, pp. 263–276.
6 Goldstein 1995, pp. 197–203; pp. 253–304; pp. 332–343.
7 Raukar 1997, pp. 26–42.
8 Birin 2015, pp. 45–58.
9 Šišić 1914, p. 87.
10 Šišić 1990, pp. 434–437.
11 Budak 2020, pp. 266–275.

vladavinu Krešimira i Miroslava na kraj 9. odnosno početak 10. stoljeća.[13] Tibor Živković, iako je prvotno i sam Porfirogenetove vladare smještao u 10. stoljeće,[14] prihvatio je Manojlovićevu tezu o Trpimiru, Krešimiru i Miroslavu kao vladarima iz 9. stoljeća.[15] Doprinos pitanju smještanja Porfirogenetovih vladara dao sam i sam u članku *Kronologija hrvatskih vladara u 9. i 10. stoljeću*, u kojem sam pokušao dokazati da se 31. poglavlje *DAI*-ja odnosi na 9., a ne na 10. stoljeće te da je Porfirogenetov Trpimir istovjetan Trpimiru kojeg poznajemo iz povijesnih izvora, dok su Krešimir i Miroslav bili njegovi nasljednici.[16]

Preispitivanje teze o Trpimiru, Krešimiru i Miroslavu kao hrvatskim vladarima iz 10. stoljeća nužno je dovelo i do nekih upitnika u vezi s vladavinom samog Mihaela Krešimira. Ako je Miroslav vladar 9. stoljeća, to znači da se sredinom 10. stoljeća nije dogodio nikakav građanski rat u Hrvatskoj, što nas dovodi do zaključka da je Krešimir II. morao učiniti nešto drugo kako bi „zaslužio" pridjev *magnificus*[17] (kako ga je nazvao Toma Arhiđakon).

Nadalje, smještanje navedenih vladara u 9. stoljeće dovodi do toga da između spomena kralja Tomislava kao sudionika splitskog crkvenog sabora 925.[18] i Tomina spomena Stjepana Držislava kao hrvatskog vladara 970. godine[19] postoji period od 45 godina u kojem znamo samo za Mihaela Krešimira II. kao hrvatskog vladara. Reinterpretacijom podataka iz *Annales Barenses* i *Annales Lupi Protospatharii*[20] o „Mihaelu, kralju Slavena", odnosno „Mihaelu Slavenu",[21] te prihvaćanjem datuma isprave Krešimira II.[22] smatram da se osnažuje argumentacija da je u razdoblju između Tomislava i Držislava jedini vladar bio Mihael Krešimir II. Također, ovakva interpretacija povijesnih izvora ide u prilog tezi da je Krešimirova vladavina zaista predstavljala „novi početak".

Prije nego što prijeđemo na samu materiju, valja razjasniti podatak o napadaču na grad Sipont 926. godine. U povijesnoj znanosti „Mihael, kralj

13 Komatina 2010, str. 85–105.
14 Živković 2008, str. 193, 199.
15 Živković 2012, bilj. 209 i 212.
16 Đaković 2023, str. 62–67.
17 HS, str. 80–81.
18 HSM, str. 98; CD 1, str. 32.
19 HS, str. 54–55.
20 Churchill 1979, str. 116, 126.
21 Đaković 2023, str. 82–84.
22 Đaković 2023, str. 80–82.

of the *DAI*. While Gavro Manojlović[12] placed the three rulers mentioned by Constantine Porphyrogenitus in the 9th century, his view remained largely isolated in scholarship. More recently, Predrag Komatina has dated the reign of Trpimir to the 9th century, while placing the reigns of Krešimir and Miroslav at the end of the 9th or the beginning of the 10th century respectively.[13] Tibor Živković, who had initially also placed Porphyrogenitus' rulers in the 10th century[14], eventually accepted Manojlović's thesis identifying Trpimir, Krešimir and Miroslav as 9th-century rulers.[15] In my own contribution to this debate with the scientific paper *Kronologija hrvatskih vladara u 9. i 10. stoljeću* (Chronology of Croatian rulers in the 9th and 10th centuries), I have argued that chapter 31 of *De administrando imperio* refers to the 9th rather than the 10th century, that Porphyrogenitus's Trpimir is identical with the Trpimir known from the historical sources, and that Krešimir and Miroslav were Trpimir's successors.[16]

The reconsideration of the thesis that Trpimir, Krešimir and Miroslav were 10th-century Croatian rulers has inevitably raised certain questions about the reign of Michael Krešimir himself. If Miroslav was a 9th-century ruler, this would imply that no civil war took place in Croatia during the mid-10th century, which leads to the conclusion that Krešimir II must have distinguished himself through other achievements in order to "earn" the epithet *magnificus*[17] (as Thomas the Archdeacon called him).

Furthermore, placing those rulers in the 9th century leaves us with a span of 45 years between Tomislav's recorded participation in the Church Council of Split in 925[18] and Thomas's mention of Stjepan Držislav as Croatian ruler in 970[19] in which Michael Krešimir II is the only securely identifiable Croatian ruler. Reinterpreting the information in the *Annales Barenses* and the *Annales Lupi Protospatharii*[20] regarding "Michael, king of the Slavs," or "Michael the Slav,"[21] and accepting the date of

12 Manojlović 1902, pp. 101–102.
13 Komatina 2010, pp. 85–105.
14 Živković 2008, pp. 193; 199.
15 Živković 2012, footnotes 209 and 212.
16 Đaković 2023, pp. 62–67.
17 HS, pp. 80–81.
18 HSM, p. 98; CD 1, p. 32.
19 HS, 54–55.
20 Churchill 1979, p. 116; p. 126.
21 Đaković 2023, pp. 82–84.

Slavena“ odnosno „Mihael Slaven“ identificiran je kao Mihael Višević, humski[23] knez iz prve polovine 10. stoljeća.[24] Međutim, treba istaknuti da samom pohodu nikada nije posvećivana veća pozornost u historiografiji te ostaje dojam da je povjesničarima pojava humskog kneza u južnoj Italiji bila toliko neobična i teško objašnjiva da se tim događajem jednostavno nisu podrobnije bavili. Pišući rad o kronologiji hrvatskih vladara u 9. i 10. stoljeću, zamijetio sam neke nelogičnosti vezane za navodni pohod humskog vladara na Sipont. U *De administrando imperio* Mihael Višević spominje se kao bizantski antipat i patricij,[25] stoga ostaje nejasno zašto bi bizantski saveznik napao bizantski posjed. W. J. Churchill smatra da je Sipont tada bio u posjedu Langobarda,[26] no čini se da je langobardski vojskovođa Landulf, nakon uspjeha u ratu s Bizantom početkom 920-ih godina, vratio posjede Bizantu kako bi zauzvrat dobio titulu stratega Langobardije ili je barem ostvario određeni utjecaj na području te teme, što bi značilo da je ipak morao napustiti dio osvojenih područja, a teško je zamisliti da bi Bizant važno strateško mjesto, kakvo je Sipont bio, prepustio Landulfu.[27] Za kraj, budući da ranosrednjovjekovni izvori ne nude zapis o mornaričkoj snazi Huma, ostaje pitanje kako je moguće da Mihael Višević samostalno izvede takav pohod.[28] Ako uzmemo sve navedeno u obzir, „Mihaela, kralja Slavena“ ne treba tražiti u Mihaelu Viševiću, nego u hrvatskom kralju Mihaelu Krešimiru II., a smatram da ćemo dodatne argumente za tu tvrdnju vidjeti i u daljnjem tekstu.

Sve u svemu, tri su ključne postavke koje smatram da su točne i bez kojih se ne može razumjeti ovaj rad, a to su: da se 31. poglavlje *DAI*-ja odnosi na 9. stoljeće, da je „Mihael, kralj Slavena“ odnosno „Mihael Slaven“ iz *Annales Barenses* i *Annales*

[23] U Đaković 2023 zemlju kojom je vladao Mihael Višević nazivao sam Zahumljem, a njega zahumskim vladarom, što je neispravno. On se sam nazivao vladarom Humljana, što vidimo iz pisma pape Ivana X., stoga je ispravno i njega i njegovu zemlju označavati onako kako su se sami nazivali (Hum i Humljani).

[24] Šišić 1990, str. 424 (u bilj. 37 donosi teoriju da je Mihael zapravo hrvatski kralj Tomislav navodeći da mu je to moglo biti kršćansko ime; takva je teorija odbačena jer nema nikakvu potporu u izvorima); Nikolić Jakus 2015a, str. 270–272.

[25] DAI, str. 89.

[26] Churchill 1979, str. 201–202.

[27] Nikola Mistik, str. 339–343, 345–347.

[28] Đaković 2023, str. 83.

the charter of Krešimir II[22], strengthens, in my view, the case that the only ruler in the interval between Tomislav and Držislav was Michael Krešimir II. Such an interpretation of historical sources also reinforces the thesis that Krešimir's reign genuinely constituted a "new beginning."

Before proceeding to the main analytical discussion, it is necessary to address the question of the attacker on the city of Siponto in 926. In historiography, "Michael, king of the Slavs" or "Michael the Slav" has commonly been identified with Duke Michael Višević, the ruler of Hum[23] in the first half of the 10th century.[24] It should be emphasized, however, that the campaign itself has never received substantial attention in historiography, leaving the impression that historians have regarded the appearance of the duke of Hum in southern Italy as so unusual and difficult to explain that the episode was largely passed over without closer examination. While preparing the study on the chronology of Croatian rulers in the 9th and 10th centuries, I noted several inconsistencies in the account of the alleged campaign of the ruler of Hum against Siponto. In *De administrando imperio*, Michael Višević is described as a Byzantine anthypathos and patrician[25], it therefore remains unclear why a Byzantine ally would attack a Byzantine possession. W. J. Churchill argued that Siponto was at that time under Lombard control[26], yet it appears that the Lombard commander Landulf, following his successes in the war against Byzantium during the early 920s, returned these territories to Byzantium in exchange for the title of strategos of Lombardy, or at least secured some form of influence in the area of the aforementioned theme. This would mean that he was obliged to relinquish part of the conquered territory,

[22] Đaković, pp. 80–82.

[23] In Đaković 2023, I referred to the land ruled by Michael Višević as Zahumlje, and to him as the ruler of Zahumlje, which is incorrect. He described himself as the ruler of the people of Hum, as is clear from the letter of Pope John X; it is therefore proper to refer to him and his land as they called themselves (Hum / Humljani).

[24] Šišić 1990, p. 424. (In footnote 37, Šišić advances the theory that Michael is in fact the Croatian king Tomislav, suggesting that this may have been his Christian name. The theory has been rejected, since it finds no support in the sources.); Nikolić Jakus 2015a, pp. 270–272.

[25] DAI, p. 89.

[26] Churchill 1979, pp. 201–202.

Lupi Protospatharii[29] Mihael Krešimir II. i da je datum isprave Krešimira II. točan (podatak da je Krešimir II. 950. godine bio u 24. godini svoje vladavine) iako je ostatak isprave vjerojatno falsificiran. Zbog svega navedenog smatram da je ovakav rad potreban kako bi se dao novi pogled na njegovu vladavinu, koju treba staviti u širi kontekst europskih događanja kako bismo je u potpunosti razumjeli. Isto tako, reinterpretacija povijesnih izvora dovodi nas do spoznaje da je Hrvatska sredinom 10. stoljeća izgledala drukčije nego što se prije mislilo.

2. NAPAD NA SIPONT 926.

Godine 926.[30] na hrvatsko prijestolje došao je Krešimir II. naslijedivši Tomislava. Može se zaključiti da je novi kralj na vlast došao mirnim putem s obzirom na njegove prve poteze, koji su bili orijentirani na susjedstvo, što sugerira da nije imao većih unutarnjih problema. Takve okolnosti upućuju na to da su Tomislav i Krešimir bili u krvnom srodstvu, no ne znamo jesu li bili braća ili je novi hrvatski kralj bio Tomislavov sin.[31]

S obzirom na reinterpretaciju podatka o „Mihaelu Slavenu“ odnosno „Mihaelu, kralju Slavena“ koji je napao Sipont, potrebno je podrobnije proučiti prilike u južnoj Italiji krajem 9. i u prvoj polovini 10. stoljeća. Južna Italija i Sicilija tijekom 9. i u prvoj četvrtini 10. stoljeća bile su poprište islamske invazije, što je za posljedicu imalo i pojavu arapskih gusara u Sredozemnom i Jadranskom moru. I dok se južna Italija uspješno opirala arapskim napadima, Sicilija je konačno osvojena 902. godine padom Taormine. Arapska prijetnja sa Sicilije dovela je do razdoblja mira između langobardskih kneževina (Capue, Beneventa i Salerna) i Bizanta kako bi se zajedničkim snagama pokušala otkloniti arapska opasnost. Nakon što su kršćanske snage pobijedile arapske napadače na rijeci Garigliano 915. godine, situacija se stabilizirala te se arapska opasnost svela na pojedinačne pljačkaške pohode u južnim dijelovima Apulije, poput pljačke Taranta 928. godine. U idućim godinama ponovno je došlo do trzavica između Langobarda i Bizanta, ponajviše zahvaljujući ambicioznom Landulfu I., vladaru ujedinjenih

[29] Podatke o napadu na Sipont nalazimo i u još jednom izvoru iz 11. stoljeća, a riječ je o *Annales Beneventani*.

[30] CD 1, str. 40.

[31] U ispravi Krešimira II. navodi se da Krešimir sjedi na „očinskom tronu“. Je li njegov otac bio Tomislav ili možda čak Mutimir, ne može se reći (CD 1, str. 40).

and it is difficult to imagine that Byzantium would have ceded a strategically important centre such as Siponto to Landulf.[27] Finally, since early medieval sources provide no evidence for a significant naval force in Hum, the question remains as to how Mihajlo Višević could have undertaken such a campaign on his own.[28] If all these considerations are taken into account, “Michael, king of the Slavs” should not be identified with Mihajlo Višević, but rather with the Croatian king Mihajlo Krešimir II; a contention for which further arguments will be, in my view, provided in what follows.

In summary, this study rests on three fundamental premises which, in my view, are correct and without which it cannot be properly understood: first, that chapter 31 of *De administrando imperio* refers to the 9th century; second, that “Michael, king of the Slavs,” as mentioned in the *Annales Barenses* and the *Annales Lupi Protospatharii*[29], is to be identified with Michael Krešimir II; and third, that the date given in the charter of Krešimir II is correct, namely that in 950 he was in the twenty-fourth year of his reign, even if the remainder of the charter is in all probability a forgery. For these reasons, I consider a study of this kind necessary in order to provide a fresh view of his reign, one set within the broader European context, without which it cannot be fully understood. At the same time, the reinterpretation of the historical sources leads to the conclusion that Croatia in the mid-10th century differed considerably from the picture previously assumed in historiography.

2. THE ATTACK ON SIPONTO IN 926

In 926[30], Krešimir II ascended the Croatian throne as Tomislav’s successor. It may be concluded that the transfer of power occurred peacefully, given that his first moves were directed at his neighbours, suggesting the absence of serious internal instability. Such circumstances further imply that Tomislav and Krešimir were related by blood, although it remains uncertain whether they were brothers or whether the new Croatian king was Tomislav’s son.[31]

[27] Nikola Mistik, pp. 339–343; pp. 345–347.

[28] Đaković 2023, p. 83.

[29] Information on the attack on Siponto is also provided by another 11th-century source, the *Annales Beneventani*.

[30] CD 1, p. 40.

[31] The charter of Krešimir II states that Krešimir sits on

langobardskih kneževina Capue i Beneventa.[32]

Iako nominalno bizantski vazal, Landulf je iskoristio protubizantski ustanak u južnoj Italiji 921. godine te je zauzeo dijelove sjeverne Apulije, a njegove su snage tijekom borbi kod Ascolija ubile Ursoleona, stratega teme Langobardije. U jedno su se spojile Landulfove ambicije i otpor lokalnog stanovništva prema visokim bizantskim porezima. Langobardi su uspjeli zauzeti sjevernu Apuliju, a konačni cilj bio je zauzeti cijelu Apuliju te gradove Sipont i Bari.[33] Kada uzmemo u obzir tadašnje velike probleme Bizanta, koji se nalazio u žestokom sukobu s Bugarskom cara Simeona I., ne treba čuditi što je Landulfu, kako bi se smirila situacija na tom području, ponuđena titula stratega Langobardije pod uvjetom da se povuče s osvojenih teritorija.[34]

Status quo održan je do 926., kada dolazi do novog, ovog puta znatno ozbiljnijeg, Landulfova napada na bizantske posjede u sjevernoj Apuliji, i to u savezništvu s Guimarom II., knezom Salerna, koji je napadao na području Lucanije i Kalabrije.[35] U takvim je okolnostima došlo do Krešimirova pohoda i zauzimanja Siponta u srpnju 926.[36] Za nas je najvažnije pitanje: zašto bi hrvatski kralj zauzeo taj talijanski grad?

