

SOFIA UNIVERSITY "ST. KLEMENT OF OHRID"

FACULTY OF HISTORY

DEPARTMENT OF "HISTORY OF BULGARIA"

Ekaterina Krasimirova Angelova

Abstract of the dissertation for awarding the educational and scientific degree
"doctor"

on the subject:

The church policy of Bulgaria between the union of King Kaloyan and the
restoration of the Bulgarian Patriarchate (1204-1235)

Scientific Supervisor:

Associate Professor: Angel Nikolov

SOFIA

2024

I. General characteristics of the dissertation work:

The purpose of this scientific work is to examine the ecclesiastical policy of the Bulgarian kingdom in the period 1204-1235 and to emphasize the significant place of the Bulgarian state in the world of inter-church relations and contacts, as well as in the field of diplomacy between the East and the West in South-Eastern Europe and The Balkans.

The exhibition draws attention to the complex interaction between church and politics in Bulgaria at the beginning of the 13th century. The suppression of the Bulgarian language and culture under Byzantine political domination for years led to the decline of the old Bulgarian literary culture, the Bulgarian population and the almost disappearance of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, which from 927 onwards had the status of a patriarchate. However, during Byzantine rule at grassroots level, the church remained a central component of Bulgarian identity and cultural distinctiveness.

The second Bulgarian kingdom was strongly influenced by the Byzantine system of government, and the rulers of Turnovo aimed to make their new capital a religious center of the Orthodox world. In this sense, Tsar Kaloyan's promise to accept papal sovereignty over the Bulgarian Church in exchange for his demands further complicated the relationship between religion and politics in Bulgaria. Along with the complicated political situation in the course of the preparation and conduct of the Fourth Crusade and the rise of heretical movements undermined the authority of the Papacy and caused the need for deep church reforms and for the systematic intervention of the Roman Curia in church life and even in current politics throughout Europe. catholic world.

Church-state relations in Bulgaria during the period 1204-1235 were marked by significant political and religious changes. The beginning of this period begins with the reign of King Kaloyan and the union he concluded with Rome, as well as with the capture of Constantinople in 1204 by the troops of the Fourth Crusade, which led to the temporary collapse of Byzantium, and its end coincides with the restoration of the patriarchate in Bulgaria in 1235.

The aim of the present work is to examine church-state relations in Bulgaria with an emphasis on the policies carried out by the Bulgarian Church. To achieve this, the dissertation will examine the political and religious context of the period, analyze the interaction between

church and state, and examine the key policies that were implemented. In this way, the scientific research aims to contribute to a better understanding of the historical development of church-state relations in Bulgaria.

The dissertation covers a too short for history period of three decades. But these are years of complex and dynamic processes, both in military and political terms, not only for Bulgaria, but also for the entire European Southeast. The takeover of the hitherto powerful Byzantine Empire by the Latin Knights had its impact on the restored Bulgarian kingdom. In the dissertation, the ecclesiastical policy of the first kings of the Assen dynasty - Theodore - Peter (1185 - 1190; 1196 - 1197), John Assen I (1190 - 1196), Kaloyan (1197 - 1207), Boril (1207 - 1218) is followed in sequence. and John Assen II (1218 – 1241) with the Roman Church, with the Latin Empire, with Hungary, with the Ohrid Archbishopric and with Nicaea. The issue of how to reach the union concluded by King Kaloyan in 1204, as well as that of its termination in 1232 under King John Assen II. The starting point of the research will be the problem of whether there was an attempt to bond between the Bulgarian and Roman Churches before the union of Tsar Kaloyan (1197-1207) from 1204, by looking at the contacts between Prince Boris I- Michael (852-889; †907) with the Roman high priest Pope Nicholas I (858-867).

Bulgaria's relations with Rome are a fundamental and important part of our political history. Their study occupies a significant place in the historical scientific literature. Contributions in this field have a number of our and foreign researchers, both in the past and now. Thanks to them, generalizing and specifically historical studies of different countries of Bulgaria's relations with the West and more specifically with the Roman Church during the Middle Ages were made. One of the tasks of the present text will be to try to add new data and interpretations to the existing scientific literature on the studied issue.

The main task of the work was the collection and processing of the existing and accessible source material, research of the publications related to the topic and interpretation of the collected data, making an attempt to trace the development of Bulgaria's relations with Rome, to discover political and religious - ecclesiastical and ideological motives that determine the nature of these relationships. The disclosure of these relationships showed the importance of Bulgarian foreign policy, its development and implementation in relation to the Roman Church and other neighboring countries. To achieve these goals and tasks, the main scientific method of work is used - historical research and analysis. There is no event in the entire

medieval Bulgarian history, such as the accession of Bulgaria to the bosom of the Western Church in 1204 by Tsar Kaloyan, which has been so often the object of attention in Bulgarian and foreign media studies. The significant contributions in research and the unceasing interest in this important episode of the Bulgarian medieval history, is not only its importance, but also the good source base. In this regard, the relevance of the chosen topic, despite numerous studies on it, is undisputed.

The sources are mostly written and are divided into domestic and foreign by language. The domestic ones are in Old Bulgarian, and the foreign ones are in Latin, Greek, and Old French. Some domestic sources are in Latin - such are the letters and the goldsmith of Tsar Kaloyan, the letter of Prince Belota, the letters of Archbishop Basil, which are preserved in the repeatedly published correspondence between Tsar Kaloyan (1197-1207) Pope Innocent III (1198-1216), the last critical edition of which, begun in 1964 by the Austrian Cultural (later Historical) Institute in Rome, is difficult to access and has not yet been completed. Not all of Kaloyan's letters to the pope have survived to this day, but parts of them are preserved in the *Gesta Innocentii III papae* ("Acts of Pope Innocent III"). The correspondence of King John Assen II (1218-1241) with Pope Gregory IX (1227-1241), about which we know from the correspondence of Pope Gregory IX (1227-1241), since they are also not preserved, are also one of the important sources for the ecclesiastical policy of Bulgaria during the researched period. The historical accounts of the Council of Tarnovo called by Tsar Boril against the Bogomils, which took place in 1211 and the Account of the Restoration of the Bulgarian Patriarchate in 1235, included in the Boril Synod refer to domestic sources written in the Old Bulgarian language. According to authorship, sources are divided into official and unofficial. In terms of their type, official documents are letters, letters, historical and hagiographic works.

Of the foreign sources, the Byzantine historical works from the end of the 12th and the beginning of the 13th centuries are important, since their authors were contemporaries of the events, and in some cases, direct participants in them. Such are the works of Nikitas Choniates, George Akropolites, Nicephorus Grigoras, Theodore Scutariot and the Morean Chronicle (*To χροικον του Μορέως*), which is known in four versions: French, Greek, Aragonese and Italian. The historical period covered by the chronicle is 1204-1292 or later depending on the version. The Latin sources for the period under consideration are richer than

the Byzantine ones, since they include sources of a documentary nature. These are papal and sovereign letters, charters, contracts, historical works and chronicles. The Act Material, which was examined, consists of some letters of Byzantine emperors, attention was also paid to the Hungarian letters from the XIII century. The letters of Honorius III (1216 – 1227) and Gregory IX (1227 – 1241) are also an important source.

