

Jelena Mrgić-Radojčić
Faculty of Philosophy
Belgrade

RETHINKING THE TERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE MEDIEVAL BOSNIAN STATE*

In many ways, the medieval Bosnian state developed at the cross-roads – between West and East, the Hungarian Kingdom, a predominantly Western European state, and the Serbian Kingdom, under the strong influence of the Byzantine Empire. One may, without any further elaboration, say that Bosnia formed the periphery of both the Byzantine Empire, and Western Europe (first the Frankish and then the Hungarian state). Bosnia was far away from the most important communication line of the Balkans: the valleys of the rivers *Morava* and *Vardar*, *Via militaris* and also those of the rivers *Ibar* and *Sitnica*. The axis of the Bosnian state was the valley of the river *Bosna*, but not of the *Drina* ill suited for communication with its steep banks and many canyons.¹

* The author wishes to thank Prof. J. Koder, University of Vienna, Prof. S. Ćirković, Prof. M. Blagojević, and Prof. S. Mišić of Belgrade University for their useful comments and corrections of the following text.

¹J. Ferluga, *Vizantiska uprava u Dalmaciji*, (*Byzantine Administration in Dalmatia*), Beograd 1957; J. Koder, *Der Lebensraum der Byzantiner. Historisch-geographischer Abriss ihres Mittelalterlichen Staates im östlichen Mittelmeerraum*, Byzantische Geschichtsschreiber 1, Graz-Wien-Köln 1984, 2001², 13-21, passim; S. Ćirković, *Bosna i Vizantija (Bosnia and Byzantium)*, Osam Stotina godina povelje bana Kulina, Sarajevo 1989, 23-35. Even though Bosnia was situated on the »cross-roads«, it is unacceptable to depict it as being “more of a no-man’s-land than a meeting ground between the two worlds“, as J.V.A. wrote in his synthesis “*The Late Medieval Balkans. A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the Ottoman Conquest*“, The University of Michigan Press 1987, 1990⁴, 17-18. However, this impression was founded on the Yugoslav historiographic texts of that time and reveals just to what extent Bosnia’s history was unknown.

On the other hand, there was yet another obstacle between the Mediterranean, i.e. the Adriatic see in the south and the Pannonian plain in the north. The breakthrough of influences from the south was blocked by the high mountain range of *Dinara*, the most dominant characteristic of the Western and Central Balkan Peninsula relief. The main lines of communications that follow the beds of the main rivers: *Neretva – Bosna*, *Neretva – Vrbas* and *Drina*, are heavily obstructed by Dinaric mountains, i.e. those representing the watershed between the Adriatic and the Black Sea basin: Uzlomac (1907 m), Raduša (1956 m), Bitovnja (1700), Bjalašnica (2068), Treskavica (2086), Lelija (2032), Zelengora (2014), Lebršnik (1985). Dense and vast forest covered the mountains, making a considerable impediment for all means of transportation. On the opposite side, towards the north of the Peninsula, the relief becomes significantly lower, milder and the whole land opens up to the great Pannonian plain.² Therefore, Bosnia was more of a continental land, than one would say by just looking at the map. This geostrategic position on the Balkan Peninsula has largely influenced its political, social, economic, and cultural history.

The first historiographic work dedicated solely to the historical geography of the medieval Bosnian state was written by Vladimir Ćorović (1885–1941), one of the most eminent Serbian historians.³ He could base his work upon the studies of K. Jireček (*Commercial Roads and Mines of Serbia and Bosnia in Middle Ages*, 1879)⁴ and of S. Novaković (*Serbian Lands in 10th and 12th century*, 1880). The author began his essay by marking the borderlines of the Roman province of Dalmatia, in the heart of which the future Bosnian state would emerge. This

² J. Cvijić, *Balkansko poluostrvo (Balkan Peninsula)*, Sabrana dela 2, Beograd 1989; J. Marković, *Geografske oblasti SFRJ, (Geographical Regions of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia)*, Beograd 1950.

³ V. Ćorović, *Teritorijalni razvoj srednjovekovne bosanske države*, Glas SKA 167 (1935); ib., *Die territoriale Entwicklung des Bosnischen Staates im Mittelalter*, Beograd 1935; short biography in: *Enciklopedija srpske istoriografije (Encyclopedia of Serbian Historiography)*, eds. R. Mihaljčić-S. Ćirković, Beograd 1997, 688-690 (R. Mihaljčić).

⁴ K. Jireček, *Handelsstrassen und Berwerke von Serbien und Bosnien während des Mittelalters, Historische-geographische Studien*, Abhandlung der königlichen böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften VI Folge, 10 Band, Prag 1879 (= *Trgovački putevi i rudnici Srbije i Bosne u srednjem veku*, Zbornik Konstantina Jirečeka I, Beograd 1959, 254-303).

line of approach was indeed necessary, and his remarks here were very short and general, accounting for only an introduction to the subject. He devoted greater attention to this matter in his capital work – *The History of Bosnia* (1940). He found traces of the Roman tradition in what was in his opinion was the northern frontier of the “old Bosnia“. Ćorović thought it failed to reach the left bank of the river Sava, and only went up to the line drawn between the town of Vranduk, on the bank of the Bosna, and a *castrum* near Šipovo on the river Pliva, (as shown on his map), i.e. it was in the south of the northern borderline of the province of Dalmatia (*castrum* near Doboj – *castrum* in Banjaluka). “Old Bosnia“ for him was the historical province – i.e. the “land“ of Bosnia, which indeed did reach the town of Vranduk. He was the first author to distinguish Bosnia proper within the whole territory of the Bosnian state. The term „land“ (Serb. „земља“) has been introduced into the Serbian historiography only recently (see below). Ćorović saw another element of tradition in the continuity of Roman settlements and that is one of the most important lines pointed out in his text.⁵

Large improvements have been made in this area since Ćorović, fully in line with the general development and expanding areas of the scientific interest. In 1960, Esad Pašalić wrote a capital work – *Antique Settlements and Communications in Bosnia and Hercegovina*, firmly based on his own pedological research. He also established a connection between the Illyric tribes, their settlements and economy with those of the Roman era. His results have been widely accepted by other scientists, such as J. J. Wilkes and G. Alföldy.⁶ Somewhat different results were presented in the work of Ivo Bojanovski *Bosnia and Hercegovina in Antique Times* (1988). The next step was the publishing of *The Archeological Lexicon of Bosnia and Hercegovina I-III (ALBiH, 1988)*, which represented a broad database of all archeological sites from prehistoric to medieval times, also including 75 maps.

However, what is still needed is a more systematic scientific analysis, which should in greater depth investigate all the links between

⁵ V. Ćorović, *Teritorijalni razvoj*, 5-9; ib., *Die territoriale Entwicklung*, 3-7.

