

ARCHDEACON THOMAS OF SPLIT (1200–1268)– –A SOURCE OF EARLY CROATIAN HISTORY

Mirjana MATIJEVIĆ SOKOL*

Thomas, the archdeacon of Split, one of the most interesting figures of medieval Croatia, a participant in many of events in public, political and clerical life in Split from the early to mid-thirteenth century, would have remained almost entirely unremembered had he not written a work of historiography that surpassed the customary story-telling of medieval chroniclers, the well-known “*Historia Salonitana*” (‘History of Salona’), as it was called by the father of Croatian historiography, Ivan Lučić Lucius, when first presenting it to the scholarly public in 1666.¹

Information about Thomas’s life has been obtained both directly and indirectly, from the “*Historia Salonitana*” itself and from other documents. His youth and schooling in Split and Italy are generally the subject of conjecture. Since the “*Historia Salonitana*”, besides describing the history of the Church in Split up to Thomas’s time, is nonetheless largely a memoir with emphasis on events in which the archdeacon himself participated, there are some data here which can be discerned as autobiographical or biographical notations by Thomas, since he writes of himself in the third person.

In past historiography, there were differing views of Thomas’s social origins. Beginning with Daniele Farlati² and up to Kerubin Šegvić,³ a common view was that Thomas came from a patrician family. There is no way of knowing the basis for Farlati’s claims, but Šegvić believes that only a clergyman who was also a member of the nobility could aspire to such high positions within the Church hierarchy and play such a major role in the city’s public life as Thomas did. Franjo Rački⁴, however, strictly adhering to historical sources and basing his assertions only on them, stated that Thomas was “from an unknown family.” Izidor Kršnjavi very sharply reproached

* Mirjana Matijević Sokol, Ph. D., University of Zagreb, Faculty of Philosophy, History Department, Zagreb

¹ *Ioannis Lucii De regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae libri sex* (Amstelaedami MDCLXVI – Amsterdam, 1666), pp. 310-370.

² Daniele Farlati, *Illyricum sacrum*, vol. III, (Venetiis MDCCLXV – Venice, 1765), p. 258.

³ Kerubin Šegvić, *Toma Splitski, državnik i pisac (1200 – 1268)* (Zagreb, 1927), pp. 42-43.

⁴ Franjo Rački, “Ocjena starijih izvora za hrvatsku i srbsku poviest srednjega vieka (II),” *Književnik* I (1864) vol. 3: 358-388.

Thomas for hating both the Croats and Hungarians because he was a “die-hard Latin, which he proudly emphasized”, and that his writing bears the stamp of his political convictions.⁵ Even today, Lujo Margetić, based on interpretations of the portrayal of the earliest eras of Croatian history in the “*Historia Salonitana*,” considers Thomas explicitly hostile to the Croats⁶, while Nada Klaić recognized that age-old and still present rural-urban antagonism in Thomas’s political opinions, speculating that he may have even been a Croat.⁷

Thomas was born in 1200 or 1201,⁸ and withdrew from public life in 1266⁹, and based on his tombstone it is known for certain that he died on May 8, 1268¹⁰ and that he was interred in the Franciscan church on the Riva in Split. The entirely undecorated tombstone bears an inscription in Latin in verse which indicates the affinity of Archdeacon Thomas for the Franciscan worldview. The composer of the verses believed that the epitaph should reflect the views of Thomas:

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

⁵ Izidor Kršnjavi, “Prilozi historiji salonitani Tome arcidjakona Spljetskoga,” *Vjestnik kr. hrvatsko-slavonsko-dalmatinskog Zemaljskog arkiva* II (1900): 129-169.

⁶ Lujo Margetić, “Historia Salonitana i Historia Salonitana Maior – neka pitanja,” *Historijski zbornik* XLVII (1994), 1:1-36.

⁷ Nada Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata u ranom srednjem vijeku* (Zagreb, 1971), p. 23; *Ibid.*, *Povijest Hrvata u razvijenoj srednjem vijeku* (Zagreb, 1976), p. 208.

⁸ Thomas cites 1230 as the year of his appointment as archdeacon and that he was thirty years of age, so it follows that he was born in 1200 or 1201. See: Thomas Archidiaconus, *Historia Salonitana* (hereinafter: Thomas), *Scriptores*, vol. III, digessit Fr. Rački (Zagrabiae 1894 – Zagreb, 1984), p. 107; *Historia Salonitana: Thomae Archidiaconi, Historia Salonitanorum atque Spalatinorum pontificum – Toma Arhidakon, Povijest salonitanskih i splitskih prvosvećenika*, (hereinafter: *Historia Salonitana*, 2003) (bilingual Latin-Croatian edition). Foreword, Latin text, critical analysis and Croatian translation by Olga Perić. Historical commentary by Mirjana Matijević Sokol. The study *Toma Arhidakon i njegovo djelo* by Radoslav Katičić (Split: Književni krug, 2003), p. 172; *Thomae Archidiaconi Spalatenensis Historia Salonitanorum atque Spalatinorum pontificum – Archdeacon Thomas of Split: History of the Bishops of Salona and Split* (hereinafter: *Historia Salonitana*, 2006), Damir Karbić, Mirjana Matijević Sokol, Olga Perić and James Ross Sweeney, eds. (Budapest: CEU Press, 2006); p. 198.

⁹ The “*Historia Salonitana*” ends with the events of 1266, so it is assumed that the last two years of his life were dedicated to writing this text.

¹⁰ Kerubin Šegvić published the text of Thomas’s tombstone. *Op. cit.*, p. 120.

Translation: "Oh Christ, Archdeacon Thomas taught the doctrine to which he himself adhered and he taught (other) tenets: spurn the world, flee from sin, subdue the body, mourn after the luxuries of life, flee from tempting gain! He was born in Split, where he bid his life farewell. When death succeeded life, my fame had passed. When death succeeded life, my glory ceded. Here the worms feed on me and the decomposing body succumbs to the law of death, and to the soul which relinquishes it. In the year of our Lord 1268 on the eighth day of the month of May."

Taking into account the situation in Split in the first half of the thirteenth century, where the operation of the school of Master Treguan has been ascertained, it can be supposed with great certainty that Thomas acquired his first knowledge and received guidance for his future schooling in meetings with Treguan and Archbishop Bernardo. The era of Split Archbishop Bernardo (1200-1217) and Treguan, first a teacher of *belles-lettres* in Split, and then a clergyman, archdeacon and finally bishop of Trogir, left a mark on the cultural life of Split and Trogir and despite turbulent political events it resulted in international masterpieces of Romanesque artistic and also literary expression in both cities. A distinguished series of masters and artists such as Buvina, Otto and Radovan were joined by Archdeacon Thomas, a master of the written word. Thomas himself indirectly testified to the role and influence of Bernardo and Treguan.¹¹ He spoke of them with great respect and admiration. They were from the Apennine Peninsula, one from Perugia and the other from Florence. Bernardo came to the post of Split archbishop after serving as an instructor to the Hungarian king. He spent about thirty years in Bologna, studying doctrine; he possessed a library and wrote tracts against heretics. Treguan came to Split at the invitation of Archbishop Bernardo to teach the clergy grammar and writing skills. In 1203, he reworked the "Life of St. John, Bishop of Trogir"¹² himself, and his role in the construction of the cathedral's portal is recorded in an inscription on that portal.¹³ Such an atmosphere obviously suited the young Thomas, arousing his affinities and prompting him to pursue his education in their homeland, at one of the most prestigious universities of the time, in Bologna.

