

**GÁBOR SZEBERÉNYI**

**Remarks on Government of Dalmatia  
in the Twelfth Century  
A Terminological Analysis\***



*Abstract*

Because of the rare and very heterogenous sources, reconstructions of medieval governmental systems in 'frontier zones' such as twelfth-century Dalmatia can only often be based on the titles of governing officials, and on terms used for denominating the ruled territories. In this paper the author – after the examination of terms used in Venetian, Byzantine, and Hungarian official writings referring to Dalmatia - concludes that if we can contextualize these terms by taking into consideration of regional origins and local contexts of their meanings and their usage, structural differences and similarities lying behind the superficially identical terminology can be revealed.

*Key words*

Government – Dalmatia – Croatia – Hungary – Byzantium – Venice – Twelfth Century

Reconstructions of medieval history of Croatian lands (the so-called 'maritime' Croatia, Dalmatia, and the interriver region of Slavonia) in the twelfth century can be characterized by a distinctive dichotomy. In the works of Hungarian medievalists history of Croatian regions are mainly discussed in the context of the *Hungarian Kingdom's* medieval system of government, which is certainly a relevant aspect if we follow a central-peripheral approach. However, these works have paid less attention to those 'specifics' – often overvalued in the the *Croatian* historiography in turn, in the context of historical continuity – which gave proper and evidently existing characteristics of „the lands beyond the Drava”.<sup>1</sup>

---

\* This article is part of a research project supported by the Hungarian fund OTKA (reference number: T S 049775)

<sup>1</sup> The term „*beyond the Drava*” (*ultra Dravam, ultradravanus*) was a common phrase of Hungarian charters from the 1230s. Its meaning can be correlated with the term „*tota Slavonia*”, which appeared in the charters at the same time. Both terms referred to the lands between the river Drava and the Adriatic, mainly from a governmental, and thus fairly *Hungarian* point of view. Gy. KRISTÓ: *A feudális széttagozás Magyarországon*, [The Feudal Decentralization in Hungary] (Budapest: 1979) (Hereafter: KRISTÓ 1979) 91-93. Nevertheless, there is no consensus in the Hungarian historical literature about the early medieval government of the above-mentioned Croatian co-

Both approaches can be seen as one-sided (or complementary) approximations, emerging mainly from special traditions of national historiographies, but their problematic methodical effects should be taken into consideration as well. Namely, modern authors often postulate terminology of historical sources as a given and transparent phenomenon based on 'domestic' usage of latin language as a common medieval *lingua franca* during their own historical reconstructions. Authors may share a common belief that a given term of documents 'must have been used' without any doubt in a special medieval Hungarian *or* Croatian context. This postulated 'domestic framework' of language as it appears in written sources then suggests as if formally identical terms – as they were used in one *region* and in *another one* side by side – had also cover identical meanings regardless of contextual origin of the given term. Moreover, this kind of methodical/ terminological issue can be extremely problematic during the reconstruction of the governmental systems in 'frontier zones' such as twelfth-century Dalmatia. In this paper I try to prove that making clear of a medieval *terminus technicus* may not be a pointless proposition, insofar as, despite of the rare and very heterogeneous nature of our sources, we can contextualize it in a proper manner, and we take into consideration the different *regional origins* of these meanings.

The twelfth-century history of Dalmatia<sup>2</sup> is very intricate, and our sources are too scanty for even a solid political reconstruction. Nonetheless, the framework of power in Dalmatia was mainly based on the presence of three political agents in the region: the Hungarian Kingdom of the Árpáds, the revitalized Byzantine Empire of the Comneni, and Venice, which were more and more active on the eastern Adriatic since the eleventh century.<sup>3</sup> Hungarian presence in the Croatian-

---

regions in the Arpad era. See Gy. GYÖRFFY: 'Szlavónia kialakulásának oklevélkritikai vizsgálata', [The formation of Slavonia through the critical examination of charters] *Levéltári Közlemények* (1970) 223-240. (Hereafter: GYÖRFFY 1970); KRISTÓ 1979. 84-93; Gy. KRISTÓ: 'Különkormányzat az Árpád-kori Drávántúlon és Erdélyben', [Special government in the Transdravan and Transylvanian regions during the age of the Árpáds] In: Gy. KRISTÓ: *Tanulmányok az Árpád-korról*, (Budapest: 1983) 208-240; A. ZSOLDOS: 'Hrvatska i Slavonija u kraljevstvu Arpadovića', *Povijesni Prilozi* 17 (1998), 287-296; J. V. A. FINE, JR.: *The Late Medieval Balkans. A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the Ottoman Conquest*, (Ann Arbor: 1987) (Hereafter: FINE 1987) 21-23.

<sup>2</sup> The meaning of the term 'Dalmatia' diverges in different sources, and depends on the perspective of the writer of a given historical source (mainly charters), similar to the meanings of 'Scalvonia'. As I will discuss this problem in details later, I would only like to indicate where I do *not* use the term between quote marks, there I mean Dalmatia as a *geographic* term: the coastal region between the Istria-peninsula and the Bay of Kotor, and the islands along the coast.

<sup>3</sup> Staged around these three agents a larger European political context could be drawn with keyroles of the Normans of Southern Italy, the Papacy, or the Holy Roman Empire. However, as they did *not govern* Dalmatia in the twelfth century, I will not deal with their purposes in this paper.

Dalmatian region was established during László I.'s southern expansion in 1091, his nephew's (Álmos) short-lived Croatian „regnum” at the end of the eleventh century, and was consolidated by Coloman the Learned's coronation in Biograd-na-moru (1102), and by his campaign in Dalmatia in 1105.<sup>4</sup> From that time 'Dalmatia'<sup>5</sup> was under the Hungarian kings' jurisdiction till 1918. Their power *de jure* was, however, contested by both Byzantium, and – initially intervening as a representative of the *basileus*, but later on supported by her own political and economical ambitions – Venice.<sup>6</sup> We can ignore further details in this respect, but must emphasize here the fact that Dalmatia (or more exactly: the Dalmatian *cities* along the coastline and on the islands) was a region where dominant powers of the time clashed, and thus, structures of rules were permanently unstable during the whole century.

