

HOLY KING MILUTIN – PROTECTOR OF
“ALL SERBIAN AND BULGARIAN LAND”¹

Abstract: This paper analyses the evolution of the veneration of the Serbian King Stefan Uroš II Milutin (1282–1321) with regards to the translation of his relics to Sofia (before 1469). Besides providing an analysis of the specific manifestations of his cult in Sofia, the aim of the paper is to demonstrate the polyphony of the memories of saints as an important characteristic of their veneration. As in this case, this dynamic of the saint’s veneration is often caused by wider social and political changes, thus signalling its “social logic.”

Keywords: King Stefan Uroš II Milutin, Sofia, cult of a saint, translation of a saint’s relics, polyphony, memories of saints, “social logic”

The veneration of the Serbian King Stefan Uroš II Milutin (1282–1321) before the translation of his relics to Sofia (before 1469) was recently thoroughly and interdisciplinarily analysed.² Different memories of King Milutin, nurtured in this period, were transferred together with his relics to Sofia. For that reason, I will outline the evolution of the veneration of King Milutin in its formative period, stress the reasons for the changes and transformations it went through, and then proceed to analyse its manifestations in Sofia.

King Milutin was included among the saints in a period marked by the aspiration to create the “pantheon of Serbian saints.”³ Serbian archbishop Danilo

1 This paper presents the results of the research conducted at the Institute for Balkan Studies, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia based on the Scientific Research Realization and Co-Funding Contract for 2022 no. 451–03–68/2022–14 of 17/1/2022.

2 Поповић 2022.

3 This period saw the inauguration of the eremitic model of sainthood with the cult of Petar of Koriša, the redefinition of the cults of Sts Simeon (Grand Prince Stefan Nemanja, 1166–1196, d. 1199) and Sava (first archbishop of the Serbian autocephalous church, 1218/19–1233), now celebrated as the “holy dyad,” and the commemoration of the Serbian kings and archbishops. See Роровић 1997; Марјановић-Душанић 2004; eadem 2007: 148–170; eadem 2011; Шпадијер 2014; Марјановић-Душанић 2016; Поповић, 2016.

II (1324–1337) partook in this process by writing the extensive hagiographies of King Milutin, his brother King Stefan Dragutin (1276–1282, d. 1316), their mother Jelena Anžujaska/Helen of Anjou (d. 1314), and three of his distinguished predecessors on the archbishop's throne.⁴

The Extensive *vita* of King Milutin was the first text intended for his commemoration. However, since it was written shortly after his inclusion among the saints, i.e., the translation of his relics two and a half years after his death, it belongs to the nascent phase of his veneration.⁵ This is evident in the fact that Danilo II describes the translation of Milutin's incorrupt body within his mausoleum, Banjska Monastery, but does not mention further miracles, nor does he address prayers to the holy king.⁶ Nonetheless, the time of writing makes this unsurprising.

The Extensive *vita* of King Milutin differs from the hagiographies of King Dragutin and Queen Jelena. In fact, it is a story of hero's deeds, i.e., it corresponds to the *gesta* genre, inspired by chivalric romance and the *speculum* genre.⁷ In other words, even though some attributes of King Milutin – such as being a just judge, protector of the Church and the weak, builder of churches, victorious leader of the chosen people and defender of the true faith – were already present in Serbian cultic practice, they were reinterpreted in the context of Milutin's status of an invincible warrior and a soldier of Christ, a chivalric hero.⁸

Another important aspect of King Milutin's portrait is that he achieves his victories with God's help and the intercessory prayers of his ancestors, Sts Simeon and Sava.⁹ This, and the fact that Milutin's hagiography is found in the collection of *vitae* of Serbian rulers, places his sainthood in the dynastic context.¹⁰ Lastly, Danilo II emphasises Milutin's ktetorial activities, which earned him the epi-

4 On the work of Danilo II and his disciples and continuators, later collated and collectively known as Danilo's Miscellany, see Мак Даниел 1991.

5 On the different stages of the commemoration of saints – veneration before the translation of relics, composition of the first texts, and creation of the cult (the writing of the office and synaxarial *vita*), and the writing of the texts for more frequent commemoration – see Васиљевић 2021a: 31–39, 366–367.

6 *Животи краљева и архиепископа српских* 1866: 159–161. On this see Васиљевић 2021a: 174–176. Danica Popović also commented on this in Поповић 2022, 543.

7 This was commented on several occasions: Марјановић-Душанић 2007: 166; eadem 2013: 697; eadem 2017a: 296; eadem 2017b: 125.

8 The chivalric concept of a hero was introduced through the concept of the invincible body, Марјановић-Душанић 2013; eadem 2017a: 294–303. The portrait of King Milutin is also analysed in Поповић 2022, 532–536.

9 Марјановић-Душанић 2007: 166–169; eadem 2013: 698; eadem 2017b: 123–126; see also Поповић 2022, 536.

10 See previous footnote for the comments on this.

thet “builder of churches.”¹¹ His unrivalled extensive founding and restoration of churches throughout the Christian *oikoumene* (for example, in Jerusalem, Sinai, Mount Athos, Constantinople, etc.) had the strongest influence on the collective image of King Milutin.

