

ГОДИШНИК НА СОФИЙСКИЯ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ „СВ. КЛИМЕНТ ОХРИДСКИ“

ИСТОРИЧЕСКИ ФАКУЛТЕТ

Том 105, 2020

ANNUAL OF SOFIA UNIVERSITY “ST. KLIMENT OHRIDSKI”

FACULTY OF HISTORY

Volume 105, 2020

THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF OHRID THROUGH THE CENTURIES (1019 – 1767)

ANGELIKI DELIKARI

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

Ангелики Деликари. ЮРИСДИКЦИЯ ОХРИДСКОЙ АРХИЕПИСКОПИИ НА ПРОТЯЖЕНИИ ВЕКОВ (1019 – 1767)

История Охридской Архиепископии, изучением которой исследователи занимаются в течение более двух столетий, является излюбленной темой славистов (историков, богословов, искусствоведов). В разные хронологические периоды эта византийская архиепископия была центральным объектом притязаний Византийской, Болгарской и Сербской Церквей. Значение Архиепископии зависело и от обширности территории входившей в ее юрисдикцию. Функция Архиепископии была церковной и политической. Она действовала не только как автокефальная церковная организация, но и как институт поддерживавший политические структуры.

Ключевые слова: Охридская архиепископия, Охрид, Василий II, царь Самуил, Юстиниана Прима, Феофилакт, архиепископ Охридский, Дмитрий Хоматин, царь Стефан Душан.

Research on the Archdiocese of Ohrid has been going on for more than two centuries. The studies published in the past are many¹. They focus in the first place

¹ See for instance **Gelzer**, H. Der Patriarchat von Achrida. Geschichte und Urkunden (Abhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, philol.-histor. Kl. 20/5). Leipzig, 1902; **Снегаров**, И. История на Охридската архиепископия. Т. 1. От основаването ѝ до завладяването на Балканския полуостров от турците. 2. фототип. изд. София,

on matters relating to the establishment and jurisdiction of the Archbishopric and its relations with neighbouring Churches. It is hardly surprising that the Archbishopric of Ohrid was frequently at the centre of conflicts between the Byzantine, Bulgarian and Serbian Churches.

In 1018, the Byzantine Emperor Basil II demolished the state of Tsar Samuel (976 – 1018)² and annexed its territory to the Byzantine Empire. The Archbishopric was established in the same year. To assess this act in an appropriate manner, we must start by discussing briefly the status of the Church in Samuel's empire. In his book about Samuel's reign, Srdjan Pirivatrić alleges that this Church was headed by a patriarch who took up the tradition of the Bulgarian patriarchate of Preslav and Dristra respectively. This in turn had been based on the earlier elevation of the Bulgarian Archbishop Damian to patriarch in Tsar Peter's realm for purely political reasons by Emperor Romanos I Lakapenos³. Like all the rulers in his time, Samuel probably was seeking international recognition for his state and his own independent Church. There is no hard evidence on what basis this Church existed. It is certain that Samuel really did raise the first representative of the Church in his empire to the rank of patriarch or archbishop, without having obtained the consent of the Ecumenical Patriarchate beforehand⁴. His state was constantly at war with Byzantium. The reference to tradition could possibly lie in the fact that

1995 [1924]; т. 2. От падането ѝ под турците до нейното унищожение (1394 – 1767). 2. фототип. изд. София, 1995 [1932]; **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδών κατά τον Μεσαίωνα. Ο ρόλος της ως ενωτικού παράγοντα στην πολιτική και εκκλησιαστική ιστορία των Σλάβων των Βαλκανίων και του Βυζαντίου (Ελληνισμός και κόσμος των Σλάβων 12). Θεσσαλονίκη, 2014; **Delikari**, Α. The Archdiocese of Ohrid through the centuries. In: San Clemente di Ocrida: Allievo e maestro. Nell'undicesimo centenario del beato transito (916 – 2016) (Accademia Ambrosiana – Slavica Ambrosiana 7). Ed. Kr. Stantchev, M. Calusio. Milano, 2017, p. 171 – 191.

² **Ταχιάος**, Α.-Αι. Το εφήμερο κράτος του Σαμουήλ (976 – 1018). Προβλήματα και ερωτηματικά. Θεσσαλονίκη, 1990; **Πιριватριћ**, С. Самуилова држава. Обим и карактер (САНУ, Византолошки институт посебна издања 21). Београд, 1997; **Павлов**, П. Векът на цар Самуил. София, 2014; **Николов**, Г. Н. Българският цар Самуил (Малка македонска библиотека 4). София, 2014; Европейският югоизток през втората половина на X – началото на XI век. История и култура. Международна конференция, София, 6 – 8 октомври 2014 г. Състав. В. Гюзелев, Г. Н. Николов. София, 2015; **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η άνοδος και η πτώση του εφήμερου κράτους του Σαμουήλ (976 – 1018) – In: **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Βυζαντινο-Σλαβικά Μελετήματα. Θεσσαλονίκη, 2017, σ. 90 – 100; **Ранов**, М. The Blinded State. Historiographic Debates about Samuel Cometopoulos and His State (10th – 11th Century) (East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450 – 1450, Vol. 55). Leiden – Boston, 2019.

³ **Πιριватριћ**, С. Самуилова држава..., с. 312 – 316. Cf. **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδών κατά τον Μεσαίωνα..., σ. 93 – 98.

⁴ **Delikari**, Α. Die Situation in Nord-West Makedonien während der Regierung des Basileios II., die sogenannte Kirche des Zaren Samuel und die Gründung des Erzbistums von Ochrid. – В: Европейският югоизток през втората половина на X – началото на XI век..., с. 236 – 243.

he, as a ruler or tsar, had followed Romanos I's practice in doing so⁵. It is often assumed by a number of scholars that Samuel received his crown from Rome. They combine this suggestion with references to Samuel in the correspondence between Tsar Kalojan and Pope Innocent III. In one letter, the coronation of Symeon, of Peter and of Samuel by the see of Rome is mentioned⁶. The same applies to Pope Innocent's letter to the Hungarian king Imre⁷. As a matter of fact, neither Symeon nor Peter had been crowned by Rome⁸. In my opinion this is hardly plausible. In the middle of 9th century, Pope Nicholas had not granted Boris I's request to establish an independent Bulgarian Church. Why then should the Pope have granted ecclesiastical independence to Samuel so easily? We know that Samuel enjoyed good relations with Rome because he was in possession of an extended stretch of territory along the Dalmatian coast, where there were many bishoprics under the jurisdiction of Rome⁹. But this hardly constituted a strong position for exerting pressure.