⁶ See also: E. Pašalić., *Sabrana dela (Collected works)*, Sarajevo 1975; G. Alföldi, *Bevölkerung und Gesellschaft der Römischen Provinz Dalmatien*, Budapest 1965, 30, 12-156; J. J. Wilkes, *Dalmatia*, London 1969, 269-275.

the Roman and the medieval history of the whole region, especially regarding the questions of continuity, tradition and heritage.⁷ Nevertheless, we may offer a few conclusions regarding the forms of the Roman heritage in a particular part of the medieval Bosnian state subject to our research – Donji Kraji (later, Bosanska Krajina), stretched between the rivers of Vrbas, Sana and Sava. There we found a strong continuing link between the sites of settlements and those of the mining sites (for example, Splonum – Stari Majdan and Ljubija), and the route of the Roman roads were the same as the ones today (*Salona – Servitium*, Split – Bosanska Gradiška). However, as Pašalić correctly noted, the valley of the Vrbas, between the towns of Jajce and Banjaluka, and also that of the river Ugar, were of no significance to the Roman authorities, and were not settled in the Roman times, but afterwards. That also speaks of a greater number of inhabitants in medieval times, who settled there despite the fact that those areas were not too suitable for living. To sum up, further studies should give us a deeper insight into this field of research.⁸

In the first part of his article, Ćorović dealt with the data of the first historical source - Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio* (DAI), especially its chapters 29-32 which have been thoroughly studied in modern times. In chapter 31 Bosnia is depicted as one geographical area (χωρίον Βόσωνα) within “baptized Serbia“ and surrounded by what was the oldest state of the Serbian people. Ćorović rightly assumed that Bosnia was the name for the area around the upper and middle course of the river Bosna – the fields of Sarajevo and of Visoko.

⁷ For a general overview: S. Ćirković, *Istorija srednjovekovne bosanske države (History of the Medieval Bosnian State)*, Beograd 1964, 27-33; also: *Kulturna istorija Bosne i Hercegovine*, Sarajevo 1984²; J.V.A. Fine, *The Early Medieval Balkans. A Critical Survey From the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*, The University of Michigan Press 1983.

⁸ E. Pašalić, *Antička naselja*, 18-42; Z. Žeravica, *Arheološki spomenici Goleša, Dobrinje i Zmijanja (Archeological Monuments in Goleš, Dobrinja and Zmijanje)*, *Naše Starine* 18-19 (1989) 23-48. Yet I. Bojanovski was the only scientist who thought that the Roman authorities had built the road which ran along the river bed of Vrbas, between the town of Jajce and Banja Luka – *Dolabelin sistem cesta u rimskoj provinciji Dalmaciji (Dolabella's Road System in the Roman Province Dalmatia)*, Sarajevo 1974, map I; Cf. J. Mrgić-Radojčić, *Donji Kraji. Krajina srednjovekovne Bosne (Donji Kraji. Mark of the Medieval Bosnia)*, Beograd 2002, 184-262 (settlements, with tables and a map), 273-280 (mining locations), 281-296 (communications, with a map).

There were two “inhabited cities“ (κάστρα οικούμενα) – Kotor (Κάτερα) and Desnik (Δεσνήκ), presumably located in the two fields respectively. He also thought that *župa* Vrhbosna was central - the region where the process of state building began, and pointed out its geographical and communication advantages, undisputable to this day.⁹

Our knowledge of the formation and development of *župas* (Serb. жупа - Engl. county), the basic territorial and administrative units of both Bosnia and Serbia, is far better today, and the Serbian historiography owes that to several scientists, such as M. Dinić, G. Škrivanić, G. Tomović, M. Blagojević and S. Mišić. The earliest *župas* were also geographical units, i.e. their boundaries were the same as those of compact and distinctive natural features, as were the valleys, karstic fields and meadows. In terms of administration, a *župa* consisted of a number of villages governed from one local center – initially a *refugium* location, a fortified place surrounded by trenches and wooden fences. Later it became a fortress, made predominantly of stone, where a *župan* resided, who acted as both a civic and military commander. *Župa* was also considered to be an economic unit, as clearly indicated in the articles of *Czar Dušan's Code*.¹⁰

⁹ V. Čorović, *Teritorijalni razvoj*, 9-10; ib., *Die territoriale Entwicklung*, 7-8; K. Porphyrogenitos, *Spis o narodima*, 58, n. 112, 202, 203, 204 (B. Ferjančić, with references); C. Porphyrogenitus, *DAI*, Greek text ed. by Gy. Moravcsik, English transl. by R.J.H. Jenkins, Washington 1967, (Ch. 32, 151) 160-161; C. Porphyrogenitus, *DAI – Commentary*, ed. R.J.H. Jenkins, London 1962, 137. For general overview – A. Toynbee, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus and his world*, London 1973, 575-605, 619-651. However, those two “inhabited cities“ are still not precisely unified – some new approaches and identifications see in: S. Ćirković, “Naseljeni gradovi“ *Konstantina Porphyrogenita i najstarija teritorijalna organizacija* (“Inhabited cities“ of Constantine Porphyrogenitos and the Oldest Territorial Organization), *ZRVI XXXVI* (1998) 9-32; A. Loma, *Serbisches und Kroatisches Sprachgut bei Konstantin Porphyrogennetos*, *ZRVI XXXVIII* (1999/2000) 87-161. For the history of the whole period: M. Blagojević – D. Medaković, *Istorija srpske državnosti 1 (The History of Serbian Sovereignty I)*, Novi Sad 2000, 25-44.

¹⁰ Literature on *župa* is very extensive and what is offered here is but a selection of works: *Leksikon srpskog srednjeg veka (Lexicon of the Serbian Middle Ages)*, Beograd 1999, 195-197 (G. Tomović), with references; M. Dinić, *Srpske zemlje u srednjem veku (Serbian Lands in Middle Ages)*, Beograd 1978; G. Škrivanić, *Žičko eparhisko vlastelinstvo (The Žiča Eparhial Nobility)*, *IČ* 4 (1952) 147-172; M. Blagojević, *Pregled istorijske geografije srednjovekovne Srbije (Survey of Historical Geography of Medieval Serbia)*, *Zbornik IMS* (1987); ib., *Srpsko Kraljevstvo i “države“ u delu Arhiepisko-*

In time, *župa* had also changed its character: the early feudal *župas* (between the 9th and 12th centuries) were more spacious, with smaller population density. However, as the number of inhabitants grew in parallel with economic development, new *župas* were formed in parts of former units, i.e. larger *župas* were usually divided in two. There are several examples of this process concerning *župas* in river valleys, usually named after the river concerned: till the end of the 12th century there were *župas* called *Cetina*, *Lab* and *Bosna*, and afterwards *Vrhrika* and *Cetina*, *Vrhlab* and *Lab*, *Vrhbosna* and *Bosna*. The prefix – *vrh* was added to distinguish the area around the source and the upper part of the river, where a new *župa* was founded, with a new center. The same was with *župas* prefixed *Gornji/-a* (Upper) and *Donji/-a* (Lower) *Ibar*, *Lepenica*, *Polog*.¹¹ Considering the development process mentioned

