

STANOJE BOJANIN

(Institute for Byzantine Studies of the SASA, Belgrade)

SACRED AND PROFANE TOPOGRAPHY IN A MEDIEVAL SERBIAN PARISH – AN OUTLINE*

This article presents a basic research scope of the social importance of micro-toponyms and topographical features of villages and their precincts, which in the Middle Ages were organized as parish communities. The social space of the rural environment is segmented by different entities important for the social and religious life of the local community, such as a parish church with its yard, a cemetery, other churches and chapels in the fields and groves, freestanding crosses, certain bodies of water or some marked trees, typically the oak.

The issue of the methods of analysing medieval sources of different provenience and fragmented data is of major importance. In order to understand the sources properly, we have to be aware of the social segmentation of a medieval society, from which diverse interpretation and functions of the cultural artefacts and performances (rituals, festivities) originated.

Keywords: sacred and profane space, parish, popular culture, popular religiosity, local religion, the penitentials, canon law.

In the preserved documentary material, consisting mainly of deeds of gifts donated by the kings, princes and regional magnate of Serbia to the medieval monasteries, we often encounter the following entities recorded on the boundaries of village precincts or feudal estates: a church, a cemetery, a cross, a crossroads, a vineyard, a mill, a spring-well, a ford, a single isolated tree or a group of them, and so forth. Generally, their function as boundary markers was not a primary one, nor were they situated only on the boundaries of villages. In fact, they were landmarks testifying to the segmentation of the social space organized both as a village and as a parish, in other words, as a space with both profane and sacred features.¹

* This paper results from the project *Tradition, innovation and identity in the Byzantine world* (no 177032) funded by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Serbia.

¹ For the most important editions of Serbian medieval documents, see: *F. Miklosich, Monumenta Serbica spectantia historiam Serbiae, Bosnae, Ragusii, Viennae 1858; J. Šafarik, Hrisovulja cara Stefana*

The segmentation of the social space into the sacred and profane one is recognized as a cultural construct viewed in the series of dichotomies, such as official / unofficial culture, “learned” / “unlearned”, “high” / “low”, the culture of the clergy and the culture of the laity or a local culture of a parish and that of important religious centres of the Church and the state. The concepts of sacredness of a certain space varied and were arranged in a hierarchical order, but differently defined for different social groups. The parish with its priest was the place where those concepts met each other and where they were imposed or refused, appropriated and adapted.²

For many of the above mentioned entities, it is clear that they did not have the primary function of boundary markings. As for the freestanding crosses, so far scholarly studies have not indicated their multiple meanings. In Serbian, but also in broader southern Slavic medieval studies, the crosses in the medieval charters were examined only in the function of boundary markers.³ However, the medieval charters provide evidence that boundary markers were put up beside certain crosses. As opposed to the cross which was usually wooden, the boundary markers were made of hard materials, which can be seen from their names, such as “marble” (*mramor*), “stone” (*kamen*), and suchlike.⁴

Unfortunately, in the said charters, where it was important to mark the boundaries, the topography of the entire village precincts was not presented. In order to determine more precisely the importance of a freestanding cross in the village precincts, it is necessary to cross-examine the data from sources of different origins.

In the hagiography of the archbishop St Sava Nemanjić written by Domentijan around the middle of the 13th century, St Sava used to erect churches and crosses in fields, valleys and hills “in order to celebrate the name of God in every place”.⁵ In

Dušana, kojom osniva manastir Sv. Arhangela Mihaila i Gavрила u Prizrenu, Glasnik Društva srpske slovesnosti 15 (1862) 266–318; P. Ivić, M. Grković, Dečanske hrisovulje, Novi Sad 1976; S. Mišić, T. Subotin-Golubović, Svetoarhandelovska hrisovulja, Beograd 2003; M. Grković, The First Charter of the Decani monastery, translated by Randall A. Major, Belgrade 2004; Zbornik srednjovekovnih ćirilčkih povelja i pisma Srbije, Bosne i Dubrovnika I (1186–1321), priredili V. Mošin, S. Ćirković, D. Sindik, redigovao D. Sindik, Beograd 2011; Povelja kralja Milutina manastiru Banjska – Svetostefanska hrisovulja, knj. 1: Fototipija izvornog rukopisa, priredio Đ. Trifunović, Beograd 2011.

² J. Le Goff, Time, Work and Culture in the Middle Ages, (trans. by A. Goldhammer), The University of Chicago Press 1980, 153–188; P. Burke, Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe, New York University Press, New York 1978, 23–29; P. Burke, Popular Culture, in: Encyclopedia of European Social History from 1350 to 2000, vol. V, editor in chief P. N. Stearns, Charles Scribner’s Sons 2001, 3–13; N. Z. Davis, Some Tasks and Themes in the Study of Popular Religion, edd. C. Trinkaus – H. A. Oberman, The Pursuit of Holiness in Late Medieval and Renaissance Religion, E. J. Brill, Leiden 1974, 307–336; J.-C. Schmitt, “Religion populaire” et culture folklorique (note critique), Annales, É. S. C. 31 (1976) 941–953; A. Gurevich, Medieval Popular Culture: Problems of Belief and Perception, (translated by János M. Bak and Paul A. Hollingsworth), Cambridge 1990, 5; For research on medieval folklore, see Medieval Folklore: An Encyclopedia of Myths, Legends, Tales, Beliefs, and Customs, Vol. I–II, edd. C. Lindahl – J. McNamara – J. Lindow, Santa Barbara-Denver-Oxford 2000. On segmentation of the social space and its importance for local religious practices, see W. Christian, Local Religion in Sixteenth-Century Spain, Princeton University Press, New Jersey 1981.