Bologna at that time was a European university which was distinguished by its law school. The selection of such a university would prove significant to Thomas's activities after his return to his native city, reft by all manner of political and social turmoil. As a gifted and attentive observer, Thomas learned from the political events and social processes in Italian cities and in

¹¹ Thomas, pp. 78-82, 85-88, 90; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, pp. 120-127, 130-136; *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, pp. 137-141, 145, 149-157, 163.

¹² "Život Svetoga Ivana Trogirskoga", edited by Milan Ivanišević, in: *Legende i kronike* (Split, 1977), pp. 59-121.

¹³ The inscription on the Trogir cathedral's western portal dates to the time of its construction as rendered by Master Radovan: ... ANNO MILLENO DUCENO BISQUE UICENO PRESULE TUSCANO FLORIS EX URBE TREGUANO... Josip Stošić, "Trogirska katedrala i njezin zapadni portal", *Zbornik radova međunarodnog znanstvenog skupa održanog u Trogiru 26-30. rujna 1990. godine* (Trogir, 1994), p. 84.

the northern part of the Apennine Peninsula in general. He witnessed the struggle of the urban communes for independence from any central authority, the mutual conflicts between cities, the creation of new methods of city governance influenced by new social and economic trends, and the struggle between papal and imperial authority. It all began with Pope Innocent III (1198-1216), who attempted to bring order to many church matters, not hesitating to become involved in secular issues, because he did so “with a feeling of responsibility and conviction that the matters of this world must be subjugated to the order which God had established, and that kings and princes must submit to God’s judgement. The world seemed to him a hierarchy, or rather a ‘sacred order’” ... Innocent believed that the papacy could fulfil its universal duty only when the independence and sovereignty of the clerical state allowed it full freedom. However, Innocent also had his own ideas on the development of European states: “all states in Europe must join in a single higher order under papal leadership”. The Franciscans and Dominicans were the Church’s mainstay in the exposition of these views, particularly when, after Innocent’s death, the inevitable clash arose between the two universal authorities: *regnum* and *sacerdotium* i.e. the Holy Roman Emperor and pope waged a struggle for predominance on Italian soil, and it was precisely at that time that Thomas was studying in Bologna.¹⁴ St. Francis preached in Bologna. Dominic de Guzmán, the founder of the Dominican order in Bologna, fulfilled the instruction of the Gospel according to Mark: “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature” (16, 15).¹⁵ Thomas would apply all of these experiences to his political activity, and record them in his “*Historia Salonitana*”, for he could compare the situation in Split—where, on the one hand, the Hungarian king attempted to rule the city through his adherents, very often the archbishop, while on the other hand there was the Croatian nobility, whose proximity was a great potential and real threat to the development of urban communal independence—with that in the Italian communes. This is precisely the reason why Thomas would advocate the “Latin” model of city management (*regimen Latinorum*), meaning application of the *podesteria*: this entailed bringing in a paid administrator, usually a foreigner, as the best solution to his city’s problems. As soon as the opportunity arose, he exploited the situation and as a very expeditious “import” tried and tested in Italy and Provence¹⁶ bring a *podestà* to Split from Ancona. It is worthwhile mentioning the scholars whom Thomas may have met in Bologna. Besides the already mentioned St. Francis and Dominic

¹⁴ August Franzen, *Pregled povijesti crkve* (Zagreb, 1988), str. 182-186.

¹⁵ That was in 1221. See: Franjo Šanjek, *Crkva i kršćanstvo u Hrvata* (Zagreb, 1988), p. 280; John Foster, *Crkvena povijest 2 (500-1500)* (Novi Sad, s.a.), p. 84.

¹⁶ Roberto Lopez, *Rođenje Evrope* (Zagreb, 1978), p. 152.

de Guzmán, there was also Petrus de Vineis¹⁷, Iohannes de Viterbo¹⁸, Paulus (Ungarus) of Dalmatia,¹⁹ and Rolandinus Passagerii.²⁰ They were sufficient to guarantee that Thomas received what for his time was the finest education in theology and law.

The diplomatic sources in the archives of Split and Trogir show that during the period from 1227 to 1232, Thomas was a notary public in Split, first as a cleric and then as a subordinate deacon and then archdeacon, which he became in 1230.²¹ However, Kerubin Šegvić believes that Thomas's notary service ceased in 1230 upon his appointment to the archdeaconate and that the document dated 1232—if it was in fact drafted by Thomas as stated thereon—had to be older, i.e. written prior to 1230.²²

Thomas did not dedicate any attention to this period of his life in the "Historia Salonitana". Nonetheless, from the sources it is known that he inherited this post from the Split notary Sabatius and that he held it for a relatively brief time. Only a single original document written by him has been preserved, as well as two transcripts. Analysis has shown that he used the old completion formula (*complevi*), that he melded elements of charters and notitia, and under him the *signum notarii* became a permanent element of the corroboration formula for documents. It was precisely in the performance of these duties that his education in Bologna came to the fore, as Roman law at the time was undergoing a Renaissance, and the *ars notaria*, as an expression of the needs of a new civil society, became a subject of study

¹⁷ Petrus de Vineis, died in 1249, stylist, anti-papist, chief advisor to Friedrich II, studied in Bologna. See: Jakov Stipišić, "Zagrebački rukopis epistolara Petra de Vineis", *Zbornik Historijskog instituta JAZU* 4 (1961): 405-421.

¹⁸ Iohannes de Viterbo wrote the "Liber de regimine civitatum" at around 1228. Jacques le Goff, *Srednjovjekovna civilizacija zapadne Evrope* (Belgrade, 1974), p. 520.

¹⁹ Paulus of Dalmatia, until recently known as Ungarus (ca. 1190-1255) was a law professor at the Bologna University at the beginning of the 13th century, who wrote the commentary for a collection of canon law and served as first provincial of the Croatian-Hungarian Dominicans. See: Stjepan Kراسić, "Fr. Paulus Hungarus seu ut alii volunt, Dalmata O.P. – Jedna zanimljiva ličnost iz XIII st.", *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* IV. (1978), no. 7-8: 131-156.

²⁰ Rolandinus Passagerii was the author of one of the best known notary formularies, and in 1234 he performed notary services in Bologna, while later he headed the notary school. He died in 1300, and his work bears the title *Summa artis notariae*. The oldest manuscript held in the Metropolitan Library in Zagreb (MR 109) was written in 1275. See: Jakov Stipišić, *Pomoćne povijesne znanosti u teoriji i praksi*, Zagreb 1991³, p. 164.

