

Tibor ŽIVKOVIĆ  
Dragana KUNČER  
Institute of History  
Belgrade

### ROGER — THE FORGOTTEN ARCHBISHOP OF BAR

**Abstract:** According to a tombstone inscription in the Cistercian monastery of Zwettl, Lower Austria, and few other charters from the year 1305, a Cistercian monk Roger appeared in Austria in 1305 and acted as a Bosnian bishop, claiming that he had been previously banished from his archbishopric seat of Bar. The documents that testify his existence, the context and the chronology of the political events which led to such a development are the subject of this paper.

**Key words:** Archbishop Roger of Bar, King Milutin, King Charles II of Naples, Queen Helen, Paul Šubić, Dioclea.

Today, a short non-existent tombstone inscription in the Cistercian monastery of Zwettl, Lower Austria, seems to hide unusually important information for the history of Dioclea, and Serbia, at the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>1</sup> It was engraved in 1305, but a record of it was published, for the first time, in the *Zwettl chronicle* of abbot Link in 1723.<sup>2</sup> The text was inscribed on a slab of red marble placed in front of the altar of St. Bernard and Egidius, which was written in Latin verse. The inscription was dedicated to a certain bishop and monk named Roger, who died in 1305, as a refugee in the Zwettl monastery. Recently, Austrian historian Dr. Herwig Weigl published an extensive article

---

<sup>1</sup> Zwettl (lat. *Claravallis*) monastery was founded in 1137 and it is one of the oldest Cistercian monasteries. It was established as the *daughter-monastery* of Heiligenkreuz (lat. *Sancta Crux*), which was founded in 1133 in Lower Austria.

<sup>2</sup> *Annales Austrio-Clara-Vallenses I*, ed. B. Linck, Wien 1723, 572.

concerning Bishop Roger and this inscription.<sup>3</sup> This inscription is the one which informs us that Roger was the Archbishop of Bar (Antivari), Dioclea. Its first critical edition was published in 1851 in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* series,<sup>4</sup> and it reads:

Item ante altare sancti Bernhardi et Egidi scribantur isti versus:

Cysterciensis

Rudgerus presul hic et monachus iacet exul.  
In celis Christe cum sanctis hunc tibi siste,  
Quem que concepit matrem tibi luxque recepit,  
Annos dum quinos es natus mille trecentos.  
Hunc propulsavit a sede fidemque negavit  
Pezzen plebs prava trans Ungariam quasi Sclava,  
Cui Diocleensis<sup>5</sup> qui preses et Antibarensis  
Archipatris more digno presedit honore,  
Dum tibi connupta fidei bene iura teneret.  
Que nunc corrupta sathane complexibus heret.<sup>6</sup>

The aim of this research is to attempt to answer the following questions: Firstly, was Roger really the Archbishop of Bar, and if he was, in what year? Secondly, when and how did he migrate to Lower Austria?

---

<sup>3</sup> H. Weigl, *Ein bosnischer Bischof auf Arbeitssuche, Frater Ruger, sein Wirken als Passauer Weihbischof und sein Grab in Zwettl (1305)*, *Unsere Heimat* 73/3 (2002) 168 – 195 (= Weigl, *Bischof*).

<sup>4</sup> *Kalendarium Zwettlense a. 1243 – 1458*, MGH SS IX, ed. G.H. Pertz, Hannoverae 1851, 690.4-15

<sup>5</sup> In the critical apparatus stands *Diodecensis*, which the publisher, with good reason, corrected into *Diocleensis*.

<sup>6</sup> *Here lies Roger, a bishop, a monk, and a refugee.  
Christ, amongst other saints in heaven place him,  
From the day you were born and saw the light of day,  
One thousand three hundred years and five.  
Banished from his church see by those who had not recognized true faith  
Bosnians, wretched people, who are behind Hungary and likely Slavic,  
He governed Dioclea and Antivari  
Honourably as each archbishop does,  
As long as his see was married to You and obeyed the laws of faith  
Which now, fallen, embraces the Satan.*

According to the inscription, it is clear that before year 1305, the Cistercian monk Roger was once the Archbishop of Bar, Dioclea (*Cui Diocleensis qui preses et Antibarensis/ Archipatris more digno presedit honore*).<sup>7</sup> However, he was banished from this position by the Bosnian people (*Pezzen plebs*), who were probably of Slavic origin (*quasi Sclava*), and who (Bosnians) had rejected [true] faith (*fidemque negavit*), and who (Bosnians) lived beyond Hungary (*trans Ungariam*), south of the Sava River. It also says that he died in 1305<sup>8</sup> when he was Bishop (*presul*).<sup>9</sup>

Apart from this inscription, Roger's name can also be found in four other documents which were personally issued by him, and three records from the monastery chronicles. All seven documents originate from the year 1305, and all of them mentioned him with the title of the *Bosnian bishop*. They were mostly similar in contents and represented confirmations of his pastoral activities such as the consecration of altars or churches and the absolution of sins. The earliest document was dated from March 1305, in which Roger, as *Brother Roger, by the grace of*

---

<sup>7</sup> The expressions *archipater* can be encountered in medieval Latin literature mostly as a poetical term for archbishop: The poet Balderic (11<sup>th</sup> century) used it for archbishop Bruno, brother of the Emperor Otto I; cf. Balderic, *Chronique d'Arras et de Cambrai*, Paris 1834, 130; the poet Guillaume le Breton (1165 – 1226) used it in the poem *Philippides* for Guillaume, archbishop of Rheims; cf. *Histoire littéraire de la France t. XVIII*, Paris 1835, 273; it was also used by the poet John of Garlande in his work created in 1245; cf. *Iohannes de Garlandia, Carmen de misteriis ecclesiae*, ed. E. Könsgen, Brill 2004, 42; also by the Dominican poet Stefanardo da Vimercate († 1297) in his work *De gestis in civitate Mediolani* for the archbishop of Milan Otto Visconti; cf. *Geschichte der europäischen Staaten, Geschichte der Italien III*, Hamburg 1829, 221.