The earliest source for the relations between Tarnovo and Rome from the end of the 12th and the beginning of the 13th century is the widely known Correspondence of Pope Innocent III with the Bulgarians, as many of the letters in it are of domestic origin. Other sources in Latin include the historical chronicles of Geoffrey de Villardouin, Robert de Clary, Henri de Villanciennes, the monk Alberich, and the rhyming chronicle of Philip Muskes. The historical work of Marino Sanuto Torcello, as well as the Venetian Dispatches of 1228, can also be cited as an important source. The relations between Tarnovo and Rome from the end of the 12th and the beginning of the 13th centuries were dealt with by a number of foreign mediavists, the most prominent representatives being from the French, Russian and Byzantological schools. Charles de Fren Seigneur Ducange - his work is a valuable source for Bulgarian history and he pays special attention to Kaloyan. In his history, it is noted that the Bulgarian ruler sought the patronage of Rome, to which he subordinated his kingdom, and Kaloyan was called a "usurper" by the author. Attention is also given to the letters sent between Rome and Bulgaria and to the coronation of the Bulgarian ruler. Blasius Kleiner, Fyodor Ivanovich Ouspensky, Konstantin Irechek, John Fine, - make a brief overview of the church policy of the Bulgarian state during the considered period, paying more attention to the overall history of the kingdom. Their works rely on multiple sources available at the time, which have been critically and thoroughly examined. They pay due attention to the union of King Kaloyan and his relations with Rome, the Council of King Boril against the heretics and the restoration by John Assen II of the Bulgarian Patriarchate. Byzantinist Vasily Grigorevich Vasilevsky paid special attention to the restoration of the Bulgarian patriarchate by John Assen II, as his work is considered with great authority and scientific value. Ernst Gerland, Robert Lee Wolff, Florin Kurta, Yves Congar, and Michael Angold should also be mentioned for their works, as they all deal with church history, the East-West schism, and contribute to the study of the medieval past of Eastern Europe. Yves Kongar believes that initially Kaloyan's subordination to the Pope was only nominal, and later it completely disappeared, since the Bulgarian ruler opposed even the first attempts at papal intervention in the

management of the Bulgarian state and church, as Innocent III tried to exercise the role of an arbitrator between Bulgaria and neighboring countries. The contacts between Bulgaria and the Roman Catholic Church are also dealt with by Kenneth Seaton, Joseph Gill, Walter Ullman, Alessandro Magjarou, who believe that the union is a political union. Walter Ullmann, in his work, outlines the development of the papacy as an institution during the Middle Ages. It traces the course of papal history from the late Roman Empire to its eventual decline in the Renaissance. The focus of his study is on the institution and idea of the papacy rather than individual figures, recognizing the shaping power of the roles of popes that make them exceptional individuals. The Romanian historian Alexandru Madjaru, in his work on the Asenevtsi, summarizes the rule of the mentioned dynasty, referring to a large part of research by Bulgarian media scientists. According to him, as is generally accepted, the initiative to start the long talks between Tarnovo and Rome should be attributed to Pope Innocent III. Interesting and detailed study of the ecclesiastical politics of Bulgaria in the period (1204-1232) is made by the observations of Francesco Dal Allo, Jord Avery, Boris Florya, Gerhard Podkalski, Marshall Baldwin, Francesco Massetti, Paul Engel, Jonathan Shepherd, Ivana Komatina, Elena Belyakova, Momir Jovic, Gunter Prinzig, and Philip van Tricht. It is interesting the opinion of Gerhard Podskalski that the union of Kaloyan does not have so little importance in Bulgaria, as noted in most studies. Francesco Massetti mentions, in his work, that a change was noticed in the anointing, which is witnessed in a letter of the Pope to Basil dated February 25, 1204. In the letter, the Pope advises the archbishop when consecrating high priests that they be anointed. This practice, as noted by other researchers until then, was not present in the Bulgarian church, since "it was not customary to anoint the high priests when they visited". The part of the body on which the anointing is practiced acquires special significance, since, unlike the biblical model, the anointing of the head is reserved by the Church only for bishops, while rulers are anointed in the humerus. Also, the anointing of bishops is done with chrism, while kings are anointed with the oil of catechumens. Thus, in the twelfth century, the church tried to limit the significance of royal anointing by excluding it from the number of sacraments set at seven. Innocent III, in the letter written to the bishop of Tarnovo dated February 1204, explicitly insists on the superiority of the anointing of the head with chrism, reserved for bishops, compared to the royal anointing of the hand with the oil of the catechumens, so the Pope wishes to emphasize the supremacy of episcopal power over the power of rulers. Among the representatives of Bulgarian historical science who pay attention to the issue - the place of the Roman Catholic Church in the foreign policy of

Bulgaria during the time of Asenevtsi, the names of Paisiy Hilendarski, Sabi Stoykov Popovich, known as Georgi Rakovski, Dobri Voinikov, who do overview of the entire Bulgarian Middle Ages, but they also pay attention to the union of King Kaloyan. In their research, it is characteristic that they mix the history of the Bulgarian Church with political history. They emphasize the patriotic and the benefit of history for understanding how important it is to know the glorious Bulgarian past and to glorify it. In his preface, Dobri Voinikov himself notes that for the compilation of the History, he followed the well-known "Tsarstvenik" or "Slavic Bulgarian History" by Paisii Hilendarski. The influence of Paisius on Voinikov's work can be seen even in the preface of "A Short Bulgarian History". The last "Fourth Period" of Voynnikova's "Brief Bulgarian History" begins with the uprising of Assen and Peter until the fall of the Second Bulgarian Kingdom under the Turkish yoke. The rule of Assen I, the expulsion of the Byzantines, and the final restoration of the Bulgarian state are considered independently. With a brilliant mastery of expressive means, Voynikov describes the Kaloyan kings and his alliance with Rome, Boril as a bad ruler, in contrast to John Assen II, who is strong, wise and confident. The authors listed above aim to raise the national consciousness and spirit of the readers. Spiridon Palauzov and Marin Drinov contributed to the problem under consideration, the latter dealing with the history of the Bulgarian church in connection with the settlement of the Bulgarian-Greek church dispute. Dimitar Tsuhlev is the author of the first independent study of the history of the Bulgarian Church and the spread of Christianity in Bulgaria. Vasil Zlatarski has made a huge contribution to Bulgarian media studies, as he makes a critical analysis of already published sources and examines in detail the ecclesiastical contacts of Asenevtsi with Rome. Petar Mutafchiev's name should also be mentioned, as his research is of high value even today. Important studies on the history of the Bulgarian Church in the period under consideration are also carried out by Petar Nikov, Ivan Duichev and Petar Petrov, academician Ivan Duichev made significant contributions, as he used a series of sources for Bulgarian medieval history. Petar Petrov also makes detailed analyzes of the ecclesiastical policy of King Kaloyan, and his work on ecclesiastical life in Macedonia is particularly important. Petar Nikov also left remarkable works on the history of the Bulgarian Church from the time of Asenevtsi. He refers, in his studies, to a huge volume of sources, some of which Hungarian letters. His role in Bulgarian media studies is huge. The name of Academician Ivan Snegarov should also be mentioned, as he deals with the ecclesiastical politics of Bulgaria, and his contribution with his "History of the Ohrid Archdiocese" is of great importance. He also has a study on the life of Patriarch Joakim I

Turnovski. Borislav Primov, Genoveva Tsankova - Petkova, Ani Dancheva - Vasileva deal with Bulgaria's relations with the Latin Empire, examining in detail the papacy's contacts with the Kingdom of Tarnovo. The scientific works of Vasil Gyuzelev and Ivan Bozhilov, who research not only the general history of medieval Bulgaria, but also the church and culture of the Second Bulgarian Kingdom, are of indisputable great scientific value for Bulgarian medieval history. Their names and researches have an indisputable authority in world media studies. Bistra Nikolova, who is the author of four monographs related to the history of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, should also be mentioned. Angel Nikolov and Tsvetana Cholova examine the question of the Union and whether it has an impact on church life in Bulgaria. Tsvetana Cholova shares the thesis that the union probably has an influence on the Bulgarian church as well. Yordan Nikolov, Yordan Andreev, Petar Angelov (who examines Kaloyan's contacts with Rome in detail), Miliyana Kaimakamova, Georgi Nikolov, Ilia Iliev, Hristo Dimitrov, Iva Indjova, Elena Kostova, Yavor Mitov and Kristiyan Kovachev make important studies concerning the period under consideration and problematic. Ana-Maria Totomanova, Elka Mircheva and Georgi Minchev have made a huge contribution, with their research dedicated to the Boril synod. The names of Dimitar Angelov, Ivan Lazarov, Kiril Petkov and Pavel Stefanov should also be mentioned, the studies of the last two making an impression, as they perceived the union of Tsar Kaloyan not so much as a formal political act, and that according to them the ritual system of the Bulgarian Church undergoes some changes. Angel Nikolov also believes that the importance of the union should not be underestimated.