Prije nego što se pozabavimo tim pitanjem, trebalo bi odrediti komu je u tom trenutku pripadao Sipont. Churchill je napad na Sipont promatrao u svjetlu toga da ga je izveo Mihael Višević te je zaključio da je teško očekivati da bi bizantski patricij napao grad pod bizantskom kontrolom. Nastavno na taj zaključak zamijetio je podatak da je 921. Atenulf II., brat Landulfa I., zauzeo Sipont te je ostavio mogućnost da je Mihael Višević napao grad kako bi ga vratio pod bizantsku kontrolu.[37] Međutim, čini mi se da su pritom zanemarena pisma Nikole I. Mistika, carigradskog patrijarha, Landulfu I., u kojima se od langobardskog vladara traži da se povuče iz osvojenih područja, a zauzvrat mu se nudi pozicija stratega teme Langobardije.[38] Nemamo potvrdu da je Landulf doista prihvatio ponudu, ali je indikativno da su sukobi prestali sve do 926. godine te stoga možemo pomišljati da se Landulf povukao iz važnih mjesta u Apuliji, a zauzvrat možda dobio

[32] Loud 1999, str. 626–627.
[33] Loud 1999, str. 627.
[34] Nikola Mistik, str. 339–343, 345–347.
[35] Nikolić Jakus 2015a, str. 272.
[36] Churchill 1979, str. 116, 126.
[37] Churchill 1979, str. 201–202.
[38] Nikola Mistik, str. 339–343, 345–347.

In light of the reinterpretation of the references to "Michael the Slav" or "Michael, king of the Slavs," who attacked Siponto, it is necessary to examine more closely the political conditions in southern Italy at the end of the 9th and during the first half of the 10th century. Throughout the 9th century and into the first quarter of the 10th century, southern Italy and Sicily became the battleground for the Islamic invasion, with the consequent appearance of Arab pirates in the Mediterranean and Adriatic Sea. While southern Italy resisted the Arab assaults with some success, Sicily was definitively conquered in 902 with the fall of Taormina. The continuing Arab threat emanating from Sicily contributed to a temporary rapprochement between the Lombard principalities (Capua, Benevento and Salerno) and Byzantium, whose rulers joined forces in an effort to ward off the danger. Following the Christian victory over the Arab forces at the Garigliano River in 915, conditions in the region stabilised, and Arab incursions were thereafter largely confined to occasional raids in southern parts of Apulia, such as the sack of Taranto in 928. In the years that followed, tensions between the Lombards and Byzantium once again intensified, owing in large measure to the ambitions of Landulf I, ruler of the united Lombard principalities of Capua and Benevento.[32]

Although formally a Byzantine vassal, Landulf exploited the anti-Byzantine uprising in southern Italy in 921 in order to seize parts of northern Apulia, while his forces killed Ursoleon, strategos of the theme of Lombardy, during the fighting at Ascoli. Landulf's personal ambitions thus converged with the local population's resistance to the heavy Byzantine taxation. The Lombards succeeded in taking northern Apulia, while their ultimate objective appears to have been the conquest of the entire Apulian region, including the strategically significant cities of Siponto and Bari.[33] Given the serious difficulties Byzantium faced at the time, particularly its ongoing conflict with the Bulgaria of Tsar Simeon I, it is hardly surprising that, in an effort to stabilise the region, Landulf was offered the title of strategos of Langobardia on condition that he withdraw from the territories he had occupied.[34]

the "paternal throne." Whether his father was Tomislav or perhaps even Mutimir cannot be determined. (CD 1, p. 40.)
[32] Loud 1999, pp. 626–627.
[33] Ibid., p. 627.
[34] Nikola Mistik, pp. 339–443; pp. 345–347.

određenu sferu utjecaja (ili je zaista postao strateg s obzirom na to da se u tom razdoblju ne spominje neki novi bizantski strateg Langobardije).[39] U tom je kontekstu teško zamisliti da bi Bizant samo tako prepustio Sipont, grad na obali Jadranskog mora, na upravljanje Langobardima. Ipak, lako je moguće da su Langobardi u novom, snažnijem pohodu 926. godine ponovno zauzeli Sipont.

Kao što je već istaknuto, Krešimirov pohod treba promatrati u kontekstu obnovljenog sukoba između Langobarda i Bizanta. Tražiti razloge ovog pohoda u navodnom hrvatsko-bizantskom savezništvu smatram da je pogrešno. Pitanje tog savezništva bit će podrobnije obrađeno u sljedećem poglavlju, no valja samo razmisliti o jednom pitanju: bi li se Mihael Krešimir II. zaista odlučio na ovaj pohod, koji je očito osobno vodio, dok mu se u neposrednom susjedstvu nalazi moćna Simeonova Bugarska (s kojom bi, da je doista bio bizantski saveznik, bio u ratnom stanju)?

Poluotok Gargano, na kojem se nalazi Sipont, geografski je najbliži istočnojadranskoj obali te je stoga najpogodniji za plovidbu između dviju obala, a prednosti tog pravca bio je svjestan i car pisac Konstantin Porfirogenet.[40] Kao takav, sigurno je bio jedan od putova kojima se odvijala trgovina između zapadne i istočne obale Jadrana. Mogućnost da je ovdje riječ o pohodu pokrenutom radi trgovine prva je, prilično sramežljivo, spomenula Zrinka Nikolić Jakus, napominjući da su Bari i Sipont imali veliku ulogu u jadranskoj trgovini.[41] Možda razlog pohoda doista treba tražiti u osiguravanju strateški važne točke s druge strane Jadrana kako komunikacija između dviju obala, a time i trgovina, ne bi bile ugrožene. Ta je potreba mogla proizići iz činjenice da se Sipont 926. godine već drugi put u nekoliko godina našao u vihoru langobardsko-bizantskog rata, a nije naodmet spomenuti i da su 922. Mađari u svojim pljačkaškim pohodima došli sve do Apulije,[42] što je samo dodatno moglo potaknuti želju za akcijom čimbenika s istočnojadranske obale.

Još od druge polovine 8. stoljeća postoje dokazi o komunikaciji između južne Italije (i Sicilije) i istočnojadranske obale: novac Konstantina V. Ko-

This arrangement appears to have preserved the status quo until 926, when Landulf initiated a renewed and considerably more serious attack on the Byzantine possessions in northern Apulia, this time in alliance with Guaimar II, prince of Salerno, who simultaneously attacked territories in Lucania and Calabria.[35] It was under these circumstances that Krešimir undertook his campaign and captured Siponto in July 926.[36] The most important question for our purposes is why the Croatian king would have seized the aforementioned Italian city?

Before addressing this issue, it is first necessary to determine who controlled Siponto at the time of the attack. Churchill interpreted the attack on Siponto as an action carried out by Michael Višević and concluded that it is difficult to assume that a Byzantine patrician would have attacked a city under Byzantine control. Building on this conclusion, Churchill noted that in 921 Atenulf II, brother of Landulf I, had taken Siponto, leaving open the possibility that Michael Višević attacked the city in order to restore it to Byzantine control.[37] However, such an interpretation appears to overlook the letters of Nicholas I Mystikos, Patriarch of Constantinople, addressed to Landulf I, in which the Lombard ruler was urged to withdraw from the conquered territories in exchange for the office of strategos of the theme of Langobardia.[38] Although there is no direct confirmation that Landulf formally accepted the proposal, it is telling that hostilities ceased until 926, suggesting that he may indeed have withdrawn from the major sites in Apulia, perhaps obtaining in return some sphere of influence (or even de facto becoming strategos, since no new Byzantine strategos of Langobardia is mentioned during this period).[39] Viewed in this context, it is difficult to imagine that Byzantium would simply have handed Siponto, a city on the Adriatic coast, over to Lombard administration. Nevertheless, it remains possible that, during the renewed offensive of 926, the Lombards once again succeeded in occupying the city.

As previously noted, Krešimir's campaign should be viewed against the background of the renewed conflict between the Lombards and Byz-

39 Zuckerman 2014, str. 21. Jean-Marie Martin smatra da Landulf nije postao strateg Langobardije (Martin 2021, str. 189).

40 Nikolić Jakus 2015a, str. 272–273.

41 Nikolić Jakus 2015b, str. 568.

42 Bakay 1999, str. 543.

35 Nikolić Jakus 2015a, p. 272.

36 Churchill 1979, p. 116; p. 126.

37 Ibid., pp. 201–202.

38 Nikola Mistik, pp. 339–343; pp. 345–347.

39 Zuckerman 2014, p. 21; Jean-Marie Martin holds that Landulf did not become strategos of Langobardia (Martin 2021, p. 189).

pronima, kovan u Sirakuzi, te novčić Grimoalda III., langobardskog vladara Beneventa, pronađen u Trogiru.[43] Vrijedi spomenuti i širenje kulta sv. Bartolomeja iz južne Italije na područje ranosrednjovjekovne Hrvatske u 9. stoljeću, koje je bilo rezultat djelovanja benediktinaca.[44] Veze dviju obala Jadrana posebno su intenzivirane u prvoj polovini 11. stoljeća, kada je došlo do naseljavanja slavenske populacije na poluotok Gargano.[45] Zbog manjka povijesnih izvora[46] i arheoloških istraživanja nemoguće je utvrditi koliko su intenzivne bile veze između tih dviju regija, ali možemo pretpostaviti da su trgovinske veze u prvoj polovini 10. stoljeća zasigurno postojale. U tom je smislu zanimljiv primjer s otoka Hvara, gdje su pronađene dvije svjetiljke južnoitalske proizvodnje datirane u 9. i 10. stoljeće.[47] Osim navedenog primjera, pretpostavka o trgovačkim vezama južne Italije i dalmatinske obale temelji se i na procesima u 9. stoljeću. Pojava gusarenja upućuje na porast trgovačke aktivnosti na Jadranu, a protjerivanje Arapa iz Barija 871. godine te smirivanje tenzija između Hrvata i Venecije zasigurno su dodatno pospješili trgovinu. Također, gradovi južne Italije (Rim, langobardski Benevento te bizantski Napulj i Amalfi) tijekom 9. stoljeća sve su se više međusobno povezivali trgovačkim vezama, a uspon Venecije dodatno je osnažio važnost trgovine za te gradove, pogotovo za Benevento.[48] U takvim okolnostima ne treba čuditi što je Landulf imao ambiciju osvojiti Sipont i Bari. Posjedovanje tih dvaju gradova osiguralo bi mu izravnu komunikaciju s Venecijom i istočnojadranskom obalom.

Prema mišljenju Danijela Džina, glavnina prihoda hrvatske elite nije dolazila od trgovine, nego od poljoprivrede, što znači da je primarna okupacija elite bila vezana za zemlju, a ne za more.[49] To ne znači da trgovine nije bilo. Štoviše, u *De administrando imperio*[50] navodi se da je dio Hrvata trgo-

43 Curta 2010, str. 270.
44 Budak 1999, str. 245–246.
45 Nikolić Jakus 2015a, str. 273–277.
46 U *Kraljevstvu Slavena* donosi se priča o svrgnutom kralju Radoslavu kojeg su spasili mornari iz Apulije i odveli u Sipont. Iako je događaj fiktivan, spomen mornara iz Apulije govori o povezanosti južne Italije i, u ovom slučaju, južne Dalmacije u ranom srednjem vijeku (LjPD, str. 62–63).
47 Petrić 1990, str. 173–175.
48 McCormick 2001, str. 622.
49 Džino 2020, str. 190–191.
50 U 31. glavi navodi se da je dio Hrvata počeo koristiti brodove za trgovinu nakon misije izvjesnog Martina u

antium. In my view, attempts to explain this military campaign through the hypothesis of a supposed Croatian–Byzantine alliance appear unconvincing. Although the question of this supposed alliance will be addressed in more detail in the following chapter, one issue merits immediate consideration: would Michael Krešimir II truly have undertaken and personally led such a campaign while confronted in his immediate vicinity by the powerful Bulgaria of Tsar Simeon (with whom he would presumably have been at war had he truly been a Byzantine ally)?

The Gargano peninsula, on which Siponto lies, is the closest point between the Italian and eastern Adriatic coasts and therefore the most favourable location for crossing between the two shores, an advantage well known to the emperor-writer Constantine Porphyrogenitus.[40] Consequently, it almost certainly must have been one of the routes used for trade between the western and eastern Adriatic shores. The possibility that this campaign was motivated and undertaken for economic reasons was first raised, rather cautiously, by Zrinka Nikolić Jakus, who pointed out that Bari and Siponto played a major role in Adriatic trade.[41] The objective of the campaign may indeed have been to secure a strategically crucial point on the opposite Adriatic shore so that communication between the two coasts — and with it, trade — would not be endangered. Such a necessity may have arisen precisely because Siponto had in 926, for the second time within only a few years, found itself caught up in the Lombard–Byzantine war. It is also worth noting that in 922 the Magyars, in the course of their raiding campaigns, had penetrated as far as Apulia[42], which may have further encouraged political actors along the eastern Adriatic coast to take preventative action.

Evidence of contact between southern Italy (and Sicily) and the eastern Adriatic coast dates as early as the second half of the 8th century, and is provided by coins of Constantine V Copronymus minted in Syracuse and a single coin of Grimoald III, the Lombard ruler of Benevento, which were found in Trogir.[43] Also worth noting is the spread of the cult of Saint Bartholomew from southern Italy into early medieval Croatia in the 9th century, which was

40 Nikolić Jakus 2015a, pp. 272–273.
41 Nikolić Jakus 2015b, p. 568.
42 Bakay 1999, p. 543.
43 Curta 2010, p. 270.

vao na istočnojadranskoj obali od grada do grada pa sve do Venecije.[51] Ovdje se najvjerojatnije radilo o trgovini robovima.[52] Ipak, ne može se reći da su Hrvati bili nositelji trgovačke aktivnosti na Jadranu na prijelazu iz 9. u 10. stoljeće, osobito ako uzmemo u obzir Veneciju (i donekle dalmatinske gradove), koja je bila bolje povezana s Bizantom, što joj je donijelo veliku prednost u toj sferi.

Uzevši sve u obzir, valja zaključiti da pohod na Sipont nije inicirao hrvatski kralj jer mu Sipont nije predstavljao dovoljno važnu lokaciju da bi zbog nje poveo vojsku na drugu stranu Jadrana. Možda se može pomisliti na pljačkaški pohod, no za takvo što Krešimir nije morao ići na zapadnojadransku obalu, već se mogao orijentirati na brodove koji su plovili Jadranom, kao što je to činio knez Domagoj. Imajući to na umu, interpretirati osvajanje Siponta isključivo kao pljačkaški pohod bilo bi pogrešno.

Tko je onda mogao biti inicijator akcije? Iako nam nedostatak arheoloških nalaza ne dopušta donošenje bilo kakvih zaključaka o tome koliko su veze, a samim time i trgovina, između južne Italije i istočnojadranske obale bile jake, možemo pretpostaviti da je taj pohod bio u interesu dalmatinskih gradova. Gradovi su još od 880-ih godina bili oslonjeni na svoje zaleđe,[53] a težak položaj Bizanta nakon početka rata s bugarskim carem Simeonom samo je dodatno davao za pravo dalmatinskim gradovima da se okrenu hrvatskim vladarima kako bi spriječili novo langobardsko zauzimanje Siponta, koje bi prekinulo kontakt s bizantskim posjedima u južnoj Italiji.

doba arhonta Trpimira. Iako dio povjesničara smatra da je riječ o navodnom Trpimiru II., iz podrobnije analize poglavlja može se zaključiti da se radi o događajima iz 9. stoljeća, što nas dovodi do zaključka da se navod Konstantina Porfirogeneta o hrvatskoj trgovini na istočnojadranskoj obali odnosi na sredinu 9. stoljeća, kada je vladao knez Trpimir (Đaković 2023, str. 63–64).

51 CD 1, str. 82 (*Toga radi niti sagene tih Hrvata, niti kondure nigda ni na koga ne idu ratom, van da tko na njih navali s tim brodovima polaze tek, koji su od tih Hrvata željni prometati trgovinu od grada do grada, obilazeći zaliv Dalmatinski i do Venecije*).