pa Danila II (Serbian Kingdom and "States" in the work of the Archbishop Danilo II), in: Arhiepiskop Danilo II i njegovo doba, Beograd 1991, 139-155; *Grad i župa – mede gradskog stanovništva (City and Župa – the Borders of the Urban Society)*, Socijalna struktura gradskih naselja (XII-XV vek), Beograd-Smederevo 1992, 67-84; ib., *Državna uprava u srpskim srednjovekovnim zemljama (Administration in Serbian Medieval Lands)*, Beograd 1997, 13-14, 38 passim.; ib., *Župa Moravica i zemlja Moravice (Župa Moravica and the "land" of Moravica)*, *Sveti Ahilije u Arilju – istorija, umetnost, Zbornik radova sa naučnog skupa (25-28.05.1996)*, Arilje 2002, 13-23; ib., *Državnost Zemlje Pavlovića (Statehood of the Land of Pavlović)*, in: *Zemlja Pavlovića – Srednji vijek i period turske vladavine*, Banjaluka – Srpsko Sarajevo 2003, 113-144; S. Mišić, *Humaska zemlja u srednjem veku (The land of Hum in Middle Ages)*, Beograd 1996; ib., *Istorijska geografija Srbije u žitijima Sv. Simeona i Sv. Save (Historical Geography of Serbia in the biographies of St. Simeon and St. Sava)*, *Sveti Sava u srpskoj istoriji i tradiciji*, Beograd 1999, 95-105; ib., *Zemlja u državi Nemanjića (Land in the State of Nemanjić Dynasty)*, Zbornik za društvenu istoriju IV, 2-3 (1999) 133-146; ib., *Teritorijalno-upravna organizacija Polimalja (XII-XIV vek) (Territorial and Administrative Organisation of Polimlje, 12th-14th Century)*, in: *Kralj Vladislav i Srbija XIII veka*, Beograd 2003, 73-87; . See also A. Loma, o.c., 90-91.

¹¹ Župa Cetina was first mentioned in DAI (Τζ^ανζήνα, ch. 30), as the area round the river Cetina, but by 1185, a new župa - Vrhrika was formed in the upper part of its course. Župa Lab existed at the time of Stefan Nemanja, since it was mentioned the charter he granted to the monastery of Chilandari (1198), and župa Vrhlab was known to exist no later than the rule of King Stefan Milutin, i.e. at the beginning of the 14 century – F. Miklosich, *Monumenta Serbica*, Vienna 1858, 4; T. Smičiklas, *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae II*, Zagreb 1904, 193; A. Solovjev, *Odabrani spomenici srpskog prava (Selected Monuments of Serbian Law)*, Beograd 1926, 97; *Rječnik JAZU* 21, Zagreb 1974, 480-490; P. Skok, *Prilozi k ispitivanju srpko-*

above, it is safe to conclude that in the beginning (9th –12th century) there was one large, spacious *župa* - Bosna, which was later on divided in two *župas* – *Bosna* and *Vrhbosna*. Even the two “inhabited cities“ in DAI indicate the process of detachment of a new territorial unit, but this division happened sometime before 1244, when the newly formed *župa* (*Vrhbosna*) is for the first time mentioned in a historical source. There is no doubt that *župa* Bosna covered the field of Visoko, and the one of the later date – the field of Sarajevo. Near Visoko, as well as in it, were the courts of the Bosnian rulers (Mili, Moštre, Sutjeska, Bobovac), centers of the heretic Bosnian church (Janjići), as well as the necropolis of the ruling family of Kotromanić (Mili-Arnautovići). Therefore, Čorović was right to presume that the earliest center of the medieval Bosnian state was precisely in those two fields in the valley of the river Bosna.¹²

The emergence of towns and the development of the feudal society (and Bosnian state was no exception) eventually led to the disintegration of the *župa* as an administrative unit, since it was taken apart by rights of ownership. In order to obtain and sustain the loyalty of the nobility, the ruler was obliged to grant land and immunity rights to his vassals. He was able to donate a village, town, market etc., simply by excluding it from the jurisdiction of his representatives in *župa*. However, it should be underlined that *župas* continued to exist as geographical units, and some of them may still be found today. For example, the people of the region of Šipovo still use the name *Župa* for the area round the upper course of the Pliva (Pljeva) and the lower part of its tributary Janj, be-

hrvatskih imena mjesta, Rad JAZU 224 (1921), 140-141; ib., *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika (Etymological Dictionary of Croatian or Serbian language) III*, Zagreb 1973, 624-625; A. Loma, *Sprachgut*, 100-101. A text of G. Škrivanić, *Imenice usta i vrh u toponomastici*, *Onomatološki prilozi* 1 (1979), 55-57, has no particular scientific importance compared with P. Skok, since it only gives a number of well known examples.

¹² On *župa* Vrhbosna: V. Mušeta-Aščerić, *Župa Vrhbosna – Problem granica i vlasti (- The Problem of the Borders and the Authority)*, *Prilozi* 20, 21 (Sarajevo 1985) 257-268. For further reading on material remains see: P. Anđelić, *Bobovac i Kraljevska Sutjeska*, Sarajevo 1973; ib., M. Popović, *Vladarski i vlasteoski dvor u srednjovekovnoj Bosni. Prilog proučavanja fizičkih struktura (Rulers and Nobilities' Courts in Medieval Bosnia. A Contribution to the Study of Physical Structures)*, *Prilozi za istoriju BiH* 2 (1997) 1-34; J. Maksimović, *Umetnost u doba bosanske srednjovekovne države (Arts in the Bosnian Medieval State)*, in the same historical journal, 35-72.

cause of its fertile land of lower height and milder climate, reminiscing the former župa Pliva as a governmental unit. Other examples can be found in the valleys of Ukrina and Usora in Northern Bosnia, which have similar geoclimatic features, and were once župas in the administrative sense.¹³

But what is also known today is that, on the other hand, there was an opposite process right from the very start, whereby a few neighboring župas, at least two, were grouped into a larger administrative, territorial and economic unit, which also had distinctive geographical borders, such as mountain ranges and watersheds. Those spacious units were called „land“ (Serb. „земља“) and may nowadays be recognized in the existence of historical provinces, for example, Bosnia and Krajina. Long before his time, Ćorović rightly noted this kind of development, relying on anthropologic records of the time, testifying to the fact that people living in different parts of Bosnia and Hercegovina clearly expressed their local territorial belonging.¹⁴

The political unity of “baptized Serbia“ lasted until the death of prince Časlav Klonimirović, around 950, who after having been defeated in battle by the Hungarian king drowned in the river Sava. Since the town of Soli (Σαληνές, Tuzla) according to DAI (ch. 32), belonged to the “baptized Serbia“, and moreover lies only about 50 km south of the river, it could be concluded that the northern border of Serbia at that time ran near the left bank of the Sava. These new results have recently been presented on the maps of the *Historical Atlas* (1997).¹⁵ After Časlav's death,

¹³ On medieval towns see: D. Kovačević-Kojić, *Gradska naselja srednjovjekovne bosanske države (Town Settlements of the Medieval Bosnian State)*, Sarajevo 1978; on the abovementioned examples: J. Mrgić, *Župe i naselja “zemlje“ Usore (Župas and Settlements of the “Land“ of Usora)*, JIČ 1-2 (2000) 27, passim; J. Mrgić-Radojčić, *Donji Kraji*, 193.

