

Tibor Živković

DE CONVERSIONE  
CROATORUM ET SERBORUM  
a lost source





Tibor Živković

---

---

**DE CONVERSIONE CROATORUM ET SERBORUM**  
**A Lost Source**



INSTITUTE OF HISTORY

---

---

Monographs  
Volume 62

TIBOR ŽIVKOVIĆ

**DE CONVERSIONE  
CROATORUM ET SERBORUM  
A Lost Source**

Editor-in-chief

Srdan Rudić, Ph.D.  
Director of the Institute of History

---

---

Belgrade  
2012

*Consulting editors:*  
Academician Jovanka Kalić  
Prof. Dr. Vlada Stanković

*This book has been published with the financial support of*

THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE  
OF THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA  
(project No III47025)

## CONTENTS

PREFACE	9
ABBREVIATIONS	13
INTRODUCTORY NOTE	
The Workshop of Constantine Porphyrogenitus	19
THE STORY OF THE CROATS	43
THE STORY OF DALMATIA	91
THE STORY OF THE SERBS	149
THE DISPLACED SECTIONS OF CONSTANTINE'S PRIMARY SOURCE ON THE CROATS AND THE SERBS	181
CONCLUSIONS	197
SOURCES	225
REFERENCES	229
INDEXES	241



*Nec plus ultra*

To the memories  
of the finest gentleman  
Božidar Ferjančić  
(1929 – 1998)



## PREFACE

This book is the result of 20 years of research on the so-called Slavic chapters of Constantine Porphyrogenitus' *De administrando imperio*, the last stage of which took place in Athens 2009/2010, where I was completing my postdoctoral research on the supposed main source Constantine Porphyrogenitus had used for the earliest history of the Croats and the Serbs. The research took place at the Centre for Byzantine Research in Athens (IVE) with the financial support of the Ministry of Science and Technology of Serbian Government and the Serbian Orthodox Metropolis of Montenegro.

The first preliminary results on the supposed, now lost source of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, were published in an article in *Byzantina Symmeikta* (2010) and the results I presented at that time allowed me to try to make a more profound analysis of that source and eventually to reveal the most significant number of its fragments preserved in the Croat and Serb chapters of *De administrando imperio* – its original purpose – as well as the possible background of its composition. However, a lack of corroborative sources that would enable me to support some of my thoughts about this issue prevented me from having the last word on this. Since the whole study was made on the basis of a completely new discovery – that the earliest history of the Croats and the Serbs was mostly extracted from a now lost Latin source – I kept myself from making any further analysis about the value of the historical data contained in the source. This was something which had to be done once when the complete and profound philological analysis of these chapters had been completed.

Another important issue was that I did not want to introduce the title of the supposed Latin source in the early stages of my study, I revealed the possible title of this source only when my analysis allowed me to do so safely; until then, I referred to this source only as *Constantine's primary source on the Croats and the Serbs*, or *Constantine's major source*, or something along these lines, as all these expressions have a

---

technical meaning. In this way, I felt that the reader and the author would come to this conclusion together, namely that Constantine's primary source on the Serbs and Croats was eventually entitled *De conversione Croatorum et Serborum*.

Furthermore, there is an issue in the methodology used. The usual approach to the historical sources introduced in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was: 1) It was vital to find the name of the author; 2) place his work chronologically; 3) find the place where his work was written; and 4) search for the author's sources. I have rejected this methodology – since over the centuries it has yet to bring us closer to the answers that arise from Slavic chapters of the *De administrando imperio*. The order of research must be exactly the reverse: 1) the sources of the author; 2) the place of writing; 3) the time of writing; and 4) the actual author. It appears then that the methodology which was originally set up in the 19<sup>th</sup> century was essentially correct – but its steps were placed in the wrong order.

Any research about a document based on the presumption or even *empirical truth* that its author is known, contains a dose of imposed subjectivity which burdens the further research of the scholar. The supposed name of the author enforces the scholar to place the author's work in a limited timeframe and place, and consequently restricts the range of the possible sources that author used. The researchers/historians try to maintain their objectivity while they are examining a particular source, but since they are *only human*, they are in permanent danger of adjusting their further research and conclusions based on the main premises they have already come to for the document (e. g. the name of the author, time and place). Due to this, it is better to commence research from the sources of a particular document without imposing such restrictions as the name of its author, as well as the time and place of its composition. This gives more freedom to scholars, enabling them to see things which they would usually not notice if they had restricted themselves at the very beginning of their work, such as the supposed author of a particular document.

Finally, a thorough analysis of the Croat and Serb chapters of the *De administrando imperio*, unveils many details about its author and his workshop. It appears that the marginal notes, which appear in the oldest manuscript, deserve much more attention, since they reflect

the gradualness of the composition of the work itself. The differences in style between some of the chapters of the *De administrando imperio* also deserve special examination, since they are not a consequence of the work of different authors, but rather the traces of the various sources Constantine Porphyrogenitus used. They are also evidence that the *De administrando imperio* is merely an unfinished work. The alleged ideological message as seen by many scholars in particular chapters of the *De admnistrando imperio* also cannot be detected on such a large scale once it is understood that Constantine Porphyrogenitus too often transcribed his sources verbatim. It also became plainly clear that Constantine Porphyrogenitus was a *man of the Archives*, not of oral tradition. He was also extremely methodological in the process of his work.

During my work in Athens, I enjoyed great support from Greek scholars to whom I owe my gratitude. Dr. Ilias Anagnostakis read the whole manuscript and provided me with invaluable suggestions, in addition to the fact that he supervised my work from the early stages. Dr Gerasimos Mereinos, and Nikos Livanos also helped me in many ways, either through conversations with them on specific topics or about the specific philological dilemma I encountered. I would like to express my gratitude to all of them, since the writing of this book would be more difficult without their support. I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to Dr Taxciarchis Koliass, the director of the IVE who made my stay in Greece and at the IVE possible, and made me feel at home.

Belgrade, November 20th, 2010

Author



## ABBREVIATIONS

Alexander, <i>Ideology</i>	S. S. Alexander, <i>Heraclius, Byzantine Imperial Ideology, and the David Plates</i> , <i>Speculum</i> 52 (1977) 217 – 237.
<i>Ann. Bert.</i>	<i>Annales Bertiniani</i> , MGH SRG in usum scholarum, ed. G. Waitz, Hannoverae 1883.
<i>Ann. Fuld.</i>	<i>Annales Fuldenses</i> , ed. F. Kurze, MGH SRG in usum scholarum, Hannoverae 1891.
<i>ARF</i>	<i>Annales regni Francorum inde ab a. 741. usque ad a. 829 qui dicitur Annales Laurissenses maiores et Einhardi</i> , rec. F. Kurze, MGH SRG in usum scholarum, Hannoverae 1895.
Barford, <i>Slavs</i>	P. M. Barford, <i>The Early Slavs: Culture and Society in Early Medieval Eastern Europe</i> , London 2001.
<i>Bekkerus</i>	<i>Constantinus Porphyrogenitus De thematibus et De administrando imperio</i> , I – II, ed. I. Bekkerus, Bonnae 1840.
Belke – Soustal, <i>Byzantiner</i>	K. Belke – P. Soustal, <i>Die Byzantiner und ihre Nachbarn, Die De administrando imperio genannte Lehrschrift des Kaisers Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos für seinen Sohn Romanos</i> , Wien 1995.
Budak, <i>Prva</i>	N. Budak, <i>Prva stoljeća Hrvatske</i> , Zagreb 1994.
Bury, <i>Book</i>	J. B. Bury, <i>The Ceremonial Book of Constantine Porphyrogennetos</i> , <i>EHR</i> 22 (1907) 209 – 227.
Bury, <i>Treatise</i>	J. B. Bury, <i>The Treatise De administrando imperio</i> , <i>BZ</i> 15 (1906) 517 – 577.
BZ	Byzantinische Zeitschrift
<i>CD I</i>	<i>Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Sclavoniae I</i> , ed. M. Kostrenčić, Zagreb 1967.
Chadwick, <i>East and West</i>	H. Chadwick, <i>East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church, from Apostolic Times Until the Council of Florence</i> , Oxford 2003.
<i>Chron. Salern.</i>	<i>Chronicon Salernitanum</i> , MGH SS III, ed. G. Pertz, Hannoverae 1839, 467 – 561.
<i>CMT</i>	<i>Constantinus et Methodius Thessalonicenses</i> , ed. F. Grivec – F. Tomšić, Radovi Staroslovenskog instituta 4, Zagreb 1960.

Ćirković, “Naseljeni gradovi”	S. Ćirković, “Naseljeni gradovi” <i>Konstantina Porfirogenita i najstarija teritorijalna organizacija</i> , ZRVI 37 (1998) 9 – 32.
DAI I	<i>Constantine Porphyrogenitus De administrando imperio I</i> , ed. R. J. H. Jenkins – Gy. Moravcsik, Washington D. C. 1967.
DAI II	<i>Constantine Porphyrogenitus De administrando imperio II - Commentary</i> , ed. F. Dvornik – R. J. H. Jenkins – B. Lewis – Gy. Moravcsik – D. Obolensky – S. Runciman, London 1962.
Davis, <i>Lives</i>	<i>The Lives of the Ninth-Century Popes (Liber pontificalis)</i> , ed. R. Davis, Liverpool 1995.
<i>De conversione</i>	<i>De conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum libellus</i> , ed. D. W. Wattenbach, MGH SS XI, ed. G. H. Pertz, Hannoverae 1854, 1 – 15.
<i>De them.</i>	<i>Constantino Porfirogenito De thematibus</i> , ed. A. Pertusi, Vatican 1952.
Denniston, <i>Particles Diac.</i>	J. D. Denniston, <i>The Greek Particles</i> , Oxford 1954. <i>Giovanni Diacono Istoria Veneticorum</i> , ed. L. A. Berto, Bologna 1999.
<i>Documenta</i>	<i>Documenta historiae Chroaticae periodum antiquam illustrantia</i> , ed. F. Rački, Zagrabiae 1877.
DOP	Dumbarton Oaks Papers
Dzino, <i>Croat</i>	D. Dzino, <i>Becoming Slav, Becoming Croat: Identity Transformations in Post-Roman and Early Medieval Dalmatia</i> , Leiden 2010.
Eggers, <i>Situation</i>	M. Eggers, <i>Das De administrando imperio des Kaisers Konstantinos VII. Porphyrogenetos und die historisch-politische Situation Südosteuropas im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert</i> , Ostkirchliche Studien 56 (2007) 15 – 100.
EHR	English Historical Review
<i>Ep. VI</i>	<i>Hadriani II. papae epistolae</i> , ed. E. Perels, MGH Epistolarvm VI, Karolini Aevi IV, Berolini 1925, 691 – 765.
<i>Ep. VII</i>	<i>Iohannis VIII papae registrvm</i> , ed. E. Caspar, MGH Epistolarvm VII, Karolini Aevi V, Berolini 1928.
Evans, <i>Archaeology</i>	H. M. Evans, <i>The Early Medieval Archaeology of Croatia A.D. 600 – 900</i> , Oxford 1989.
FB II	<i>Fontes Byzantini Historiam populorum Jugoslaviae spectantes II</i> , rec. B. Ferjančić, Beograd 1959.

- Ferjančić, *Dalmacija* B. Ferjančić, *Dalmacija u spisu De administrando imperio – vrela i putevi saznanja*, ZRVI 29/30 (1991) 9 – 21.
- Ferjančić, *Dolazak* B. Ferjančić, *Dolazak Hrvata i Srba na Balkansko poluostrvo*, ZRVI 35 (1996) 117 – 154.
- Ferjančić, *Struktura* B. Ferjančić, *Struktura 30. glave spisa De administrando imperio*, ZRVI 18 (1978) 61 – 80.
- Fine, *Ethnicity* J. V. A. Fine, Jr., *When Ethnicity Did Not Matter in the Balkans: A Study of Identity in Pre-nationalist Croatia, Dalmatia, and Slavonia in the Medieval and Early-modern Periods*, Ann Arbor 2006.
- Fine, *Medieval Balkans  
Fragmenta* V. A. Fine, Jr., *The Early Medieval Balkans*, Ann Arbor 1991. *Fragmenta registri Iohannis VIII. Papae*, rec. E. Caspar, MGH Epistolarum VII, Karolini aevi V, ed. P. Kehr, Berolini 1928, 273 – 312.
- Goldstein, *Hrvatski  
Grafenauer, Prilog* I. Goldstein, *Hrvatski rani srednji vijek*, Zagreb 1995. B. Grafenauer, *Prilog kritici izvještaja Konstantina Porfirogenita o doseljavanju Hrvata*, HZ 5 (1952) 1 – 56.
- Gregorii Ep.* *Gregorii I papae Registrum epistolarum, liber I – IV*, MGH Epistolarum I, ed. P. Ewald – L. M. Hartmannm Berolini 1891.
- Hauptmann, *Dolazak* Lj. Hauptmann, *Dolazak Hrvata*, Zbornik kralja Tomislava, Zagreb 1925, 86 – 127.
- Hewsen, *Pappus* R. H. Hewsen, *The Geography of Pappus of Alexandria: A Translation of the Armenian Fragments*, Isis 62 (1971) 186 – 207.
- HS* *Historia Salonitana Thomae Archidiaconi*, ed. O. Perić – M. Matijević-Sokol – R. Katičić, Split 2003.
- HSM* *Historia Salonitana maior*, ed. N. Klaić, Beograd 1967.
- Hussey, *Orthodox Church* J. M. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, Oxford 1990.
- HZ* Historijski zbornik
- IČ* Istorijski časopis
- Katić, *Gottschalk* L. Katić, *Saksonac Gottschalk na dvoru kneza Trpimira*, Zagreb 1932.
- Katičić, *Uz početke  
Kazhdan, Literature* R. Katičić, *Uz početke hrvatskih početaka*, Split 1993. A. Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature (850–1000)*, ed. C. Angelidi, Athens 2006.
- Klaić, *Najnoviji* N. Klaić, *Najnoviji radovi o 29, 30. i 31. poglavlju u djelu De administrando imperio cara Konstantina VII. Porfirogenita*, SHP 15 (1985) 31 – 60.

- Klaić, *O problemima* N. Klaić, *O problemima stare domovine, dolaska i pokrštanja dalmatinskih Hrvata*, Zgodovinski časopis 29 (1984) 253 – 270.
- Klaić, *Povijest* N. Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata u ranom srednjem vijeku*, Zagreb 1971.
- Kos, *Gradivo II* *Gradivo za zgodovino Slovencev v srednjem veku II*, ed. F. Kos, Ljubljana 1906.
- Košćak, *Pripadnost* V. Koščak, *Pripadnost istočne obale Jadrana do splitskih sabora 925 – 928*, HZ 33 – 34 (1981) 291 – 355.
- Kreutz, *Normans* B. M. Kreutz, *Before the Normans: Southern Italy in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, Philadelphia 1996.
- Lemerle, *Premier Lib. Pontif.* P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin*, Paris 1971.
- Litavrin, *Ob upravljenii* *Konstantin Bagrúnorodný Ob upravljenii imperiey*, ed. G. G. Litavrin – A. P. Novoselôcev, Moskva 1989.
- Loma, *Sprachgut* A. Loma, *Serbisches und Kroatisches Sprachgut bei Konstantin Porphyrogennetos*, ZRVI 38 (2000) 87 – 161.
- Lončar, *Porfirogenitova seoba* M. Lončar, *Porfirogenitova seoba Hrvata pred sudom novije literature*, Diadora 14 (1992) 375 – 448.
- Lounghis, *Ambassades* T. C. Lounghis, *Les ambassades byzantines en Occident depuis la fondation des états barbares jusqu'aux Croisades (407 – 1096)*, Athens 1980.
- Lounghis, *DAI* *Κωνσταντίνου Ὁ Πορφυρογεννήτου, De administrando imperio*, Thessalonike 1990.
- Louth, *Greek East* A. Louth, *Greek East and Latin West: The Church AD 681 – 1071*, New York 2007.
- Maksimović, *Pokrštanje* Lj. Maksimović *Pokrštanje Srba i Hrvata*, ZRVI 35 (1996) 155 – 174.
- Maksimović, *Struktura* Lj. Maksimović, *Struktura 32 glave spisa De administrando imperio*, ZRVI 21 (1982) 25 – 32.
- Manojlović, *Pomorje* G. Manojlović, *Jadransko pomorje 9. stoljeća u svjetlu istočno-rimske (bizantinske) povijesti*, Rad JAZU 150 (1902) 1 – 102.
- Manojlović, *Studije* G. Manojlović, *Studije o spisu De administrando imperio cara Konstantina VII. Porfirogenita*, I – IV, Rad JAZU 182 (1910) 1 – 165, Rad JAZU 186 (1911) 35 – 103, 104 – 184, Rad JAZU 187 (1911) 1 – 132.
- Margetić, *Konstantin Porfirogenit* L. Margetić, *Konstantin Porfirogenit i vrijeme dolaska Hrvata*, Zbornik Historijskog zavoda JAZU 8 (1977) 5 – 88.

- McKitterick, *Frankish Kingdoms* R. McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms Under the Carolingians, 751 – 987*, London – New York 1993.
- MGH *Monumenta Germaniae historica*
- Monumenta Serbica* *Monumenta Serbica spectantia historiam Serbiae, Bosnae, Ragusii*, ed. Fr. Miklosich, Viennae 1858.
- Nikeph.* *Nikephoros Patriarch of Constantinople Short History*, ed. C. Mango, Washington D.C. 1990.
- Notitia dignitatum* *Notitia dignitatum*, ed. O. Seeck, Frankfurt am Main 1962.
- Notitiae* *Notitiae episcopatum ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, ed. J. Darouzès, Paris 1981.
- Novaković, *Zapažanja* R. Novaković, *Neka zapažanja o 29. i 30. glavi De administrando imperio*, IČ 19 (1972) 5 – 54.
- Oikonomidès, *Listes* N. Oikonomidès, *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IX<sup>e</sup> et X<sup>e</sup> siècles*, Paris 1972.
- Ostrogorski, *Hronika* G. Ostrogorski, *Porfirogenitova hronika srpskih vladara i njeni hronološki podaci*, IČ 1 – 2 (1948) 24 – 29.
- Paul. Hist.* *Pauli Historia Langobardorum*, ed. L. Bethmann – G. Waitz, MGH SRL, Hannoverae 1878, 12 – 188.
- Povest* *Povest vremennyh let*, Sanktpeterburg 1910.
- Poythress, *Asyndeton* V. S. Poythress, *The Use of the Intersentence Conjunctions de, oun, kai, and Asyndeton in the Gospel of John*, *Novum Testamentum* 26/4 (1984) 312 – 340.
- Sakač, *Ugovor* S. Sakač, *Ugovor pape Agatona s Hrvatima*, Zagreb 1931.
- Sakcinski* *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae I*, ed. I. Kukuljević Sakcinski, Zagreb 1874.
- SHP *Starohrvatska prosvjeta*
- Slovene History* P. Štih – V. Simoniti – P. Vodopivec, *A Slovene History: Society – Politics – Culture*, Ljubljana 2008.
- Sode, *De administrando imperio* C. Sode, *Untersuchungen zu De administrando imperio Kaiser Konstantins VII. Pophyrogennetos*, *Varia V*, ed. T. Pratsch, *Poikila Byzantina* 13, Bonn 1994, 147 – 260.
- Souda* *Suidae Lexicon*, rec. I. Bekkerus, Berolini 1854.
- SRG *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum*
- SRL *Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum*
- Šišić, *Povijest* F. Šišić, *Povijest Hrvata u vrijeme narodnih vladara*, Zagreb 1925.
- Šišić, *Priručnik* Šišić, *Priručnik izvora hrvatske istorije*, Zagreb 1914.
- Theoph. Cont.* *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Caemniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*, ed. I. Bekker, Bonnae 1838.

Waldmüller, <i>Begegnungen</i>	L. Waldmüller, <i>Die ersten Begegnungen der Slawen mit dem Christentum und den christlichen Völkern vom VI. bis VIII. Jh.</i> , Amsterdam 1976.
<i>Vita Basilii</i>	= <i>Theoph. Cont.</i>
Vlasto, <i>Entry</i>	A. P. Vlasto, <i>The Entry of the Slavs into Christendom</i> , Cambridge 1970.
Wolfram, <i>Salzburg</i>	H. Wolfram, <i>Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich: Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum und die Quellen ihrer Zeit</i> , Wien - München 1995.
ZRVI	Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta
<i>Žitie na Kliment Ohridski</i>	<i>Žitie na Kliment Ohridski</i> , ed. I. Iliev, <i>Fontes Graeci historiae Bulgaricae IX, Fontes Historiae Bulgaricae 30</i> , Sofia 1994, 8 – 41.
Živković, <i>Crkvena organizacija</i>	T. Živković, <i>Crkvena organizacija u srpskim zemljama (rani srednji vek)</i> , Beograd 2004.
Živković, <i>Forging Unity</i>	T. Živković, <i>Forging Unity, The South Slavs Between East and West: 550 – 1150</i> , Belgrade 2008.
Živković, <i>Južni Sloveni</i>	T. Živković, <i>Južni Sloveni pod vizantijskom vlašću 600 – 1025</i> , Beograd 2007.
Živković, <i>Kastra oikoumena</i>	T. Živković, <i>Constantine Porphyrogenitus' kasta oikoumena in the South Slavs Principalities</i> , IČ 58 (2008) 7 – 26.
Živković, <i>Portreti</i>	T. Živković, <i>Portreti srpskih vladara</i> , Beograd 2007.
Živković, <i>Sources</i>	T. Živković, <i>Sources de Constantin VII Porphyrogénète concernant le passé le plus éloigné des Serbes et des Croates</i> , <i>Byzantina Symmeikta</i> 20 (2010) 11 – 37.
Živković, <i>Unknown source</i>	T. Živković, <i>An Unknown source of Constantine Porphyrogenitus</i> , <i>Byzantinoslavica</i> 68 (2010) 129 – 143.

## INTRODUCTORY NOTE

### *The Workshop of Constantine Porphyrogenitus*

The Byzantine emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (944 – 959) dedicated eight chapters (cc. 29 – 36) out of the 53 chapters of his *De administrando imperio* (hereafter, the *DAI*) to the principalities of the South Slavs and Dalmatia.<sup>1</sup> These eight chapters, especially those chapters from the 29<sup>th</sup> to the 32<sup>nd</sup>, have been considered by historians as being the most important source for the early medieval history of the Serbs and the Croats.<sup>2</sup> If Constantine Porphyrogenitus did

---

<sup>1</sup> For a general overview of the *DAI*, see, J. B. Bury, *The Treatise De administrando imperio*, BZ 15 (1906) 517 – 577 (= Bury, *Treatise*); G. Manojlović, *Studije o spisu De administrando imperio cara Konstantina VII. Porfirogenita*, I – IV, Rad JAZU 182 (1910) 1 – 65, Rad JAZU 186 (1911) 35 – 103, 104 – 184, Rad JAZU 187 (1911) 1 – 132 (=Manojlović, *Studije*); *Constantine Porphyrogenitus De administrando imperio II - Commentary*, ed. F. Dvornik – R. J. H. Jenkins – B. Lewis – Gy. Moravcsik – D. Obolensky – S. Runciman, London 1962, 1 – 8 (= *DAI II*); A. Toynbee, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus and His World*, London 1973; *Konstantin Bagrünorodnóy Ob upravljenii imperiey*, ed. G. G. Litavrin – A. P. Novoselócev, Moskva 1989 (= Litavrin, *Ob upravljenii*); T. Lounghis, *Κωνσταντίνου Ζ' Πορφυρογεννήτου, De administrando imperio*, Thessalonike 1990 (= Lounghis, *DAI*); C. Sode, *Untersuchungen zu De administrando imperio Kaiser Konstantins VII. Pophyrogenetos, Varia V*, ed. T. Pratsch, Poikila Byzantina 13, Bonn 1994, 147 – 260 (= Sode, *De administrando imperio*).