Basil II avoided putting the Archdiocese of Ohrid under the control of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and granted it far-reaching independence, making it an autocephalous Archbishopric (following the model of Cyprus). The Emperor had the right to designate or appoint the Archbishop. In concrete terms, though, in 1018, Basil II appointed John, the last prelate of Samuel's Church, as the (new) Archbishop¹⁰, thus leaving him in office but perhaps at a lower rank.

⁵ **Prinzling**, G. Die autokephale byzantinische Kirchenprovinz Bulgarien/Ohrid. Wie unabhängig waren ihre Erzbischöfe. – In: Proceedings of the 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Sofia, 22 – 27 August 2011, Vol. 1. Plenary Papers. Sofia, 2011, p. 391 – 392. Cf. **Κατσαρός**, Β. Το σχέδιο εκβυζαντινισμού του ελληνικού χώρου κατά την εποχή της μακεδονικής δυναστείας. Από την ειρηνευτική (θρησκευτική) πολιτική και διπλωματία στη σύγκρουση: Μύθοι και Πραγματικότητες. In: Κύριλλος και Μεθόδιος. Παρακαταθήκες πολιτισμού. Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου: «Η πολιτισμική κληρονομιά του έργου των αγίων Κυρίλλου και Μεθοδίου ως παράγοντας ενότητας με τους λαούς της Ν.Α. Ευρώπης» (Αμόνταιο 21 – 22 Μαΐου 2010). Ed. Κ. Γ. Νιχωρίτης. Θεσσαλονίκη, 2012, σ. 291 – 292.

⁶ ЛИБИ. Т. 3. София, 1965, с. 334 – 335: *Et diligenter perscrutantes, in eorum invenimus scripturis quod beate memorie illi imperatores Bulgarorum et Blachorum Symeon, Petrus et Samuel et nostri predecessores, coronam pro imperio eorum et patriarchalem benedictionem acceperunt a sanctissima Dei Romana ecclesia et ab apostolica sede, principe apostolorum Petro.*

⁷ ЛИБИ. Т. 3, с. 353: *Nam antiquitus in Bulgaria multi reges succesive fuerunt auctoritate apostolica coronati, sicut Petrus et Samuel et alii nonnulli post illos.*

⁸ **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η οικειοποίηση βυζαντινών τίτλους από Σλάβους ηγεμόνες ως έκφραση της πολιτικής ιδεολογίας τους. Η περίπτωση του Βούλγαρου τσάρου Συμεών. – In: **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Βυζαντινο-Σλαβικά Μελετήματα..., σ. 80 – 89.

⁹ **Антолјак**, Ст. Самуиловата држава. Скопје, 1969, с. 80 – 81, 84; **Снегаров**, И. История на Охридската архиепископия... Т. 1, с. 16 – 21. Cf. **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδών κατά τον Μεσαίωνα..., σ. 86.

¹⁰ **Προκίη**, Β. Први охридски архиепископ Јован. // *Глас СКА*, 88 (52), 1911, с. 267 – 303; **Προκίη**, Β. Постанок охридског патријархата. // *Глас СКА*, 90 (53), 1912, с. 232 – 233;

The fact that the Emperor himself rather than the Patriarch appointed the subsequent Archbishops of Ohrid is a clear indication of the see's independence. In *Taxis tōn patriarchikōn thronōn* of Neilos Doxapatres (1143) we read the following¹¹:

Ὁμοίως τῇ Κύπρῳ ἐστὶν αὐτοκέφαλος μὴ ὑποκειμένη τινὶ τῶν μεγίστων θρόνων, ἀλλ' αὐτεξούσιος ἀγομένη, καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων ἐπισκόπων χειροτονουμένη, καὶ ἡ Βουλγαρία, μὴ οὕσα ἐξ ἀρχῆς Βουλγαρία· ὕστερον δὲ διὰ τὸ αὐτὴν ὑπὸ τῶν Βουλγάρων κυριευθῆναι λέγεται Βουλγαρία. Ἐμείνεν οὖν καὶ αὐτὴ αὐτοκέφαλος διὰ τὸ ὑπὸ βασιλικῆς ἐξουσίας ἀποσπασθῆναι τῆς χειρὸς τῶν Βουλγάρων, ἥτοι τοῦ βασιλέως Κυροῦ Βασιλείου τοῦ Πορφυρογεννήτου, καὶ μὴ ἀνατεθῆναι ποτε τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως.

The seat of the Archbishopric was in reality the former Lychnis which had been the seat of a diocese from before the middle of the 4th century until the 10th¹². Its boundaries and jurisdiction were defined in three sigillia issued by Basil II between 1019 – 1025¹³. Although the original documentation has unfortunately been lost, its gist is preserved in the text of a golden bull of Michael VIII a century and a half later (i.e., 1272 or 1273)¹⁴. The Emperor explained that the passage of time had brought

Белчовски, J. Историските основи за автокефалноста на македонската православна црква. Скопје, 1990, с. 36.

¹¹ PG 132, 1097A. See also **Φειδάς**, Βλ. Ιστορική εξέλιξη της οργανώσεως της Εκκλησίας Μακεδονίας. // *Επιστημονική Επετηρίδα της Θεολογικής Σχολῆς του Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών*, 30 [Τμητικόν αφιέρωμα εις Ανδρέαν Θεοδώρου], 1995, σ. 51; **Ταρνανίδης**, Ι. Οι «Κατά Μακεδονίαν Σκλαβήνοι»: Ιστορική πορεία και σύγχρονα προβλήματα προσαρμογῆς. Θεσσαλονίκη, 2001, σ. 64; **Delikari**, A. Macedonia's image and the meaning of "Macedonian-ness" among Balkan Slavs in the Byzantine period. – In: *Macedonian identities through time. Interdisciplinary approaches*. Ed. I. Stefanidis, V.I. Vlasidis, Ev. Kofos. Thessaloniki, 2010, p. 117 – 118; **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδών κατά τον Μεσαίωνα..., σ. 90 – 91.