---

For further details see: F. MAKK: *Magyar külpolitika (896-1196)*, [Hungarian Foreign Policy, 896-1196] (Szeged: 1993) (Hereafter: MAKK 1993) 140-173., and P. STEPHENSON: 'Political Authority in Dalmatia during the Reign of Manuel I Comnenus (1143-1180)' in: G. PRINZING – M. SALAMON (eds.): *Byzanz und Ostmitteleuropa 950-1453. Beiträge zu einer table-ronde des XIX International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Copenhagen 1996*, (Wiesbaden: 1999) 127-150. (Hereafter: STEPHENSON 1999)

<sup>4</sup> I. GOLDSTEIN: 'Dinastija Arpadovića i ranosrednjovjekovna Hrvatska', in: I. GOLDSTEIN (ed.): *Zvonimir, kralj hrvatski. Zbornik radova*, (Zagreb: 1997) 261-272; M. ANČIĆ: 'Desetljeće od godine 1091. do 1102. u zrclu vrela', *Povijesni prilozi* 17 (1998) 240-244. The Hungarian expansion in Dalmatia was admitted by Byzantium (though not without any necessity), and was confirmed by a dynastic marriage between László's daughter, Piroška, and John Comnenus. F. MAKK. *The Árpáds and the Comneni. Political Relations Between Hungary and Byzantium in the 12th Century*, (Budapest: 1989) 14; STEPHENSON 1999. 128-129.

<sup>5</sup> Besides other important factors, the legal continuity between the Croatian Tripimiovići and the Árpáds in Dalmatia was based on privileges granted to the Dalmatian cities by former Croatian rulers and confirmed by new Hungarian kings as well; the Árpáds in general respected these „old liberties” of the cities. See N. KLAIĆ: *Povijest Hrvata u srednjem vijeku*, (Zagreb: 1990) (Hereafter: KLAIĆ 1990) 165-167; S. GULDESCU: *History of Medieval Croatia to 1526*, (The Hague: 1964) 188; FINE 1987. 23; Gy. GYÖRFFY: 'A XII. századi dalmáciai városprivilegiumok kritikájához', [Remarks on the critical examination of twelfth-century charters of the Dalmatian cities] *Történelmi Szemle* 10 (1967) 45-56.

<sup>6</sup> Venice seized control over the Dalmatian cities between 1116 and 1119, and in 1125 it was consolidated for the next decade. In 1135-1136 the central region of Dalmatia – around Spalato – fell back to Hungarian suzerainty, but it was crushed by Manuel I Comnenus' campaigns between 1162 and 1165. From that time (fortified by a peace treaty between Hungary and Byzantium in 1167) Dalmatia was once again under Byzantine supremacy until 1180/ 81, Béla III's campaigns. The storm-center of the whole maritime region was Zadar; the city and its surroundings was highly contested by Venice and Hungary, and it was a ground of continual confrontations during the twelfth century. J. V. A. FINE, JR.: *The Early Medieval Balkans. A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*, (Ann Arbor: 1983) (Hereafter: FINE 1983) 289-290; T. RAUKAR: *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje. Prostor, ljudi, ideje*, (Zagreb: 1997) (Hereafter: RAUKAR 1997) 65-66.

Since the reconstruction of actual (Hungarian, Byzantine, or Venetian) supremacy over this region can be established mainly on the *titles* used by governing officials of 'Dalmatia' in a given time, and on their terms used for *denominating their ruled territories*, henceforth I will analyse these terms and titles in detail.

We can determine most easily – at least on the level of terminology – *Venice's* positions in Dalmatia. 'Dalmatia' was included in the general title of Venetian doges (*dux Venetie Dalmatie atque Chroatie*<sup>7</sup>), and the consequent usage of the term can be traced continuously after the end of the eleventh century. The inner logic behind the change of the Venetian doge's title followed the very similar pattern to those of the forming of Hungarian king's titles after Coloman the Learned.<sup>8</sup> This fact has to be emphasized since – as we will discuss it later in detail – the other main part of the title, *dux*, in Dalmatian context of the twelfth century includes many interpretational difficulties, but in case of Venetian doges it originates evidently from the *latin* form of title 'doge'. In order to depict the reality wholly, it should be mentioned that Venice's rule over Dalmatia was based mainly on the leaders (*comes*, *knez*) of the secular governments of *Dalmatian cities* replaced by Italians.<sup>9</sup> Thus, though the Venetian doge's title suggests his total

<sup>7</sup> This title – though at first it referred *only* to 'Dalmatia' – already appeared a few times as early as the eleventh century, but it was amended with the interpolation of the term „and of Croatia” only at the end of the century. FINE 1983. 275; MAKK 1993. 126. The full title – contested by Hungarian kings since Coloman's rule – was used continuously by Venetian doges after the beginning of the twelfth century. See T. SMIČIKLAS (ed.): *Codex Diplomaticus Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, Vols. II-III. (Zagreb: 1904-1905) (Hereafter: CD) II. No. 1, No. 25, No. 66, No. 130, No. 132, No. 148, No. 150, No. 170, No. 203, and so on.

<sup>8</sup> G. GYÖRFFY (ed., op., praef.): *Diplomata Hungariae antiquissima aecedunt epistolae et acta ad historiam Hungariae pertinentia*, Vol. I. Ab anno 1000 usque ad annum 1131. (Budapestini: 1992) (Hereafter: DHA) No. 116, and CD II. No. 10, No. 391 etc. About changes of regal titles of the Árpáds: Gy. SZABADOS: 'Imre, Bulgária királya', [Emeric, king of Bulgaria] in: S. HOMONNAI – F. PITI – I. TÓTH (eds.): *Tanulmányok a középkori magyar történelemről. Az I. Medieviztikai PhD-konferencia (Szeged, 1999. július 2.) előadásai*, (Szeged: 1999) 115-120.