The Extensive *vita* was probably the basis of the veneration of King Milutin in the following decades. Its centre was Banjska Monastery, where the King’s relics were kept.¹² Different sources show that his veneration spread. Donation charters to ecclesiastical establishments, issued by Milutin’s successors, often refer to him as “holy king.”¹³ Furthermore, many portraits designate him as a saint, attesting to his veneration.¹⁴ Finally, stemmas – a historiographical genre written probably around 1371 or shortly after – also mention King Milutin as “holy.”¹⁵ This information is important because, unlike the charters and portraits intended for or found in churches, stemmas, as lay texts, indicate the reach of Milutin’s veneration outside of the liturgical practice.

After this decades-long veneration of King Milutin, another head of the Serbian church – Patriarch Danilo III (1390–1395/6 or 1400),¹⁶ created his cult with the Office and the Synaxarial *vita*.¹⁷ These texts have been dated differently. One of the most widely accepted opinions is that Patriarch Danilo wrote the Office for King Milutin while he was a monk in Banjska monastery, around 1380.¹⁸ However, the atmosphere in both texts and the fact that Danilo did not have to be at the monastery to write them, allows the hypothesis that he wrote them later, perhaps even in the last decade of the 14th century.¹⁹

Both the Office and Synaxarial *vita* are interesting for several reasons. First,

11 On this see Поповић 2022, 534.

12 On Banjska Monastery and new interpretations of the funerary programme, see *ibid*, 539–543.

13 Васиљевић 2013: 87–90.

14 Поповић 2022, 545–547.

15 On stemmas see Васиљевић, 2015: 102–103. On King Milutin’s place in stemmas see *eadem* 2021a: 343–344.

16 Different dates of Danilo’s term on the patriarchal throne stem from the fact that his last mention can be found in a charter that has survived in two copies, dated to 1395 and 1400. On Patriarch Danilo see Пурковић 1975: 127–134, and on the copies of the charter see Младеновић 2007: 293–313.

17 His cult is examined in detail in Васиљевић 2021a: 189–201 and Поповић 2022, 549–553.

18 Đorđe Trifunović was the first to express this opinion in Трифуновић 1970: 297–298.

19 Other researchers placed them around the Battle of Marica (1371) or the Battle of Kosovo (1389), Ђоровић 1292: 29–30; Богдановић 1980: 192–193; Бојовић 2007: 212. It should be borne in mind that Grigorije Camblak/Gregory Tsamblak wrote the texts for the cult of King Stefan Uroš III of Dečani (1321–1331) after he left Dečani Monastery, where he served as the hegoumenos. Danilo wrote the text for the commemoration of Prince Lazar (1371–1389) while serving as the Serbian patriarch, which suggests that he could have written Milutin’s Office and Synaxarial *vita* in the same period. For the dating see also Васиљевић 2021a, 179–180.

Patriarch Danilo dates Milutin's death to October 30, unlike Archbishop Danilo, who reports that the king died on October 29.²⁰ This inconsistency and the differences in the portrayal of King Milutin suggest that the extensive hagiography was unknown to Patriarch Danilo.

The Synaxarial *vita* is lengthy for its genre. At the beginning, where the origin of a saint is usually presented, Danilo III stresses that Milutin was the great-grandson of St Simeon and then mentions all of his predecessors.²¹ However, it is the commemoration of Milutin's brother, King Dragutin, that brought about the length of this text. Unlike the Extensive *vita* of King Dragutin, the Synaxarial *vita* of King Milutin notes that Dragutin was venerated as a saint, more specifically, the most highly revered myrrh-gusher.²² With this, the Serbian patriarch created a new "holy dyad" in the image of the dynastic founders, Sts Simeon and Sava.²³

After the lines dedicated to King Dragutin, Patriarch Danilo describes the life of King Milutin. However, his portrait differs from the previous one. For example, Danilo mentions his military successes and victories only in passing. In other words, one of the most important components of the Extensive *vita* was upstaged by a more traditional image of the merciful shepherd of the flock entrusted to his care, feeder of the hungry, pillar of the weak, etc. The centrepiece of the narrative is the depiction of the churches and monasteries Milutin built, restored and endowed throughout the *oikoumene*.²⁴ As expected, Hilandar and Banjska hold a special place – the former because it connects him to the dynastic founder and the latter as his mausoleum and the centre of his cult.

If Patriarch Danilo was indeed unaware of the extensive hagiography of King Milutin, that could explain the change in his portrayal. Another possibility is that the brevity of synaxarial hagiographies and their focus on the road to holiness made the king's military successes redundant. It could also be that this portrait reflects the collective memory of King Milutin. This seems more plausible given that stemmas and the Synaxarial *vita* bring some of the same information.²⁵

20 This and the following were noticed by Ђоровић 1929: 25–26.

21 Јовановић 2016: 222.

22 *Ibid.*: 225. This information does not contradict the Extensive *vita* of King Dragutin, where it is noted that Dragutin forbade the translation of his body. This was interpreted either as a sign of extreme piety or the intention to extinguish his veneration. Since the Synaxarial *vita* of King Milutin mentions that Dragutin was venerated as a saint, whose "dry bones" were "myrrh-gushing" (myroblyte), this could confirm the former interpretation. On previous opinions and interpretations and how this information could contribute to the dilemma see Васиљевић 2021a: 191–194.

23 For a comment on this see Васиљевић 2021a: 196.

24 Јовановић 2016: 226–232.

25 Perhaps Patriarch Danilo consulted the stemmas or maybe both were based on a now unknown work on King Milutin or collective remembrance, Васиљевић 2021a: 196–197.