¹² **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η επισκοπή Λυχνιδού (-ών) μέχρι τον 10ο αιώνα. Ι. Από την ίδρυσή της έως τις αρχές του βου αιώνα. // *Κληρονομία*, 35/Α'-Β', (2003) [2005], σ. 69 – 85.

¹³ **Gelzer**, H. Ungedruckte und wenig bekannte Bistümerverzeichnisse der orientalischen Kirche. II. // *BZ*, 2, 1893, S. 42 – 46; **Иванов**, Ъ. Български старини из Македония. Ред. Б. Ангелов, Д. Ангелов. София, 1970² (1931), с. 550 – 562.

¹⁴ **Бенешевич**, В. Н. Описание греческихъ рукописей монастыря святой Екатерины на Синае. Т. I. С. Петербургъ, 1911 (repr. *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum graecorum*. Vol. I. Hildesheim, 1965), с. 542 – 554; **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδών κατά τον Μεσαίωνα..., σ. 97 – 99. See also **Podskalsky**, G. *Theologische Literatur des Mittelalters in Bulgarien und Serbien 865 – 1459*. München, 2000, S. 72; **Müller**, A. E. Zur Datierung des Chrysobulls Michaels VIII. für Ochrid: nicht August 1272, sondern Juli 1273. – In: *Zwischen Polis, Provinz und Peripherie. Beiträge zur byzantinischen Geschichte und Kultur*. Hrsg. L. M. Hoffmann, A. Monchizadeh (Mainzer Veröffentlichungen zur Byzantinistik 7). Wiesbaden, 2005, S. 427 – 432; **Prinzinger**, G. Die autokephale byzantinische Kirchenprovinz Bulgarien/Ohrid. Wie unabhängig waren ihre Erzbischöfe. – In: *Proceedings of the 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies*, Sofia, 22 – 27 August 2011, Vol. I: Plenary Papers. Sofia, 2011, p. 393.

changes in the jurisdictional status of Justiniana Prima as the result of hostile plots and the disappearance of episcopal and metropolitan sees or their inclusion in other metropolitan sees or foreign Churches. He formally permitted the Archbishop of Ohrid to restore to his Archbishopric all the prelatical churches covered by the sigillia that had been seized by Byzantine prelates, as well as any sees that had been under the authority of Ohrid and had preferred to become autonomous. In addition, any diocese that was not independent of Ohrid and had appropriated prelatical churches of that Archbishopric was to release them immediately and to allow them to return to Ohrid's jurisdiction, unless of course they were able to produce a Byzantine imperial document attesting to some other status. What is particularly striking about this golden bull is that Michael VIII associated the Archbishopric of Ohrid with the Archbishopric of Justiniana Prima¹⁵, thus extending the historical lifetime of the Archbishopric of Ohrid and adding considerably to its prestige¹⁶.

The number of 32 dioceses in the Archbishopric (Kastoria, Glavitza (Kephallenia), Moglaina, Strumitza, Boutelis (Bitola), Morobisdos (Morovizd), Belebusdion (Velbužd), Triaditza (Sofia), Niš, Braničevo, Belegrada (Berat), Thramos (Sirmion/Srmska Mitrovica), Skopje, Prisdriana (Prizren), Lipainion (Lipljan), Servia, Dristra (Silistra), Vidin, Ras, Horaia (Oroš N. Albania), Tzernikos (Černik N. Albania), Chimaira, Adrianoupolis (Dryinoupolis), we cannot read the name of the next bishopric, perhaps Bela¹⁷, Bothrotos (Butrint), Ioannina, Kozile, Petron (Petra?), Rigoi (Regon), Stagoi, Verroia, and of course the metropolise of Dyrrachion), which was the overall number after Basils' three decrees¹⁸, was often altered depending on the change of political power in the region. However, it must be admitted that some of the metropolitan and episcopal sees mentioned in the sigillia still remain unidentified.

¹⁵ **Grañić**, B. Die Gründung des autokephalen Erzbistums von Justiniana Prima durch Kaiser Justinian I im Jahre 535 n.Chr. // *Byzantion*, 2, 1925 [1926], S. 123 – 140; **Zlatarski**, V. N. Prima Justiniana im Titel des bulgarischen Erzbischofs von Achrida. // *BZ*, 30, 1929 – 1930 [Festgabe A. Heisenberg zum 60. Geburtstage gewidmet], S. 484 – 489; **Prinzling**, G. Entstehung und Rezeption der Justiniana-Prima-Theorie im Mittelalter. // *BBg*, 5, 1978, S. 269 – 287; **Markus**, R. A. Carthage – Prima Justiniana – Ravenna: An aspect of Justinian's Kirchenpolitik. // *Byzantion*, 49, 1979, p. 289 – 292.

¹⁶ **Бенешевич**, В. Н. Описание греческих рукописей..., с. 542: *Βασιλικὸν γράμμα γράφον τὰ ἱεροκύκλια τῆς ἀγιωτάτης μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας τῆς α΄ Τουστανιανῆς καὶ πάσης Βουλγαρίας, Σερβίας καὶ λοιπῶν*. See also **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδῶν κατὰ τον Μεσαίωνα..., σ. 99 – 102, 148 – 154.

¹⁷ **Прокић**, Б. Први охридски архиепископ Јован..., с. 292; **Прокић**, Б. Постанак охридског патријархата..., с. 253; **Снегаров**, И. История на Охридската архиепископия... Т. 1, с. 61, 186.

¹⁸ **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδῶν κατὰ τον Μεσαίωνα..., p. 158 – 160.

After the first Archbishop, John I⁹, who was probably a Slav, all other Archbishops were Greek until the last one, Arsenios²⁰. According to the testimony of Neilos Doxopates', only the Synod of the Ohrid Archbishopric had the exclusive liturgical right to ordain Archbishops. Frequently the Archbishops of Ohrid were chosen from among the clergy of the Church of Constantinople and belonged to the most highly educated and most spiritual men in Constantinople (e.g. Theophylact, Demetrios Chomatenos and others).

As far as the official designation of the Archbishopric is concerned, it must be inferred in the first place from the form in which Archbishops style themselves in documents (including letters) and inscriptions (on stone, frescoes, icons and seals) and from the form in which they were addressed or designated by others in letters and similar sources.