<sup>9</sup> If we believe the account of Venetian chronicler from the 14th century, Andrea Dandolo, doge Petrus Polanus's son, Vid, was *comes* in *Osor* (Absar), on the island of Cres in the 1130s. In the second half of the twelfth century two important Venetian families – from which doges came –, the Michieli and the Maurocena rivalled for supremacy over the city until the balance was turned for the good of the laters at the beginning of the thirteenth century. KLAIĆ 1990. 173. Reign over *Krk* island (Veglia) and its main settlement was in the hand of the ancestors of the Frankapans, and they consolidated their rule with Venetian support in the twelfth century. On August of 3 in 1163 doge Vitalis Michiel confirmed the privileges given by his predecessors to quondam *comes* of Veglia, Doimus, for the good of Doimus's sons, Bartholomeus and Guido, though for that they were bound to pay 350 Byzantine *nomisma* annually. (*Singulis uero annis in festo sancti Michaelis pro ipso comitatu et insula atque redditibus illorum trecentos quinquaginta romanatos nostro communi persolvere debetis* CD

'territorial' rule over all Dalmatia (and even Croatia), it was obviously only partial. This fact sheds light on one of the main problems of reconstructions of medieval structures based on analysis of official terms as they appear in sources. Namely, all these terms referring to territories ruled by a given power (so-called 'name of countries' in titles) have a *fundamentally totalizing character* so do not match with territories ruled by the same power in 'real'. Thus, these titles can be seen as expressions of claims of supremacy, and not of supremacy in effect. For instance, in the case of Venice the term 'Dalmatia' (supported by data of charters) obviously referred to the islands of the Bay of Kvarner (Krk, Cres, Rab), and only to Zadar on the coast,<sup>10</sup> and thus Venetian rule over 'Croatia' (or even 'the whole of Dalmatia') in the twelfth century was absolutely out of question.

The determination of the outlines of *Byzantine* supremacy in the region is similarly difficult, though chronological frames are more evident than in the former case. 'Dalmatia' – along with other territories of the Northern Balkans –, after the Byzantine-Hungarian struggles in 1163-1165 and 1166-1167 became part of the Byzantine Empire once again, and by the treaty between the Comneni and the Árpáds of 1167 remained generally uncontested until the year of 1180, death of Manuel I Comnenus.<sup>11</sup> We know four Byzantine officials who governed 'Dalmatia' during this one and a half decade of Byzantine rule. Nicephorus Chaluphes between 1167 and 1170,<sup>12</sup> *sebastos* Constantine from 1171

---

II. No. 92, See: KLAJČ 1990. 174.) *Duymus* already appeared as *comes* of Veglia in 1133: CD II. No. 41.

<sup>10</sup> The city of Zadar was Venice's most important base on the Dalmatian coast, where the position of *comes* was kept by the Maurocena since the 1160s. KLAJČ 1990. 176. Beforehand, Venetian diplomacy succeeded in raising the bishopric of Zadar to the grade of an archiepiscopal see by Pope Anastasius IV in 1154 (CD II. No. 78), while in 1157 the Pope submitted the newly established archiepiscopal see under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Grado. (CD II. No. 81) Thus, Venice – since suffragan bishoprics on the islands of the Bay of Kvarner (Osor, Krk, Rab, Hvar) were submitted to the archbishop of Zadar as well – was able to secure her claims over Northern Dalmatia through the framework of ecclesiastical institutions too. N. KLAJČ – I. PETRICIOLI: *Zadar u srednjem vijeku do 1409. Prošlost Zadra II*, (Zadar: 1976) 163-165. RAUKAR 1997. 179., 180. However, Venetian supremacy over Zadar was very unstable; citizens of Zadar rose against Venetian rule many times during the twelfth century (1159, 1164, 1172, 1180-1181), and tried to submit themselves to the Hungarian kings. See: MAKK 1993. 167., 173., 181; STEPHENSON 1999. 130-138.

<sup>11</sup> MAKK 1993. 170-173; F. MAKK: 'Megjegyzések III. István történetéhez', [Remarks on Stephen III's history] In: F. MAKK: *A turulmadártól a kettős keresztig. Tanulmányok a magyarság régebbi történelméről*. (Szeged: 1998) 197-213; P. STEPHENSON: *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier. A Political Study of the Northern Balkans, 900-1204*, (Cambridge: 2000) (Hereafter: STEPHENSON 2000) 253-261.

<sup>12</sup> Chaluphes, who was general of Byzantine troops sent by Emperor Manuel to support Stephen IV against Stephen III, the legal Hungarian king in 1164, according to Cinnamus, had already got the title of *sebastos*. See: Gy. MORAVCSIK (ed.): *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai. Fontes*

till 1174,<sup>13</sup> *doux* Philokales in 1178,<sup>14</sup> and *dukas* Rogerius in 1180<sup>15</sup> ruled Byzantine Dalmatia in the name of the *basileus*. Since in Dalmatian charters (more precisely, of Spalato) one can only come across these three last names, hereafter I will focus on their roles.

At the beginning of the twelfth century, when fundamental reforms of official titles were performed by Emperor Alexius I Comnenus in order to get a clearer and more transparent system of imperial administration, and to proceed 'family rule' of the Comneni in a larger extent, the content of titles *sebastos* and *dukas* (*doux*) changed.<sup>16</sup> *Sebastos* was not a mere honorific title anymore; from that time it was connected to the highest ranks of Byzantine nobility, especially to those who were related to the imperial dynasty.<sup>17</sup> On the other hand, though it is evident that obtaining the title of *sebastos* also marked the highest imperial respect given to Constantine and Chaluphes,<sup>18</sup> this still general character of the *sebastos*

---

*byzantini historiae Hungaricae aevi ducum et regum ex stirpe Árpád descendantium*, (Budapest : 1988) 225. To Kaluphes' rule in Dalmatia, see: F. ŠIŠIĆ: *Poviest Hrvata za kraljeva iz doma Arpadovića (1102-1301). Prvi dio (1102-1205). Od Kolomana do Ladislava III*, (Zagreb: 1944) (Hereafter: ŠIŠIĆ 1944) 92., and Gy. KRISTÓ: 'A korai feudalizmus (1116-1241)', [Early feudalism, 1116-1241] In: Gy. SZÉKELY, (ed.-in-chief), A. BARTHA (ed.): *Magyarország története. I./ 1-2. Előzmények és magyar történet 1242-ig*, (Budapest: 1984) I./2. 1230; STEPHENSON 1999. 143.