³ On this issue, see S. Bojanin, Krst u seoskom ataru: Sakralna topografija i njena društvena funkcija u parohiji srednjovekovne Srbije, Istorijski časopis LVI (2008) 317.

⁴ Ibidem, 316, 318.

⁵ Domentijan, Žitije svetoga Save, prevod i komentari Lj. Juhas-Georgijevska, iz. T. Jovanović, Beograd 2001, 169–170.

a later document dating from the 16th century, a certain deacon known as Simeon erected a cross on a rock and that same cross was renewed by another priest, about a hundred years later.⁶ In the Ottoman *kanunname* of the Sanjak of Bosnia from 1517, it was prohibited to put up crosses beside roads because that was a custom, as it was stated, from “the olden times of infidels”.⁷ Considerable data is to be found in travels from the 16th century, such as, for instance, in the travel book of Hans Dernschwam of 1553. In certain Serbian or Bulgarian villages (*Ctzaribrod* or *Welicze*) he came across one or two crosses put up at the entrance to a village or on a nearby hill.⁸

Apart from erecting freestanding crosses, a cross could be carved into the bark of a tree, usually that of an oak.⁹ There were far fewer of these crosses in the medieval lists. In the last third of the 14th century, on the estate of the Ravanica monastery, there was the Crossbearer’s oak (*Krstonošin hrast*),¹⁰ a village entity which probably had a polysemous function. Still, though carved in the tree bark, the cross did not lose its sacred meaning, and was still regarded as “the honourable and life-giving cross”.¹¹

The said records clearly show that in the medieval rural environment, crosses did not have to be located only on village boundaries. Dernschwam testifies that they were wooden crosses.¹² Furthermore, they were not nameless. Listed in the medieval charters there was a Tryphon’s cross (*u Trifun’ kr’st’*), a Nikola’s cross (*k’ Nikolinu kr’stu*), a Pribčev’s cross (*Prib’čev’ krst’*), etc.,¹³ which indirectly tells us that their primary function, after all, was not to mark out a boundary. The mention of folk names along with Christian names, reveals that crosses did not have to be named after the saint to which they were dedicated, but probably also bore the names of those who had erected them. This type of cross must have also had apotropaic functions (see below) and it could be deemed as forerunner of a *zavetni krst* (votive cross) and *zavetina* (a vow given to a saint or God), a custom recorded by ethnographers of southeast Europe from the 19th and first half of the 20th century.¹⁴

⁶ *L.J. Stojanović*, *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi I*, Beograd 1902, № 1537; 381.

⁷ *Kanuni i kanun-name za Bosanski, Hercegovački, Zvornički, Kliški, Crnogorski i Skadarski sandžak*, uredili *B. Đurđev – N. Filipović – H. Hadžibegić – M. Mujić – H. Šabanović*, Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu, Beograd 1957, 31.

⁸ Hans Dernschwam’s *Tagebuch einer Reise nach Konstantinopel und Kleinasien (1553/55) nach der Urschrift im Fugger-Archiv*, herausgegeben und erläutert von *F. Babinger*, München und Leipzig 1923, 13, 14.

⁹ *V. Mošin*, *Akti iz svetogorskih arhiva*, Spomenik Srpske kraljevske akademije XCI (1939) 169.

¹⁰ *A. Mladenović*, *Povelje kneza Lazara: tekst, komentari, snimci*, Beograd 2003, 54, 61, 87.

¹¹ *V. Mošin*, *Akti*, 169.

¹² “Alda ein hulzenen † vor dem dorff”, or “Vor dem dorff auff einem hubell zway hulzene hohe kreutz...”, Hans Dernschwam’s *Tagebuch*, 13, 14.

¹³ For the list of the crosses recorded in village precincts of the most important Serbian medieval charters, see *S. Bojanin*, *Krst u seoskom ataru*, 312–315.

¹⁴ For descriptions of the freestanding crosses and customs connected with them in the Serbian and South Slavic ethnography around 1900, see *M. S. Filipović*, *Običaji i verovanja u Skopskoj kotlini*, SEZ LIV, Beograd 1939, 359–361; *Kulišić – Petrović – Pantelić*, *Srpski mitološki rečnik*, Beograd 1998², s.v. *Zavetina* 184–186; s.v. *Krst*, 269. Cf. *S. Bojanin*, *Krst u seoskom ataru*, 323–326.

In order to examine successfully this issue, the scant medieval sources that were not particularly interested in folk and popular culture should be contrasted to ethnographic descriptions from the 19th and first half of the 20th centuries. In this context, the comparative and regressive methods can be recommended. The latter one comprises the concept of the *longue durée* and slow changes of the folk culture. The regressive method does not mean transfer of data from the ethnographic material directly to the different historical

Probably, a sacred location could have been formed around certain bodies of water, such as springs, wells (*studenac*, *kladenac*) or other water sources, although we do not have any explicit information about this.¹⁵ In the previously mentioned medieval diplomatic sources, those springs and wells, like the crosses, were registered at the boundaries of village precincts.¹⁶ At first sight, their names do not tell us much about their possible religious or social functions in the segmentation of the local communities' social space. However, some changes in the names of certain water places occurred in the course of time that might be instructive.¹⁷ A more significant indicator of a sacred place organized at spring-well is the toponym *Vodice* in the vicinity of which a cross could have been erected. This toponym and other similar ones, such as *Dobre vodice*, *Bele vodice*, *Tri vodice*, etc. were mentioned relatively frequently in the medieval documents that referred to different feudal estates.¹⁸ The name *Vodice* is very well-known as a place that is sacred to Christians in the historic and ethnographic sources of Serbia from the 18th century to the present days, and it could probably reveal the meaning and the function of its medieval predecessor.¹⁹