The first Archbishops were designated as Archbishops of *Bulgaria* (*Ἐντεῦθεν οὖν καὶ τὸν εὐλαβέστατον μοναχὸν Ἰωάννην ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Βουλγαρίας ἐκνῶσαμεν εἶναι καὶ τὰ τῆ ἀρχιεπισκοπῆ προσήκοντα παρ' αὐτοῦ ἰθύνεσθαι; Ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ Θεοδοῦλον τοῦ Βουλγαρίας ἀρχιερέως κοιμηθέντος*, etc.)²¹.

Under Theophylact of Ohrid²², one of the most famous biblical scholars and exegetes, the official designation, although it remains in most references *Bulgaria*, was expanded to *The Whole Bulgaria*. In a letter to Michael Pantechnes, the imperial

¹⁹ **Προκίη**, Β. Први охридски архиепископ Јован...; **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδών κατά τον Μεσαίωνα..., σ. 107 – 110.

²⁰ **Ταχιάος**, Α.-Αι. Ο τελευταίος αρχιεπίσκοπος Αχριδών. – In: **Tachiaos**, Α.-Ε. Ν. Greeks and Slavs. Cultural, Ecclesiastical and Literary Relations. Thessaloniki, 1997, p. 141 – 154; **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδών κατά τον Μεσαίωνα..., σ. 278. Cf. **Πάντος**, Δ. Ο αρχιεπίσκοπος Αχρίδας Πρόχορος (; – 1550) και οι σχέσεις του με τη Μονή Δοχειαρίου (πρώτο μισό του 16ου αιώνα. Αθήνα, 2009, σ. 96, 113 – 119, 125.

²¹ **Gelzer**, Η. Ungedruckte und wenig bekannte Bistümerverszeichnisse..., S. 42. 6 – 8; **Иванов**, Ъ. Български старини из Македония..., с. 550; **Τσολάκης**, Εὐ. Η συνέχεια της Χρονογραφίας του Ιωάννου Σκυλίτση (Ioannes Skylitzes Continuatus) (Εταιρεία Μακεδονικών Σπουδών/Ίδρυμα Μελετών Χερσονήσου του Αίμου 105). Θεσσαλονίκη, 1968, σ. 117. 21 – 23; **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδών κατά τον Μεσαίωνα..., σ. 109 – 121.

²² **Ξανάλατος**, Δ. Θεοφύλακτος ο Βουλγαρίας και η δράσις αὐτοῦ ἐν Αχρίδι. // *Θεολογία*, 16, 1938, σ. 228 – 240; **Katičić**, R. Βιογραφικά περί Θεοφύλακτου Αχρίδος. // *Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν*, 30, 1960 – 1961, σ. 364 – 385; **Gautier**, P. Théophylacte d'Achrida Discours, Traités, Poésies. Introduction, Texte, Traduction et notes (CFHB XVI/1). Thessalonique, 1980, p. 11 – 37; **Obolensky**, D. Theophylaktos of Ohrid and the Authorship of the Vita Clementis. – In: Βυζάντιον. Αφιέρωμα στον Ανδρέα Ν. Στράτο. Vol. 2. Θεολογία και Φιλολογία. Αθήνα, 1986, σ. 601 – 618; **Obolensky**, D. Six Byzantine Portraits. Oxford, 1988, p. 34 – 82; **Delikari**, Α. Der Hl. Klemens und die Frage des Bistums von Velitza. Identifizierung, Bischofsliste (bis 1767) und Titularbischöfe. Thessaloniki, 1997, S. 40 – 44.

doctor, Theophylact refers to himself as Archbishop of *The Whole Bulgaria* (*Ὁ δὲ πάσης Βουλγαρίας ἀρχιεπίσκοπος, ὃν ὅσοι περ ὀρώσι τε καὶ ἀκούουσιν*)²³.

Some years later (in August/September 1157) the Archbishop John IV [Adrian] Komnenos, the cousin of Emperor John II Komnenos, used the title *Justiniana Prima and The Whole Bulgaria* for the first time in his signature in the proceedings of the synod of 1157 against the heretic Soterichos Panteugenos (*Ὁ ταπεινὸς μοναχὸς Ἰωάννης καὶ ἐλέω θεοῦ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος πρώτης Ἰουστινιανοῦ (Ἰουστινιανῆς) καὶ πάσης Βουλγαρίας ὁ Κομνηνὸς ὀρίσας ὑπέγραψα*)²⁴.

This grandiose terminology had arisen under the influence of the pseudo-theory developed, probably not before the end of the 11th century, identifying the Archbishopric of Ohrid with the diocese of the city of Justiniana Prima founded in 535²⁵ but suppressed only 75 years or so later under the onslaught of the Avars. However, John Komnenos's successors in office, until Demetrios Chomatenos' predecessor avoided this title. At all events, for a long time it was not recognised by anybody outside the Archbishopric²⁶.

After the fall of Constantinople to the Latins in 1204 and with the foundation of the Bulgarian and Serbian states on the territory under the jurisdiction of the Ohrid Archbishopric, autonomous Churches were founded which recognised neither the jurisdiction of Constantinople nor that of Ohrid²⁷. The Serbian Church achieved autocephalus status in 1219 under the leadership of St Sava²⁸, and it took three bishoprics from Ohrid, those of Ras, Prizren and Lipainion²⁹. In 1235 a Church Council convened in the town of Lampsakos confirmed the Patriarchal dignity of

²³ **Gautier**, P. Théophylacte d'Achrida Lettres. Introduction, Texte, Traduction et notes (CFHB XVI/2). Thessalonique, 1986, p. 583, No 129.

²⁴ **Mai**, A. et. al. (ed.). Spicilegium romanum. Vol. 10. Graz, 1974, p. 89.

²⁵ **Grabar**, A. Les monuments de Tsaritchin Grad et Justiniana Prima. // *Cahiers Archéologiques*, 3, 1948, p. 49 – 63; **Мано-Зиси**, Ђ. Ископавања на Царичином граду 1953 и 1953 године. // *Старинар*, 5 – 6, 1954 – 1955, с. 155 – 180; **Мано-Зиси**, Dj. Justiniana Prima (Caričin Grad). // *Realexikon zur byzantinischen Kunst*, 3, 1978, S. 687 – 717; **Bavant**, B., **Ivanišević**, V. Justiniana Prima – Caričin Grad. Beograd, 2003, p. 44 – 46.