<sup>8</sup> The exact date of Roger's death (8<sup>th</sup> December 1305) is preserved in a short record in the necrology of the Cistercian monastery of Lilienfeld (lat. *Campus Liliorum*) in Lower Austria, where he is mentioned as *D. Rugerus eps. Bornensis, m. Cisterciensis ordinis in Zweltla*; cf. *Monumenta necrologica monasterii Campi Liliorum*, MGH Necrologia Germaniae V, ed. A. F. Fuchs, Berolini 1913, 423.

<sup>9</sup> Maigne d'Arnis, *Lexicon manuale ad scriptores Medie et Infime Latinitatis*, ed. J-P. Migne, Paris 1858, s. v. *praesul*.

*God bishop of Bosnia (Frater Rugerus dei gratia Episcopus Boznensis)* informed that he consecrated the church and altar in Steyr on the demand of the illustrious queen of the Holy Roman Empire<sup>10</sup> (*ad mandatum Serenissime domine regine Romanorum*).<sup>11</sup> In the document dated on the 8<sup>th</sup> May 1305, he informed that he blessed an altar in the *capitulum* of the Zwettl monastery, and he granted an indulgence for the absolution of sins to all those who listened to mass and the sermons preached from that altar, calling himself *the Bosnian bishop and Cistercian monk (frater Rudgerus dei gracia ecclesie Boznensis episcopus ordinis Cystericiensis)*.<sup>12</sup> He used the same title when he presented himself in the next document dated 4<sup>th</sup> July 1305, while he resided in the Baumgartenberg monastery,<sup>13</sup> when he granted an indulgence for the absolution of sins to all who had listened to the sermons and masses of Cistercian monks. In this document he added that he acted with the permission of Bernard, father in Christ, and the bishop of Passau,<sup>14</sup> whose diocese included Baumgartenberg monastery, and whom he, with his permission, substituted in episcopal duty (*auctoritate venerabilis in Christo patris et domini Wernhardi Pataviensis ecclesie pontificis, prescripti monasterii dyocesani, cuius vices in pontificali officio exercendo tunc tempore gessimus*).<sup>15</sup>

The same title is also mentioned in the last preserved document, issued on the 13<sup>th</sup> June 1305, in the monastery of Vyšší Brod,<sup>16</sup> in which he granted an indulgence for the absolution of sins to all those who said

---

<sup>10</sup> Elisabeth (1262 – 1313), was the wife of Austrian Herzog Albrecht (duke, 1282 – 1298), king of the Holy Roman Empire (1298 – 1308).

<sup>11</sup> *Urkundenbuch des Landes ob der Enns IV*, Wien 1867, N<sup>o</sup> 515, 479. A yellow wax seal with the inscription *BOSNENSIS* was also preserved together with the original parchment.

<sup>12</sup> A. Plessner, *Zur Kirchengeschichte des Waldviertels vor 1627 (3)*, Geschichtliche Beilagen zum St. Pöltner Diözesan-Blatt 14, St. Pölten 1954, 187.

<sup>13</sup> A Cistercian monastery in Upper Austria, founded in 1142.

<sup>14</sup> Wernhard von Prambach, bishop of Passau († 1313), founded in 1293 a Cistercian monastery *Cella Angelorum*, today Engelszell, in Upper Austria; cf. *MGH Necrologia Germaniae IV*, Berolini 1920, 459.

<sup>15</sup> See note 12.

<sup>16</sup> A Cistercian Monastery in the south of the Czech Republic, founded in 1259 (ger. *Hohenfurt*, lat. *Altum Vadum*).

their prayers in that monastery during major holidays.<sup>17</sup> This document was sealed with a white wax seal carrying the inscription *S. RUGERUS DEI GRACIA EPS. Boznensis*.

Other documents which mention Roger's name can be found in: the necrology of the Lilienfeld monastery,<sup>18</sup> the Chronicle of Bernardus Noricus,<sup>19</sup> and in a judicial commission.<sup>20</sup> In the Necrology and in Chronicle he was mentioned as *Roger, the Bosnian bishop*. The latter document recorded only the name of a certain bishop Roger who participated in a judicial commission, in December 1305. This was summoned by Herzog Albrecht regarding the investigation of a mysterious case of the appearance of a bloody host in the hands of some Jews. It was considered that this could be no one else but Roger, the Bosnian bishop and Zwettlan monk, known to us from previous sources.<sup>21</sup>

However, the question whether Roger could have really been the archbishop of Bar some time before 1305, can only be answered by reflecting on the history of the Archbishopric of Bar in the second half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, and by analysing the possible meaning of *Bosnian bishop* in Roger's title.

Since, the identities of the Archbishops of Bar, in the second half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century were known<sup>22</sup> — its leaders were Lovro (1255 –

<sup>17</sup> *Urkundenbuch des Cistercienserstiftes B. Mariae V. zu Hohenfurt in Böhmen*, ed. Mathias Pangerl, *Fontes Rerum Austriacarum* II/23, Wien 1865, N° 58; cf. Weigl, *Bischof*, 170 – 171.

<sup>18</sup> See note 8.

<sup>19</sup> *Die mittelalterlichen Stiftsurbare des Erzherzogtums Österreich ob der Enns* 2, ed. Konrad Schiffmann (*Österreichische Urbare* III/2/2, Wien/Leipzig 1913, 221. The chronicler of the monastery Kremsmünster accused Roger for wrongly consecrating the church to St. Nicholas (*nunc vero est dedicata erronea ignorancia et culpabili devocione in honore s. Nycolai ab episcopo Bosniensi Rugero*).

<sup>20</sup> W. Stelzer, *Am Beispiel Korneuburg: Der angebliche Hostienfrevler österreichischer Juden von 1305 und seine Quellen*. In: *Österreich im Mittelalter, Bausteine zu einer revidierten Gesamtdarstellung*, ed. W. Rosner, St. Pölten 1999, 309 – 347.