As expected, Danilo III mentions miracles occurring in Banjska.²⁶ The importance of the miracles of both Dragutin and Milutin reveals itself at the end of the hagiography. The author asks the new “holy dyad” – kings Milutin and Dragutin – and Queen Jelena to protect their people and their fatherland from the attacks of the “godless Hagarenes,” i.e., Ottomans.²⁷ In the Office, the saints were asked to bring salvation, save them from enemy attacks and bring peace and victory against the “godless Hagarenes.”²⁸ These prayers reveal that the need for saintly protection grew in the face of the Ottoman invasion, which is why the same plea for salvation is often found in liturgical texts of that time.²⁹

The wars with the Ottomans could explain the translation of King Milutin’s body from Banjska to Trepča. The information on the translation comes from a 16th-century genealogy, which notes that the relics of King Milutin are in Sofia, where they were translated from Trepča.³⁰ The translation to Trepča is usually dated to c. 1389, probably before 1402, at the time of the Ottoman attacks and the devastation of Banjska.³¹ Their relocation to the nearby town of Trepča could indicate that the plan was to bring the relics back to Banjska.³²

It does not seem that this translation hindered the commemoration of King Milutin. Two related texts show that the memory of King Milutin stemming from the Extensive vita continued to be nurtured. These are the Autobiography, found in a 15th-century falsified charter on beekeepers on the Bistrica River³³ and the Short Vita, whose date of writing is still unknown³⁴.

Both texts report Milutin’s military successes and only briefly note his founding activities.³⁵ Also, both texts designate King Milutin as a saint and mention

26 Јовановић 2016: 234.

27 *Ibid.*: 235.

28 For example: *idem* 2015: 104–106, 111–113, 132. Queen Jelena’s role is more prominent in the Office, but she is always in the shadow of her two sons. On the veneration of Queen Jelena before this period and the creation of her cult around 1600 see Marjanović-Dušanić 2012 and Тодић 2018.

29 Ottoman conquests brought about the proliferation of the veneration of saints. For the interpretation of the cults of saints in their social and political contexts see Васиљевић 2021a.

30 Стојановић 1927: 32.

31 Новаковић 1892: 24–30; Поповић 1992: 98.

32 On this translation in the context of the widespread translations of relics of that age see Vasiljević 2021b: 38.

33 The charter was intended to be used in a dispute between Hilandar and Peć monasteries and was composed between 1413 and 1427. On the charter see Ћирковић 1991. The Autobiography is published in Мошин 1977.

34 The oldest manuscript containing the Short vita was dated to the first decade of the 16th century, but whether it was written earlier remains to be researched. The description of the surviving copies of the Short vita and one published version see in Убипарић 2005.

35 Two texts were analysed in Поповић 2022, 536–539.

his miracles, absent from the *Extensive Vita*. A particularly notable feature is the mention of saints performing miracles in the Church of the Holy Apostles in Ras, Studenica, Žiča, Peć, and Hilandar monasteries.³⁶ In doing so, the author attests to the flourishing of the cults of saints in Milutin's age, but I would suggest, also at the time of writing of these texts. However, even though they share the central theme, these texts have some notable differences. Firstly, the *Short Vita* is shorter than the *Autobiography*. Another difference is that the author of the *Autobiography* stresses the intercession of the Virgin Mary and Sts Simeon and Sava, although not always alone,³⁷ completely absent from the *Short Vita*.

The question is: what propelled the re-actualisation of the memory of King Milutin as a God-chosen warrior? I believe that the dating of the *Autobiography* can give us some answers. Like in the case of the creation of the cult and the translation of relics to Trepča, the charter was written during the Ottoman conquests. The changes they caused could bring about the need to commemorate the military successes of King Milutin. In other words, the community could feel the call to celebrate their king – the ever-victorious leader, whose power could help in the coming wars. In fact, both texts report that the King defeated “Persians and Hagarenes” – he banished them from the Serbian Kingdom and helped the Byzantine emperor in his fight against them.³⁸ These were the Turkish mercenaries, who were at one point in the service of the Byzantine emperor and King Milutin but later rebelled.³⁹ Since the Ottomans were also called “Hagarenes” in liturgical texts,⁴⁰ I believe that the Turkish mercenaries and the Ottomans came to be identified with each other. In doing so, the venerating community could believe that King Milutin had already defeated the contemporary enemy. As he had done during his lifetime, now that he was a saint, he could intercede for aid and help secure another victory against them. Even if that was not the case, I believe that the contemporary circumstances brought about the need to remember the age of military successes.

Both of these texts and liturgical works by Patriarch Danilo show that different memories of King Milutin were nurtured at the same time. This polyphony of the memories is a good example of another characteristic of the veneration of saints. Although the main goal is to present the fulfilment of universal and timeless ideals, every memory of a saint reflects the worldviews, hopes, and needs of (sometimes different) communities of the faithful. This “social logic” of the memories

36 Мошин 1977: 352–353; Убипарип 2005: 67. This was noticed and commented on in Поповић 2022, 537.

37 For examples see Мошин 1977: 341, 345, 348, 350.

38 Мошин 1977: 348–352; Убипарип 2005: 65–66.