²⁶ **Prinzing**, G. The autocephalous byzantine ecclesiastical province of Bulgaria/Ohrid. How independent were its Archbishops? // *Bulgaria Mediaevalis*, 3, 2012, p. 363.

²⁷ **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδών κατά τον Μεσαίωνα..., σ. 188 – 210.

²⁸ **Станојевић**, Ст. Свети Сава и независност српске цркве. // *Глас СКА*, 161 (83), 1934, с. 199 – 251; **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Οι πολιτικοί και εκκλησιαστικοί λόγοι της ίδρυσης της Σερβικής αρχιεπισκοπής (1219). – In: **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Βυζαντινο-Σλαβικά Μελετήματα..., σ. 198 – 218; **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η συμβολή του Αγίου Σάββα στον εκκλησιαστικό προσανατολισμό Σερβίας και η αντίδραση του αρχιεπισκόπου Αχρίδος Δημητρίου Χωματηνού στη δημιουργία της Σερβικής Εκκλησίας. // *Црквене Студије*, 16, 2019, No 1, с. 213 – 228.

²⁹ **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδών κατά τον Μεσαίωνα..., σ. 192 – 195.

the Bulgarian Orthodox Church and consecrated the Bulgarian archbishop Joachim as Patriarch³⁰

The division of Byzantium also caused a division of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. From then on, under the pressure of the civil authorities, the Bishops of the dioceses in Trapezunt and Epirus, started to ordain Bishops for the vacant dioceses, and began to refuse the authority of the Patriarch of Constantinople who had his seat in Nicea³¹.

This was strongly opposed by the Patriarch. The Byzantines believed that a kingdom could not exist without a Patriarchate, and this encouraged the other Greek rulers to establish church administrations in their own states. Demetrios Chomatenos, elected as Archbishop of Ohrid in 1216, strongly supported the Bishops of Epirus, which soured relations between the church centres of Ohrid and Nicea. At the request of Theodore the despot of Epirus, Archbishop Chomatenos crowned him emperor in 1227³². After this event there was a certain breakdown of communication between the Patriarch of Nicea and the Bishops of Epirus.

³⁰ **Heisenberg**, A. Georgii Acropolitae Opera. Lipsiae, 1903·(Ed. correctiorem curavit P. Wirth. Vol. 1, Stutgardiae 1978), p. 50.23 – 51.3: *καὶ πληροῦσι τὴν τῶν παίδων συνάφειαν, τοῦ πατριάρχου Γερμανοῦ τὰ τῆς ἱερολογίας τελέσαντος. τότε καὶ ὁ Τρινόβου ἀρχιερεὺς, ὑπὸ τῶν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τελῶν, αὐτονομία τετίμηται καὶ πατριάρχης ἀναγορευέσθαι κέκρται βασιλικῶ καὶ συνοδικῶ τῷ θεσπίσματι, χάριτας τῶν προυχόντων ἀποτιννόντων τῶ Βουλγάρων ἀρχοντι Ἀσάν τοῦ κήδους ἔνεκα καὶ τῆς φιλίας;* **Божилев, И., Тотоманова, А., Билярски, И.** Борилев синодик. Издание и превод (История и книжнина). София, 2010, с. 160.13 – 17: *ἰωάννινα πρὸς τὸν δεκάτην ἀρχιεπίσκοπον, нарикоушъ ἑго πατριῶ ἀρχι-не τῷ κῆμο словомъ, нъ ἡ ρακοпсани ѣмъ гѣрманна патрῶ ἀρχа.* See also **Цанкова-Петкова, Г.** Восстановление болгарского патриаршества в 1235 г. и международное положение болгарского государства. // *ВВр*, 28, 1968, с. 139 – 141 and 146 – 150; **Снегаров, И.** История на Охридската архиепископия... Т. 1, с. 151 – 152.

³¹ **Nicol, D. M.** Ecclesiastical relations between the Despotate of Epirus and the Kingdom of Nicaea in the years 1215 to 1230. // *Byzantion*, 22, 1952, p. 212 – 214, 217; **Karpozilos, A. D.** The Ecclesiastical Controversy between the Kingdom of Nicaea and the Principality of Epiros (1217 – 1233) (Βυζαντινὰ Κείμενα καὶ Μελέται 7). Thessaloniki, 1973, p. 52; **Σταυρίδου-Ζαφράκα, Α.** Νίκαια καὶ Ἠπειρος τὸν 13^ο αἰῶνα. Ἰδεολογικὴ ἀντιπαράθεση στὴν προσπάθειά τους νὰ ἀνακτήσουν τὴν αυτοκρατορία (Ἐταιρεία Βυζαντινῶν Ἐρευνῶν 7). Θεσσαλονίκη, 1991, σ. 153 – 154 and n. 24; **Angold, M.** Church and Society in Byzantium under the Comneni, 1081 – 1261. Cambridge, 1995, p. 215 – 217.

³² **Prinzing, G.** A quasi Patriarch in the State of Epiros: The Autocephalous Archbishop of «Boulgaria» (Ohrid) Demetrios Chomatenos. // *ZRVI*, 41, 2004, p. 165; **Stavridou-Zafraκα, Α.** The Political Ideology of the State of Epiros. – In: *Urbs Capta. The Fourth Crusade and its Consequences* (Réalités Byzantines 10). Ed. A. Laiou. Paris, 2005, p. 314 and 318 – 321; **Γιαρένης, Η.** Πτυχές τῆς ἰδεολογικῆς ἀντιπαράθεσης Νίκαιας καὶ Ἠπείρου. Ὁ ρόλος τοῦ χρίσματος. – In: *Μεσαιωνικὴ Ἠπειρος. Πρακτικὰ ἐπιστημονικῶν συμποσίων* (Ἰωάννινα 17 – 19 Σεπτεμβρίου 1999) (Διατμηματικὸ Μεταπτυχιακὸ Πρόγραμμα Μεσαιωνικῶν Σπουδῶν, Φιλοσοφικὴ Σχολή, Πανεπιστήμιο Ἰωαννίνων, Σειρὰ Συμποσίων 1). Ed. Κ. Ν. Κωνσταντινίδης. Ἰωάννινα, 2001, σ. 108 – 113.