<sup>13</sup> According to Šišić, Constantine ruled 'Dalmatia' between 1171 and 1178 (Šišić 1944. 92), but it can only be traced by data of charters in the period of 1171-1174: CD II. No. 125 (y. 1171), No. 126 (y. 1171), No. 135 (y. 1174) According to Stephenson he was withdrawn from Spalato some time before 1176. STEPHENSON 1999. 146.

<sup>14</sup> CD II. No. 153. The Croatian editor of the charter, T. Smičiklas, amended the text with the name of Rogerius in his critical edition: "[...] *al tempo di Emanuele magnifico et piissimo imperatore, (Rogerio) duce in Spalato et in tutto l'regnio di Croatia et Damatia il filocale [...]*", and Ibid. "[Rogerio] *duce in Spalato et in tutto l'regnio di Croatia et Dalmatia*". However, according to J. Ferluga this charter does not refer to Rogerius, but to an otherwise unknown *doux*, Philokales (CD II. No. 153: "[...] *nel medesimo tempo anco di filocale duca supradetto [...]*"), who supposed to be the governor of Byzantine Dalmatia in the interval period between Constantine and Rogerius. See: J. ФЕРЛУГА: *Византијска управа у Далмацији*. (Београд: 1957) (Hereafter: FERLUGA 1957) 139-140; J. FERLUGA: 'L'administration byzantine en Dalmatie', in: J. FERLUGA: *Byzantium on the Balkans. Studies on the Byzantine Administration and the Southern Slavs from the VIIth to the XIIth Centuries*, (Amsterdam: 1976) (Hereafter: FERLUGA 1976a) 141-149., especially: 148., and STEPHENSON 1999. 146-147.

<sup>15</sup> CD II. No. 163, No. 165.

<sup>16</sup> G. OSTROGORSKY: *History of the Byzantine State*, (New Brunswick – New Jersey: 1969) (Hereafter: OSTROGORSKY 1969) 367-368.

<sup>17</sup> A. P. KAZHDAN – W. EPSTEIN: *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, (Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: 1985) (Hereafter: KAZHDAN – EPSTEIN 1985) 69; A. KAZHDAN: 'Sebastos', in: A. P. KAZHDAN (ed.): *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, Vols. I-III. (New York – Oxford: 1991) (Hereafter: ODB) III. 1862-1863.

<sup>18</sup> According to Cinnamus, Constantine joined the ranks of *sebastoi* by marrying Emperor Manuel's niece. STEPHENSON 1999. 143.

makes drawing solid conclusions on structures of power in Byzantine Dalmatia based on this mere title unfounded. Fortunately, Constantine also appeared as *dux* in 1171,<sup>19</sup> which can be collated with the title *dukas*, held by Philokales and Rogerius a couple of years later.

The content of title *dux/doux* – spawned originally in the Later Roman Empire – was also changed by the administrative reforms of Alexius I, though modern Byzantinology reached no consensus about its varying meanings.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, concerning the Byzantine *duces* the term undoubtedly referred to the officer in charge who governed the Byzantine territorial unit of the Adriatic coast: the *ducatus* (thema) of Dalmatia.<sup>21</sup> That territorial character of the Byzantine government is the very difference between Byzantine practices and the above-mentioned Venetian forms of administration applied in the region. The revitalized Byzantine governmental system of Dalmatia was *distinct from* the Venetian one; the later was based on the original self-governing system of local communes, and Venice simply *expropriated* the extant framework by appointed Venetians. Contrary to that, though Byzantine administration was also raised upon existing communes of Dalmatian cities, its rule was organized within *territorial frames* (*Dalmatia thema*) by imperial designation of a *dux*, and by the Byzantine practice, which though directly affected the government of the maritime cities, but left the inner autonomous system fundamentally untouched.<sup>22</sup> This can be supported by data from Spalato, the central city of Byzantine Dalmatia in the 1170s. Priors of the city were permanently in charge right through the whole Byzantine period – *comes* John appeared when *sebastos* Constantine was in duty, and *comes* Martin worked at the end of the decade<sup>23</sup> –, moreover, among witnesses of charters we can find the *knez* of Trogir as well as other *župans* (*iuppanus*) of the local elites from territories under Byzantine

---

<sup>19</sup> CD II. No. 125

<sup>20</sup> A. KAZHDAN: 'Doux', in: *ODB I*. 659. In P. Stephenson's opinion "the *doux* was regarded as the highest judicial authority in Dalmatia". STEPHENSON 2000. 262.

<sup>21</sup> CD II. No. 125: "*Dominantis Constantini ducis ducatus anno primo.*", CD II. No. 165: "[...] *regnante domino nostro Manuele sanctissimo imperatore et in ducatu Dalmatie et Croatia existente domino Rogerio Selauone duca [...]*" According to Ostrogorsky, every Byzantine officer who governed a *thema* was called officially *dux*. OSTROGORSKY 1969. 368.

<sup>22</sup> FERLUGA 1976a. 148.

<sup>23</sup> CD II. No. 126: "[...] *comitatu(m) prephate ciuitatis [scilicet Spalato – G. SZ.] gubernante Johannes comes*"; CD II. No. 135, CD II. No. 153: "*conte Martino*" CD II. No. 165: "*Martinus Spalatinorum comes*"

authority.<sup>24</sup> These facts altogether can confirm the territorial character of the Byzantine rule in Dalmatia in the middle of the twelfth century.