The studies of the above-mentioned historians, as well as of others noted in the study itself, make a significant contribution to the examination of the relations between the Eastern and Western Churches, and undoubtedly the largest number of studies on the issue under consideration is due to Bulgarian historians.

I. Structure of the dissertation:

Chapter One: ECCLESIASTICAL POLICY OF KING KALOYAN: THE UNION OF BULGARIA WITH THE ROMAN CHURCH

First paragraph: Relations between Tarnovo and Rome between December 1199 and November 1204. - Tells about Bulgaria's contacts with the Roman Catholic Church in the specified period. Correspondence between Rome and Bulgaria is examined in detail. It

contains 27 letters, 16 of which are letters of the Pope addressed to: Tsar Kaloyan – 8 letters, to Archbishop Basil – 6 letters, to Belota – 1 letter and Anastasius, Metropolitan of Velbuzhd – 1 letter. The Bulgarians sent 11 letters to the Pope, 5 of which were from Tsar Kaloyan, 4 from Archbishop Basil, as letter number 8 consists of 2 parts, or rather 2 letters joined in one in the registers, to Kaloyan and to Basil, one is of Belota and one was written by a group of Bulgarian metropolitans and bishops. There are also three other letters which have been lost or not entered in the registers. The Bulgarian letters that were sent to Rome were in Latin, and only the first letter of Tsar Kaloyan was written in Bulgarian, then it was translated into Greek and finally into Latin. The beginning of the correspondence itself is presented in detail. From the first letter of Innocent III, his main goal is evident, namely the expansion of the influence of the Roman Church. The letter was sent between December 1199 and February 22, 1200 and was addressed to the "Nobili viro Johannitio" (Nobili viro Johannitio), thus the Pope deftly avoided committing himself to the recognition of a higher title of the Bulgarian statesman. It was sent to Dominic "archipresbyterum Grecorum" the archpresbyter of the Greeks of Brindisi. In this letter, the Pope mentions Joanica's military victories, which were facilitated by her loyalty to the Roman Catholic Church: "The Lord saw the humility and devotion which we knew you felt towards the Church of Rome, which not only strongly defended you in the turmoil and dangers of wars, but by miraculous and have graciously helped your kingdom to expand." This suggests that Kaloyan had been favorably disposed to the Church of Rome for some time. What this meant in practice remains unknown, but there was no conversion to Catholicism prior to the Archbishop of Tarn's declaration of union with the Church of Rome in September 1203. Although in reply to the Pope's first letter, Kaloyan wrote that he wished to enter into a relationship with the pope as early as 1197, the initiative to start the long talks between Tarnovo and Rome must be attributed to Pope Innocent III. This initiative harmonized with his policy of joining the South Slavic states to Rome through a union, and then the Slavic states opposed the hegemonic claims of the Patriarchate of Constantinople during a period of deep crisis in the Byzantine Empire. Later, with the letters of February 25, 1204, Pope Innocent III crowned Kaloyan as king of Bulgarians and Vlachs, and made the archbishop of Tarnovo the primate of all Bulgaria and Wallachia, sending him a privilege, and in the letter it was made clear that " primate and patriarch, although their names are different, mean almost the same thing, because primates and patriarchs are the same in rank", and then only the content of the letters remains to be turned into a legal act. Among the privileges of the Bishop of Tarnów in his capacity as Primate are his right to confirm the

church elections of He can also consecrate the holy myrrh in his territory and he has the right to carry the cross before him during a procession, and as he is of the Oriental Rite he has the right to bear a sceptre. The archbishop of Tarnovo received from Innokenty II archiepiscopal vestments and accoutrements, which correspond to his position in the hierarchy of the Catholic Church and are necessary for the proper celebration of the liturgy in the main cathedral of his diocese: "He sent a vestry to the patriarch of the Bulgarians, as well as a tunic of white velvet, beautifully embroidered with gold, and a large ring with five topazes, which he had for his own use, a miter embroidered with gold, a shirt, an amis, a stole, a chinkture, shoes, sandals, gloves, and other ornaments befitting a patriarch. These accessories suggest that it is possible that the union had a canonical and ritual character for a certain period and that the question of its formality should be reconsidered. There are those who believe that initially Kaloyan's subordination to the Pope was only nominal, and later completely disappeared, since the Bulgarian ruler opposed even the first attempts at papal intervention in the management of the Bulgarian state and church, since Innocent III tried to exercise the role of arbitrator between Bulgaria and neighboring countries. However, this hypothesis does not seem particularly true in view of the documentary evidence (mentioned in the text) proving the exact opposite, and it should be revised. On the question of whether the union has a dogmatic and ritualistic character or is only formal, the union must be seen as a political act strongly desired by Kaloyan in order to obtain the international recognition so sought by the Roman Church. A change is noticeable in the anointing, which is witnessed in a letter of the Pope to Basil dated February 25, 1204. In the letter, the Pope advises the archbishop when consecrating high priests that they be anointed. This practice was not present in the Bulgarian church until then, since "there was no custom to anoint the high priests when they visited.

The second paragraph - **Bulgaria, the Papacy and the Latin Empire between 1204 - 1207** - begins with a presentation of the Fourth Crusade, which is characterized by the fact that not religious, but political goals come to the fore. The main goal of the knights was the conquest of Constantinople, an eternal enemy of the West since the First Crusade. Throughout the 12th century, Rome's relations with the Orthodox East and the Byzantine Empire were ambivalent, characterized by alternating theological attacks and negotiations aimed at the mutual benefit of both parties. The clashes between the passing crusader knights and the population of the Balkans, the destruction of Orthodox sanctuaries by Westerners and their haughty behavior brought hatred between Catholics and Orthodox. When announcing the Second Crusade, Pope