²¹ Tadija Smičiklas, *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae* (hereinafter: CD), vol. III., (Zagreb, 1905), pp. 267, 301, 365.

²² K. Šegvić, op. cit., p. 51. Gunjača made a similar point, although he believed that the document which is also Thomas's own work was dated 1231 and not 1227 as Šegvić believed, or 1232 as Smičiklas stated (CD III, 365). Gunjača concluded he did not know why Thomas stopped serving as a notary and disagrees with Šegvić's view that the service is incompatible with performance of the archdeacon's duty. Stjepan Gunjača, *Ispravci i dopune starijoj hrvatskoj historiji* I (Zagreb 1973), pp. 9-21.

at universities.²³ That Thomas was well-versed in the legal profession and diplomatics is reflected in his history, where his skill was demonstrated in his use of diplomatic materials as historical sources.²⁴

He proudly emphasized his election as archdeacon and wrote that it was made in complete accord (*in summa concordia*), when he was thirty years old. Thus commenced Thomas's ascent in the church hierarchy and his major role in everything that occurred in Split.²⁵

Very soon after his appointment as archdeacon, obviously due to his reformist zeal and loyalty to the pope, he came into conflict with Archbishop Guncellus (1220-1242). He dedicated several chapters²⁶ to these turbulent events which signified Thomas's first involvement in the city's public life. It would appear that this was the determinant for all later activities which brought Thomas many rises and falls in the social hierarchy, as well as appreciation and condemnation. Guncellus was appointed archbishop by the Hungarian royal court. He was an ethnic Hungarian, the son of the nobleman Cornelius and related to Gyula, the Croatian *ban* or viceroy. He was appointed archbishop in Split due to lay pressure. He proved incompetent, and came into conflict with the Cathedral Chapter even before Thomas became archdeacon, and thereafter the antagonism only grew and Thomas criticized him for exercising the authority of archbishop even before he received the pallium. An open confrontation between representatives of one or the other side arose in the city. However, Thomas emerged as the moral victor based on a verdict by Cardinal Otto, the authorized proxy of Pope Gregory IX, who was approached in Perugia, where he was at the time, by both sides. Guncellus remained archbishop even after this, while Thomas became very actively involved in public life. Political circumstances in Split were quite anarchic. A lover of law, order and labour and a follower of the reformers St. Francis of Assisi and Dominic de Guzmán, Thomas believed only a person from outside could ensure communal stability. It is in this light that one should view and understand Thomas's sometimes harsh assessments of the representatives of the Croatian magnates, who performed the duty of princes in Split, but who did not actually care about the city. Taking his words and opinions out of context, historiography judged Thomas too harshly and characterized him as someone who despised the Croats. This is a very one-sided view, for Thomas was extravagant in his praise for those who were capable and deserving of credit. This, for example,

²³ Jakov Stipišić, "Razvoj splitske notarske kancelarije", *Zbornik Historijskog instituta JAZU* (1954): 117-119.

²⁴ Mirjana Matijević Sokol, "Starohrvatski Solin u Kronici Tome Arhiđakona", *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* 85 (1992 – published in 1993): 83-90; Mirjana Matijević Sokol, *Toma Arhiđakon i njegovo djelo. Rano doba hrvatske povijesti* (Jastrebarsko: Naklada Slap, 2002), *passim*.

²⁵ Thomas, p. 107; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, p. 172; *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, p. 198.

²⁶ Thomas: chapt. XXVI. *De promotione Guncellusli*, pp. 92-99; XXXI. *De scandalo, quod factum est inter archiepiscopum et archidiaconum*, pp. 107-113; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, pp. 144-145, 172-181; *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, pp.166-181, 198-211.

was the case with Grgur (Gregory) of Bribir, whom he described with great appreciation. He wrote that Grgur was very rich and powerful, thoughtful and adept in governance, and that there was not a more powerful man in Croatia than he who had vanquished all of his enemies (*uir potens et diues, et in administrandis rebus satis circumspetus et strenuus ... nec erat in tota prouintia Chroatie, qui tanta potentie prerogatiua polleret; omnes enim inimicos suos superauerat*), but when he was elected prince of Split, he did not solely deal with the city due to his many duties and appointed a regent, and Split, Thomas said, was like a widow (*quia civitas quasi uidua sine rectoris gubernatione*).²⁷ Obviously this was a very understandable assessment of the situation by a Split native and a sound reason for the application of his own ideas.

To resolve the situation in the city, Thomas believed that it was necessary to bring a foreigner into the city based on the model of the communes in Italy and Provence – a paid chief official and impartial city administrator. To be sure, this new idea would hardly have been feasible without the support of the moral authorities. At that time, the followers of St. Francis were already present in Split, and they enjoyed a high reputation due to their modesty. Apparently sharing Thomas's views, they came to his aid at that time and extolled the populace, torn between the two opposing sides in the city, to unity and accord, and to have an administrator brought in from the Apennine Peninsula. Thomas and Miha Madijev received authorization from their fellow citizens and set off for Ancona to find a person to serve as administrator. In Ancona they sought the advice of the Ancona podesteria, which directed them to a respected Franciscan. They placed full confidence in his recommendation and selected Gargano de Arscindis, who arrived in Split on 15 May 1239. Gargano served three one-year terms as podestà. According to Thomas's description, this was an era of order in the city,²⁸ particularly important to the codification of city ordinances and customs, which were registered in a capitulary. It is not difficult to assume that all of this was done precisely under the influence of Thomas and probably his direct participation as an individual well-versed in law, and also in the city's rules and customs. Legal historians assert that Thomas, in his selection of rules and customs to codify, was a proponent of the noble caste, and not an interpreter of the "popular will", although the claim that he preferred the so-called Latin character of Split does not stand.²⁹ This successful move for Split had far-reaching consequences, as subsequent city statutes in Dalmatia, including that of Split, contained provisions that the podestàs of cities cannot be from the city itself nor its near hinterland.³⁰ In general,

²⁷ Thomas, p. 113; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, pp. 182-183; *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, pp. 210-213.

²⁸ Thomas, pp. 117-125; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, pp. 194-215; *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, pp. 222-253.

²⁹ *Statut grada Splita*, edited and translated by Antun Cvitanić (Split: Književni krug, 1985), p. XVI.