52 Alajbeg 2020, str. 287–288.

53 Bazilije je zapovjedio dalmatinskim gradovima da određenu svotu novca plaćaju vladarima u zaleđu, a ne strategu. Tako je hrvatski kralj dobivao danak od Splita, Trogira, Zadra, Osora, Raba i Krka (DAI, str. 80).

mainly the result of the work of the Benedictines.[44] Relations between the two Adriatic coasts became particularly intensive during the first half of the 11th century, when Slavic populations settled on the Gargano peninsula.[45] Owing to the scarcity of historical sources[46] and archaeological investigations, it is impossible to determine the precise intensity of these contacts between the two regions; nevertheless, it is reasonable to assume that commercial ties between the regions certainly existed during the first half of the 10th century. In this context, the example of the island of Hvar is particularly noteworthy, where two lamps of southern Italic production, dated to the 9th and 10th centuries, have been discovered.[47] Apart from this example, the assumption of a commercial link between southern Italy and the Dalmatian coast is further supported by the developments during the 9th century, when the rise of piracy clearly reflects increased commercial activity in the Adriatic Sea. The expulsion of the Arabs from Bari in 871, together with the easing of tensions between the Croats and Venice, undoubtedly contributed to the further growth of trade. The cities of southern Italy (Rome, Lombard Benevento, and Byzantine Naples and Amalfi) likewise became increasingly bound to one another by commercial ties over the course of the 9th century, while the rise of Venice further enhanced the importance of trade for these cities, especially Benevento.[48] Within such circumstances, Landulf's ambition to take Siponto (and Bari) is hardly surprising: possession of these two cities would have secured him direct communication with Venice and the eastern Adriatic shore.

In the view of Danijel Džino, the principal source of income of the Croatian elite derived not from trade but from agriculture, implying that its principal interests were oriented toward the land rather than the sea.[49] This, however, does not imply the absence of commercial activities. On the con-

44 Budak 1999, pp. 245–246.

45 Nikolić Jakus 2015a, pp. 273–277.

46 The *Kingdom of the Slavs* contains the tale of the deposed king Radoslav, who was rescued by sailors from Apulia and brought to Siponto. Although the event is fictional, the mention of Apulian sailors indicates the connection between southern Italy and, in this case, southern Dalmatia in the Early Middle Ages. (LjPD, pp. 62–63.)

47 Petrić 1990, pp. 173–175.

48 McCormick 2001, p. 622.

49 Džino 2020, pp. 190–191.

Krešimir II. u konačnici je osvojio Sipont, a jedan izvor iz kasnog 12. stoljeća (*Romualdi Salernitani Chronicon*) govori o nasilnom karakteru pohoda te navodi da je osvajač po gradu „pustošio pljačkom i mačem".[54] Budući da je izvor nastao više od dva stoljeća nakon opisanih događaja i da je spominjanje pustošenja i pljačke osvojenog grada karakteristično za srednjovjekovne kronike, ne možemo sa stopostotnom sigurnošću znati jesu li se napadači doista tako ponašali. Ono što je moguće pomisliti jest da je Krešimir iskoristio ovaj pohod za porobljavanje određenog broja ljudi nakon upada u grad, što je moglo koristiti hrvatskoj ekonomiji, ponajprije Ninu, koji se već u 9. stoljeću razvio u važno ekonomsko središte Hrvatske.[55]

Za kraj, ovaj nas pohod možda može navesti na promišljanje o kršćanskom imenu Krešimira II. Zasad postoje dvije pretpostavke. Prva je ona Nevena Budaka, koji smatra da si je Krešimir nadjenuo ime Mihael po arkanđelu ratniku, pobjedniku nad zmajem, simbolom zla.[56] Ova se teza nadovezuje na Šišićevu kronologiju prema kojoj je Krešimir II. pobijedio Miroslava u građanskom ratu, što bi značilo da je pobjeda nad zlom metafora za pobjedu nad Miroslavom. Druga pretpostavka, koju sam iznio u ranijem radu, jest da je uzimanje imena Mihael moglo proizići iz pobjede nad Bugarima, koji su u to vrijeme mogli predstavljati „simbol zla".[57] Ipak, treba reći da je pohod na Sipont bio Krešimirov prvi ratni uspjeh. Stoga nije naodmet spomenuti da se na poluotoku Garganu posebno štuje arkanđel Mihael pa se uzimanje tog imena možda može povezati s navedenim pohodom. Budući da se kršćansko ime obično uzimalo prilikom krunidbe, može se pomisliti da je smrt kralja Tomislava zatekla Krešimira usred priprema za pohod na Sipont te se čin krunidbe dogodio nakon povratka iz južne Italije. To bi značilo da je Krešimir tijekom ekspedicije već bio kralj, što bi objašnjavalo zašto ga autori južnotalijanskih kronika pamte kao kralja iako formalno nije bio okrunjen.

3. RAT PROTIV BUGARA I SPLITSKI CRKVENI SABOR 928.

Godine 913. bizantski car Aleksandar odbio je plaćati godišnji danak bugarskom vladaru Simeo-

[54] Uzelac 2018, str. 243.
[55] Alajbeg 2020, str. 263–264.
[56] Budak 2020, str. 271.
[57] Đaković 2023, str. 87.

trary, *De administrando imperio*[50] records that some Croats traded along the eastern Adriatic coast from city to city and as far as Venice.[51] Such commercial activity most likely involved the slave trade.[52] It cannot, however, be claimed that the Croats were the principal carriers of commercial activity in the Adriatic at the turn of the 10th century, particularly when we consider the dominant role of Venice—and, to a lesser extent, the Dalmatian cities—which, owing to their closer political and economic ties with Byzantium, possessed a substantial advantage in trade.

Taking all of this into account, it should be concluded that the campaign against Siponto was not initiated by the Croatian king himself, since Siponto did not represent for him a place of sufficient importance to justify leading an army across the Adriatic. One might propose that the campaign was motivated by plunder; however, for such purposes Krešimir did not need to undertake a campaign on the western Adriatic coast, as he could instead have targeted shipping within the Adriatic itself, much as Duke Domagoj had done previously. For this reason, it would be mistaken to interpret the seizure of Siponto solely within the framework of a raiding expedition.

The question therefore arises as to who may have initiated the operation? Although the lack of archaeological evidence prevents firm conclusions regarding the intensity of contacts, and, consequently, the extent of trade, between southern Italy and the eastern Adriatic coast, it nevertheless remains possible to suggest that the campaign served the in-

[50] Chapter 31 states that some of the Croats began to use ships for trade following the mission of a certain Martin in the time of archon Trpimir. Although some historians interpret this as referring to Trpimir II, a closer analysis of the chapter suggests that the events belong to the 9th century, leading to the conclusion that Constantine Porphyrogenitus's reference to Croatian maritime trade in the eastern Adriatic pertains to the mid-9th century, during the reign of Duke Trpimir (Đaković 2023, pp. 63–64)

[51] CD 1, p. 82. (For this reason neither the galleys (Gr. σαγήνα, Lat. sagena) nor the cutters (Gr. κονδούρα, Lat. condura) of these Croats ever go against anyone to make war, unless of course he has come upon them. But in these vessels go those of the Croats who wish to engage in commerce, travelling round from city to city, in Pagania and the gulf of Dalmatia and as far as Venice.)

[52] Alajbeg 2020, pp. 287–288.

nu, što je dovelo do rata između Bugarske i Bizanta. U idućim godinama velik problem za Carstvo predstavljali su unutarnji obračuni oko skrbništva nad Konstantinom VII. Porfirogenetom. Te su borbe slabile bizantsku poziciju, a može se reći da je takva situacija dovela do velikog poraza kod rijeke Aheloj 917. godine. Međutim, Simeon, koji se okitio titulom cara, nakon te bitke nije uspio učiniti ništa značajno što bi dotuklo Bizant, nego je njegova vojska u idućim godinama pljačkala po Carstvu.[58]

Pobjeda Romana I. Lekapena u dvorskim borbama i njegov uspon na carsko prijestolje 920. godine doveli su do eskalacije rata jer je Simeon želio Romanovu abdikaciju. Simeon je gotovo svake godine dovodio svoju vojsku pred zidine Konstantinopola te je svojem carskom naslovu pridodao i titulu „cara Rimljana". Za našu je temu važno spomenuti da je tih godina svojevrstan problem Bugarima predstavljala Srbija, koja je u tom ratu često mijenjala strane. Simeon je uspio osvojiti Srbiju i podvrgnuti je svojoj vlasti, a srpski se knez Zaharija s dijelom stanovništva sklonio u Hrvatsku.[59] Tradicionalna historiografija bugarsko zauzimanje Srbije datira u 924. godinu,[60] no Predrag Komatina doveo je tu dataciju u pitanje. On smatra da se Simeonov pohod dogodio 925. ili 926.,[61] a to temelji na rečenici iz *DAI*-ja u kojoj stoji da Zaharija „nikada ne prestade – kako i prije njega arhonti slahu poklonstva carevima romajskim – biti njihovim podložnikom podvrženikom".[62] Komatinino je mišljenje da navedena rečenica sugerira kako je između prvog bugarskog pohoda na Zahariju (koji se dogodio između 921. i 923.) i drugog morao postojati nešto veći vremenski odmak. Kao dodatni argument uzima se iduća Porfirogenetova vijest o bugarskom napadu na Hrvatsku, u kojoj se navodi da su Bugari krenuli „u to sad doba", što implicira da se radilo o kratkom vremenskom razmaku između osvajanja Srbije i pohoda na Srbiju.[63]

Zadržimo se nakratko na bugarskom pohodu usmjerenom protiv Hrvatske. Vojskovođa Alogobotur bio je zapovjednik bugarske vojske u tom pohodu, no nije uspio izvršiti zadanu zadaću. Štoviše, njegova je vojska potučena do nogu te je tom prili-

[58] Shepard 1999, str. 573–577.
[59] DAI, str. 87.
[60] Shepard 1999, str. 577–578.
[61] Komatina 2021, str. 259.
[62] DAI, str. 87.
[63] Komatina 2021, str. 259; DAI, str. 87.

terests of the Dalmatian cities. Since the 880s, the cities had been oriented towards their hinterland[53], while the weakened position of Byzantium following the outbreak of war with the Bulgarian emperor Simeon further encouraged the Dalmatian cities to turn toward the Croatian rulers in order to prevent a renewed Lombard seizure of Siponto, which would have cut their links with the Byzantine possessions in southern Italy.

Krešimir II ultimately succeeded in capturing Siponto, and a late 12th-century source, the *Romualdi Salernitani Chronicon*, describes the violent character of the campaign, stating that the conqueror "devastated the city with hostile plunder and the sword."[54] Since the source was composed more than two centuries after the event, and since descriptions of plunder and devastation are conventional elements of medieval historiography, it is impossible to determine with certainty whether the attackers indeed behaved in such a manner. It may nevertheless be assumed that Krešimir exploited the conquest in order to enslave a number of captives following the seizure of the city, a development that would have benefited the Croatian economy, particularly Nin, which had already emerged as a significant economic centre during the 9th century.[55]

Finally, this campaign may prompt reflection on the Christian name of Krešimir II. At present there are two hypotheses. The first, proposed by Neven Budak, maintains that Krešimir assumed the name Michael in honour of the warrior archangel Michael, conqueror of the dragon and symbol of the triumph of good over evil.[56] This interpretation aligns with Šišić's chronology, according to which Krešimir II defeated Miroslav in the civil war, making the victory over evil a metaphor for victory over Miroslav himself. The second hypothesis, advanced by the present author, proposes that the adoption of the name Michael followed the victory over the Bulgarians, who at that time may have represented the "symbol of evil."[57] It should, however, be emphasised that the expedition against Siponto was Krešimir's first known military success. In this

[53] Basil ordered the Dalmatian cities to pay a fixed sum to the rulers of the hinterland rather than to the strategos. The Croatian king thus received tribute from Split, Trogir, Zadar, Osor, Rab and Krk. (DAI, p. 80.)
[54] Uzelac 2018, p. 243.
[55] Alajbeg 2020, pp. 263–264.
[56] Budak 2020, p. 271.
[57] Đaković 2023, p. 87.

kom poginuo i sam Alogobotur.[64] Teško je reći kada se navedeni sukob dogodio. Teofanov Nastavljač navodi da je bugarski car Simeon 27. svibnja 927. zapovjedio napad na Hrvate,[65] no možemo pretpostaviti da je riječ o pogrešnom datumu jer je Simeon toga dana umro. Smatram da bi Alogoboturov pohod trebalo smjestiti između srpnja 926. (napad na Sipont) i svibnja 927. (Simeonova smrt). Naime, kao što je spomenuto u prethodnom poglavlju, teško je zamisliti da bi se Mihael Krešimir II. odvažio na pohod u južnu Italiju da je istodobno bio u ratnom stanju s Bugarima. No, koji je bio razlog Simeonove zapovijedi da krene u novu avanturu prema zapadu?

Tradicionalna historiografija promatrala je ovaj pohod u kontekstu navodnog hrvatsko-bizantskog savezništva. Prevladavajuće je mišljenje bilo da je kralj Tomislav ušao u savez s Bizantom te zauzvrat dobio dalmatinske gradove na upravljanje. Saznavši to, Simeon je poveo vojsku na zapad kako bi porazio bizantskog saveznika.[66] Takva teza polazi od pretpostavke da je Bizant imao čvrstu kontrolu nad Dalmacijom, no vrlo je teško govoriti o većoj prisutnosti bizantske središnje vlasti u 920-im godinama.

Istina je da se, primjerice, u oporuci priora Andrije iz 918. godine spominje bizantski car, no ne spominje se neki predstavnik vlasti Bizantskog Carstva.[67] Usporedbe radi, gradovi u južnoj Italiji, kao i langobardski vladari, također su u prvoj četvrtini 10. stoljeća koristili vladarske godine bizantskih careva u datacijama isprava. Doduše, u langobardskim vojvodstvima spominjanje bizantskih vladara nije bilo konstantno te je ponegdje izostajalo, no langobardski su vladari sve do 920. godine uredno isticali svoje patricijske titule.[68]

Za našu bi povijest zato moglo biti važno usporediti slučajeve dalmatinskih gradova i langobardskih vojvodstava, odnosno njihov odnos prema Bizantskom Carstvu. Riječ je o područjima na periferiji Carstva koja su u fokus središnje vlasti dolazila kada je ona bila stabilna i kada je imala ambiciju voditi proaktivnu politiku na Jadranskom i Sredo-

[64] Konstantin Porfirogenet piše da su Hrvati pogubili sve Bugare (DAI, str. 87).

[65] VIJ 3, str. 12.

[66] Birin 2015, str. 53–54; Budak 2018, str. 222–224; Curta 2006, str. 195–196; Šišić 1990, str. 406–412, 421–422.

[67] CD 1, str. 25–28.

[68] Loud 1999, str. 625–626.

regard, it is noteworthy that the archangel Michael enjoyed particular veneration on the Gargano peninsula, raising the possibility that the adoption of the name Michael was connected specifically with this campaign. Since a Christian name was usually taken at coronation, one may suppose that the death of King Tomislav caught Krešimir in the middle of preparations for the campaign against Siponto, and that the act of coronation took place after his return from southern Italy. This would mean that Krešimir was a king during the expedition itself, which would explain why the authors of the south Italian chronicles remember him as a king although he had not yet been formally crowned.