Chomatenos admitted openly that he was governing the dioceses belonging to the Patriarchate of Constantinople temporarily and because of the situation that had recently arisen³³. This was the beginning of disputes between the Patriarchate and the Archbishopric of Ohrid. Chomatenos was keen to promote the papal-patriarchal image of his see, deliberately adopting again the former designation of Justiniana Prima. He used it or referred to it in important letters and synodal deeds, expanding the theory on which it was based even further. Chomatenos' conception of himself shaped his entire official conduct and resulted in the close imitation of many characteristics of the patriarchal chancery, above all in his correspondence³⁴. Many of his successors followed his example.

Formulas such as *Bulgaria* and *Justiniana Prima* that appear as part of the Archbishop's titles were of a legal and canonic nature and were used for defending the autocephalous rights of the Archbishopric. The appearance of the title *Bulgaria* and *Justiniana Prima* in the foundation inscription of the Theodokos Peribleptos church in Ohrid (in the year 1295) could be a result of the intention by Makarios, Archbishop of Ohrid, to highlight the ties of the Ohrid see with Justiniana Prima³⁵. This also shows by this time this title had already been consolidated.

³³ **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδών κατά τον Μεσαίωνα..., p. 161 – 163.

³⁴ **Prinzing**, G. Demetrii Chomateni Ponemata diaphora (CFHB 38). Berlin – New York, 2002, S. 376 – 377.198 – 208, No 114: *ὁ ἐν βασιλεῦσι μέγας καὶ περιβόητος Ἰουστινιανός ... καὶ πρῶτον εἶναι πάντων τῶν ἱερέων εἰπὼν τὸν ἀγιώτατον πάπαν τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ρώμης, ἔπειτα δεύτερον μετ' αὐτὸν τὸν μακαριώτατον Κωνσταντινουπόλεως μετὰ τοῦτον εὐθὺς τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκοπικοῦ θρόνου τῆς Βουλγαρίας μέμνηται, ὃν καὶ Ἰουστινιανὴν ὀνομάζει, ὅτι τε ἐκεῖθεν τὸ γένος εἴλκε καὶ ὅτι μόχοις ἰδίους καὶ ἰδρωῖσι στρατηγικοῖς τὴν Βουλγαρικὴν ταύτην περιχώρον τοῖς ὄροις Ρωμαῖδος προσήρμοσεν*; **Prinzing**, G. Demetrii Chomateni Ponemata diaphora..., S. 55. 1 – 5, No 10: *Τῷ πανευγενεστάτῳ μεγάλῳ ζουπάνῳ πάσης Σερβίας καὶ Διοκλείας, ἐν Κυρίῳ ἀγαπητῷ ἡμῖν τέκνῳ κυρῷ Στέφανῳ τῷ Νεεμάνη, Δημήτριος ἐλέῳ Θεοῦ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς Πρώτης Ἰουστινιανῆς καὶ πάσης Βουλγαρίας*; **Prinzing**, G. Demetrii Chomateni Ponemata diaphora..., S. 296. 3 – 7, No 86: *Δημήτριος, ἐλέῳ Θεοῦ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς Πρώτης Ἰουστινιανῆς καὶ πάσης Βουλγαρίας, καὶ ἡ τῶν ἀρχιερέων τῶν ὑπὸ τὴν κατ' αὐτὸν ἐπαρχίαν ἱερά καὶ θεῖα ὀμῆνυρις τῷ τιμιωτάτῳ ἐν μοναχοῖς καὶ υἱῷ τοῦ μεγάλου ζουπάνου Σερβίας κυρῷ Σάββα χάριν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ καὶ εἰρήνην καὶ τὸν ἐν ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι ἀσπασμόν*. See also **Prinzing**, G. Convergence and divergence between the Patriarchal Register of Constantinople and the Ponemata Diaphora of Archbishop Demetrios Chomatenos of Achrida/Ohrid. – In: **Крсмановић, Б., Максимовић, Љ., Радић, Р.** Византијски свет на Балкану. Књ. I (Византолошки Институт САНУ посебна издања књ. 42/1). Београд, 2012, с. 13 – 15; **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδών κατά τον Μεσαίωνα..., σ. 126 – 133.

³⁵ **Иванов**, Й. Български старини из Македонија..., с. 38 – 39, No 8: *Ἀνηγέρθη ὁ θεῖος καὶ πάνσεπτος ναὸς οὗτος τῆς πανυπεραγίας δεσποίνης ἡμῶν θεοτόκου τῆς περιβλέπτου διὰ συνδρομῆς κ(αἰ) ἐξόδου κυρίου Προγόνου τοῦ (υἱοῦ) Gelzer) Σγούρου (Γγιούρου Bodlev) μεγάλου ἐταιριάρχου κ(αἰ) τῆς συζύγου αὐτοῦ κυρ(ᾶς) Εὐδοκίας κ(αἰ) γαμβροῦ τοῦ κρατίστου κ(αἰ) ἀγίου ἡμῶν αὐτοκ(ράτορος) βασιλέως. ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου βασιλέως κ(αἰ) αὐτοκράτορος Ρωμαίων Ἀνδρονίκου τοῦ Παλαιολόγου κ(αἰ) Εἰρήνης τῆς εὐσεβεστάτης ἀγούστης, ἀρχιε-*

But from the end of the 13th century on, the inclusion of the name of Ohrid in the designation of the Archbishopric is also documented³⁶.

The expansion of the Serbian state southwards reached its maximum in the time of Tsar Stephen Dušan (1331 – 1355). The exact year when Stephen Dušan occupied Ohrid is not known, but it was most probably around 1334. Tsar Dušan respected the decrees issued to the Ohrid Archbishopric by the Byzantine emperors. The autocephalous state of the Archbishopric of Ohrid remained untouched and endured³⁷. Archbishop Nicolaos was on good terms with the Serbian ruler³⁸. On Palm Sunday, the 9th of April, 1346 Tsar Dušan summoned a church council to Skopje where Symeon, the Patriarch of Trnovo, and Nicolaos (1346 – ?), the Archbishop of Ohrid, conferred the dignity of Patriarch on the Serbian Archbishop Joannikije (1337 – 1354). On Easter Day, the 16th of April, 1346, the new Patriarch, whose election had contravened church law, solemnly crowned Stephen Dušan as Emperor of Serbs and Romans³⁹.