³⁰ Op. cit., pp. 37-38: Book One, Chapt. XVIII, notes that "the podestà or administrator of the city of Split and his officials and entourage shall not be from the Slavic (i.e. Croatian – translator's note) lands nor from the province of Dalmatia".

the time Gargano spent as podestà in Split was successful. Circumstances in the city stabilized, he introduced taxes, resolved many vital urban problems, and set the foundations for future utilities.³¹ To be sure, Thomas's vision and education deserve credit for this and they were incorporated into these developments.³²

Thomas did not achieve the success he had desired in his rise in the Church hierarchy. The departure of Gargano de Arscindis and the death of Guncellus in 1242 opened up new antagonisms. This was the time of Tartar invasions and a conflict between Split and King Bela IV and Queen Maria, which actually made the entire situation even more difficult. Thomas once more participated in events in the Church at this time. He came out of these events a disheartened man, his pride hurt. These were certainly sound reasons for his decision to put his education to the service of defending himself and, as some historians maintain, to write an apology for himself and – aware of the potential of such interpretations – characterize himself as a lover of justice and a detester of iniquity (*amator iustitiae et nequitiae detestator*).³³ Many of Thomas's assessment of events and persons must be viewed critically and placed in the context of his general opinions, but also his personal failures. Thomas was a fierce opponent of everything that came from the Hungarian royal court, but this was not straightforward opposition simply because it was Hungarian, but rather because it conflicted with the interests of communal independence. Where the Church is concerned, he was a fierce opponent of the interference of secular with Church authority. Thus in the case of the attempt by laymen to impose Ugrin as the archbishop of Split, he asserted that no election made by secular tumult could be implemented, but rather only an election conducted by means of the mature deliberations of monks and Church officials (*electio non est celebranda precipitanter et cum secularium tumultu, sed matura deliberatione fratrum et religiosorum uirorum*).³⁴ Laymen did not accept him, Thomas, the archdeacon of Split, as archbishop,³⁵ nor was his candidate for abbot of the Monastery of St. Stephen accepted. These were bitter moments for a misunderstood man. It should be noted that the Franciscans and Dominicans always supported him, including in the election of the archbishop. Although he did not manage to secure the highest career within the Church and albeit somewhat disheartened, he nonetheless remained involved in many activities that required his legal expertise. He served as a judge in disputes. Together with the reputable Franciscans

³¹ See: Ludwig Steindorf, "Stari svijet i novo doba. O formiranju komune na istočnoj obali Jadrana", *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* III. (1986 published in 1987), vol. 16:141-152.

³² For more see: Mirjana Matijević Sokol, *Toma Arhiđakon i njegovo djelo. Rano doba hrvatske povijesti*, pp. 307-327.

³³ Thomas, p. 107; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, p. 172; *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, p. 198.

³⁴ Thomas, p. 196; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, pp. 290-291 *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, p. 342.

³⁵ The election of the Split archbishop, when Thomas was elected but not accepted, occurred at the beginning of 1244, on 7 January. Thomas wrote about these events in Chapt. XLIV. *De seditione, que facta est per laycos in processu electionis archiepiscopi*. Thomas, pp. 187-190; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, pp. 276-281; *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, pp. 322-331.

from Italy, Gerard of Modena, Paul and Andrew, he served as witness to the peace agreement between Split and Trogir, and he also performed delicate missions for Pope Alexander IV (1254-1261).³⁶ This speaks sufficiently of the reputation of this trustworthy and scholarly individual. After the death of Archbishop Rogerius (1250-1266), whom he esteemed more than others, he retired from public life, and, it would appear, dedicated himself to writing his life's work.

If not for Thomas's chronicle, all that would be known of him based on other historical sources was that he was an educated medieval priest and nothing more. However, the need of Archdeacon Thomas to write, regardless of whether this partially entailed his need to for self-justification or apology, enriched medieval Croatia with a work that far exceeded the confines of its time and place. The "*Historia Salonitana*" is a monument more durable than brass.

Kerubin Šegvić characterized Thomas's work as literary in external form, historical in content, and didactic in purpose and intention.³⁷ Namely, Thomas intended to write a history of the Church in Split as the successor to the metropolitan rights of Salona, and thus the title "*Historia Salonitana*". But he also wanted to justify his own successes and failures. Just as other historical events intertwined around the main theme, Church history since Apostolic times, so too is it a significant work for Croatian history as it encompasses some matters from its earliest periods. Here it has historiographic importance, while for the period of Thomas's active involvement in public affairs it bears the features of a memoir. Thomas himself wrote that it was written on the basis of original sources, traditions and differing views (*partim scripta, partim relata, partim opinionem sequentes*)³⁸ and this is precisely why it is classified as unique not only in Croatia but in the broader European context. On this occasion, attention shall be accorded to three historiographic themes that Thomas covered. These are the overview of the history of the Split, and also Salona, Archdiocese, those sections which deal with individual episodes in Croatian history and some aspects and reflections on European history.

Overview of Church history: The basic theme of the "*Historia Salonitana*" is to present the history of the Church in Split which, as the successor to the Church in Salona, inherited the archdiocesan and metropolitan authority over most of the Croatian state territory in the Middle Ages. Because of this, Nenad Ivić placed it in the genre of so-called "*gesta episcoporum*", meaning a chronicle which tells of events from the past of individual Church organizations as a specific literary medieval form.³⁹ The recounting of events associ-

³⁶ CD IV, Zagreb 1906, p. 197; CD V, Zagreb 1907, p. 162.

³⁷ K. Šegvić, op. cit., p. 143.

³⁸ Thomas, p. 34; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, p. 30; *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, 34.

³⁹ Ivić states that the so-called "*gesta episcoporum*" is a type of history popular from the ninth to the end of the eighteenth centuries, which in their lists and catalogues in uninterrupted sequences emphasize the inheritance of a certain service, creating something of a diocesan

ated with a dominant individual, such as a bishop or archbishop, constitute the foundation of such works. According to the custom of medieval historians and chroniclers, the introduction to the work forms the title and definition of its basic content. In the “*Historia Salonitana*” it is: “*Incipit historia Salonitanorum atque Spalatinorum pontificum.*” Isidore of Seville, a writer also cited by Thomas, began his work in the same fashion, i.e.: “*Incipit historia Gotorum*”. In portraying history from the establishment of the Church in Salona to 1266, Thomas described three different periods. The first period covers the existence of the Church in Salona, the metropolis of the Roman province of Dalmatia, the second covers the transfer and establishment of continuity in Split, and the third covers a period that is not history for Thomas, but rather a memoirist account of events in which he participated, often as the chief protagonist. It is essential to point out these three periods, because the methodological approaches of the writer are adapted to the period in question, so the statement that he wrote the work partially using “written” sources pertains to the first two thematic sections. In them, Thomas discussed two key points in the sequence of events: first the establishment of the Salona Diocese, i.e. the metropolitan see, and then the transfer of these privileges to the Church in Split, embodied in two figures, St. Domnio and the so-called John of Ravenna. Based on the depiction of these two turning points, Thomas can be assessed as a Church historian. Analyzing the Early Christian, Salona sequence of the so-called “*gesta episcoporum*”, historians have concluded that Thomas, with certain qualifications, was reliable because he used written sources. A more careful analysis indicates that Thomas often even “concealed” certain sources, or passed over events that perhaps disrupted his established sequence. Thomas made a representative selection of bishops/archbishops from the past of the Church in Salona, about whom he wrote and who fit into his “glorious” past of Salona,⁴⁰ but he could not avoid the weakness of all Church chroniclers who sought Apostolic roots. He dedicated special attention to St. Domnio, the founder of the Church in Salona. Even though, as an educated priest, he could and should have known that the Church in Salona was established only in the third/fourth century and that Domnio was a martyr at the time of Roman Emperor Diocletian, he was unable to avoid the snare imposed by Church tradition in Split, burdened by the legends which it had created with the objective of justifying that which Thomas was completing in his text, claiming that the Church in Split had inherited that which Salona had since the distant past (*quod Salona*

pseudo-genus for the purpose of demonstrating its regularity and legitimacy”. Nenad Ivić, *Domšljanje prošlosti* (Zagreb, 1992), p. 74. See also: Mirjana Matijević Sokol, *Toma Arhidakon i njegovo djelo. Rano doba hrvatske povijesti*, pp. 43-45.