39 On this see Тирковић 1981: 458–461, 469.

40 Perhaps the best examples are the texts written for the veneration of Prince Lazar. See, for example, Новаковић 1867: 162, 163; Радојичић 1955: 251; Плаовић 2016: 48.

of saints is the main reason they could be reinterpreted and/or transformed.⁴¹ When there were different interpretations, like in this case, they needed not be conflicted, but could also be complementary.⁴²

The same reason that propelled the creation of the cult of King Milutin, the translation of his relics and the re-actualisation of his image as a victorious leader, brought about another translation, now from Trepča to Sofia. The fact that the translations were not described in separate texts suggests that both were informal and hasty events.⁴³ The 16th-century genealogy notes that Metropolitan Siloan translated the relics to Sofia, where they perform miracles to those who approach them with faith.⁴⁴ Since Vladislav the Grammarian mentions in his account of the translation of the relics of John of Rila that the relics of King Milutin are in Sofia, the last translation must have taken place before 1469.⁴⁵ The relics were probably translated during or after the wars that led to the fall of the Serbian Despotate (1459).⁴⁶

The cult of the holy king, as implied in the genealogy, flourished in Sofia.⁴⁷ Numerous references to the relics of King Milutin in Sofia in the works of 15th and 16th century writers confirm this. Among them is Vladislav the Grammarian, who notes that the relics of St John of Rila were laid to rest in the church of St George, where he and “that holy king, called Banjski, Milutin” performed miracles.⁴⁸ Pop Peja, the author of the Extensive vita of St George of Kratovo (d. 1515), has his hero remark that King Milutin, “who lies in this town,” is a miracle worker.⁴⁹ Matej the Grammarian, the author of the Extensive vita of Nicholas the New (d. 1555), describes Sofia and its surroundings and mentions the most important saints: John of Rila, George of Kratovo and another martyr called George, whose time of death is unknown but is usually placed in the middle of

41 One of the most prominent examples is the cult of Stefan Uroš III of Dečani, which evolved into another model of sainthood, in reflection to social and political changes. For more details on his cult see Поповић 2006: 143–183; Марјановић-Душанић 2007 and some remarks in Васиљевић 2021a: 202–218.

42 On this see Васиљевић 2021a: 17–24.

43 See eadem 2021b: 38–39.

44 Стојановић 1927: 32. For a possible identification of Metropolitan Siloan see Гергова 2007: 249.

45 Владислав Граматик 1975: 132.

46 This was noted in Гергова 2007: 249.

47 King Milutin’s cult in Sofia throughout the centuries, with a special focus on the 18th and 19th centuries, is analysed in Гергова 2007. Some of the results of this study are included here, but I focus on the 15th and 16th centuries and on liturgical texts and the nature of the translation of relics.

48 Владислав Граматик 1975: 132.

49 Богдановић 1976: 238–239. The text was probably written between 1523 and 1539, Васиљевић 2021a: 151–152.

the 16th century. Only after this does he mention the miracle-working relics of King Milutin and the “aforementioned martyrs.”⁵⁰ These references show that the relics of King Milutin were an important focal point of religious life in Sofia, although it seems that the relevance assigned to them depended on the author. Besides these, I believe that the mention by Stephen Gerlach, a Lutheran theologian and diplomat, is of great importance.⁵¹ He mentions that the relics of King Stefan, a “Bulgarian emperor who was supposed to become a monk,” are in the church of St Marina.⁵² The fact that Milutin was mentioned by an author who did not personally belong to the Orthodox community shows the reach of his cult.

Another sign of the reach of King Milutin’s cult is that in 1558 the monks of Hilandar sought help from the Russian Emperor Ivan the Terrible, who was also a ktetor of the monastery, to translate the king’s relics.⁵³ This plea did not come to fruition, but around this time – the middle of the 16th century – the cult of King Milutin reached Russia.⁵⁴

The afore-mentioned authors also attest that King Milutin’s relics reposed in the most important church of the moment.⁵⁵ According to Vladislav the Grammarian, in 1469, his relics were in the church of St George, the metropolitanate seat. After the church was converted into a mosque, the relics were placed in the “main city church,” according to Matej the Grammarian. This was the Church of the Holy Archangels.⁵⁶ The relics did not stay there for long because Stephen Gerlach claims they are in the church of St Marina. These relocations of the relics around Sofia in the first century and a half of their sojourn in Sofia were a consequence of the contemporary life realities – often acts of necessity.

However, the cult adapted to the new environment. As usual in this period, the translation of relics meant the translation of liturgical texts, which often left minor marks on them.⁵⁷ Those minor changes were common for two reasons, one of them general and the other inherent to the veneration of saints.⁵⁸ The first is that texts intended for oral presentation were always open to changes and adjust-

50 Иванова 1986: 317–320. The only preserved copy of the hagiography is from 1564. On the hagiography and Georgije, martyred in the middle of the 16th century, see *idem*, 613–615 and Милтенова 2008: 705–707.

51 He was a priest of David Ungnad, envoy of Emperor Maximilian II in Constantinople, between 1573 and 1578. On Stephen Gerlach and his Diary see Герлах 1976: 5–17.

52 *Ibid.*: 264.

53 Фотић 2000: 209–210. This plea could also be viewed as a means of attracting pilgrims, which could bring economic prosperity in a period when Hilandar Monastery was troubled by debts.

54 Рашковић 2020: 264–269.

55 This was already stressed by Гергова 2007: 250–251.

56 *Ibid.*: 250.

57 On the translation of the content of the cult together with the translations of relics see examples in Васиљевић 2021a: 218–282.