¹⁴ V. Ćorović, *Teritorijalni razvoj*, 7-8, 34-35; ib., *Die territoriale Entwicklung*, 6, 34-35. The first historiographer who pointed to the existence of the “land“ as a higher administrative unit of the Serbian states was M. Blagojević, who investigated this subject in many of his works. This was a sort of key that improved the understanding and knowledge of the administration and territorial government in the Middle Ages, and has influenced the works of S. Mišić, as well as ours – see n. 9.

¹⁵ M. Blagojević – D. Medaković, o.c., 38, passim; *Istorijski atlas (Historical Atlas)*, Beograd 1997, 35 (M. Blagojević); T. Živković, *Južni Sloveni pod vizantijskom vlašću (600-1025) (Southern Slavs under the Byzantine Authority)*, Beograd 2002, 430-433.

all former tribal and geographical units continued to develop as separate Serbian states – Paganija, Zahumlje, Travunija, Duklja on the coast, and inland - Bosnia and Raška. At the same time, within these states, adjoining *župas* merged to form higher territorial and administrative units – “zemlje” (“lands”). The central *župa* usually lent its name to the whole “land” – Ras, Hum, Trebinje and Bosnia. For the first three, it is certain that initially it was the town that gave its name to a *župa*, to gradually spread on to a much wider area (“land”, state). However, no such conclusion can be made concerning Bosnia.¹⁶

As for Bosnia, in particular, it meant that, in addition to Vrhbosna and Bosna, several other *župas* were linked by a central authority, i.e. that of a ruler. These were *župas Lepenica* and *Lašva*, named after the rivers, and *župa Brod* in the field of Zenica, which got its name after a ford on the river Bosna. In the east, a new *župa* - Prača, in the valley of the left tributary of the Drina was added. So, the “land” of Bosnia, i.e. Ćorović’s “old Bosnia” was the central part of the earliest state of Bosnia, but only for a brief period of time.

Ćorović was right in drawing the public attention to a paragraph of the second most important historical source – *Letopis popa Dukljanina* (The Annals of the Priest of Dioclea, second half of the 12th century). According to him, in 969 the Croatian ruler Mihailo Krešimir II attacked the Bosnian ban and invaded *župas Pliva, Luka* and *Uskoplje*, forcing the ban to flee to Hungary. Therefore, by that time Bosnia was established as a state, governed by a ruler with the title of *ban*, who had the authority over the above-mentioned *župas*. The fact that *župa Pliva* (Πλέβα) is mentioned in DAI (ch. 30), as an area on the eastern border of Croatia, and those *župas* lied in the valley of the Vrbas and Pliva, testifies to the territorial expansion of Bosnia within a few decades after the death of prince Časlav. *Župas Luka* and *Uskoplje*, in the east of *župa Pliva*, were formerly part of the “baptized Serbia”. Ćorović correctly marked this as the earliest, and also easiest, expansion. The plain of *Uskoplje*, between the today's towns of Gornji and Donji Vakuf, had been densely populated

¹⁶ S. Ćirković, “*Naseljeni gradovi*”, passim; M. Blagojević – D. Medaković, o.c., 27-44, 56, passim. P. Živković tried to identify and locate a settlement by the name of Bosnia – *Visoko i okolina kroz historiju I (The Town of Visoko and its Surrounding Area through History I)*, Visoko 1984, 110-116.

in the Roman era and several roads led over the mountains between the river flows of Vrbas and Bosna. Those župas – Pliva, Luka and Uskoplje become the “nucleus“ out of which a new “land“ will emerge – Donji Kraji (Partes Inferiores).¹⁷

The unity of Bosnia and Raška was renewed under the reign of the Dioclean ruler, king Bodin († c. 1102), who appointed his vassals to govern these states – in Raška the župans were brothers Vukan and Marko (who established the new dynasty), and in Bosnia prince Stefan. Ćorović pointed out to the texts of the Priest of Dioclea and John Kinnamos, who congruently testified that in the 12th century, Bosnia and Raška were both considered parts of Serbia. The Bosnian ruler mentioned by Kinnamos was *ban Borić* (c. 1154 – c. 1164), who participated in the battles against the Byzantine Empire led by the Hungarian king and župan Uroš II for the towns of Sirmium, Belgrade and Braničevo. The Byzantine historiographer named ban Borić as the ruler of the “Dalmatian land of Bosnia“ (“the ruler of Bosnia, a Serbia region“, as translated by Ch. M. Brand), and since he used the term “Dalmatians“ (Δαλμάται) for Serbs, one may assume that Bosnia was considered to be one of the Serbian states, like Raška and others. He further wrote (Book III) that the river Drina separated Bosnia (Βόσθνα) from the rest of Serbia, but also that Bosnia was not submitted to the “arch-župan“ (ἀρχιζούπανος) of Serbia, “but is a tribe which lives and is ruled separately“.¹⁸ The Priest of the Dioclea specifically wrote: “Surbiam autem, quae et Transmontana dicitur, in duas divisit provincias: unam a magno flumine Drina contra occidentalem plagam usque ad montem Pini, quam et Bosnam vocavit, alteram vero ab eodem flumine Drina contra orientalem plagam usque ad Lapiam et ad paludem Lageatidem, quam Rassam vocavit“.¹⁹

¹⁷ *Letopis popa Dukljanina*, ed. F. Šišić, Beograd 1928, 324; *Ljetopis popa Dukljanina*, transl. by V. Mošin, Zagreb 1950, 73; V. Ćorović, *Teritorijalni razvoj*, 14; *ib.*, *Die territoriale Entwicklung*, 12; J. Mrgić-Radojčić, *o.c.*, 32.

¹⁸ J. Kinam, Serb. transl. by N. Radošević, comm. by J. Kalić, VIINJ IV, Beograd 1970, 28, 51; John Kinnamos, *Deeds of John and Manuel Comnenus*, Engl. transl. by Ch. M. Brand, New York, 1976, 84, 103-104. Cf. S. Ćirković, “*Narod Kačića*“ *Jovana Kinama* (“*The Nation of Katzikioi*“ by John Kinnamos), ZRVI 32 (1993) 21-22.

¹⁹ *Letopis*, ed. F. Šišić, 307; *Ljetopis popa Dukljanina*, transl. by V. Mošin, Zagreb 1950, 54-55; M. Hadžijahić in his text *Das Regnum Sclavorum als historische Quelle und als territoriale Substrat*, (Südost-Forschungen 42 (1983) 11-60) tried to challenge

Ćorović then focused on the ubification of the *mons Pini*, reportedly located on the western border of the Bosnian state. He looked for it in the watershed between the Adriatic and the Black Sea basins and there, near the field of Livno, he found *Borova glava* (1290 m), a high and distinct peak in the mountain range on the watershed. If this identifications were to be accepted, it would mean that the Bosnian state of ban Borić had expanded from the upper valley of the river Vrbas (Uskoplje) to the field of Livno, thus encompassing the fields of Vukovo, Kupres and Glamoč. Although no other location has so far been mentioned in this context, we must make note of another mountain *Borja* (1093 m) in northern Bosnia, which, too, derives its name from a pine (Serb. “bor“ tree).²⁰