<sup>21</sup> cf. Weigl, *Bischof*, 172.

<sup>22</sup> I. Marković attempted to establish the chronological order of the archbishops

1270), Gaspar Adam (1270 – 1280), Michael (1282 – after 1293), and Marin Petrov Žaretić (1301 – 1306/1307) – the only possible time that Roger could have been the head of the Archbishopric of Bar was the period for which we lack information, i.e. the period between Michael and Marin's terms at the office (from late 1293 or 1298 until early 1301).<sup>23</sup>

Michael and Marin were confirmed by the Pope, who sent them their episcopal stoles and maintained an active correspondence with both of them. We know that Michael received his archbishop's insignia on the 22<sup>nd</sup> November 1282, from Pope Martin IV (1281 – 1285), who, on that occasion, recommended him to the King of Serbia.<sup>24</sup> We also know that he was present in Rome on the 25<sup>th</sup> October 1287,<sup>25</sup> and that Pope, Nicholas IV (1288 – 1292), in his epistles to Michael from the 1<sup>st</sup> March and 27<sup>th</sup> June 1291, recommended that Michael choose and invest the bishop of Sarda.<sup>26</sup> It is also considered that Michael was mentioned in letters by the King of Naples, Charles II, from May and June 1293, addressed to the customs officers of Brindisi and Apulia (*Archiepiscopum Antibarensem; venerabili P. M[ichaeli] Archiepiscopo Antibarensi*).<sup>27</sup>

The next known archbishop of Bar, Marin, before ascending to this position in 1301, was for a long time (definitely from 1291) the archdeacon of the Bar archbishopric, because he was mentioned with this title in a letter by Pope Nicholas IV addressed to Queen Helen in March

---

of Bar; I. Marković, *Dukljansko-barska mitropolija*, Zagreb 1902, 190 – 193.

<sup>23</sup> The Pope Bonifacius VIII directed letters to the archbishops of Dyrrachium, Antivari, Ragusa, Spalato and Iadera on 29<sup>th</sup> April 1298. That could mean, *ex silentio*, that Michael was still archbishop of Bar at that time; cf. *Acta et diplomata res Albaniae mediae aetatis illustrantia I*, ed. L. Thallóczy – C. Jireček – E. Sufflay, Vindobonae 1913, N<sup>o</sup> 530 (= *Acta Albaniae*). And, of course, a papal letter addressed to an unnamed office-holder still leaves the possibility that the office was vacant.

<sup>24</sup> *Acta Albaniae I*, N<sup>o</sup> 467.

<sup>25</sup> *Acta Albaniae I*, N<sup>o</sup> 506.

<sup>26</sup> *Acta Albaniae I*, N<sup>o</sup> 513; N<sup>o</sup> 516.

<sup>27</sup> F. Rački, *Izvadci iz kralj. Osrednjega arkiva u Napulju za jugoslovensku poviest*, Arkiv za povjestnicu jugoslavensku 7 (1863) 22.

1291.<sup>28</sup> He became archbishop on the 21<sup>st</sup> June 1301, when Pope Boniface VIII (1294 – 1303) handed him letters for his suffragans and Queen Helen.<sup>29</sup> It is even possible that he was elected earlier (April/May 1301) and got the papal confirmation not much before the expiration of the three months term, which was canonically permitted span of time between election and confirmation.<sup>30</sup> Marin also received letters from the next Pope, Benedict XI (1303 – 1304), who, on the 18<sup>th</sup> November 1303, in the name of the Holy See, allowed him to settle issues which were under his influence (*fraternitati tue presentium auctoritate committimus, ut hac vice corrigas, emendes et reformes hec omnia in Regno et locis predictis*).<sup>31</sup> The Pope emphasised the necessity of the implementation of order in Albania, Pilot, Chunovia, Dyrrachium, Kotor, Ulcinj, Svač, Skadar, Drivast, Bar and other places of Andronicus' (Byzantine Emperor Andronicus II, 1282 – 1328) empire, and in the state of Uroš (Milutin, King of Serbia, 1282 – 1321), his brother Stephen (Dragutin) and their mother Helen, realising that the reputation of the Roman Catholic Church was being destroyed, as he was informed, due to the unruly behaviour of priests and monks, and even because of looting of churches and other church properties.<sup>32</sup> In his other letter from the same

<sup>28</sup> cf. *Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia*, ed. A. Theiner, *Monumenta Historica Hungariae*, Osnabrück 1968, N<sup>o</sup> 607 (= Theiner, *Monumenta I*). It is interesting to note that in the other letter addressed to Dragutin, from the same date as the previous, the same Marin is referred to, not as the archdeacon of Bar, but as the archbishop of Bar (*per dilectum filium Marinum Archiepiscopum Antibarensem, tue Celsitudinis nuntium*); cf. Theiner, *Monumenta I*, N<sup>o</sup> 610. However, this may only be a mistake of the publisher.

<sup>29</sup> *Acta Albaniae I*, N<sup>o</sup> 531.

<sup>30</sup> *Decretum magistri Gratiani*, *Corpus iuris canonici v. I*, ed. Ae. Friedberg, Graz 1959, 352.

<sup>31</sup> Theiner, *Monumenta I*, N<sup>o</sup> 650.