Eugene III (1145 – 1153) set as a second goal the imposition of the supremacy of the Roman Church over Constantinople, and this was a continuation of the plan set by Gregory VII (1073 – 1085), namely his idea of world domination of the Pope. At the time of Innocent III, this idea became possible. He excelled his predecessors in the practical exercise of the political power of the papacy. As a statesman, he left Gregory VII far behind him, but he did not enjoy his glory at all. Innocent III brought his policy as close as possible to the realization of Gregory VII's idea of a universal theocracy - the rule of God. The very first bull of Pope Innocent III of 1198 called for a new campaign. Sources are examined, and in the paragraph the information about the desire of the Bulgarian king Kaloyan to establish peaceful contacts with the Latin Empire is given by the history of Nikitas Choniates and the deeds of Pope Innocent III. Nikita Choniates notes that the peace proposal made of Caloyan, the Latins reply with contempt: "John suspected the arrogance of the Latins, and feared their spear as a fiery sword, for when he had also sent ambassadors of friendship, he was answered in his letters to treat them not as a king with friends, but as a servant with masters. Otherwise they would take up arms against him and easily devastate Mysia, which he ruled not by right, but as a breakaway from the Romans, and restore him to his former position". It is also clear from the works of Pope Innocent III that the Bulgarian ruler sent letters to the Latins with objections and proposals for peace, which were also rejected. Even when the rulership of King Kaloyan was officially recognized by the head of the Roman Church in November 1204, the Latins rejected peace proposals, announcing "that there will be no peace with him unless he returns the land belonging to the Empire of Constantinople, in which he had invaded with violence". To this, the Bulgarian autocrat replied "that he owned this land more justly than they did Constantinople". All these attempts of Kaloyan to establish peaceful relations with the Latin Empire ended in failure, as the reason for this can be stated both the ambitions of the Bulgarian ruler to regain Thrace and Macedonia - lands with a significantly predominant Bulgarian population, and the desire of the Latin Empire as well to rule as the successor of Byzantium these areas. And the joining of these territories to Bulgaria, as already stated, was one of the main goals of the Asenevtsi, and the third brother Kaloyan continued this trend. In this case, it can be said that the already concluded union was not decisive, since the strained relations between Bulgaria and the Western knights did not improve. Correspondence between Bulgaria, Rome and the Latin Empire is also noted in detail in the paragraph, and ecclesiastical policy is examined in detail. It is stated that the Union has a certain positive impact on Bulgaria's relations with the newly formed Latin Empire. The Pope did not succeed

in preventing the hostile actions of the crusaders against Tarnovo, but he did not prevent Kaloyan from defeating their armed forces. Through a letter to a French clergyman, the Pope urged the French King Philip II Augustus (1180 - 1223) "to come to the aid of the king of kings, especially him in this most critical situation, we command and order by an apostolic letter to your brotherhood, appearing in person before the same king, to explain to him faithfully all the above written and intelligently and to urge him to lay down wisely and powerfully to help the Holy Land".

As a conclusion, it is said that in 1205 - 1207 papal diplomacy tried to achieve peace between the Latin Empire and Bulgaria, with Rome inciting some western rulers to help the Latins in their fight against Bulgaria. In this way, the concluded union loses its political significance, although formally it continues to exist. This statement could be disputed, since the heirs to the Kaloyan throne also benefited from the contract concluded in 1204. union.

Regardless of the concluded union with the Roman Church, the Bulgarian Kingdom acted against the Latin Empire. In the Bulgarian and Slavic historical tradition (XIII-XVI centuries), this fact is assessed in a very categorical way: "In the year 6712 (=1204) Constantinople was captured by the Latins, because Tsar Theodore Laskar was either not there or could not give them opposed. But then the Orthodox Church had a defender - the Bulgarian king... The Greek kingdom was split in two: Theodore Laskar ruled in all of Thessaly, Illyria and Thessaloniki; throughout Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia and Asia, the God-fearing Kaloyan Vatsi ruled." In the Bulgarian position towards this great change in the status quo of the European Southeast in the period 1204-1207, there was a lack of constancy in dimensions and goals. Initially, Tsar Kaloyan, led by his intention to annex the Bulgarian kingdom through union with the Roman Church, he was ready for the "partition of Romania", i.e. on the territory of the collapsed Byzantine Empire, with the Crusaders. After their refusal, although he had already concluded a union with the Catholic Church, he acted not only as a defender of Orthodoxy and of Bulgarians and Greeks against Latin arrogance, but also with the intention of becoming the ruler of the Bulgarian-Greek kingdom. When, already in the spring of 1205, the newly created Latin Empire was threatened with destruction, the Bulgarian-Greek union fell apart. The separatist behavior of the Roman aristocracy forced the Bulgarian king to fight against both the Latins and the Greeks, who united against him. As a conclusion, it can be

said that during Kaloyan's rule, the Bulgarian kingdom revived its power and became a dominant factor on the Balkan Peninsula.

In addition, as it has already become clear, the main goal of Kaloyan is to obtain recognition of his title and an independent church, for which he also needs the union with the Roman Church. After the Bulgarian ruler gets what he so desired, he no longer has any real benefit from the concluded union, but it continues to be a leading factor in Bulgaria's politics.

At the end of the paragraph, some archaeological evidence is briefly mentioned about Bulgaria's contacts with the Latin Empire and the Roman Church in the first half of the 13th century.

CHAPTER TWO: ECCLESIASTICAL POLICY OF THE BULGARIAN KINGDOM UNDER THE SUCCESSORS OF KING KALOYAN UNTIL THE TERMINATION OF THE UNION WITH THE ROMAN CHURCH.

The first paragraph - Bulgaria, Nicaea, the Latin Empire and the West during the reign of Tsar Boril (1207 - 1218) - the accession to the throne of Tsar Boril and his ecclesiastical policy towards the countries mentioned in the title of the paragraph are examined. Information is given about the persecutions against the Bogomils in the Bulgarian state. Attention is also paid to the states of despot Alexius Slav and Sebastocrator Strez.

As a conclusion, it is stated that the Belgrade and Braničevo regions were seized by Hungary, and the lands around Nis by the Serbs. At the beginning of his reign, Boril tried to follow Kaloyan's political agenda, but his actions did not have the same results. This is because Boril inherited the throne, when Bulgaria no longer had the military potential that it had under Kaloyan, separatism began to increase more and more, and the kingdom began to disintegrate. The Bulgarian ruler, after seeing that he had no military potential, began to pursue a policy of cooperation with Hungary and the Latin Empire, which is also indicated by the kinship of the three in 1213. It can be argued that the new Bulgarian king Boril politically after 1213 achieves what Pope Innocent III appealed to King Kaloyan, namely, cooperation and peace with Hungary and the Latin Empire. Before that, however, on his accession to the throne, Boril continued the war with the Latin Empire.

In 1215-1217, the papal curia started a new initiative for another crusade. As the inspiration of this idea is Pope Innocent III. The peak of his politics can be said to be the Fourth Lateran Ecumenical Council from November 11 to 30, 1215. At this council, Innocent III was recognized as the head of the ordained Latin patriarchs of the East - Constantinople, Jerusalem and Antioch. All the bishops and abbots of the church, as well as prelates and even (what was new) heads of churches and religious orders - namely Cistercians, Premonstrians, Hospitallers and Templars - and kings and civil authorities throughout Europe were invited. The bishops are asked to propose topics for discussion at the council, something that does not seem to have happened at previous Lateran councils. This was done by the legates who were sent throughout Europe to preach the crusade. In each province only one or two bishops are allowed to remain at home; all others are ordered to attend. The goals of the council are stated by Innocent himself: "to root out vices and plant virtues, to correct errors and reform morals, to eliminate heresies and strengthen the faith, to resolve differences and establish peace, to get rid of oppression and promote freedom, to make princes and Christians flock to the aid and assistance of the holy land ... ". It seems that when Innocent convened the council he wanted to observe the customs of the early ecumenical councils, and indeed this fourth Lateran council was regarded as an ecumenical council by all the learned and religious men of the age. The Lateran Council can be said to be a balance sheet of the reign of Innocent III. 500 bishops, 800 abbots and representatives of various countries arrived at the Lateran Palace. Among the participants are the emperors of Jerusalem and Constantinople. The council is personally presided over by the Pope. The Bulgarian cleric was invited to the council as the Pope sent a circular letter to Basil dated April 19, 1213, but there is no information about the presence of Bulgarian clergy at the council. This letter is also the last one addressed to Bulgaria recorded in the correspondence of Innocent III. Patriarch Basil's invitation to attend the Lateran Council suggests that the union is still in force in Bulgaria. The Lateran Council also aimed to restore the power of the Latin Empire and the Roman high priest to continue his influence over the Balkan states, including Bulgaria.