<sup>2</sup> There are numerous studies dedicated to these chapters; see, G. Manojlović, *Jadransko pomorje 9. stoljeća u svjetlu istočno-rimske (bizantinske) povijesti*, Rad JAZU 150 (1902) 1 – 102 (= Manojlović, *Pomorje*); Bury, *Treatise*, 556 – 561; Lj. Hauptmann, *Dolazak Hrvata*, Zbornik kralja Tomislava, Zagreb 1925, 86 – 127 (= Hauptmann, *Dolazak*); Idem, *Seobe Hrvata i Srba*, Jugoslavenski istorijski časopis 3 (1937) 30 – 61 (= Hauptmann, *Seobe*); A. Dabinović, *Državnopravni odnos Hrvata prema istočnom carstvu*, Rad HAZU 270 (1941) 49 – 148; G. Ostrogorski, *Porfirogenitova hronika srpskih vladara i njeni hronološki podaci*, IČ 1 – 2 (1948) 24 – 29 (= Ostrogorski, *Hronika*); B. Grafenauer, *Prilog kritici izvještaja Konstantina Porfirogenita o doseljenju Hrvata*, HZ 5 (1952) 1 – 56 (= Grafenauer, *Prilog*); J. Ferluga, *Vizantija i postanak najranijih južnoslovenskih država*, ZRVI 11 (1968) 55 – 66; Idem, *Vizantijsko*

not write these chapters, our knowledge about the time of the settlement, baptism and political circumstances which brought the Serbs and the Croats into the territories of what is today the modern Western Balkans, would virtually not exist. This unique information about the Early Medieval history of the Serbs and Croats, preserved in the *DAI*, has attracted the attention of scholars for centuries, and the *DAI* has become the most studied medieval source in the historiography of the Croats and the Serbs. Since the *DAI* contains information which cannot be found in any other source, this historiography has witnessed great degree of discrepancy in its interpretations, which are reflected in a number of hypotheses and theories. It appears that the *DAI*'s chapters on the Slavs of Dalmatia and its hinterland are much misinterpreted, misjudged, and are over or underestimated.<sup>3</sup>

---

*carstvo i južnoslovenske države od sredine X veka*, ZRVI 13 (1971) 75 – 107; L. Margetić, *Konstantin Porfirogenit i vrijeme dolaska Hrvata*, Zbornik Historijskog zavoda JAZU 8 (1977) 5 – 88 (= Margetić, *Porfirogenit*); B. Ferjančić, *Struktura 30. glave spisa De administrando imperio*, ZRVI 18 (1978) 61 – 80 (= Ferjančić, *Struktura*); Idem, *Dolazak Hrvata i Srba na Balkansko poluostrvo*, ZRVI 35 (1996) 117 – 154 (= Ferjančić, *Dolazak*); Idem, *Vasilije I i obnova vizantijske vlasti u IX veku*, ZRVI 36 (1997) 9 – 30; V. Koščak, *Pripadnost istočne obale Jadrana do splitskih sabora 925 – 928*, HZ 33 – 34 (1981) 291 – 355 (= Koščak, *Pripadnost*); Lj. Maksimović, *Struktura 32 glave spisa De administrando imperio*, ZRVI 21 (1982) 25 – 32 (= Maksimović, *Struktura*); Idem, *Pokrštavanje Srba i Hrvata*, ZRVI 35 (1996) 155 – 174 (= Maksimović, *Pokrštavanje*); N. Klaić, *O problemima stare domovine, dolaska i pokrštavanja dalmatinskih Hrvata*, Zgodovinski časopis 29 (1984) 253 – 270 (= Klaić, *O problemima*); N. Klaić, *Najnoviji radovi o 29, 30. i 31. poglavlju u djelu De administrando imperio cara Konstantina VII. Porfirogenita*, SHP 15 (1985) 31 – 60 (= Klaić, *Najnoviji*); I. Ševčenko, *Re-reading Constantine Porphyrogenitis*, Byzantine Diplomacy, ed. J. Shepard – S. Franklin, Ipswich 1995, 167 – 195 (= Ševčenko, *Re-reading*); S. Ćirković, *“Naseljeni gradovi” Konstantina Porfirogenita i najstarija teritorijalna organizacija*, ZRVI 37 (1998) 9 – 32 (= Ćirković, *“Naseljeni gradovi”*); M. Eggers, *Das De administrando imperio des Kaisers Konstantinos VII. Porphyrogenetos und die historisch-politische Situation Südosteuropas im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert*, Ostkirchliche Studien 56 (2007) 15 – 100 (= Eggers, *Situation*) For the older historiography see, *Fontes Byzantini Historiam populorum Jugoslaviae spectantes II*, rec. B. Ferjančić, Beograd 1959, passim (= *FB II*).

<sup>3</sup> See, for instance, Margetić, *Porfirogenit*, passim; Klaić, *O problemima*, passim; M. Ančić, *Imperija na zalasku. Nestanak bizantske vlasti na istočnoj obali Jadrana u 9. stoljeću*, Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru 41 (1999) 6 – 9. However, Lounghis, *DAI*, 84 – 91, developed an original opinion about the ideological purpose of the *DAI* regarding Dalmatia and the Slavs, which is hardly supported by any methodology. It is merely a fictitious essay.

The methodology, which has usually been applied to the *DAI*'s chapters about the Serbs, Croats, and other Slavs of Dalmatia, obviously has not provided good and reliable answers.<sup>4</sup> This methodology has observed the Serbo-Croat's information of the *DAI* in the manner: *true – untrue, possible – impossible, reliable – not reliable, invention – genuine*. It has been in the process of piling up of evidence, as a blind carpenter assembles parts of furniture, that the model of the approach to the *De administrando imperio* has come to nothing, as in the course of three centuries we are still at the beginning; namely: Who were those Serbs and Croats? Did they come to Dalmatia during the rule of Heraclius or centuries later? Did they truly originate from southern Poland or from Bohemia? Did they receive baptism in the time of Heraclius? Had they been *foederati* of Byzantium or just brutal intruders? These and many other questions which have been repeated in cycles and enriched upon from time to time with new ideas and hypotheses – usually ones worse than those posited previously – are a consequence of this obsolete methodology. If there is a persistent wandering between the same questions and the same or similar answers without any evident progressive conclusions, then something has been wrong with our methodology.<sup>5</sup>

The first step which has to be done is to find Constantine's sources, if possible. This is an idea proposed more than century ago by the great British scholar J. B. Bury, but has been left unachieved.<sup>6</sup> In turn, the next step would be to explain and understand when, why and how Constantine's sources were composed. Only after these two analyses

---

<sup>4</sup> It is interesting to note that Bogo Grafenauer, in his study on the *DAI* which was conducted almost sixty years ago, stressed that *everything which was written, even the best* (about the Croats and Serbs according to the *DAI*, T. Ž), until the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, *is obsolete and not useful*; cf. Grafenauer, *Prilog*, 3. Grafenauer criticized the methodology by which scholars approached the *DAI*, but he did not provide any better methodology. In my opinion, Grafenauer's opinion is valid, even in the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

<sup>5</sup> The basis of this methodology has been explained in the *Preface* of this study. This methodology, which follows four basic steps: 1. authorship of the work; 2 – 3. localization of the document in time and place; 4. source(s) of the author, is still taught; see, K. N. Chitnis, *Research Methodology in History*, New Delhi 2006, 38, 42. Exactly the same steps had been proposed a century ago; see for instance, E. Bernheim, *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode und der Geschichtsphilosophie*, Leipzig 1908; F. Šišić, *Priručnik izvora hrvatske istorije*, Zagreb 1914, 27 – 30 (= Šišić, *Priručnik*).

<sup>6</sup> Bury, *Treatise*, 519.

have been completed can we judge and estimate the information for which Constantine exposed in the *DAI*. This kind of approach would eventually show exactly from which sources and how Constantine Porphyrogenitus forged the Slav chapters of *De administrando imperio* (chapters 29 to 36).

However, the *DAI* is the work of one author – Constantine Porphyrogenitus – and consequently this would mean that there must be a pattern of work, a methodology.<sup>7</sup> The chapters on the South Slavs cannot much differ regarding the author's approach to his sources from the rest of the *DAI*. Neither can the origin of his sources be much different. Constantine's workshop had some rules, set by the author himself, and followed during the various stages of his work.<sup>8</sup> The unique trace of Constantine's methodology is preserved in some characteristic words, which he used to mark the beginning of an *excerpta* from his source – *isteon oti, oti*. (ἰστέον ὅτι, ὅτι).<sup>9</sup> This is why the great British scholar J. B. Bury emphasized long time ago that the whole work, which appears to us in a single manuscript from ca. 1070, is merely a concept.<sup>10</sup> This may sound strange, but historians are

<sup>7</sup> *DAI II*, 5, supposed that the concept of the *DAI* as a political hand-book dates from 951/952. It is also assumed that cc. 14 – 42 were composed as a treatise *Περὶ ἔθνων*; cf. *DAI II*, 3; Manojlović, *Studije I*, 11 – 16, 56. It is also prevailing opinion that the *DAI*, based on the original *Peri thematon*, was turned into a diplomatic guide by Constantine Porphyrogenitus himself, and that he took a peculiar and personal interest in the project; cf. *DAI II*, 8. More recently, J. Howard-Johnston, *Byzantine Sources for Khazar History*, The World of the Khazars, ed. P. B. Golden – H. Ben-Shammai – A. Róna-Tas, Leiden 2007, 179, argued that the core of the (sc. cc. 14 – 42) *DAI* was commissioned at the very beginning of the tenth century by the Emperor Leo VI.

<sup>8</sup> In the Introduction to his *DAI (Proem)* Constantine enumerated the most important subjects found in his work. Then, he stressed that all the things he discovered were “of my own wisdom”; cf. *Constantine Porphyrogenitus De administrando imperio I*, ed. R. J. H. Jenkins – Gy. Moravcsik, Washington D. C. 1967, Proem, 25 (= *DAI I*). Ševčenko, *Re-reading*, 188, understood that Constantine gave instructions that the *DAI* had to have been composed (based on the incorrect translation in the *DAI I*, 47: *I have decreed*); also, P. Stephenson, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier: A Political Study of the Northern Balkans, 900 – 1204*, Cambridge 2004, 25. On the contrary, Constantine said that he thought (*I said to myself*, lit.) that these things shall be made known to his son (καὶ εἶπα γνωστά σοι ποιῆσαι). The correct translation is given by, Litavrin, *Ob upravlenii*, 35.

<sup>9</sup> Bury, *Treatise*, 524 – 525. See also opinion of, Eggers, *Situation*, 17.

<sup>10</sup> This is the *Codex Parisinus gr. 2009*. See, Bury, *Treatise*, 575: ...we are almost forced to conclude that Constantine set aside the work in an unfinished state and never completed it.

actually very lucky to have this version of the *DAI* today, since they are able to trace back Constantine's sources through careful examination. These are usually hidden behind its opening words of the sections – *isteon oti, oti* – and reveal how he, from all these entries, gathered from mostly lost sources today, composed chapters which, either can be considered as being final, being brought almost to the final version, or just being first drafts.<sup>11</sup> Generally speaking, these chapters, which contain these words, are in fact just prepared for further elaboration, and therefore unfinished, and those without these words can be considered as finished, i.e. final or semifinal versions.<sup>12</sup> By following this methodology, it can be said that the chapters: 1 – 13; 15; 21; 25 – 29; 31 – 41; 44 – 46; 48; 50 – 53, are

<sup>11</sup> Bury's approach is criticized by, N. Tomašić, *Život i djela cara Konstantina VII. Porfirogenita*, Vjesnik Zemaljskog Arkiva 20 (1918) 14 – 18; Grafenauer, *Prilog*, 17. The general view of historiography is that Constantine Porphyrogenitus **finished** the *DAI* by the middle of 952 when his son Roman entered officially into man's estate on his fourteenth birthday; cf. *DAI II*, 5. It is plausible hypothesis, and even accepted as highly probable that Constantine Porphyrogenitus truly intended to compose the *DAI* as a special gift to his son, the internal evidence, scattered accros the *DAI*, strongly suggest that Constantine did not finish his work. For instance, the repetition of two chapters on Dalmatia (cc. 29 and 30), the information about Venice dispersed in cc. 27 and 28, the brief notes of Pechenegs (cc. 1 – 8) and surrounding nations which are used again in chapter 37, as it is the case with the Russians in chapter 9. The marginal notes in chapter 9 suggest that chapter 9 previously consisted of significant number of *oti*-sections; cf. *Codex Parisinus gr. 2009*, fol. 14v: Περὶ τῶν λεγομ(ένων) καταράκτων, fol.15r: Περὶ τοῦ β' φραγμοῦ and fol. 15r, and 16r, for another six barrages; fol. 16v: Περὶ τῆς νήσου καὶ τοῦ δρυὸς καὶ τῶν θυσῶν. Furthermore, the brief note on the Turks, Pechenegs, and *megali* Moravia, hardly fits in chapter 13, and were actually notices which found their place in cc. 37, 38, 41. Therefore, the particular *oti*-section was not "one imperial advice", (esp. cc. 1 – 8), but rather notes of Constantine while he was drafting his work.

<sup>12</sup> In the *De thematibus*, which is a finished work, it is possible to trace in which manner the former *oti*-sections were "attached" to the main text through the so-called *fine-seams* – Καὶ αὐτὴ γὰρ (64.21); Μετὰ δὲ (65.55 - 56); Ἡ δὲ (67.19; 75.1; 85.32; 90.6; 94.35); Ἐπὶ δὲ (73.3; 90.11); Ὁ δὲ (77.12); Ἀφ' οὗ γὰρ (84.11); Ἐκεῖσε γὰρ (92.20). Examples are given only for the cases where it is obvious that the author switched to another source; i.e. from patristic literature to historical work or diplomatic documents, or from the Roman times to the time of Leo VI or Roman Lacapenos; or when the statement is related to another issue rather than to a previous one. The most frequent *fine-seams* are: καὶ, ἐπὶ, γὰρ, δὲ. About the *fine-seams*, see below, n. 83.

unfinished.<sup>13</sup> Since there are chapters which are obviously brought to their final version (e.g. c. 30), it can be assumed that the whole *DAI* we have today is in fact at least the second version.<sup>14</sup>

There must be a specific relationship between the chapters of the *DAI* titled with *Περὶ τῶν* (*peri ton*) and the presence of *isteon oti*, *oti*, in them. *Peri ton* and *isteon oti*, *oti*, suggest that just the material collected under a general title, which embraced all sources related to specific matters (i.e. Pechenegs, Turks, Hazars, Croats), is met. Throughout the analysis of the *DAI*, *peri ton* goes alongside *isteon oti* or *oti* in almost all the chapters that have been marked as unfinished (see above). In those chapters which are finished, meaning without *isteon oti* or *oti*, their titles never contain *peri ton*.<sup>15</sup> On the contrary, the titles of such chapters are elaborate and sophisticated. For instance, the first chapter in the *DAI*, which does not contain *peri ton* in the title, is that of 28, and it is titled: *Διήγησις...*, then follows chapter 30 with the same beginning *Διήγησις...*, then 49 (*Ὁ ζῆτων*), and finally 53 (*Ἱστορία...*). Therefore, only four chapters of the *DAI* have elaborated titles. This also coincides with the absence of *isteon oti* or *oti* in them, as well as the absence of marginal notes.<sup>16</sup> This, very restricted

<sup>13</sup> Only 14 chapters of the *DAI* can be considered as final or partially finalized versions and 39 chapters as being unfinished. Mathematically, this means that the *De administrando imperio* is less than 30% complete. This analysis does not actually take into account that the chapters on the Arabs (14 to 22) are merely extracts from Theophanes' Chronicle, George the Monk, and some, now lost, Eastern sources, and, that they are rather *excerpts* for further elaboration than finished chapters as they first appeared to be.

<sup>14</sup> Therefore, cc. 14 – 42 are not simple *rifacimento* of an earlier work, as it was stressed in the *DAI I*, 12 (The General Introduction) – but rather the second version of yet unfinished work.

<sup>15</sup> The only exceptions are chapters: 14 (*Of the Genealogy of Mahomet*, based on George the Monk), 16 (which is just a single entry from Constantine's source), 17 (the whole passage transcribed from the Chronicle of Theophanes), 18 – 20, 22 (about the Arabs' chieftains, also from Constantine's source), 23 – 24 (the entries on Spain from an unknown source), 42 (assembled together from several sources, it has an extensive title but not of the chapter, rather a description of the contents for the author himself), 43 (which contains *peri* in the title, but runs smoothly without an *oti* or *isteon oti*. The transitions and interruptions are marked with *meta*), 47 (about the Cypriots, transcribed literally from Constantine's source).

<sup>16</sup> The only marginal note in these chapters can be found in chapter 53, but this note, even though written by an 11<sup>th</sup> century copyist of the manuscript, was made by the same

approach, would eventually show up in less than 10% of the *DAI* which could be considered as those which are finished. Through this brief analysis, we can deduce that Constantine, in fact, just temporarily called chapter 31: “*Of the Croats and of the Country They Now Dwell in*”, so as to be able to concentrate all entries there from his sources related either to the Croats or to Dalmatia. However, this does not mean that he exploited all of his material, rather only what he had found to be interesting (“*worthy of attention*”, by his own words) and important for a specific issue.<sup>17</sup> Finally, we can therein safely conclude that most of the chapters’ titles in the *DAI* should be more properly called *folder titles*.

Chapter 50 of the *DAI* is an excellent example. It contains valuable information about Constantine’s sources and we are able to understand how he assembled a coherent story based on different documents through examining it. In addition to the notorious fact that this chapter deals with a variety of subjects, and therefore has 14 *isteon oti* sections, many of these sections are, in fact, assembled well from several similar sources. For instance, regarding the Slavs of Peloponnesus, there are at least two letters (reports) of the *strategos* to the emperor, at least one order sent by the emperor to the *strategos*, the letter of the Melingoi and Ezeritai to the emperor, and an imperial decision on the taxation of the Slavs (Milingoi and Ezeritai).<sup>18</sup> Another *isteon oti* section of chapter 50 was based on an imperial letter to Manuel of Tekis by which the emperor promised him immunity, the imperial decision by which Manuel of Tekis became a *protospatharios*, at least two other imperial decisions about the appointments of the sons of Manuel of Tekis – Pankratoukas, who became a *strategos* of the Boukellarioi, and Iachnoukas who became a *strategos* of Nicopolis – and at least two imperial charters or Golden Bulls by which the two younger sons of Manuel of Tekis, Moudaphar and John, were granted land in Trapezunt.<sup>19</sup> In the following *isteon oti* sections of chapter 50 of

---

person who made notes in cc. 43.136, 45.56 and 45.103, around the year 979; cf. *DAI I*, 19. These three marginal notes are of the same style and characteristics – e. g. *this one was father of this one*. Of course, only those marginal notes which are written by the same hand that copied the manuscript in the 1070s are to be considered.

<sup>17</sup> Constantine literally said this in the introduction of chapter 30: ...μὲν τούτων τὴν δὴλωσιν, πῆ δὲ ἑτέρων ἀξιολόγων τινῶν...; *DAI I*, c. 30.4 – 5.

<sup>18</sup> *DAI I*, c. 50.25 – 28; 32 – 33; 60 – 61; 66 – 67.

<sup>19</sup> *DAI I*, c.50.118 – 119; 119 – 120; 122 – 126.

the *DAI*, there are at least: the letter of the emperor to Argyrus by which he was recalled from banishment; the imperial decision of the appointment of the same Argyrus as the *strategos* of Charsianon; at least one letter of banished dignitaries directed to the emperor and to Argyrus (Melias, Baasakios, Krikorikios, Pazounis, and Ismael) by which they demanded to be placed in military or administrative positions; and at least five imperial decisions by which these five people were granted new positions.<sup>20</sup> Another *isteon oti* section of chapter 50 is based on a letter of the *strategos* Niketas to the emperor, then the letter of the emperor to Niketas, then another letter of Niketas to the emperor, and finally, an imperial decision about these appointments as a result of the previous correspondence between the emperor and Niketas.<sup>21</sup> There is also an interesting *isteon oti* section in chapter 50 of the *DAI*, by which it is obvious that Constantine sometimes used the payroll list of the dignitaries. This is the case for a certain cleric named Ktenas who asked *parakoimomenos* Samonas to be granted the rank of *protospatharios* and to receive an annual stipend of one pound of gold. Samonas passed this request to the emperor, and the emperor answered to Samonas. Then, Samonas informed Ktenas about the negative result of his request; then, after Ktenas wrote again to Samonas, the *parakoimomenos* wrote to the emperor again on behalf of Ktenas. Finally, the emperor appointed Ktenas as the *protospatharios*. At the end of this section, Constantine states that Ktenas died two years later, since he received his stipend of one pound of gold only for the two subsequent years.<sup>22</sup> Therefore, Constantine Porphyrogenitus used the documents from the Archives of the Imperial Palace<sup>23</sup> to assemble the *isteon oti* sections of chapter 50, but he could not write it down immediately in the shape preserved in the *DAI*.<sup>24</sup> His narrative is well

<sup>20</sup> *DAI I*, c. 50.136 – 138; 140 – 145; 146.

<sup>21</sup> *DAI I*, c. 50.208 – 211; 211 – 212; 213 – 214; 214 – 217.

<sup>22</sup> *DAI I*, c. 50.238 – 243; 243 – 246; 246 – 247; 249 – 250; 253 – 255; 255 – 256.

<sup>23</sup> The term *Archives of the Imperial Palace*, covers various departments of Byzantine administration; see, P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin*, Paris 1971, 278 (= Lemerle, *Premier*); Eggers, *Situation*, 17: *...Staatarchiv und der kaiserlichen Bibliothek in Konstantinopel...*

<sup>24</sup> For a different opinion, namely that Constantine did not have many documents at his disposal, see, Ševčenko, *Re-reading*, 190 – 192. It is partially accepted by, J. Shepard, *Byzantine Diplomacy, A.D. 800 – 1204: Means and Ends*, Byzantine Diplomacy, ed.

assembled, and this is why he had to write at least one draft based on these documents before he made this version of chapter 50. Since the contents of this chapter do not correspond to its title, it is obvious that this chapter had to be rewritten (recomposed, divided into two or three chapters) in some later phase of the emperor's work. However, the most important conclusion is that an *isteon oti*, or *oti*-section, was able to be assembled from several sources.

As we have already underscored, the words *isteon oti*, *oti*, which mark a new entry prepared for further elaboration, can also be considered as being traces of the *DAI*'s particular source.<sup>25</sup> They are, in fact, the most specific marks of Constantine's workshop.<sup>26</sup> For instance, in the three subsequent sections, opened with the words *isteon oti* or *oti*, one can trace at least one, two, or three different sources (i. e. A, B, C). Sometimes, the sections A and C can also be from the same source and merely separated by an entry from another source in section B. On the other hand, sometimes all sections can belong to the same source, having been merely displaced from their original position due to Constantine's own course of the narrative. This latter possibility seems to be merely theoretical, since if the author had the need to displace sections from his major source, this would mean that he probably used some other source(s) for the insertions, and therefore he used at least two different sources for this chapter. The only case when sections A, B, and C, could be based on the same source is if the chapter were preserved as the first draft of the author, revealing that he was preparing the material by cutting off the most interesting parts from a

---

J. Shepard – A. Franklin, Ipswich 1995, 47. Also, A. Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature (850 – 1000)*, ed. C. Angelidi, Athens 2006, 135 – 136 (= Kazhdan, *Literature*), thought that most of the material in the *DAI* is *primarily contemporary to Constantine*.

<sup>25</sup> Manojlović, *Studije II*, 37, thought that *isteon oti* could be a signal that text which follows belongs to specific source. *FB II*, 3, did not make any difference regarding *isteon oti* and *oti*; cf. Bury, *Treatise*, 518 – 519.

<sup>26</sup> See, J. B. Bury, *The Ceremonial Book of Constantine Porphyrogenetos*, EHR 22 (1907) 223 (= Bury, *Book*). The *oti*-sections in another work of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *Excerpta historica*, also mark either verbatim, abridged, or retold text of its source; cf. *Excerpta Historica iussu imperatoris Constantini Porphyrogeniti*, ed. U. PH. Boissevain – C. De Boor – Th. Büttner-Wobst, I – IV, Berolini 1903 – 1910.

source for his narrative. In such a case, this would mean that the author intentionally omitted the sections between A, B, and B, C. The intended omissions are as important as those sections which were used by the author, since the intentional omissions point out that he had reason to do so. However, sometimes omitted sections appear in other chapters of the *DAI*, unfortunately not so often do they provide full insight into the original source.<sup>27</sup> If one were able to recover a part of omitted text of the original source, they would eventually understand Constantine's mind better. Through the analysis of information contained in these *oti*-sections, we should be able to partly identify how many sources Constantine had used, even though we no longer have these sources at our disposal. The frequent appearance of the consequent *oti*-sections, where it is obvious that all of them belong to the same source, is clear evidence that the primary source had been more or less mutilated by Constantine. Yet, as has been stated already, it is necessary to stress that this does not mean necessarily that he did not use those sections omitted somewhere else in his work.<sup>28</sup>

The thesis that the *DAI* we have today is in fact a second version, can be observed through the examination of sections which begin with *isteon oti*, or *oti*, and which contain the author's references to some other chapters further in the text. This could mean that Constantine first made a basic concept of his further work – probably just titles below which he added *excerpts* from the sources related to this matter. Then, in the second version, he was able to merge the information from his sources inside a particular section, even those opening with *isteon oti* or *oti*. This can be observed, for instance, in chapter eight of the *DAI*. In the middle of the section here, which begins with *oti*, Constantine switched to another source.<sup>29</sup> In addition to

<sup>27</sup> For instance, see the story about the Terbounian *Archon* Belae and the marriage of his son Kraina with the daughter of the *archon* of Serbia, Vlastimer, which was most probably displaced from the main narrative on the Serbs, to be placed in chapter 34 on Terbounia; cf. *DAI I*, c. 34.7 – 9 (see below, section 6.3).