3. THE WAR AGAINST THE BULGARIANS AND THE CHURCH COUNCIL OF SPLIT IN 928

In 913, the Byzantine emperor Alexander refused to pay the annual tribute to the Bulgarian ruler Simeon, an act that led to war between Bulgaria and Byzantium. In the following years, the Empire was further destabilised by internal struggles surrounding the regency over Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus. These conflicts weakened the Byzantine position considerably and may be regarded as one of the principal causes of the catastrophic Byzantine defeat at the Battle of the Achelous River in 917. Nevertheless, Simeon, who subsequently assumed the title of *tsar*, failed to achieve any decisive success against Byzantium after this victory, and in the following years his forces were largely confined to raiding campaigns within imperial territory.[58]

The triumph of Romanos I Lekapenos in the court struggles and his ascent to the imperial throne in 920 led to a renewed escalation of the war, since Simeon sought Romanos's abdication. In nearly every successive year, Simeon led his army before the walls of Constantinople, adding to his title that of "emperor of the Romans." For the present discussion, it is particularly important to note that during these years Serbia represented a particular problem for the Bulgarians, as it frequently shifted allegiances throughout the conflict. Simeon ultimately succeeded in conquering Serbia and bringing it under Bulgarian authority, while the Serbian prince Zaharija sought refuge in Croatia with part

[58] Shepard 1998, pp. 573–577.

zemnom moru. Na primjeru langobardskih vojvodstava vidimo što se dogodilo kada je Bizant oslabio. Langobardi su vrlo brzo postali neprijateljski nastrojeni prema Carstvu i krenuli u ekspanzionističke pohode na jugu Italije. Naravno, obrazac ponašanja nije bio isti u dalmatinskim gradovima jer su oni još od Justinijanove rekonkviste bili integralni dio Bizanta. Također valja istaknuti da se djelomično radilo o istoj kulturnoj sferi pa dalmatinski gradovi nisu imali razloga, ali ni resursa i vojno-političke moći, da budu neprijateljski nastrojeni prema Bizantu. Međutim, teritorijalni diskontinuitet između gradova i ostatka Carstva kao i manjak prisutnosti središnje vlasti na tom području znali su dovesti do samostalnije politike gradova. Očite primjere toga imamo 805. godine, kada je iskazana vjernost Karlu Velikom,[69] odnosno u 20-im godinama 9. stoljeća, kada su se gradovi „osamostalili"[70] u vrijeme cara Mihaela II.[71] Ta dva primjera sa zapadne periferije Carstva, unatoč bitnim razlikama, pokazuju da je bilo itekako moguće da dođe do samovolje lokalnih moćnika ako nije bilo snažnije prisutnosti središnje vlasti. Shodno tomu, izostanak spominjanja predstavnika bizantske vlasti u oporuci priora Andrije vjerojatno sugerira da dalmatinski gradovi više nisu bili toliko vezani za Bizant te je vrlo moguće da su počeli provoditi samostalniju politiku, osobito ako uzmemo u obzir da je većina gradova još od 880-ih godina plaćala danak hrvatskom vladaru.

Plaćanje danka Hrvatskoj bilo je jedan od važnih pokretača integracije dalmatinskih gradova i hrvatskog zaleđa. Kada tomu pridodamo manjak prisutnosti bizantske središnje vlasti, mogućnost bugarskog upada kao i sjećanje na arapske pljačkaške pohode iz druge polovine 9. stoljeća, nije nelogično pomisliti da je dolazak dalmatinskih gradova pod okrilje kralja Tomislava rezultat njihove inicijative, odnosno diplomacije, a ne hrvatsko-bizantskog savezništva. Suočeni sa svim potencijalnim opasnostima i manjkom vojne snage da im se odupru, predstavnici dalmatinskih gradova zaštitnika su pronašli u Tomislavu, koji nije imao razloga odbiti

[69] Goldstein 1992, str. 153; Gračanin 2015, str. 504–506.

[70] Konstantin Porfirogenet imao je za cilj kritizirati vladavinu Mihaela II., stoga njegovu tvrdnju o potpunom osamostaljivanju dalmatinskih gradova treba uzeti s oprezom. Ipak, njegove se rečenice mogu okarakterizirati kao dokaz da Bizant nije imao potpunu kontrolu nad dalmatinskim gradovima.

[71] DAI, str. 64.

of his people.[59] Traditional historiography dates the Bulgarian conquest of Serbia to 924[60], but Predrag Komatina has questioned this chronology, arguing instead that Simeon's campaign should be dated to 925 or 926[61]. His argument rests upon a passage in *De Administrando Imperio* in which it is said of Zacharias that he "never ceased- like the princes also that were before him, to send missions to the emperors of the Romans- to be in subjection and servitude to them…."[62] According to Komatina, this formulation implies that a somewhat longer interval must have elapsed between the first Bulgarian campaign against Zacharias (which occurred between 921 and 923), and the second campaign. An additional argument is Porphyrogenitus's next item of information concerning the Bulgarian attack on Croatia, where it is stated that the Bulgarians set out "at that very time," which implies a short interval between the conquest of Serbia and the campaign against Serbia.[63]

It is necessary at this point to turn briefly to the Bulgarian campaign directed against Croatia. The Bulgarian army was commanded by Alogobotur, who ultimately failed in his mission. On the contrary, his army suffered a crushing defeat, and Alogobotur himself was killed during the conflict,[64] though the exact time of this conflict is difficult to determine. The *Theophanes Continuatus* reports that the Bulgarian tsar Simeon ordered the attack on the Croats on 27th May 927[65]; we may, however, suppose this date to be wrong, since Simeon died on that very day. In my view, Alogobotur's campaign should be placed between July 926 (the attack on Siponto) and May 927 (the death of Simeon). As noted in the preceding chapter, it is difficult to imagine that Michael Krešimir II would have ventured on an expedition to southern Italy had he been at war with the Bulgarians. This therefore raises the question of what motivated Simeon to initiate yet another western military campaign.

Traditional historiography has interpreted this campaign within the framework of an alleged Croatian–Byzantine alliance. The prevailing opinion

[59] DAI, p. 87.

[60] Shepard 1999, pp. 577–578.

[61] Komatina 2021, p. 259.

[62] DAI, p. 87.

[63] Komatina 2021, p. 259; DAI, p. 87.

[64] Constantine Porphyrogenitus writes that all the Bulgarians were killed by the Croats (DAI, p. 87).

[65] VIJ 3, p. 12.

njihov prijedlog.[72] Tomislav Raukar, pišući o ovoj problematici, ustvrdio je sljedeće: „Bizant se ili suglasio s vlašću Tomislava nad dalmatinskim gradovima ili se tome nije mogao oduprijeti.“[73] Smatram da je ovdje riječ o bizantskoj nemoći da poduzme bilo što po tom pitanju, no Carstvo je i dalje polagalo pravo na gradove. S druge strane, gradovi nisu zaboravili na svoju pripadnost Carstvu, ali su se prilagodili trenutnoj situaciji kako bi prvenstveno sebe zaštitili. Može se postaviti i pitanje u kojoj je mjeri pojedini dalmatinski grad osjećao pripadnost Bizantu. Je li možda, primjerice, Split težio boljim odnosima s hrvatskim elitama u zaleđu, u kojima je mogao prepoznati novu snagu na istočnojadranskoj obali, kako bi osigurao bolji položaj u odnosu na Zadar, koji je kao središte teme i dalje bio više vezan za Bizant?

Uzevši u obzir prethodno izneseno, razloge kratkog hrvatsko-bugarskog rata valjalo bi potražiti negdje drugdje, odnosno u sklanjanju srpskog kneza Zaharije u Hrvatsku. Novi bugarski pohod na Srbiju trebalo bi promatrati u kontekstu priprema za novi pohod protiv Bizanta, koji je Simeon pripremao[74] neposredno prije svoje smrti. Doživjevši poraz, Zaharija se sklonio u Hrvatsku, a bugarski vojskovođa Alogobotur nastavio je s vojskom prema zapadu kako bi pokušao nanijeti poraz onome tko je pružio zaštitu srpskom knezu, odnosno hrvatskom vladaru.[75] Naravno, dodatni razlog napada može se tražiti u želji za teritorijalnim širenjem, kao i u pokušaju da se zaprijeti dalmatinskim gradovima, koji su nominalno bili bizantski teritorij.

Prihvatimo li prijedlog Predraga Komatine o bliskosti ovih dvaju događaja, bugarski pohod na Srbiju trebali bismo smjestiti negdje u sredinu 926., a napad na Hrvatsku na kraj 926. ili početak 927. godine. Da ta dva događaja treba promatrati u istom kontekstu možda pokazuje i to da je Simeon jednostavno nastavio s pripremama za pohod protiv Bizanta ne mareći za poraz u Hrvatskoj. To bi značilo da mu je Srbija, kao bizantski saveznik u tom trenutku, bila primarni cilj, dok bi eventualni uspjeh u Hrvatskoj, na koju isprva nije ni gledao kao na neprijatelja, predstavljao tek dodatnu korist.

U konačnici, Krešimir je porazio Alogobotura, ali nije imao namjeru upasti na bugarski teritorij.

[72] Đaković 2023, str. 79–80.
[73] Raukar 1997, str. 38.
[74] Fine 1983, str. 157.
[75] DAI, str. 87.

held that King Tomislav entered into an alliance with Byzantium and, in return, received administrative control over the Dalmatian cities. Upon learning this, Simeon allegedly launched his campaign westward in order to defeat a Byzantine ally.[66] Such an interpretation presupposes strong Byzantine control over Dalmatia; however, it is extremely difficult to speak of any significant presence of Byzantine central authority in the region during the 920s.

It is true that, for instance, the Byzantine emperor is mentioned in the testament of Prior Andrew from 918, yet no representative of the Byzantine imperial administration is mentioned.[67] By way of comparison, the cities of southern Italy, as well as the Lombard rulers, also employed the regnal years of Byzantine emperors in the dating clauses of their charters during the first quarter of the 10th century. Admittedly, references to Byzantine rulers in Lombard principalities were neither continuous nor entirely consistent, and at times occurred only sporadically; nevertheless, Lombard rulers regularly continued to mention their patrician titles up until 920.[68]

For Croatian history, it may therefore prove particularly useful to compare the cases of the Dalmatian cities and the Lombard principalities, especially in terms of their relationship with the Byzantine Empire. Both regions occupied peripheral positions within the Empire and tended to attract the attention of the central government only during periods of imperial stability and when Constantinople pursued a proactive Adriatic and Mediterranean policy. The example of the Lombard principalities demonstrates clearly what occurred when Byzantine power weakened. Namely, the Lombards rapidly adopted a hostile stance toward the Empire and embarked upon expansionist campaigns in southern Italy. Naturally, this pattern of behaviour cannot be directly applied to the Dalmatian cities, which had been an integral part of Byzantium since the reconquest under Justinian and, to some extent, belonged to the same cultural sphere. Accordingly, the Dalmatian cities had neither reason nor the resources and political-military capacity to be hostile to Byzantium. Nevertheless, the territorial discontinuity between

[66] Birin 2015, pp. 53–54; Budak 2018, pp. 222–224; Curta 2006, pp. 195–196; Šišić 1990, pp. 406–412; pp. 421–422.
[67] CD 1, pp. 25–28.
[68] Loud 1999, pp. 625–626.

Razlog vjerojatno leži u strahu od Simeona i snage njegove vojske. Bugarski car umro je u svibnju 927., dok se pripremao za novi pohod protiv Bizanta,[76] što je očito bio svojevrstan okidač da Hrvati počnu planirati vojni pothvat protiv Bugara, o čemu svjedoče zapisi Simeona Logoteta[77] i Teofanova Nastavljača.[78] Zbog nedostatka pisanih izvora nemoguće je reći je li došlo do hrvatskog napada na Bugare, no znamo da je ubrzo sklopljen mir, vjerojatno krajem 927. ili početkom 928., između Mihaela Krešimira II. i Petra, novog bugarskog vladara. Glavni posrednik u mirovnim pregovorima bio je biskup Madalbert, koji je, nakon što je uspješno zaključio mir, došao iz Bugarske u Split, gdje je kao papin legat sudjelovao na novom splitskom crkvenom saboru.[79]

Do novog crkvenog sabora očito je došlo zbog slabog ili nikakvog provođenja odluka sabora iz 925. koje su se odnosile na izbor metropolita i slavensko bogoslužje. Ninski biskup Grgur i zadarski biskup Formin nisu se mirili s odlukom da Splitska nadbiskupija ima crkveno prvenstvo na teritoriju Hrvatskog Kraljevstva, a očito ni suzbijanje pojave svećenika glagoljaša nije išlo prema planu. Tako su se 928. godine u Splitu ponovno okupili crkveni velikodostojnici (izrijekom se spominju splitski, zadarski i ninski biskup) i hrvatski vladar (njegovo ime nije spomenuto, no riječ je o Mihaelu Krešimiru II.). Sabor je potvrdio odluke iz 925., uz naglasak da se zadarski, rapski, krčki i osorski biskupi moraju držati zacrtanih granica biskupija. Isto tako, ukinuta je Ninska biskupija, a biskupu Grguru, čiji je naslov bio biskup Hrvata (*episcopus Croatorum*), ponuđene su Sisačka, Skradinska i Delmitanska biskupija. Na kraju su dubrovački, stonski i kotorski biskup dobili upozorenje da se moraju držati ispravnog vjerskog nauka. Upozorenje je vjerojatno došlo kao posljedica korištenja slavenske liturgije u tim biskupijama.[80]

Odluke splitskog crkvenog sabora potvrdio je papa Lav VI., koji je naslijedio Ivana X. Splitskom nadbiskupu Ivanu poslao je palij te obvezao sve biskupe da mu budu pokorni. Bivšem ninskom biskupu Grguru zapovjeđeno je da preuzme Skradinsku biskupiju, a ostalim biskupima (osobito zadar-

[76] Fine 1983, str. 157.
[77] VIJ 3, str. 8–9.
[78] Bekker 1838, str. 412.
[79] CD 1, str. 37.
[80] Budak 2018, str. 242–243.

the cities and the rest of the Empire, together with the limited presence of the central authority in the region, occasionally encouraged the cities to exert a greater degree of political autonomy. Clear examples of this can be observed in 805, when allegiance was sworn to Charlemagne[69], and during the 820s when the cities "gained autonomy"[70] under the emperor Michael II.[71] Although these two examples from the western periphery of the Empire differ in important respects, both demonstrate that it was entirely possible for local power-holders to act on their own authority where there was no stronger central presence. The absence of any reference to a representative of the Byzantine authority in the will of Prior Andrew probably suggests that the Dalmatian cities were no longer so closely bound to Byzantium, and that they may very well have begun to pursue a somewhat more independent policy, particularly considering that most of the cities had, since the 880s, been paying tribute to the Croatian ruler.

The payment of tribute to Croatia was one of the principal driving forces in the integration of the Dalmatian cities with the Croatian hinterland. When this is further combined with the limited presence of Byzantine central authority, the possibility of a Bulgarian incursion, and the memory of Arab raiding campaigns from the second half of the 9th century, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the incorporation of the Dalmatian cities under the protection of King Tomislav was the result of their own initiative and diplomatic action rather than a consequence of a Byzantine–Croatian alliance. Confronted with all these potential dangers and lacking the military strength to resist them, the representatives of the Dalmatian cities found a protector in Tomislav, who had no reason to refuse their proposal.[72] Tomislav Raukar, writing on this issue, stated the following: "Byzantium either agreed to Tomislav's authority over the Dalmatian cities or was unable to resist it."[73] In my view, the decisive factor was Byzantine

[69] Goldstein 1992, p. 153; Gračanin 2015, pp. 504–506.
[70] Constantine Porphyrogenitus aimed to criticise the reign of Michael II, so his claim of a complete emancipation of the Dalmatian cities should be treated with caution; nonetheless, his statements may be taken as evidence that Byzantium did not exercise full control over the cities.
[71] DAI, p. 64.
[72] Đaković 2023, pp. 79–80.
[73] Raukar 1997, p. 38.

skom, osorskom, rapskom i dubrovačkom) upućeno je upozorenje da se drže granica svojih biskupija. Jedino je Splitska nadbiskupija dobila dozvolu za širenje na teritorij Hrvatskog Kraljevstva u skladu s prijašnjim odlukama crkvenog sabora.[81] Potvrdom pape Lava VI. finalizirana je obnova jedinstvene crkvene pokrajine na području Hrvatskog Kraljevstva i Dalmacije, što je omogućilo još veću povezanost hrvatskog vladara i elite u zaleđu s dalmatinskim gradovima.

4. MEĐUNARODNI KONTEKST OD OKO 930. DO OKO 965. GODINE

Početak Krešimirove vladavine bio je doista buran. U samo nekoliko godina uspješno je napao Sipont, obranio se od Bugara, s kojima je potom posredstvom papinskog legata sklopljen mir, te je sudjelovao na splitskom crkvenom saboru 928., gdje je konačno potvrđeno novo crkveno uređenje na prostoru Hrvatskog Kraljevstva i Dalmacije. Nakon 928. pa sve do vladavine Stjepana I. Držislava povijesni izvori o Hrvatskoj vrlo su rijetki. Zbog toga ćemo pokušati sagledati međunarodni kontekst u kojem se odvijala Krešimirova vladavina od kraja 920-ih do oko 965. godine.