58 See some remarks in *ibid.*: 168–170.

ments, even in the act of rewriting. The other is the already mentioned “social logic” of the veneration of saints.

Two manuscripts attest to these changes. One is from the 16th century, and the other from the end of the 16th century or the beginning of the 17th.⁵⁹ Both include versions of the Office and Synaxarial vita that are different from the other preserved copies.⁶⁰ This suggests that his cult was so important for religious life in Sofia that a local version of the relevant liturgical texts emerged. The changes in the Synaxarial vita were minor and did not alter the saint’s identity.⁶¹ However, the Office suffered several important modifications. The older manuscript describes that King Milutin, like the brightest star, illuminates “all Serbian and Bulgarian land” instead of “all Serbian land.”⁶² Also, at the end of the text, the original phrasing that Milutin fortifies the sceptre of his land and brings victory against the enemies was reworked to: “he fortifies the sceptre of Orthodox emperors and brings victory against the enemies.”⁶³ These places are treated differently in the younger manuscript. There, the line “all Serbian and Bulgarian land” was crossed out and something, not quite legible, was overwritten.⁶⁴ Also, at the end, it is written that King Milutin fortified the sceptre of his own land.

These changes in the Office reflected the growth of the venerating community. In other words, the community in Sofia and surrounding areas accepted King Milutin as their own protector. The extent to which he became part of religious life in Sofia is aptly illustrated by Stephen Gerlach’s reference to King Milutin as a “Bulgarian emperor.”

These manuscripts also give other information on the veneration of King Milutin. Both are collections of offices and hagiographies of saints. The first one, dated to the 16th century, contains, among others, the extensive hagiographies of kings Stefan Uroš III of Dečani and Dragutin, Queen Jelena, and hermits John of Rila and Joachim of Osogovo, and the Office and Synaxarial vita of King Milutin.⁶⁵ The second, from the end of the 16th century or the beginning of the 17th, includes the Office and the Synaxarial vita of King Milutin, extensive hagiographies of King Dragutin and Queen Jelena, a genealogy, and, at the end, the Short vita of King Milutin.⁶⁶

Both manuscripts show that the translation of relics and liturgical texts for

59 Јовановић 2015: 98–99.

60 *Ibid.*: 101–102.

61 Differences are noted in the publication of the hagiography Јовановић 2016.

62 Јовановић 2015: 120.

63 *Ibid.*: 132. The interesting question is to whom the phrase “Orthodox emperors” refers. Since the Russian emperors remained the only independent Orthodox rulers, this may refer to them.

64 See *ibid.*: 120. Also, for the possibility of reading the overwritten text as “sanctified” see *ibid.*

65 Стојановић 1903: 103–104.

66 Цоневъ 1910: 170–172.

King Milutin led to the veneration of King Dragutin and Queen Jelena. In other words, their place in liturgical texts for King Milutin motivated the inclusion of their hagiographies in the manuscripts. The marginalia in the older manuscript suggest that it was written on the outskirts of Sofia or in Osogovo Monastery.⁶⁷ However, the vitae of John of Rila and Joachim of Osogovo imply that it could have been intended for monastic use – for Osogovo or even Rila Monastery. There are several points that could explain the inclusion of the hagiography of King Stefan of Dečani: he was the son of King Milutin and a highly venerated martyr in his own right, whose type of holiness corresponded to the contemporary realities of life.⁶⁸ If the manuscript was written in Osogovo or Rila, the proximity of Dečani might have contributed to the inclusion of this vita. Additionally, this was not the first time the narratives on Milutin and Stefan of Dečani appeared together in manuscripts – one was compiled from parts dated between the end of the 15th century and the seventh decade of the 16th, and the other is dated to the middle of the 16th century.⁶⁹ To conclude, the translation of the relics of King Milutin also led to the veneration of other Nemanjić saints in Bulgarian lands.

The choice of the texts in the younger manuscript suggests that it was written precisely for the veneration of King Milutin in Sofia. In fact, every text is closely connected to the cult of King Milutin, even the genealogy, which recounts the history of the holy lineage of these saints.⁷⁰ For that reason, the manuscript was later kept in the Sveta Nedelya Church (dedicated to Kyriake of Nicomedia), where Milutin's relics were treasured.⁷¹ However, very interestingly, it also includes the Short vita, which fostered, as we saw, a different memory of King Milutin.

The question is: what prompted the inclusion of this text in the manuscript? One of the reasons could be that the compiler wanted to collate every text about King Milutin into a manuscript dedicated to his veneration. Of course, this was not the first time the Office, the Synaxarial and the Short vita appeared in the same manuscript – they can be found together in a manuscript from the middle of the 16th century.⁷² However, since the versions of the two texts by Patriarch Danilo differ,⁷³ as does the content of the manuscripts, the one from the middle of the 16th century probably did not serve as the template. Therefore, we can note a tendency to bring together complementary memories of King Milutin. This was

67 Ђоровић 1929: 18–19, 33.

68 For the bibliography on the veneration of Stefan of Dečani see note 41.

69 For detailed descriptions of the first manuscript see in Богдановић 1976: 206–208 and the second in Мошин 1976: 128.

70 On the first genealogies, written to narrate the Nemanjić lineage, see Васиљевић 2015: 96–101.

71 Суботин-Голубовић 1994: 115; Гергова 2007: 257.

72 Мошин 1976: 128.