As a conclusion of the paragraph, a conclusion is made about Boril's rule. It is said that Boril took the throne at a very difficult time, and is by no means to be considered a weak king, as the older literature claims. He achieved an alliance with Hungary and with the Latin Empire, alliances Kaloyan failed to achieve. Boril lost territories, but given the circumstances and the emerging separatism within the state, it seems that the Bulgarian ruler had nothing else to do

and resigned himself to this fact after his unsuccessful military campaigns. Tsar Boril somehow managed to maneuver between Hungary, the Latin Empire and Rome, but at the same time to hold an Orthodox council in the capital Tarnovo without rejecting the union concluded under Kaloyan. And as for whether the Bulgarian king Boril made an attempt to reach a rapprochement with the Patriarchate of Constantinople in Nicaea, it is not known.

Second paragraph - **The Boril Council - between the Union and Orthodoxy**- among the most interesting domestic sources, cutting off the state of late Bogomilism in our lands, is Boril's synodic, which is a medieval Bulgarian monument, arose as a result of convocations on Friday of Silopustna Sunday, on February 11, 6718 or 1211, indictment 14 in the Council of Tarnovo against the Bogomils. The teaching of Pope Bogomil, which was further developed by his first followers, later received the name Bogomilism. It appeared in Bulgaria in the first third of the 10th century and continued to develop over the next few centuries in the Bulgarian lands until the fall of Bulgaria under Turkish rule at the end of the 14th century, and it changed throughout its existence.

Bogomilism is the doctrine that King Boril encountered at the beginning of 1211 and which is the reason why he convened an anti-Bogomil council in one of the largest churches in Tarnovo. The fact that the Bogomils reappeared as an active religious factor in the 13th century is also indisputable, since at the time of Boril, the state was in an economic crisis and the central authority was weakened, as it was in the 10th century. The Council of Turnov was not present Primate Basil, which can be explained by the fact that the council, as it was called earlier, is Orthodox. This emphasis on the Orthodoxy of the Council by the Tsar and the absence of the Bulgarian Primate from the Council were not accidental. It is quite logical to come to the conclusion that the Uniate Basil was against this council and did not agree with its convening because he propagated Orthodoxy. Emperor Henry in the September 1208 letter to Pope Innocent III called Boril "the most hostile persecutor of the Church of God, which can be interpreted as referring to the Western Church, i.e. Boril, since his ascension to the Bulgarian throne, clearly does not respect the union, and he is certainly not on good terms with the Patriarch of Tarnovo, Basil. In this paragraph, Boril's Synodical itself is considered, as the main text of the Synodical is composed of two parts - positive (wishes for a long life and eternal memory) and negative (anathema or excommunication from the church). This second part of the Synod makes it a source for legal history, bearing in mind that in the

Middle Ages legislation was directly related to the church. In addition to Boril's synodical source for church legislation in medieval Bulgaria, there are the Slavic translation of the Life of Theodosius Turnovsky by Patriarch Callistus and the epistolary correspondence of Patriarch Euthymius. In the Synodic of Tsar Boril, the Bulgarian tsar is presented as an advocate for the true faith - Orthodoxy and a representative of God, the most significant result of which is the appearance of a Synodic for the Sunday of Orthodoxy, as a result of the council called by him. "And when King Boril found out about these things, he was inflamed with divine desire and sent throughout his kingdom to gather them (bogomils - note m, EA) in bundles, as if they were weeds. And he ordered a council to be called." The information in the Synodical says that the basis of Bogomilism from the beginning of the 13th century is still the dualistic-gnostic view of the universe and man. However, in contrast to Bogomilism in the Bulgarian lands from the 10th century, in the views of the heretics, anathemosans in the Boril Synod show some tendencies towards absolute dualistic ideas in the field of eschatology. This is evident from a curse that is addressed to "those who do not believe that there will be a resurrection, a rising with the bodies of the dead and an appearance before the Lord's judgment."

The Boril synodical can be considered as a source for the history of Bogomilism, and also for some episodes of the history of the Bulgarian church. The account of the council against the worshipers under King Boril in 1211 is the first historical account from the beginning of the 13th century, and it is an important component of the original narrative in the Boril Synod. The author of the synodic belonged to the high clergy. The content of the story shows that it is directly related to the compilation of the Boril Synod. The slavoslavia and memorials of the Bulgarian kings and queens, Narrative of the council against the Bogomils, Narrative of the restoration of the Bulgarian patriarchate, included in the collection, make it an important source for Bulgarian medieval history. The compendium, which Boril ordered to be translated and used during the service, was a work of the theological and canonical thought of the Byzantines, created in 843, which suggests that even after the conclusion of the ecclesiastical union with Rome, the life of the Bulgarian Church continues to be defined by Byzantine Orthodox traditions.

Third paragraph - **Ecclesiastical policy of the Bulgarian kingdom under John Assen II** - Already with his ascension to the throne, John Assen II is clear that initially he has no

intention of changing his political orientation externally and follows the policy of Tsar Boril, which can be explained, that the new ruler of Tarn continued the union from 1204. From the very moment he ascended the throne, he undertook a number of diplomatic actions, among which he aimed to restore the territorial integrity of Bulgaria, which was declining during Boril's time, and to raise its international authority again. With a militarily weakened state, this can only happen through diplomatic means, and more precisely through dynastic marriages. As it is reported, the Hungarian king Andrew II wrote a letter to Pope Honorius III dated March 5, 1219, in which he mentioned that he had concluded an alliance with the Bulgarian ruler, secured by a dynastic marriage, which alliance ensured him the right to pass through Bulgarian territory. Andrew II, now in Hungary, again wrote to the Pope, asking him to legalize the marriage arrangements between Hungary and Bulgaria and the union between the two. Andrei has no problem with recognizing the title of "tsar" for John Assan II, something his predecessors stubbornly refused to do for Kaloyan and Boril. Given the Hungarian king's conflict with Rome, which began in 1215 at the Lateran Council, over the king's hiring of Jews and Muslims to administer royal revenues, and the failure of the Fifth Crusade, it can be assumed that Andrew II was not he wanted to create trouble and conflicts with his neighbors, including the Bulgarian kingdom.

The sources provide information that until March 21, 1231, the territorial borders between Bulgaria and Hungary were preserved, correspondingly, until then, there were good relations between the two countries. According to a letter of Pope Gregory IX to Chaplain Egidius dated March 3, 1229, the Hungarian princess Maria, wife of John Assen II received a land that was called "Beyond Symria". This letter provides information about the establishment of the Bulgarian Diocese of Srem. Srem includes the territories west of Belgrade to the Drava and south of the Sava. Which means that at the beginning of the 20s of the 13th century, Bulgaria acquired a part of the Srem region, and the emergence of the Throne in Srem must be placed between 1221 and 1229. Srem in this case is the extreme northwestern part of the Tarnovo archbishopric. Accordingly, by 1229, good relations between Hungary and Bulgaria continued to exist. Another information about the return of Belgrade, Branicevo and Vidin to Bulgarian hands is from 1230. This is the Charter of Goodwill of John Assen II, which lists Belgrade, Branicevo and Vidin as belonging to the regions of the territory of the Bulgarian state: "to walk all over part of my kingdom... with any goods, to import or export... from any land or

region to come: to Bdin or Branicevo and Belgrade... everywhere to buy and sell freely without any damage, to have no prohibitions on all the regions of my kingdom.”