Krenimo najprije od južne Italije. Ondje su se borbe između Landulfa i Guimara, s jedne strane, te Carstva, s druge strane, nastavile sve do 934. godine. U tom periodu Bizant je najteži poraz doživio 929., kada je knez Salerna Guimar porazio stratega Sicilije[82] Anastazija kod rijeke Basentello.[83] Ipak, 934. Carstvo je uspjelo stabilizirati situaciju u svojoj temi Langobardiji. Osiguravši savezništvo s talijanskim kraljem Hugom, carska središnja vlast poslala je vojsku na čelu s patricijem Kosmasom u južnu Italiju. Pod prijetnjom uporabe sile Bizant je uspio natjerati langobardske prinčeve na povlačenje iz zauzetih dijelova te je uspostavljen mir.[84] Idućih tridesetak godina bilo je razdoblje mira između Langobarda i Bizanta, a carska vlast u južnoj Italiji izgrađivana je kroz dvije teme – temu Siciliju, koja se trebala prostirati na Siciliju, Kalabriju, Napulj i Amalfi, a u stvarnosti se sastojala samo od Kalabrije, te temu Langobardiju, koja je trebala obuhvaćati Apuliju, Basilicatu te područje Beneventa i Capue,

[81] CD 1, str. 38–39.

[82] Ime bizantske teme bilo je Sicilija, no u stvarnosti se prostirala na području Kalabrije.

[83] Zuckerman 2014, str. 213–214.

[84] Zuckerman 2014, str. 215.

inability to act effectively on that matter, although claims over the cities were still maintained. At the same time, the cities did not forget their affiliation with the Empire, but rather adapted to the prevailing circumstances in order to secure their own protection. This also raises the question of the degree to which individual Dalmatian cities felt a sense of belonging to Byzantium. Did Split, for instance, perhaps seek closer relations with the Croatian elites in the hinterland, perceived as a rising power on the eastern Adriatic coast, in order to secure a more favourable position compared to Zadar, which, as the centre of the theme, remained more closely tied to Byzantiumin?

In view of the above, the reasons for the brief Croatian–Bulgarian war should be sought elsewhere, namely, in the refuge granted to the Serbian prince Zacharias in Croatia. The new Bulgarian campaign against Serbia should be viewed in the context of preparations for a broader offensive against Byzantium that Simeon was organising[74] shortly before his death. After suffering defeat, Zacharias fled to Croatia, while the Bulgarian commander Alogobotur continued westward with his army, aiming to strike at the power that had offered protection to the Serbian prince, that is the Croatian ruler.[75] An additional motive for the attack may, of course, be sought in the desire to expand territory and in an effort to intimidate the Dalmatian cities, which were nominally Byzantine territory.

If we accept Predrag Komatina's suggestion that the two events stood in close temporal proximity, the Bulgarian military expedition against Serbia should be dated to around mid-926, while the attack on Croatia would fall at the end of 926 or the beginning of 927. The fact that the two events should be viewed within the same context may also be suggested by Simeon's continued preparations for a campaign against Byzantium, undertaken without regard for the defeat suffered in Croatia. This would imply that Serbia, as a Byzantine ally at that time, represented his primary objective, while any success in Croatia, initially not even conceived as an enemy, would have constituted only an additional gain.

Krešimir ultimately defeated Alogobotur, but had no intention of invading Bulgarian territory. The reason probably lies in his fear of Simeon and

[74] Fine 1983, p. 157.

[75] DAI, p. 87.

ali se *de facto* prostirala samo na Apuliju i Basilicatu.[85]

Prijetnja bizantskoj Italiji ponovno su postali Arapi sa Sicilije nakon što su krajem 940-ih godina riješili unutarnje probleme. Ponovno su počele arapske pljačke po Kalabriji, Reggio je zauzet 950., a 956. došlo je do bizantske intervencije s ciljem jačanja kontrole nad vlastitim teritorijem, odvraćanja Langobarda od eventualnog napada i zaštite Kalabrije od novih arapskih napada.[86]

Zemlja koja je u ranom srednjem vijeku bila hrvatski konkurent za prevlast na istočnojadranskoj obali – Venecija – tijekom 9. stoljeća doživjela je uspon ponajviše zahvaljujući trgovini, a pritom valja posebno istaknuti *Pactum Lotharii*,[87] koji je Veneciji davao brojne povlastice pri trgovanju na teritoriju karolinške Italije (a kasnije i otonske Italije). Osim trgovine, uspon Venecije i njezine elite proizlazio je i iz političkih, kulturnih, ekonomskih i ženidbenih veza s područjima u njezinu neposrednom zaleđu, a zatim i sa sjevernom Italijom te Istrom.[88] Tijekom prve polovine 10. stoljeća taj se uspon nastavio.

Dužd Petar II. Kandijan vojnim napadom 932. godine uspio je poraziti Comacchio, čime je taj grad prestao biti ekonomski konkurentan Veneciji.[89] Iste godine Koper se stavio pod venecijansku zaštitu, a ubrzo se dužd našao u ratu s istarskim i furlanskim markgrofom Vinterijem, koji je provalio na venecijanske posjede u Istri. Rat je završio pobjedom Petra II. i sklapanjem mira u ožujku 933., kojim je osigurana venecijanska trgovina na području istarskog akvatorija, a njezini posjedi u Istri postali su *de facto* neovisni o lokalnim vlastima.[90] Kao što vidimo, Venecija je tijekom tog razdoblja učvršćivala svoj položaj na sjevernom Jadranu, ali još uvijek nije imala snage za ekspanziju prema istočnojadranskoj obali. O tome svjedoči epizoda iz 948. godine, kada je dužd Petar III. Kandijan u dvama navratima slao svoje brodovlje protiv neretvanskih Slavena (*Narrentanos Sclavos*),[91] ali su oba pohoda

[85] Martin 2021, str. 189.

[86] Loud 1999, str. 628–629.

[87] *Pactum Lotharii* je naziv za trgovinske povlastice koje je 840. Veneciji dodijelio Lotar, karolinški car i kralj Italije. Povlastice su obnavljane svaki put kada bi novi vladar došao na talijanski tron.

[88] West-Harling 2013, str. 237–264.

[89] West-Harling 2013, str. 241.

[90] Čoralić 2015, str. 554.

[91] Mladen Ančić u svojem je članku „Ranosrednjovjek-

the strength of his army. The Bulgarian tsar died in May 927 while preparing a new campaign against Byzantium,[76] which appears to have served as a catalyst for the Croats to begin planning military action against the Bulgarians, as evidenced in the accounts of Simeon Logothetes[77] and Theophanes Continuatus.[78] Due to the scarcity of written sources, it is impossible to determine whether a Croatian attack on Bulgaria actually took place; however, it is known that peace was soon concluded, most likely towards the end of 927 or at the beginning of 928, between Michael Krešimir II and Peter, the new Bulgarian ruler. The principal mediator in the peace negotiations was Bishop Madalbert, who, after successfully concluding the agreement, travelled from Bulgaria to Split where, as papal legate, he participated in the new Church Council of Split.[79]

The convening of the new church council was evidently necessitated by the fact that the decisions of the council of 925 concerning the election of the metropolitan and the use of the Slavonic liturgy had either been weakly implemented or not implemented at all. The Bishop of Nin, Gregory, as well as the Bishop of Zadar, Formin, refused to accept the decision granting ecclesiastical primacy over the territory of the Croatian Kingdom to the Archdiocese of Split, while the campaign against Glagolitic clergy appears not to have been effectively enforced. Thus, in 928, ecclesiastical dignitaries once again gathered in Split (explicitly mentioning the bishops of Split, Zadar and Nin), together with the Croatian ruler (whose name is not recorded, but who was in fact Michael Krešimir II). The council confirmed the decisions of 925, with particular emphasis on the obligation of the bishops of Zadar, Rab, Krk and Osor to remain within the defined boundaries of their dioceses. In addition, the diocese of Nin was abolished, and Bishop Gregory, whose title had been bishop of the Croats (*episcopus Croatorum*), was offered the sees of Sisak, Skradin and Delminium. Lastly, the bishops of Dubrovnik, Ston and Kotor received a warning that they must adhere to orthodox doctrine, most likely as a consequence of the use of the Slavonic liturgy within their dioceses.[80]

[76] Fine 1983, p. 157.

[77] VIJ 3, pp. 8–9.

[78] Bekker 1838, p. 412.

[79] CD 1, p. 37.

[80] Budak 2018, pp. 242–243.

završila neuspjehom.[92] Nažalost, povijesni izvori ne otkrivaju je li Krešimir II. na bilo koji način pomagao Neretvanima u borbi protiv Venecije.

Sjeverno od Hrvatskog Kraljevstva nalazila se Ugarska. Mađari su između 895. i 900. zauzeli većinu Panonske nizine, koja im je u idućim desetljećima služila kao polazište za pljačkaške pohode diljem Europe. Ti su pohodi trajali sve do 955. godine. Tijekom 920-ih posebno je zapažen bio pljačkaški pohod po Italiji, a najupečatljiviji trenutak dogodio se 927., kada su Mađari umarširali u Rim na poziv Petra, brata pape Ivana X. Karakteristika tih pljačkaških kampanja bila je usmjerenost Mađara na zapadnu i srednju Europu te Italiju. Kada govorimo o jugoistoku Europe, zabilježen je mađarski pohod sve do Konstantinopola 934. te pljačke po Grčkoj 943. godine. Mađarima je na kraj stao Oton I., koji ih je porazio na Leškom polju 955., što je označilo kraj velikih mađarskih pljačkaških pohoda, iako oni nisu u potpunosti prestali.[93]

Oton I. na scenu je stupio još 936., naslijedivši svojeg oca Henrika I. Ptičara kao istočnofranačkog (njemačkog) kralja. Njegova krunidba u Aachenu bila je izrazito simbolične prirode. Osim što se krunio u nekadašnjem karolinškom središtu, Oton je na krunidbu došao u franačkoj obući s jasnom simbolikom – on je nasljednik Karla Velikog. Na početku svoje vladavine, između 937. i 941. godine, uspio je slomiti otpor različitih kneževa, grofova i markgrofova koji su se protivili njegovoj vlasti.[94]

Na istoku je nakon Simeonove smrti na bugarsko prijestolje došao car Petar, koji je pokrenuo veliki napad na Bizant, nastavivši ondje gdje je njegov otac stao. Međutim, Petrov se pohod nije pokazao osobito efikasnim te je već u jesen 927. sklopio mir s Bizantom.[95] Čini se da je tom prilikom bugarskoj Crkvi priznata autokefalnost, a Petru carski naslov. Također, Petar je oženio Mariju, unuku cara Romana I. Lekapena.[96] Bugarsko-bizantski mir pokazao se dugotrajnim te je potrajao oko 40 godina. U tom

ovni Neretvani ili Humljani: Tragom zabune koju je prouzročilo djelo *De administrando imperio*" doveo u pitanje postojanje Neretvana, no njegova teza nije (barem zasad) zaživjela u historiografiji. Ipak, njegov članak itekako potiče na daljnju raspravu o tome tko se zaista krije iza *Narrentani Sclavi*.

92 Ivan Đakon, str. 158.

93 Bakay 1999, str. 539, 544.

94 Müller-Mertens 1999, str. 244–246.

95 Stephenson 2004, str. 23–24.

96 Shepard 1999, str. 579.

The decisions of the Council of Split were confirmed by Pope Leo VI, who succeeded John X. He sent the pallium to Archbishop John of Split, and bound all the bishops to obedience to him. The former bishop of Nin, Gregory, was ordered to take up the see of Skradin, while the other bishops (those of Zadar, Osor, Rab and Dubrovnik in particular) were warned to adhere to the boundaries of their dioceses. Only the Archdiocese of Split was granted permission to extend its authority over the territory of the Croatian kingdom in accordance with the prior decisions of the council.[81] With the confirmation by Pope Leo VI, the restoration of a unified ecclesiastical province across the territory of the Croatian kingdom and Dalmatia was completed, an outcome that further strengthened the ties of the Croatian ruler and the elite in the hinterland with the Dalmatian cities.

4. THE INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT FROM C. 930 TO C. 965

The initial years of Krešimir's reign were undeniably turbulent. Within the span of only a few years, he successfully launched an expedition against Siponto, repelled a Bulgarian invasion and subsequently concluded peace through the mediation of a papal legate, and participated in the Church Council of Split in 928, where the new ecclesiastical order within the Croatian Kingdom and Dalmatia was eventually confirmed. After 928, however, and until the reign of Stephen I Držislav, references to Croatia in the surviving historical sources become exceedingly scarce. Consequently, an examination of the broader international context in which Krešimir's reign unfolded between the end of the 920s and approximately 965 is essential.

The situation in southern Italy provides an appropriate point to begin with. Hostilities between Landulf and Guaimar on the one hand and Byzantium on the other continued until 934. During this conflict, the Byzantine Empire suffered its most serious setback in 929, when Guaimar, prince of Salerno, defeated Anastasios, the strategos of Sicily[82], at the river Basentello.[83] Yet in 934, the Empire managed to stabilise the situation in its theme of Langobardia. Having secured an alliance with

81 CD 1, pp. 38–39.

82 The name of the Byzantine theme was Sicily, although in reality it extended over the territory of Calabria.

83 Zuckerman 2014, pp. 213–214.

je razdoblju carska vlast u Konstantinopolu razvila dobre diplomatske odnose s Mađarima u Podunavlju, Rusima na Dnjepru i Pečenezima u Hersonu. Posljedica te bizantske diplomatske „ofenzive" bila je i pojačana bizantska trgovačka aktivnost na tim područjima.[97]

Čini se da mir s Bizantom nisu dobro prihvatili bugarski velikaši skloni ratu te je 928. izbila pobuna u Preslavu s ciljem svrgavanja Petra i postavljanja njegova brata Ivana za cara. Pobuna je suzbijena, a Ivan poslan u izgnanstvo u Konstantinopol,[98] no čini se da je te okolnosti u Preslavu iskoristio Časlav. Pobjegavši iz bugarskog grada, iste se godine[99] vratio u Srbiju te ondje uspostavio svoju vlast. Također, novi srpski vladar proširio je svoju državu i na prostor Bosne, o čemu svjedoči Porfirogenetov podatak da se „zemlja Bosna" nalazila u sastavu Srbije. Na temelju podataka koje donosi *DAI* može se reći da je Časlavova Srbija održavala dobre odnose s Bizantom, čiji je car Roman I. Lekapen pomogao Časlavu pri dolasku na prijestolje.[100]

Bosna nam je zanimljiva i u kontekstu vladavine Mihaela Krešimira II. jer nam *Kraljevstvo Slavena*,[101] premda vrlo nepouzdan izvor za rani srednji vijek jer autor piše fiktivnu povijest s brojnim izmišljenim vladarima i događajima, donosi priču o Krešimiru koji je osvojio Bosnu, a nakon smrti svojeg oca zavladao Bijelom Hrvatskom. Da se ovdje kriju zrnca povijesne istine možda svjedoči to što se u idućim glavama spominje bugarski car Petar te se navodi da je Krešimira naslijedio njegov sin Stjepan, koji je nastavio vladati Bijelom Hrvatskom i Bosnom.[102] Iz relevantnih povijesnih izvora znamo da je sredinom 10. stoljeća na bugarskom prijestolju bio car Petar te da je Stjepan (Držislav) bio sin i nasljednik (Mihaela) Krešimira. Međutim, zbog problematičnosti izvora ne možemo sa sigur-

97 Vedriš 2015, str. 600.

98 Fine 1983, str. 162.

99 Isprva je Časlavov bijeg datiran između 931. i 934., no Georgije Ostrogorski pokazao je da se Porfirogenetova vremenska odrednica („Sedam godina za tim") odnosi na sedam godina od početka Zaharijine vladavine, a ne od bugarskog osvajanja Srbije, što bi značilo da je Časlavova vladavina počela 928. godine. Uzmemo li u obzir okolnosti u Bugarskom Carstvu te nemire u Preslavu, vjerojatno je Časlav iskoristio nered u gradu kako bi pobjegao iz njega (Ostrogorski 1948, str. 24, 28–29).