73 Јовановић 2015: 102.

not uncommon in cultic practice,⁷⁴ but it could also be explained by the need for commemorating the ever-victorious king, who would help the liberation from the Ottomans, just like he banished them during his lifetime.

However, this Short vita was reworked – some episodes were shortened, and others completely left out.⁷⁵ For example, the name of the Serbian Archbishop Sava II,⁷⁶ several episodes involving King Dragutin, and Milutin's ktetorial activities were left out. It seems that the purpose and content of the manuscript could explain all of those alterations. The name of the Serbian Archbishop was probably of little relevance in the new surroundings. Next, the narrative on King Dragutin was part of the manuscript, which means that not every episode that includes him in the Short vita had to be kept. This did not jeopardise the main message of the text – that Milutin was an invincible king. Lastly, information on churches Milutin built, repaired, or donated is included in the Synaxarial vita of King Milutin, which rendered it redundant in the Short vita.

In my opinion, the King's wars with the Turkish mercenaries are particularly important, as they reflect contemporary desires and hopes of Christians. In the previous version of the Short vita, "Persians and Hagarenes" were named once as a group and afterwards mostly as "Persians" and only once as "Hagarenes."⁷⁷ In this version, both terms are used equally.⁷⁸ This could further support the hypothesis that Milutin's adversaries were identified with the Ottomans, which prompted the frequent use of the term "Hagarenes" in this version of the Short vita. However, whether this was the reason for the change in the text or not, I believe that the contemporary conditions of social, religious, and everyday life led to the nurturing of a different memory of King Milutin, preserved in the Short vita.

To conclude, the veneration of King Milutin could only be understood in the social and political contexts in which it took place. Starting with his inclusion among the saints in his mausoleum, Banjska, the shaping of his sainthood and veneration was part of the wider currents in the venerating community. For that reason, his extensive hagiography depicts him as a chivalric hero, ever-victorious king, builder of churches and heir of dynastic sanctity. Several decades later, when his cult was created, he was portrayed only as a pious king and member of the holy dynasty, who built churches throughout the Christian *oikoumene*. His cult was created at the time of the conflicts with the Ottomans, from whom he was supposed to save his flock. The Ottoman conquests were the reason for two translations of Milutin's relics – from Banjska to Trepča and from Trepča to Sofia.

74 For the case of the veneration of Prince Lazar see Васиљевић 2021a: 39–78.

75 This was pointed out and exhaustively discussed in СубОТИН-ГОЛУБОВИЋ 1994: 117–118. The author proposed that this could be a "folk" version of the Short vita.

76 This was noticed by УБИПАРИП 2006: 60.

77 УБИПАРИП 2005: 65–66.

78 СУБОТИН-ГОЛУБОВИЋ 1994: 123–124.

However, in this period, his memory, based on the extensive hagiography, was cultivated through the Autobiography in one falsified charter and the Short vita. With the translation of King Milutin's relics, his veneration, in all its complexity and polyphony, was also translated to Bulgarian lands. The acceptance of the holy king as a new protector is attested by references to him in the works of many writers, the placing of relics in the city's most important churches, adjustments of liturgical texts and the inclusion of the Short vita in one of the manuscripts. The example of the veneration of King Milutin reveals the dynamic world of the veneration of saints, which the establishment of a new social and cultural environment as a result of the Ottoman conquest did not hinder. In other words, some of the most important characteristics of the commemoration of saints, such as its synchronic and diachronic dynamics and their "social logic," prove to be ever-present and, in this case, traceable.

Bibliography

Sources

Богдановић 1976: Д. Богдановић, "Житије Георгија Краивоца", *Зборник историје књижевности 10. Стара српска књижевност*, ed. В. Ђурић, Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности 1976, 203–267.

Герлах 1976: С. Герлах, *Дневник на едно патуване до Османската порта в Цариград*, Софија: Отечествен фронт.

Граматиќ 1976: В. Граматиќ, "О обнови Рилског манастира и о преносу моштију светог Јована Рилског", *Примери из старе српске књижевности. Од Григорија Дијака до Гаврила Стефановића Венцловића*, ed. Ђ. Трифуновић, Београд: Слово љубве 1976, 126–136.

Животи краљева и архиепископа српских 1866: *Животи краљева и архиепископа српских. Написао архиепископ Данило и други*, на свијет издао Ђ. Даничић, Загреб: Светозара Галца.

Иванова 1986: К. Иванова, *Стара бугарска литература 4. Житијени творби*, Софија: Бугарски писател.

Јовановић 2016: Т. Јовановић, "Синаксарско житије светог краља Милутина патријарха Данила Бањског", *Манастир Студеница: 700 година Краљеве цркве*, eds. Љ. Максимовић, В. Вукашиновић, Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности 2016, 215–236.

Јовановић 2015: Т. Јовановић, „Служба светом краљу Милутину Данила Бањског“, *Косовско-метохијски зборник 6 (2015)* 97–134

Мошин 1977: В. Мошин, "Краљ Милутин според неговата биографија од Данило II, неговото „житије по свиток“ и неговата автобиографија”,

Споменици за средновековната и поновата историја на Македонија II, ed. В. Мошин, Скопје: Архив на Македонија 1977, 339–354.

Новаковић 1867: С. Новаковић, „Нешто о кнезу Лазару. По рукопису XVII. вијека“, *Гласник Српског ученог друштва* 21 (1867) 157–164.