There are not many records concerning the relations between Dušan's heir, his son, tsar Uroš V, and the Archbishop of Ohrid, but most probably, at that time, the Ohrid Archbishopric retained all its former privileges. Its jurisdiction spread through different states: 1. The kingdom of Vukašin, and later of his son Marco, in whose territory the town of Ohrid was located; 2. the despotate of Radoslav Hlapen (where Veroia and Vodena belonged); 3. the kingdom of Symeon Uroš Palaiologos in Epirus and southern Albania; 4. the Kanina-Avlonia despotate; 5. the principedom of Elbasan and 6. the despotate of Velbužd⁴⁰.

During the reign of the Serbs, the Ohrid Archbishopric controlled the smallest territory since the time of its creation. Most of the territory to the north that had previously been under its jurisdiction was lost⁴¹. Thus, its northern border went

ρατεύοντος δὲ Μακαρίου τοῦ παναγιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου τῆς πρώτης Ἰουστινιανῆς κ(α)ί πάσης Βουλγαρίας.

³⁶ **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδών κατά τον Μεσαίωνα..., σ. 136 – 138 and 144 – 154. See also **Gelzer**, H. Der Patriarchat von Achrida..., S. 13, 15; **Prinzing**, G. The autocephalous byzantine ecclesiastical province of Bulgaria/Ohrid..., p. 364.

³⁷ **Soulis**, G. The Serbs and Byzantium during the Reign of Tsar Stephen Dušan (1331 – 1355) and his Successors. Washington D.C., 1984, p. 84 – 85; **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδών κατά τον Μεσαίωνα..., σ. 220 – 221.

³⁸ **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδών κατά τον Μεσαίωνα..., σ. 222 – 236; **Κυριακούδης**, Ευ. Ο αρχιεπίσκοπος Αχρίδας Νικόλαος και η κτητορική του δραστηριότητα στα μέσα του 14ου αιώνα. // *Црквене Студије*, 1, 2004, с. 309 – 339.

³⁹ **Soulis**, G. C. Problèmes des relations byzantino-serbes au XIVe siècle. – In: Γεώργιος Σούλης 1927 – 1966. Ιστορικά Μελετήματα. Βυζαντινά, Βαλκανικά, Νεοελληνικά. Αθήνα, 1980, σ. 103; **Радојчић**, Н. Српски државни сабори у средњем веку (СКА посебна издања 130, Друштвени и историски списи 54). Београд, 1940, с. 123 – 125.

⁴⁰ **Снегаров**, И. История на Охридската архиепископия... Т. 1, с. 330 – 331; **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδών κατά τον Μεσαίωνα..., σ. 238 – 239.

⁴¹ **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδών κατά τον Μεσαίωνα..., σ. 214 – 236.

past Debar and Kičevo, not far from Ohrid, and then descended over the Mokren mountains towards the Adriatic to the Bay of Avlona. To the south-west, the border was marked by the rivers Aaos and Aliakmon, touching on the town of Servia and turning north-eastwards, leaving the town of Veroia under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople. Of the dioceses belonging to it in earlier times, only the following remained: Ohrid, Kastoria, Grevena, Moglena, Slanitza, Strumitza, Pelagonia, Devol or Selasphor, Glavinitza, Kanina (and Wallach). After the fall of Dušan's kingdom, the Ohrid Archbishopric slightly expanded north and southwards, so that the following dioceses then became part of its territory: Prizren, Skopje, Debar, but most probably, it also expanded towards eastwards, including the towns of Velbužd (today's Kjustendil) and Razlog⁴².

In the battle of the Maritsa river (26 September 1371) King Vukašin und Jovan Ugleša were killed. The Serbian states were forced to pay taxes to the Ottomans, and to supply them with soldiers in times of war. In 1392, the Turks conquered Skopje, and after the deaths of King Marco (1394) and of the despot Constantine Dragaš of Velbužd (1395), they finally conquered the entire territory formerly ruled by these two men. Thus, in 1408, Ohrid was firmly under Turkish rule⁴³.

After the fall of the Trnovo Patriarchate, some of the dioceses under its jurisdiction became part of the Ohrid Archbishopric. Thus, in the beginning of the 15th century, the Archbishop of Ohrid, Matthaios (1408 is mentioned), attached the dioceses of Sofia and Vidin to the Ohrid Archbishopric. By showing the Byzantine Emperor, Manuel Paleologos (1391 – 1425) and the Synod, some golden bulls issued by previous Byzantine emperors and concerning the jurisdiction and privileges of the Ohrid Archbishopric, Matthaios tried to win not only the right to govern the dioceses of Sofia and Vidin, but also to obtain dioceses given to the see of Ohrid in the chrysobulls of his predecessors. After a certain interval, the Patriarchate of Constantinople opposed this move. It argued that before the creation of the Patriarchate of Trnovo, the dioceses of Sofia and Vidin had been under its own jurisdiction. This led to a cooling down in the relations between the Patriarchate and the Archbishopric which had been quite good until then⁴⁴. Matters came to a head when the Patriarchate of Constantinople entered into a union with

⁴² **Снегаров, И.** История на Охридската архиепископия... Т. 1, с. 339–340; **Δεληκάρη, Α.** Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδίων κατά τον Μεσαίωνα..., σ. 236 – 246.

⁴³ **Снегаров, И.** История на Охридската архиепископия... Т. 2, с. 1; **Vacalopoulos, Α.** History of Macedonia, 1354 – 1833 (transl. P. Megann) (Εταιρεία Μακεδονικών Σπουδών/Ίδρυμα Μελετών Χερσονήσου του Αίμου 131). Thessaloniki, 1973, p. 48 – 49.