On the other hand, the exact frontiers of the Byzantine territory cannot be defined adequately through 'names of countries' appeared in *duces*' official titles. As a matter of fact, these had an even more totalizing character than Venetian ones. In cases of *duces* Constantine and Philokales we can find another term referring to their territories besides the term '*ducatu*', and more totalizing than the previous one: 'the whole country (*regnum*) of Dalmatia and Croatia'.<sup>25</sup> This term, even in the case of 'Dalmatia' could not cover more than the surroundings of Spalato and Trogir, and it is sure that very small parts of 'Croatia' were under *de facto* Byzantine rule at that time.<sup>26</sup> By all accounts, our sources in cases of all Byzantine *duces* emphasized that their court was maintained in Spalato.<sup>27</sup> In 1180 *dukas* Rogerius in order to fulfill the request of the archbishop of Spalato, Rainer, appointed two bailiffs by imperial mandate to enforce the rights of the church of St. Bartholomew over estates near the centre of archiepiscopal see. This also confirms that Byzantine rule at that time was very limited in geographical sense, in spite of the titles officially used.<sup>28</sup>

Concerning *dukas* Rogerius, there appears one more special terminological phenomenon, which has implied in literature in the context of history of ideas in Byzantium under the Comneni. A letter of Emperor Manuel from March of 1180 was addressed to Rogerius as '*ligiae imperii mei*'.<sup>29</sup> As Jadran Ferluga pointed out Rogerius's appearance as imperial *ligius* may refer to the presence of a special legal institution in Dalmatia: as though there had been a *classic feudal bound*

---

<sup>24</sup> CD II. No. 165: "[...] *Marinus Traguriensis comes, iuppanus Desa, iudex Vileota, Breuico iuppanus, comes Nicolaus, iuppanus Mirozlaus filius Bogdanazi, iuppanus Scepanus filius Raccos, iuppanus Grubessa filius Saioli, iuppanus Descó*".

<sup>25</sup> CD II. No. 126: "*in ciuitate nostra Spalatina et in toto regno Dalmacie et Chroacie imperante Constantino sebasto*"; CD II. No. 153: "*duce in Spalato et in tutto l'regno di Croatia et Dalmatia il filocale*"; Ibid.: "*duce in Spalato et in tutto l'regno di Croatia et Dalmatia*"

<sup>26</sup> FERLUGA 1976a. 148.

<sup>27</sup> CD II. No. 126., No. 153.

<sup>28</sup> CD II. No. 163, No. 165. See FERLUGA 1957. 144; STEPHENSON 1999. 149; STEPHENSON 2000. 262-263. According to archbishop Rainer, the worriers of the church estates were (among others) members of the Kačići: "*Insinatum est imperio meo [scilicet Manuel I Comnenus – G. SZ.] ab honorificentissimo archiepiscopo Spalatensi (Rainerio), quod quidam incolarum eiusmodi regionis sed et Caciclorum aliqui non pauca eorum, que in suo privilegio et ad suam ecclesia illis suis bonis priuatur (!)*." The central town of the Kačići was Omiš, in the wash of river Cetina, at a distance of about 20 kilometers south of Spalato.

<sup>29</sup> CD II. No. 163.: "*Ligiae imperii mei Rogerio Sclauoni*." Ibid. "Quomodo vero et idem archiepiscopus conquestus est, quod predia ecclesiae sancti Bartholomei occupata sunt a quibusdam consideratu *Rogeri ligiae mei imperii* [...]"



between the emperor and his maritime resident in contemporary Western European sense.<sup>30</sup> Though the cognomen of the *dux* of Spalato, 'Sclauone', may refer to its holder's slavonic origin,<sup>31</sup> his normann descendance was seconded as well, and the later may explain the presence of feudal bounds respectively.<sup>32</sup> In byzantinologist works there can even be found the idea that Rogerius had been a sovereign ruler of Dalmatia in effect,<sup>33</sup> and thus the term *ligius* would have been referred an intrinsic feudal bound between he and Emperor Manuel. Nevertheless, if we use the *institutional concept* of feudalism, which can accept the using the term of 'Feudalism' exclusively in case when *co-existence* of particular feudal institutions (aspects of personal bounds, tangible properties, and elements of power of statehood) can be found in a given region,<sup>34</sup> we can easily draw the conclusion that the *mere* trace of such feudal bounds in themselves like in the case of *dux* Rogerius is insufficient for maintaining the concept of existence of feudalism in Dalmatia.<sup>35</sup> Moreover, the terminology of feudalism as appeared in Byzantium at that time is enough in itself for an argument against an assumed concept of 'feudal bounds' represented by the title *ligius* of Rogerius. The term as it appeared in Byzantium in the age of the Comneni was evidently originated

---

<sup>30</sup> FERLUGA 1957. 141-142; FERLUGA 1976a. 148; STEPHENSON 1999. 146. note 100. See: J. FERLUGA: 'La ligesse dans l'Empire Byzantin. Contribution à l'étude de la féodalité à Byzance', in: J. FERLUGA: *Byzantium on the Balkans. Studies on the Byzantine Administration and the Southern Slavs from the VIIth to the XIIIth Centuries*, (Amsterdam: 1976) 399-426. (Hereafter: FERLUGA 1976b), especially: 420.

<sup>31</sup> CD II. No. 163, No. 165.

<sup>32</sup> At first, Ferluga supported the theory of Rogerius' Croatian origin, but later he argued for his normann descendance. FERLUGA 1976a 148; FERLUGA 1976b. 420. According to Henrik Marczali, Rogerius' cognomen referred to the fact that he was *dukas* of Sclavonia. See: H. MARZALI: *Az Árpádok és Dalmácia*, [The Árpás and Dalmatia] (Budapest: 1898) 80. Marczali's argument can be seen as a typical example when one tries to neglect perspective aspects of a given *terminus technicus*.

<sup>33</sup> See: A. KAZHDAN: 'Rogerios', in: *ODB III*. 1802.