<sup>28</sup> For instance, see, Bury, *Book*, 223: *On the other hand the incorporation of cc. 40 – 57 in the second book (sc. of the De cerimoniis) was the work of the redactor. These chapters are evidently the miscellaneous contents of a dossier or collection of pieces, which he found physically associated with the original manuscript of the De cerimoniis. They are in fact, literary papers of Constantine, partly excerpts, partly compositions of his own.*

<sup>29</sup> *DAI I*, c. 8.22 –23.

the characteristic *fine seam* such as τοῦ γὰρ, there is also a marginal note in the manuscript exactly at that point where the author switched to another source: Πε(ρὶ) τοῦ κληρικοῦ Γαβριήλ.<sup>30</sup> These sorts of marginal notes were a kind of reminder to Constantine himself, either to remember from which source he took the information, or to trace back to some other sources related to the specific question.<sup>31</sup> Therefore in both cases, Constantine, in fact, left traces that he had another source related to the specific issue. The most recent research has shown that Constantine, in fact, made his final (or at least the latest version) of the *DAI* just a few months before his death (November 959).<sup>32</sup> It will probably never be known whether he had ever considered his work (the *DAI* as it is) as being finished.

On the other hand, the unfinished *DAI* has become a gold mine to research Constantine's historical workshop. It is something very close, as if one were to enter a workshop of a medieval architect who had died in the middle of a project, he would be able to examine his drafts, ideas, and plans in their different stages of accomplishment. Therefore, we can trace his thoughts from the moment he started to develop the idea, having been able to see what kind of difficulties he

<sup>30</sup> Cf. *Codex Parisinus gr. 2009*, fol. 12r.

<sup>31</sup> See the *Codex Parisinus gr. 2009*, fol. 44r, where the marginal note *peri tis nisou tis Kritis*, from which Constantine switched the Chronicle of Theophanes to another source is located. The editors of the *DAI* considered these marginal notes either as the notes of the collaborators of the author, or the remarks of later readers; cf. *DAI I*, 19. It is true for most of those which were written in various hands from the 14<sup>th</sup> century and onward, but those written by the same hand that copied the whole 11<sup>th</sup> century manuscript were originally placed there by Constantine. Bury, *Treatise*, 520, considered these marginal notes as a rough guide for a reader. On the other hand, the appearance of the titles of some chapters on the margins, in addition to the fact that title itself is written in the main text – reveals that these titles were most probably the original titles of intended section in the first draft. Constantine had to keep them in his second draft to be able to trace his work from the previous stages. This is why the titles of chapters preserved on the margins were written in red ink, as well as the titles incorporated in the main text. About the Constantine's editorial work in the *DAI*, see, J. Howard-Johnston, *The De administrando imperio: A Re-examination of the Text and a Re-evaluation of its Evidence about the Rus*, Les centres proto-urbains russes entre Scandinavie, Byzance et Orient, ed. M. Kazanski – A. Nersessian – C. Zuckermann, Paris 2001, 308; *DAI II*, 8.

<sup>32</sup> T. Živković, *Forging Unity, The South Slavs Between East and West: 550 – 1150*, Belgrade 2008, 157 – 173 (= Živković, *Forging Unity*).

encountered and in which way he struggled with them. If he was such an architect, many questions can be posed, such as: Was he acting as a historian or just a propagator of imperial ideology? How did he usually solve the conflicting statements about the same matter or event? How did he struggle with the lack of sources for important issues he wanted to address? Did he personally read all of his sources, or was it an obligation of his collaborators? Did he have a pattern on how to use a source? Did he dictate or write it personally? Did he make marginal notes, and if so, why did he do so? Did he personally undertake the search for documents in the Archives of the Imperial Palace, or was it done by those who worked with him? These and many other questions can be addressed to the author of the *DAI*, and answers to them will shape the methodology by which we will reach beyond the text itself.

Chapter 30, *The Story of the Province of Dalmatia*, and the following chapter 31, *Of the Croats and of the Country they Now Dwell in*, contain information about the Croats, even though both chapters are a mixture of information related either to Dalmatia or to the Croats. Actually, chapter 30, even though it is titled as *The Story of the Province of Dalmatia*, speaks a great deal about the history of the Croats, but in a different manner than is presented in chapter 31. For instance, according to chapter 31, the Croats came to the command of the emperor Heraclius and, by his command, they also received holy baptism from Rome.<sup>33</sup> On the other hand, the settling of the Croats, in chapter 30, is described as if it was their own enterprise, as well as the receiving of baptism from Rome.<sup>34</sup>

It was the great British scholar J. B. Bury who pointed out that chapter 30, in its structure, is different from the rest of the *DAI*. The famous British Byzantologist noted that this chapter does not contain the specific beginnings of the sections such as *isteon oti*, or *oti*, which are much more common for many of the other chapters of the *DAI*, and which are evidence that these sections are based on material prepared for further elaboration.<sup>35</sup> Due to these differences between chapters 30 and 31, (and not only these), it has been proposed that chapter 30 was

<sup>33</sup> *DAI I*, c. 31.6 – 8; 31.21 – 25.

<sup>34</sup> *DA I*, c. 30.61 – 67; 30.87 – 90.

<sup>35</sup> Bury, *Treatise*, 524 – 525.

written later than the other chapters of the *DAI*, either by Constantine or by an anonymous author who might even have written it after the death of the emperor.<sup>36</sup> It should be noted that Constantine, in his *Vita Basilii*, completed ca. 950, decided to tell another story about the baptism of the Croats, the Serbs and other Southern Slavs, but this time from the point of view of glorifying the Macedonian dynasty and its founder, his grandfather Basil I.<sup>37</sup> In this version of the South Slavs' baptism, Constantine stressed that they abandoned Christianity in the times of the emperor Michael II (820 – 829), and that they re-approached Basil I after the Byzantine fleet had intervened against the Arabs in the Adriatic, asking to be baptized and received under the protection of the emperor.<sup>38</sup> This version clearly shows that the story about the baptism of the Southern Slavs recorded in chapters 30 and 31 of the *DAI* was based on completely different sources. This version, preserved in *the Vita Basilii*, as it mentions the embassy of the Croats and the Serbs to Constantinople, was most probably composed of diplomatic materials gathered from the Archives of the Imperial Palace.<sup>39</sup> This is why these different stories on the baptism of the Croats/Serbs actually signal that Constantine had at least two independent sources regarding this issue. This also means that one of these two works – the *Vita Basilii* and the *DAI* – was not considered to

---

<sup>36</sup> An overview of the previous historiography is given by, Ferjančić, *Struktura*, 67 – 70, with notes 1 – 13; Idem, *Dolazak*, 117 – 154; V. A. Fine, Jr., *The Early Medieval Balkans*, Ann Arbor 1991, 49 – 59 (Fine, *Medieval Balkans*); M. Lončar, *Porfirogenitova seoba Hrvata pred sudom novije literature*, *Diadora* 14 (1992) 375 – 448 (= Lončar, *Porfirogenitova seoba*); K. Belke – P. Soustal, *Die Byzantiner und ihre nachbarn, Die De administrando imperio genannte Lehrschrift des Kaisers Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos für seinen Sohn Romanos*, Wien 1995, 158 (= Belke – Soustal, *Byzantiner*); Klaić, *Najnoviji*, 38, thought that the anonymous author of chapter 30 made corrections to the story about the Croats as a kind of *revenge to the lying emperor*.

<sup>37</sup> For the date of the composition of the *Vita Basilii*, see, Bury, *Treatise*, 551, 573; I. Ševčenko, *Storia letteraria*, La civiltà bizantina dal IX all' XI secolo, Bari 1978, 99 – 101. For the narrative structure of *Vita Basilii*, see, Kazhdan, *Literature*, 137 – 144.

<sup>38</sup> *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*, ed. I. Bekker, Bonnae 1838, *Theophanes Continuatus*, 288.10 – 289.2; 291.1 – 292.13 (= *Theoph. Cont.*).

<sup>39</sup> Constantine used this same material from the Archives of the Imperial Palace for chapter 29 of the *DAI* as well; cf. *DAI I*, c. 29.54 – 88.

be finished by the author; and that the *DAI* must be the unfinished work. If one source, or a group of sources, had been of Byzantine origin (presumably the diplomatic letters exchanged between the *archontes* of the Slavs and the emperor, or official reports made by Byzantine legates, according to which Constantine assembled the story of the ninth century baptism of the South Slavs, as well as of their political relations with Byzantium recorded in the *Vita Basilii* and in chapter 29 of the *DAI*) then the story recorded in chapters 30 and 31, as well as in chapter 32, could have hardly originated in Byzantium. The two, completely opposite and conflicting stories about the Southern Slavs and Byzantium: their political ties, internal affairs managed by Basil I, their process of baptism, – which found their place in the *DAI* – actually direct one again to the only possible conclusion: that the *DAI* we have today is a draft of the work which had, according to Bury, *never enjoyed a final revision*.<sup>40</sup>

It seems that Bury's point has not been exploited enough for the research of the *DAI* that followed. On the contrary, some historians have proposed the basic idea of this chapter of the *DAI* (with some variations) was written either by the emperor after 950, or 955, or even by an anonymous writer after the death of Constantine Porphyrogenitus.<sup>41</sup> Furthermore, some researchers have understood that chapter 30 is based on the Croat tradition, and therefore closer to the *truth* than the description of the Croat past which has been preserved in chapter 31.<sup>42</sup> The Serbian Byzantologist Božidar Ferjančić expressed strong and well grounded doubts that even the information on the Croat's earliest past recorded in chapter 30 is based completely on their tradition.<sup>43</sup> It

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Bury, *Treatise*, 525.

<sup>41</sup> Hauptmann, *Dolazak*, 95 – 101; Grafenauer, *Prilog*, 16 – 18; *DAI II*, 97 – 98; N. Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata u ranom srednjem vijeku*, Zagreb 1971, 37 (= Klaić, *Povijest*); Margetić, *Porfirogenit*, 17 – 19.

<sup>42</sup> See, for instance, Klaić, *Povijest*, 38 – 39; Eadem, *Najnoviji*, 32; Margetić, *Porfirogenit*, 22.

<sup>43</sup> Ferjančić, *Struktura*, 73 – 74. On the other hand, even if he accepted the general conclusions of the previous historiography about Constantine's official(s) who collected the material on the Croats from Dalmatia as being the most probable, J. V. A. Fine, Jr., *When Ethnicity Did Not Matter in the Balkans: A Study of Identity in Pre-nationalist Croatia, Dalmatia, and Slavonia in the Medieval and Early-modern Periods*, Ann Arbor 2006, 29 – 33 (= Fine, *Ethnicity*) rightly advanced the two most important questions: 1. *Where did the Croatian tradition come from?* 2. *When was the tale brought to Constantinople?*

was also noted quite some time ago that there is no chapter about the *theme* of Dalmatia in Constantine's *De thematibus*, and it was assumed that chapter 30 was actually intended to be a part of the *De thematibus*.<sup>44</sup> The absence of a chapter on the *theme* of Dalmatia in the *De thematibus* could mean that, until ca. 955, when the *De thematibus* was finished, the Emperor still did not create a final chapter on Dalmatia for his *De administrando imperio*.<sup>45</sup>

According to generally accepted opinion, this chapter (30) of the *DAI* was composed well after chapters 29, 31 – 36 had been written.<sup>46</sup> The authorship of this chapter was often ascribed to an anonymous man, a Dalmatian by birth, who wrote this chapter according to the tradition of the Dalmatian Croats.<sup>47</sup> It has been overlooked that the supposed author from Dalmatia could have not had some documents at his disposal in Dalmatia which could have been found only in the Archives of the Imperial Palace: for instance the imperial *keleusis* by which coastal towns had to pay tribute to the Slavs instead of to *strategos*. If this chapter was based on the Croat tradition, then it is impossible to explain how Croats had any knowledge about the

<sup>44</sup> G. Labuda, *Pierwsze państwo slowiańskie, Państwo Samona*, Poznań 1949, 230 – 233.

<sup>45</sup> For this view upon the date of the composition of the *De thematibus*, see, T. C. Lounghis, *Sur la date du De thematibus*, *REB* 31 (1973) 299 – 305; H. Ahrweiler, *Sur la date De thematibus de Constantine VII Porphyrogénète*, *TM* 8 (1981) 1 – 5. It was thought previously that the *De thematibus* was composed ca. 933/934; see, *Constantino Porfirogenito De thematibus*, ed. A. Pertusi, Vatican 1952, 48 (= *De them.*); Bury, *Treatise*, 574 (934 – end of 944).

<sup>46</sup> Bury, *Treatise*, 556 – 561, 574 (after 951); *DAI II*, 4, 97; Hauptmann, *Dolazak*, 95 – 101 (between 962 and 973); Grafenauer, *Prilog*, 16 – 18 (after 959); *FB II*, 26, n. 71; Klaić, *Povijest*, 38 – 39; Ferjančić, *Struktura*, 67 – 70, 79. See also, Fine, *Medieval Balkans*, 49 – 50; Belke – Soustal, *Byzantiner*, 158 (between 955 and 973). Most recently, É. Malamut, *Les adresses aux princes des pays slaves du sud dans le livre des Cérémonies, II, 48, interprétation*, *TM* 13 (2000) 612 (= Malamut, *Adresses*), argued that chapter 30 is an interpolation after the death of Constantine Porphyrogenitus – *selon l'avis de tous les spécialistes*; similar, F. Curta, *The Making of the Slavs: History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube Region, c. 500 – 700*, Cambridge 2001, 65 (= Curta, *Making*).

<sup>47</sup> Grafenauer, *Prilog*, 21 – 22; C. A. Macartney, *The Magyars in the Ninth Century*, Cambridge 1968, 137; *DAI II*, 100 – 101, 114; Klaić, *Povijest*, 38 – 39, 133, 137; Margetić, *Dolazak*, 31, 48, 61; Litavrin, *Ob upravljenii*, 368 – 370. Ferjančić, *Dolazak*, 150, thought that the author was in Constantinople, and that his informant was a Byzantine official from Dalmatia; cf. Ferjančić, *Struktura*, 78 – 79.

borders of Roman Dalmatia – such kind of information must be from an author who read about it, not from some popular tradition.<sup>48</sup> It is evident that chapter 30 consists of information which belongs to different timelines: for instance the Croat *župas* were not enumerated in accordance to the borders of Croatia provided at the end of the chapter.<sup>49</sup> This detail demonstrates that here we meet a written source and not the tradition of the Croats. The traces of at least two different sources can also be detected in the description of the boundaries of Dalmatia. Only at the end of the chapter is there a note wherein the author considered Dalmatia as a tiny strip of land along the coast, since the author states that the Slavs settled in Dalmatia and the *surrounding territory of Dalmatia*.<sup>50</sup> Previously, the same author considered that the *surrounding territory* as having been part of Dalmatia proper.<sup>51</sup> This conflict of statements must be the consequence of the usage of different sources as well as the different times of their origin.<sup>52</sup>

Therefore, there is little evidence to support the thesis that chapter 30 is based completely on the Croat tradition, and our conclusion is congruent with the analysis of Ferjančić.<sup>53</sup> Chapter 30 was based on written sources of a different origin.<sup>54</sup> One of these sources should have the Croat tradition as its backbone. There is also no need to date the composition of chapter 30 after 955 or 959, and to ascribe it to some unknown author – since it would mean that there was an anonymous author, a Dalmatian by birth, who lived in Constantinople and was in such a prominent position that he had access to such a confidential work as the *DAI*, as well as to the Archives of the Imperial Palace, and who was only interested in one subject: Dalmatia/the Croats. This does not seem likely at all. A variant of this opinion – that chapter 30 was written during the lifetime of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, and that

<sup>48</sup> Similarly, see Ferjančić, *Struktura*, 71.

<sup>49</sup> This peculiarity is noticed by a number of scholars; cf. *DAI II*, 121 – 122; Klaić, *Povijest*, 287 – 288; Litavrin, *Ob upravljenii*, 373, n. 26; Ferjančić, *Dolazak*, 150.

<sup>50</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.119 – 120.

<sup>51</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.8 – 11.

<sup>52</sup> See, Ferjančić, *Struktura*, 77.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Ferjančić, *Struktura*, 78 – 79. For an opposing opinion, see, Klaić, *Povijest*, 133, 137; Margetić *Dolazak*, 29 – 30; 48, 61; Klaić, *Najnoviji*, 49 – 52; Goldstein, *Hrvatski*, 392; N. Budak, *Prva stoljeća Hrvatske*, Zagreb 1994, 62 – 67 (= Budak, *Prva*),

<sup>54</sup> Chapter 30 was certainly not a ‘source-document’, as it was understood in *DAI II*, 4.

only his informant was of Dalmatian origin, is equally weak. Namely, as further analysis of chapter 30 will show, there are sections which contain details related to the early 870s, which only a contemporary of that time could provide (i.e. the names of Frankish military commanders, the list of *kastra oikoumena*, the number of Croat horsemen, soldiers and ships, the phrase: *until recently*, related to the end of Frankish rule over the Croats) and generally the information on the Croats does not exceed ca. 878. Therefore, the most plausible explanation is that of J. V. A. Fine, who carefully assumed that Constantine discovered material about the Croats which had been collected in Constantinople at an earlier time.<sup>55</sup> Chapter 30 was written, as J. Bury had stressed a century ago, by the same author who wrote all other chapters of the *DAI* – Constantine Porphyrogenitus.<sup>56</sup>

The *DAI* was not intended to be a typical historical work written to amuse a reader or to glorify a particular Byzantine dynasty or emperor – such as Theophanes and Theophanes Continuatus were. Therefore, it was never published for popular use. It was not a secret work, yet rather some type of manual on *how to rule successfully*, which was compiled not only for Constantine's son Roman, but also for any emperor in the future.<sup>57</sup> The 11<sup>th</sup> century manuscript of the *DAI*, which belonged to Caesar John Ducas, *a prominent member of the ruling dynasty*, actually is a matter of proof that the *DAI* had never left the Imperial palace.

The short introduction in chapter 30, as well as the nonexistence of the *isteon oti* or *oti*, could be two important clues that Constantine considered it as being finished. As shall be shown in a moment, this chapter was based on Constantine's sources which he had already used for chapters 29 and 31. Therefore, he perhaps had to come back to his primary source on the Croats, and to connect the information from that source with the information he had found in some other

---

<sup>55</sup> Fine, *Ethnicity*, 32; similar, Margetić, *Porphyrogenit*, 14.

<sup>56</sup> Bury, *Treatise*, 525. Similar, D. Dzino, *Becoming Slav, Becoming Croat: Identity Transformations in Post-Roman and Early Medieval Dalmatia*, Leiden 2010, 106 – 107 (=Dzino, *Croat*). Opposite, *DAI II*, 112 – 113.

<sup>57</sup> Similar, *DAI I*, 11, 13; J. Shephard, *The Uses of "History" in Byzantine Diplomacy: Observations and Comparisons*, *Porphyrogenita: Essays on the History and Literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in Honour of Julian Chrysostomides*, ed. J. Chrysostomides – C. Dendrinos – J. Herrin, Aldershot 2003, 109.

documents. It seems that chapter 30 was composed with the basic idea to connect the history of the Croats with the history of Dalmatia, but in such manner that the history of Dalmatia had to come first and the Croats had to fit into it. The final result was that chapter 30 appeared to tell us a much different story about the Croats (and Dalmatia), than is found in chapters 29 and 31. The alleged differences in style between chapter 30 and the rest of the Slavic chapters (29, 31 – 36) eventually appear because Constantine personally wrote chapter 30, and he merely collated information for chapters 29, 31 – 36 based on extracts from different kinds of documents.<sup>58</sup> Chapter 30 actually demonstrates Constantine's methodological approach to the issue, and that his scholarly workshop had been set up since the beginning of his work. The first phase was to transcribe excerpts from ancient texts of different kinds (i.e. historical works, official reports, letters, imperial *keleusis*...) mechanically and to bind them together roughly, sometimes even retold in his own words, and then, to use that material in the second phase according to his overall knowledge on the specific subject, which derived from all the documents he had read.<sup>59</sup> Constantine revealed, in fact, that he had carefully studied various documents before being able to extract information needed for a particular subject of his interest from them. This means that even if he had had an extensive source on the Croats, he was trying to obtain more information about them as well as about the country they dwelled in. This effort was not without purpose, as Constantine had to present his own conclusions about the subject (Dalmatia and the Croats) and to make personal remarks he considered worthy for his son and heir to the throne, Roman. If Constantine's workshop applied in chapter 30 is to be understood, one needs to review those sections of chapter 29 as well, which, according to the opinion presented herein, contain information from the same source Constantine had used for chapter 30. This method allows one to come closer to the original text of Constantine's primary source on the Croats.

---

<sup>58</sup> Bury, *Treatise*, 525, did not notice any difference in style except the absence of the *oti*. However, *DAI II*, 112 – 113 insists that there is an apparent difference in style; Similar, Grafenauer, *Prilog*, 17 – 18. For works bearing the emperor's name that are in different styles, see, Ševčenko, *Re-reading*, 184, n. 44. See, also, Lemerle, *Premier*, 274 – 295.

<sup>59</sup> See, also, Lemerle, *Premier*, 278.

The point that chapter 30 is a finished piece of work, not only because of the absence of the words *isteon oti*, or, *oti*, but also due to the short, elaborated introduction at the beginning of this chapter, would be suitable to examine chapter 31 in regard to its sources, which were also at the emperor's disposal. In fact, chapter 31 was written before chapter 30, and certainly after chapter 29, since in this chapter Constantine stated that the events connected to the settlement of the Croats and the Serbs would be explained in the chapters concerning them.<sup>60</sup> This means that Constantine had been preparing his material for the *DAI* for some time and that he made a primordial, rudimentary composition. The unusual position of chapter 30 as being a finished one, between two unfinished chapters with a similar narrative, unveils that the chapters were written separately, not in one scroll or book, and that a scribe, on the command of the author, collected all these separate chapters into one book. This would then be the second version of the *DAI* and according to this semi-finished work Constantine had the intention, most probably, to elaborate and to polish up the unfinished chapters. If this were the case, in the intended final version of the *DAI*, the author would then have probably removed chapters 29 and 31, and have kept only chapter 30, since its contents cover both important issues – the story about Dalmatia, as well as the history of the Croats. Otherwise, his manual on *how to rule successfully*, intended to his son and heir, would have not been so *plainly clear*, since it would contain conflicting statements about the same issues – i.e. Dalmatia, the Croats, Heraclius, Basil I. The *DAI* had to be plainly clear for the reader, the future emperor, and that is another piece of evidence that this manuscript had been left unfinished. It is the aimed clarity of the work itself which had to be achieved, which gave great pains to Constantine. The same holds true for chapter 26, which is positioned between 25 and 27, and was composed after chapter 27.<sup>61</sup> Chapter 26 only opens with *isteon, oti* (as is the case with chapter 32 on the Serbs) but it is, in fact, considered by the author as having been nearly brought to its final version. Though, the author probably had to elaborate upon some minor details.

Additional confirmation that chapter 30 did not exist when Constantine was writing chapters 33 and 35, can be found exactly in

<sup>60</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.55 – 56; cf. Bury, *Treatise*, 525.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Bury, *Treatise*, 524; *DAI II*, 83.

these same chapters since he himself mentioned (speaking of Diocletian and his resettlement of the Romans to Dalmatia) *as having been told in the history of the Croats*.<sup>62</sup> The only chapter in the *DAI*, which contains such a title, is chapter 31: Περὶ τῶν Χρωβάτων καὶ ἥς νῦν οἰκοῦσι χώρας.<sup>63</sup> Chapter 30 has a completely different title: Διήγησις περὶ τοῦ θέματος Δελματίας.<sup>64</sup> Therefore, the analysis of Constantine's sources on the earliest history of the Croats has to begin with chapter 31, and only after this would a proper analysis of chapter 30 be able to be made.

Chapter 32 of the *DAI*, on the Serbs, was composed, according to well established and deeply rooted opinions in historiography, around the same time when chapter 31 was written (ca. 949).<sup>65</sup> Since there are some similarities between the story about the Croats and the Serbs, such as: the date of their arrival in Dalmatia during the rule of the Emperor Heraclius, the way of their receiving baptism *via* Rome and through the jointed efforts of Rome and Constantinople, as well as generally the same political frame of their settlement, – it is assumed and is highly probable that both stories once belonged to the same source which had then been subdivided into two main parts, *On the Croats* and *On the Serbs*.<sup>66</sup> Even though chapter 32 is opened by the specific words *isteon oti*, which usually indicate that they are excerpts from Constantine's source(s), the whole text appears to be composed from different sources and a well arranged narrative almost to the end of that chapter. Only at the end of this chapter are there two short sections opened by *oti*.<sup>67</sup> It seems that Constantine had almost brought chapter 32 to its final version. Through an investigation of the appearance of the so-called *fine-seams*, which specifically mark either the author's

<sup>62</sup> *DAI I*, cc. 33.5; 35.5.

<sup>63</sup> *DAI I*, c. 31.1 –2.

<sup>64</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.1.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Bury, *Treatise*, 574. Maksimović, *Struktura*, 29 – 31, (927/928 – 944).

<sup>66</sup> In, *DAI II*, 100, the editors assumed that the first part of chapter 32 (c. 32.1 – 81) had belonged to an olden source dated back to the time of Leo VI (886 – 912). On the contrary, Ostrogorski, *Hronika*, 25, and Maksimović, *Struktura*, 28, n. 15, considered chapter 32 as a complete work, a Chronicle, which had been written by an Anonymous author between 927/28 and 944; cf. Maksimović, *Struktura*, 31.