Another document testifying to Bulgaria's rule over the areas of Belgrade and Branicevo is the letter of Pope Gregory IX to the bishop of Chanad dated March 21, 1232, which letter also gives information about the termination of Bulgaria's union with Rome and reads as follows: "we mourn not a little and we are embarrassed that the Bulgarian bishops - of Alba (Belgrade) and... of Branduzium (Branichevo), who have long been subordinated only to the Roman high priest, deviating from the union with the Roman Church, are breaking away from its leadership, moving away from the herd of co-religionists" . If at that time the areas in question - Belgrade and Branicevo were in Hungarian hands, their bishops would probably have rejected the union with the Roman Church. In this letter, the bishopric of Belgrade is defined as long subordinate to the Roman see, and because of its deviation from Rome, it should join the bishopric of Sirmium. In short, the Bishopric of Belgrade was considered a Uniate Bulgarian diocese, returned to Eastern Orthodoxy during the time of John Assen I, and until 1221 or 1232 it had a Catholic see. The Bishopric of Belgrade remained on the border between Rome and the East after, under the kings Koloman I (1241–1246) and Michael II Assen (1246–1256), the Bulgarian Church lost control over Belgrade, which one after the other passed under the rule of Hungary, Rostislav Mihajlovic, and finally to Serbia. In Branichevo, the case is similar. At the beginning of the 1930s, Branichevo rejected the union and began a policy of rapprochement with the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The city of Vidin is also discussed in this paragraph, and there is evidence for it that it was pro-Uniate in 1203. This is evidenced by a letter of the Bulgarian archbishops and bishops from 1203 to Pope Innocent III, in which Clement, bishop of Vidin, wishes to receive a pallium, which means that he supports Kaloyan's policy of joining the Roman Church. During the reign of John Assen II, the church began to pursue a policy of severing ties with Rome, and after 1235, the Vidin cathedral acquired a metropolitan title. After the breaking of the union with Rome and the binding of Bulgaria again with the Romans - Nicaea - against the Latins, the relations between the Bulgarian state and Hungary worsened. "With a letter dated May 9, 1231, Pope Gregory IX convinced the Hungarian clergy and King Andrew II to preach and organize a crusade against the enemies surrounding the Latin Empire" - that is, the Bulgarians.

In 1225, the Bulgarian tsar again appeared as a diplomat and concluded a contract with a dynastic marriage. Basileus of Thessalonica's brother Manuel married one of John Assen II's daughters from his first marriage. With this political move, Theodore Comnenus aims to neutralize the Bulgarian state in order to succeed in his advance towards Constantinople, while at the same time securing in the person of the Bulgarian ruler a possible ally against John III Duke Vatsi. John Assen II benefited from this marriage, because the Epirus ruled areas with a Bulgarian population and were an obstacle to the future political and ethnic unification of Bulgaria, and the new Bulgarian ruler, as well as Kaloyan, aimed at annexing territories with a Bulgarian population.

A few years ago, a more complete and new transcript of a historical account of changes in the church organization of the lands newly annexed to Bulgaria at the beginning of the 13th century became known. In this Athos story from 1235 mention is made of the elevation of the Bulgarian Michael Bratan as metropolitan of Thessaloniki (1230-1233?) and of placing the monasteries of Athos under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the bishop of Jeriso, who was also erected by the Bulgarian ruler, but according to some scholars, this monument is more a late forgery. But if this note is to be trusted, it briefly states that John Assen II was attempting to bring the Holy Mountain under his authority by giving the rights to do so to the bishop of Jeriso.

Among the domestic sources that inform about the territorial expansion of Bulgaria after the battle of Klokotnitsa, in addition to the Turnovo inscription, are the Dubrovnik Charter, the Life of St. Petka by Patriarch Euthymius and the Life of St. Hilarion of Muglen.

In the Life of St. Petka by patriarch Euthymius Turnovski describes that after the battle of Klokotnitsa, Tsar John Assen II placed "bright and pious bishops" in the newly annexed territory, as from a later transcript of the life it is clear that the Bulgarian king removed the bishops subordinate to the Roman Catholic Church and placed in their place, Bulgarian bishops and metropolitans prepared and trained in the Holy Mountain.

From a list in the Boril Synod, it is reported that at the time of John Assen II, the dioceses of Preslav, Ohrid, Filipiijska (Dramska), Mesemvriyska, Velbazhdka, Branichevska, Niška, Belgrade, Vidinska and Siarska were located in the Bulgarian territory. The metropolis of Philippi, which became Bulgarian after the battle of Klokotnitsa in 1230, was examined.

CHAPTER THREE

TERMINATION OF THE UNION WITH THE CHURCH OF ROME.

First paragraph. **Change in the political map of the Balkans (1228 - 1230) - the foreign policy of Bulgaria with its neighbors and with Rome is briefly considered.**

Second paragraph. **Return of Bulgaria to the bosom of Orthodoxy** - in the new political situation, after the interruption of the union with the Latins, the union no longer meets the interests of the Bulgarian state and John Assen II undertakes a diplomatic move to break the union with Rome and return Bulgaria to the bosom of Orthodoxy.

The negotiations for the return of Bulgaria to the bosom of Orthodoxy and, accordingly, the correspondence of the Bulgarian ruler with the Patriarch of Nicaea, German II, began as early as 1228. As evidence, he relied on the letter of Metropolitan Ivan of Navpakstan, written in the same year 1228, as the expression in the letter "let him be glorified and glorified in the letters of the supreme Vasilevs, and the ruler of Hem, the hermit Asen".

In order to form an alliance between Nicaea and Bulgaria, diplomacy was again resorted to and a dynastic marriage was concluded between the daughter of the Bulgarian ruler - Elena and the heir to the throne of the Nicaean Empire - Theodore Laskaris. The initiative for the rapprochement between John III Duka Vatsi and John Assen II, according to George Acropolis, was the Nicaean emperor's, and he did not mention ecclesiastical affairs, but only the proclamation of the patriarchate. Nikifor Grigora is of the opposite opinion, mentioning that the Bulgarian ruler was the one who initiated the rapprochement between the two countries "While the emperor was busy with these concerns, envoys from the Bulgarians arrived at him with a proposal for peace and at the same time asked for the husband of Elena, the daughter of Assen, Theodore, son of the emperor". John Assen II undoubtedly had a reason to seek the alliance with the Greek state, because in this way he could obtain a patriarchate, with which he could consolidate his sovereignty as the ruler of the newly appropriated territories and in practice entered into an alliance against the Latins. Nicaea also benefits from the coalition in question, and it is more logical to assume that the emperor is

looking for Tsar John Assen II to help him enter Constantinople, and in return for the Bulgarian ruler to return to the bosom of Orthodoxy.