Ćorović dedicated some of his efforts to analyzing a very significant historical source – the chart of the Hungarian king Bela IV, issued on 20th July 1244. He used the data it offers not only to reconstruct the size of the Bosnian state of that time, but also to argue that they may apply in establishing the borders of Bosnia at the time of the famous *ban Kulin* (c. 1180- c. 1204). His conclusions are still correct and we can only stress that favorable political circumstances, such as the death of the Czar Manuel Comnenus (1180) and the fact that he became the vassal of the Hungarian king, enabled Kulin to expand the borders of his state and improve its central administration. Until the year 1322, that was not to be the position of his successors – ban Stjepan (c. 1204 to c. 1233), ban Matija Ninoslav (c. 1233 – c. 1250), ban Prijezda (c. 1250- c. 1290) and ban Stjepan (I) Kotroman (c. 1290- c. 1310). It was the time of the slow, but steady decrease of the Bosnian state that ended when ban Stjepan (II) Kotromanić (1322-1353) took the throne.

the identification of Transmontana with Serbia, as resulting from the false representation of the bishopry of Ragusa; L. Steindorff presented some new ideas about the spatial concept of this source – *Die Synode auf der Planities Dalme. Reichanteilung und Kirchenorganisation im Bild der Chronik des Priesters von Dioclea*, *MIÖG* 93, 3-4 (1985) 279-324; *ib.*, *Deutung des Wortes Dalmatia in der mittelalterlichen Historiographie, zugleich ber die Synode auf der Planities Dalmae*, *Etnogeneza Hrvata – Ethnogeny of the Croats*, Zagreb 1995, 250-261.

²⁰ V. Ćorović, *Teritorijalni razvoj*, 10-13; *ib.*, *Die territoriale Entwicklung*, 9-12; J. Mrgić-Radojčić, *o.c.*, 35.

The aforementioned chart was issued to the Bosnian bishopric, after the defeat of ban Matija Ninoslav in a long struggle to avoid the acknowledgment of the supremacy of Bela IV, and persistent attempts at establishing a catholic church organization in the Bosnian state. There are several separate legal decisions combined in this document: king Bela IV confirmed the Bosnian bishopric's title to Đakovo and Blizna in Slavonija, granting the license to the Bosnian bishop to collect the tithe in Usora, Soli and Donji Kraji; and, secondly, the king approved the personal donation of land made by ban Matija to the Bosnian bishopric, stretching between the lower course of the river Bosna, Sava and Tolisa; finally, he also confirmed the land possessions of the same bishopric in the Bosnian state, after they were confirmed by ban Matija and his Bosnian vassals. This last part, wherein these possessions were listed, is the most valuable, as it represents a kind of a catalogue of the župas – *Vrhbosna, Lašva, Lepenica, Prača, Brod, Uskoplje, Mel* and *Neretva*. Župa "Vydogossa Lubinchi" remained unidentified, although Ćorović placed it near the field of Livno, where the villages of Vidoši and Ljubunčić are situated.²¹

The Bosnian ban's personal donation of a territory that was part of the "land" of Usora, between the river beds of Bosna – Tolisa – Sava, allows for two conclusions: first, the Bosnian ruling family had its domain in the "land" of Usora prior to the time of ban Matija; and, second, the "land" of Usora expanded over the riverbank of Bosna, i.e. to its right side before 1244, but that was not the end of its enlargement.²²

Some improvements important to historical geography were made only recently, such is the case with the term "čestnik" (ЧЕСТЬНИКЪ), first recorded in the charter of ban Kulin issued to Dubrovnik in 1189. The true meaning of this term, translated with a *terminus technicus* as "udeoni knez" ("co-ruler"), remained unknown until M. Blagojević dedicated an article to this problem. He showed that the practice of organizing "co-

²¹ V. Ćorović, *Teritorijalni razvoj*, 13-21; ib., *Die territoriale Entwicklung*, 12-21; S. Ćirković, *Istorija*, 44-80; J. Mrgić-Radojčić, o.c., 36.

²² M. Dinić, *Za istoriju rudarstva u srednjovekovnoj Srbiji i Bosni I (To the History of Mining in the Medieval Serbia and Bosnia)*, Beograd 1955, 32-33; M. Blagojević, *Bosansko Završje (Bosnian Završje)*, Zbornik FF u Beogradu XIV-1 (1979) 141; J. Mrgić, *Župe i naselja "zemlje" Usore*, 29-30.

ruled principalities“ could be observed within the state of župan Uroš II, and still more significantly, in the state of grand župan Tihomir and his successor – Stefan Nemanja. Before he seized the throne, Nemanja had been given a separate part of Serbia, his own “part of fatherland“ (Serb. “čest otačastva“), but with a strong obligation of obtaining the approval of his brothers and especially the oldest one – the grand župan, for every important decision and act. All decisions regarding interior and foreign matters had to be reached unanimously. Nemanja’s “co-principality“ consisted of four župas in the eastern part of the state – Ibar, Rasina, Toplica and Reke, while his brother prince Miroslav ruled in the “land“ of Hum, and prince Stracimir in the “land“ of Moravice. In Raška this practice ceased to exist during the reign of king Stefan Uroš I, somewhere around 1254.²³

Ćorović correctly noticed the semi-independent positions of the Bosnian “lands“ of Usora and Soli and Donji Kraji towards the central government placed in the “land“ of Bosnia. In the case of the Bosnian state, we have been able to recognize the same tradition of “co-ruled principalities“, organized within the state of ban Kulin and ban Stjepan Matija Ninoslav. In his aforementioned chart, ban Kulin gave the traders of Dubrovnik his own, as well as the protection of the “co-rulers“, he shared his power with. This became more obvious in the time of ban Matija, whose opponent was, for a while, prince Sibislav (c. 1236 – c. 1245), the son of the former Bosnian ban Stefan, the “co-ruler“ of the “land“ of Usora. In the charters of ban Matija, there were three financial officials with the title of “kaznac“ (Lat. comes camerarius), whose authorities were restricted to the boundaries of three “lands“ – Bosnia, Usora and Donji Kraji. In order to elevate their position in relation to other “co-rulers“, and also because the Bosnian state consisted of several “lands“, both Kulin and Matija took the title of the Grand Bosnian ban.²⁴

²³ M. Blagojević, *Srpske udeone kneževine*, 45-62; ib., *O “Zemljištu radnje Nemanjine“* (On “The Territory of the Land of Nemanja“), Stefan Nemanja – Sveti Simeon Mirotočivi, Beograd 2000, 65-76; ib., *Župa Moravica i zemlja Moravice (Župa Moravica and the “land“ of Moravica)*, 13-23; J. Kalić, *Srbija u doba kneza Stracimira (Serbia in the time of count Stacimir)*, Čačak u prošlosti, Čačak 1995, 49-58; S. Mišić, *Zemlja u državi Nemanjića*, 133-146.

²⁴ V. Ćorović, *Teritorijalni razvoj*, 22-29, passim; ib., *Die territoriale Entwicklung*, 21-27, passim; J. Mrgić-Radojčić, *Donji Kraji*, 37-39.