<sup>67</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.146 – 148; 149 – 151.

switch to another source, or an abbreviation and retelling of the main source, one would be able to determine which sections of chapter 32 had belonged to that supposed source in which had also contained the earliest history of the Croats.

Chapter 32 of the *DAI*, *On the Serbs and of the country they now dwell in*, was not preserved in its initial concept as is the case with the Croats in chapter 31. There is also a profound difference between chapter 32 and chapters 30 and 31 in regard to the chronological frame of the narrative. While the story about the Croats runs only up to ca. 878 (see below), the story about the Serbs is extended until the rule of Roman Lacapenos (ca. 935). It is interesting to note that Constantine was able to gather much more information about the Serbs, especially about the events after ca. 890, but he did not express any interest in finding any recent material on the Croats. The reasons for such a different approach towards these two tribes should be in their political importance for Byzantium during the first half of the tenth century. The Serbs, as is learned from Constantine's narrative, played a major role during the long lasting Byzantine-Bulgarian conflict during the rule of Simeon of Bulgaria (893 – 927). This is why Constantine was able to find an abundance of material from the Archives of the Imperial Palace about political ties with the Serbs, and to convert this data into a sort of "history of the Serbs".<sup>68</sup> It is also interesting to note that he did not know anything about the Serbs after the rule of Roman Lacapenos (944), and most probably only up to the year ca. 935. There is also a huge chronological gap in the narrative about the Serbs around the year ca. 856, where he had to interrupt his narrative and to proceed with the description of events from the year ca. 890.<sup>69</sup> This chronological gap actually marks the end of one source and the switch to another one. If Constantine was able to make this transition from one to another source smoothly, as it appears he did, then this means that he was working for some time on the chapter on the Serbs and that this chapter had actually been written at least twice. Therefore, the theory of G.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Bury, *Treatise*, 559 – 560.

<sup>69</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.64, marks the end of Constantine's narrative up to ca. 856 which is based on one source, and *DAI I*, c. 32.65, marks the transition to another source(s). See below, the commentary of chapter 32 of the *DAI*. In *DAI II*, 4 – 5, it is suggested that this interruption is at line 80 of chapter 32.

Ostrogorsky that Constantine actually used a Chronicle about the Serbs and just included it into his the *DAI*,<sup>70</sup> must be reexamined.

The abundance of data related to the Serbs after ca. 890, which testifies to the importance of the Serbs for Byzantium, does not correspond to the order of appearance of chapter 32 of the *DAI*. It is odd that the chapter on the Serbs which contains so much data highly relevant to that time is placed after two chapters on the Croats and Dalmatia, which contain information related only to a half a century or even more before Constantine's time. The only possible answer is that the position of these chapters – first the one regarding the Croats, then regarding the Serbs – reveals that Constantine had a source which preserved exactly such an order of appearance of the chapters related to the Croats and the Serbs. The similarity of both these stories – the timeline of their settlement, the name of the Emperor Heraclius, their baptism from Rome, the mentioning of their old homeland to the north – strongly suggests that both chapters once belonged to a source which contained stories about the Croats and the Serbs.<sup>71</sup> These two stories were of similar composition and genre, and they originated at the same time. In this source there was the story about the Croats at first, followed by a story about the Serbs. A further analysis of these chapters will clearly demonstrate what kind of source it could have been.

In addition to chapters 30, 31, and 32 of the *DAI*, there are some other chapters which are also related to the history of the South Slavs: chapter 29, related to Dalmatia, and chapters 33 to 36 related to the smaller principalities of Zachlunia, Terbounia, Diocleia, and Pagania. Not a single one of these chapters can be considered as finished. They are preserved in a kind of draft, which eventually Constantine would have had to elaborate on later.<sup>72</sup> The material exposed in these chapters shows the traces of at least two sources, and the scarcity of information on these principalities leads one to the conclusion that it was Constantine who had tried to establish their history based primarily on the appearance of the names of these principalities in his major source

---

<sup>70</sup> Ostrogorski, *Hronika*, 24 – 29; similar, Maksimović, *Struktura*, 31.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. T. Živković, *Sources de Constantin VII Porphyrogénète concernant le passé le plus éloigné des Serbes et des Croates*, *Symmeikta* 20 (2010) 11 – 37 (= Živković, *Sources*).

<sup>72</sup> Bury, *Treatise*, 524 – 525.

on the Croats/Serbs. Constantine's approach to these principalities also is significant to better understand his workshop. Having been probably induced by the appearance of these principalities in his major Croat/Serb source, Constantine conducted additional research into the Archives of the Imperial Palace in his attempt to find some up to date information about them. The result of this research was not promising, since he was only able to find the material for a few entries: the names of two major fortresses in the land of Zachlunia and a story about the origin of Zachlunia's *Archon* Michael; the etymology of the name Terbounia; the etymology of the names of two cities in Zachlunia; the etymology of the name of Diocleia and the city itself; the etymology of the name of the Pagans, and a list of islands ruled by the Pagans.<sup>73</sup>

The lack of information about these smaller principalities of the South Slavs uncovers either that Constantinople did not maintain regular diplomatic contacts with them, or that Constantine simply left these principalities to be investigated later. However, be it as it may, it helps to understand the way of Constantine's *modus operandi*. For chapters 33 through to 36, he at least expressed himself as a researcher able to trace antiquarian material through the various folders of the Archives of the Imperial Palace. Through the analysis of these chapters one could establish the provenience of his sources, and to find out which sections Constantine had displaced from his primary source on the Croats/Serbs which were to be used in chapters 33 to 36. The only way to make a proper and thorough analysis of chapter 31, as well as the chapters (29, 30 and 32 to 36), is to follow the development of the narrative and to try to establish the author's manner of writing – when and why he was repeating himself, when and how he usually switched to another source, which words he used to mark the transition from one source to another, how he treated his source(s), whether he retold his source or followed it literary, and if he needed to adjust the source to his own intentions or political ideas. Chapter 31 is an excellent ground for this kind of research, since it is composed of eight *oti*-sections, which are, most often, extracted verbatim from Constantine's primary source(s). Therefore, by *slicing* Constantine's narrative into sections, one could

---

<sup>73</sup> Cf. *DAI I*, cc. 33.10 – 18; 34.16 – 18; 35.9 – 11; 36.11 – 13, and 36.15 – 22.

be able to extract as much information as possible from them. This methodology will eventually reveal many details, which would otherwise be invisible or hardly recognizable, if the text were to be read as a whole.

## THE STORY OF THE CROATS

As has been already stated, chapter 31 had been composed before chapter 30. Therefore, according to our understanding of the composition of the *DAI*, here is insight into Constantine's material on the Croats in a very crude shape, only prepared for further elaboration. The opening word *oti* at the front of each section, all eight of them, reveals either Constantine's switches to another source or his returning to a previous one. This means that here he could theoretically use a minimum of one and a maximum of eight sources.<sup>74</sup> However, it must be kept in mind that an *oti*-section can also be based on completely different sources.

Περὶ τῶν Χρωβάτων καὶ ἧς νῦν οἰκοῦσι χώρας.<sup>75</sup>

*Of the Croats and of the country they now dwell in.*

The title of chapter 31 does not provide any clue as to what kind of narrative a reader is to expect. In chapter 33, Constantine states, referring to chapter 31, that something had been already said *in the history about the Croats* (εἰς τὴν τῶν Χρωβάτων ἱστορίαν); the same is repeated again in chapter 35.<sup>76</sup> He definitely considered his narrative about the Croats as their history (lit. *story*), but at that moment, as he

---

<sup>74</sup> The editors of the *DAI* (Moravcsik – Jenkins) did not include marginal notes (they did not, in fact, include not a single one of the dozens marginal notes, although they listed them in the *Critical Introduction*; cf. *DAI I*, 19 – 20), which preserved another of Constantine's reminder in chapter 31: Διὰ τί λέγωνται Χρωβάτοι ×; cf. *Codex Parisinus gr. 2009*, fol. 89r. This probably means that Constantine switched here to another source, since, at that place in the text, he explained the meaning of the Croat name.

<sup>75</sup> *DAI I*, c. 31.1 –2.

<sup>76</sup> *DAI I*, cc. 33.5; 35.5.

had done in chapter 32 about the Serbs, he composed just general titles below which he could place all entries from his sources related to the name of these tribes.<sup>77</sup>

1.1. Ὅτι οἱ Χρωβάτοι, οἱ εἰς τὰ τῆς Δελματίας νῦν κατοικοῦντες μέρη, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀβαπτίστων Χρωβάτων, τῶν καὶ ἄσπρων ἐπονομαζομένων, κατάγονται, οἵτινες Τουρκίας μὲν ἐκεῖθεν, Φραγίας δὲ πλησίον κατοικοῦσι, καὶ συνοροῦσι Σκλάβοις, τοῖς ἀβαπτίστοις Σέρβλοις.<sup>78</sup>

*(It should be known) that the Croats who now live in the regions of Dalmatia are descended from the unbaptized Croats, also called the 'white', who live beyond Turkey and next to Francia, and they border the Slavs, the unbaptized Serbs.*

These opening words show that Constantine made an enquiry about the White Croats, and this information was provided by someone who was observing this from Constantinople (note: *beyond Turkey*).<sup>79</sup> Note also the adverb *nun* (νῦν), since it appears that Constantine had used the phrase μέχρι τοῦ νῦν when he was referring to his own time,

<sup>77</sup> Chapter 31 is not a continuation of chapter 29, interrupted at *DAI I*, 29.295, as has been suggested in the Commentary of the *DAI* (*DAI II*, 124). Namely, each chapter is composed in accordance to its title and is based on sources of different provenience. Constantine could have also used the same source for various chapters but from different sections of the mentioned source. It is not evident that the information on the Croats in chapter 31 had a strong Byzantine bias; cf. *DAI II*, 124. The only proper conclusion regarding the material upon which chapter 29 is composed, is that for this chapter Constantine used more sources than for chapter 31, as he heavily relied on the Archives of the Imperial Palace; cf. *DAI I*, 29.217 – 284 (about the most important Byzantine cities on the Dalmatian coast); see also, *DAI I*, 29.58 – 88, about the political situation in Dalmatia from the time of Michael I until the time of Basil I (also from the Archives). This ‘diplomatic flavour’ in *DAI I*, c. 29.54 – 88, and 29.213 – 216, is also suggested in *DAI II*, 4. The story about Soldan is of Italian origin; cf. *DAI I*, 29.88 – 216. The story about the fall of Salona (*DAI I*, 29.3 – 53) was derived from two different written sources which Constantine had merged in one report. See, T. Živković, *An Unknown source of Constantine Porphyrogenitus*, *Byzantinoslavica* 68 (2010) 129 – 143 (= Živković, *Unknown source*).

<sup>78</sup> *DAI I*, c. 31.3 – 6.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Grafenauer, *Prilog*, 37.

and μέχρι τῆς σήμερον, most often, when it was literally transcribed from his source(s).<sup>80</sup>

It can be assumed that one of Constantine's unknown sources stated that the Croats in Dalmatia had been descended from the White, unbaptized Croats, and this information triggered Constantine to learn something more about those White Croats (see below 2.2). J. Bury, clearly explained how Constantine expanded his primary work in chapters 14 to 25 of the *DAI*: “*In planning Section 3 of his treatise, he may at first have contemplated almost entirely information derived orally from contemporaries, and the extracts from older, literary sources may have been due to an afterthought*”.<sup>81</sup> It would have to be added that just the opposite process has to be expected too: from the older source, back to the contemporary situation through various kinds of research and investigation. The key question is if Constantine would have been induced by a contemporary report on a tribe to conduct research into this issue in regard to said nation's ancient times and its history, or, whether he would have rather been induced by an antiquarian report to learn more about his contemporary situation. The information about the geographical position of the White Croats, most probably was gathered through an envoy directed to the Hungarians.<sup>82</sup>

<sup>80</sup> For instance, μέχρι τοῦ νῦν: *DAI*, cc. 31.1; 32.1; 33.1; 34.2; 35.1; 36.2 (in the titles of the *Slavic* chapters, composed by Constantine); c. 39.13 – 14 (referring to his own time); c. 40.21 (referring to his own time); c. 45.12 (referring to his own time); c. 45.20 (referring to his own time); c. 45.38 (referring to his own time). μέχρι τῆς σήμερον: *DAI I*, c. 19.11 (according to the Eastern source); 27.41 (according to the Latin source); c. 37.13 – 14 (referring to his own time); c. 45.39 (referring to his own time); c. 50.25 (could have either been from the Greek source or from an account from his own time). Some specific insertions in the original source were intended to determine as if something belonged to his own time - νῦν οὐδῶς; *DAI I*, c. 27.66 (New Capua). The general conclusion could be that the phrase μέχρι τοῦ νῦν always refers to Constantine's time, while the phrase μέχρι τῆς σήμερον could have had a twofold meaning. However, in the *De thematibus* Constantine used almost exclusively *nun* to refer to his own time; cf. *De them.* 59.3; 60.21; 61.1; 62.42; 64.37; 65.47, 50, 65; 66.86; 67.1; 82.3; 84.1, 23; 87.7; 88.4; 89.1; 94.3; 94.4, while μέχρι τῆς σήμερον is found only three times; cf. *De them.* 60.19 – 20; 97.17; 98.43.

<sup>81</sup> Bury, *Treatise*, 533.

<sup>82</sup> See, Bury, *Treatise*, 562, who assumed that Hungarian *archontes* visited Constantinople in ca. 948. This assumption is based on chapter 40 of the *DAI*, where Constantine mentioned Termatzous, the grandson of Arpad, *who came here recently as a “friend” with*

In any case, since Turkey is mentioned as a major geographical point to determine the position of the land of the White Croats, it is obvious that this report was made after 896, when the Hungarians settled in Pannonia. Since there is no mention of Moravia, which had not been conquered by the Hungarians until 907, this information must be after this year too. It appears that the information on the White Serbs was also an integral part of Constantine's major source which speaks about the Croats. There are no so-called *fine seams*, which would point to the switch of another source.<sup>83</sup> Therefore, it appears that this sentence had been based on several sources and was put together by Constantine to cover following issues: a) the origin of the Croats who lived in Dalmatia; b) the White Croats who were unbaptized; c) the geographical position of the White Croats; and d) the neighbors of the White Croats are the unbaptized Serbs. Constantine, as such, had concentrated at least four different pieces of information into one sentence. This is why it can be concluded that this sentence is just Constantine's retelling based on several sources. This sentence is proof in some way that an *oti*-section can contain traces of at least two sources, and not only be an excerpt from one source (see also section 2.5 below).<sup>84</sup>

---

*Boultzous, the third archon and karchas of Turkey*; cf. *DAI I*, 40.63 – 65. Gy. Moravcsik, *The Role of the Byzantine Church in Medieval Hungary*, *American Slavic and East European Review* 6 (1947) 136 – 137, dated the visit of the Hungarian *archontes* to Constantinople in spring of 948.

<sup>83</sup> The typical *fine-seam* expressions are: Οὗτος οὖν, ἄλλὰ καὶ, ἀνδ ἦ δὲ καὶ. About these *fine-seams*, see, G. R. Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral*, Downers Grove, IL, 2006, 43 – 45 (= Osborne, *Spiral*). Also, see, J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, Oxford 1954 (= Denniston, *Particles*). For the beginning of the sentences with *alla kai* (ἄλλὰ καὶ) which could itself be a sign of a switch of the speakers, see, P. Huby, *Theophrastus of Eresus, Sources of his Life, Writting, Thought & Influence*, Commentary, vol. 4, Psychology, Leiden 1992, 49. For the *fine-seam* ἦ δὲ καὶ, see, A. Garsky – C. Heil – T. Heike – J. E. Amon, *Documenta Q, Reconstructions of Q Through Two Centuries of Gospel Research Excerpted, Sorted and Evaluated*, ed. S. Carruth, Leuven 1997, 279 – 280. For the usage of the adverb *oun*, see, E. J. Richard, *First and Second Thessalonians*, *Sacra Pagina*, ed. D. J. Harrington, Collegeville 1995, 181; D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, Grand Rapids 1991, 234, 330, 660; V. S. Poythress, *The Use of the Intersentence Conjunctions de, oun, kai, and Asyndeton in the Gospel of John*, *Novum Testamentum* 26/4 (1984) 312 – 340 (= Poythress, *Asyndeton*). See also, K. Loudova, *Discourse Markers in Early Byzantine Narrative Prose*, *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 29, Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, School of Philology, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, May 10 – 11, 2008, Thessaloniki 2009, 296 – 312.

<sup>84</sup> Similar, Margetić, *Porfirogenit*, 14.

1.2. Τὸ δὲ Χρωβάτοι τῆ τῶν Σκλάβων διαλέκτῳ ἐρμηνεύεται, τουτέστιν ὅι πολλὴν χώραν κατέχοντες.<sup>85</sup>

*Croats in the Slav language means 'those who posses much land'.*

Of the various commentaries on the *DAI*, this particular section has been unusually left unexplained.<sup>86</sup> It has been either overlooked or neglected that Constantine said that the name of the Croats does not mean *in the Greek language* that **which** he said it meant, as *in the Slav language*. For many other etymologies preserved in the so-called Slav chapters of the *DAI* (for instance Spalato, Tetrangourion, Decatera, Diadora, and the Serbs), Constantine always stressed either the Latin, or Greek meaning/origin of a specific name.<sup>87</sup> Only for the tribal names of Zachlumians, Terbounians, Kanalites, and Pagans, did he provide, at least as far as he was convinced, the Slav etymology (τῆ τῶν Σκλάβων διαλέκτῳ).<sup>88</sup> It is also important to mention that historiography or linguistic sources have not provided any conclusive answer on the origin of the Serb/Croat name. This merely underlines the fact that both names do not belong to the Slav language, and that their meaning is still unclear.<sup>89</sup>

<sup>85</sup> *DAI I*, c. 31.6 – 8.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. *DAI II*, 124; *FB II*, 38, n. 116; Opinion in, Litavrin, *Ob upravljenii*, 375, n. 2, and Belke – Soustal, *Byzantiner*, 167, n. 351, that the name of the Croats is deduced from the Greek χώρα is the most common in historiography. See, also, Curta, *Making*, 66, n. 68, who concluded that Constantine's explanation for the Croat name is of *impossible etymology*; similarly see, Malamut, *Adresses*, 602; W. Pohl, *Die Awaren. Ein Steppenwolk in Mitteleuropa 567 – 822 n. Chr.*, München 1988, 268 (= Pohl, *Awaren*).

<sup>87</sup> *DAI I*, cc. 29.237; 29.259; 29.264; 29.272 – 273; 32.12 – 14.

<sup>88</sup> *DAI I*, cc. 33.10 – 12; 34.12 – 14, 16 – 17; 36.11 – 12. Only for Zachlumia was Constantine correct – the name truly meant *behind the mountain* in the Slavic language, as well as for the names of the two cities of Zachlumia – Bona and Hum. For the Pagans, he was partially correct, since the name is derived from the Latin *paganus*, but the word was adopted in the Slavic language probably before Constantine's time. For the Kanalites and Terbounians, he was wrong (see below).

<sup>89</sup> On the names of the Serbs and Croats and their meaning, see, F. Šišić, *Ime Hrvat i Srb in teorije o doseljenju Hrvata i Srba*, Godišnjica Nikole Čupića 35 (1923) 1 – 49; H. Grégoire, *L'origine et le nom des Croates et des Serbes*, Byzantion 17 (1945) 108 – 118 (= Grégoire, *L'origine*); *FB II*, 37, n. 115; H. Kunstmann, *Die Slaven*, Stuttgart 1996, 35 – 44; A. Loma, *Serbisches und Kroatisches Sprachgut bei Konstantin Porphyrogenetos*, ZRVI 38 (2000) 93 – 94 (= Loma, *Sprachgut*).

There is an opinion that this is the earliest recorded Croat explanation of the meaning of their name.<sup>90</sup>

One could assume that Constantine encountered this precise etymology of the Croat name in his source, which could have had the Croat tradition regarding the origin of their name. Another important clue, which could demonstrate that this etymology had been contained in Constantine's source, is preserved at the beginning of this sentence: Τὸ δὲ Χρωβάτοι. Namely, the particle *de*, the postpositive, marks an immediate thought or present statement, often obvious or naturally progressing.<sup>91</sup> However, this can be also due to Constantine's assembling together of his sources. It seems that the solution may be hidden behind the marginal note: Διὰ τί λέγονται Χρ(ω)βάτοι ✕. (sc. "why they are called Croats").<sup>92</sup> If this marginal note had been written by the author, then it is possible that it marks the usage of another source, the same one in which he had found the etymologies for other Slavic names.

1.3. Οἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ Χρωβάτοι εἰς τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ῥωμαίων, Ἡράκλειον πρόσφυγες παρεγένοντο πρὸ τοῦ τοὺς Σέρβλους προσφυγεῖν εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν βασιλέα, Ἡράκλειον κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν, ὃν οἱ Ἄβαρεις πολεμήσαντες, ἀπ' ἐκεῖσε τοὺς Ῥωμάνους ἐναπεδίωξαν, οὓς ὁ βασιλεὺς Διοκλητιανὸς ἀπὸ Ῥώμης ἀγαγὼν ἐκεῖσε κατεσκήνωσεν, διὸ καὶ Ῥωμᾶνοι ἐκλήθησαν διὰ τὸ ἀπὸ Ῥώμης μετοίκους αὐτοὺς γενέσθαι ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις χώραις, ἧγουν τῆς νῦν καλουμένης Χρωβατίας καὶ Σερβλίας. Παρὰ δὲ τῶν Ἀβάρων ἐκδιωχθέντες οἱ αὐτοὶ Ῥωμᾶνοι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ αὐτοῦ βασιλέως Ῥωμαίων, Ἡρακλείου, αἱ τούτων ἔρημοι καθεστήκασιν χῶραι. Προστάξει οὖν τοῦ βασιλέως Ἡρακλείου οἱ αὐτοὶ Χρωβάτοι καταπολεμήσαντες καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκεῖσε τοὺς Ἀβάρους ἐκδιώξαντες, Ἡρακλείου τοῦ βασιλέως κελεύσει ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ τῶν Ἀβάρων χώρᾳ, εἰς ἣν νῦν οἰκοῦσιν, κατεσκήνωσαν.<sup>93</sup>

<sup>90</sup> See, also, Lončar, *Porfirogenitova seoba*, 428; Eggers, *Situation*, 24.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Denniston, *Particles*, 162 – 163. Naturally, there are the cases when *de* stands for *but* if two statements are generally in contrast; cf. Poythress, *Asyndeton*, 321 – 322.

<sup>92</sup> *Codex Parisinus gr. 2009*, fol. 89r.

<sup>93</sup> *DAI I*, c. 31.8 – 20.

*These same Croats arrived as refugees to the emperor of the Romaioi Heraclius before the Serbs came as refugees to the same Emperor Heraclius, at that time when the Avars had fought and expelled from those parts the Romani whom the emperor Diocletian had brought from Rome and settled there, and who were therefore called Romani from their having been settled from Rome to those countries, I mean, to those now called Croatia and Serbia. These same Romani were expelled by the Avars in the days of this same emperor of the Romaioi Heraclius, and their countries were left desolate. Now, by the command of the Emperor Heraclius, these same Croats fought and expelled the Avars from those parts, and, by mandate of Heraclius the emperor they settled down in that same country of the Avars, where they now dwell.*

This section of chapter 31 was established mostly from the account from chapter 29, and based on Constantine's interpretation of at least two different sources.<sup>94</sup> Already in this chapter, also unfinished but brought almost to its final version, Constantine told the story about the *Romani* and Diocletian, the war against the Avars and the havoc they caused in Dalmatia. In the same chapter, he also said that in the time of Heraclius the Croats, the Serbs and other Slavs settled in Dalmatia.<sup>95</sup> Therefore, these opening words of chapter 31 merely retell much of the extended narrative, though based on the same sources, already contained in chapter 29.<sup>96</sup> Also, there is a possibility that this confusion about the Avars, who had *lived in* Dalmatia before the arrival of the Slavs, could have rather originated out of Byzantium than in Byzantium itself; nor could a single Byzantine source have ever been considered for Dalmatia as a province having been under the rule of Avars. It appears as if this was a reflection and reception of the story from Dalmatia to a foreign country. Constantine's retelling is marked by the long first sentence and repetition of the facts already exposed in the first sentence, and again in the last sentence. There is only one *fine-seam* – (Προστάξει) οὖν, which is of an inferential nature, and, closing it, comes in the right place of this section.

<sup>94</sup> See, Živković, *Unknown Source*, 136, n. 38; 139, 140.

<sup>95</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.3 – 58.

<sup>96</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.46 – 49.