<sup>34</sup> R. S. HOYT: *Feudal Institutions. Cause or Consequence of Decentralization?*, (New York – London: 1961) E. SASHALMI: 'Létezett-e feudalizmus a kievei Ruszban és a moszkvai államban?', [Did feudalism exist in Kievan Russia and in Moscowian state?] in: M. FONT – E. SASHALMI: *Állam, hatalom, ideológia. Tanulmányok az orosz történelem sajátosságairól*, (Budapest: 2007) 139-158. (Hereafter: SASHALMI 2007)

<sup>35</sup> The puzzle around a coherent concept of „feudalism” (the above-mentioned 'institutional' approach can be a possible solution) can be demonstrated by the arguement of the able Croatian historian, Nada Klaić, who considered as a 'feudal tendency' the intentions common among Dalmatian citizenry's elites in the twelfth century to make the titles (*comes, knez*) owned by their family members inheritable. KLAJĆ 1990. 172.

from the West;<sup>36</sup> its Greek counterpart was *lizios*,<sup>37</sup> as it can be traced, for example, in Anna Comnena's *Alexiad*.<sup>38</sup> However, it seems to be a remarkably meaningful fact in the history of ideas of Byzantium that just those term of Western feudalism did *not* get into the thesaurus of Byzantine terminology<sup>39</sup> that referred to the *reciprocal factor* of the relationship between *senior* and his vassal: in Greek 'vassal' was called 'slave', the emperor's *doulos*.<sup>40</sup> Therefore, in the case of Rogerius we cannot assume more than a similarly superficial 'feudal' trait which can be traced 'only' on level of terminology, and most probably it was not a structural feature of the Byzantine *ducatus* in Dalmatia.

Back to the analysis of structures of power on the Adriatic coast in the twelfth century, it can be claimed without doubt that the Byzantine period (the latest one in the history of Dalmatia), ending in 1180/1181, did not change significantly the life of cities under Byzantine rule, and gravity of Venice's power in the northern region, especially in Zadar, was more remarkable. Nonetheless, I

---

<sup>36</sup> To the standards of *ligium* in its original sense: M. BLOCH: *Feudal Society. Vol. I. The Growth of Ties of Dependence*, (Routledge: 1989) 214-218; L. KATUS: *A középkor története*, [A History of the Middle Ages] (Budapest: 2000) 221-222.

<sup>37</sup> According to byzantinologists, the usage of term *lizios* can only be traced in cases of *westerners* who were personally connected to the emperor, and Byzantine authors did never use it in reference to Greek subjects. FERLUGA 1976b. 399-426; M. C. BARTUSIS: 'Lizios', in: *ODB II*. 1243. To 'feudal' characteristics of Byzantium in the twelfth century see: KAZHDAN – EPSTEIN 1985. 56-73., and OSTROGORSKY 1969. 371-375.

<sup>38</sup> Terms referring to feudal bounds can be traced in the *Alexiad* exclusively in the twelfth chapter of the 13th Book. The chapter discussed the circumstances of the famous Treaty of Devol, signed by the ruler of Antioch, Bohemond, and emperor Alexius I Comnenus after the unsuccessful siege of Dyrrachium by the crusaders in 1107. See S. RUNCIMAN: *A keresztes hadjáratok története*, [History of the Crusades] (Budapest: 1999) 321. OSTROGORSKY 1969. 366., and STEPHENSON 2000. 182-183. The text of the Treaty: B. LEIB – P. GAUTIER (ed., transl.): *Anna Comnena: Alexiade*, Vol. I-IV. Paris, 1937-1976. (Hereafter: ALEXIAD) III. 125-139.

<sup>39</sup> FERLUGA 1976b. 401-414.. According to the text of the Treaty of Devol, as it can be read in the *Alexiad*, creators of the contract definitely stood for formulating the text in an exact Western manner. The latin term, *homo ligius* can be read everywhere in its Greek counterpart as loan translation (*lizios anthropos*, see ALEXIAD III. 126., 127., 128., 129., 134., 137.), but there can be found the common formula of *concilium et auxilium* (Ibid. III. 128.), as well as the formulation of the essence of *hominium ligium*: the vassal's obligation to take a single lord as *senior*. (Ibid. III. 129.) P. Stephenson also pointed out that "the legal language and concepts employed in the treaty demonstrate that the Byzantine emperor had become remarkably familiar with the principles of western feudalism [...]". STEPHENSON 2000. 182

<sup>40</sup> FERLUGA 1957. 142; A. KAZHDAN, A.: 'Doulos', in: *ODB I*. 659; OSTROGORSKY 1969. 375. n. 1. 'Doulos' in the Treaty of Devol: ALEXIAD III. 126., 128., 129., 134. The relation between the Byzantine emperor and his 'vassal' can be correlated with the relation bound the Russian *tzar* to his subjects from the end of the fifteenth century; the *tzar's* subject was also a *holop* ('slave'). See SASHALMI 2007. 151.

cannot agree with Jadran Ferluga's conclusion that the one and a half decade of Byzantine rule over Dalmatia vanished without trace.<sup>41</sup> Most exactly, as we will see, it really left its marks on the contemporary practice of making out charters and deeds in Dalmatia (more precisely, in Spalato), which fact may lead to important consequences about some characteristics of the *Hungarian* government over the Dalmatian region.

In this paper, I cannot cover all issues of the Hungarian administration maintained in the maritime parts during the twelfth century, especially, as they have many disputed and – due to lack of sources – fundamentally inextricable aspects. Thus, I would like to heighten only one aspect relating in many respects to the above-mentioned problems: namely, the special governorship or *ducat* of a Hungarian bishop, Kalán (Calanus), who hold his title in the early 1190s.

It is well known that after the birth of Croatian-Hungarian personal union the newly established territories were administered by a *ban*, whose title was established in the period of the Tripimirovići, but at that time he worked by the grace of the Hungarian king. Though, because of lack of sources, there is no consensus in historical literature about early Hungarian bans' exact territorial mandates, or the precise extent of their jurisdiction,<sup>42</sup> but the emerging of a churchman, Kalán, bishop of Pécs into a fundamentally secular administrative position, when he became governor (*gubernator*) of 'the whole of Dalmatia and Croatia' can be considered evidently a very special phenomenon in the history of early medieval government of the Hungarian Kingdom.<sup>43</sup> The almost unpre-

---

<sup>41</sup> FERLUGA 1976a. 178.