In 1254 ban Prijezda was forced to acknowledge the supremacy of the Hungarian king Bela IV, who conquered the northern part of the Bosnian state and formed an administrative unit called *Banat of Usora and Soli*. It stretched between the rivers Drina, Vrbas and Sava marking its eastern, western and northern borders respectively. The southern border of its territory has not been precisely established yet and it may only be assumed that it was smaller than the “land“ of Usora and Soli, as was the case of *Banat of Mačva* in northern Serbia, which took up only a part of the “land“ of Srem. Ban Prijezda gave his son-in-law the whole župa of Zemunik, in the valley of the river Vrbas, between the present day towns of Bočac and Banjaluka. This also meant that the royal family had its domain in the “land“ of Donji Kraji.²⁵

Further on in his text, Čorović described the territorial expansion of the Bosnian state during the reign of Stjepan II Kotromanić. In his opinion, its northern border stretched from the mouth of the river Drina, along the river Sava to the west, up to the confluence of the river Bosna, and then from the town of Dobor went southwest, to the rivers Vrbanja and then Vrbas, and, going above the villages of Kola and Pišćenica, finally reached the mountain of Grmeč. Only recently has the part of the border between the confluence of the river Bosna and that of the river Vrbas corrected, as proof was obtained that župas in the valley of the river Ukrina, the right tributary of the Sava – Ukrina and Modran, formed part of the “land“ of Usora as early as the first half of the 13th century, and the long-controversial župa Glaž was precisely located.²⁶

The chronology of this territorial expansion of the Bosnian state has also been somewhat more accurately established. First off, ban

²⁵ M. Blagojević, *Severna granica bosanske države u XIV veku (Northern Border of Bosnia in XIV century)*, Bosna i Hercegovina od srednjeg veka do novijeg vremena, Beograd 1995, 59-76; on the extent of the “land“ of Srem – M. Blagojević, *Naselja u Mačvi i pitanje srpsko-ugarske granice (The Settlements in Mačva and the Question of the Serbian-Hungarian Border)*, Valjevo – postanak i uspon gradskog središta, Valjevo 1994, 78-92; S. Mišić, o.c., 140-141; J. Mrgić, *Župe i naselja “zemlje“ Usore*, 31, 39-41; J. Mrgić-Radojčić, o.c., 39-41. The conclusions of J.V.A. Fine, *Was the Bosnian Banate subjected to Hungary in the half of the Thirteenth century?*, East European Quarterly, Vol. III, No. 2, June 1969, 167-177, and in *The Later Medieval Balkans*, 275-278, were based on older historiography.

²⁶ V. Čorović, *Teritorijalni razvoj*, 36-37; ib., *Die territoriale Entwicklung*, 37-38; M. Blagojević, *Severna granica*, passim.

Stjepan obtained the authority over the central region – the “land“ of Bosnia. Following that, his authority was acknowledged, no later than the first half of 1323, in the northern part – the “land“ of Usora and Soli, and also in part of the “land“ of Donji Kraji. In the next three years, from 1324 to 1326, he regained control over the remaining part of the “land“ of Donji Kraji, and established his power in Krajina – an area between the rivers Cetina and Neretva, and in addition to that, also in a substantial part of the “land“ of Hum. It was for the first time that the Bosnian state obtained an outlet to the Adriatic sea, breaking forever its long lasting land-lock – an event of immense importance for its economy, political significance and prestige. The marriage between the king of Hungary, Luis the Great (1342-1382) and Jelisaveta, daughter of ban Stjepan II, highlighted the rise of the state of Bosnia.²⁷

Also noteworthy is the fact that Stjepan II adopted the title of “gospodin“ (dominus), meaning that he was a sovereign ruler, the overlord of all of the Bosnian “lands“. Therefore, his charters became the acts of his “milost“ – grace (gratia) and he also defined the form in which his ruling title was to be written – from his time on, the names of all the Bosnian “lands“ in the state were precisely noted, in the tradition of Hungarian kings. At that time, those were the “lands“ of Bosnia, Usora, Soli, Donji Kraji and Humska zemlja (the “land“ of Hum). The title will be modified in future, to reflect the territorial changes during the government of ban Tvrtko.²⁸

The lists of witnesses in the charters are found to be an important source for the historic and geographic data, since their names were written according to their respective ranks and geographical background. On this basis M. Blagojević pinpointed our historiography’s misinterpretation regarding the location of an area called *Završje*. It was previously

²⁷ V. Ćorović, *Teritorijalni razvoj*, 38-41; ib., *Die territoriale Entwicklung*, 39-43; V. Trpković, *Branivojevići*, IG 3-4 (1960) 55-84; ib., *Kada je Stevan II Kotromanić prvi put prodro u Hum?* (When was the first time that Stephan II Kotromanić invaded Hum?), IG 1-2 (1960) 151-154; S. Ćirković, *Istorija*, 84-121; S. Mišić, *Humska zemlja*, 56-60.

²⁸ For the title of “gospodin“ see: *Istorija srpskog naroda I*, 374-375 (M. Blagojević); M. Blagojević, *Savladarstvo u srpskim zemljama posle smrti cara Uroša (Co-rule in Serbia after the Death of Emperor Uroš)*, ZRVI XXI (1982) 190-191; ib., *Istorija srpske državnosti I*, 234-236, 289-290; ib., *Državnost zemlje Pavlovića*, 125-126, n. 43; J. Mrgić-Radojčić, *Donji Kraji*, 49-50, 56-57.

believed that this area included three large karstic fields, i.e. župas – Livno, Duvno and Glamoč, but after the analysis of ban Stjepan's charters, this author proved that it was a short-lived jurisdictional region, consisting of župas Zemunik, Usora, Soli and Trebotić. Thus, it encompassed the whole northern part of the Bosnian state, from the river Vrbas to the river Drina. The reason why this name had not lived longer was the expansion of the “land“ of Usora in this region, which in 1350 included the “land“ of Soli.²⁹

Ćorović briefly summarized the reign of ban and Tvrtko (1353-1391), giving only the most significant events, having addressed this most significant Bosnian ruler in a separate work.³⁰ The first period of Tvrtko's reign, until 1366, was heavily burdened with the loss of extensive territory, which is now precisely outlined. King Luis seized the whole part between the rivers Cetina and Neretva, as well as župas Livno and Glamoč, and larger parts of the župas Banjica (i.e. the town of Ključ with its adjacent villages) and Zemunik (i.e. the town of Greben, today Krupa). The Ban's authority was diminishing among the Bosnian nobility, rightfully unsatisfied with this course of events. The upheaval of his brother Vuk in 1366 can also be regarded as an attempt to renew the tradition of the “co-ruled principalities“. With the help of his senior, king Luis, Tvrtko regained his power, defeated the rebels and, after having confiscated their landed-property, a new “land“ was formed – that of *Podrinje*. It included the area between the river Prača, left tributary of the river Drina, and the town of Zvornik, and its name was soon incorporated into Tvrtko's ruling title.³¹

In the abovementioned year, ban Tvrtko issued a charter giving his loyal vassal, prince Vukac Hrvatinić, the whole župa of Pliva, the fact which enabled us to finally chart the correct borders of this territorial unit. It was not restricted only to the valley of the river Pliva in its upper part, but covered the area along its tributaries Sokošnica and Janj, reach-

²⁹ M. Dinić, *Za istoriju rudarstva I*, 32-33, passim; M. Blagojević, *Bosansko Završje*, 129-144; J. Mrgić, *Župe i naselja “zemlje“ Usore*, 32-33.