Constantine actually left a clue that he had already read all of his sources related to the Croats, the Serbs, and Dalmatia, as he had to insert an explanation regarding which countries the Romani settled and lived in: *I mean to those now called Croatia and Serbia*. There is also an important note at the beginning of this section which states that the Croats had settled in Dalmatia before the Serbs came and asked for the protection of Heraclius. The whole sentence is without these so-called *fine-seams*, and it appears to have been created by Constantine but only after he had read all available sources on Dalmatia, the Croats, and the Serbs. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that the Croats were of greater importance for this source, and for Constantine (or generally speaking for Byzantium in the first half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century), the Serbs were far more important. This is able to be deduced from the narrative about the Serbs and can be extended almost to the rule of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. However, for the author of Constantine's source, the Croats had been of primary interest.

Therefore, not only does the sequence of the chapters in the *DAI*, first on the Croats and thereafter on the Serbs, suggest that Constantine's source had put the Croats first, but it is also confirmed by this statement in the first sentence of chapter 31, where the Croats arrive before the Serbs. Therefore, there is double confirmation that, for the author of Constantine's source, the story about the Croats was positioned as being *a priori* to the story about the Serbs.<sup>97</sup> This means, in turn, that Constantine followed the narrative of his major source on the Croats and the Serbs regardless of the fact as to whether that chapter on the Serbs should have been placed first from the point of view of Byzantium *Realpolitik* of the first half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century.

This sequence of events – the coming of the Avars, by which other nations were expelled from Pannonian (having been themselves expelled in turn by somebody else, i. e. the Slavs), - can be found in the

---

<sup>97</sup> The geographical order of appearance of the 'Slavic' chapters of the *DAI* should be excluded (i.e. from west to east), since Constantine wrote first about Croats, then moved eastward to the Serbs, then went back westward to the Zachlumians, then southeast to the Terbounians, proceeding into the same direction to Diocleians, and then turned northwest to the Pagans. The geographical approach would be: the Croats, Pagans, Zachlumians, Terbounians, Diocleians, and Serbs.

*De conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum* (hereafter, the *DCBC*). Note the beginning of the chapter on the Carantanians in the *DCBC*: *Nunc adiciendum est qualiter Sclavi qui dicuntur Quarantani et confines eorum fide sancta instructi christianique effecti sunt, seu quomodo Huni Romanos et Gothos atque Gepidos de inferiori Pannonia expulerunt et illam possederunt regionem, quosque Franci ac Bagoarii cum Quarantanis continuis affligendo bellis eos superaverunt.*<sup>98</sup> The sequence of the events is the same as in the *DAI*. The Avars expelled the Romans and other nations from Pannonia (from Dalmatia in the *DAI*), just to be, in turn expelled themselves by the Franks, Bavarians and Carantanians (by the Croats in the *DAI*). The common/same pattern is obvious; even the terminology is the same.

In the *DCBC*, there is another similar account which can be found also in the *DAI* and is related to the territory possessed by the Romans (*Romani*): *Antiquis enim temporibus ex meridiana parte Danubii in plagis Pannoniae inferioris et circa confines regiones Romani possederunt.*<sup>99</sup> The *DAI*: Ἡ δὲ καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν Ῥωμάνων διακράτησις ἦν μέχρι τοῦ Δανούβεως ποταμοῦ.<sup>100</sup> It must be assumed that all these similarities between the *DCBC* and the *DAI* are the consequence of Constantine's usage of the source on the Croats, and that the source was, by its structure and provenience of its origin, closely linked to the *DCBC*. The author of Constantine's source on the Serbs and Croats did not just read the *DCBC*, he also studied this work in detail and used it as an example for the composition of his own work.<sup>101</sup> It must be the case then that the anonymous author of Constantine's major source on the Croats was the same one who wrote that the Avars *lived* in Dalmatia, since he overstretched Dalmatia as far as up to Danube to be able to include the territory of Lower Pannonia recorded in the *DCBC*. It was then this same anonymous author who made this confusion about the Avars living in Dalmatia, not Constantine.

<sup>98</sup> *De conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum libellus*, ed. D. W. Wattenbach, MGH SS XI, ed. G. H. Pertz, Hannoverae 1854, 6.20 – 7.1 (= *De conversione*).

<sup>99</sup> *De conversione*, 9.3 – 4.

<sup>100</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.14 – 15.

<sup>101</sup> See note 588 for the examples from the *DCBC* which correspond to some other passages of the *DAI*.

The appearance of Heraclius (610 – 641), in those matters regarding Dalmatia in the beginning of the 7<sup>th</sup> century, who otherwise does not play any important role in the *DAI*, should be rendered as a consequence of the usage of that source.<sup>102</sup> Such a source, in which Heraclius played a major role in Dalmatia, could have probably been from Italy, where a strong tradition about Heraclius had already existed.<sup>103</sup> It is interesting that there is no name of Porga's father.<sup>104</sup> It is also worth mentioning that Heraclius is mentioned twice in the *DAI*, and only verbally from Constantine's source,<sup>105</sup> not counting when his name appears in the Slav chapters (29 – 36).<sup>106</sup>

Scholars are generally divided in regard to Heraclius' appearance in the Slav chapters of the *DAI*. It seems that most of them, especially the Croat scholars, believe that Constantine had inserted

<sup>102</sup> For Heraclius' role in chapters 29 – 36 of the *DAI*, see an original opinion of Lounghis, *DAI*, 90 – 91. Lounghis thinks that Porphyrogenitus made distinction between the emperors who ruled in the East – Diocletian and Constantine the Great, and those who are considered as *oikoumenikoi*, such as Zenon or Heraclius until the time of Basil I. Based on that assumption, Lounghis tried to introduce *Constitutum Constantini imperatoris* as the major source of Constantine Porphyrogenitus regarding his ideological message in the *DAI* (Lounghis, *DAI*, 57 – 60; 84 – 87), who was opposed to Justinian I's policy of *reconquista*. See, also, T. C. Lounghis, *La theorie de l'oecumène limitée et la revision du Constitutum Constantini*, Obshtoto i spetsifichnoto v balkanskite kulturi do kraja na XIX vek, ed. H. Dzurova – G. Bakalov, Sofia 1999, 119 – 122, who introduced the term 'limited oikoumene' based on the writings of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. However, that 'limited oikoumene' was in fact 'limited' much before Constantine Porphyrogenitus (i.e. from the time of Michael II and Louis the Pious). Therefore, Constantine Porphyrogenitus could hardly formulate an ideology of 'limited oikoumene' 150 years later, because that limitation could hardly escape to the Byzantine emperors who ruled during that period. The *DAI*, as a manual 'how to rule successfully' certainly had an ideological message – but only based on the contemporary political needs of the emperors of Constantinople and, on far smaller scale, the needs of the Macedonian dynasty.

<sup>103</sup> See, *Chronica patriarchum Gradensium*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH SRL, Hannoverae 1878, 395.5 – 6; *Giovanni Diacono Istoria Veneticorum*, ed. L. A. Berto, Bologna 1999, 52, 54, 70, 72 (= *Diac.*).

<sup>104</sup> The same pattern, the oblivion of the name of the first *archon* of the Serbs, can be found in, *DAI I*, cc. 32.8; 32.30 – 31.

<sup>105</sup> *DAI I*, c.16.7 (recorded from the work of Stephen the Mathematician) and *DAI I*, c. 45.22; 24; 26 (based on an unknown, Armenian (?) source).

<sup>106</sup> *DAI I*, cc. 16.7; 45.22 – 26.

Heraclius in the original tradition of the Croats.<sup>107</sup> This, very superficial and highly speculative conclusion, seems of being something of *Deus ex machina*, as otherwise they would not be able to explain Heraclius' role in the settlement of the Croats. One should ask as to why Constantine had to insert Heraclius into the story about the Croats. If Constantine had to stress that Dalmatia belonged to a Byzantine Empire from Roman times, he could have used the name of a more prominent emperor, such as Constantine the Great.<sup>108</sup> For instance, he mentioned Constantine the Great in several legendary narratives in chapter 13 of the *DAI*.<sup>109</sup> Constantine Porphyrogenitus was probably familiar with the historical writings of Procopius of Caesarea,<sup>110</sup> but yet, he did not find it interesting to note the re-conquest of Dalmatia and Salona during the reign of Justinian I (527 – 565) in 535 – 536, which is described by Procopius in detail.<sup>111</sup> He even did not mention the Goths, who ruled Dalmatia, in accordance to imperial mandate, for

<sup>107</sup> See, for instance, Klaić, *O problemima*, 257 – 258; L. Margetić, *Još o pitanju vremena dolaska Hrvata*, *Zgodovinski časopis* 42 (1988) 236; I. Goldstein, *Hrvatski rani srednji vijek*, Zagreb 1995, 96 – 97 (= Goldstein, *Hrvatski*); Fine, *Medieval Balkans*, 55.

<sup>108</sup> It is interesting that Heraclius was associated/identified with the biblical David, the idea which culminated during the final years of war with Persia; cf. S. S. Alexander, *Heraclius, Byzantine Imperial Ideology, and the David Plates*, *Speculum* 52 (1977) 217 – 237 (= Alexander, *Ideology*). Such an ideology cannot be traced in the works ascribed to Constantine Porphyrogenitus (i.e. *Vita Basilii*, the *DAI*). The idea of Lounghis, *DAI*, 91, that Constantine praised Heraclius as the emperor who subdued the Serbs and Croats, sending a message that even in such a 'limited oikoumene' the Empire did not lose these nations, is untenable. If so, why he did not praise him regarding the Persian war, which he mentioned *en passant* (*DAI I*, 45.22 – 26) speaking about the Iberians and their history. On the contrary, Heraclius was mentioned in another chapter of the *DAI* in purely historical context – for instance, his name was only mentioned to mark the beginning of the invasion of the Arabs (*DAI I*, c. 16.6 – 7).

<sup>109</sup> *DAI I*, c. 13.28 – 37; 13.48 – 72; 13.76 – 103; 13.111 – 118. There is another mention of Constantine the Great in chapter 40 of the *DAI*, also being of a legendary nature, the mention of the Constantine's tower in Belgrade; cf. *DAI I*, c. 40.29 – 31. See, also, P. A. Yannopoulos, *Histoire et légende chez Constantin VII*, *Byzantion* 57 (1987) 159 – 160, notes 9 and 10.

<sup>110</sup> Constantine referred directly to Procopius in *De them.* 63.10.

<sup>111</sup> *Procopii Caesariensis Opera omnia*, vol. II: *De bellis libri V – VIII*, ed. G. Wirth, Lipsiae 1963, *De bello Gothico I*, 32.22 – 34.9; 36.18 – 38.24.

almost half a century. His obvious neglecting of the sources on Dalmatia, which he should have had at his disposal in Constantinople, but perhaps did not use, could support the thesis that Constantine's narrative about Dalmatia had come from one or two unknown (or never used?) sources in Byzantium before his own time. If this is the case, the name of Heraclius might be written in one of his sources in connection to the settlement of the Serbs and Croats.

1.4. Εἶχον δὲ οἱ αὐτοὶ Χρωβάτοι τῷ τότε καιρῷ ἄρχοντα τὸν πατέρα τοῦ Ποργᾶ.<sup>112</sup>

*These same Croats had the father of Porga for their archon at that time.*

This information had come, most probably, from Constantine's primary source on the Croats. The name of this *archon* appears in the *DAI*, again in sections, 1.5 and 2.11. The etymology of Porga's name is non-Slavic, and the best proposed solution is, in my own opinion, of Iranian origin: *pouru-gâo*, "rich in cattle".<sup>113</sup> Note that another Slav word denoting the word "ruler" is "gospodar", and most probably derived from the Iranian *gōspanddār* = "rich in sheep".<sup>114</sup>

It is interesting that the name of Porga's father is not preserved, but it was recorded among the names of the five brothers which led the Croats to Dalmatia, mentioned in chapter 30 (see section 2.3). According to a well known *archon* of Croatia, the majority of historians have indentified Porga/Porin as being Borna, duke of Dalmatia (d. 821).<sup>115</sup> It

<sup>112</sup> *DAI I*, c. 31.20 – 21.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. *DAI II*, 124. The usual interpretation of this name was based on Slavic Borko; cf. *Documenta historiae Chroaticae periodum antiquam illustrantia*, ed. F. Rački, Zagrabiae 1877, 291, n. 1 (= *Documenta*); P. Skok, *Kako bizantski pisci pišu slovenska mjesna i lična imena*, SHP 1 (1927) 180; S. Sakač, *Ugovor pape Agatona s Hrvatima*, Zagreb 1931, 5 – 7 (= Sakač, *Ugovor*).

<sup>114</sup> T. Živković, *Južni Sloveni pod vizantijskom vlašću 600 – 1025*, Beograd 2007, 201 (= Živković, *Južni Sloveni*).

<sup>115</sup> Grafenauer, *Prilog kritici*, 26 – 27; Lj. Hauptmann, *Konstantin Porfirogenit o porijeklu stanovništva Dubrovačkog zaleđa*, Zbornik iz Dubrovačke prošlosti M. Rešetara, Dubrovnik 1931, 19 – 20; Belke – Soustal, *Byzantiner*, 158; Eggers, *Situation*, 25. On the other hand, F. Šišić, *Povijest Hrvata u vrijeme narodnih vladara*, Zagreb 1925, 386,

is not so difficult to refute this theory, or rather hypothesis, and to show how fragile it is. The names of the earliest Croat nobility are known, being preserved in section 2.11 of the *DAI*, and they are all of non-Slavic origin (see below), and according to Frankish sources (*Annales regni Francorum*) we know that the names of Borna and his relatives are pure Slavic (Vladislav, Ljudemisl).<sup>116</sup> Therefore, the names themselves are silent witness to Constantine's narrative regarding how the arrival of the Croats cannot be placed at the beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, since it is impossible that such a drastic change of Croat personal names occurred in a matter of one subsequent generation. The change of personal names, which shifted from Iranian (Iranian = Sarmatian, Alanic?)<sup>117</sup> to Slavic, must be the consequence of a longer period between the settlement of the Croats (ca. 630) and the time of Borna, Vladislav and Ljudemisl (ca. 800 – 823). The personal names of the foreign nobility which settled among another ethnic group had to be preserved, because they had to be distinguished by their personal names from their (Slav) subjects, which underlined their specific position in the society.<sup>118</sup> Exactly the same occurrence happened in Bulgaria, where the Bulgars, who settled among the Slavs to the south of the Danube River, kept their personal names for another two centuries before being Slavicized. In their case, a written source of

---

n. 20 (= Šišić, *Povijest*), proposed the identification Porin = Branimer. See, also, *FB II*, 42, n. 119. Klaić, *Povijest*, 194 – 195 (Porin = Borna). In fact, as further analysis will demonstrate, the only possible identification is that Porin = Porga (see below).

<sup>116</sup> *Annales regni Francorum inde ab a. 741. usque ad a. 829 qui dicitur Annales Laurissenses maiores et Einhardi*, rec. F. Kurze, MGH SRG in usum scholarum 6, Hannoverae 1895 (= *ARF*), 155: *Borna ...defunctus est...nepos illius nomine Ladasclavus...constitutus est*; 161: *Liudemuhslum avanculum Bornaе*.

<sup>117</sup> About the Iranian theory of the origin of the Croats (and Serbs), see, Hauptmann, *Dolazak*, 53 – 54, 50 – 61. It is cautiously mentioned by, Pohl, *Awaren*, 268; Budak, *Prva*, 55 – 70. The brief overview of this theory in, Dzino, *Croat*, 20 – 21.

<sup>118</sup> The names of the prominent witnesses (*župans*) recorded in the charter of Terpimer from 852 (or 837) are significant: Comicino, Pretilia, Nemustlo, Zarsata, Ludovico, and Negutia *camerario*. Only one, Ludovico, bears a non-Slavic name (however, very modern in his time); cf. *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Sclavoniae I*, ed. M. Kostrenčić, Zagreb 1967, N° 3 (= *CD I*). Therefore, not only the Croat ruler had a Slavic name, but also the most prominent *župans* as well. Such transformation of personal names from Iranian to Slavic could not have taken place in only one or two generations.

Byzantine provenience is not encountered, rather inscriptions – first grade testimonies.<sup>119</sup> If this story about the earliest Croat nobility had merely been an invention of the Croats of the 10<sup>th</sup> century, as some scholars have suggested it to be,<sup>120</sup> then, due to their Slavicization at that time, they would have not insisted upon their strange, non-Slavic names, but rather on the contrary, as their invention would be marked by some specific Slavic names.

1.5. Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ἡράκλειος ἀποστείλας καὶ ἀπὸ Ῥώμης ἀγαγὼν ἱερεῖς καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ποιήσας ἀρχιεπίσκοπον καὶ ἐπίσκοπον καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους, τοὺς Χρωβάτους ἐβάπτισεν· εἶχον δὲ τῷ τότε καιρῷ οἱ τοιοῦτοι Χρωβάτοι ἄρχοντα τὸν Ποργᾶ.<sup>121</sup>

*The emperor Heraclius ordered (sc. through an envoy) and brought priests from Rome, and made of them an archbishop and a bishop and presbyters and deacons, and baptized the Croats; at that time these the Croats had Porga for their archon.*

The first part of this section (up to ἐβάπτισεν) was, most probably, written down verbally from Constantine's source, and the last part (from εἶχον δὲ) merely repeats the information found in the same source, which Constantine had already used (see 1.4). It reveals the way in which Constantine treated his source. Namely, he would take particular passages of his major source from the extensive narrative, which he needed for a particular section, and then strengthen said statement with the repetition of some facts, having already extracted and exploited from another or the same source.<sup>122</sup> At this specific section, the repetition (from εἶχον δὲ) also marks the boundaries of the source used in this part of the narrative. It must be expected that in the

<sup>119</sup> For instance, Ησβουλος, γενεᾶς Κουβιαρης, γένος αὐτοῦ Κυριγηρη, γενεᾶς Ερμηαρης, Τζεπα; See, V. Beševliev, *Die Protobulgarischen Inschriften*, Berlin 1963, N<sup>os</sup> 57, 59, 60, 62, 67.

<sup>120</sup> For instance, Goldstein, *Hrvatski*, 392; R. Katičić, *Uz početke hrvatskih početaka*, Split 1993, 58 – 59 (= Katičić, *Uz početke*).

<sup>121</sup> *DAI I*, c. 31.21 – 25.

<sup>122</sup> For these methods, used by writers in their works revealing their way of thinking and relation to their sources, see, Osborne, *Spiral*, 43 – 45.

next section there will be a switch to another source or another section of the same source, and that the story about the baptism of the Croats and Heraclius's role shall be exhausted, which actually is the case (see below 1.6).

The mention of an archbishop, could be used as a trace to narrow down the date of the origin of Constantine's source. Namely, the only possible archbishop in Dalmatia in the Early Middle Ages who is known from various sources is the one of Spalato, and scholars still argue as to when the first archbishop of Spalato was consecrated.<sup>123</sup> The Archdeacon Thomas of Spalato (d. 1268) did not have any doubt; for him, the first archbishop of Spalato was a certain Iohannes of Ravenna.<sup>124</sup> According to Thomas of Spalato, a (unnamed) pope sent Iohannes of Ravenna, who was given the task of having to renew the former archbishopric of Salona in Spalato.<sup>125</sup> Thomas also abbreviated his source, since after the first section he opened the following with *tunc*, in which he explained how Iohannes, not only established the archbishopric, but also rebuilt destroyed churches, and how he conducted missionary work in Dalmatia and *Sclavonia*. Furthermore, Iohannes consecrated the bishops and established parishes.<sup>126</sup> It is the

<sup>123</sup> Before the fall of Salona, the seat of an archbishop was there, and the archbishops of Spalato were actually successors of the archbishops of Salona. See, also, T. Živković, *Crkvena organizacija u srpskim zemljama (rani srednji vek)*, Beograd 2004, 85 – 89, with the notes 278 – 282 (= Živković, *Crkvena organizacija*).

<sup>124</sup> *Historia Salonitana Thomae Archidiaconi*, ed. O. Perić – M. Matijević-Sokol – R. Katičić, Split 2003, 48.1 – 18 (= *HS*). About Iohannes of Ravenna see Živković, *Crkvena organizacija*, 85 – 89; I. Bašić, *Venerabilis presul Iohannes. Historijski Ivan Ravenjanin i začetci crkvene organizacije u Splitu u VII. stoljeću*, *Povijesni prilozi* 29 (2005) 7 – 22.

<sup>125</sup> In his previous work on the history of the archbishopric of Salona, the so-called *Historia Salonitana maior*, Thomas wrote the name of the pope, *Joannes quartus*; cf. *Historia Salonitana maior*, ed. N. Klaić, Beograd 1967, 94 (= *HSM*). For the *HSM* and various interpretations on its origin and date, see, T. Živković, *Gesta regum Sclavorum II*, Beograd 2009, 132, n. 568 (= *GRS II*). In the *HSM* there is another year, MCII (1102), which Thomas removed from his final version (*HS*). Both changes were, most probably, due to the uncertainty of the data, and therefore Thomas removed them both, having been aware that Pope John IV belonged to the 7<sup>th</sup> century, and not to the 12<sup>th</sup>, as it appears in the *HSM*.

<sup>126</sup> *Tunc cepit ecclesiam clerumque componere, instare doctrine, predicationi uacare curamque pastoralis officii multum sollicitate exercere. Etenim per Dalmatie et Sclavonie regiones circueundo restaurabat ecclesias, ordinabat episcopos, parochias disponebat et paulatim rudes populos ad informationem catholicam attrahebat*; cf. *HS*, 48.14 – 18. See also, M. Jarak, *Toma Arhidakon i vrijeme osnutka splitske mitropolije*, *Opuscula archaeologica* 27 (2003) 543 – 548.

apparent connection between Constantine's and Thomas' narrative about these first steps towards the baptism of the Slavs (Croats). Both sources know that this action was directed towards the Croats/Slavs by the command of the emperor/pope, and both of them mention an archbishop, bishops, and the clergy. This cannot be an accident. There must be a connection between the narratives of Constantine and Thomas of Spalato (the source in between?). Historiography has not provided any answer to this intriguing question, yet. For a moment at least, this peculiarity should be noted.

However, a similar account in the *DCBC* must be noted: *Peractis aliquantibus temporibus praenominatus dux Carantanorum petiit Virgilium episcopum visitare populum gentis illius, eosque in fide firmiter confortare. Quod ille tunc minime adimplere valuit, sed sua vice misso suo **episcopo** nomine Modesto ad docendam illam plebem, et cum eo Wattonem, Reginbertum, Cozharium, atque Latinum **presbyteros suos**, et Ekihardum **diaconum** cum aliis **clericis**, dans ei licentiam ecclesias consecrare et **clericos** ordinare iuxta canonum diffinitionem...*<sup>127</sup> There are also a *bishop*, *presbyter*, *deacons*, and *clerics*, as in section 1.5 of chapter 31 of the *DAI*.

It appears so far that Constantine's major source on the Croats as well as on the Serbs should have been of ecclesiastical provenience.<sup>128</sup> The author of this source was well informed on the content of the *DCBC*. His work was, most probably, induced by the *DCBC*.<sup>129</sup>

However, the appearance of an archbishop in Constantine's story about the first baptism of the Croats, best fits up to 638, when Heraclius was still on very good terms with the pope.<sup>130</sup> Therefore, Constantine's source had described the events in this section before this year. The problem, which arises from such an interpretation, is that the Croats had at that time, the son of the *archon* for their *archon*, who had brought them into Dalmatia. This would then mean that during the rule

<sup>127</sup> *De conversione*, 7.31 – 35.

<sup>128</sup> This is underlined for the first time in, T. Živković, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus' kastra oikoumena in the South Slavs Principalities*, IČ 58 (2008) 7 – 26 (= Živković, *Kastra oikoumena*).

<sup>129</sup> See also commentary of section 4.6 below.

<sup>130</sup> Cf. Živković, *Južni Sloveni*, 206 – 207; W. E. Kaegi, *Heraclius, Emperor of Byzantium*, Cambridge 2003, 196, 271. See also the commentary of this section in *DAI II*, 125 – 126.

of Heraclius (610 – 641) the Croats had two subsequent *archontes*, and their rule would be squeezed into some six or seven years (between ca. 630, the earliest possible date of their arrival in Dalmatia, and 638).<sup>131</sup> While this is possible, it does not seem likely.

It is highly probable that Constantine's source mentioned Heraclius, but that this Heraclius, in relation to the baptism of the Croats, could be Heraclius Constantine (641 – 668), known better as Constans II.<sup>132</sup> Furthermore, how many Emperors of the name Heraclius (regardless if they were rulers or just members of the imperial family), appear in Byzantine history: Heraclius I (610 – 641), Heraclius Constantine III the son of Heraclius (641), and his son Heraclius Constantine (Constans II, 641 – 668), and Heraclius the son of Constans II. Agnellus of Ravenna says: *Privilegium Constantini Eraclii imperatorum ad Maurum archiepiscopum Ravennatem*.<sup>133</sup> This same Agnellus said that Emperor Constantine (Constans II) *liberavit ecclesiam suam* (Maurus), *de iugo Romanorum servitutis*.<sup>134</sup> Therefore, Agnellus called Constans II, Heraclius and Constantine, respectively. The strong ties between Heraclius Constantine and the Church of Ravenna are obvious,<sup>135</sup> and, in this respect, the story of Thomas of Spalato about the Iohannes of Ravenna gains more ground. An inscription from the island of Brač (Croatia), found in ca. 1400, also has mention of Heraclius Constantine (Constans II): *Salonitani et Epetiani cives Braciae oppidum desolatum concorditer pro domicilio refabricant et Florus presbyter*

<sup>131</sup> On the date of the Croat settlement in Dalmatia between c. 622 and c. 638, see, Grafenauer, *Prilog*, 32 – 34; *FB II*, 64 – 65; Klaić, *Povijest*, 133 – 140; Živković, *Južni Sloveni*, 197. Different view, the end of the eighth century, Margetić, *Konstantin Porfirogenit*, passim. Recent overview of various opinions on this subject was provided by Dzino, *Croat*, 46 – 48.