Плаовић 2016: И. Плаовић, “Слово о Светом кнезу Лазару непознатог Раваничанина у српскословенској рукописној традицији”, *Археографски прилози* 38 (2016) 39–59.

Радојичић 1955: Ђ. Сп. Радојичић, „Похвала кнезу Лазару (један досад непознати спис с краја XIV века)“, *Историјски часопис* 5 (1955) 241–253.

Убипарип 2005: М. Убипарип, „Зборник са Кратким житијем краља Милутина“, *Прилози за књижевност, језик, историју и фолклор* 71 (2005) 53–72.

Literature

Богдановић 1980: Д. Богдановић, *Историја старе српске књижевности*, Београд: Српска књижевна задруга.

Бојовић 2007: Д. Бојовић, “Два Данила и бањски краљ Милутин”, *Манастир Бањска и доба краља Милутина: зборник са научног скупа одржаног од 22. до 24. септембра 2005. године у Косовској Митровици*, ed. Д. Бојовић, Ниш, Косовска Митровица, Манастир Бањска: Центар за црквене студије, Филозофски факултет Косовска Митровица 2007, 211–217.

Васиљевић 2013: М. Васиљевић, „Помени предака у повељама Немањића и легитимизација власти“, *Иницијал. Часопис за средњовековне студије* 1 (2013) 77–96.

Васиљевић 2015: М. Васиљевић, „Настанак српских родослова и летописа као последица политичких и друштвених промена“, *Иницијал. Часопис за средњовековне студије* 3 (2015) 95–117.

Васиљевић 2021a: М. Васиљевић, *Култови светих на централном Балкану у време османских освајања*, Београд: Балканолошки институт САНУ.

Vasiljević 2021b: М. Vasiljević, “Translation of Saints’ Relics in the Late Medieval Central Balkans”, *Balkanica* 51 (2021) 23–43.

Гергова 2007: И. Гергова, “Култ към св. крал Милутин „Софийски” в България”, *Манастир Бањска и доба краља Милутина: зборник са научног скупа одржаног од 22. до 24. септембра 2005. године у Косовској Митровици*, ed. Д. Бојовић, Ниш, Косовска Митровица, Манастир Бањска: Центар за црквене студије, Филозофски факултет Косовска Митровица 2007, 249–273.

Мак Данилел 1991: Г. Мак Даниел, „Генезис и састављање Даниловог зборника”, *Архиепископ Данило II и његово доба: међународни научни скуп поводом 650 година од смрти, децембар 1987*, ed. В. Ј. Ђурић, Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности 1991, 217–224.

Марјановић-Душанић 2004: С. Марјановић-Душанић, „Молитве светих Симеона и Саве у владарском програму краља Милутина“, *ЗРВИ 41* (2004) 235–250.

Марјановић-Душанић 2017а: С. Марјановић-Душанић, *Свето и пропадљиво: тело у српској хагиографској књижевности*, Београд: Балканолошки институт САНУ, Clío.

Marjanović-Dušanić 2011: S. Marjanović-Dušanić, “La réécriture hagiographique: usages et fonctions dans la Serbie médiévale”, *Remanier, métaphraser. Fonctions et techniques de la réécriture dans le monde byzantin*, ed. S. Marjanović-Dušanić, B. Flusin, Belgrade: Faculté de Philosophie 2011, 163–180.

Marjanović-Dušanić 2012: S. Marjanović-Dušanić, “La sainteté féminine et les cultes dynastiques en Serbie médiévale: la sainte reine Helene d’Anjou”, *Les réseaux familiaux: Antiquité tardive et Moyen Âge. In memoriam A. Laiou et É. Patlagean*, ed. B. Caseau, Paris: Assoc. des Amis du Centre d’Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance 2012, 125–133.

Marjanović-Dušanić 2017b: S. Marjanović-Dušanić, *L’écriture et la sainteté dans la Serbie médiévale. Étude d’hagiographie*, Turnhout: Brepols.

Марјановић-Душанић 2007: С. Марјановић-Душанић, *Свети краљ. Култ Стефана Дечанског*, Београд: Балканолошки институт САНУ, Clío.

Марјановић-Душанић 2016: С. Марјановић-Душанић, “Свод српских светих у време краља Милутина: династички култови”, *Манастир Студеница: 700 година Краљеве цркве*, eds. Љ. Максимовић, Б. Вукашиновић, Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности 2016, 35–59.

Марјановић-Душанић 2013: С. Марјановић-Душанић, „Тело у српској хагиографији и настанак концепта непобедивог јунака“, *Зборник радова византолошког института 50* (2013) 693–704.

Милтенова 2008: А. Милтенова, „Култовете кџм новомџчениците“, *История на бџлгарската средновековна литература*, ed. А. Милтенова, София: Изток-Запад 2008, 705–707.

Младеновић 2007: А. Младеновић, *Повеље и писма деспота Стефана: текст. коментари, снимци*, Београд: Чигоја.

Мошин 1976: В. Мошин, „Житије краља Милутина према архиепископу Данилу II и Милутиновој повељи-аутобиографији“, *Зборник историје књижевности 10. Стара српска књижевност*, ed. В. Ђурић, Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности 1976, 109–136.

Новаковић 1892: С. Новаковић, “Манастир Бањска, задужбина краља Милутина”, *Глас српске краљевске академије 32* (1892) 3–55.