100 DAI, str. 88.

101 Ovo djelo poznatije je kao *Ljetopis popa Dukljanina*.

102 LjPD, str. 73.

the Italian king Hugh, the imperial central authority sent an army under the patrician Kosmas to southern Italy. Under threat of force, Byzantium succeeded in compelling the Lombard princes to withdraw from the territories they had taken, and peace was restored.[84] The thirty years that followed are a period of peace between the Lombards and Byzantium. Imperial authority in southern Italy was organised through two themes: the Theme of Sicily, which theoretically encompassed Sicily, Calabria, Naples and Amalfi, but in reality consisted only of Calabria; and the Theme of Longobardia, intended to include Apulia, Basilicata and the regions of Benevento and Capua, but *de facto* extended only over Apulia and Basilicata.[85]

Once the Arabs of Sicily had resolved their internal problems at the end of the 940s, they again emerged as a threat to Byzantine Italy. Arab incursions resumed in Calabria, Reggio was captured in 950, and in 956 the Empire undertook a military intervention aimed at consolidating control over its Italian territories, discouraging potential Lombard aggression, and strengthening the defence of Calabria against renewed Arab attacks.[86]

Venice, Croatia's principal rival for dominance along the eastern Adriatic during the Early Middle Ages, had experienced substantial growth during the 9th century, largely owing to its trading activities. Particularly important in this regard was the *Pactum Lotharii*[87], which granted Venice extensive privileges for trade within Carolingian Italy and later Ottonian Italy. Beyond trade, the rise of Venice (and of its elite) also derived from political, cultural, economic and marital ties with areas in the immediate hinterland, and subsequently with northern Italy and Istria.[88] This process of expansion continued throughout the first half of the 10th century.

In 932, Doge Pietro II Candiano successfully defeated Comacchio in a military campaign, effectively eliminating the city as an economic competitor to Venice.[89] In the same year, Koper placed

84 Ibid., p. 215.

85 Martin 2021, p. 189.

86 Loud 1999, pp. 628–629.

87 The *Pactum Lotharii* comprised trade privileges granted to Venice in 840 and 841 by Lothar, Carolingian emperor and king of Italy. The privileges were renewed each time a new ruler ascended the Italian throne.

88 West-Harling 2013, pp. 237–264.

89 Ibid., p. 241.

nošću ni prihvatiti ni odbaciti mogućnost da je Krešimir II. osvojio Bosnu.[103]

Caru Romanu Lekapenu mir na zapadu omogućio je znatno veću aktivnost na istoku, gdje se borio protiv Abasidskog Kalifata, ponajviše u Armeniji, Mezopotamiji i Edessi. Krajem 944. s carskog prijestolja svrgnuli su ga mlađi sinovi, ujedno i suvladari, Stjepan i Konstantin, no već u siječnju braća su skinuta s trona te je Konstantin VII. Porfirogenet prvi put otkako je zasjeo na carsko prijestolje zavladao Carstvom samostalno.[104]

Iste je godine Konstantin svojeg sina Romana II. okrunio za suvladara. Godine 949. pokrenuta je velika vojna kampanja s ciljem zauzimanja otoka Krete, no bez uspjeha. Ipak, na istoku je ratna sreća bila na strani Bizanta, što je kulminiralo 958. pobjedom kod Rabana. Iduće godine carske su se snage približile Aleppu, a krajem godine umro je Konstantin VII. Porfirogenet. Možemo slobodno reći da je sukob s Arapima tijekom 950-ih iznjedrio vojskovođu Nikefora II. Foku kao relevantnog čimbenika u Bizantu.[105]

Za relativno kratke vladavine Romana II. Nikefor II. nastavio je s uspješnim vojnim pohodima. Prva na meti bila je Kreta, na koju je u lipnju 960. navalila ogromna carska flota s jasnim ciljem da se osvajanjem otoka osigura grčka obala od arapskih pljački te da eventualna pobjeda posluži caru za učvršćivanje vlasti na samom početku njegove vladavine. Kreta je zauzeta u ožujku 961., a Nikefor se odmah uputio na istok kako bi osvojio Aleppo, što je konačno uspio u prosincu 962.[106] Nakon iznenadne smrti cara Romana II. u ožujku 963., Nikefor je uspio iskoristiti novonastalu situaciju te je iz političkog meteža izišao kao car u kolovozu iste godine.

U vrijeme kada se Nikefor II. uspinjao na društvenoj ljestvici Bizanta, Oton I. uspio je dovršiti svoju misiju obnavljanja Carstva na zapadu okrunivši se kao *imperator augustus* u bazilici sv. Petra u Rimu u veljači 962. Toj je krunidbi prethodilo čitavo desetljeće borbi protiv različitih protivnika, od talijanskog kralja Berengara II. preko vlastitog sina Liudolfa, koji se pobunio protiv njega, pa sve do Mađara. Tijekom svojeg drugog pohoda u Italiju (od 961. nadalje) nastupao je kao zaštitnik pape Ivana XII., koji ga je pozvao da zaštiti rimsku Crkvu od Berengara i njegova sina Adalberta.[107]

[103] Džino 2023, str. 194.
[104] Shepard 2008, str. 509–511.
[105] Shepard 2008, str. 516–518.
[106] Shepard 2008, str. 518–519.
[107] Müller-Mertens 1999, str. 246–251.

itself under Venetian protection. Shortly thereafter, the doge found himself at war with Winther, margrave of Istria and Friuli, who had invaded Venetian possessions in Istria. The war ended with Pietro's victory and the conclusion of peace in March 933, which secured Venetian trade in the waters of Istria, and *de facto* rendered Venetian possessions in Istria independent of local authorities.[90] As these developments demonstrate, Venice consolidated its position in the northern Adriatic during this period, but did not yet possess the strength to expand towards the eastern Adriatic coast. Evidence for this may be found in the events of 948, when Doge Pietro III Candiano twice sent his fleet against the Narentine Slavs (*Narrentanos Sclavos*)[91], yet both expeditions ended unsuccessfully.[92] Unfortunately, the surviving sources do not reveal whether Krešimir II provided any form of assistance to the Narentines in their struggle against Venice.

To the north of the Croatian kingdom lay Hungary. Between 895 and 900, the Magyars occupied most of the Pannonian Plain, which subsequently served as the base for their extensive raiding campaigns throughout Europe until 955. Particularly notable during the 920s were their incursions into Italy, culminating in the dramatic event of 927 when Magyar forces entered Rome at the invitation of Peter, brother of Pope John X. These campaigns were characterised by a focus on western and central Europe as well as Italy, while in southeastern Europe, recorded Magyar operations include the military campaign all the way to Constantinople in 934 and the plundering of Greece in 943. The Magyars were finally stopped by Otto I, who defeated them at Lechfeld in 955, an event that marked the end of the great Magyar raiding expeditions, although smaller incursions still occurred thereafter.[93]

Otto I himself emerged as one of the dominant political figures of the period already in 936, after succeeding his father, Henry I the Fowler, the East

[90] Čoralić 2015, p. 554.
[91] In his article "Ranosrednjovjekovni Neretvani ili Humljani: Tragom zabune koju je prouzročilo djelo De administrando imperio," Mladen Ančić has called into question the very existence of the Narentines; his thesis has generally not (at least for the time being) been accepted in historiography. His article nevertheless prompts further debate about who actually lies behind the *Narrentani Sclavi*.
[92] Ivan Đakon, p. 158.
[93] Bakay 1999, p. 539; p. 544.

U ovom kratkom pregledu međunarodnih zbivanja od oko 930. do oko 965. godine vjerojatno možemo tražiti razlog zbog kojeg se Hrvatska vrlo malo spominje u izvorima toga vremena. Sile tog doba nisu gledale prema istočnojadranskoj obali zbog vlastitih problema, bilo unutarnjih bilo vanjskih. U tako burnoj okolini Hrvatska je ipak sredinom 10. stoljeća „plovila" mirno. Takve su okolnosti omogućile Mihaelu Krešimiru II. mirnu vladavinu tijekom koje se hrvatski kralj, među ostalim, posvetio izgradnji svoje dinastije i prikazivanju svojeg stolovanja na prijestolju kao novog početka.

5. NOVI POČETAK

Hrvatski kralj Petar Krešimir potvrdio je 1066./1067. samostanu sv. Krševana posjed Diklo, koji je još ranije samostanu darovao Mihael Krešimir II. U toj ispravi, među ostalim, stoji sljedeće:

Ja Krešimir, koji se drugim imenom zovem i Petar, kralj Hrvata i Dalmatinaca, dajem svima na znanje, da mi se čini pravednim, da se ne krše odredbe mojih pradjedova, posebno onih, koje su učinjene za spasenje duša njihovih. Našli smo naime u djelima našega pradjeda Krešimira starijega, da kako bi spasio svoju dušu, da je predao samostanu svetog Krševana neki posjed u mjestu koje se zove Diklo (…).[108]

Najvažnije saznanje iz ovog dijela isprave jest postojanje *Gesta Cresimiri maioris*, izgubljene srednjovjekovne kronike u kojoj su zasigurno bili sačuvani događaji iz vladavine Mihaela Krešimira II., a možda i njegovih neposrednih nasljednika. Djelo je vjerojatno služilo za legitimaciju kraljeve vladavine, za uzdizanje kralja i njegovih postupaka te kao zapis o „novom početku", odnosno o novoj dinastiji čiji je osnivač bio Krešimir. Naravno, *Gesta* su bila samo jedan od načina na koji je hrvatski kralj, zajedno sa suprugom Jelenom, gradio svoju ostavštinu koju su trebale pamtiti iduće generacije vladara i velikaša.

[108] *Ego Cresimir, qui alio nomine uocor Petrus, Chroatorum rex Dalmatinorumque, notifico omnibus, quod iustum mihi uidetur, ut statuta parentum meorum antiquorum non cassentur, maxime illa, que ad salutem eorum pertinent animarum. Comperimus namque in gestis proaui nostri Cresimiri maioris, quod pro remedio anime sue tradidisse (!) monasterio sancti Chrisogoni territorium aliquod in loco, qui dicitur Hyculus* (CD 1, str. 105–106).

Frankish (German) king. His coronation at Aachen was deeply symbolic. Not only did he choose the former Carolingian capital as the site of the ceremony, but he also appeared in Frankish dress with a clear symbolism, namely he was the heir of Charlemagne. During the early years of his reign, between 937 and 941, Otto successfully suppressed the resistance of various dukes, counts and margraves who opposed his authority.[94]

In the east, after Simeon's death, his son Peter ascended the Bulgarian throne as tsar. Determined to continue his father's policy, Peter launched a major campaign against Byzantium, which, however, achieved little, and by the autumn of 927 he concluded peace with Byzantium.[95] It appears that this agreement recognised the autocephalous status of the Bulgarian Church, while Peter himself received formal recognition of his imperial title. Furthermore, Peter married Maria, granddaughter of Emperor Romanos I Lekapenos.[96] The resulting Bulgarian–Byzantine peace proved remarkably long-lasting, holding for some 40 years. During this period, the imperial government in Constantinople cultivated good diplomatic relations with the Magyars of the Danube region, the Rus' of the Dnieper, and the Pechenegs of Cherson. This Byzantine diplomatic "offensive" was accompanied by a significant increase in Byzantine commercial activities throughout these regions.[97]

It seems however that the peace with Byzantium was not well received by all members of the Bulgarian aristocracy, particularly those favouring a more aggressive policy. Consequently, a rebellion broke out in Preslav with the aim of deposing Peter and placing his brother Ivan on the throne. The rebellion was suppressed and Ivan was sent into exile to Constantinople.[98] These circumstances appear to have been exploited by Časlav, who escaped from the Bulgarian city in the same year[99] and returned to

[94] Müller-Mertens 1999, pp. 244–246.
[95] Stephenson 2004, pp. 23–24.
[96] Shepard 1999, p. 579.
[97] Vedriš 2015, p. 600.
[98] Fine 1983, p. 162.
[99] Časlav's flight was initially dated between 931 and 934, but Georgije Ostrogorski showed that Porphyrogenitus's chronological indication ("Seven years thereafter…") refers to seven years from the beginning of Zacharia's rule, and not from the Bulgarian conquest of Serbia, which would mean that Časlav's reign began in 928. Considering the circumstances in

Da u Mihaelu Krešimiru II. treba tražiti utemeljitelja nove dinastije, kako su prije predlagali Vjekoslav Klaić i Ferdo Šišić, a u novije vrijeme Neven Budak,[109] svjedoči i prije spomenuta isprava Petra Krešimira IV. Ona nam je uvelike pomogla spoznati tko su bili hrvatski vladari od Mihaela Krešimira II. do Petra Krešimira IV. Tekst glasi:

(…) *u njegovo vrijeme* (Mihaela Krešimira II., op. L. Đ.) *i sina njegova Držislava i njihovih moćnih banova, naime Pribine i Godimira, i u vremenima Svetoslava i njegove braće, Krešimira i Gojslava, i njegova sina Stjepana, oca mojega* (…).[110]

Smatram da je ovo svojevrsni dokaz da je, primjerice, Petar Krešimir vidio Mihaela Krešimira kao osnivača dinastije i da je on to zaista bio. Jasno je da je Krešimir II. bio taj koji je darovao posjed Diklo samostanu sv. Krševana te da nakon toga slijedi niz vladara koji su priznavali taj posjed samostanu. Ipak, indikativno je da se u ispravi ne spominje tko je otac Mihaela Krešimira. To bi nam moglo govoriti da je za hrvatske vladare 11. stoljeća (do Zvonimira) Krešimir II., odnosno *Cresimir Maior*, predstavljao početak, tj. onoga od kojeg je potekla čitava vladarska kuća.

Krešimirova supruga Jelena bila je jednako važna za, mogli bismo to nazvati, ideološku koncepciju „novog početka", koja je uspješno oblikovana sredinom 10. stoljeća. Ona je u Solinu podigla dvije crkve – Sv. Marije i sv. Stjepana – koje su predane redovnicima da čuvaju uspomenu na one koji su ih podigli i na one koji su tamo pokapani.[111] Iako o položaju tih crkava postoje različite pretpostavke, danas se smatra da je na Otoku zasigurno bila crkva sv. Stjepana,[112] koja je služila i kao mauzolej hrvatskih vladara,[113] dok se lokacija crkve Sv. Marije još uvijek ne može sa sigurnošću odrediti.

Odabir Solina, odnosno bivše Salone, nekadašnjeg središta rimske provincije Dalmacije, nije bio nimalo slučajan. Prije nego što se pozabavimo simboličkim, odnosno ideološkim značenjem te lokacije, valja istaknuti da je ona imala i stratešku važ-

Serbia, where he established his rule. The new Serbian ruler also expanded his dominion into Bosnia, as suggested by Porphyrogenitus' statement that the "land of Bosnia" formed part of Serbia. On the basis of the evidence contained in *De Administrando Imperio*, it may be concluded that Časlav's Serbia maintained good relations with Byzantium, whose emperor Romanos I Lekapenos assisted Časlav in his accession to the throne.[100]

Bosnia is also of interest in the context of the reign of Michael Krešimir II, since the *Kingdom of the Slavs*[101], despite being an extremely unreliable source for the Early Middle Ages —its author presenting a largely fictional history populated by numerous invented rulers and events— nevertheless contains an account according to which Krešimir conquered Bosnia and, following his father's death, assumed rule over White Croatia. The possibility that this narrative contains a kernel of historical truth is perhaps suggested by the fact that subsequent chapters mention the Bulgarian tsar Peter and state that Krešimir was succeeded by his son Stjepan, who went on to rule White Croatia and Bosnia.[102] Relevant historical sources confirm that Tsar Peter ruled Bulgaria in the mid-10th century and that Stephen (Držislav) was indeed the son and successor of Michael Krešimir. Nevertheless, given the problematic nature of the source, we can neither confirm nor reject the possibility that Krešimir II conquered Bosnia.[103]

The peace secured in the west enabled Emperor Romanos Lekapenos to pursue a far more active policy in the east, where he was engaged in campaigns against the Abbasid Caliphate, particularly in Armenia, Mesopotamia and the region of Edessa. At the end of 944, he was deposed by his younger sons and co-emperors, Stephen and Constantine. Their rule, however, proved short-lived, as the brothers themselves were removed from power in January 945, allowing Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, for the first time since his accession to the imperial throne, to assume sole authority over the Empire.[104]

[109] Budak 2020, str. 264, 271.

[110] (…) *tempore ipsius et filii eius Dirzislai et eorum potentibus banis, uidelicet Pribyne et Godemiri, et temporibus Suataslao et eius fratrum, silicet Cresimiri et Goyslaui, et filii eius regi Stephani, patris mei* (CD 1, str. 106).

[111] HS, str. 80–81; Budak 2020, str. 273.

[112] Delonga 1996, str. 130.

[113] Budak 2020, str. 272.

the Bulgarian Empire and the unrest in Preslav, it is likely that Časlav took advantage of the turmoil in the city to escape. (Ostrogorski 1948, p. 24; pp. 28–29.)

[100] DAI, p. 88.

[101] This work is better known as the *Chronicle of the Priest of Duklja*.

[102] LjPD, p. 73.

[103] Džino 2023, p. 194.