⁴⁰ Mirjana Matijević Sokol, “Toma Arhidakon i crkvena organizacija u Saloni”, *Zbornik Zavoda za povijesne znanosti IC JAZU* 15 (1988): 11-26; Ivo Babić, “Splitske uspomene na salonitanske kršćanske starine”, *Vjesnik za arheologiju u historiju dalmatinsku* (1992 – published in 1993), no. 85: 21-26; Mirjana Matijević Sokol, *Toma Arhidakon i njegovo djelo. Rano doba hrvatske povijesti*, pp. 54-75.

antiquitus habuit, optineret ecclesia Spalatensium).⁴¹ Thomas attempted to square the knowledge he had acquired during his studies with the Split tradition, so he even invented two Domnios, one in Apostolic times, an alleged pupil of St. Peter, and the other from the time of Emperor Diocletian. This is precisely why the chapter of the “*Historia Salonitana*” on St. Domnio and St. Donnino cannot be considered successful, because he not only failed to contribute to the clarification of contrived stories, he also added to them.⁴² Probably aware of these shortcomings, but also unable to eliminate them, he justified himself by explaining that he wrote about Church officials (bishops and archbishops) about whom he knew something (*de aliquibus, prout scire potuimus*).⁴³ Besides Domnio, Thomas also wrote about Glycerius, Natalis and Maximus. Generally his knowledge is trustworthy, and based on Jordan, the correspondence of Pope Gregory the Great.⁴⁴ The choice of persons about whom he wrote is questionable, as there are indications in the “*Salona chronicle*” that Thomas concealed or passed over certain events. Although Thomas’s bias in his aspiration to secure the most glorious foundations for his Split archdiocese cannot be overlooked nor entirely set aside, the time in which Thomas lived and worked must nonetheless be taken into consideration. Ivo Babić believes that Thomas as much data as he could given the scope of his general knowledge and as much as epoch allowed, citing the example of Iacobus de Voragine, who was Thomas’s contemporary (1230-1298) and who only covered four bishops in his history of Genoa, acknowledging that he could not find anything on the earliest history.⁴⁵ Medieval practices were certainly an unavoidable component in the manner in which such works were compiled. Nenad Ivić stressed the anthology as one of the fundamental figures of literary composition, which played a role in the determination and selection of individual themes.⁴⁶ The conclusion that Thomas exploited such a possibility is inescapable, particularly in his description of the conflict between the Salona Bishop Natalis and Archdeacon Honoratus, where he could have sided with the archdeacon without hesitation, particularly given his extensive knowledge of written documents and keeping in mind his conflict with Archbishop Guncellus, for in the presentation of events in which he was a participant many centuries later he had to be much more cautious and restrained. The very delicate question of the transfer of the privileges of the Church in Salona to that of Split was resolved simply by Thomas through the person of John of Ravenna. This chapter in

⁴¹ Thomas, p. 33; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, p. 48; *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, p. 54.

⁴² Frane Bulić – Josip Bervaldi, *Kronotaksa solinskih biskupa, uz dodatke Kronotaksa spljetskih nadbiskupa (od razorenja Solina do polovice XI. v.)* (Zagreb, 1912); F. Bulić, *Mučenici solinski. Broj i stališ, godina i dan smrti mučenika solinskih* (Zagreb, 1919); “*Istorija svetoga Dujma i Staša*”, edited by Hrvoje Morović, in: *Legende i kronike* (Split, 1977), pp. 13-57; I. Babić, op. cit.

⁴³ Thomas, p. 12; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, p. 20; *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, p.22.

⁴⁴ F. Bulić, *S. Gregorio Magno papa nelle sue relazioni colla Dalmazia (a. 590–604)* (Spalato - Split, 1904).

⁴⁵ I. Babić, op. cit., p. 26.

⁴⁶ N. Ivić, op. cit., p. 40.

Croatian historiography has been the subject of the most debate, for it is closely tied to the fundamental questions of coexistence between several Dalmatian cities and the Croatian state in the territory up to the Drava River in Pannonia. Historiographic views vary. Thomas here certainly demonstrated all of the weaknesses of a biased individual who did not wish to clarify the most important moment in the succession of the privileges of one church organization by another, for this right was exercised under ambiguous circumstances. Thomas studied at the most prestigious law school of his time and was familiar with canon law, which was obvious based on many examples. He knew that Zadar, as the metropolis of the Byzantine province, should have assumed metropolitan authority. The struggle of the Church in Split to ensure its legitimacy, which rested on the relics of St. Domnio, influenced Thomas, so the chapter on John of Ravenna, like the one on St. Domnio, was among the least founded and most biased with the objective of obfuscation and maintaining the unquestioned privileges of the Split Archdiocese.⁴⁷ For that period of Church history in Split after the appearance of John of Ravenna to the his own time, Thomas provided data on those archbishops of whom there are memories (*de quibus extat memoria*).⁴⁸ He then dedicated one chapter to the exemption of the bishop of Upper Dalmatia and a particularly long chapter to the reformist Split Archbishop Lawrence, whose service was marked by three Croatian kings. Furthermore, he wrote about the establishment of the Hvar Diocese, Archbishop Manas, the exemption of the Zadar Diocese and the famed Split Archbishop Raynerius, who is honoured as a martyr in the legends of the Church in Split. The conclusion of this sequence is a chapter on two archbishops named Peter. Thomas wrote about the archbishops who succeeded John of Ravenna by transcribing the catalogue notations which are held by the Split Archdiocese. These notations are particularly important to Croatian history, because the archbishops are dated according to Croatian, Frankish and Byzantine rulers, so this chapter was especially used in the establishment of a chronology for the earliest Croatian history.⁴⁹ Thomas covered the archbishops of his time based on the principles of memoirist literature, and since there are other preserved historical sources, it is not difficult to ascertain which are historical facts and which are Thomas's subjective viewpoints. To be sure, Thomas's political convictions and views come to the fore precisely in the descriptions of those persons he knew and events in which he participated. It has already been noted that he wrote positively of Archbishop Bernardo, while he conflicted with both Guncellus and Hugrin. He also touched upon the attempt to unify the Split Archdiocese with the Zagreb

⁴⁷ N. Klaić, "Ivan Ravenjanin i osnutak splitske metropolije", *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* LXV–LXVII (1963–1965 – published in 1971): 209–249; L. Margetić, op. cit., pp. 20–23; Neven Budak, *Prva stoljeća Hrvatske* (Zagreb, 1994), pp. 83–86; Ivo Goldstein, *Hrvatski rani srednji vijek* (Zagreb, 1995), pp. 135–138. All views and my elaborated position: Mirjana Matijević Sokol, *Toma Arhiđakon i njegovo djelo. Rano doba hrvatske povijesti*, pp. 75–114.