<sup>132</sup> His baptismal name was Heraclius; see, P. Grierson, *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in Whittemore Collection*, vol. II/2, Washington D.C. 1968, 402; Alexander, *Ideology*, 231.

<sup>133</sup> Cf. *Agnelli qui et Andreas Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatis*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH SRL, Hannoverae 1878, 350, n. 7 (= *Agnellus*). Agnellus composed his work between 830/831 and the mid-840s; see, T. S. Brown, *Romanitas and Campanilismo – Agnellus of Ravenna's View of the Past: The inheritance of Historiography*, ed. C. Holdsworth – P. Wiseman, Exeter 1986, 115.

<sup>134</sup> *Agnellus*, 353.31 – 32.

<sup>135</sup> See, T. S. Brown, *The Church of Ravenna and the Imperial Administration in the Seventh Century*, *EHR* 94 (1979) 1 – 28.

*benedicendo dicat Vitaliano pontif. et Heraclio Const. Augusto.*<sup>136</sup> It seems that Constans II was better known in his own time as Heraclius Constantine, especially in Dalmatia and Italy.<sup>137</sup> Furthermore, it seems that some recovery of urban and ecclesiastical life in Dalmatia occurred exactly at the time of Heraclius Constantine (Constans II).

Constantine's primary source on the history of the Croats probably did speak about Heraclius. However, it did not only speak about Heraclius I, but also about his grandson Heraclius Constantine. This can be deduced from the Greek phrase: τοῦ αὐτοῦ βασιλέως – *of this same emperor* – when Constantine's source mentions Heraclius related to the story about the settlement of the Croats, and not used when Constantine speaks about their baptism (see 1.3 above). Then, in 1.5 there is an interruption in the narrative, since the next sentence runs smoothly as it was only displaced from the main source: Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ἡράκλειος..., there is no τοῦ αὐτοῦ βασιλέως, which would have to be expected if it is the *same* Heraclius mentioned in 1.3, and who is connected to the settlement of the Croats. Furthermore, the *archon* of the Croats in 1.3 is the one who **brought** the Croats into Dalmatia, and in 1.5 it is **his son** who received baptism. These two pieces of information are chronologically separate. This could also mean that here two emperors of the same name are encountered, Heraclius I and Heraclius Constantine (Constans II). In turn, this would mean that Constantine Porphyrogenitus **did not invent** Heraclius in the story about Croats. He even **did not know** that his source had mentioned **two emperors** of the same name. He probably noted a chronological gap between the settlement and baptism of the Croats, due to the appearance of two different *archontes* of the Croats, the father and the son, but in his source there was only one imperial name – Heraclius – it was either Heraclius I or his grandson Heraclius Constantine (Constans II) and Constantine just transcribed the narrative in front of him verbatim.

<sup>136</sup> Dujam Hranković, *Braciae insulae descriptio*, Legende i kronike, ed. V. Gligo – H. Morović, Split 1977, 219.

<sup>137</sup> Paul the Deacon described Constans II's affairs in Italy at length; cf. *Pauli Historia Langobardorum*, ed. L. Bethmann – G. Waitz, MGH SRL, Hannoverae 1878, 146.16 – 148.9; 149.4 – 150.12 (= *Paul. Hist.*).

However, Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ἡράκλειος ἀποστείλας καὶ ἀπὸ Ῥώμης ἀγαγὼν ἱερεῖς, means that the emperor ordered someone (sc. envoy) for the priests to be brought from Rome, however, this does not mean that he was in Constantinople, yet. Heraclius Constantine visited Rome in July 663, and Pope Vitalianus (657 – 672) welcomed him six miles outside of Rome where he cordially received him. The emperor stayed for some 12 days in Rome.<sup>138</sup> Around the same time pope Vitalianus was able to send an archbishop and clerics to the far more distant land of England.<sup>139</sup> One could therefore ask, “Why not in Dalmatia, too, just over the Adriatic?” Since Heraclius Constantine had been in southern Italy for some time prior to his visit to Rome, this sentence could therein be applied (because of the term *aposteilas*) to the emperor who was not in Rome or Constantinople, but who was, for instance, in Italy. Furthermore, in chapter 32 of the *DAI*, related to the Serbs, the sentence: οὗς ὁ βασιλεὺς πρεσβύτας ἀπὸ Ῥώμης ἀγαγὼν, ἐβάπτισεν...(see below 4.6), without *aposteilas*, means that the emperor **was in Rome** and not that he just ordered action to be taken through another.

It appears that the baptism of the Croats should be brought into connection with Heraclius Constantine (Constans II), not Heraclius I. That is why Constantine’s source clearly distinguished events related to the father of Porga (Heraclius I) and to Porga himself (Heraclius Constantine). If Constantine’s source was based on the Croat tradition, then the name of Heraclius existed in that story too. For the Croats, it was Heraclius, (whether Heraclius I or Heraclius Constantine (Constans II) and it probably did not bother them too much two centuries or so after the events described. It was only by coincidence that the names of these two emperors were the same, and, in the Croat tradition, they could have become united under the name of Heraclius.<sup>140</sup>

<sup>138</sup> *Paul. Hist.* 149.26 – 28; *Gesta episcoporum Neapolitanorum*, ed. G. Waitz, MGH SRL, Hannoverae 1878, 418.15 – 29. In fact, the only Byzantine emperor who ever entered Rome was Constans II (and John V, much later in 1369).

<sup>139</sup> *Paul. Hist.* 154.15.

<sup>140</sup> Therefore, the information from *Liber pontificalis I – III*, ed. L. Duchesne, Paris 1955, I, 330.1 – 3 (= *Lib. Pontif.*) that pope John IV (640 – 642) sent Abbot Martin to redeem the enslaved Christians from the Slavs, which should be in this case rendered as pagans, is not in contradiction to Constantine’s statement that Heraclius baptized the Croats, since their baptism did not occur during the rule of Heraclius I, but Heraclius Constantine (Constans II).

1.6. Ὅτι ἡ τοιαύτη χώρα, εἰς ἣν οἱ Χρωβάτοι κατεσκηνώθησαν, ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἦν τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Ῥωμαίων, ἐξ οὗ καὶ παλάτια καὶ ἵπποδρόμια τοῦ βασιλέως Διοκλητιανοῦ ἐν τῇ [τῶν] αὐτῶν Χρωβάτων χώρα μέχρι τῆς νῦν περισώζονται εἰς τὸ κάστρον Σαλώνας πλησίον τοῦ κάστρου Ἀσπαλάθου.<sup>141</sup>

*(It should be known) that this country in which the Croats settled was under the rule of the emperor of the Romaioi from ancient times, and hence the palace and hippodromes of Emperor Diocletian are still preserved in the country of these same Croats, in the city of Salona, near the city of Spalato.*

This is Constantine's retelling based on his material that was already used in chapter 29. This passage, opening with *oti*, since it had not brought anything new or important, did not find a place in the final version (sc. chapter 30) on the Croats/Dalmatia. The only new element in the old story about Salona, Spalato, Diocletian, and his palace, was the mentioning of the *hippodromes*. Whether it was taken from Constantine's primary source or according to an eyewitness account from his own time, it is difficult to say. One could remember that a joint Frankish-Byzantine commission had the task of establishing the boundaries between the Slavs (in fact the Franks) and Byzantium in Dalmatia in 817.<sup>142</sup> Constantine could have then mentioned the *hippodromes* according to an official report from the Archives of the Imperial Palace.

There is confusion in this section: Diocletian's palace is in the city of Salona; Diocletian's palace is in the country of these same Croats – this should be rendered as a consequence of Constantine's retelling of information from at least two independent sources. The *fine-seam* seems to be ἐξ οὗ καὶ, and marks the part of the sentence

<sup>141</sup> *DAI I*, c. 31.26 – 30.

<sup>142</sup> *Astronomus, Vita Hludowici imperatoris*, MGH SRG 64, ed. E. Tremp, Hannover 1995, 370.1 – 8; it is briefly mentioned in *ARF*, 145. The other timeline when such a limitation would have been able to occur should be from ca. 870, when Basil I settled matters in Dalmatia with the Slavs.

from which Constantine actually switched to another source (note the term *παλάτια*, from Lat. *palatium*).<sup>143</sup> There is also the phrase *μέχρι τῆς νῦν*, which usually signalizes Constantine's updating to his own time.<sup>144</sup> Therefore, it should be said that this section (1.6) is merely Constantine's retelling of information that he had already used in other parts of his work, except for the information about the hippodromes, which is, most probably, from the Archives of the Imperial Palace, and dated back to the first half of the 9<sup>th</sup> century.

1.7. Ὅτι οὗτοι οἱ βαπτισμένοι Χρωβάτοι ἔξωθεν τῆς ἰδίας αὐτῶν χώρας πολεμεῖν ἀλλοτρίας οὐ βούλονται· χρησμὸν γάρ τινα καὶ ὄρισμὸν ἔλαβον παρὰ τοῦ πάπα Ῥώμης, τοῦ ἐπὶ Ἡρακλείου, τοῦ βασιλέως Ῥωμαίων, ἀποστείλαντος ἱερεῖς καὶ τούτους βαπτίσαντος. Καὶ γὰρ οὗτοι οἱ Χρωβάτοι μετὰ τὸ αὐτοὺς βαπτισθῆναι συνθήκας καὶ ιδιόχειρα ἐποίησαντο καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἅγιον Πέτρον, τὸν ἀπόστολον ὄρκους βεβαίους καὶ ἀσφαλεῖς, ἵνα μηδέποτε εἰς ἀλλοτρίαν χώραν ἀπέλθωσιν καὶ πολεμήσωσιν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰρηνεύειν μετὰ πάντων τῶν βουλομένων, λαβόντες καὶ παρὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πάπα Ῥώμης εὐχὴν τοιάνδε, ὡς εἴ τινες ἄλλοι ἔθνη κατὰ τῆς τῶν αὐτῶν Χρωβάτων χώρας ἐπέλθωσιν καὶ πόλεμον ἐπενέγκωσιν, ἵνα τῶν Χρωβάτων ὁ Θεὸς προπολεμῇ καὶ προΐσταται, καὶ νίκας αὐτοῖς Πέτρος ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μαθητῆς προξενεῖ.<sup>145</sup>

*(It should be known) that these baptized Croats will not fight foreign countries outside their own borders; for they received a kind of prophecy and order from the Pope of Rome who in the time of Heraclius, emperor of the Romaioi, sent priests and baptized them. Namely, these Croats, after their baptism made a convent, confirmed with their own signature, and by oaths sure and binding in the name of St. Peter the apostle, that never would they go upon a foreign country and make war upon it, but would rather live at peace with all who were willing to do so. They received from the same Pope of Rome this*

<sup>143</sup> See for instance, *Antapodosis*, Liutprandi opera, MGH SRG in usum scholarum, ed. J. Becker, Hannoverae – Lipsiae 1915, 86.7 – 15. In *DAI I*, c.30.16, it is βασιλικά instead of *παλάτια*.

<sup>144</sup> See, Živković, *Unknown Source*, 135.

<sup>145</sup> *DAI I*, c. 31.31 – 42.

*benediction: If some other foreigners should come against the country of these same Croats and bring war upon it, then might God fight for the Croats and protect them, and Peter the disciple of Christ give unto them victories.*

This section, opened with *oti*, appears to be an extraction from Constantine's primary source on the Croats. The additional sentence, which interrupts the narrative – *who in the time of Heraclius, emperor of the Romaioi, sent priests and baptized them* – is most probably Constantine's insertion, and a repetition of the text from the section 1.5.<sup>146</sup> The traces of this, as so far has appeared to be of the Latin source, can be observed through the appearance of St. Peter's name and from the context of the peace agreement described. Namely, the only foreigners upon whom the Croats might wage war should be to the West. It is well known that the Slavs attacked the eastern shores of Italy (Sipont, against the Longobards) in 642.<sup>147</sup> The mention of St. Peter, God, and Christ, can be observed as further evidence that this source was of an ecclesiastical nature. The same is valid for the term *baptized Croats*, which underlined the importance of their belonging to Christianity. Since this section is separated from the previous one (see 1.6) by *oti*, it seems as if it was displaced from its original position in Constantine's source. Between sections 1.6 and 1.7 there should be some other information, which Constantine either had not used at all, or used them in another section of this chapter. In this section, the pope is explicitly mentioned as being the one who sent clerics to Dalmatia, and the name of Heraclius probably appeared only to establish the timeline.

The abbreviations of Constantine's source and Constantine's retelling can be traced to the beginning of the second sentence of this section: *Καὶ γὰρ*.<sup>148</sup> Constantine either rearranged the material from his source in a different order or he abbreviated it. Since there is another

<sup>146</sup> It seems that the name of Heraclius and his role in the baptism of the Croats was very important for the anonymous author. Actually, it appears that the importance is stressed by mentioning the emperor and the pope on the joint mission of their baptism. The general message should be that the emperor and the pope converted the Croats to Christianity through their mutual efforts. This is an important clue for tracing the political background of the source of the Croats and the Serbs.

<sup>147</sup> *Paul. Hist.* 135.2 – 11.

<sup>148</sup> For the *kai gar*, see, Denniston, *Particles*, 109 – 110; Poythress, *Asyndeton*, 319 – 321.

earlier interruption in the first sentence, immediately behind βούλονται, the conclusion that the first sentence is just a retelling of the larger portion of the text, which actually followed the rest part of this section, should be inclined to. It seems that Constantine, at first glance, had been satisfied with the recapitulation of this section, about the agreement between the Croats and the pope, and then, feeling it as being an unsatisfactory explanation, he decided to give a fuller account from his source. This is why he opened the following section with Καὶ γὰρ.<sup>149</sup> This is also why there are no other *fine-seams*, which would indicate insertions or abbreviations of the text, until the end of this section.

The ties between the Slavs of Dalmatia with Constantinople ca. 660, are recorded by Thomas of Spalato who said that the citizens of Spalato sent letters to the **emperors** in Constantinople asking them to stop the incursions of the Goths/Slavs upon their land. The emperors sent an *iussio* to the rulers of the Goths/Slavs and such attacks ceased.<sup>150</sup> This event could have occurred during the co-roles of Heraclius Constantine and his sons Heraclius and Tiberius, from 659, and before Constans II left for Italy (661).<sup>151</sup> Additionally, the co-emperors, during the first half of the 7<sup>th</sup> century, could also have been Heraclius and Heraclonas (638 – 641).<sup>152</sup> The main point is that this appeal of the citizens of Spalato could have been possible only **after** the destruction of Salona. The oaths, which the Croats gave to the pope, must have been in some way connected with their previous military misdeeds they had already committed.<sup>153</sup> It should be remembered that in *Liber pontificalis* there is information about Abbot Martin, who was sent by Pope Iohannes IV to Dalmatia, in 641, to redeem those Christians who were enslaved from the Slavs.<sup>154</sup> Since the Slavs of Dalmatia were considered as pagans at that time, this lends more ground to the

<sup>149</sup> According to, Poythress, *Asyndeton*, 320, *gar* indicates a relationship of implication-grounds of result-reason.

<sup>150</sup> *HS*, 44.25 – 30; *HSM*, 93.

<sup>151</sup> However, Constans II arrived in Italy only in 663; cf. R. J. H. Jenkins, *The Imperial Centuries A. D. 610 – 1071*, Toronto 1987, 41; A. J. Ekonomou, *Byzantine Rome and the Greek Popes*, Plymouth 2007, 168 – 169.

<sup>152</sup> Šišić, *Povijest*, 282, n. 35. For other opinions, see, Živković, *Južni Sloveni*, 410, n. 1030.

<sup>153</sup> This could be related to the story of the fall of Salona. This event, described by Constantine, and much later by Thomas of Spalato, is still not satisfactorily explained.

<sup>154</sup> *Lib. Pontif. I*, 330.1 – 3.

interpretation presented here that Constantine or Constantine's source spoke about Heraclius Constantine as the one who had baptized the Croats/Serbs, not Heraclius I.

The whole idea about an agreement between the Croats and the pope is obscure. In its basis there is a strong papal bias, since he is the one who would have provided all the elements for the Croats' victories.<sup>155</sup> On the other hand, the pope was hardly able to exercise any political influence in Dalmatia during the 7<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup> centuries. Pope Agathon (678 – 681), in his letter (680) to Emperor Constantine IV, states that many bishops were serving, among other nations, and among the Slavs too.<sup>156</sup> From the letter of Pope John VIII to the Croat *Archon* Branimer (881), we learn that the pope could have had been thinking of some type of pact to be concluded between St Peter's successor and the Croats.<sup>157</sup> In his previous letter to Branimer from June 7<sup>th</sup> 879, John VIII already had stressed the fidelity of the Croats to St Peter, and emphasized support *against the visible and invisible enemies*, as well as for the victories against the enemies through the help of God and SS Peter and Paul.<sup>158</sup> The content of these letters strongly suggests that there should be a relationship between them and section 1.7 of the *DAI*. The following section 1.8 describes events from ca. 850, and, therefore, these letters of Pope John VIII could not be considered as being the trigger for such an idea regarding a pact between the Croats and the Holy See.<sup>159</sup> Quite the contrary, the letters of John VIII could have been induced by a source which had already exposed the story about an *ancient pact* between the Croats and the Holy See. Therefore, it could be assumed that this agreement is just an invention of the anonymous author of Constantine's source. The reasons for such an invention are much more important than the genuineness of the story itself. If the

<sup>155</sup> See the commentary of this section in *DAI II*, 126 – 127, which argues that this story seems to combine two events in the Croat history, i.e. the first from the early 7<sup>th</sup> and the second from the late 9<sup>th</sup> centuries. See also, *FB II*, 42, n. 121.

<sup>156</sup> *S. Agathonis papae epistolae*, ed. J. – P. Migne, PL 87 (1851), col. 1224 – 1225. See, Živković, *Južni Sloveni*, 206.

<sup>157</sup> *Iohannis VIII papae registrvm*, ed. E. Caspar, MGH Epistolarvm VII, Karolini Aevi V, Berolini 1928 (= *Ep. VII*) 258.22 – 24; See also the commentary in *DAI II*, 127; Hauptmann, *Dolazak*, 124; Šišić, *Povijest*, 386.

<sup>158</sup> *Ep. VII*, 152.14 – 16.

<sup>159</sup> As it was suggested by Ferjančić, *FB II*, 42, n. 121.

author of Constantine's primary source about the Croats/Serbs had been based in Rome (see the commentary of section 4.6 below), then the date of composition of the author's work would eventually point out why it was necessary for him to bind the Croats to Rome, which would have already been from the dawn of their Dalmatian history. It is probable that this author had to find some earlier ties between Rome and the Croats to justify the political situation of his own time. Having been contemporaries, if Pope John VIII based his letters exactly on this anonymous author, then these two men were, most probably, very close to one another. It is worthwhile to mention that in the letters directed from the pope to the Croat *Archon* Domagoi (ca. 864 – 876) there is no trace of any kind of previous pact between the Croats and the pope, neither the slightest hint about the support of God and SS Peter and Paul against the Croat enemies.<sup>160</sup> According to this analysis it must be expected that Constantine's primary source on the Croats was written before June 879, when, most probably, the traces of its narrative in the letter of John VIII to Branimer are met, and after 875, since there is no trace of such a story in the letters of John VIII to the *Archon* Domagoi (872/73, and 874/75).

If the story about the oaths which the Croats gave to the pope had indeed been an invention (as it appears so far to be), then the anonymous author of Constantine's primary source had reasons to create it. In the political sphere, the message would be that the Croats are faithful to the pope and that Rome exercised some sort of control over them, especially regarding matters of war and peace.

1.8. Μετὰ δὲ χρόνους πολλοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Τερπημέρη τοῦ ἄρχοντος, τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἄρχοντος Κρασημέρη, ἔλθων ἀπὸ Φραγγίας, τῆς μεταξὺ Χρωβατίας καὶ Βενετίας, ἀνὴρ τις τῶν πάνυ μὲν εὐλαβῶν, Μαρτίνος ὀνόματι, σχῆμα δὲ κοσμικὸν περιβεβλημένος, ὃν καὶ λέγουσιν οἱ αὐτοὶ Χρωβάτοι θαύματα ἱκανὰ ποιῆσαι· ἀσθενῆς δὲ ὢν ὁ τοιοῦτος εὐλαβῆς ἀνὴρ καὶ τοὺς πόδας ἠκρωτηριασμένος, ὥστε ὑπὸ τεσσάρων βαστάζεσθαι καὶ περιφέρεσθαι, ὅπου δ' ἔν καὶ βούλεται, τὴν τοιαύτην τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου πάπα ἐντολὴν τοῖς αὐτοῖς Χρωβάτοις διατηρεῖν μέχρι

<sup>160</sup> *Ep. VII*, 278.14 – 17 (December 872 – Mai 873); 296.6 – 16 (874 – 875).

τέλους ζωῆς αὐτῶν ἐπεθέσπισεν, ἐπευξάμενος δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτοῖς τὴν ὁμοίαν τοῦ πάπα εὐχὴν. Διὰ τοῦτο οὔτε αἱ σαγήναι τῶν τοιούτων Χρωβάτων, οὔτε αἱ κονδοῦραι οὐδέποτε κατὰ τινος πρὸς πόλεμον ἀπέρχονται, εἰ μὴ ἄρα τις κατ' αὐτῶν ἐπέλθοι. Πλὴν διὰ τῶν τοιούτων πλοίων ἀπέρχονται οἱ βουλόμενοι τῶν Χρωβάτων διοικεῖν ἐμπόρια, ἀπὸ κάστρον εἰς κάστρον περιερχόμενοι τὴν τε Παγανίαν καὶ τὸν κόλπον τῆς Δελματίας καὶ μέχρι Βενετίας.<sup>161</sup>

*After many years, in the days of Archon Terpimer, the father of Archon Krasimer, there came from Francia, which lies between Croatia and Venice a man called Martin of the utmost piety, clad in the garb of a layman, who, as these same Croats say, made many miracles; this pious man, who was of weak health, and had had his feet amputated, was carried by four bearers and taken about wherever he wanted to go, recommended to these same Croats, that they should keep this injunction of the most holy Pope until the end of their life; and he himself also pronounced on their behalf a benediction similar to that which the Pope had made. For this reason, neither the sagēnai nor the kondoures of these Croats ever go against anyone to make war, unless of course he has come upon them. In these vessels go those of the Croats who wish to engage in commerce, traveling round from city to city, in Pagania and the gulf of Dalmatia, and as far as Venice.*

Most probably, this is the verbatim transcribed text of Constantine's primary source, which followed directly the one preserved in the section 1.7. First of all, for the Anonymous Latin writer *many years passed* between the arrival of the Croats (ca. 630) as well as of their baptism (ca. 660), and the rule of *Archon* Terpimer (ca. 840 – ca. 854). Therefore, the perception of the flow of time is correct. During Terpimer's rule, a pious man, Martin, came from Istria or Friuli (which should mean the land *between Croatia and Venice*).<sup>162</sup> This is not impossible since it is known that one Frankish preacher, Gottschalk (of Orbais, France), also found hospitality in Terpimer's court around

<sup>161</sup> *DAI I*, c. 31.42 – 57.

<sup>162</sup> For various opinions on date of this event, placed in a wide timeline, from ca. 850 to ca. 935, see, *DAI II*, 127 – 128.

ca. 846 – 848.<sup>163</sup> This Gottschalk was also accompanied by the young Gottschalk, his disciple.<sup>164</sup> Terpimer, on the other side of the coin, had already found a Benedictine monastery near Spalato in 852.<sup>165</sup> It seems that the Anonymous writer had a strong wish to confirm that the Croats at that time were still obeying orders distantly issued by the pope. This is probably why Anonymous stressed that the Croat's merchants, in his own time, were still sailing as far as Venice, as he wanted to show that the oaths which had been given in such olden times were still respected. This description of the trade routes held by Croats, to the south up to Pagania, and to the north up to Venice, shows clearly who could have written such a report – obviously a western, Latin writer. No trace of intervention by Constantine into his primary source can be found here. There is also no mention of the Franks. This could mean that this source was written after ca. 876, the most likely date of when the Croats became independent from Franks.

The Latin origin of Constantine's primary source on the Croats can be also noted through the term *sagēnē* as being a type of merchant.<sup>166</sup> Other strong evidence suggests the usage of a Latin source, namely the formula: τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου πάπα, which Constantine had **never used** in the *DAI* when he mentioned

<sup>163</sup> See, L. Katić, *Saksonac Gottschalk na dvoru kneza Trpimira*, Zagreb 1932, 5 – 6, 9 – 10 (= Katić, *Gottschalk*).