However, marking a sacred place with a freestanding cross did not require any involvement on the part of the official representatives of the Church, primarily the local bishop. Indeed, according to official views, it was strictly prohibited. In the penitentials that were relatively frequently copied in Trebnik (Slavic Euchologion) from the 14th to the 17th centuries,²⁰ this practice was severely criticized, as was the performance of church rituals around such crosses. The reason for this was that freestanding crosses in a profane setting could be desecrated (rendered impure) by village

period in the Middle Ages. As Peter Burke warns, the main aim of using the regressive method is "to make sense of surviving fragments of evidence, not as a substitute for them", *P. Burke*, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*, 87.

¹⁵ On the holy springs and wells in the Middle Ages, see *Medieval Folklore*, s. v. Wells and Springs (D. A. Bray) 1028–1030.

¹⁶ *Leksikon srpskog srednjeg veka*, priredili S. Ćirković – R. Mihaljević, Beograd 1999, s.v. Studenac (S. Mišić) 718; S. Mišić, *Korišćenje unutrašnjih voda u srpskim zemljama srednjeg veka*, Beograd 2007, 66–69.

¹⁷ The toponym of the High Well (*Visoki kladenec*) in the charter of the Serbian King Milutin (c. 1300) to the monastery of St George at Skopje, had its earlier name, the Fairy Well (*Vil'ski kladenec*), according to the charter issued several decades earlier by the Bulgarian Emperor Constantine Asen (1255–1277), *Zbornik srednjovekovnih ćirilćkih povelja i pisma*, 325; A. *Daskalova – M. Rajkova*, *Gramoti na b'lgarskite care*. Uvod. Tekstove. Rećnik. Bibliografija, Sofia 2005, 32, 202.

¹⁸ *D. Danićić*, *Rjećnik iz književnih starina srpskih I*, Beograd 1863, 96, 97, 143; *P. Ivić*, *M. Grković*, *Dećanske hrisovulje*, 316, 317, 321; *M. Grković*, *The First Charter of the Decani monastery*, 96, 97; *Povelja kralja Milutina manastiru Banjska – Svetostefanska hrisovulja*, 100; *G. Tomović*, *Vlastelinstvo manastira Svetog Stefana u Banjskoj*, ed. *D. Trifunović*, *Povelja kralja Milutina manastiru Banjska – Svetostefanska hrisovulja*, knj. 2: Fototipije izdanja i prateće studije, Beograd 2011, 201, 235, 236. The Monastery of St Anthony was built "on Vodice" (*na Vodice*), on the right bank of the Djerdap gorge at the end of the 14th century, A. *Veselinović*, *Tri povelje za manastire Tismena i Vodica*, *Stari srpski arhiv* 8 (2009) 183–203.

¹⁹ On the sacred places of Vodice in the 18th and the 19th centuries, see *M. Đekić*, *Vodice u Vojvodini*, Novi Sad 2001.

²⁰ *V. Jagić*, *Sitna gradja za crkveno pravo*, *Starine JAZU VI* (1874) 125–151. For the penitentials, see *S. Bojanin*, *Zabave i svetkovine u srednjovekovnoj Srbiji (od kraja XII do kraja XV veka)*, Beograd 2005, 29–33; *S. Bojanin*, *Penitencijalni sastavi u dećanskim trebnicima № 68 i № 69*, ed. *T. Subotin-Golubović*, *Dećani u svetlu arheografskih istraživanja*, Beograd 2012, 163–181.

dogs or pigs. Therefore, a cross had to be transferred to the official sacred location in the parish, to the church.²¹

The only officially permitted freestanding cross in village surroundings according to canon law was the cross erected on the occasion of the founding and building the parish church (*stauropēgion*).²² Namely, the main and official sacred place in the local community was the parish church. The sacredness of the parish church originated from the official ritual of its consecration, which was performed by representatives of the ecclesiastical authorities, personified in the bishop or his envoy, a priest of the local community.²³ According to the said penitentials, it was supposed to be erected in the middle of the village. It had to be physically separated from its profane surroundings by a fence, while the structure itself had to have well-maintained walls, a roof and a door that could be locked.²⁴ In this way, the churchyard was also distinguished as a sacred place. The importance of the churchyard could be manifold. Its sacredness might have usually overlapped with another holy entity of a local community, the parish graveyard.²⁵

However, as opposed to the instructions of the penitentials, numerous churches outside populated places were listed in medieval charters.²⁶ Like the crosses, they were mainly called by the names of the saints they were dedicated to, or after their donors or owners (Rajko's church of St Nicolas),²⁷ and sometimes according to their appearance (White Church),²⁸ or the material from which they were made (Wooden Church).²⁹ The basic question is whether such churches were erected in accordance

²¹ *Ne podobajet kr'st na puti postaviti i liturgisati pri njem, jako skvr'njet jeho psi i svinije. Kr'st v'nosite v' cr'kv sel'skuju V. Jagić, Sitna gradja, 148; see the canon 73th of the Council in Trullo, Zakonopravilo ili nomokanon svetoga Save, Ilovički prepis 1262. godina. Fototipija, priredio M. M. Petrović, Gornji Milanovac 1991, f 155v. Cf. S. Bojanin, Parohijska zajednica u ogledalu srpskih penitencijalnih zbornika, edd. S. Ćirković – K. Čavoški, Srednjovekovno pravo u Srbia u ogledalu istorijskih izvora, SANU, Beograd 2009, 268.*

²² See chapter 12 of the letter E of the Syntagma of Matthew Blastares concerning building and consecrating churches, Matije Vlastara Sintagmat. Azbučni zbornik vizantijskih crkvenih i državnih zakona i pravila. Slovenski prevod vremena Dušanova, ed. S. Novaković, SKA, Beograd 1907, 275–277; Σύνταγμα τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων VI, edd. G. A. Rhalles, M. Potles, Athena 1859, 262–263. Cf. The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium III, ed. A. P. Kazhdan, Oxford University Press, New York–Oxford 1991, s. v. Stauropēgion (A. P. Kazhdan – A. M. Talbot) 1946–1947.