³⁰ V. Ćorović, *Teritorijalni razvoj*, 38-41; ib., *Die territoriale Entwicklung*, 39-43; ib., *Kralj Tvrtko I Kotromanić*, Beograd 1925.

³¹ M. Dinić, o.c., 48-49; S. Mišić, o.c., 63-64, passim; J. Mrgić, o.c., 33, 36-37.

ing the foot of the mountain Vitorog. Its neighboring župas were Uskoplje, Glamoč, Lušci and Luka, as cited in this charter.³²

After the fall of župan Nikola Altomanović in 1373, ban Tvrtko achieved major territorial expansion due southeast by taking the area around the lower course of the river Lim, together with the monastery of Mileševa, and the whole area of upper Drina. The expansion ended in 1377, when he finally took Trebinje, Konavle and Dračevica, and was crowned in the monastery of Mileševa as Stefan Tvrtko, the “King of the Serbs, Bosnia, the Littoral and of Western Parts“. Tvrtko established his authority over the territories which had for centuries been the political center of the oldest Serbian state, as well as over a significant part of the Nemanjićs' domain, whose throne was vacant. He was also a descendant of the Nemanjić Dynasty, being the grandson of Jelisaveta, daughter of King Dragutin. His title was adjusted to the ones of Czar Uroš Nemanjić and King Vukašin Mrnjavčević, and its most significant part was its first reference to the “the Serbs“, emphasizing the fact that since Tvrtko ruled over the Serbs, he had every right to take the title of the King. There were a few other innovations in the court organization and the diplomatic practice of the Bosnian Kingdom.³³

As for the southern and western parts, major success was achieved only after the death of king Luis in 1382. Tvrtko first established his authority over the lost territories and then moved onwards, acquiring towns in Croatia and Dalmatia (except the towns of Dubrovnik and Zadar). As a result, the border of the Bosnian state reached the bank of the river Zrmanja, and that was as far as it went. The main role in the campaigns and negotiations on the southern border was played by the grand duke of Bosnia Hrvoje Vukčić. His activity was the subject of our recent work, because he was at the same time the prince (“knez“) of the “land“ of Donji Kraji. A more thorough research of this particular region has showed that a “land“ could cease to exist as an administrative unit, but just like a župa, it could continue to be a geographical and historical

³² J. Mrgić-Radojčić, *Donji Kraji*, 193-198; ib., *Povelja bana Tvrtka knezu Vukcu Hrvatiniću 1366* (*The Charter of ban Tvrtko issued to prince Vukac Hrvatinić in 1366*), *Stari Srpski Arhiv* 2 (2003) 167-184.

³³ S. Čirković, “*Sugubi venac*“ (*The Doubled Crown*), *Zbornik FF u Beogradu VIII-1* (1964) 343-370; M. Blagojević, *Istorija srpske državnosti I*, 236-242.

province. Its continuous role of a border territory – *krajina*, led to the appearance of another political, administrative, historical and geographical region under the name of (Bosanska) *Krajina* (1593). But then it was meant to be the border area of the Turkish Empire towards the Habsburg monarchy, and it kept this role till 1878.³⁴

In the period after the death of king Stefan Tvrtko I, Čorović indicated just the most remarkable territorial losses of the Bosnian state. This can be supplemented with a few newly established facts. In 1412 in the “land“ of Usora *Banat of Usora*, under the rule of the Hungarian Kingdom was again established. Then, in 1433 despot Đurađ Branković established his power over the area on the left bank of the river Drina, from the town of Srebrnica to the river Sava, including the towns of Zvornik and Teočak. Thus he took the title of “lord of the whole of Usora“, even though he acquired only a small part of it.³⁵

The historical province of *Hercegovina*, the second most important part of the Bosnian state, was demarcated in the work of M. Dinić *The lands of the Duke of St. Sava* (1940). It has the same scientific significance as Čorović’s work on Bosnia. Due to the further thorough and extensive research work of S. Ćirković (1964) and S. Mišić (1996, 2002), the activity of Stefan Vukčić-Kosača was more precisely established. In 1448 he took the title of “herceg (duke) of Hum and the Littoral“, then briefly after that the title of “herceg of St. Sava, Hum and the Littoral“. His rule, between 1435 and 1466, stretched over a huge territory between the river Cetina and the Gulf of Boka Kotorska, and in the hinterland it almost reached up to the town of Višegrad on the river Drina. The name Hercegovina thus denoted the whole territory ruled by the Herceg. The establishing of the Turkish administrative unit – the “sandžak“ of Hercegovina (1470), also helped preserve this name. The present day region of Hercegovina is substantially smaller than it was in the Middle Ages.³⁶

³⁴ S. Ćirković, *Istorija*, 133-165; J. Mrgić-Radojčić, o.c., 71-108, 131-132.

³⁵ V. Čorović, *Teritorijalni razvoj*, 41-43; ib., *Die territoriale Entwicklung*, 43-45; ib., *Historija Bosne*, 339-560; M. Dinić, o.c., 33, 74; J. Mrgić, *Župe i naselja “zemlje“ Usore*, 37-38.

³⁶ M. Dinić, *Zemlje hercega Svetog Sava (Territories of Duke of St. Sava)*, in: *Srpske zemlje u srednjem veku*, Beograd 1978, 178-269; S. Ćirković, *Stefan Vukčić-Kosača*, Beograd 1964; S. Mišić, *Humaska zemlja*, 88-109; M. Blagojević, *Istorija srpske*

Until the end of the first half of the 15th century, in addition to the territory of Herceg Stefan Vukčić, two other regions grew into independent territories – the “land of Pavlovići” and the “the land of Kovačevići”, named after the noble families which ruled them. The first one, with center in the town of Dobrun, had its eastern border on the river Drina, including the towns of Ustikolina and Višegrad, as well as the town of Olovo on the river Krivaja. Up north was the “land of Kovačević”, placed between the town of Srebrenica and Zvornik. All of the abovementioned territories, together with the “land of the King” (“*contrata del re*”), were in 1463/70 included in the Turkish administrative unit – the Bosnian “sandžak”.³⁷ Our knowledge would be certainly improved if the Turkish land registries of that time (*defters*) were published.

In the last chapter of his article, Čorović summarized his thoughts on medieval Bosnia. He insisted that this state had no national features and was made as “a pure geographical unit”, a sort of “a bond” between the Serbian and Croatian nations.³⁸ It was an expression of a personal (pro-Yugoslav) belief, a reflection of his time. Since then, however, science has greatly developed and many new improvements have been made in the historical geography of the Bosnian state.