⁴⁴ **Баласчевъ, Г. Д.** Кореспонденция между Цариградския патриархъ и Охридския архиепископъ отъ началото на XV век. // *Минало*, I, 1909, No 1, с. 6 – 9; **Снегаров, И.** История на Охридската архиепископия... Т. 2, с. 7 – 8 and 156 – 158; **Tegou-Stergiadou, Ev.** Die Sigilla von Basileios II. für das Erzbistum von Achrida und ihre Beziehung mit den Bistümern von Berroia und Servia. // *Orthodoxes Forum*, 12, 1998, No 1, S. 18 – 19; **Τέγου-Στεργιάδου, Ευ.** Αρχιεπισκοπή Πρώτης Ιουστινιανής (Συμβολή στη διερεύνηση του προβλήματος).

the Roman-Catholic Church at the Council in Florence in 1439, which resulted even in an interruption of relations. In fact, the Ohrid Archbishopric was one of the fiercest opponents of the Union. It was not until after the fall of Constantinople to the Turks in 1453, when the Patriarchate of Constantinople ceased to support the Union, that relations were restored. Some scholars hold that in the second half of the 15th century, the Danubian Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia fell under the jurisdiction of the Ohrid Archbishopric. The reason for this could have been that the Ohrid Archbishopric sharply rejected the Union of Florence⁴⁵. In the year 1715, Chrysanthos Notaras in his *Συνταγμάτιον περί των οφφικίων, κληρικάτων και αρχοντικίων της του Χριστού αγίας εκκλησίας* rejected outright the ecclesiastical dependence of these two principalities from the Ohrid Archdiocese⁴⁶.

According to several scholars, the ecclesiastical provinces of the Serbian Patriarchate were attached to the Ohrid Archbishopric after the Ottoman conquest of Smederevo (1459), but we do not have any confirmation from written sources. We only know that the Serbian Patriarch Arsenije II continued to serve until his death in 1463. Towards the end of 1529 or the beginning of 1530, the Bishop of Smederevo, Paul, supported by some Serbian dignitaries and with the connivance of the Turkish authorities, whom he had bribed with money, separated the Peć diocese and some other dioceses from the Ohrid Archbishopric and proclaimed the Church of Peć independent⁴⁷. In spite of this, the Serbian Patriarchate was officially restored in 1557 by Suleiman the Magnificent at the instigation of Mehmet Pasha Sokolović. During this period the Ohrid Archbishopric expanded its jurisdiction in the Balkans, as we see from the designation of the Archbishop Prochoros (1528 – 1550)⁴⁸: *Πρόχορος ἐλέω θεοῦ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος ἃ Ἰουστινιανῆς, Σερβίας, Βουλγαρίας καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν*.

Θεσσαλονίκη, 2003, σ. 62 – 63; **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδών κατά τον Μεσαίωνα..., σ. 146 and 246 – 247.

⁴⁵ **Снегаров**, И. История на Охридската архиепископија... Т. 2, с. 11 – 15; **Péchaÿre**, A.-P. L'archevêché d'Ochrida de 1394 à 1767. A propos d'un ouvrage récent. // *Échos d'Orient*, 35, 1936 [1971], p. 187 – 188; **Δεληκάρη**, Α. Η αρχιεπισκοπή Αχριδών κατά τον Μεσαίωνα..., σ. 247 – 248. Cf. **Gelzer**, H. Der Patriarchat von Achrida..., S. 21 – 22.

⁴⁶ **Χρυσανθος Νοταράς**. Συνταγμάτιον περί των οφφικίων, κληρικάτων και αρχοντικίων της του Χριστού αγίας Εκκλησίας... Târgoviște, 1715, σ. 81 – 84 (σ. 84: *Ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν πρὸς ἀπόδειξιν, ὅτι δηλαδὴ τῆς Βλαχίας καὶ Μπογδανίας αἱ Μητροπόλεις δὲν ἦσαν ποτὲ ὑποκειμεναὶ τῷ Ἀχρίδος*).

⁴⁷ **Архиепископ Јован**. Кратка историја на Охридската Архиепископија. Охрид, 2007, с. 44 – 47.

⁴⁸ **Gelzer**, H. Der wiederaufgefundene Kodex des hl. Klemens und andere auf den Patriarchat Achrida bezügliche Urkundensammlungen. // *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, 55, 1903, S. 104. See also **Стојановић**, Ј. Стари српски записи и натписи. Књ. 1 (Зборник за историју језик и књижевност српскога народа прво одељење Споменници на српском језику Књ. 1), Београд, 1902 (repr. 1982), с. 176.547 and с. 177.552.

A very important source for the last years of the Archdiocese is the Codex of the Archbishopric of Ohrid, also known as the Codex of St Clement⁴⁹. This Codex is a collection of synodical acts from the 17th and 18th century treating matters relating to that ecclesiastical district. According to the first document in the Codex, the collection was created by Meletios, Archbishop of Justiniana Prima, Ohrid and The Whole of Bulgaria, whose intent was to make a record of various acts and matters relating to the Archbishopric⁵⁰: *Αφιερώθη ὁ παρῶν ἱερὸς κώδηξ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ἀρχιεπισκοπῇ τῆς Ἰουστινιανῆς Ἀχριδῶν καὶ πάσης Βουλγαρίας εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τῆς ἐποπτείας ἡμῶν*. The dedicatory preface of the Codex, chronologically the first document it contains, is dated May, 1st, 1677; the last document in the volume is the act of enthronement of Archbishop Joseph in 1746. The Codex of St Clement preserves information relating to the jurisdiction of the Archbishopric of Ohrid over a period of some seventy years, that is, from the beginning of its compilation to its conclusion. Based on the signatures of the Metropolitans and Bishops on the documents it contains, and on the references in them to various episcopal and metropolitan sees, it is possible to determine the extent of the ecclesiastical territory controlled by Ohrid during that time (twenty years before its abolition in 1767). The extent of the Archbishopric in the Codex comprised the bishoprics of Velegrada, Velessos, Vodena, Gora and Mokra, Grevena, Debar, Korytza, Moglena, Pelagonia, Prespa, Sisanion, Strumitza and the metropolises of Dyrrachion and Kastoria.

Greeks, Slavs and other nationalities coexisted harmoniously in the area of the Archbishopric through the centuries. Although at various times this Byzantine Archbishopric, or parts of its dependent territories, were outside the borders of the Byzantine state, it sought, despite frequently adverse circumstances, to preserve the substance of its Byzantine identity and to defend its rights against the interests of foreign conquerors, sometimes through vigorous resistance and sometimes by striving to find ways of collaborating with them.

⁴⁹ **Gelzer**, H. Der Patriarchat von Achrida..., S. 35 – 103.

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, S. 45.