⁴⁸ Thomas, p. 35; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, p. 52; *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, p. 58.

⁴⁹ L. Margetić, op. cit., 13–20.

Diocese under Zagreb Bishop Stjepan, which did not succeed. Nada Klaić judged that Archdeacon Thomas was not a good historian in his presentation of the Salona and Split Churches.⁵⁰ It is true that his bias actually obscured some key events even more, although on the other hand one cannot overlook the fact that Thomas's historiographic approach surpassed that of many contemporaries. Even though the text was composed in the thirteenth-century literary tradition as a "*gesta episcoporum*", it touched upon many events important to Croatian and European history – and when he "digressed" from these main themes he returned to them with the words "*sed iam ad propositum redeamus*" (but let us return to the main subject)⁵¹, "*his ergo breuiter prelibatis, nunc ad materiam redeamus*" (since we have briefly presented this, let us return to the subject)⁵² – and he wrote about many events precisely on the basis of written testimony. The method whereby he employed them and the fact that he used them placed Thomas above his contemporaries and many writers of later centuries as well.⁵³

Episodes in Croatian history: All historians who dealt with the earliest periods of Croatian history could not bypass the "*Historia Salonitana*". It was not always simple to resolve the problems raised by Thomas due to a shortage of reliable written sources, but everything he recorded helped despite the shortcomings entailed by their use. The description of the arrival of the Croats merits attention. The so-called Goth theory, i.e. Thomas's identification of the Croats as Goths, served many as the principal argument that Thomas hated the Croats.⁵⁴ Since the Priest of Dioclea resolved this matter similarly, it is believed that both had used the same source.⁵⁵ The most important information which Thomas provides in the catalogue of the Split bishops (archbishops) is the dating by Frankish and Byzantine, but also Croatian rulers. He mentioned Branimir, Trpimir, Muncimir, Tomislav, Držislav and Krešimir. The note accompanying Držislav, that since his rule Byzantium accorded the royal designation to Croatian rulers, has been the subject of much debate.⁵⁶ Lujo Margetić believes that Thomas did not obtain the data on the titles of Croatian rulers, beginning with Držislav, from a catalogue, but rather that it was the result of his own assessment and conclusions based on some other historical sources.⁵⁷ Based on historical sources, Thomas wrote

⁵⁰ N. Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata u ranom srednjem vijeku*, p. 23.

⁵¹ *Propositum* is a term for a rhetorical thesis or main theme.

⁵² Thomas, p. 92, 99, 171, 185; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, p. 142, 145, 242, 268; *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, p. 164, 178, 286, 318.

⁵³ See: Mirjana Matijević Sokol, *Toma Arhidakon i njegovo djelo. Rano doba hrvatske povijesti*, pp. 114-233.

⁵⁴ L. Margetić, op. cit., pp. 11-13, 33.

⁵⁵ Ferdo Šišić, *Letopis Popa Dukljanina* (Belgrade–Zagreb, 1928); Radoslav Katičić, "Vetustiores ecclesiae spalatensis memoriae", *Starohrvatska prosvjeta*, ser. III. (1988), no. 17: 17-51; Eduard Peričić, *Sclavorum regnum Grgura Barskog. Ljetopis popa Dukljanina* (Zagreb, 1991).

⁵⁶ F. Šišić, *Povijest Hrvata u vrijeme narodnih vladara* (Zagreb, 1925); N. Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata u ranom srednjem vijeku*.

⁵⁷ L. Margetić, op. cit., p. 18.

about Archbishop Lawrence, the great reformer who stood in line with Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085). About him, he writes that the Croatian rulers (and Thomas dates him to the time of Stjepan, Krešimir and Zvonimir) issued many deeds on old and new donations of property to the Split Church.⁵⁸ Thomas also mentions a council held in Nin at which Zvonimir, the Croatian king, confirmed the donation of the Church of St. Stephen and St. Mary at Otok in Solin to the Church in Split and that the tombs of the Croatian King Krešimir and many other Croatian kings and queens are in this church. Archaeological research has confirmed Thomas's assertion and uncovered an epitaph to Queen Jelena, which Thomas probably could have seen during his lifetime.⁵⁹ The weak points of the "*Historia Salonitana*" include the interpretation of the arrival of the Croats and the establishment of the cities of Split, Dubrovnik, and Zadar, while the Aryanism of the Goths, i.e. according to him, the Croats, proved opportune for Thomas to attack the heresy of his time, and also the use of the Slavic language and script. In Chapter XVII he writes about the end of the Croatian national dynasty and the assumption of authority by the Arpads, and their entry into the Dalmatian cities of Split, Trogir and Zadar. Of his own time, Thomas wrote very evocatively about events such as Split's conflicts with Trogir, with the natives of the Cetina region, and with the Croatian magnates who threatened the city, and about the siege and destruction of Zadar in the Fourth Crusade in 1202. Thomas's descriptions are also very lively when he revels in the misfortune of this rival city. Thomas, as a Church official in Split, never forgot that Zadar aspired to the metropolitanate and archdiocesan privileges, which it in fact managed to do. This event surpasses the framework of Croatian history⁶⁰ and enters the sphere of the next section.

Episodes in European history: It is precisely based on individual episodes that do not pertain specifically to Croatian history or the history of the Church in Split, about which Thomas wrote by interpolating them into the main theme, that this work surpassed similar chronicles or histories. Thomas describes the arrival of the Hungarians on the European historical scene, portraying them as pagans who later converted to Christianity. He dedicated an entire chapter to a description of the occupation of Zadar in the Fourth Crusade.⁶¹ This event was shocking to the world of the time, for the crusaders, led by the Venetians, destroyed a lovely and wealthy Christian city. This event was described by some other European chroniclers besides Thomas, including some of the participants themselves.⁶² Thomas sought the reasons for the downfall of Zadar in its alleged heresy, and describes

⁵⁸ Thomas, p. 47-56; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, pp. 68-83; *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, pp. 72-91.

⁵⁹ M. Matijević Sokol, "Starohrvatski Solin..."

⁶⁰ Mirjana Matijević Sokol, *Toma Arhiđakon i njegovo djelo. Rano doba hrvatske povijesti*, pp. 233-327.

⁶¹ Mirjana Matijević Sokol, *Toma Arhiđakon i njegovo djelo. Rano doba hrvatske povijesti*, pp. 286-290.