<sup>42</sup> See the literature of note 1, and: G. SZEBERÉNYI: "Kalán, Isten kegyelméből palliumos pécsi püspök, egész Dalmácia és Horvátország kormányzója" Újabb szempont a horvát-magyar perszonálunió 12. századi történetének kérdéséhez', ["Kalán, by God's grace bishop of Pécs with pallium, the governor of whole Dalmatia and Croatia". New aspect to the question of the history of the Croatian-Hungarian personal union in the 12th century] in: L. VARGA – J. VONYÓ (eds.): *Tanulmányok Pécs történetéből 10-11-12. Az Előadások Pécs történetéből '98, Előadások Pécs történetéből '99 és az Előadások Pécs történetéből 2000. című konferenciák válogatott előadásai*, (Pécs: 2001) 229-241. (Hereafter: SZEBERÉNYI 2001)

<sup>43</sup> Charters mentioning Kalán as 'governor': J. KOLLER: *Historia Episcopatus Quinqueecclesiarum. I. Complectus res gestas ab anno M. ad MCCXIX et appendixes IV. diversi argumenti*, (Posonii: 1782) 303. (y. 1190, false), CD II. No. 244, No. 250, No. 247, No. 248, No. 249; F. KNAUZ – L. C. DEDEK (red.): *Monumenta ecclesiae Strigoniensis*, Vol. I-III. (Strigonii: 1874-1924) (Hereafter: MES) I. No. 127. We have authentic data only from the year 1193. Nonetheless, a deed mentioned Kalán as ban in 1209, but this charter proved to be false, and no other authentic source calls him *ban*. CD III. No. 74., and see: I. SZENTPÉTERY – I. BORSA (eds.): *Regesta regnum stirpis Arpadianae critico-diplomatica. Az Arpád-házi királyok okleveleinek kritikai jegyzéke*, I-II./1-4. Budapest, 1923-1987. No. 250. It is unknown why got a churchman such as Kalán such an uncommon, fundamentally secular position in the Hungarian government; J. Sweeney characterized the bishop of Pécs wittily as „a qualified

cedented<sup>44</sup> speciality of that situation gets even sharper edges if we know that some charters related to Kalán's governorship called him 'dux' as well, which term had got a very special connotation in the context of latin terminology officially used in medieval Hungary.<sup>45</sup> Apropos of the later title, even that opinion has been conceived that the bishop of Pécs, albeit he was certainly not a member of the dynasty, and thus his standing was really unusual in that wise, surely hold his position as a 'duke' in effect (or, at least, as a governor who was in a rank alike of a duke).<sup>46</sup>

However, the charters which could support this opinion cannot be interpreted in context of latin terminology used in the Hungarian Kingdom at that time. First of all, deeds referring to the so-called „dukedom” (*ducatus*) of Kalán were written *in Spalato*, and moreover, did not remain in their original latin forms,<sup>47</sup> but only in *Italian* translations.<sup>48</sup> It also tells much about Kalán's supposed title of *dux* (in Hungarian wise of the term) that he never used it in his own charters' intitulations,<sup>49</sup> nor was it used in charters written in the royal chancery; in both cases he always was called *gubernator*.<sup>50</sup>

---

careerist” See: J. R. SWEENEY: ‘III. Ince és az esztergomi érsekválasztási vita’, [Innocent III and the Esztergom Election Dispute] *Aetas* 1993:1 147-170.

<sup>44</sup> The title *gubernator* appeared in sources only once before Kalán, in the respect of Hungarian *ban* of the 'maritime parts', Dénes, between 1181 and 1184. KRISTÓ 1979. 90.

<sup>45</sup> CD II. No. 248, No. 249.

<sup>46</sup> KRISTÓ 1979. 47. note 178., 48. note 180. L. KOSZTA: *A pécsi székeséptalan bitelesbeji tevékenysége (1214-1353)*, [The Pécs Cathedral Chapter As A Place of Authentication, 1214-1353] (Pécs: 1998) 12; F. MAKK: 'Kalán' in: Gy. KRISTÓ (ed.-in-chief), P. ENGEL – F. MAKK (eds.): *Korai magyar történelmi lexikon (9-14. század)*, [Encyclopedia of Early Hungarian History, 9th-14th Centuries] (Budapest: 1994) 312-313.

<sup>47</sup> CD II. No. 248: “[...] *regnante Bela re d'Ungheria, procurando anco il ducato di Dalmatia et Croatia Calano* [...]”; CD II. No. 249: “[...] *L'anno del verbo incarnato 1193., nell'inditione X., regnando Bela re degli Ungari, duca Calano presidente alla Dalmatia et Croatia* [...]”.

<sup>48</sup> Gy. Szabados has already drawn the attention to that linguistic divergence which can render the interpretation of that objected terms more difficult. Nonetheless, he discussed the above-mentioned charters as if they had been written in a neo-latin („Dalmatian”) dialect, albeit it is known that they were reserved as a part of a collection of texts (*Scritture del monastero di san Stefano di Spalato*) composed and *translated into Italian* at the very latest in the seventeenth century. Gy. SZABADOS: Imre és András, [Emeric and Andrew] *Századok* 1999:1 85-111., especially: 89-90. To the collection reserved in the *Biblioteca Marciana*, Venice: M. KOSTRENCIĆ (red.): *Codex Diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, Vol. I. (Zagrabiae: 1967) 58.

<sup>49</sup> CD II. No. 244, No. 250: “*Calanus dei gratia Quinqueecclesiensis episcopus palleatus et totius Dalmatie atque Chroatie gubernator*”.

<sup>50</sup> CD II. No. 247: “*Kalano Quinqueecclesiensi episcopo et eodem Dalmatie atque Chroatie gubernatore* [...]”, MES I. No. 127: “[...] *Calano Quinqueecclesiensi Episcopo, et eodem tocius dalmacie atque Croacie Gubenatore* [...]” These charters were written by the provost of Fehérvár and royal chancellor, Katapán.

Without ignoring interpretational issues originating from the above-mentioned descendance of our texts, I submit that this 'ducal' title of bishop Kalán – reserved in the exact form *duca* – derived from the Dalmatian (Spalatian) terminological practice, which emerged /reborn from/ in the previous Byzantine period, but can only be explained in a strictly *local* context.