<sup>32</sup> Theiner, *Monumenta I*, N<sup>o</sup> 650. The differences in the Pope's relations with other Serbian rulers can be seen from the salutation formulas in which the Pope addresses Helen and Dragutin as *Carissime in Christo filie/Carissimo in Christo filio*, and Milutin only as *viro magnifico*; cf. Theiner, *Monumenta I*, N<sup>o</sup> 581; N<sup>o</sup> 605; N<sup>o</sup> 610; N<sup>o</sup> 611;.

year, which he wrote as an answer to Marin's pledge for the establishment of other parochial churches in the catholic districts in Serbia (Brskovo, Rudnik, Rogozna, Trepča and Gračanica), the Pope empowered Marin to install or depose priests in whichever dioceses because the bishops, as he had heard, did not respect the Roman Catholic faith and rites (*...fraternitati tue... instituendi et destituendi Rectores in eisdem ecclesiis, in quibuscumque dioecesibus fuerint, prefatis Episcopis a fide et ritibus antedictis taliter deviantibus, plenam et liberam tibi concedimus auctoritate presentium facultatem*).<sup>33</sup>

Apart from the close ties with the Pope, Marin also had close relations with King Milutin. The King confirmed his possessions (August 1306), which were previously held by his father and uncle during the reign of Milutin's mother, Queen Helen (архиепископъ Маринъ... королевство ми потвърди...що нмъ штъць држалъ и стриць нмъ Маринъ ѿ матере королевства ми).<sup>34</sup> Marin is also mentioned as present in Milutin's donation charter to St. Mary monastery on Ratac, on the 15<sup>th</sup> March 1305 (архиепискоупъ барскъ Маринъ).<sup>35</sup> We learn of Marin's death from the letter of Pope Clement V (1305 – 1314), dated 25<sup>th</sup> February 1307, in which he said that due to Marin's death (*per obitum bonae memoriae Marini Antibarensis episcopi*), the duty of the archbishop of Bar will be temporarily performed by Gregory, the bishop of Svač.<sup>36</sup>

Therefore, from the preserved papal letters which mention the archbishops of Bar until 1305, we can conclude that the period from the 15<sup>th</sup> June 1293, when the last letter was sent to Michael (or from the year 1298 when he is mentioned for the last time)<sup>37</sup> to the 21<sup>st</sup> June 1301, when Marin was nominated as archbishop (or to April/May 1301 when he could have been consecrated),<sup>38</sup> represents a gap which leaves us with enough space to claim that the archbishop of Bar during this period was

---

<sup>33</sup>Theiner, *Monumenta I*, N° 649.

<sup>34</sup>*Acta Albaniae I*, N° 581.

<sup>35</sup>*Monumenta Serbica spectantia historiam Serbiae, Bosnae, Ragusii*, ed. F. Miklosich, Viennae 1858, N° 65 (= Miklosich, *Monumenta*).

<sup>36</sup>*Acta Albaniae I*, N° 582.

<sup>37</sup>See note 22.

<sup>38</sup>See note 30.

unknown. However, in the papal letter which mentioned Marin we cannot notice the assumed discontinuity, because Michael was mentioned (1301) as Marin's immediate predecessor (*dudum siquidem Antibarensi ecclesia post obitum bone memorie Michaelis archiepiscopi Antibarensis pastoris solatio destituta*).<sup>39</sup> Even though, since news travelled slowly in the times of war and other unstable circumstances, it was possible that the information about the new archbishop did not reach the Pope and that he did not know that there was a new archbishop. It was also possible, that the Pope was informed of the new archbishop but was not able to send him confirmation, and thus chose to omit him completely from his letters.<sup>40</sup> If we allow the possibility that Marin did not succeed Michael directly, then Roger, the exiled bishop of Bar, as the aforementioned inscription informs us, could have performed this duty, during the constricted time between 1298 to 1301.<sup>41</sup>

Apart from the title of archbishop of Bar, which was recorded in Roger's tombstone inscription, Roger carried in Austria the title of Bosnian bishop.<sup>42</sup> The Bosnian bishops during that period were not

---

<sup>39</sup> *Acta Albaniae I*, N° 531.

<sup>40</sup> Roger could have been elected archbishop through seniority, as the oldest bishop.

<sup>41</sup> See note 23. It is less possible that Roger was archbishop in 1293. We have to expect that he would have been mentioned in some document (not only the papal) during this span of time (1293 – 1301).

<sup>42</sup> According to the charter of Hungarian King Bela IV from 1244, the borders of the Bosnian bishopric extended from the Drina river on the east, from the central flow of the Neretva river to the south, from the Sava river on the north all the way from the estuary of Ukrina to the estuary of Drina, and the region around Đakovo and Blizna in Slavonia. The borders on the west are not quite precise – the Bosnian bishop had control over the *župa* Uskoplje on the upper flow of the Vrbas river and the *župas* of Luka and Pliva. Cf. *Acta Bosnae potissimum ecclesiastica cum insertis editorum documentorum regestis ab anno 925 usque ad annum 1752*, ed. P. E. Fermendžin, Zagrabiae 1892, No 69 (= *Acta Bosnae*); *Poviest hrvatskih zemalja Bosne i Hercegovine*, Sarajevo 1942, 744 – 751. At the beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> century the Bosnian bishopric was under the Ragusan archbishopric under which authority it was exempted and placed under the archbishopric of Kalocsa in 1247. The Holy See saw this

active on the Bosnian territory, since their centre was moved to Djakovo in Slavonia. However, in a few sources at the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century we have information of two Bosnian bishops — Nicholas and Gregory. The name of Bishop Nicholas can be encountered in 1303 in a signature under an announcement by the Bosnian church, and the papal letter concerning the succession of the Hungarian throne.<sup>43</sup> The last mention of his name was in an agreement by Hungarian prelates with the Austrian Duke Rudolf on the 24<sup>th</sup> August 1304, in Poszony.<sup>44</sup> After that, on the 31<sup>st</sup> July 1307, we encounter an unnamed bishop of Bosnia whom Pope Clement V instructed to give the *pallium* to the bishop of Kalocsa.<sup>45</sup> However, from a letter of the Episcopal synod to the Pope, written on the 24<sup>th</sup> June 1308 in Budva (Butua), we know that the name of the Bosnian bishop was Gregory.<sup>46</sup> The lack of sources for 1305 permits the assumption that the Bosnian bishopric was vacant at that time, and since Roger said that he performed his duties by permission of the bishop of Passau, we can conclude that he was a so-called *auxiliary bishop*,<sup>47</sup> a function which began to appear at the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, especially in German parts (in the bishopric of Passau from 1282 or 1285).<sup>48</sup> These were prelates who helped the bishop in whose diocese they resided carrying the title of the dioceses which were not active, or were vacant

---

region as heretic in the 13<sup>th</sup> century and tried to reform it and bring it under its control through a number of crusades and reliable bishops (from the Dominican order). It did not succeed in its task so the seat had to be moved outside of the Bosnian territory to Slavonia (1252), where it remained for centuries; cf. С.Тирковић, *Историја средњовековне босанске државе*, Београд 1964, 50 – 69.