⁶² Stjepan Antoljak, "Pad i razaranje Zadra u IV. križarskom ratu", *Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru, Razdio društvenih znanosti* 5 (1973/1974 – published in 1974): 57-88.

it as God's punishment which struck the city on the feast day of its patron saint, Chrysogonus. Thomas's description is, it would appear, rather accurate, and it generally corresponds with that of other chroniclers and the memoirs of participants. He states that after sacking Zadar, the crusaders set off for Constantinople and seized it with the force of their navy.⁶³ Thomas also describes the departure of the Hungarian King Andrew for the Crusade in 1217, as he led the navy from Venice, Ancona and Zadar through Split, fought against the Saracens, stayed in Antioch, Greece and Bulgaria, and then returned to Hungary.⁶⁴ The description of the Tartar invasion belongs in any anthology of medieval European literature. Thomas dedicated several chapters to this event, which alarmed all of Europe, and which directly influenced events in Split as well.⁶⁵ Thomas demonstrated his loyalty to the pope and the papacy, which entirely marked his political stance and public actions, upon the arrival in Split of King Conrad, who had been excommunicated by the pope, by leaving the city with Archbishop Rogerius so that they would not have to demonstrate fealty to the king, whose Italian subject Rogerius was, and ordering all churches closed.⁶⁶ He also very precisely described two solar eclipses that occurred on 3 June 1239 and 6 October.⁶⁷ When he was in Bologna, Northern Italy, or as he called it, Liguria, Emilia and the province of Venice were hit by an earthquake. Thomas interpreted this and previous phenomena as punishments for heresy. At this time he also met St. Francis of Assisi and described him in the warmest terms, as a person whom he respected and admired.⁶⁸ "In that same year (i.e. 1222.), on the Feast of the Assumption of the Madonna, when I was attending my studies in Bologna, I saw St. Francis, who was preaching on the square in front of the city palace where almost the entire city had gathered. And the basis of his sermons were: angels, people demons. Namely, he explained these three orders of reason-endowed spirits so well and so rationally that many well-schooled people who heard the speech of this unlearned man were awestruck: he nonetheless did not hold an assembly, instead he preached. Truly the entire content of his words pertained to overcoming hostility and renewing the alliance of peace. His garments were simple, his personage aroused loathing, his face nondescript. But God imparted so much effect to his words that many of nobles among whom the fierce rage of old hostilities had led to much bloodshed, were thinking of peace. There was so much reverence and love

⁶³ Thomas, pp. 82-88; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, pp. 128-137; *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, pp. 144-157.

⁶⁴ Thomas, pp. 88-92; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, pp. 138-143 ; *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, pp. 158-165.

⁶⁵ Thomas, chapt. XXXVI. *De peste Tartarorum*, pp. 132-168; XXXVII. *De natura Tartarorum*, pp. 168-172; XXXIX. *De sevitia Tartarorum*, pp. 174-178; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, pp. 216-243, 248-255; *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, pp. 252-288, 294-304.

⁶⁶ Thomas, pp. 205-206; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, 306-307; *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, 362-364.

⁶⁷ Thomas, pp. 121, 139; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, pp. 196-197, 216-217; *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, pp. 230-231.

⁶⁸ Thomas, p. 98; *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, 152-153; *Historia Salonitana*, 2006, p. 178-179.

for this man, that the men and women crowded around him in a throng, attempting to touch the hem of his garment or to tear a piece off.”

The fact that Thomas was able to examine the Archdiocesan and Cathedral Chapter Archives in Split and use them, i.e. what he himself referred to as “scripts”, gives the “*Historia Salonitana*” incontestable authenticity. In more recent years, historians and linguists have concentrated greater efforts in attempts to identify these written sources which had the value of historical sources for Thomas. Lovre Katić had already ascertained Thomas’s credibility and discovered some of his sources.⁶⁹ Radoslav Katičić studied Split’s historical tradition and indisputably confirmed that Thomas made use of these oldest notations.⁷⁰ Mirjana Matijević Sokol studied the diplomatic sources in the “*Historia Salonitana*” and noted a new dimension and depth to Thomas’s knowledge of diplomatics and treatment of diplomatic documents, and she also found a trace of a deed issued by King Zvonimir unknown in its original form.⁷¹ Additionally, after an analysis of the entire “*Historia Salonitana*”, Matijević Sokol identified a series of diplomatic historical sources and works by writers used by Thomas to compile his text.⁷² Nada Klaić, while stressing the weakness of Thomas’s historiographic approach and assessing him as very biased in his descriptions of Split’s clerical history, nonetheless held that Thomas’s “*Historia Salonitana*” is the “best historical source produced on the eastern Adriatic coast in the High Middle Ages”.⁷³ The “*Historia Salonitana*” also stands out in terms of the beauty of its literary expression. The description of the Tartar invasion is unparalleled. As to the form of Latin in which it was written, this was a cultivated, lovely medieval Latin based on Antiquity, clerical and medieval writers and on the Bible. It is far above the quality of medieval Latin in use in the coastal communes of the time. Olga Perić also dealt with Thomas’s language, emphasizing its high quality.⁷⁴ Nenad Ivić approached the “*Historia Salonitana*” as a literary work, and based on a modern literary analysis, he ascertained that Thomas composed his text based on the principles of European medieval writers, observing the rules of rhetoric.⁷⁵

⁶⁹ Lovre Katić, “Vjerodostojnost Tome Arcidjaka i posljednji dani Solina”, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* LIII (1950–1951 published in 1952): 99-120.

⁷⁰ Radoslav Katičić, “*Vetustiores ecclesiae spalatensis memoriae*”, pp. 17-51.

⁷¹ Mirjana Matijević Sokol, “Starohrvatski Solin”.

⁷² Mirjana Matijević Sokol, *Toma Arhidakon i njegovo djelo. Rano doba hrvatske povijesti*, str. *pasim*, a osobito poglavlje V. V *Povijesni izvori kao temelj »Salonitanske povijesti«*, pp. 335-339.

⁷³ Nada Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata u razvijenom srednjem vijeku*, p. 212.

⁷⁴ Olga Perić, “Složeni pasivni oblici u djelu ‘Historia Salonitana’”, *Živa antika* XXX (1980): 113-118; *Ibid.*, “O morfosintaksi srednjovjekovnog latinskog u djelu Tome Arhidakona splitskog”, *Suvremena lingvistika* (1980–1981), no. 21-22: 3-18; *Ibid.*, “Neke jezične osobitosti djela ‘Historia Salonitana’”, *Živa antika* 32 (1982): 93-103.

⁷⁵ The author stresses that his objective is, “based on his (Thomas’s) explanations, to reconstruct the personality of the Split archdeacon and historian Thomas as a more or less typical thirteenth-century Western clerical mental landscape”. N. Ivić, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

It is in fact the style of the “*Historia Salonitana*” which indicates a work that emerged fully within the framework of the Latin literary tradition of the thirteenth century, which is grounded in both a fine medieval Latin and adopted methods of structuring literary works on the basis of rhetorical rules and customs. This means employing the customary rhetorical instruments (*flores, colores rhetorici*) which prescribed the *ars dictaminis* through the manuals of the time. One of the most important rhetorical figures is repetition. Words, parts of sentences, individual syllables and so forth are repeated.⁷⁶ This is why the “*Historia Salonitana*” is imbued with the so-called Isidorian style (*stilus Ysidorianus*), i.e. that style which emerged precisely during Thomas’s time under another classification as the fourth style (*genus mixtum sive compositum*).⁷⁷ Given all of this, the structure, language and style of the “*Historia Salonitana*” place it entirely within contemporary European Latinist literary trends, and its quality elevates it among the finest historiographic texts of its time.