Fortunately, the reconstruction of that practice can be eased by the fact that we have many charters from Spalato that can be related to different known *scriptors* of the twelfth century. Thus, we have a special corpus of texts suggesting that structures of power in Dalmatia, at least, on the level of terminology, were *the same* in the Byzantine period of the 1170s, *and* in the Hungarian one after 1180. The fact that the title of Philokales in 1178, and of Kalán (in its original latin form, evidently) in 1193 were written by the same *scriptor*, presbiter Sabatius, a simple cleric of Spalato in 1178, but already a subdeacon and public notary in 1193 can be seen as a decisive proof of that.<sup>51</sup> A significant part of the charters written by him only survived in Italian translations,<sup>52</sup> and the unknown translator used in cases of both the Byzantine governor and Kalán the term *duca(s)* to depict their official titles. Most probably this may refer to the fact that either the translator used an Italian term familiar for him in a later century, or Sabatius himself used the term *duca(s)* to describe Kalán's title, in which case it was he who blurred the differences between the two – Byzantine and Hungarian, respectively – structures covered by the same term. On the other hand, though the assumption that the translation distorted the scene may be really plausible, the term *duca(s)* can be explained in the context of the contemporary Spalatian charters' practice as well. In 1180 magister Gualterius, another known *scriptor* of several charters at that time,<sup>53</sup> though he wrote in latin, used consequently the Greek term *ducas* to depict the official title of Rogerius.<sup>54</sup> By all means, it can be asserted that the content of title *duca* of the Spalatian charters whether referring to the bishop-governor Kalán or to a Byzantine governor cannot be identified by the

<sup>51</sup> CD II. No. 153: “[...] *Et io Sabatio clerico ho scritto.*” CD II. No. 248: “[...] *Et io Sabatio subdiacono nodaro giurato del commune fui presente alla predetta vendita et pregato dalle parti ho scritto.*”

<sup>52</sup> Charters written by Sabatius can be traced between 1178 and 1223. Third of them reserved in Italian translations: CD II. *Na. 151, Na. 153*, No. 168, No. 191, No. 204, *Na. 205*, No. 208, No. 216, *Na. 232*, No. 236, No. 241, *Na. 248, Na. 249*, No. 258, *Na. 263*, No. 267, *Na. 276, Na. 288*, CD III. No. 6, No. 9, No. 10, No. 30, No. 48, No. 60, No. 70, No. 78, No. 90, No. 108, No. 111, *Na. 164*, No. 184, No. 200. (Numbers of Italian texts are in italics.)

<sup>53</sup> CD II. No. 139, No. 141, No. 165, No. 187. etc.

<sup>54</sup> CD II. No. 165: “[...] *in ducatus Dalmatie et Croatiae existente domino Sclauone duca.*” Ibid.: “*Dominus Rogerius Sclauone ducas de mandato domini nostri sanctissimi imperatoris Manuel dedit [...]*”. Ibid.: “*Et ego Gualterius communis notarius, qui hanc chartulam scripsi, testor. Ego Rogerius Sclauone dei et imperiali gracia Dalmatie et Croatiae ducas manu mea subscripsi.*”

content of the latin term *dux* used in Hungarian sense, for example, by Kalán's or the Hungarian kings' chanceries; its 'Hungarian' equivalent was, definitely, the term *gubernator*.<sup>55</sup> On the other hand, a short allusion of the anonym Hungarian chronicler to term *duca* may suggest that it might be derived, though through the mediation of medieval Greek, from *slavonic*. Anonymus unfolded a story about the conquering Hungarians who encamped near the castle of Ung, but „the *comes* of the castle, Laborc, who was called *duca* in their [scilicet, of the occupants of Ung – G. Sz.] language (*qui in lingua eorum duca vocabatur*) preferred getting away, and hurried to the castle of Zemplén”.<sup>56</sup> It can be asserted by the context of that passage that Anonymus talked about slavs and their language here, albeit they lived on the northeastern parts of Hungary, not in Dalmatia. Nonetheless, most probably he recorded a somehow living phrase in the Hungarian Kingdom (and especially, in the royal chancery) at the turn of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

Analogously we can even take the risk of supposing that the part of Kalán's title referring to the territorial „totality” of his power over „*the whole of Dalmatia and Croatia*” might come from the traditions of phrasing used in Spalatian charters at that time. At least, the attribute *tota* was used inconsequently in Spalatian charters of the 1170s in cases of all Byzantine *duces*, which can indicate that it was not a basic part of their official titles.<sup>57</sup> Moreover, it was not used by Sabatius in his charters relating with Kalán in 1193, as well as it did not appear in the intitulations of the Hungarian *gubernator's* own charters.<sup>58</sup> On the grounds of this inconsistency of terminological practice we can conclude that behind using the attribute *tota* in the Hungarian Kalán's case probably lied a very similar ambition (expressing the claim to the supremacy) as it could be seen in the cases of both Venetian and Byzantine administrations in 'Dalmatia' during the twelfth century. Moreover, we may presume that it had expressed an even less structural meaning than it surely did in the thirteenth century, when the term *tota Sclavonia*

---

<sup>55</sup> Even so, I can support the idea that the jurisdiction exercised by the bishop-governor, as far as it can be found out from his arrangements made in Zagreb in 1193 (See: SZEBERÉNYI 2001. 234-237.), was in excess of *bans*, and it was *similar* somehow to ducal power; this may even explain why was the almost unprecedented term *gubernator* used by Hungarian charters referring to Kalán.

<sup>56</sup> E. SZENTPÉTERY (ed.): *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum*, Vols. I-II. Budapestini, 1937-1938., I. 51-52.

<sup>57</sup> CD II. No. 125, No. 126, No. 135, No. 153, No. 163, No. 165.

<sup>58</sup> CD II. No. 244, No. 248, No. 249, No. 250. It should be noted, however, that the royal chancellor, Katapán, followed a similarly incoherent terminological practice in depicting Kalán's official title when used the attribute *tota* in one case, and not in another. CD II. No. 247; MES I. No. 127.

appeared in Hungarian official writings, used undoubtedly in an extended sense at the end of the 1220s.<sup>59</sup>

To sum up, we can assert that the possibility of exact reconstructions of governmental structures on the Adriatic coast during the twelfth century is very limited if we can only build upon official terms and titles, so *local* practices of terminology definitely should be taken into consideration for interpreting them properly.



---

<sup>59</sup> KRISTO 1979. 92-93.