<sup>164</sup> Katić, *Gottschalk*, 8.

<sup>165</sup> *CD I*, N° 3. *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae I*, ed. I. Kukuljević Sakcinski, Zagreb 1874, N° 59 (= *Sakcinski*), dated this charter in 837.

<sup>166</sup> *Sagēnē* is a Greek word meaning a small fishing boat. It also had the meaning for a small military ship and can only be found in use before Constantine (after Constantine it never appeared again in Byzantine sources) only in Pseudo-Maurice, while *kondoura* can be found only in the *DAI*; cf. *DAI I*, 323, 328 (Glossary). Cf. *Das Strategikon des Maurikios*, ed. T. Dennis – E. Gamillscheg, Wien 1981, XII B, 21.21: Ἐπειδὴ δὲ σαγηνῶν. It should be noted that the late 10<sup>th</sup> century *Souda* does not mention *sagēnē*. Emperor Louis II and Pope John VIII used the term *sagenae*, too; cf. *Ep. VII*, 394.5 (871), 45.29 (17 April 877), but both letters were probably drafted or composed by Anastasius the Librarian. It is important to note that Constantine Porphyrogenitus used the term κοράβιον for the Arab ships in Adriatic, which blockaded Ragusa in 866, as well as for Ragusan ships which transported the Slavs of Dalmatia to Italy in 868; cf. *DAI I*, c. 29.91,114. On the other hand, the Arab ships which devastated the shores of Italy are called *sagenae* in the letters written by Anastasius the Librarian (see above in this footnote).

popes.<sup>167</sup> It is this formula we meet in the letter of the Pope John VIII to Photius, the patriarch of Constantinople (from August of 879), preserved in both its Latin and Greek versions: *sanctus papa Leo – ὁ ἀγιώτατος πάπας Λέων*.<sup>168</sup> Additionally, there is the possibility that the names of Terpimer and Krasimer were transliterated from the Latin: ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Τερπημέρη τοῦ ἄρχοντος, τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἄρχοντος Κρασημέρη, since they preserved the Latin genitive, Terpimerus/i, Krasimerus/i.<sup>169</sup> This could also be a Greek genitive from the nominative Τερπημίρης, but according to the Latin inscription, the name of this *archon* was *Terpimerus (Divino natu dux Croatorum)*. The Latin Terpimerus should be Τερπημίρος in Greek.<sup>170</sup>

In this section another connection between Constantine's primary/Latin source and the *DCBC* can be noticed. Namely, in the *DCBC*, there was a record on a pious man by the name Virgilius, who came to the Bavarian Duke Otilo: *...venit vir quidam sapiens et bene doctus...et comperto eo bene docto misit (sc. Pippinus) eum praefato duci Otiloni, ac consessit ei episcopatum Salzburgensem*.<sup>171</sup> The *DAI* states: ἀνήρ τις τῶν πάνυ μὲν εὐλαβῶν, Μαρτίνος ὀνόματι, σχῆμα δὲ κοσμικὸν περιβεβλημένος.<sup>172</sup> However, the appearance of a pious and wise man in medieval literature could be just a reflection of a common pattern of writers. The pious man Martin mentioned by Constantine seems to be genuine, since there are no other similar parallels in medieval literature: *a man of utmost piety, clad in the garb of a layman who performed miracles and had been carried by four bearers*. It is interesting to note that the scribe who wrote the charter of

<sup>167</sup> Constantine usually simply states, either when he used a source, or when he retold from his source: πάπας; cf. *DAI I*, cc. 26.12; 27.16; 29.105, 107; 31.33, 39, 50.

<sup>168</sup> *Ep. VII*, 183.35; 183.39 – 40.

<sup>169</sup> See, *DAI II*, 128.

<sup>170</sup> Note the names of the two *archontes* of Terbounia: Φαλιμέρης and Τζουζήμερης; *DAI I*, c. 34.10 – 11. On the other hand the names of the *archontes* of Serbia always have the same ending -ος: Βλαστίμηρος (*DAI I*, cc. 32.35; 34.7), Βοϊσέσθλαβος, Ῥοδόσθλαβος, (*DAI I*, c. 32.34 – 35), Μουντιμήρος, Στροϊμήρος, Τζεέσθλαβος, (*DAI I*, c. 32.43, 44, 63, 74). The only exception is Προσηγός. (*DAI I*, c. 32.34 – 35). The Bulgarian *Archon* Boris is always Βορίσης (*DAI I*, c. 31.62; 32.49, 64; 32.45, 54).

<sup>171</sup> *De conversione*, 6.9 – 13.

<sup>172</sup> *DAI I*, c.31.45 – 46. For the possible identification of the pious man, Martin, see, Katić, *Gottschalk*, 28 – 30; also, *DAI II*, 127.

Duke Terpimer in March 852, was also a Martin: *Martinus presbyter capellanus preceptione domini mei ducis*.<sup>173</sup> There is another holy man, St Martinus Podsusedski, mentioned in the two 13<sup>th</sup> century charters of Zagreb's Church.<sup>174</sup> With that, here we come to the end of the list of possible candidates for the holy man Martin who came to the Croats in the time of the *Archon* Terpimer.

Yet, this holy man, even though dressed only as a layman (σχῆμα δὲ κοσμικὸν περιβεβλημένος), was probably a preacher of Gotschalk's kind, and the land from which he had come to the Croats belonged at that time to the Franks.<sup>175</sup> The source did not clarify that this land was in fact part of Francia, but provided enough parameters to be understood as Istria, which was the land of the Franks in the time of the *Archon* Terpimer. The authenticity of this holy man is confirmed by the words: ὄν καὶ λέγουσιν οἱ αὐτοὶ Χρωβάτοι θαύματα ἱκανὰ ποιῆσαι. This means that someone had spoken to the Croats and they told the story to that informant. Furthermore, that holy man took a similar oath from the Croats as the pope had done previously, and he personally made the Croats swear to obey this. However, at this point the crucial conflicting element in the entire story is reached. How was it possible that a Frankish preacher or missionary, with the task to bind the Croats to his ecclesiastical authorities, had advised the same Croats to obey the ancient oaths given to the pope of Rome? The competition between the Frankish and papal missionaries in Dalmatia, or among the Croats, would not allow such a generous gesture. A possible answer could be that an anonymous author of Constantine's source had some information about a holy man who had visited Croatia (Gotschalk?), and that he used this story to invent the previous agreement between the pope and the Croats. Since both stories make an unproportionately large portion of his text, it must mean that this invention was made with good reason. Finally, since it has been suggested above that section 1.7 was written between 875, and June 879, the informant who gathered the information about the Croats had then been in Croatia ca. 876/877.

<sup>173</sup> *CD I*, N° 3.

<sup>174</sup> Sakač, *Ugovor*, 73 – 76.

<sup>175</sup> The phrase σχῆμα δὲ κοσμικὸν περιβεβλημένος, most probably means *dressed in a common robe; simple, modest robe*. It does not mean that a person wearing such a robe is not a priest or monk – his dress just indicates that he did not wear rich or luxurious garments.

In section 1.7 it is said that the Croats *received from the same Pope of Rome this benediction: If some other foreigners should come against the country of these same Croats and bring war upon it, then might God fight for the Croats and protect them, and Peter the disciple of Christ give unto them victories* (ὡς εἴ τινες ἄλλοι ἔθνικοὶ κατὰ τῆς τῶν αὐτῶν Χρωβάτων χώρας ἐπέλθωσιν καὶ πόλεμον ἐπενέγκωσιν...). In the *Vita* of St Eligius (588 – 660), written by Bishop Dado of Rouen, there is exactly the same wording in the description of Eligius' mission to the Bretons (636/637): *Quo* (sc. Eligius) *cum pervenisset, Brittanorum principem adiit, causas pacti indicavit, pacis obsidem recepit; et cum nonnulli iurgia eos vel bella mutuo sibi indicare aestimarent, tanta praefatum principem benignitate et mansuetudine hac lenitate adtraxit, ut etiam secum eum adducere facile suaderet.*<sup>176</sup> Eligius was, according to his *Vita*, very prophetic, and he also had many visions.<sup>177</sup> Section of 1.7 about the prophecy to the Croats, χρησμὸν γάρ τινα...ἔλαβον, corresponds to the Latin phrase *prophetando praedixit* – also in the *Vita* of Eligius.<sup>178</sup> Furthermore, in section 1.8, the holy man Martin: Μετὰ δὲ χρόνους πολλοὺς...ἔλθὼν ἀπὸ Φραγγίας... σχῆμα δὲ κοσμικὸν περιβεβλημένος, corresponds to the Eligius adventures in his *Vita*: *Alio quoque tempore sub laicali adhuc habitu carpebat iter cum pueris suis de villa regali, quae vocatur Sterpiniacus.*<sup>179</sup> Similarly, and even closer to the *DAI*'s description of the prophecies given by Martin, σχῆμα δὲ κοσμικὸν περιβεβλημένος, can be found in another passage of the *Vita* of Eligius: *Sed dum adhuc laicali habitu esset praesagus futura praenuntiavit.*<sup>180</sup>

Then, in section 1.8 it is stated that Martin was sick and had his feet amputated and, due to this, four men carried him wherever he

<sup>176</sup> *Vita Eligii episcopi Noviomagensis*, ed. B. Krusch, MGH Scriptorum rerum Merovingicarum IV, Hannoverae – Lipsiae 1902, 680.8 – 11 (= *Vita Eligii*). It is noticeable that the portion of the text after *aestimarent* is missing, since the first part of this sentence is not congruent with the second part: *tanta praefatum principem benignitate et mansuetudine hac lenitate adtraxit, ut etiam secum eum adducere facile suaderet.*

<sup>177</sup> However, it is usual as *topos* in the Lives of the Saints.

<sup>178</sup> *Vita Eligii*, 717.4 – 5.

<sup>179</sup> *Vita Eligii*, 685.22 – 23.

<sup>180</sup> *Vita Eligii*, 716.3 – 4.

wanted to go (ἀσθενής δὲ ὢν ὁ τοιοῦτος εὐλαβῆς ἀνὴρ καὶ τοὺς πόδας ἠκρωτηριασμένος, ὥστε ὑπὸ τεσσάρων βαστάζεσθαι καὶ περιφέρεισθαι, ὅπου δ' ἔν καὶ βούλεται). On the contrary, Egilius was of good health, but when he arrived in the village of Gamappius he entered the basilica where he found a poor cripple lying in front of the door (...*ingrediens ilico basilicam, invenit quendam pauperem claudum pro foribus iacentem...*).<sup>181</sup> On the other hand, the idea of a cripple carried by four bearers can be found only in one passage of the Scripture: *Et venerunt ferentes ad eum paralyticum qui a quattuor portabatur*.<sup>182</sup> Finally, the name of pope Martin I (649 – 653) also appears in the *Vita* of Egilius, especially his sufferings induced by the Emperor Constans II (*Erat autem eo tempore Romae presul beatissimus papa Martinus, qui sollicite ac viriliter pro hac causa invigilans immoque pugnans multa probra adversa ab hereticis sustinebat...multiplicibus iniuriis affectus diuque coram populo flagellatus, demum, revinctis postergum manibus...*).<sup>183</sup>

It appears that the anonymous author of Constantine's source on the Croats had only a small amount of information about the holy man who visited Croatia in the time of *Archon* Terpimer – and that holy man should be Gottschalk. Since he was a heretical monk, his name was not welcomed to appear in that source – and this is the cause our anonymous author invented Martin, the holy man, most probably begotten from the *Vita* of St Eligius. The general idea for the oaths given to God and promise that one will follow the way of God must come from the Bible: *Omnis qui poterat sapere spondentes pro fratribus suis optimates eorum et qui veniebant ad pollicendum et iurandum ut ambularent in lege Dei quam dederat in manu Mosi servi Dei ut facerent et custodirent universa mandata Domini Dei nostri et iudicia eius et caerimonias eius*.<sup>184</sup>

1.9. Ὅτι ὁ ἄρχων Χρωβατίας ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ἤγουν ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας Ἡρακλείου τοῦ βασιλέως, δουλικῶς ἐστὶν ὑποτεταγμένος τῷ βασιλεῖ Ῥωμαίων, καὶ οὐδέποτε τῷ ἄρχοντι

<sup>181</sup> *Vita Eligii*, 685.24 – 25.

<sup>182</sup> Mark, 2:3.

<sup>183</sup> *Vita Eligii*, 689.20 – 691.3.

<sup>184</sup> Nehemiah, 10:29.

Βουλγαρίας καθυπετάγη. Ἄλλ' οὐδὲ Βούλγαρος ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς πόλεμον κατὰ τῶν Χρωβάτων, εἰ μὴ Μιχαήλ, ὁ ἄρχων Βουλγαρίας, ὁ Βορίσης, ἀπελθὼν καὶ πολεμήσας αὐτοῖς καὶ μηδὲν ἀνύσαι δυνηθεὶς εἰρήνευσε μετ' αὐτῶν, ξενιάσας τοὺς Χρωβάτους καὶ ξενιασθεὶς παρὰ τῶν Χρωβάτων. Ἄλλ' οὐδὲ πώποτε οἱ Χρωβάτοι οὗτοι τοῖς Βουλγάροις πάκτον δεδώκασιν, εἰ μὴ πολλάκις ἀμφοτέρω ξενιά τινα πρὸς ἀλλήλους παρέσχον φιλοφρονήσεως ἕνεκα.<sup>185</sup>

*(It should be known) that the archon of Croatia has from the beginning, that is, ever since the reign of the Emperor Heraclius, been in servitudal submission to the emperor of the Romaioi, and never has been to the archon of Bulgaria. Nor has the Bulgarian ever gone to war with the Croats, except Michael Boris, archon of Bulgaria, who went and made war against them and, unable to make any headway, concluded peace with them, and made presents to the Croats and received presents from the Croats. However, nor have these Croats ever paid tribute to the Bulgarians, although the two have often made presents to one another in the way of friendship.*

At first glance, it appears that Constantine switched from his primary source and elaborated on information found in another source from this point onward, which is able to be deduced from the contents of this narrative, especially due to the description of the political relations between Croatia, Bulgaria, and Byzantium. This interpretation is the consequence of the generally deeply rooted opinion in historiography that Constantine was the one who had wanted to stress the Croats' everlasting independence from Bulgaria and, in turn, their permanent obedience to Byzantium.<sup>186</sup> In chapter 32, Constantine said the same for the Serbs – they never had been (sc. the Serb *archontes*) subject to the *archon* of Bulgaria.<sup>187</sup> This noticeable insistence upon the fact that both major South Slavic tribes had never been under the

<sup>185</sup> *DAI I*, c.31.58 – 67.

<sup>186</sup> Cf. *FB II*, 44, n. 126; *DAI II*, 129. See also, the very different opinion of Eggers, *Situation*, 48 – 49, who dated this war in 863/864 within the wider context of the politics of Franks, Byzantium and Bulgaria.

<sup>187</sup> Cf. *DAI I*, c. 32.146 – 148. This *oti*-section comes almost at the end of this chapter.

dominion of the Bulgarians, could have only two possible explanations: either Constantine insisted upon it, or his primary source already had done so. It is also important to underline that the chapter on the Bulgarians did not find its place in the *DAI*. If there was a source on the Bulgarians, Constantine would probably have used it in some other sections of his works (the *De thematibus*, the *Vita Basilii*, the *De caerimoniis*, the *DAI*), but such information cannot be traced in them. Therefore, we should assume that the Bulgarians were mentioned in the context of the Serbs and Croats as a specific source which dealt with their own histories.

To support the opinion that Constantine transcribed the text of his source in this section verbatim, and that he did not make this section because of his political goals and projections, it would be enough to stress that Constantine at that time, when he was writing chapter 31, already had all the information about the Serbs, since in this chapter he stated that the Croats came before the Serbs, and both of them arrived as refugees to the emperor Heraclius.<sup>188</sup> However, in the further narrative about the Serbs, Constantine wrote that Simeon of Bulgaria (893 – 927) attacked the Croats.<sup>189</sup> When Constantine was writing chapter 31, he knew only that Michael of Bulgaria once warred against the Croats. This means that the latter sections of chapter 32, on the Serbs describing the events after ca. 856, **had not belonged** to the source in which the data on their earliest past was recorded.

However, since it has been established that Constantine was able to merge together various information from his sources, and consequently adjust and update some events, this can only mean that he did not make any corrections to his primary source in section 1.9 of chapter 31 of the *DAI*, even though he was able to know from his material that the Bulgarians and Croats were warring at the time of Simeon of Bulgaria. Therefore, it was Constantine's source, which underlined that the Croats had always been under the rule of Byzantium. The same conclusion is valid for the Serbs. Since this statement is stressed twice in Constantine's primary source on the Croats/Serbs, it must have been of great importance for the anonymous

---

<sup>188</sup> *DAI*, c. 31.8 – 10.

<sup>189</sup> *DAI*, c. 32.126 – 128.

author of said source. Furthermore, the author did not paint the Bulgarians in completely dark colors – on the contrary, he insisted on the friendship between them and the Croats/Serbs, trying to create an impression of harmony among them in spite of occasional hostilities.<sup>190</sup>

Alongside this interpretation, an odd question arises: Who else, out of Byzantium, could have had such an interest? This could be a vital clue not only for Constantine’s primary source on the Croats/Serbs and its origin, but also it could reveal the background and circumstances which led to its writing. The double form of the name of Bulgarian *archon* – Boris-Michael – should be a sign that this source was written after Boris’ conversion to Christianity, but not much **after** that date, since both names are obviously well known to their contemporaries. This double name of the Bulgarian *archon* appeared again in chapter 32 on the Serbs, and is related to the same time as in the case of Terpimer (ca. 854).<sup>191</sup> Also, there is no apparent connection between sections 1.8 and 1.9, which could mean that Constantine had skipped a part of the original narrative.

1.10. Ὅτι [ἐν] τῇ βαπτισμένη Χρωβατία. εἰσὶν κάστρα οἰκούμενα· ἡ Νῶνα, τὸ Βελέγγραδον, τὸ Βελίτζιν, τὸ Σκόρδονα, τὸ Χλεβένα, τὸ Στόλπον, τὸ Τενήν, τὸ Κόρι, τὸ Κλαβόκα.<sup>192</sup>

*(It should be known) that in baptized Croatia are the kastra oikoumena<sup>193</sup> of Nona, Belgrade, Belitzin, Skordona, Chlebena, Stolpon, Tenin, Kori, Klaboka.*

This list of the cities of Croatia could be Constantine’s insertion in the main narrative based either on the material from the Archives of

<sup>190</sup> In light of this interpretation, one could ask whether the Croat-Bulgarian war is pure fiction of the anonymous author, created on the basis of his knowledge about the Serb-Bulgarian war. If he had had the intention to make twin-chapters about the Croats and the Serbs, then he had to supplement their stories with similar events, as he had done in the case of *origo gentis* of the Serbs – created on the basis of the Croat *origo gentis*.

<sup>191</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.45; 32.54.

<sup>192</sup> *DAI I*, c. 31.68 – 70.

<sup>193</sup> The usual translation: *inhabited cities*, was wrong; see, *DAI I*, p. 151, 161, 163, 165. For *kastra oikoumena*, see Živković, *Kastra oikoumena*, passim.

the Imperial Palace or on his primary/Latin source. The opening word, *oti*, suggests that if this section had belonged to Constantine's primary source, then this sudden appearance of a list of cities is due to Constantine's abbreviation of his primary source. Since there is no logical connection between the last sentence in 1.9, and the first sentence in 1.10, it can be assumed that at this point Constantine has skipped a part of the narrative from his primary source, and inserted this section, having displaced it from another part of this source. The other possibility – that this list of cities was from the Archives of the Imperial Palace – should be ruled out, as further evidence suggests (see below).

One should note the different writings of the same *zupanias* and towns in chapter 30 vs. chapter 31: Χλεβίαννα - Χλεβένα, Νόνα - Νῶνα, Τνήνα - Τνήν.<sup>194</sup> The names of *zupanias* and towns repeated in chapter 30 appear to be closer to the Greek, and the names in chapter 31 have been recorded as being closer to the Latin.<sup>195</sup> There is also an interesting repetition of the term ἡ βαπτισμένη Χρωβατία (see also 1.11 below), which is necessary if the author had been speaking of two Croantias, so that these two can be clearly recognized. This is probably due to the fact that Constantine's Latin source had already made this distinction by mentioning that the White Serbs and the White Croats to the north were unbaptized. This terminology supports our assumption that the supposed Latin source was of even greater ecclesiastical provenience.

The term *kastra oikoumena* actually reveals, completely, the provenience of Constantine's source – it was beyond any doubt an ecclesiastical one. This term, as has been argued, does not mean *inhabited cities*, but rather cities which belonged to the ecclesiastical organization, as *Christian cities*.<sup>196</sup> This phrase, *kastra oikoumena*, appears in the *DAI* only in its Slav chapters, and, at the head of the each list of the cities mentioned in those particular principalities (Croatia, Zachlounia, Terbounia, Diocleia, Pagania, and Serbia),<sup>197</sup> the bishoprics can be noticed – Nin in Croatia, Ston in Zachlounia, Trebinje in Terbounia, and Mokro in Pagania.<sup>198</sup> The other cities listed below

<sup>194</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.91 – 93.

<sup>195</sup> See, Loma, *Sprachgut* 114 (but only for Nona).

<sup>196</sup> See, Živković, *Kastra oikoumena*, 22 – 27.

<sup>197</sup> *DAI I*, cc. 31.68; 32.149; 33.20; 34.19 – 20; 35.12; 36.14.

<sup>198</sup> See, Živković, *Crkvena organizacija*, 111, 159, 169.

them, in this case, should be their parishes. To the opposite of the *kastra oikoumena* are Constantine's *erimokastra*, i.e. the cities which were not included in the ecclesiastical organization.<sup>199</sup> The term *kastra oikoumena* does not appear in any single Byzantine source, except in the *DAI*, and therefore this fact alone should be enough to rule out the possibility that this section was based on the Archives of the Imperial Palace.

Anastasius the Librarian,<sup>200</sup> who played a major role as an administrative officer in Rome during the pontificates of the three subsequent Popes: Nicholas I (858 – 867), Hadrian II (867 – 872), and John VIII (872 – 882), left an interesting clue about the meaning of *oikoumena* for the Latins and the Greeks. In his epistle to Pope Hadrian II in 871, he says: *Verum cum apud Constantinopolim positus frequenter Grecos super hoc vocabulo reprehenderem et fastus vel arrogantiae redarguerem, asserbant, quod non ideo oecomenicon, quem multi universalem interpretati sunt, dicerent patriarcham, quod universi orbis teneat praesulatum, sed quod cuidam parti praesit orbis, quae a christianis inhabitatur. Nam quod Grece oecumeni<sup>201</sup> vocatur, Latine non solum orbis, a cuius universitate universalis appellatur, verum etiam habitatio vel locus habitabilis nuncupatur.*<sup>202</sup>

The English translation is as follows: *When I was on my duty in Constantinople, I often reprimanded the Greeks due to this term. Having reproached them, their arrogance, and conceit, they claimed that they do not call their Patriarch oecomenicon,<sup>203</sup> being translated*

<sup>199</sup> For a different opinion, that these cities were in fact *inhabited cities* and a specific trace of the earliest *territorial organization* of the Slavic principalities, see, Ćirković, "Naseljeni gradovi", 9 – 32.

<sup>200</sup> See, J. N. D. Kelly, *Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, Oxford 1996, 106 – 107; A. Louth, *Greek East and Latin West: The Church AD 681 – 1071*, New York 2007, 168 (= Louth, *Greek East*); H. Chadwick, *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church, from Apostolic Times Until the Council of Florence*, Oxford 2003, 99 (= Chadwick, *East and West*).

<sup>201</sup> Sc. οἰκουμένη.

<sup>202</sup> *Ep. VII*, 417.20 – 26.

<sup>203</sup> This is was an old problem well known from the letter of Pope Gregory I (590 – 604) from 595 in which he said: *Ad hoc enim usque pervenit, ut sub occasione presbyteri Iohannis* (sc. the patriarch of Constantinople) *gesta hic transmitteret, in qua se paene per omnem versum ycomenicon patriarcham nominaret*; cf. *Gregorii I papae Registrum epistolarum, liber I – IV*, MGH Epistolarum I, ed. P. Ewald – L. M. Hartmann Berolini 1891, 344.14 – 16 (= *Gregorii Ep.*). The same pope warned (in 599) the bishops of Thessalonica, Dyrrachium, Nicopolis, Corinth, Iustiniana Prima, Crete,

wrongly by many as universal, because he rules the whole world, and because he rules only the world which is inhabited by the Christians. Namely, what is called in Greek *oecumeni* in Latin should not be translated only as the world, by which universality the Patriarch is called universal, **but also an inhabited, and inhabitable place.**

This example clearly shows that *oikoumena* meant not only the world inhabited by the Christians, but also every place in which Christians lived. Anastasius clearly stated that the Greek term *oecoumeni* has to be understood differently in Latin. The unique testimony of Anastasius the Librarian – that each place inhabited by Christians (*locus habitabilis*) is part of *oecumeni*, and set against the *kastra oikoumena* of Constantine’s primary source on the Serbs/Croats – has a value equal to finding a fingerprint in modern criminology. At this stage of our pursuit for Constantine’s supposed Latin source on the Serbs/Croats, Anastasius the Librarian can be noted as being a major suspect for the authorship of this source. In that source he intentionally made that distinction between *oecumeni* – realated (in the *DAI*) to the province of Dalmatia as a part of it, in which Byzantium ruled over the Slavs – and *kastra oikoumena* – the cities in the Slavic principalities which were under the spiritual guidance of Rome.