The most important ones are the establishing of an adequate terminology concerning the territorial government (*župa*, “land”, “co-ruled principality”); officials of the local and central administration (*župan*, *knez*, *vojvoda*, *kaznac*, *tepčija*, *čelnik*, and after the coronation – *protovestijar* and *logotet*); and legal practice (titles, witnesses, *pristav*, *ručnik*, *milost*, *gospodin*).³⁹ In addition to the expansion of the Hungarian

državnosti I, 291-296, S. Mišić, *Kosače – gospoda humska (Kosače – Lords of Hum)*, Kosače – osnivači Hercegovine, Bileća-Gacko-Beograd 2002, 342-350.

³⁷ M. Dinić, *Za istoriju rudarstva I*, 41-43; S. Ćirković, *Rusaška gospoda*, IČ XXI (1974) 5-17; H. Šabanović, *Bosanski pašaluk*, Sarajevo 1982, 38-40, 116-117, *passim*; M. Blagojević, *Župa Moravica i zemlja Moravice*, 19-20; *ib.*, *Državnost zemlje Pavlovića (Statehood of the Land of Pavlović)*, in: *Zemlja Pavlovića – Srednji vijek i period turske vladavine*, Banja Luka – Srpsko Sarajevo 2003, 113-144.

³⁸ V. Čorović, *Teritorijalni razvoj*, 20, 43-47; *ib.*, *Die territoriale Entwicklung*, 20, 45-49.

³⁹ M. Blagojević, *Državna uprava u srpskim srednjovekovnim zemljama*, Beograd 1997, and see here under n. 9, 22, 24; see also: P. Anđelić, *Studije o teritorijalnoj organizaciji srednjovekovne Bosne (Studies on Territorial Organization of the Medieval Bosnia)*, Sarajevo 1982 – he took Turkish and modern administrative organization as corresponding to the medieval one, which is usually not the case, i.e. a *župa* did not necessarily match the 'nahija' or an 'opština'.

kingdom, the role of the Bosnian nobility, gathered in the “stanak“- the state assembly, proven to be of decisive importance.⁴⁰ Bosnia was a typical feudal state, with the usual shifts of power between the ruler and the nobility, who were mutually bonded with “vera gospodska“ (fides) and “verna služba“ (servitium).⁴¹ It was not highly centralized and integrated – Bosnian “lands“, except for Bosnia itself, were frequently more or less independent from the central government, as shown by the titles of Bosnian rulers. Most of the Bosnian “lands“ have been located correctly and some of them have been the subject of detailed research work. Urban, economic and cultural history was also addressed in extensive scientific investigations, with increased use of Turkish sources. One of the outcomes of the major scientific progress are the new historical maps of the medieval Bosnian state and its “lands“. (cf. the map attached to this article).⁴²

In the end, a reconsideration of the study of Vladimir Ćorović allows for a firm conclusion that most of his scientific results remain unchallenged to this day, which proves that he is undoubtedly one of the greatest Serbian historiographers ever.

⁴⁰ M. Dinić, *Državni sabor srenjovekovne Bosne*, Beograd 1955.

⁴¹ A. Babić, *O odnosima vazaliteta u srednjovjekovnoj Bosni (On Vassal Relationships in Medieval Bosnia)*, GID BiH 6 (1954) 29-44; ib., *Iz istorije srednjovekovne Bosne (From the History of Medieval Bosnia)*, Sarajevo 1972; S. Ćirković, “Verna služba“ i “vjera gospodska“, *Zbornik FF u Beogradu VI-2* (1962) 96-11.

⁴² Here we give only an extract from the bibliography: M. Vego, *Naselja srednjovekovne bosanske države (Settlements of the Medieval Bosnian State)*, Sarajevo 1957; D. Kovačević, *Trgovina u srednjovjekovnoj Bosni (Commerce in Medieval Bosnia)*, Sarajevo 1961; D. Kovačević-Kojić, *Gradska naselja srednjovekovne bosanske države*, Sarajevo 1978; ib., *Privredni razvoj srednjovekovne bosanske države (Economic Development of the Medieval Bosnian State)*, in: *Prilozi za istoriju BiH 1*, Sarajevo 1987, 89-190; S. Ćirković, *Bosanska crkva u bosanskoj državi (Bosnian Church in Bosnian State)*, in: o.c., 191-254; ib. *Rabotnici, vojnici, duhovnici*, Beograd 1997; on the use of the Turkish sources: A. Handžić, *O formiranju nekih gradskih naselja u Bosni u XVI vijeku (On Emergence of some town settlements in Bosnia in 16th century)*, *POF 25* (1975) 133-167; ib., *Tuzla i njena okolina u XVI vijeku (Town of Tuzla and Its Surrounding Area in the 16th century)*, Sarajevo 1975; ib., *Rudnici u Bosni od druge polovine XV do početka XVII vijeka (Mines in Bosnia from the 2nd half of the 15th till the Beginning of the 17th century)*, *Prilozi za istoriju BiH 2*, Sarajevo 1989, 7-38; *Istorijski atlas (Historical Atlas)*, ed. in chief M. Blagojević, Beograd 2002³.

Јелена Мргић-Радојчић

**Разматрање територијалног развоја
средњовековне босанске државе**

Текст је посвећен поновном сагледавању Ћоровићеве студије “Територијални развој босанске државе у средњем веку“ (1935), с намером да се укаже почаст једном од највећих српских историчара, али и да се прикажу нови резултати на овом пољу научног истраживања. Кроз текст се сукцесивно указује на Ћоровићеве резултате и на њихову валидност у односу на достигнућа модерне историографије. Он је био први историограф који је посветио посебно дело историјско-географској проблематици средњовековне босанске државе и на тај начин је положио темеље будућим истраживањима. Показало да су његова размишљања о најстаријем језгру средњовековне босанске државе – жупи Врхбосни и »старој Босни« била савсим исправна, потом, да је правило уочио полунезавистан положај различитих делова босанске државе, за које је однедавно утврђена прецизна термилошка одредница – »земља«. Управо су највећа достигнућа модерне историјске науке постигнута на пољу проучавања државне и територијалне управе, захваљујући томе што је извршена прецизна термилошка идентификација. Утврђено је постојање “удеоних кнежевина“ у босанској средњовековној држави, затим, осветљена је делатност бројних службеника локалне и централне управе (жупани, кнезови, војводе, челници, тепчије, казнаци) и правна регулатива. У модерној науци познат је постанак и развој и других историјских провинција: Усоре, Соли, Подриња, Крајине, Хумске земље (Херцеговине). Такође су неке од заблуда, као што је она о величини и просторном положају Завршја, успешно отклоњене. Развитак и структура феудалног друштва средњовековне Босне, културна и верска историја – ове теме су добиле свој савремени приказ у историографији, а живот и делатност најистакнутијих босанских великаша су такође били предмет темељних истраживања. На основу свих гореописаних резултата, могуће је прилично тачно и детаљно реконструисати процес настанка и територијалног развоја средњовековне босанске државе и прецизније повући линије њених

граница кроз историју. Нови резултати приказани су и графички, на картама *Историјског атласа* (1997), у чијој изради је учествовало мноштво савремених српских историографа. Поновно ишчитавање Ђоровићеве студије показало је да је, чак и у светлу нових научних достигнућа, већина његових резултата и данас валидна, што овог аутора с правом сврстава у ред највећих српских историографа.