²³ *Canons of St Nikephoros the Confessor – the 30th canon in medieval Slavic translation, S. Troicki, Dopunski članci Vlastareve sintagme, SAN, Beograd 1956, 78; the 31st canon in the Greek text, Σύνταγμα IV, edd. G. A. Rhalles, M. Potles, 430.*

²⁴ *V. Jagić, Sitna gradja, 127, 147; A. Solovjev, Srpska crkvena pravila iz XIV veka, Glasnik Skopskog naučnog društva XIV (1934) Skoplje 1935, 37; cf. S. Bojanin, Parohijska zajednica, 268.*

²⁵ The structure of the holy space comprised by a church and a cemetery was recorded in the aforesaid travel books, *Stephan Gerlachs deß Aeltern Tage-Buch...*, Franckfurth am Mayn 1674, 526, “ein klein Kirchlein, und Begräbniß” and confirmed in modern archaeological excavations, cf. D. Minić, Ribnica – praiistorijsko i antičko nalazište, srednjovekovno naselje sa nekropolom, Starinar n. s. 33–34 (1982–1983) Beograd 1984, 259–263; Ž. Jež, Nekropola Dići. Prilog poznavanju srednjovekovnih nadgrobnih spomenika, Saopštenja 32–33 (2000–2001) 135–147.

²⁶ Cf. M. Purković, Popis crkava u staroj srpskoj državi, Biblioteka Hrišćanskog dela, knjiga 8, Skoplje 1938, 1–50; cf. G. Tomović, Vlastelinstvo, 201, 203, 209, 211, 215, 228, 242.

²⁷ ... priloži cr'kv Svetago Nikolu Rajkovu, cf. J. Šafarik, Hrisovulja cara Stefana Dušana, 271; S. Mišić, T. Subotin-Golubović, Svetoarhandelovska hrisovulja, 89, 90.

²⁸ *Bela crkva*, cf. P. Ivić, M. Grković, Dečanske hrisovulje, 130, 264, 316.

²⁹ *Drevena crkva*, cf. J. Šafarik, Hrisovulja cara Stefana Dušana, 274; S. Mišić, T. Subotin-Golubović, Svetoarhandelovska hrisovulja, 91.

with the official rituals, that is, whether they were consecrated by a bishop or a priest with the bishop's blessing, and whether each of them had the relics of a saint. That need not have been the case, as we learn from canon law which is translated into Old Slavonic for the needs of the Slavic Orthodox Christian churches of the Late Middle Ages.³⁰

The present analysis of the scant medieval sources can help us to conclude that the daily life of individuals in a parish went on in constantly crossing the line between the sacred and the profane. These cross-overs could have taken place during a church holiday when people went to the parish church or took part in religious processions, organized to mark the great Christian feast-days, when in a procession, they walked round the parish and its sacred places.³¹ Those sacred places might be separated from their profane rural environment not only by the parish church erected in the middle of a village, but also by crosses, chapels and churches or a carved cross in a tree trunk, set near a spring-well or an old oak, at a crossroad, on an adjacent hill, etc. These cross-overs constantly and always redefined both the established boundaries in the social space and the existing social relationships.

Religious processions were organized in late spring on Saint George's Day, Ascension and Pentecost, as it was written down in an instruction of the *Prayer against "evil rains"*. The *Prayer* had to be read three times "at the four sides of a village" (*na četiri strane sela*)³² or "at the crosses" (*pri krsteh*) according to one copy of the same prayer.³³ When processions were going to sacred places in a parish, prayers were recited to God and the saints, seeking protection from various adverse forces, from the devil and from humans, prayers to help disperse the hail-bearing and storm clouds, to protect the fields from pests. The Southern Slavic Trebnik contains texts of rituals, such as an official procession service,³⁴ or less official service which was performed, as it said in its title, "in fields, vineyards and gardens" against the pest,³⁵

³⁰ The issue is presented in the first chapter of the second Title of the *Nomocanon of Fourteen Titles* concerning the consecration of churches that have no relics of saints, *Zakonopravilo ili nomokanon*, f. 24v, or in aforementioned chapter in the *Syntagma of Blastares* (see note 22) which was partly incorporated in the abridged version of Blastares' *Syntagma of Dušan*' codification, *T. Florinskij*, *Pamjatniki zakonodatel'noj dejatel'nosti Dušana, Carja Serbov i Grekov, Kiev 1888, Priloženija V, 166.*

All of those Serbian law books contain the text of canon 84 (83) of the Council of Carthage that orders that churches and "small churches" (*crkvice*) which were set up without relics of martyrs or on account of dreams should be either demolished or turned into proper churches by the local bishop. Such churches and chapels were generally put up "in fields, in cultivated fields or in vineyards" (*Saint Sava's Nomocanon*), cf. *Zakonopravilo ili nomokanon*, 127r.