Поповић 2022: Д. Поповић, „Светачко прослављање краља Милутина“, *Свети краљ Милутин. Владар на раскрићима светова*, eds. С. Пириватрић, С. Марјановић-Душанић, Д. Поповић, Београд 2022, 529–555.

Поповић 2006: Д. Поповић, “Свети краљ Стефан Дечански”, *Под окриљем светости. Култ светих владара и реликвија у средњовековној Србији*, Београд: Балканолошки институт САНУ, 143–183.

Поповић 2016: Д. Поповић, “Свод српских светих у време краља Милутина: црквени поглавари и пустињаци”, *Манастир Студеница: 700 година Краљеве цркве*, eds. Љ. Максимовић, В. Вукашиновић, Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности 2016, 81–97.

Роровић 1997: D. Popović, “The Cult of St Petar of Koriša – Stages of Development and Patterns“, *Balkanica* 28 (1997) 181–212.

Пурковић 1975: М. Пурковић, *Српски патријарси средњег века*, Дизелдорф: Српска православна епархија западноевропска.

Рашковић 2020: А. Рашковић, “Свети краљ Милутин и Свети мученик кнез Лазар у руским богослужбеним рукописима XVI–XIX века”, *Богословље и духовни живот Карловачке митрополије година 3. Богословље и духовни живот Карловачке митрополије у оквиру 800 година аутокефалије Српске православне цркве. Зборник радова са научног скупа, Београд – Нови Сад, 16-17 децембар 2019*, eds. В. Вукашиновић, П. Перић, Београд: Центар за литургијске студије МОНС ХЕМУС, Институт за литургику и црквену уметност Православног богословског факултета Универзитета у Београду 2020, 262–275.

Стојановић 1903: Љ. Стојановић, *Каталог Народне библиотеке у Београду IV. Рукописи и старе штампане књиге*, Београд: Краљ.-српска државна штампарија.

Тодић 2018: Б. Тодић, „Култ градачке ктиторке краљице и монахиње Јелене“, *Саопштења* 50 (2018) 33–50.

Трифуновић 1970: Ђ. Трифуновић, “Белешке о делима у Србљаку”, *О србљаку. Студије*, ed. Ђ. Трифуновић, Београд: Српска књижевна задруга 1970, 271–368.

Ћирковић 1991: С. Ћирковић, “Биографија краља Милутина у Улијарској повељи”, *Архиепископ Данило II и његово доба: међународни научни скуп поводом 650 година од смрти, децембар 1987*, ed. В. Ј. Ђурић, Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности 1991, 53–67.

Ћирковић 1981: С. Ћирковић, “Унутрашње борбе почетком XIV века”, *Историја српског народа I. Од најстаријих времена до Маричке битке (1371)*, ed. Сима Ћирковић, Београд: Српска књижевна задруга 1981, 449–475.

Ћоровић 1929: В. Ћоровић, “Силуан и Данило II. Српски писци XIV–XV века”, *Глас Српске краљевске академије* 86 (1929) 13–103.

Фотић 2000: А. Фотић, *Света Гора и Хиландар у Османском царству (XV–XVII век)*, Београд: Балканолошки институт САНУ, Манастир Хиландар, Свети архијерејски синод Српске православне Цркве.

Цоневъ 1910: Б. Цоневъ, *Описъ на рѣкописитѣ и старопечатнитѣ книги на Народната библиотека въ София*, София: Издание на библиотеката.

Шпадијер 2014: И. Шпадијер, *Свети Петар Коришки у старој српској књижевности*, Београд: Чигоја штампа.

СВЕТИ КРАЉ МИЛУТИН: ЗАШТИТНИК „СВЕ СРПСКЕ И БУГАРСКЕ ЗЕМЉЕ”

Рад је посвећен анализи развитка прослављања српског краља Стефана Уроша II Милутина (1282–1321), посебно у вези са преносом његових моштију у Софију (пре 1469. године). Прва етапа прослављања обележена је Опширним житијем, у којем је архиепископ Данило II представио краља Милутина као непобедивог витеза, градитеља цркава и заштитника праве вере. У последњој четвртини 14. века патријарх Данило III саставио је Службу и Синаксарско житије и ставио у први план краљеву побожност, оличену пре свега у ктиторској делатности, и тражио спасење од „Агарена“. Ипак, на основу Опширног житија настале су Аутобиографија у Улијарској повељи и Кратко житије, чиме су комеморисани краљеви војнички успеси. То показује да је сећање на краља Милутина одликовало вишегласје (полифонија). Османска освајања, која су утицала на заокруживање култа и неговање различитих сећања, довела су и до преноса Милутинових моштију – из Бањске у Трепчу, а потом из Трепче у Софију. Да су краљеве мошти брзо постале фокус религиозног живота у Софији сведоче помени од стране Владислава Граматика, попа Пеје, Матеја Граматика и Стефана Герлаха. Такође, Служба и Синаксарско житије уведени су у богослужбену праксу, о чему сведоче два преписа која представљају посебну грану. У једном рукопису се покрај богослужбених састава налази Кратко житије, што указује да су се различити облици сећања на краља здруживали. Развитак прослављања краља Милутина илуструје две важне одлике прослављања светих: вишегласје сећања на њих и њихова „друштвена логика“. Наиме, поред сликања испуњења универзалних идеала, сваки култ јесте и одраз услова политичког, друштвеног и религиозног живота и израз страхова, жеља и надања верујућих.