<sup>43</sup> *Acta Bosnae*, N° 103.

<sup>44</sup> *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae. VIII*, ed. T. Smičiklas, Zagreb, 1910, N° 83 (= CD).

<sup>45</sup> *Acta Bosnae*, No 106.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.* N° 107.

<sup>47</sup> cf. Weigl, *Bischof*, 175.

<sup>48</sup> cf. Weigl, *Bischof*, 172; H. W. Wurster, *Das Bistum Passau unter Bischof Albert Herzog von Sachsen-Wittenberg 1320–1342*, Aus Bayerns Geschichte. Forschungen als Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag von Andreas Kraus, ed. E. J. Greipl – A. Schmid – W. Ziegler, St. Ottilien 1992, 192.

for a longer period of time. Most of the time these vacant dioceses were the regions conquered by infidels, into which the Roman Catholic Church had no access.<sup>49</sup>

At the time when Roger performed his Episcopal duty, we know of the examples of auxiliary bishops: *Antonius Geneccensis episcopus ordinis Cisterciensis* (1304),<sup>50</sup> *Hermann, episcopus Pristinensis* or *Prisirinensis* (1310 – 1322, Passau),<sup>51</sup> *Gratiadei(?)*, *episcopus Salviensis* (1285 – 1309, Konstanz),<sup>52</sup> *Iohannes, archiepiscopus Capodocie maioris Armenie* (1284),<sup>53</sup> *Ulrich, episcopus Salviensis* (1305 – 1312, Freising),<sup>54</sup> *Konrad, episcopus Aniensis* (1311),<sup>55</sup> *Nikolaus, episcopus Tribuniensis* (1317 – 1336, Freising),<sup>56</sup> *Bonifacius*, titular bishop *Bosoniensis prov. Schlavoniae* (1289 – 1294, Konstanz),<sup>57</sup> *Bonifatius*, titular bishop *Bosoniensis* (1293, Basel),<sup>58</sup> *Thomas, episcopus Salvinensis* (1302).<sup>59</sup>

<sup>49</sup> cf. J. Bögl, *Die Weihbischöfe des Bistums Freising*, Frigisinga 5 (1928) 439 (= Bögl, *Die Weihbischöfe*).

<sup>50</sup> O. Grillnberger, *Regesten und Urkunden des Stiftes Engelszell von 1293 bis 1500*, Archiv für die Geschichte der Diözese Linz 3 (1906) N° 70.

<sup>51</sup> A. A. Strnad, *Das Bistum Passau in der Kirchenpolitik König Friedrichs des Schönen (1313 – 1320)*, Beiträge zur Rechts-, Landes- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte. Festgabe für Alfred Hoffmann zum 60. Geburtstag, Mitteilungen des Oberösterreichischen Landesarchivs 8, 1964, 213, n. 107; *Die Bischöfe des Heiligen Römischen Reiches 1198 – 1448. Ein biographisches Lexikon*, ed. E. Gatz – C. Brodkorb, Berlin 2001, 549 (= *Die Bischöfe*).

<sup>52</sup> cf. *Die Bischöfe*, 549.

<sup>53</sup> R. Deutinger, *Unbekannte Weiheinschriften des 12. bis 14. Jahrhunderts aus Burghausen*, Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte 64 (2001) 95, n. 46.

<sup>54</sup> cf. Bögl, *Die Weihbischöfe*, 440.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.* 440.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.* 440.

<sup>57</sup> *Die Bischöfe*, 287; *Regesta episcoporum Constantiensium. Regesten zur Geschichte der Bischöfe von Constanz von Bubulcus bis Thomas Berlower 517–1496*, vol. 1: 517–1293, ed. P. Ladewig – Th. Müller, Innsbruck 1895, vol. 2, ed. A. Cartellieri – K. Rieder, Innsbruck 1905, I, 310, 320 (= *Regesta episcoporum*).

<sup>58</sup> *Die Bischöfe*, 58; *Regesta episcoporum I*, 308, 324, 326.

<sup>59</sup> Les registres de Boniface VIII, vol. III, ed. G. Digard – R. Fawtier, Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome II/4/III, Paris 1907, 414 (= *Boniface*).

That Roger was not the only auxiliary bishop of Bosnia, we can see from the example of Boniface, Bosnian bishop, who worked in Basel in 1293 and in Konstanz in 1289 – 1294.