³¹ *S. Bojanin*, *Krst u seoskom ataru*, 326–335.

³² *Molitva ot zlago d'žda da se č'et' na Georgijev d'n' i na V'znesenie Gospodnje i na S'š'š'tvie svetago duha. i da se č'ite na četiri strane sela, po trišt*, Goraždanska štamparija 1519–1523: *Molitvenik 1523*, fototipsko izdanje, priredila *K. Mano-Zisi*, Beograd – Istočno Sarajevo 2008, 230'. The text of the prayer was published in *V. Kačanovskij*, *Molitva s apokrifičeskimi čertami „ot zlago (vredonosnago) doždja"*, *Izvestija otdelenija russkago jazyka i slovesnosti IAN*, tom II, kn. 3 (1897) 608–610.

³³ *Molitva glagolema pri krsteh ot zlago dažda*, Trebnik (15th or 16th century), NBKİM № 612, f. 80r–v; cf. *B. Conev*, *Opis na slavjanskite rükopisi v Sofijskata narodna biblioteka II*, Sofia 1923, 119.

³⁴ *Čin kako podobajet ishoditi s kr'sti v litiju*, Trebnik in Serbian redaction of Old Slavonic language (the late 13th century), *Svodnyj katalog slavjano-russkih rukopisnyh knjig, hranjaščihsva v SSSR XI–XIII vv*, *Akademia nauk SSSR, Moskva 1984, № 482, 369–370.*

³⁵ *Čin bivajemii na nive ili na lozi ili v vr'ograde*, Trebnik (1453), Dečani № 131, f. 100v–105v; *Opis čirilskih rukopisnih knjiga manastira Visoki Dečani I*, 529. An instruction on performing this kind

or *Prayers of St Tryphon said by a priest in the vineyards, fields and granaries*,³⁶ which were supposed to protect the crops and the fruits. On this occasion, I would like to point out the relation between the *Prayers to St Tryphon* and a relatively large number of crosses from the medieval charters that were dedicated to St Tryphon.³⁷ The crosses mentioned in the charters and other sources probably marked the places where the processions usually halted for supplications. In any case, the procession around the sacred places in a certain part of the countryside, symbolically established the boundaries of the local community.³⁸ Then the village and its precinct acquired the characteristics of the sacred, in relation to the area that was not socially organized. In some apocryphal prayers from the Slavonic Trebniks, pests and evil forces were always expelled out of the parish borders, to “deserted places”, “where semantrons could not be heard... and church bells don’t toll”³⁹ or “dogs don’t bark and roosters don’t sing” as one prayer said.⁴⁰

A different idea of a sacred space is recognized in the existence of different concepts of the ways the feast-days were celebrated.⁴¹ A parish church or other holy places in the village precinct did not have to be just a place where believers assembled in order to pray. It also served for other social events during festivals. In the churchyard and the narthex, holiday feasts could be organized, dances held and other activities of entertainment. The aforesaid penitentials indicate those phenomena as characteristic for a village celebration.⁴² The same applied when organizing village fairs when the official views of the church presented in the canon and church law⁴³ on

of service and supplications is contained in one variant of the text of this *Čin*, copied in a 16th century manuscript, *V. Kačanovskij*, *Apokrifne molitve, gatanja i priče*, *Starine JAZU XIII* (1881) 157–158.

³⁶ *Molitva svetago Trifona glagoljemije ot irea, v vinogradeh, v nivah. v žit'nicah*, Trebnik (1422), Dečani № 68, f. 362–368, *Opis cirilskih rukopisnih knjiga manastira Visoki Dečani I*, 248.

³⁷ St Tryphon was the protector of fields and vineyards. According to a text copied in the 16th century manuscript “four crosses around the village” should have been planted in the procession with the prayers addressed to the Saint, *V. Kačanovskij*, *Apokrifne molitve*, 157–159; Cf. *S. Bojanin*, *Krst u seoskom ataru*, 348. On the „magical prayers“ of St Tryphon, see *P. H. G. Greenfield*, *A contribution to the Study of Palaeologan Magic*, ed. *H. Maguire*, *Byzantine Magic*, *Dumbarton Oaks*, Washington 1995, 149 note 108; *R. Mathiesen*, *Magic in Slavia Orthodoxa: The Written Tradition*, ed. *H. Maguire*, *Byzantine Magic*, *Dumbarton Oaks*, Washington 1995, 160–161, note 11.

³⁸ Unfortunately, there are no medieval descriptions of village processions. However, there is an interesting description of a religious procession with crosses and icons organized by monks of the monastery of Chilandar from the 16th century manuscript. They walked around a bakery, a wine cellar, a threshing floor, a granary and storerooms inside the monastery and went outside its walls to vineyards and the tower of St Basil, *A. A. Turilov*, *Rasskazy o čudotvornyh ikonah monastyrja Hilandar v ruskoj zapisi XVI veka*, ed. *A. Lidov*, *Čudotvornaja ikona v Vizantii i Drevnej Rusi*, Moskva 1996, 510–531.

³⁹ *Gde se klepalo ne čuje ni kleplje, gde zvona ne zvone*, *V. Kačanovskij*, *Apokrifne molitve, gatanja i priče*, 157.

⁴⁰ *Ideže petal ne slišit se*, *V. Kačanovskij*, *Apokrifne molitve, gatanja i priče*, 157; *...ni psi laut ni petli pojut...*, *L.J. Štavljanin-Dorđević*, *M. Grozdanović-Pajić*, *L. Cernić*, *Opis cirilskih rukopisa Narodne biblioteke Srbije I*, Beograd 1986, 101–102.