[104] Shepard 2008, pp. 509–511.

nost. Izgradnja mauzoleja na Otoku omogućila je kontrolu puta Trogir – Split te je ujedno „približila" hrvatske vladare Splitu, središtu crkvene pokrajine.[114]

Valja spomenuti i dio rukopisa iz 18. stoljeća koji se čuvao u Trogiru. U njemu se navodi da je Krešimir, sin Tišimira, kralja Srbije, godine 932. pripojio Hrvatsku svojem kraljevstvu i izabrao Salonu za glavni grad te da je njegova supruga Jelena osnovala baziliku oko Solina i umrla oko 954.[115]

Autor tog rukopisa donosi katalog hrvatskih *duces* i *reges*, a posebno je zanimljivo da je prema tom katalogu Krešimir prvi hrvatski kralj i da je on izabrao Salonu za svoje središte. Iako je velik dio onoga što je zapisano u tom katalogu plod autorove mašte ili možda lošeg tumačenja njemu dostupnih povijesnih izvora,[116] spominjanje Salone kao glavnog grada Hrvatskog Kraljevstva može nas potaknuti na daljnje razmišljanje. Budući da je novoizgrađeni mauzolej hrvatskih vladara zaista bio u Solinu, možemo se zapitati je li Mihael Krešimir II. premjestio svoj dvor negdje u blizinu Solina (primjerice na Klis) ili je dvor doista bio izgrađen u jednom dijelu nekadašnje Salone. Naravno, nemamo potvrdu ni za jedno ni za drugo, ali bi nam u odgovoru na to pitanje pomogla eventualna arheološka otkrića, konkretnije otkriće ranosrednjovjekovnog naselja na području Solina.

Vratimo se sada ideološkom značenju mauzoleja na Otoku. Vidjeli smo na primjeru splitskog crkvenog sabora 925. iznimnu važnost simbolike Salone. U konačnici je splitska Crkva dobila metropolitanski status upravo zbog toga što se u Splitu nalaze kosti sv. Dujma, onoga kojeg je, prema legendi, sveti Petar poslao da propovijeda po Saloni.[117] Crkvena pokrajina, koja je u vjerskom smislu ujedinila Hrvatsku i Dalmaciju, na neki je način obvezala Krešimira II. da se prilagodi novonastalim okolnostima te je on prostor Solina iskoristio za legitimaciju svoje vladavine u dalmatinskim gradovima.

Nasljeđe antičkog Rimskog Carstva koristilo se kao sredstvo legitimacije u ranom srednjem vijeku te je pozivanje na ostavštinu Rima donosilo svojevrstan prestiž.[118] Osim što se Bizant smatrao izravnim nasljednikom starog Rima, imamo primjere u

[114] Budak 2020, str. 272–273.
[115] Bulić 1901, str. 223–224.
[116] Budak 2020, str. 274.
[117] CD 1, str. 31.
[118] Pohl 2018, str. 39.

In the same year, Constantine crowned his son Romanos II as co-ruler. In 949, a large military campaign was launched with the aim of seizing the island of Crete, but it ended in failure. In the east, however, Byzantine fortunes proved more favourable, culminating in the victory at Raban in 958. The following year imperial armies advanced toward Aleppo, and by the end of 959 Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus had died. It is no exaggeration to state that the wars against the Arabs during the 950s brought forth Nikephoros II Phokas as one of the most significant military and political figures in the Byzantine world.[105]

During the relatively brief reign of Romanos II, Nikephoros II continued his successful military campaigns. The first target was Crete, against which an enormous imperial fleet sailed in June 960 with the clear objective of securing the Greek coast from Arab raids through the island's conquest, and of providing the emperor with the kind of victory that would consolidate his rule at the very start of his reign. Crete was captured in March 961, after which Nikephoros immediately turned eastward in order to seize Aleppo, a goal he ultimately achieved in December 962.[106] After the sudden death of Emperor Romanos II in March 963, Nikephoros managed to exploit the resulting situation and emerged from the political turmoil as emperor in August 963.

At the very time when Nikephoros II was ascending the Byzantine social hierarchy, Otto I succeeded in completing his mission of restoring the Empire in the west by crowning himself *imperator augustus* in the Basilica of Saint Peter in Rome in February 962. This coronation was preceded by an entire decade of struggles against various opponents, ranging from the Italian king Berengar II, through his own son Liudolf, who rebelled against him, to the Magyars. During his second campaign in Italy (from 961 onwards), he acted as protector of Pope John XII, who had called on him to defend the Roman Church from Berengar and his son Adalbert.[107]

Within this brief overview of international events from approximately 930 to approximately 965, we can likely identify the reason why Croatia is mentioned very sparsely in the sources of the period. The great powers of the time were not focused

[105] Ibid., pp. 516–518.
[106] Ibid., pp. 518–519.
[107] Müller-Mertens 1999, pp. 246–251.

likovima Karla Velikog, Otona I. i njegovih neposrednih nasljednika, pa i Simeona, koji su se, između ostalog, nazivali rimskim carevima ili pozivali na rimsku ostavštinu. Uzmemo li u obzir da su se u neposrednoj Krešimirovoj blizini nalazili dalmatinski gradovi, *de iure* teritorij Bizantskog Carstva, koje u tom trenutku ipak nije bilo značajnije prisutno na istočnojadranskoj obali u vidu utjecaja središnje vlasti, te da su neki od tih gradova (poput Zadra) imali neprekinut kontinuitet od antike, mogli bismo pomisliti da su Mihael Krešimir II. i njegova supruga Jelena koristili Solin, odnosno nekadašnju Salonu, kao simbol svoje vladavine izgradivši mauzolej u kojem su pokapani hrvatski vladari upravo na mjestu gdje su nekoć stolovali upravitelji rimske provincije Dalmacije. Kao što je splitski nadbiskup Ivan iskoristio ostavštinu rimske Salone prilikom stjecanja prvenstva u crkvenoj provinciji, tako je i Krešimir II. mogao istu ostavštinu iskoristiti za legitimaciju svoje političke vlasti. Pojednostavljeno rečeno, iz ideološke perspektive, splitska Crkva bila je nasljednica salonitanske Crkve te je dobila crkveno prvenstvo nad dobrim dijelom nekadašnje rimske Dalmacije, dok je Mihael Krešimir predstavljao svojevrsnog nasljednika rimskih upravitelja provincije, što mu je moglo dati dodatni legitimitet u odnosima s dalmatinskim gradovima.

Nažalost, zbog nedostatka pisanih izvora ne možemo reći kakav je bio odnos hrvatskog kralja s dalmatinskim gradovima sredinom 10. stoljeća. Ipak, prije spomenuta darovnica za Diklo otkriva da je Krešimir II. mogao darovati zemlju koja je bila dio zadarskog gradskog teritorija te da je jačao odnose sa samostanom sv. Krševana u Zadru.[119]

Vratimo se nakratko na *Gesta Cresimiri maioris*. Vidjeli smo da je u vrijeme Petra Krešimira IV., u drugoj polovini 11. stoljeća, to djelo bilo poznato. O tome jesu li *Gesta* (ili barem neki njihovi dijelovi) bila poznata i drugim srednjovjekovnim autorima možemo samo nagađati.

O Krešimiru II. i njegovoj Jeleni u spisu Tome Arhiđakona nalazimo sljedeće:

Dok je nadbiskup Lovro proglašavao (zaključke sabora, op. L. Đ.)*, presjajni muž Dmitar, nazvan Zvonimir, kralj Hrvata, vratio je crkvi svetoga Dujma crkve svetoga Stjepana i svete Marije u Solinu sa svim njihovim dobrima. Crkve je sagradila i obdarila izvjesna kraljica Jelena darujući ih splitskoj*

[119] CD 1, str. 105–106.

on the eastern Adriatic coast due to their own internal or external challenges. In such a turbulent environment, Croatia nevertheless experienced a relatively peaceful course in the mid-10th century. Such circumstances enabled a peaceful reign for Mihajlo Krešimir II, during which the Croatian king devoted himself, among other things, to consolidating his dynasty and to presenting his rule on the throne as a new beginning.

5. A NEW BEGINNING

In 1066/67, the Croatian king Petar Krešimir confirmed to the monastery of Saint Chrysogonus the possession of Diklo, an estate that Michael Krešimir II had earlier bestowed on the monastery. The charter reads, among other things, as follows:

I, Krešimir, who by another name am also called Peter, King of the Croats and Dalmatians, make it known to all that it seems just to me, that the decisions of my forefathers should not be broken, especially those that were made for the salvation of their souls. For we have found in the deeds of our forefather Krešimir the Elder that, for the salvation of his soul, he gave to the monastery of Saint Chrysogonus a certain estate in a place that is called Diklo…[108]

The most significant information contained in this passage is the reference to the *Gesta Cresimiri maioris*, a now-lost medieval chronicle in which events from the reign of Michael Krešimir II, and perhaps also those of his immediate successors, were undoubtedly recorded. The work most likely served to legitimise the king's rule, to exalt both his person and his deeds, and to provide a record of a "new beginning", that is, of a new dynasty whose founder was Krešimir. The *Gesta*, of course, was but one of the means by which the Croatian king, together with his wife Jelena, built up a legacy to be remembered by future generations of rulers and nobles.

Further support for identifying Michael Krešimir II as the founder of a new dynasty, as

[108] *Ego Cresimir, qui alio nomine uocor Petrus, Chroatorum rex Dalmatinorumque, notifico omnibus, quod iustum mihi uidetur, ut statuta parentum meorum antiquorum non cassentur, maxime illa, que ad salutem eorum pertinent animarum. Comperimus namque in gestis proaui nostri Cresimiri maioris, quod pro remedio anime sue tradidisse (!) monasterio sancti Chrisogoni territorium aliquod in loco, qui dicitur Hyculus…* (CD 1, pp. 105–106.)

stolici u trajan posjed. Te su crkve zbog štovanja kraljevskih grobova bile predane na određeno vrijeme nekim redovnicima koji su u njima revno obavljali obrede. Tamo je uzvišeni muž kralj Krešimir, u atriju bazilike svetog Stjepana, pokopan s mnogim drugim kraljevima i kraljicama.[120]

Tomino nazivanje Jelene *quedam regina*, odnosno „izvjesna kraljica", govori nam da on nije bio upoznat ni s *Gesta Cresimiri maioris* ni s Jeleninim epitafom. Štoviše, Budak smatra da je Tomino nepoznavanje Jelenina epitafa svojevrsna potvrda da je on uništen prije 13. stoljeća.[121] S druge strane, izraz *magnificus vir Cresimirus rex* definitivno je nešto što bi se moglo pronaći u djelu koje veliča Krešimira II. Budući da Toma nije poznavao *Gesta*, postavlja se pitanje odakle mu ta sintagma. Budak smatra da je autor *Historije Salonitane* do tog izraza mogao doći na temelju neke bilješke o osnutku samostana u kojoj bi se spominjalo da je u crkvi sv. Stjepana pokopan „uzvišeni muž kralj Krešimir" te drugi kraljevi i kraljice.[122] Mogli bismo razmotriti mogućnost da je Toma navedenu sintagmu pronašao u nekom rukopisu čiji je autor koristio *Gesta*, no smatram da je to malo vjerojatno jer bi takav autor zasigurno zabilježio i Jelenino ime. Ona je, naime, također bila vrlo važna u uspostavljanju ideološkog narativa o novoj dinastiji te su njezini postupci zasigurno bili opisani u *Gesta*. Toma Arhiđakon zasigurno bi zamijetio spominjanje Jelene te ne bi pisao o „izvjesnoj kraljici". Zbog svega navedenog smatram da je Budakovo objašnjenje vrlo vjerojatno te da se može zaključiti kako Toma nije poznavao *Gesta* niti je imao uvid u rukopis koji je sadržavao podatke preuzete iz tog djela.

Nasuprot tomu, autor isprave Krešimira II. zasigurno je u rukama imao ili samo djelo ili neki rukopis koji je sadržavao podatke preuzete iz tog djela. Vjekoslav Klaić and Ferdo Šišić proposed earlier, and as Neven Budak has more recently argued,[109] is provided by the aforementioned charter of Peter Krešimir IV. This document has proved invaluable for reconstructing the succession of Croatian rulers from Michael Krešimir II to Peter Krešimir IV. The relevant passage reads:

...in his time (i.e. that of Michael Krešimir II, note by L. Đ.) *and that of his son Držislav and their powerful bans, namely Pribina and Godimir, and in the times of Svetoslav and his brothers, Krešimir and Gojslav, and of his son Stjepan, my father...*[110]

This passage may be interpreted as a form of evidence that, for example, Petar Krešimir regarded Michael Krešimir as the founder of the dynasty, and that he indeed was the founder. It is clear that Krešimir II was the one who had granted the estate of Diklo to the monastery of St Chrysogonus and that thereafter a sequence of rulers acknowledged that grant. It is nonetheless telling that the charter does not mention the father of Michael Krešimir. This omission may indicate that, for the Croatian rulers of the 11th century (up to the reign of Zvonimir), Krešimir II, or *Cresimir Maior*, represented the point of origin, i.e. the ancestor from whom the entire ruling house was believed to descend.

Krešimir's wife Jelena was equally important in what may be described as the ideological conception of a "new beginning" that was successfully established during the mid-10th century. She had two churches built in Solin, St. Mary's and St. Stephen's, which were entrusted to monks responsible for preserving the memory both of their founders and of those interred within them.[111] Although the precise locations of these churches remain the subject of scholarly debate, it is now generally accepted that the Church of St. Stephen stood on Otok[112], where it also served as the mausoleum of the Croatian rulers[113], whereas the location of the Church of St. Mary has yet to be determined with certainty.

[120] *Vbi proclamationem faciente Laurentio archiepiscopo illustris uir Demetrius, cognomento Suinimir, rex Chroatorum, restituit ecclesie sancti Domnii ecclesias sancti Stephani et sancte Marie in Salona cum omnibus earum bonis. Has siquidem ecclesias edificauit et dotauit quedam Helena regina, donans eas Spalatine sedi iure perpetuo possidendas. Que ob reuerentiam regalium, sepulchrorum concesse fuerant quibusdam regularibus ad tempus, qui assidue in eis officiorum ministeria exercebant. Ibi namque magnificus uir Cresimirus rex, in atrio uidelicet basilice sancti Stephani, tumulatus est cum pluribus aliis regibus et reginis* (HS, str. 80–81).

[121] Budak 2020, str. 269.

[122] Budak 2020, str. 269.

[109] Budak 2020, p. 264; p. 271.

[110] *...tempore ipsius et filii eius Dirzislai et eorum potentibus banis, uidelicet Pribyne et Godemiri, et temporibus Suataslao et eius fratrum, silicet Cresimiri et Goyslaui, et filii eius regi Stephani, patris mei...* (CD 1, p. 106.)

[111] HS, pp. 80–81; Budak 2020, p. 273.

[112] Delonga 1996, p. 130.

[113] Budak 2020, p. 272.

pis u kojem su se nalazili podatci preuzeti iz *Gesta*. Kako bi svoj rad[123] učinio što vjerodostojnijim, autor isprave na njezinu početku navodi da je pisana 950. godine te da je Krešimir tada bio u 24. godini svoje vladavine.[124] Teško je zamisliti da bi tako precizan podatak potjecao iz nekog drugog izvora koji nije bio povezan s *Gesta*. Ono što znamo o toj ispravi jest da ju je Ivan Lučić prepisao prema prijepisu iz 1397.,[125] no to nam i dalje ništa ne govori o točnom vremenu njezina nastanka. Bez obzira na to kada je isprava doista napisana, u njoj bismo mogli tražiti prežitak djela nastalog sredinom 10. stoljeća.

[123] O ovoj ispravi žestoku su raspravu vodili Jakov Stipišić i Stjepan Antoljak (Stipišić 1969, str. 75–96; Antoljak 1972, str. 41–116; Stipišić 1973, str. 89–97). Stipišić je isprva tvrdio da su dijelovi isprave autentični, dok su pojedini dijelovi falsificirani. Nakon što ga je Antoljak žestoko napao u svojem članku i proglasio čitavu ispravu autentičnom, Stipišić je „uzvratio udarac" proglasivši je falsifikatom. U historiografiji ovoj ispravi nije posvećivana veća pažnja jer je većina povjesničara prihvatila Stipišićeve argumente. Uz to, datum isprave nikako se nije uklapao u Šišićevu kronologiju hrvatskih vladara, koja je bila većinom prihvaćena. Ipak, nedavno sam upozorio (Đaković 2023, str. 80–81) da je datum isprave vjerojatno ispravan jer je autor želio učiniti svoj rad vjerodostojnim te mi se stoga činilo pomalo nevjerojatnim da bi se upuštao u tako preciznu dataciju Krešimirove vladavine, a da prethodno nije znao kada je taj Krešimir došao na prijestolje. Treba spomenuti da indikcija isprave ne odgovara 950. godini, u čemu se slažu i Antoljak i Stipišić, ali Antoljak navodi mogućnost da je jednostavno pogrešno prepisana tijekom nastanka prijepisa isprave.