The period for which we assume that Roger was the archbishop of Bar, seen from a wider perspective from 1293 to 1301, needs to be examined in the context of political relations between King Milutin, his mother Helen and other important political factors. These factors could have contributed to the disorder that could have led to the deposition and banishment of the archbishop of Bar. This period was not hard to identify, since Marin became the archbishop on the 21<sup>st</sup> June 1301, and Roger, if he really was Marin's predecessor, had to be deposed somewhat earlier in April or May 1301. This was the time when Helen, Queen of Serbia, the protector of Roman Catholics, was still ruling Dioclea.<sup>60</sup>

Three letters from Pope Nicholas IV and one letter from Pope Benedict XI, addressed to Queen Helen, testified of her attempts to secure a better position for the Roman Catholic Church in Serbia and Bulgaria.<sup>61</sup> Helen was especially sympathetic to the Franciscans. She even asked the Pope for permission to take Franciscan Nicholas of Vosika as her personal confessor.<sup>62</sup> Unlike her, we should not forget that at the beginning of Dragutin's and Milutin's conflict in 1299, Milutin had the backing from the Serbian church.<sup>63</sup> Already in 1298, Pope Boniface

---

<sup>60</sup> Helen ruled Dioclea until the end of 1304, or the beginning of 1305. In the already mentioned charter of King Milutin to St. Mary on Ratac, the Serbian ruler confirmed those possessions which the monastery acquired through the charter issued by his mother Helen. This undoubtedly meant that Helen, on the 15<sup>th</sup> March 1305, was not in charge of Dioclea. Furthermore, in the charter from 1306, by which he confirmed the possessions of Marin, the archbishop of Dioclea, Milutin also referred to the donations made by his mother, which could not be done if she was still in reign. The last document in which Helen was mentioned as the ruling queen in Dioclea, was in her letter from the 18<sup>th</sup> May 1304, to the Rector of Dubrovnik Marin Badoar; cf. Miklosich, *Monumenta*, N<sup>o</sup> 64: **ЮЛѢНА** крали(ц)а. It seems that she ruled Dioclea until the end of that year – *Sotiannus nuncius domine regine...*; cf. *Acta Albaniae I*, N<sup>o</sup> 577 (9<sup>th</sup> December).

<sup>61</sup> Theiner, *Monumenta I*, N<sup>o</sup> 607.

<sup>62</sup> Theiner, *Monumenta I*, N<sup>o</sup> 606.

<sup>63</sup> М. Динић, *Однос између краља Милутина и Драгутина*, ЗРВИ 3 (1955) 58.

VIII wrote to the head of the Franciscans *in administratione provincie Sclavonie*, instructing him to take care of the heretical plague *in partibus Servie, Rasie, Dalmatie, Crovatie, Bosne atque Istrie provincie Sclavonie*, in the archbishoprics of Dyrrachium, Bar, Ragusa, Split and Zadar.<sup>64</sup> During an open and very long conflict between the brothers, from 1301 until 1312, the support Milutin received from the Serbian church was undoubtedly crucial, so that the Queen Mother's work on strengthening the position of Catholicism in Serbia would have not been tolerated on Milutin's part. The Anonymous writer, who wrote about the state of affairs in Serbia in 1308, said that Milutin persecuted Catholics.<sup>65</sup> According to this writer, Catholics lived in Dioclea, i.e. Latins, but apart from them, there were also *perfidious schismatics who persecuted the mentioned Catholics greatly and destroyed the Latin churches, attacking and imprisoning the priests*. Since that this description referred to the time of the conflict between Dragutin and Milutin, we should not discard it as an exaggeration. It is obvious that Milutin took great care to keep the Catholic element under control in his state. However, Milutin had written in 1304 and 1305, to Popes Benedict XI and Clement V, asking them to accept him and his Kingdom into the protection of the Holy See. The papal legates were sent to Serbia in 1308, to realize the union of Milutin's state with the Catholic Church.<sup>66</sup> But we should point out that this action was actually a political question, not a religious one. It is unequivocal that the periods when Milutin was leaning towards Catholicism, attempting to use it as a diplomatic tool for foreign policy reasons, existed during his reign, alike those periods when, for the support of the Orthodox Church, he remained very intolerant towards the Catholics. These periods of change in Milutin's policy depended on the present balance of power, between Dragutin, Helen and himself.

The key moment when Milutin changed his foreign policy happened in 1298, when the weak Byzantine's military offensive failed in Macedonia. Furthermore, it was concluded that Serbia and the

<sup>64</sup> Theiner, *Monumenta*. I, N° 614.

<sup>65</sup> *Anonymi Descriptio Europae orientalis*, ed. O. Górká, Cracoviae 1916, 30.11 – 31.4.

<sup>66</sup> *Istorija srpskog naroda I*, (С. Ђирковић) Београд 1994, 456 – 457 (= *ISN I*); cf. М. Пурковић, *Авињонске папе и српске земље*, Пожаревац 1934, 14 – 16.

Byzantine Empire could move closer to each other, through the marriage between Milutin and Eudochia, sister of Emperor Andronicus II. However, the marriage negotiations were terminated because Eudochia refused to get married to the Serbian ruler who had already been previously married three times, and who was still lawfully bound to his third wife, Anne Terter, the Bulgarian princess. Milutin used military pressure and threats to continue the negotiations, and Andronicus was forced to find him a new bride, his 5-year old daughter Simonida.<sup>67</sup>

The negotiations between Milutin and Theodore Metochite, the Emperor's emissary, lasted from 1298 until the winter 1299, when an agreement was finally reached. Theodore travelled to Serbia on five occasions during that period. He described his last trip, when the marriage agreement was concluded, in his letter which held information about the interesting relations between Milutin and his mother. The Byzantines namely, held out for three demands: 1. The Serbs were to hand Anne Terter over to them; 2. The Serbs were to surrender the hostages, including Kotanić, a Byzantine who battled on the Serbian-Byzantine border; 3. Queen Mother Helen was to swear an oath during the signing of the agreement. Theodore described in detail how this agreement was reached during his last stay in Serbia. Everything had been agreed in a few days, but not without intensive negotiations. Milutin received him on the first day and he was allowed to present the Byzantine demands. Theodore was unexpectedly dismissed before he received an answer. Three days later, George, a man of Milutin's great confidence, approached him in a church, and they tried to come up with a solution. A few days after that, Theodore at last agreed with the Serbian ruler. The Byzantines relinquished their demand that Helen be present during the ceremonial oath swearing and signing off the agreement, while they resolved the other two demands in their favour. It is interesting that Milutin persistently avoided Helen's appearance, by justifying her absence due to the great distance, winter weather and difficult roads.<sup>68</sup> The Serbian ruler obviously cared a great deal to exclude his mother from this marriage agreement. The Byzantines probably used this request as added pressure, in order to achieve the two other demands which were

---

<sup>67</sup> On these events see: *ИСНІ*, 451 – 454 (С. Ћирковић).