⁴¹ *S. Bojanin*, *Zabave i svetkovine*, 43–98, 407–409.

⁴² *Egda tvorite pamet ili svetomu ili za pokoj... ašte li kto ot ljudi doneset v' cr'kov ili dovedet čto ili v' vinaa mesto olovinu i priimet pop to i sed s ljudmi i jast i pijet perd cr'kviju, da jest lih popov'stva, a ljudije ti da se udr'žet od kom'kanja*, *V. Jagić*, *Sitna gradja*, 148. For the issue of proper celebration of the patron saint's day after the church service, see *S. Bojanin*, *Zabave i svetkovine*, 113–135, 146–148; *S. Bojanin*, *Parohijska zajednica*, 268–269.

⁴³ See the second and third chapters of the fifth Title of the *Nomocanon of Fourteen Titles*, *Zakonopravilo ili nomokanon*, f 27v–28r; *Syntagma I*, edd. *G. A. Rhalles*, *M. Potles*, 18, and chapter E-15

separation between the church sacred place and the profane one of village streets and a square were not considered. The German travel writer, Stefan Gerlach, described in 1578 such a village celebration held on St Peter's Day (29th June). After the church liturgy, festive tables with food were placed around the church around which the people danced,⁴⁴ or, at such gatherings, they would praise God and His saints, whose feasts they were celebrating.⁴⁵

From the point of view of church elite and its learned men, the piety of a parish did not always have to be in keeping with the official concepts of the sacred and the profane, whether it involved a relationship towards the parish church as the official sacred space of the community or whether it concerned the practice of multiplying the sacred space without the official approval of the relevant representatives and authorities of the Church.

The diversity of the sacred places in a local community testifies to the particular forms of popular and parochial religiosity. Included in the system of the sacred topography of a parish, special religious and social significance was attached to such places. This was expressed in the times of feast-days when going to the sacred places in the parish in a procession and saying prayers. On those occasions, it always reconfirmed the sacredness of both the specific places and the entire village precincts, and also the religious and social identity of the local communities.

ЛИСТА РЕФЕРЕНЦИ – LIST OF REFERENCES

Извори – Primary Sources

Необјављени извори – Unpublished Primary Sources:

Dečani 68, *Trebnik*, Serbian, 1422, Dečani monastery.

Dečani 131, *Trebnik*, Serbian, 1453, Dečani monastery.

NBKIM 612, *Trebnik*, Serbian, 15th–16th century, Nacionalna biblioteka „Sveti Sveti Kiril i Metodij“, Sofia.

Објављени извори – Published Primary Sources:

Daničić Đ., Rječnik iz književnih starina srpskih I–III, Beograd 1863–1864.

Daskalova A. – Rajkova M., Gramoti na b'lgarskite care. Uvod. Tekstove. Rečnik. Bibliografija, Sofia 2005.

Domentijan, Žitije svetoga Save, prevod i komentari *Lj. Juhas-Georgijevska*, iz. *T. Jovanović*, Beograd 2001.

of the Syntagma of Matthew Blastares, Matije Vlastara Sintagmat, 279; Syntagma VI, edd. *G. A. Rhalles, M. Potles*, 266.

⁴⁴ “Nach dem Essen haben die Jungfern in einem Reyhen getantzet und Chorweise gesungen...”, *Stephan Gerlachs deß Aeltern Tage-Buch...*, 523. Cf. *P. Matković*, Putovanja po Balkanskom poluotoku XVI. vieka. XIII. Putopisi Stj. Gerlacha i Sal. Schweigera, ili opisi putovanja carskih poslanstava u Carigrad, naime Davida Ungnada od g. 1573. do 1578. i Joach. Sinzendorfa od god. 1577, Rad JAZU 116 (1893) 49–50; *S. Bojanin*, Zabave i svetkovine, 125, 298.

⁴⁵ “...loben Gott und ihren Heiligen dessen Gedächtnüß sie begehnen“, *Stephan Gerlachs deß Aeltern Tage-Buch*, 515.