A number of manuscripts of the “*Historia Salonitana*” have been preserved.⁷⁸ The oldest was written in the Beneventan script and is today held in the Cathedral Archives in Split (*Codex Spalatensis*). It is divided into 49 chapters, and based on it, Franjo Rački prepared an edition which was published after his death. Today this text is believed to be either Thomas’s own manuscript or his own copy on which some of the author’s interventions can be recognized.⁷⁹ The next oldest codex which was held in historiographic circles to be the oldest transcript is the so-called *Codex Traguriensis*. From the Split Archdiocesan Archives and Library, this copy came into the possession of the Garagnin family in Trogir, hence its name. Lučić and Farlati were familiar with it. The *Codex Vaticanus* is close to the Split codex and it was probably written in the fourteenth century, even though Lučić – and Rački initially – believed it to be the oldest. These are the three most important and oldest copies of the “*Historia Salonitana*”.⁸⁰ Some other manuscripts are known, but they do not have the same value as they emerged later; these are held in archives and libraries in Split and Zagreb. Several transcripts which are associated with the “*Historia Salonitana*” can be found in archives and libraries in Rome, Split and Vienna. The oldest is held in the archives of the *De propaganda fide* Congregation in Rome. Farlati referred to this manuscript as “*Historia Salonitana maior*” and described it in detail. It corresponds to the text of the “*Historia Salonitana*” (HS) up to the year 1185. Its existence has provoked some doubt. Most historians believe that it emerged later, in the sixteenth century. It is important because of the insertion of transcripts of original materials which are of great importance to the earliest periods of

⁷⁶ Olga Perić, *Jezik i stilске osobitosti u djelu Tome Arhidakona* (Zagreb, 1989 - dissertation, manuscript).

⁷⁷ Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1973), pp. 148-154.

⁷⁸ *Historia Salonitana*, 2003- V-XXI.

⁷⁹ *Historia Salonitana*, 2003, VII, XVII-XIX.

⁸⁰ I. Kršnjavi, op. cit., 129-135.

Croatian history. Stjepan Gunjača generated some confusion, as he thought this manuscript was Thomas's original draft.⁸¹ This view has been entirely rejected by historiography,⁸² although the inserted transcripts of the Salona and Split synods are differently assessed. Most consider them credible. Ivan Lučić⁸³ and, most recently, Ivo Babić⁸⁴, reject them and consider them contrived and inserted spuriously. Franjo Rački,⁸⁵ as a genuine expert and diplomatics specialist, evaluated them using scholarly methods and considered some of them authentic, which can even today be deemed a correct assessment.

The first edition (*editio princeps*) of the "Historia Salonitana" was prepared by Ivan Lučić. It was published together with his own work "*De regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae*". It was further reprinted by Schwandtner,⁸⁶ and an Italian abstract was also made.⁸⁷ Until recently, the most used was the edition by Rački,⁸⁸ who revised his earlier view on the age of the codex and turned to the Split manuscript. In recent years, however, a number of new editions have been published. A new edition was published by the publishing concern Književni krug of Split, with a critically prepared Latin text, a Croatian translation and a facsimile of the original Split codex.⁸⁹ The Latin text from this Split edition of 2003 was assumed, and together with an English translation it was published as the *History of the Bishops of Salona and Split* in 2006 by the CEU Press. Thus, this work by Split's medieval chronicler has become available to researchers outside of Croatia as well.⁹⁰

In conclusion, it should be noted that in 2000 an international scholarly seminar was held in Split, at which researchers from a diversity of fields delivered papers that dealt with every aspect of the "*Historia Salonitana*".⁹¹ The aforementioned publishing and scholarly projects of recent years have not exhausted every possibility. Rather, by means of new approaches, they opened new avenues to further research into the life and work of Archdeacon Thomas of Split and Croatian medieval studies in general, and also secured a place for the latter within the general framework of European medieval studies.

⁸¹ Stjepan Gunjača, "Historia Salonitana Maior", *Rad JAZU*, 283, Zagreb 1951, pp. 175-243.

⁸² Nada Klaić, *Historia Salonitana Maior* (Belgrade: SANU, 1967); Ibid., "Način na koji je nastajalo djelo Historia Salonitana Maior", *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* LXXII-LXXIII (1979):171-198; L. Margetić, op. cit.

⁸³ *Ioannis Lucii Inscriptiones Dalmaticae* (Venetiis MDCLXXIII - Venice, 1673), p. 73.

⁸⁴ Ivo Babić, op. cit., p. 15, 35-36.

⁸⁵ Franjo Rački, *Documenta historiae Chroaticae periodum antiquam illustrantia* (Zagreb, 1877), p. 197.

⁸⁶ I. G. Schwandtner, *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*, vol. III., Lipsiae 1746, pp. 532-635.

⁸⁷ *Tommaso arcidiacono della chiesa di Spalato* (Venice, 1843). See: Mirjana Matijević Sokol, *Toma Arhidakon i njegovo djelo. Rano doba hrvatske povijesti*, pp. 50-52.

⁸⁸ This is the edition cited in this paper as *Thomas*.

⁸⁹ This is the edition cited in this paper as *Historia Salonitana, 2003*.

⁹⁰ This is the edition cited in this paper as *Historia Salonitana, 2006*.

⁹¹ *Toma Arhidakon i njegovo doba. Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 25-27. rujna 2000. godine u Splitu*, edited by M. Matijević Sokol and O. Perić (Split, 2004).

Toma Archidiakon von Split (1200-1268) – als Quelle für frühe Geschichte Kroatiens

Zusammenfassung

Toma Archidiakon (1200 – 1268), Chroniker aus Split, studierte in Split und Bologna, an einer sehr angesehenen mittelalterlichen Universität, die insbesondere für das Studium der Rechtswissenschaften bekannt war. Toma schloss das Studium der Theologie und der Rechtswissenschaften ab und bekleidete nach der Rückkehr nach Split das Notariatsamt. Im Jahr 1230 wurde er zum Splitter Archidiakon gewählt und damit beginnt dein Aufstieg in der kirchlichen Hierarchie. Er hat sich um die Einführung des Potestadienstes in Split verdienstlich gemacht (regimen Latinorum), nach dem Vorbild der Städte in Italien und Provenca, wobei er sich um die Entwicklung der kommunalen Selbstverwaltung eingesetzt hat. Er brachte Gargan de Arscindis aus Ancona, der im Potestadienst drei Jahre war (1239 – 1242) und alle städtischen Gesetze und Bräuche niederschrieb. Tomas Auswahl zum Splitter Erzbischof am 7. Januar 1244 fand keine Unterstützung. Aus dem öffentlichen Leben zog er sich 1266 zurück. Er stand den Franziskanern sehr nah, in deren Kirche er in Split an der Riva auch nach seinem Tod am 8. Mai 1268 begraben wurde. Er schrieb ein Werk, das Ivan Lučić Lucius zum ersten Mal veröffentlicht und ihm den Titel "Historia Salonitana" verlieh.