The reasons for the resumption of Orthodoxy in Bulgaria can be that after the break with the Latins, the union no longer met the interests of the Bulgarian state and John Assen II turned his attention to the Nicaean Empire - the center of the Byzantine Orthodox Church at that time. The Bulgarian ruler used an old axiom in his diplomacy, betting on the differences between the West and the East, and in the case of Nicaea, he saw an ally with whom they had common interests and the well-known common benefit. That is why John Assen II ignored the traditional hostility towards the Roma and became an ally with them. The reason for the dissolution of the union with the Roman Church is the fact that after the success of the Klokotniška battle, new dioceses entered the newly joined territories, "which were hierarchically dependent on the patriarch in Nicaea or the archbishop of Ohrid and the bishops of these western dioceses, which are under political authority of the Bulgarian tsar, who refused to recognize the Primate of Tarnovo", in order to stop this hierarchical difference, the Bulgarian ruler decided to resume the autocephaly of the Bulgarian church. Another reason that led to a change in the church policy of John Assen II, no small role for it was played by the fact that he, as the ruler of the most powerful Balkan power, believed that the Bulgarian Church should occupy a worthy place among other churches. However, the religious policy of the previous decades did not lead to this goal. The Bulgarian Church did not acquire official independence, and its ambiguous position, when, remaining practically Orthodox, it officially submitted to the supreme authority of the Pope, led to the fact that it did not enjoy real recognition from either its Catholic or Orthodox neighbors. The change in orientation enabled John Assen II to secure a prominent and honorable place for the Bulgarian Church in the Orthodox world. Obviously, the change in policy undertaken for this purpose can only take place with the support of the Bulgarian clergy, which actually has nothing to do with Rome and suffers from all the consequences of the unclear position of the Bulgarian Church. Ensuring a recognized, honorable and independent position of the Bulgarian Church was one of the conditions of the agreement with the main political opponent of the papacy and the Latin Empire - Nicaea, which was accompanied by a change in the religious policy of the Second Bulgarian Kingdom. As mentioned before, the question of the formality of the union must be reconsidered and that it leaves bright traces in the church life of Bulgaria and the

Bulgarian clergy has something in common with the Western church and attempts to change church practices are being observed.

During the period 1213 – 1231, the union played an important role in the relations between Bulgaria and the Catholic Latin Empire and Hungary. If this is not the case, the Bulgarian king will not resort to severing the union with the Roman Church. The rejection of the union for the Bulgarian ruler would mean complete political independence of Bulgaria from Rome. In 1232, the Primate of the Bulgarian Church - Basil I (1185 - 1232) retreated to Sveta Gora and refused to return to Tarnovo. A successor must be chosen in his place, and that is Joachim I (1232-1246). In the biography of Joachim I, the following is mentioned: "bishops gathered from all over the Bulgarian land, I held a council, looking for a suitable one for the bishop's office and they found it". The council must have taken place in 1233, either after Christopher's letter to the Bulgarian king and Basil's departure to the Holy Mountain, or between the first and Joachim's departure to Nicaea. There is information in the Boril synod that in his elevation to patriarch in 1235, Joakim I was called only "pre-consecrated archbishop", which means that when he was elevated in 1233 to archbishop of Turnov, it happened without the participation of the ecumenical patriarch . It is believed that this patriarch had some involvement in the establishment of the Cherven Bishopric in the town of Cherven. The emergence of the Cherven Bishopric in the 13th century, located near the rock monasteries near Ivanovo and Lomovete, may also be a consequence of the need for church administration in an area with a dynamic religious life. There is no clear evidence whether the church had a connection to the union or to the subsequent events surrounding the restoration of the patriarchate, because its appearance in the 13th century is unclear. However, the most logical explanation remains that the bishopric appeared precisely when Joakim became patriarch, since before that he was connected with one of the largest monasteries near Ivanovo.

The hypothesis that Saint Sava of Serbia may have played an important role in the negotiations leading to the autocephaly of the Bulgarian Church is indicated. John Assen II was associated with St. Sava by marriage, and the latter died in Tarnovo on January 14, 1235. It is mentioned that, according to him, Christopher recognized the imperial title of John Assen II.

For the return to Orthodoxy of John Assen II, an important role was played by Bulgaria's relations with Hungary in the period 1231 - 1233. In the war between Hungary and Bulgaria, the Bulgarian state irretrievably lost beyond the Danube northwestern regions, in which the Hungarians settled permanently by creating around the beginning of 1233. The Northern Banat. The most prominent proof of this is a charter of Bela IV issued in 1235. The charter describes Bela IV's participation in the campaign against Bulgaria, the siege of the city of Vidin and the resistance of Sebastocrator Alexander. After the hostilities between the two countries, they concluded a truce, which partially restored the political union between them. The refusal of the Hungarian king Béla IV to fight against Bulgaria under the pressure of the Pope in the years 1235-1236, as well as to participate in a crusade on the side of the Latin Empire, can be cited as evidence of this.

The main source providing information about the independence of the Bulgarian church after 1235 is George Acropolitus, who was a contemporary of the events and the Boril synod. Georgi Acropolitus wrote that "in order to thank the Bulgarian king for his kinship and friendship, by definition imperial and conciliar, the bishop of Tarnovo, subordinate to the patriarch of Tsarigrad, was made autocephalous and proclaimed patriarch." This letter provides information that the Tsarigrad Patriarch agrees that the Bulgarian High Priest should be independent.

The same information with additions, like those of Acropolis, is given in the Boril Synodic, which describes in more detail the process of the restoration of the Bulgarian Patriarchate and its independence.

Paragraph three - **Ecclesiastical policy of Bulgaria under John Assen II after the council in Lampsak** - Information on the church policy of John Assen in the lands newly annexed to the Bulgarian kingdom after March 1230 is provided by the "Athonian Narrative relating to 1235" (Narratio Athonensis ad annum MCCXXXV). Parts of the monument are preserved in several manuscripts from the 15th and 16th centuries, and the only complete copy dates from 1520 and was made in the monastery of the Great Lavra of the Holy Mountain. The exact time of writing of the Athonian Narrative has not yet been determined, but its references to the history of George Acropolis, written in the last two decades of his life (1261–1282), date the creation of the Narratio Athonensis ad annum MCCXXXV at the earliest the last quarter of the thirteenth century. The monument contains the information that John Assen wanted the

Bulgarian church head to be elevated to the rank of patriarch before the Nicaea Patriarchate, and with its consent this happened. of Jeriso, at the head of which a new bishop was also placed. Michael Bratan, however, is unwilling to do this and complains to the king about the pressure that was put on him. At the same time, the monks of Svetogorje, realizing that the Bulgarian king John Assen and the Nicaean emperor John Vatsi had gathered in Kaliupol, sent their representatives with a request that the monasteries of Svetogorje should not be placed under the dependence of the bishop of Jeriso, nor of any other bishop, since have been freed from any dependence by a special charter since the time of Emperor Alexius I Comnenus.

In the meantime, strong opposition arose at the council against the Bulgarian patriarch and his appointees in Thessaloniki and Jeriso, and in order to preserve his newly established patriarchate, the ruler of Turnovo agreed to depose the metropolitan of Thessaloniki and the bishop of Jeriso, named by him. In their place, the Council elects, and the Nicene patriarch ordains his own candidates, whom he expressly forbids to interfere in the life of the monastic republic of Mount Athos. The church council referred to in the narrative is that of 1235 in Lampsak. Traces of the measures taken by John Assen II to settle church-administrative matters in the newly annexed southwestern Balkan lands after March 1230 can be seen in the Athos narrative. The autonomy of the Athos monasteries and their central administration, the so-called PROTAT, was also established.

The Treaty of Lampsak provides not only the restoration of the Bulgarian Patriarchate, but also a political and military union between Bulgaria and Nicaea for a common struggle against the Latins.

Conclusion: As a conclusion of the ecclesiastical policy of Bulgaria in the period from 1199 to 1235, it can be said that Tsar Kaloyan won the international recognition he so desired from the authority of the highest spiritual authority, which he saw in the person of the Roman High Priest, judging the position of the Pope as a leader in Europe at the height of his power through the union signed in 1204 with the Roman See. The Union places the Bulgarian Church in a dependent position on Rome and partly affects the dogmatic and ritual affiliation of the Bulgarian Church to Eastern Orthodoxy. The Union is also a political act, which both the Bulgarian ruler and the Pope need. The union concluded between Bulgaria and Rome has a hierarchical character - the Bulgarians recognize the supremacy of the Pope and there is a

change in their Orthodox rites. The question of the formality of the union must be re-examined and the claim that it was concluded solely for political purposes changed.