[124] CD 1, str. 40.

[125] Stipišić 1969, str. 77–78.

The choice of Solin, i.e. the site of the former Roman metropolis of Salona and the administrative centre of the province of Dalmatia, is anything but accidental. Before addressing the symbolic and ideological significance of this location, it is important to note that it also possessed strategic importance. The construction of the mausoleum on Otok enabled control over the Trogir–Split route, and at the same time, it brought the Croatian rulers "closer" to Split, the centre of the ecclesiastical province.[114]

Worth mentioning is also a passage from an 18th-century manuscript that was preserved in Trogir, which states that Krešimir, son of Tišimir, king of Serbia, incorporated Croatia into his kingdom in the year 932 and chose Salona as his capital, while his wife Jelena founded a basilica in the vicinity of Solin and died around 954.[115]

The author of this manuscript presents a catalogue of Croatian *duces* and *reges*, and it is particularly noteworthy that, according to this catalogue, Krešimir is identified as the first Croatian king and as the ruler who selected Salona as his centre. Although much of what is recorded in this catalogue is the product of the author's imagination or perhaps of a misinterpretation of the historical sources available to him[116], the mention of Salona as the capital of the Croatian Kingdom can certainly encourage further reflection. Given that the newly built mausoleum of the Croatian rulers was indeed located in Solin, one may ask whether Michael Krešimir II moved his court somewhere in the vicinity of Solin (for example Klis), or whether the court was actually established within a part of the former Salona itself. Naturally, there is no confirmation for either hypothesis; however, this question could potentially be clarified by future archaeological discoveries, more specifically by the possible discovery of an early medieval settlement in the area of Solin.

Returning to the ideological significance of the mausoleum at Otok, the Church Council of Split in 925 clearly demonstrated the extraordinary symbolic importance of Salona. Namely, the Church of Split ultimately gained metropolitan status on the grounds that the relics of St. Domnius, who, according to tradition, had been sent by Saint Peter to preach in Salona, rested in Split.[117] The ecclesi-

[114] Ibid., pp. 272–273.

[115] Bulić 1901, pp. 223–224.

[116] Budak 2020, p. 274.

[117] CD 1, p. 31.

astical province, which in religious terms unified Croatia and Dalmatia, in a sense obliged Krešimir II to adapt to the newly established circumstances. He therefore used the area of Solin to legitimise his rule over the Dalmatian cities.

The legacy of the ancient Roman Empire was used as an instrument of legitimisation in the Early Middle Ages, and references to Rome's heritage conferred a certain prestige.[118] In addition to Byzantium being regarded as the direct successor of ancient Rome, examples can be found in figures such as Charlemagne, Otto I and his immediate successors, as well as Simeon, all of whom, among other things, either adopted the title of Roman emperors or invoked the Roman imperial legacy as a source of authority. Considering that the Dalmatian cities were in the immediate vicinity of Krešimir's sphere of influence, and these being *de iure* territory of the Byzantine Empire, which nevertheless at that time maintained only a limited presence on the eastern Adriatic coast in terms of the influence of the central authority, and given that some of these cities (such as Zadar) had preserved an uninterrupted continuity from Antiquity, it may be suggested that Michael Krešimir II and his wife Jelena may have used Solin, i.e. former Salona, as a symbol of their rule by building a mausoleum intended as the burial place of Croatian rulers at a location that once served as the seat of the governors of the Roman province of Dalmatia. Just as Archbishop John of Split utilised the legacy of Roman Salona in his efforts to secure primacy within the ecclesiastical province, so too could Krešimir II have drawn upon the same heritage to legitimise his political authority. In simplified terms, from an ideological perspective, the Church of Split represented the successor to the Salonitan Church and thereby acquired ecclesiastical primacy over a substantial part of the former Roman Dalmatia, while Michael Krešimir, in turn, may be understood as a kind of successor to the Roman provincial governors, which could have provided him with additional legitimacy in his relations with the Dalmatian cities.

Due to the scarcity of written sources, it is not possible to determine the nature of the relationship between the Croatian king and the Dalmatian cities in the mid-10th century. Nevertheless, the aforementioned deed of donation for Diklo reveals that Krešimir II was in the position to grant land that was part of the urban territory of Zadar, and that he maintained and strengthened relations with the monastery of St. Chrysogonus in Zadar.[119]

Let us return briefly to the *Gesta Cresimiri maioris*. As has already been noted, this work was known during the reign of Peter Krešimir IV in the second half of the 11th century. Whether the aforementioned *Gesta* (or at least parts of it) was known to other medieval authors prior to this period can only be a matter of conjecture.

In Thomas the Archdeacon's account, the following passage concerning Krešimir II and Jelena is found:

While Archbishop Laurence was promulgating (the decisions of the council, note by L. Đ.) *the most illustrious man Dmitar, called Zvonimir, King of the Croats, restored to the Church of St. Domnius the churches of St. Stephen and St. Mary in Solin, together with all their possessions. These churches had been built and endowed by a certain Queen Jelena, who granted them to the see of Split in perpetual possession. Because of the veneration of the royal tombs, these churches had been entrusted for a time to certain monks, who diligently performed the liturgical services within them. There, in the atrium of the basilica of St. Stephen, the exalted man King Krešimir was buried, along with many other kings and queens.*[120]

Thomas's designation of Jelena as *quedam regina,* or "a certain queen", indicates that he was not acquainted either with the *Gesta Cresimiri maioris* or with Jelena's epitaph. Moreover, Neven Budak has suggested that Thomas's lack of knowledge of Jelena's epitaph may constitute indirect evidence that it had been destroyed prior to the 13th century.[121] On the other hand, the term *magnificus vir*

[118] Pohl 2018, p. 39.

[119] CD 1, pp. 105–106.

[120] *Vbi proclamationem faciente Laurentio archiepiscopo illustris uir Demetrius, cognomento Suinimir, rex Chroatorum, restituit ecclesie sancti Domnii ecclesias sancti Stephani et sancte Marie in Salona cum omnibus earum bonis. Has siquidem ecclesias edificauit et dotauit quedam Helena regina, donans eas Spalatine sedi iure perpetuo possidendas. Que ob reuerentiam regalium, sepulchrorum concesse fuerant quibusdam regularibus ad tempus, qui assidue in eis officiorum ministeria exercebant. Ibi namque magnificus uir Cresimirus rex, in atrio uidelicet basilice sancti Stephani, tumulatus est cum pluribus aliis regibus et reginis.* (HS, pp. 80–81.)

[121] Budak 2020, p. 269.

Cresimirus rex is clearly of the kind that could have appeared in a text that glorified Krešimir II. Since Thomas was unaware of the *Gesta*, the question arises as to the origin of this expression. According to Budak, the author of the *Historia Salonitana* may have derived this formulation from some note about the foundation of the monastery, in which it would have been recorded that "the exalted King Krešimir" was buried in the Church of St. Stephen, together with other kings and queens.[122] One might also consider the possibility that Thomas encountered the aforementioned phrase in a manuscript whose author had used the *Gesta* as a source. However, I regard this possibility as highly unlikely, since such an author would almost certainly have recorded Jelena's name as well, given her central role in the construction of the ideological narrative surrounding the new dynasty and the likelihood that her actions were certainly described in the *Gesta*. Thomas the Archdeacon would surely have noted the mention of Jelena and would not have referred to her merely as "a certain queen". For these reasons, Budak's explanation appears highly plausible, and it may be concluded that Thomas neither had access to the *Gesta* nor to a manuscript that drew the information from it.

Although Thomas the Archdeacon was not familiar with the *Gesta Cresimiri maioris* and did not have access to any information that could have been derived from it, the author of the charter of Krešimir II must have had either the work itself or a written record containing information taken from the *Gesta*. In order to give his work[123] all the credibility he could, the author of the charter explicitly states at its beginning that it was composed in the year 950 and that Krešimir was in the twenty-fourth year of his reign.[124] It is difficult to imagine that such a precise chronological reference could have been derived from any source unrelated to the *Gesta*. What we know about the charter is that Ivan Lučić transcribed it from a transcript from 1397[125], but this still provides no conclusive information regarding its original date of composition. Regardless of when the document was actually written, it may nonetheless preserve a surviving trace of a text originating in the mid-10th century.

[122] Ibid. 2020, p. 269.

[123] This charter has been the subject of a fierce debate between Jakov Stipišić and Stjepan Antoljak (Stipišić 1969, pp. 75–96; Antoljak 1972, pp. 41–116; Stipišić 1973, pp. 89–97). Stipišić initially argued that parts of the charter were authentic while other parts were forged. After Antoljak attacked his position sharply in his article and declared the entire charter authentic, Stipišić "struck back" by declaring the whole charter a forgery. Most historians have not devoted significant attention to this charter, largely because Stipišić's arguments became widely accepted. In addition, the charter's dating did not fit Šišić's chronology of Croatian rulers, which was generally accepted. Recently, however, I have suggested (Đaković 2023, pp. 80–81) that the date of the charter is likely correct, since the author of the document appears to have sought to enhance its credibility; it therefore seems improbable that he would have introduced such a precise dating of Krešimir's reign without having been aware of the year in which this ruler ascended the throne. It should also be noted that the indiction given in the charter does not correspond to the year 950, a point on which Antoljak and Stipišić agree. However, Antoljak allows the possibility that it was simply miscopied at the time the transcription of the charter was produced.

[124] CD 1, p. 40.

[125] Stipišić 1969, pp. 77–78.

Bibliografija / *Bibliography*

Izvori / *Sources*

Bekker 1838
Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus ex cognitione Immanuelis Bekker, Bonn 1838.

CD 1
Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae / *Diplomatički zbornik Kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije*, sv. 1, Zagreb 1967.

DAI
Konstantin Porfirogenet, *O upravljanju Carstvom*, Zagreb 2003.

Ivan Đakon
G. Diacono, *Istoria Veneticorum*, Bologna 1999.

HS
T. Arhiđakon, *Historia Salonitana: Povijest salonitanskih i splitskih prvosvećenika*, Split 2003.

HSM
Historia Salonitana Maior, Beograd 1967.

LjPD
Ljetopis popa Dukljanina, Zagreb 1950.

Nikola Mistik
Nikola I. Mistik, *Letters*, Washington 1973.

VIJ 3
Vizantijski izvori za istoriju naroda Jugoslavije, knj. 3, Beograd 1966.

Literatura / *Literature*

Alajbeg 2020
A. Alajbeg, Trgovina robljem i kršćanstvo u arheološkom zapisu – primjer ranosrednjovjekovne Dalmacije, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta*, s. III, 47, Split 2020, 251–302.

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, u: *Nova zraka u europskom svjetlu: Hrvatske zemlje u ranome srednjem vijeku (oko 550 − oko 1150)*, Zagreb 2015, 37–72.

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

Budak 1999
N. Budak, Was the Cult Of St Bartholomew a Royal Option in Early Medieval Croatia?, u: *...The Man of Many Devices, Who Wandered Full Many Ways...: Festchrift in Honor of János M. Bak*, Budimpešta 1999, 241–249.

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

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

Bulić 1901
F. Bulić, Izvještaj o crkvi sv. Marije od Otoka i nadgrobnom napisu kraljice Jelene, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 5 (1), Zagreb 1901, 201–227.

Churchill 1979
W. J. Churchill, *The Annales Barenses and the Annales Lupi Protospatharii: Critical Edition and Commentary*, doktorska disertacija, Toronto 1979.

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

Čoralić 2015
L. Čoralić, Venecija, u: *Nova zraka u europskom svjetlu: Hrvatske zemlje u ranome srednjem vijeku (oko 550 − oko 1150)*, Zagreb 2015, 549–562.

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

Dinić 1938
M. Dinić, O hrvatskom knezu Iljku, *Jugoslavenski istorijski časopis* 4 (1–2), Beograd 1938, 77–86.

Džino 2020
D. Džino, *From Justinian to Branimir: The Making of the Middle Ages in Dalmatia*, New York 2020.

Džino 2023
D. Džino, *Early Medieval Hum and Bosnia, ca. 450-1200*, New York 2023.

Đaković 2023
L. Đaković, Kronologija hrvatskih vladara u 9. i 10. stoljeću, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta*, s. III, 50, Split 2023, 51–99.

Fine 1983
J. V. A. Fine Jr., *The Early Medieval Balkans: A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*, Ann Arbor 1983.

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 2015
H. Gračanin, Bizant na hrvatskom prostoru u ranome srednjem vijeku, u: *Nova zraka u europskom svjetlu: Hrvatske zemlje u ranome srednjem vijeku (oko 550 − oko 1150)*, Zagreb 2015, 495–516.

Klaić 1975
N. Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata u ranom srednjem vijeku*, 2. izdanje, Zagreb 1975.

Komatina 2010
P. Komatina, O hronologiji hrvatskih vladara u 31. glavi spisa De administrando imperio, *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu* 42 (1), Zagreb 2010, 83–105.

Komatina 2021
P. Komatina, *Konstantin Porfirogenit i rana istorija Južnih Slovena*, Beograd 2021.

Loud 1999
G. A. Loud, Southern Italy in the tenth century, u: *The New Cambridge Medieval History III, c. 900 – c. 1024*, Cambridge 1999, 624–645.

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.

Martin 2021
J. M. Martin, Byzantine Apulia, u: *Byzantium, Venice and the Medieval Adriatic: Spheres of Maritime Power and Influence, c.700-1453*, Cambridge 2021, 188–202.

McCormick 2001
M. McCormick, *Origins of the European Economy: Communications and Commerce, A.D. 300-900*, Cambridge 2001.

Müller-Mertens 1999
E. Müller-Mertens, The Ottonians as kings and emperors, u: *The New Cambridge Medieval History III, c. 900 – c. 1024*, Cambridge 1999, 233–265.

Nikolić Jakus 2015a
Z. Nikolić Jakus, Slavs but not Slaves: Slavic Migrations to Southern Italy in the Early and High Middle Ages, u: *Travels and Mobilities in the Middle Ages: From the Atlantic to the Black Sea*, Turnhout 2015, 267–290.

Nikolić Jakus 2015b
Z. Nikolić Jakus, Južna Italija, u: *Nova zraka u europskom svjetlu: Hrvatske zemlje u ranome srednjem vijeku (oko 550 − oko 1150)*, Zagreb 2015, 563–580.

Ostrogorski 1948
G. Ostrogorski, Porfirogenitova hronika srpskih vladara i njeni hronološki podaci, *Istorijski časopis* 1–2, Beograd 1948, 24–29.

Petrić 1990
N. Petrić, Srednjovjekovne svjetiljke i predromanički pilastar s Hvara, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 23 (1), Zagreb 1990, 173–182.

Pohl 2018
W. Pohl, Introduction: Early medieval Romanness – a multiple identity, u: *Transformations of Romanness: Early Medieval Regions and Identities*, Berlin – Boston 2018, 3–40.

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

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

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

Stephenson 2004
P. Stephenson, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier: A Political Study of the Northern Balkans, 900-1204*, Cambridge 2004.

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 insinuacije, *Dometi: kultura – književnost – društvena pitanja* 6 (7–8), Rijeka 1973, 89–97.

Šišić 1914
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).

Uzelac 2018
A. Uzelac, Prince Michael of Zahumlje – a Serbian ally of Tsar Simeon, u: *Emperor Symeon's Bulgaria in the History of Europe's South-east: 1100 years from the Battle of Achelou*, Sofija 2018, 236–245.

Vedriš 2015
T. Vedriš, Balkanske sklavinije i Bugarska, u: *Nova zraka u europskom svjetlu: Hrvatske zemlje u ranome srednjem vijeku (oko 550 − oko 1150)*, Zagreb 2015, 581–608.

West-Harling 2013
W. O. West-Harling, 'Venecie due sunt': Venice and its grounding in the Adriatic and North Italian background, u: *Italy, 888-962: a turning point*, Turnhout 2013, 237–264.

Zuckerman 2014
C. Zuckerman, Squabbling *protospatharioi* and other administrative issues, *Revue des* études *byzantines* 72, 2014, 193–233.

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

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