- Florinskij T.*, Pamjatniki zakonodatel'noj dejatel'nosti Dušana, Carja Serbov i Grekov, Kiev 1888, Priloženija V.
- Goraždanska štamparija 1519–1523: Molitvenik 1523, fototipsko izdanje, priredila *K. Mano-Zisi*, Beograd – Istočno Sarajevo 2008.
- Grković M.*, The First Charter of the Decani monastery, translated by *R. A. Major*, Belgrade 2004.
- Hans Dernschwam's Tagebuch einer Reise nach Konstantinopel und Kleinasien (1553/55) nach der Urschrift im Fugger-Archiv*, herausgegeben und erläutert von *F. Babinger*, München und Leipzig 1923.
- Ivić P.*, *Grković M.*, Dečanske hrisovulje, Novi Sad 1976.
- Jagić V.*, Sitna gradja za crkveno pravo, Starine Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti VI (1874) 112–156.
- Kanuni i kanun-name za Bosanski, Hercegovački, Zvornički, Kliški, Crnogorski i Skadarski sandžak, ur. *B. Durđev – N. Filipović – H. Hadžibegić – M. Mujić – H. Šabanović*, Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu, Beograd 1957, 31.
- Kaćanovskij V.*, *Apokrifne molitve, gatanja i priče*, Starine Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti XIII (1881) 150–163.
- Kaćanovskij V.*, Molitva s apokrifčeskimi čertami „ot zlago (vredonosnago) doždja”, Izvestija otdelenija ruskago jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk, tom II, kn. 3 (1897) 608–610.
- Matije Vlastara Sintagmat. Azbučni zbornik vizantijskih crkvenih i državnih zakona i pravila. Slovenski prevod vremena Dušanova, ed. *S. Novaković*, Srpska kraljevska akademija, Beograd 1907.
- Miklosich F.*, Monumenta Serbica spectantia historiam Serbiae, Bosnae, Ragusii, Viennae 1858.
- Mišić S.*, *Subotin-Golubović T.*, Svetoarhandelovska hrisovulja, Istorijski institut, Beograd 2003.
- Mladenović A.*, Povelje kneza Lazara: tekst, komentari, snimci, Beograd 2003.
- Mošin V.*, Akti iz svetogorskih arhiva, Spomenik Srpske kraljevske akademije, XCI (1939) 153–260.
- Povelja kralja Milutina manastiru Banjska – Svetostefanska hrisovulja*, knj. 1: Fototipija izvornog rukopisa, priredio *Đ. Trifunović*, Beograd 2011.
- Solovjev A.*, Srpska crkvena pravila iz XIV veka, Glasnik Skopskog naučnog društva XIV (1934) Skoplje 1935, 33–42.
- Stephan Gerlachs deß Aeltern Tage-Buch...*, Franckfurth am Mayn 1674.
- Stojanović L.J.*, Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi I, Beograd 1902.
- Syntagma tōn theiōn kai hierōn kanonōn I–VI, edd. *G. A. Rhalles, M. Potles*, Athena 1859 (rp. 1966).
- Šafarik J.*, Hrisovulja cara Stefana Dušana, kojom osniva manastir Sv. Arhangelu Mihailu i Gavrilu u Prizrenu, Glasnik Društva srpske slovesnosti 15 (1862) 266–318.
- Troicki S.*, Dopunski članci Vlastareve sintagme, Srpska akademija nauka, Beograd 1956.
- Turilov A. A.*, Rasskazy o čudotvornyh ikonah monastyrja Hilandar v ruskoy zapisi XVI veka, ed. *A. Lidov*, Čudotvornaja ikona v Vizantii i Drevnej Rusi, Moskva 1996, 510–531.
- Veselinović A.*, Tri povelje za manastire Tismena i Vodica, Stari srpski arhiv 8 (2009) 183–203.
- Zakonopravilo ili nomokanon svetoga Save, Ilovički prepis 1262. godina. Fototipija, priredio *M. M. Petrović*, Gornji Milanovac 1991.
- Zakonopravilo svetoga Save I, priredili i preveli *M. M. Petrović – Lj. Štavljanin-Dorđević*, Istorijski institut, Beograd 2005.
- Zbornik srednjovekovnih ćirilčkih povelja i pisma Srbije, Bosne i Dubrovnika I (1186–1321), priredili *V. Mošin, S. Ćirković, D. Sindik*, redigovao *D. Sindik*, Beograd 2011.

Литература – Secondary Works

- Almazov A. I.*, K istorii molitv na raznye slučai, Odessa 1896.
- Burke P.*, Popular Culture, in: Encyclopedia of European Social History from 1350 to 2000, vol. V, editor in chief *P. N. Stearns*, Charles Scribner's Sons 2001, 3–13.

- Burke P., *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*, New York University Press, New York 1978.
- Bojanin S., Krst u seoskom ataru: Sakralna topografija i njena društvena funkcija u parohiji srednjovekovne Srbije, *Istorijski Časopis LVI* (2008) 305–347.
- Bojanin S., Parohijska zajednica u ogledalu srpskih penitencijalnih zbornika, edd. S. Ćirković – K. Čavoški, *Srednjovekovno pravo u Srba u ogledalu istorijskih izvora*, Zbornik radova sa naučnog skupa održanog 19–21. marta 2009, Odbor za izvore srpskog prava SANU, Beograd 2009, 261–283.
- Bojanin S., Penitencijalni sastavi u dečanskim trebnicima № 68 i № 69, ed. T. Subotin-Golubović, Dečani u svetlu arheografskih istraživanja, Beograd 2012, 163–181.
- Bojanin S., Zabave i svetkovine u srednjovekovnoj Srbiji (od kraja XII do kraja XV veka), *Istorijski institut – Službeni glasnik*, Beograd 2005.
- Christian W., *Local Religion in Sixteenth-Century Spain*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey 1981.
- Conev B., *Opis na slavjanskite rükopisi v Sofijskata narodna biblioteka II*, Sofia 1923.
- Davis N. Z., Some Tasks and Themes in the Study of Popular Religion, edd. C. Trinkaus – H. A. Oberman, *The Pursuit of Holiness in Late Medieval and Renaissance Religion*, E. J. Brill, Leiden 1974, 307–336.
- Dekić M., *Vodice u Vojvodini*, Novi Sad 2001.
- Filipović M. S., Običaji i verovanja u Skopskoj kotlini, *Srpski etnografski zbornik LIV*, Život i običaji narodni 24, Srpska kraljevska akademija, Beograd 1939.
- Gurevich A., *Medieval Popular Culture: Problems of Belief and Perception*, (translated by János M. Bak and Paul A. Hollingsworth), *Maison des Sciences de l’Homme and Cambridge University Press*, Cambridge 1990.
- Leksikon srpskog srednjeg veka, priredili S. Ćirković – R. Mihaljević, Beograd 1999.
- Le Goff J., *Time, Work and Culture in the Middle Ages*, (translated by A. Goldhammer), *The University of Chicago Press* 1980.
- Greenfield P. H. G., *A Contribution to the Study of Palaeologan Magic*, ed. H. Maguire, *Byzantine Magic*, *Dumbarton Oaks*, Washington 1995, 117–153.
- Jež Ž., Nekropola Dići. Prilog poznavanju srednjovekovnih nadgrobnih spomenika, *Saopštenja XXXII–XXXIII* (2000–2001) 135–147.
- Kulišić – Petrović – Pantelić, *Srpski mitološki rečnik*, Beograd 1998², (prvo izdanje 1970).
- Matković P., Putovanja po Balkanskom poluotoku XVI. veka. XIII. Putopisi Stj. Gerlacha i Sal. Schweigera, ili opisi putovanja carskih poslanstava u Carigrad, naime Davida Ungnada od g. 1573. do 1578. i Joach. Sinzendorfa od god. 1577, *Rad JAZU* 116 (1893) 1–112.
- Medieval Folklore: An Encyclopedia of Myths, Legends, Tales, Beliefs, and Customs*, Vol. I-II, edd. C. Lindahl – J. McNamara – J. Lindow, *Santa Barbara-Denver-Oxford* 2000.
- Minić D., Ribnica – praistorijsko i antičko nalazište, srednjovekovno naselje sa nekropolom, *Starinar n. s.* 33–34 (1982–1983) Beograd 1984, 259–263.
- Mišić S., Korišćenje unutrašnjih voda u srpskim zemljama srednjeg veka, Beograd 2007.
- Mathiesen R., *Magic in Slavia Orthodoxa: The Written Tradition*, ed. H. Maguire, *Byzantine Magic*, *Dumbarton Oaks*, Washington 1995, 155–177.
- Opis ćirilskih rukopisnih knjiga manastira Visoki Dečani I, priredila N. Sindik, Beograd 2011.
- Purković M., *Popis crkava u staroj srpskoj državi*, *Biblioteka Hrišćanskog dela*, knjiga 8, Skoplje 1938, 1–50.
- The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium I–III*, ed. A. P. Kazhdan, *Oxford University Press*, New York–Oxford 1991.
- Svodnjy katalog slavjano-russkikh rukopisnyh knig, hranjaščihsja v SSSR XI–XIII vv*, *Akademia nauk SSSR*, Moskva 1984.
- Schmitt J.-C., “Religion populaire” et culture folklorique (note critique), *Annales, économies, sociétés, civilisations*, 31 (1976) 941–953.