Applications:

Relations between Bulgaria's neighbor Serbia and the Church of Rome - the relations between Bulgaria's neighbor Serbia and the Roman Catholic Church are of interest in order to draw a parallel with how Rome acts towards the Serbs in comparison with the Bulgarian problems. Innocent III's goal was to expand papal influence over the Balkan Peninsula and, accordingly, over the Eastern Christian Church. The difference, however, is that in Serbia, the policy of the Papacy has a conquering character and works against the interests of the Serbian population, as the missionaries sent by Rome robbed the wealth of the population, exploited it, and Catholic propaganda slowed down the development of Serbian culture and, accordingly, the affirmation of the Serbian nation. . The success of this conquering policy of Rome was due to the fact that in Serbia at that time dynastic struggles were raging between the sons of Stefan Neman. The first documented contact between Innocent III and southeastern Europe dates from January 1199. Vucan sent a letter to Rome asking for the Pope's protection and for a legate to be sent to his lands. The registers reflect the gracious response of Innocent, who saw an opportunity to gain an ally on the eastern shores of the Adriatic and expand Rome's influence in the region. The Pope sent Chaplain John Casimirsky to the court of Vukan, which was the first of a long series of missions that then brought him to Constantinople, Bosnia, Hungary and Bulgaria. After 1204, there was a clear rapprochement between the South Slavic states and Rome. The reasons for this rapprochement must be sought in the difficult conditions in which the development of the Bulgarian and Serbian statehood was found at the beginning of the 12th - 13th centuries. The second Bulgarian kingdom arose as a result of the uprising of the population of the Bulgarian lands against the Byzantine rule. The Serbian state was formed on the basis of the unification of a number of small principalities that were previously dependent on the Byzantine Empire. By the end of the 12th century. in both states their independence from Byzantium was recognized and they successfully expanded their positions in the Balkans at the expense of a weakening empire. In Serbia and Bulgaria, however, from a political point of view, they are new formations that do not have their legitimately recognized place in the traditional political structure of the region. The imperial title of the new Bulgarian rulers was not recognized by any higher ecclesiastical

or secular authority of Christendom, and the title "Great Župan" worn by Stefan Nemanja, who united the Serbian lands, did not correspond to the titles accepted in Europe. It is logical to argue that both Serbia and Bulgaria managed to secure their independence by taking advantage of a number of favorable circumstances. Both countries needed international legitimation, something that, for obvious reasons, would not come from Constantinople, which regarded their territories as part of its domains and their leaders as rebels.

In Bulgaria, where after the beginning of the uprising it was impossible to maintain the dependence of the Bulgarian clergy on the Archbishop of Ohrid, who was located in Byzantine territory and was appointed by the Byzantine emperor, the solution to the problem was found in the fact that several bishops who came under the authority of the rebels, placed the priest Basil as archbishop in the capital of Tarnovo. Basil became the head of an independent archbishopric whose jurisdiction extended over the entire territory of the revived Bulgarian kingdom. In conclusion it may be said that, under Kaloyan as well as in Serbia, a future rapprochement with Rome would bring to the two Balkan states the final confirmation of the independence of both, and secure to them a place of honor among the states of Christendom, as in East as well as West.

General essay on the church policy of Bulgaria towards Hungary in the first decade of the 13th century - The territory Belgrade - Branicevo was examined, which was always the "apple of discord" between the Kingdom of Hungary and Bulgaria and was the conflict zone between them. Various theses have been expressed, and several have been examined. The first is that already in 1199 - 1200, the Belgrade and Branicevo regions were Bulgarian, as in the Bulgarian-Hungarian war of 1202 - 1203. between Hungary and Bulgaria, King Emmerich II captured Belgrade and Branicevo. According to another thesis, Branicevo was captured either in the spring or in the summer of 1199. In addition, North Macedonia was also occupied during this time, as evidenced by the expansion of the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Tarnovo in this area. In the autumn of 1203, the bishops of Velbajd (Belezbud), Skopje (Skopje) and Prizren (Prisdiana) are mentioned as assistants to the archbishop of Tarnovo, which strongly suggests that these lands were included in Bulgaria. Like the Dioceses of Belgrade and Branicevo, they were previously under the jurisdiction of the Ohrid Archdiocese when Northern Bulgaria was part of the Byzantine Empire. There is a list of the dioceses under the jurisdiction of the archdiocese of Tarnovo, and it confirms the information from the

Pope's letter of 1203: "These are the bishops of Bulgaria: the archbishop of Tarnovo, who is the primate, the archbishop of Velbuzhd, the archbishops of Preslav, Skopje, Prizren, Vidin, Lovech and Branichevo." This paragraph examines the ecclesiastical policy of the mentioned dioceses. The Ohrid archdiocese is presented and the 1219 council of the Ohrid archdiocese in Arta is described, where it was decided that the Bulgarian bishops, priests, deacons and subdeacons appointed in 1204 should be removed: "... the Bulgarian bishops ordained in Zagora are from today completely removed from the churches in which they were called, because they were produced in spite of the exactness and tradition of the canons, and were reduced even to episcopal dignity by the help of the secular power: and that no hope of future restoration should be maintained in them, because the living legal bishops have already established themselves in the bishoprics that fall to them, in which they were called, and in those where the legal ones who served before them were not alive, others will be called in their place. The subdeacons, deacons and priests ordained by them should be accepted at the altar and in collaboration with the rest of the priestly performance, because they received their ordination from the Orthodox and according to the priestly custom of the church...". By imposing this decision on the Ohrid Synod, the positions of the pro-Bulgarian bishops significantly weakened.

Kaloyan did not formally destroy the Ohrid archdiocese, and there is no evidence that its cathedral city was annexed to the Tarnovo archdiocese, which entered into a union with the Roman Church at that time. Otherwise, the newly installed Ohrid bishop would be among the other Bulgarian bishops asking Pope Innocent III for a pallium.

Reference of publications on the topic of the dissertation:

Reference to the more important contributions in the dissertation work:

A comprehensive study of the ecclesiastical policy of Bulgaria between the union of King Kaloyan and the restoration of the Bulgarian Patriarchate (1204-1235) is made.

Little-known sources about the activity of the Bulgarian church in this period have been introduced into scholarly circulation.

Archaeological evidence of Bulgaria's contacts with the Latin Empire and the Roman Church in the first half of the 13th century is presented.

A different point of view is presented that the Union has only a formal meaning and is not reflected in the rite of the Bulgarian Church.

1. Relations between Tarnovo and Rome between 1199 and 1204 - X March student readings at VTU - date of holding March 27, 2020 - In: - Collection of materials from the tenth scientific conference, publishing house Veliko Tarnovo, volume 7, 2020 , pp. 74-85.

2. Bulgaria and Serbia in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church - XV international scientific conference "Bulgaria, the Bulgarians and Europe - myth, history, modernity", date: November 2, 2020 - under seal.

3. The Boril synod as a source for Bulgarian history - Sp. Medical history.

4. Bulgaria, the Papacy and the Latin Empire in the period 1204 - 1207 - XI March student readings at VTU, date of March 26, 2021. In: - Collection of materials from the tenth scientific conference, Veliko Tarnovo publishing house, volume 8, 2022, pp. 80-91.

5. Brief overview of the Unions of the Bulgarian and Serbian states with the Roman Catholic Church (1204-1219) - Sp. Medical history.