<sup>68</sup> *Византијски извори за историју народа Југославије VI*, уред. Ф. Баришић – Б. Ферјанчић, Београд 1986, 120 – 129 (= *ВИНЈVI*).

of major importance to them, especially the surrender of Kotanić. Therefore, the Byzantine's demand that Queen Helen swears an oath on the contract and attend the marriage ceremony between Milutin and Simonida, should not be viewed as a real demand with political connotations — it was just an additional demand through which the Byzantines tried to strengthen their own negotiating position.

However, this Byzantine request testified that they were well aware of the poor relations between Milutin and his mother. Helen opposed this marriage, and as ruler of Dioclea and a politician who had control over a large portion of land, we assume, she rightfully concluded that this marriage would bring about the turn-around of Milutin's policy. She also believed that it would, in the end, result in his conflict with Dragutin, and mutual cousin, King Charles II of Naples, and that, if that were to be the case, the conflict would not avoid Dioclea. Namely, Mauro Orbini mentioned that Helen restored and fortified Bar, as well as many other fortresses near by.<sup>69</sup>

Around that time, Ban of Croatia and Dalmatia Paul Šubić began his military actions against Bosnia and Ban of Bosnia Stephen Kotroman, King Dragutin's son in law. In 1299, he styled himself as ruler of Bosnia (*Nos Paulus banus Croatie, Dalmatie et dominus Bosne*).<sup>70</sup> During the next few years, his brother Mladen tried to conquer the part of Bosnia under direct rule of Stephen Kotroman.<sup>71</sup> Already in the second half of 1300 Paul Šubić began military operations in Travunia and Zahumlje taking Trebinje and Onogošt.<sup>72</sup> At the start of 1301 (March?), aided by the Ragusan fleet, he also tried to conquer Kotor.<sup>73</sup> Negotiations with King Milutin were considered throughout 1303, but it is not known if they actually occurred.<sup>74</sup> The military commitment of Paul towards

<sup>69</sup> *Il regno de gli Slavi hoggi corrottamente detti Schiavoni Historia di don Mavro Orbini Rauseo*, Pesaro 1601, 251 (= *Il regno de gli Slavi*).

<sup>70</sup> *Listine I*, N° 279.

<sup>71</sup> *ИСН I*, 454 (С. Ђирковић).

<sup>72</sup> *Il regno de gli Slavi*, 395.

<sup>73</sup> *Statuta et leges civitatis Cathari*, Venetiis 1616, 209; *ИСН I*, 451, n. 7; Б. Крекић, *Зашто је вођен и када је завршен рат Дубровника и Србије 1301 – 1302?*, ЗРВИ 17 (1976) 417 – 423.

<sup>74</sup> D. Karbić, *Šubići Bribirski do gubitka nasljedne banske časti*, Zbornik Odsijeka povijesnih znanosti HAZU 22 (2004) 17; *ИСН I*, 454 (С.

Travunia, Zahumlje and Dioclea is known almost exclusively on the basis of Mauro Orbini's writings. Allegedly, after taking Onogošt, Paul sent emissaries to the Ragusans, convincing them to help him to also take Kotor, so that they could from there *con facilità c'impatroniremo ancora della Zenta, & poi di tutt'il Regno di Rassia*.<sup>75</sup> Only after, did he attack Kotor. Since it is known that King Milutin attacked Ragusa because of this reason, and that he concluded peace with the Ragusans in November 1301,<sup>76</sup> it is clear that the attack on Kotor happened in the first few months of 1301. Accordingly, Paul's attack on Travunia, Zahumlje and Dioclea must have happened in the second half of the previous year (1300).

Milutin and Simonida's marriage was carried out in Thessaloniki, on Easter 1299.<sup>77</sup> By that time, all interested parties in the struggle for power in Serbia already have chosen their allies. Milutin had behind him the Byzantine Emperor; Helen had her cousin Charles II of Naples and Paul Šubić also counted on the support of the powerful King of Naples. Dragutin also had allies in Hungary, since he helped Charles' II grandson, Charles Robert, to assume the title of Hungarian king. Milutin could count on Andronicus' help, and Andronicus indeed helped him using his own troops to threaten Dragutin in 1299.<sup>78</sup> Helen's position was noticeably complex. The appearance of Paul Šubić in front of Kotor in March 1301, indicated that Helen was at the moment on Milutin's side. If Paul could not have counted on Helen's aid in his aspirations, then maybe he could have been backed by the archbishop of Bar. The archbishop's support to Šubić could have been the reason for Milutin's confrontation with the Roman Catholic Church in Dioclea. We cannot exclude a closer relationship between Paul Šubić and Roger, the supposed Archbishop of Bar, because the Croatian ban could have embraced such an ally for his ambitious political agenda.

There are pieces of evidence that clearly show that a disorder started in Dioclea and lasted for some time: already in 1302, the

---

Ђирковић).

<sup>75</sup> *Il regno de gli Slavi*, 395.

<sup>76</sup> *CD VIII*, N° 19.

<sup>77</sup> *ВИНЈ VI*, 55 – 56.

<sup>78</sup> *ВИНЈ VI*, 56

<sup>80</sup> *CD VIII*, N° 22.