Štavljanin-Dorđević L.J., M. Grozdanović-Pajić, L. Cernić, Opis ćirilskih rukopisa Narodne biblioteke Srbije I, Beograd 1986.

Tomović G., Vlastelinstvo manastira Svetog Stefana u Banjskoj, ed. *Đ. Trifunović*, Povelja kralja Milutina manastiru Banjska – Svetostefanska hrisovulja, knj. 2: Fototipije izdanja i prateće studije, Beograd 2011, 195–249.

Сћаноје Бојанин

(Византолошки институт САНУ, Београд)

САКРАЛНА И ПРОФАНА ТОПОГРАФИЈА У ПАРОХИЈИ СРЕДЊОВЕКОВНЕ СРБИЈЕ: НАЦРТ ЗА ЈЕДНО ИСТРАЖИВАЊЕ

У сачуваној документарној грађи коју углавном представљају средњовековне манастирске даровнице краљева, кнежева и обласних господара Србије, често срећемо следеће ентитете забележене на границама сеоских атара или властелинства: црква, гробље, крст, цеста, раскрсница, виноград, воденица, студенац, *водица*, издвојено и усамљено дрво или група њих и сл. Углавном, њихова функција као међника није примарна, нити су се налазили искључиво на сеоским међама. Реч је, заправо, о ентитетима који сведоче о сегментацији друштвеног простора који је организован и као село и као парохија, односно као простор са профаним и сакралним обележјем. Сегментација друштвеног простора на свето и профано препознаје се као културна конструкција, сагледана у низу дихотомија као што су званична / незванична култура, учена (писана) / не-учена (усмена), „висока“ / „ниска“, клирикална / лаичка, култура центра и култура периферије. Концепти светости одређеног простора били су разноврсни и хијерархијски постављени, али и за различите друштвене групе, различито дефинисани. Парохија на челу са локалним свештеником била је место где су се поменути концепти сусретали, наметали, одбацивали, присвајали и прилагођавали. То сведочи о постојању локалне и парохијске побожности, чија се посебност препознаје у односу на званично учење средњовековне Цркве.

Досадашња анализа оскудне средњовековне грађе – документарна изворна гађа, описи појединих обреда записаних у требницима који су се изводили ради заштите њива, винограда и вртова, или сведочење путописаца из нешто каснијег, XVI столећа – показује да се свакодневица појединца у парохији одвијала у непрестаним преласцима граница светог и профаног. Ти су се преласци могли одигравати током црквеног празника одласком у парохијску цркву или организовањем литије када се обилазила парохија и њена света места. У средњовековним требницима релативно је честа била *мѣтва глѣма при крѣстѣх ѿт злаго дажда* која се читала на четирн странѣ села, о Ђурђевдану, Вазнесењу и Педесетници (из Горажданског штампаног требника). А та друга света места парохије могла су бити издвојена

из профаног окружења у виду црквених грађевина изван насеља, постављањем слободностојећих крстова или можда записа на кори дрвета, обично храста, око неког извора (Водице) или на раскршћу путева, или на оближњем брегу и слично. Укључењем у систем сакралне топографије парохије, таквим местима је придаван посебан верски и друштвени значај, који је најјасније до изражаја долазио у време празника. У тим се приликама увек изнова потврђивала како светост одређеног места тако и села у целини, али и верски и друштвени идентитет локалних заједница.