Ragusans ordered that their citizens leave Serbia, whilst they in turn, informed their government that they could not have carried out the order because of the war.<sup>80</sup> Bogdan, who was a goldsmith, in 1303, informed his creditor in Ragusa, that he was prevented from repaying his debts for that year, because he was unable to travel due to the war that encompassed Brskovo and all of Serbia.<sup>81</sup>

Helen's position in the time can be traced in a letter she received from Pope Benedict XI in December 1303, in which he promised to protect her and her towns, fortresses, settlements and people (...*personam tuam et regnum predictum cum civitatibus, Castris, terris, villis et bonis aliis...sub beati Petri et nostra protectione suscipimus etc. usque communimus*).<sup>82</sup> This was a usual papal formula which can be found in papal letters sent to many European rulers, but not on all occasions. In other words, this formula can be understood as a signal that the recipient was in need of papal aid, even if only in a diplomatic sense and it could be an evidence that Helen felt she was in danger.

It is evident that a close political relationship existed between Charles II of Naples, Paul Šubić and Dragutin, as an opposition to Milutin. This connection becomes even stronger if we know that Dragutin's daughter Ursula, Queen Helen's granddaughter, was married to Paul Šubić since 1289.<sup>83</sup> King Charles II called (1298) Paul and his brothers, George and Mladen, *dilectos consanguineos affines et fideles nostros*.<sup>84</sup> In another document from 1300, Paul's brother George is *vir nobilis comes Georgius de Chroatia dilectus miles et familiaris noster ac regine consortis nostre consanguineus et fidelis*.<sup>85</sup> A second daughter of King Dragutin, was married to Stephen Kotroman in 1284.<sup>86</sup> These dynastical links allowed possibilities of different aspirations of those concerned. In a certain way, Paul's military move, firstly on Bosnia, and then on Travunia, Zahumlje, and Dioclea, seemed like a family

<sup>81</sup> *Monumenta Ragusina, Libri reformationum V, A. 1301 – 1336*, ed. J. Gelcich, Zagrabiae 1897, 27, 60.

<sup>82</sup> Theiner, *Monumenta I*, N° 648.

<sup>83</sup> М. Динић, *Из наше раније прошлости*, Прилози за КЈИФ 30, 3/4 (1964) 242.

<sup>84</sup> *CD VII*, N° 271.

<sup>85</sup> *CD VII*, N° 317.

<sup>86</sup> М. Пурковић, *Принцезе из куће Немањића*, Виндзор 1956, 34.

confrontation on the basis of rights acquired through marriage relations. Even though these rights, formally looking, were quite weak, they still proved a foundation for Paul's actions. Since he was married to Queen Helen's granddaughter, he probably considered that he indeed had a solid foundation to claim the territory of Dioclea. In that case Helen's reaction was clear — she opposed this, whilst the supposed archbishop of Bar, Roger, obviously supported Paul's course of policy: Milutin would not depose the archbishop without any reason after he suppressed Paul from Zeta, Zahumlje, and Travunia.

It could be also concluded, as an answer to our second question, that Milutin in April or May 1301 deposed and exiled the archbishop of Bar, as well as a certain number of Catholic bishops and priests, as a part of his diplomatic decisions of resolving the political turmoil in Dioclea. We have shown that Roger suddenly appeared in sources in March 1305, in Lower Austria. If he, as we assume, ascended to the position of archbishop in 1293, or, rather, 1298, and was exiled in April/May 1301, then an interesting question arises; where was Roger in the meantime, before 1293, or 1298? An administrative purchase contract in Split, from the 24<sup>th</sup> May 1290, mentioned a certain Roger, procurator of the *capitulum* of Split, who together with his colleague Sergius, bought a property on behalf of the Church (*...dompno Sergio et dompno Rugerio procuratoribus capituli sancti Dompnii ementibus nomine dicti capituli terram unam...*).<sup>87</sup> In the hundreds of documents from the time concerning the Dalmatian territory, and the Dalmatian towns, from Istria to Bar, this was the only record of the name Roger. Since we know that the procurator of Split's archbishopric Roger was a man of confidence, who could undertake financial transactions in the name of the Church, it is possible that he, advancing his career, became bishop in one of Dioclea's towns. Then, after the death of the archbishop of Bar, Michael, he could have assumed, as the oldest bishop, a new function as the archbishop of Bar (most probably from 1298) from where he was deposed in Milutin's campaign from April or May 1301.

---

<sup>87</sup> *CD VI*, N<sup>o</sup> 701.

Тибор ЖИВКОВИЋ, Драгана КУНЧЕР

## РУЂЕР — ЗАБОРАВЉЕНИ АХИЕПИСКОП БАРА

## Резиме

На основу једног натписа на надгробном споменику који је некада постојао у цистерцитском манастиру Цветл, Доња Аустрија, сачуваном у препису из 1723. године, у којем је поменут Руђер, монах, епископ и изгнаник, види се да је ова личност у једном тренутку могла да буде архиепископ Бара. Према малобројним сачуваним документима његово црквено деловање могуће је пратити само у кратком раздобљу између марта и децембра 1305. године, када је умро у Цветлу. У тим документима Руђер се пак јавља са титулом босанског епископа. Највероватније је да је у поменутом раздобљу обављао дужност тзв. *помоћног епископа* у пасавској епископији. Чињеница да је на надгробном натпису поменут као некадашњи архиепископ барске и дукљанске цркве, отвара занимљиву могућност да се покуша и одговори на следећа питања: 1) да ли је заиста цистерцитски монах Руђер обављао дужност архиепископа Бара и ако јесте, када је то било; 2) који су разлози могли да доведу до његовог изгнанства.

На основу анализе расположивих извора закључујемо да је Руђер могао да управља барском црквом између 1298. и априла/маја 1301. године када га је са тог положаја, највероватније, уклонио краљ Милутин који је настојао да ојача своје позиције у Дукљи на коју је у то доба претендовао Павле Шубић. Мислимо да је Руђер био у блиским везама са Павлом Шубићем и да се у томе крије разлог његовог протеривања. Изнели смо такође претпоставку да би Руђер из наших извора могао да буде исти онај Руђер, прокуратор сплитског каптола, који је забележен на једном купопродајном уговору из 1290. године. У том случају и претпостављена веза са Павлом Шубићем 1300/1301. године имала би своју предисторију.