The already mentioned *DCBC* contained a similar list of the cities: *Item in eadem civitate ecclesia sancti Iohannis baptistae constat dedicata, et foris civitatem in Dupleipin, in Ussitin, ad Businiza, ad Bettobiam, ad Stepiliperc, ad Lindolveschirchun, ad Keisi, ad Wiedhereschirichun, ad Isangrimeschirichum, ad Beatuseschirichun, ad Quinque basilicas temporibus Liuprammi ecclesiae dedicate sunt; et ad Otachareschirchun et ad Paldmunteschirchun, ceterisque locis ubi Priwina et sui voluerunt populi. Quae omnes temporibus Priwinae constructae sunt et consecratae a praesulibus Iuvanensium.*<sup>204</sup>

---

Larissa, and Scader: *...ycomenicon, hos est universalis, sibi* (sc. Patriarch John of Constantinople) *vocabulum usurpasse*; cf. *Gregorii Ep.* 157.12 – 15. Hincmar of Reims referred to these letters in his writings 869 – 871; cf. *Opusculum LV capitulorum, Die Streitschriften Hinkmars von Reims und Hinkmars von Laon 869 – 871*, ed. R. Schieffer, MGH Concilia IV, Supplementum II, Hannover 2003, c. 17, p. 205.3 – 6; 206.27 – 32.

<sup>204</sup> *De conversione*, 12.32 – 13.2. See also the commentary of section 4.14.

This actually means that such a source, *On the conversion* of a pagan nation, could contain a list of the places in which churches had been built and consecrated. As far as can be noticed, there are great similarities between Constantine's source and the *DCBC*: the story about the settlement of the Slavs, the narrative about the manner of receiving baptism, the mentioning of the Avars, which lived towards the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> century in Pannonia, the narrative about a holy man, and a list of the cities which belonged to ecclesiastical organization. This must arise from their similar subjects of interest. It appears that Constantine's Latin source was, in fact, about the conversion of the Croats (and the Serbs) into Christianity.

1.11. Ὅτι ἡ βαπτισμένη Χρωβατία ἐκβάλλει  
καβαλλαρικὸν ἕως τῶν ξ' [αλλαγία],<sup>205</sup> πεζικὸν δὲ ἕως χιλιάδων  
ρ' [corr. κ']<sup>206</sup> καὶ σαγήνας μέχρι τῶν π' καὶ κονδοῦρας μέχρι τῶν  
ρ'. Καὶ αἱ μὲν σαγήναι ἔχουσιν ἀνὰ ἀνδρῶν μ', αἱ δὲ κονδοῦραι  
ἀνὰ ἀνδρῶν κ', αἱ δὲ μικρότεραι κονδοῦραι ἀνὰ ἀνδρῶν ι'.<sup>207</sup>

*(It should be known) that Baptized Croatia musters as many as 60 allagia of horsemen and 20 thousand foot, and galleys up to 80 and cutters up to 100. The sagēnai carry 40 men each, the kondouras 20 each, and the smaller kondouras 10 each.*

At the first glance it would seem that this report comes from the Archives of the Imperial Palace, and, if this is the case, it most probably would have been from when Basil I rearranged and settled political and military issues in Dalmatia, ca. the 870s.<sup>208</sup> However, there are some obstacles for the Byzantine provenience of this source. Namely, there is a Latin understanding of *sagēnē* as being a military ship. The whole report is written in the *Present tense*. This could mean that this information was very close to the time of the composition of

<sup>205</sup> According to *Codex Parisinus gr. 2009*, 93r, there is an abbreviation behind 60, and not 60,000 as it is in, *DAI I*, c. 31.72: ξ' χιλιάδων.

<sup>206</sup> This corr. is according to, Živković, *Forging Unity*, 197 – 198.

<sup>207</sup> *DAI I*, c. 31.71 – 74.

<sup>208</sup> For Basil and his politics in Dalmatia, see, J. Ferluga, *Vizantiska uprava u Dalmaciji*, Beograd 1957, 68 – 71.

Constantine's source on the Croats.<sup>209</sup> The term *Baptized Croatia* also suggests that this section belonged to the same source in which another – unbaptized Croatia was mentioned. Therefore, this section had most probably belonged to Constantine's primary source on the Croats, and since it is written in the *Present tense*, it would have been related to a time very close to its date of origin (ca. 878).<sup>210</sup>

1.12. Ὅτι τὴν πολλὴν ταύτην δύναμιν καὶ τὸ τοῦ λαοῦ πλῆθος εἶχεν ἡ Χρωβατία μέχρι τοῦ ἄρχοντος Κρασημέρη. Κάκεινου μὲν τελευτήσαντος, τοῦ δὲ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, Μιροσθλάβου ἄρξαντος ἔτη τέσσαρα καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Πριβουνία βοεάνου ἀναιρεθέντος, καὶ διχονοιῶν καὶ πολλῶν διχοστασιῶν εἰς τὴν χώραν γενομένων, ἠλάττωται καὶ τὸ καβαλλαρικὸν καὶ τὸ πεζικὸν καὶ αἱ σαγήναι καὶ αἱ κονδοῦραι τῆς ἐξουσίας τῶν Χρωβάτων. Ἀρτίως δὲ ἔχει σαγήνας λ', κονδοῦρας μεγάλας καὶ μικράς\*\*\*καὶ καβαλλαρικὸν\*\*\*καὶ πεζικὸν\*\*\*<sup>211</sup>

*(It should be known) that this great power and multitude of men Croatia possessed until the time of Archon Krasimer. When he died, his son Miroslav, who ruled for four years, was killed by the Ban Pribina, and since quarrels and numerous dissensions broke out in the country, the horse and foot and galleys and cutters of the Croat dominion were diminished. And now it has 30 *sagēnai* and \*\*\*kondouras, large and small, and \*\*\*cavalry and \*\*\*foot.*

This passage, opening with an *oti*, probably retells itself from an extensive source in which the political situation in Croatia, after the death of Terpimer, had been described in more detail. Constantine probably did not need all these details and therefore he shortened his source to one very crude sentence. The Latin source probably spoke

<sup>209</sup> The correct chronology of this section is given by, Manojlović, *Pomorje*, 101 – 102, who placed it in the 850's. My opinion, in, Živković, *Forging Unity*, 193, that it belongs to the early 10<sup>th</sup> century, was wrong, as well as the opinion of Eggers, *Situation*, 28 – 29 (ca. 895 – 909).

<sup>210</sup> Therefore, Manojlović, *Pomorje*, 102, was generally right when he wrote that Constantine's source had not described events in Croatia after ca. 872.

<sup>211</sup> *DAI I*, c. 31.75 – 82.

about Krasimer, the same one that has already been mentioned as being the son of the *Archon* Terpimer (see 1.8 above); then about the short rule of his son Miroslav, and then about the *Ban* Pribina who deposed him.<sup>212</sup> The text which follows is Constantine's abridgement of his source, as after that time many quarrels broke out in Croatia and the power of the Croats diminished. Constantine's retelling is also marked by the usage of the *Perfect tense*.

The blank space behind the cavalry, foot soldiers and cutters, could indicate that Constantine had either tried (in the last sentence: from ἁπείρωσ...) to establish new numbers on the military power of the Croats, but he never obtained that kind of report – at least not until 948/949 – or the author of Constantine's primary source on the Croats and the Serbs had not known this information. There is no possibility that the missing figures are the consequence of the intelligible text or damaged manuscript, since all numbers are missing, not just one, and the words in between are readable.<sup>213</sup> This is why, in both supposed cases, Constantine/Anonymous could have left blank space to write down the figures later. It should therein be proposed, according to sections 2.8 – 2.10, and especially 2.10 of chapter 30, that the beginning of section 1.12 had belonged, in fact, to the previous part of the same Latin source, in which the events before the uprising of the Croats against the Franks had been described in greater detail. There is also an important difference at the beginning of this section versus section 1.11. Namely, in 1.11 there is a *Baptized Croatia*, and in 1.12, it is only *Croatia* – which leads to the conclusion that the all of section 1.12 is just Constantine's retelling of his primary source, and the new figures of the Croat army would have been Constantine's attempt to establish them. The use of the *Perfect tense* in this section versus the *Present tense* used in 1.11, is confirmation that Constantine was aware that his primary source on the Croats had been describing a previous time.

<sup>212</sup> However, the events described in this section are understood in historiography to belong to the first half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century (ca. 948); see, *DAI II*, 129 – 130; *FB II*, 45, n. 138; Fine, *Medieval Balkans*, 264 – 266; Živković, *Forging Unity*, 199. However, Manojlović, *Pomorje*, 101, was correct – this section belongs to the period between 852 and 872, in which he placed the rule of Terpimer, Krasimer, Miroslav, and Pribina.

<sup>213</sup> Cf. *Codex Parisinus gr. 2009*, fol. 92v.

1.13. Ὅτι ἡ μεγάλη Χρωβατία, ἡ καὶ ἄσπρη ἐπονομαζομένη, ἀβάπτιστος τυγχάνει μέχρι τῆς σήμερον, καθὼς καὶ οἱ πλησιάζοντες αὐτὴν Σέρβλοι. Ὀλιγώτερον δὲ καβαλλαρικὸν ἐκβάλλουσιν, ὁμοίως καὶ πεζικὸν παρὰ τὴν βαπτισμένην Χρωβατίαν, ὡς συνεχέστερον πραιδευόμενοι παρὰ τε τῶν Φράγγων καὶ Τούρκων καὶ Πατζινακιτῶν. Ἄλλ' οὐδὲ σαγήνας κέκτηνται, οὔτε κονδούρας, οὔτε ἐμπορευτικὰ πλοῖα, ὡς μήκοθεν οὔσης τῆς θαλάσσης· ἀπὸ γὰρ τῶν ἐκεῖσε μέχρι τῆς θαλάσσης ὁδὸς ἐστὶν ἡμερῶν λ'. Ἡ δὲ θάλασσα, εἰς ἣν διὰ τῶν λ' ἡμερῶν κατέρχονται, ἐστὶν ἡ λεγομένη σκοτεινή.<sup>214</sup>

*(It should be known) that ancient Croatia, also called 'white', is still unbaptized to this day, as are also its neighboring Serbs. They muster fewer horsemen as well as fewer foot than baptized Croatia, because they are constantly plundered by the Franks and Turks and Pechenegs. Nor do they have either **sagēnai** or kondourai or merchant-ships, because they live far away from sea; it takes 30 days of travel from the place where they live to the sea. The sea to which they come down to after 30 days, is that which is called dark.*

This is the last section of chapter 31, opened also with an *oti*. The whole section could be understood as follows: Constantine's informant, who, most probably, had made an enquiry about the White Croats and the White Serbs, collected all of these materials. It appears that this informant had never reached the White Croats and the White Serbs, but rather informed himself on the issue, most probably, in Hungary.<sup>215</sup> It could be deduced from the incorrect distance from southern Poland to the Baltic sea; as this trip is impossible to be longer than a 15 days, and by the river (Vistula, Oder) probably even less.

However, there are some obstacles for this explanation. The first part of this section (up to Σέρβλοι), could have been from the Constantine's primary source, and here it is just retold (see above, 1.1) by Constantine as a sort of introduction to his own enquiry. Note also

<sup>214</sup> *DAI I*, c. 31.83 – 91.

<sup>215</sup> *DAI II*, 130, that this passage was based on some native account.

the appearance of the phrase μέχρι τῆς σήμερον related to *unbaptized Croatia*, which could mean that it had been stated in Constantine's source. It goes alongside the term *baptized Croatia* in regard to the Croats settled in Dalmatia. Constantine's primary source had made such a distinction already – *baptized* versus *unbaptized* Croatia. Therefore, it should be stated that at least the first part of this section belonged to Constantine's primary source (composed ca. 878).

For the first time there is the term μεγάλη Χρωβατία (*megali Hrovatia*) in this section, which is usually translated as *Great Croatia*,<sup>216</sup> and in chapters 13, 38, and 40, Constantine spoke about a *Megali Moravia*.<sup>217</sup> There is also *Megali Francia* in chapters 26 and 29 of the *DAI*.<sup>218</sup> It is very important to explain this adjective, since it does not mean *great*, but rather *old*, *ancient*.<sup>219</sup> In all cases, it was usually understood and translated using the adjective – *Great*. In the letter of the Pope John VIII to Photius from August 879, which is preserved in both its Latin and Greek, versions, *Leo Magnus* (440 – 461) is translated as Λέων ὁ μέγας<sup>220</sup> This does not mean the *Great*, but Leo the *Older* as to be distinguished from other popes of the same name. This meaning (i. e. *older*) is common in Greek language for people, but not for the place-names. However, Constantine used the adjective *megali* for Rome (ἡ μεγάλη Ῥώμη) with the meaning of *Old Rome*, so as to be distinguished from the Second (or New) Rome (Constantinople).<sup>221</sup> While *megali Romis* can be found often in documents of ecclesiastical provenience, with the meaning of *Old* or *First* Rome, in this specific case, Constantine speaks of political matters – that the Goths captured

<sup>216</sup> *DAI I*, cc. 31.83; 32.5 – 6. However, in the chapter regarding the Pagans, Constantine used the adjective *megali* in the sense of *the large* for the islands of Korkyra and Meleta; cf. *DAI I*, c. 36.16 – 17.

<sup>217</sup> *DAI I*, cc. 13.5; 38.58; 40.33. Each time Constantine spoke about the *former* Moravia. For other opinions, see, *DAI II*, 62; see also, S. Pirivatrić, *Vizantijska tema Morava i "Moravije" Konstantina VII Porfirogenita*, ZRVI 36 (1997) 173 – 201.

<sup>218</sup> *DAI I*, cc. 26.6; 29.134. This term is usually translated as *Great Francia*; cf. *DAI I*, 109, 131.

<sup>219</sup> See, H. Kunstmann, *Wer waren die Weisskroaten des byzantinischen Kaisers Konstantinos Porphirogenetos?*, *Die Welt der Slaven* 29 (1984) 115; I. Boba, *In Defense of Constantine Porphyrogenitus*, *Ungarn-Jahrbuch* 19 (1992) 183, n. 5 (= Boba, *Defense*).

<sup>220</sup> *Ep. VII*, 183.35; 183.40.

<sup>221</sup> *DAI I*, c. 21.32.

Rome – and not about Rome as ecclesiastical center. In the same, political meaning, Constantine used the term New Rome for Constantinople referring to Italy as the land which *if belonged to us as the New Rome*.<sup>222</sup> In *De thematibus* Constantine used the terms ἡ μεγάλη Καππαδοκία and ἡ μικρὰ Καππαδοκία,<sup>223</sup> which were well known from Roman times as *Cappadocia Prima* and *Cappadocia Secunda*.<sup>224</sup> It can be taken from another passage of *De thematibus* where Constantine referred to ἡ μικρὰ Καππαδοκία, as τῆς δὲ δευτέρας Καππαδοκίας, that he used *mikra* as a substitute for *secunda*.<sup>225</sup> Consequently, *megali* stand for *prima*, and has the meaning of *older*.<sup>226</sup> The same process of adoption of Latin terms in their specific meaning in Greek, can be traced back to Theophanes the Confessor who mentioned the ancient homeland of the Bulgarians as: ἡ παλαιὰ Βουλγαρία ἐστὶν ἡ μεγάλη.<sup>227</sup> Patriarch Nikephoros, a contemporary of Theophanes Confessor said for the ancient homeland of the Bulgarians: ἡ πάλαι καλουμένη μεγάλη Βουλγαρία.<sup>228</sup> Patriarch Nikephoros is a witness that this meaning (*megali* = *old* for geographical places) was alien to the Greek language, for he changed *παλαιὰ* into an adverb *πάλαι* - *in ancient times it was called Great Bulgaria*. In his Latin translation of Theophanes Chronographia's, Anastasius the Librarian did exactly the same as Nikephoros had done: *antiquitus Vulgaria est magna*.<sup>229</sup>

<sup>222</sup> *Theoph. Cont.* 288.14 – 15: Ἰταλίας ὄση τῆ καθ' ἡμᾶς νέα Ῥώμη προαφόριστο. D. Georgacas, *The names of Constantinople*, Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association 78 (1947) 354, considered that the term δευτέρα Ῥώμη (found in *Chronicon paschale*, I – II, ed. L. Dindorf, Bonnae 1832, I, 529.17) points out clearly enough that Constantinople was for the emperor Constantine I rather a 'Second Rome', not a 'New Rome'; see also, P. J. Alexander, *The Strength of Empire and Capital as Seen Through Byzantine Eyes*, *Speculum* 37 (1962) 340.

<sup>223</sup> *De them.* 64.19, 37, 42. See also the examples for *mikra* and **δευτέρας** Armenia; *De them.* 61.35; 73.3; 74.1 – 2; 76.32.

<sup>224</sup> *Notitia dignitatum*, 4.105 – 106; 6.45 – 46; 54.8 – 9.

<sup>225</sup> *De them.* 65.62 – 63. see,.

<sup>226</sup> Cf. *Notitia Dignitatum*, 259.7 – 8: *Armenia Maior* and *Armenia Minor*, which stand for *Armenia Prima* and *Armenia Secunda*; cf. *Notitia dignitatum*, 4.109 – 110; 7.49 – 50; 54.12 – 13.

<sup>227</sup> *Theoph. I*, 357.10.

<sup>228</sup> *Nikephoros Patriarch of Constantinople Short History*, ed. C. Mango, Washington DC 1990, c. 35.3 – 4 (*Nikeph.*)

<sup>229</sup> *Theoph. II*, 180.

Therefore, other meanings of the adjective *megalos* (great) in the Greek of the Middle Byzantine period could also mean *old, ancient, or former* even for place names and not only for people.<sup>230</sup> It seems that Constantine Porphyrogenitus used this term (*megali* – Francia, Moravia, *Hrovatia*, Rome) the way common to Latin. For instance: *major patria, major metropolis, major civitas* – as *former, olden*.<sup>231</sup> The place Staro Město (lit. Old City) near Prague, was actually called *major civitas* during the Middle Ages (1282), which the *Continuator of Cosma Pragensis* also called *antiqua civitas*.<sup>232</sup> This original understanding of the term *megali*, which possibly derived from its meaning in Latin, as *old, ancient, former* – applied to Francia, Moravia, and Croatia, can be found only in the Byzantine texts which are in the *DAI*.<sup>233</sup> Constantine Porphyrogenitus, who was familiar with various geographical works, as well as with Theophanes and Nikephoros, actually adopted the meaning of *megali* as a substitute for *old country (former, olden)*.<sup>234</sup> Consequently, the term *megali Hrovatia* was Constantine's insertion in the text of his original source on the Croats.

<sup>230</sup> See, Boba, *Defense*, 183, n. 5; Živković, *Južni Sloveni*, 194 – 195, notes 880 – 888; Eggers, *Situation*, 50 – 51: *Das ehemalige, gewesene Moravia, das nunmehr (um 950) nicht mehr existiert.*

<sup>231</sup> See, E. Kärcher, *Beiträge zur lateinischen Etymologie und Lexikographie*, Stuttgart 1844, 37.

<sup>232</sup> W. W. Tomek, *Dějepis města Prahy I*, Prague 1855, 213, n. 25; *Codex Juris Bohemici I*, ed. H. Jireček, Prague 1867, 185. See, also, for *major patria*: *Q. Curtii Rufi De gestis Alexandri Magni regis Macedonum libri qui supersunt octo*, ed. J. Mützell, Berlin 1841, 219: *...et in maiore locaverant patria.*

<sup>233</sup> Some scholars have gone to great length to prove the thesis that *megali* – ‘Great’ was in fact a particular Roman and Byzantine way of distinguishing between territories **inside** and **outside** the borders of the Empire; cf. Pohl, *Awaren*, 267; E. Chrysos, *Zum Landesnamen Langobardia*, Die Langobarden – Herrschaft und Identität, ed. W. Pohl – P. Erhard, Wien 2005, 433; U. Fiedler, *Bulgars in the Lower Danube Region: A Survey of the Archaeological Evidence and of the State of Current Research*, The Other Europe in the Middle Ages, Avars, Bulgars, Khazars and Cumans, II, ed. F. Curta – R. Kovalev, Leiden 2008, 152, n.4; V. Vachkova, *Danube Bulgaria and Khazaria as Parts of the Byzantine Oikoumene*, The Other Europe in the Middle Ages, Avars, Bulgars, Khazars and Cumans, II, ed. F. Curta – R. Kovalev, Leiden 2008, 345, with an original idea that Danube Bulgaria, on the contrary to *megali Boulgaria*, was in fact the other, “*Minor*” that is civilized.

<sup>234</sup> It is interesting that, E. Kvaternik, *Istočno pitanje i Hrvati*, Zagreb 1868, 18, noticed long time ago that Constantine Porphyrogenitus had based his usage for *megali* Croatia and Moravia on Theophanes' and Nikephoros' accounts of *megali Voulgaria*. See, also, J. Bačić, *Slav: The Origin and Meaning of the Ethnonym*, Slovene Studies 9 (1987) 34.

There is an interesting work of Pappus of Alexandria (c. 290 – c. 350) who wrote Χωρογραφία Οικουμενική now lost, but known from 10<sup>th</sup> century *Souda Lexicon*,<sup>235</sup> which is preserved in two Armenian recensions and published in 1683.<sup>236</sup> Pappus used the similar terminology to designate some provinces as ‘Great’ meaning ‘First’, or ‘New’ meaning ‘Second’, as well as the term ‘Great’ for cities of the same name to designate the most ancient city of the same name – e.g. Great Alexandria, Great Antioch, i.e. *first, older* (to be distinguished from other cities of the same name). For the provinces he used: Dalmatia Minor, Great Thessaly, Greater and Lesser Mysia (in Asia Minor), Second Cappadocia, Second Cilicia, First, Second, Third – Armenia, Greater Armenia, Lesser Armenia.<sup>237</sup> Pappus also had lot of etymological exercises (or it was unknown interpolator?): Hemaxobii (a tribe), *which means ‘living chariots’*; Entos Libya, *which means Inner Libya*; Theon Ochema (a mountain), *meaning ‘Seat of the gods’*; Cibotus (a mountain) *‘the Ark’*; Corax (a river), *which means ‘crow’*; Drakon (a river), *which means ‘dragon’*.<sup>238</sup> Finally, there are literally the same sentences in the *DAI* which appears at Pappus’s work; for instance: *It also has the island of Chios, with the city of the same name and Samus, with the cities of the same name*<sup>239</sup> versus *the large island of Kourkra or Kiker, on which there is a city*<sup>240</sup> or *Among these islands is the city of Vekla, and on another island [the city of] Arbe, and on another island [the city of] Opsara.*<sup>241</sup> Furthermore, Pappus added for the island of Cos: *mentioned by Luke in the Acts*<sup>242</sup>

<sup>235</sup> *Suidae Lexicon*, rec. I. Bekkerus, Berolini 1854, 823 (= *Souda*).

<sup>236</sup> *The Geography of Ananias of Sirak (ASXARHAC’OYC) – The Long and the Short Recensions*, ed. and transl. By R. H. Hewsen, Wiesbaden 1992, 33 – 34, dated this Armenian redaction between 591 and 636, and attributed it to Ananias of Sirak. However, this date is too early. Namely, there is a mention of Franks, “*who dwell in Gaul and half in Germany*” – the situation possible only ca. 766 when Aquitaine was incorporated into the Frankish kingdom; also, Venice, “*a district located in the water*” – which is possible to be called *a district* only after Venice was established as a regional power, i.e. after c.800 or even later.

<sup>237</sup> R. H. Hewsen, *The Geography of Pappus of Alexandria: A Translation of the Armenian Fragments*, Isis 62 (1971) 192, 194, 195, 198 – 201 (= Hewsen, *Pappus*).

<sup>238</sup> Hewsen, *Pappus*, 192, 195, 198, 200.

<sup>239</sup> Hewsen, *Pappus*, 198.

<sup>240</sup> *DAI I*, c. 36.15 – 16.

<sup>241</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.287 – 288.

<sup>242</sup> Hewsen, *Pappus*, 198.

versus *Meleta*, which *St. Luke* mentions in the *Acts of the Apostles* in the *DAI*.<sup>243</sup> In his brief description of Dalmatia Pappus also said for *Meleta* (sc. *Mljet*): *On this island the blessed apostle took shelter*.<sup>244</sup> The *DAI* states: *Another large island, Meleta...in which a viper fastened upon St. Paul by his finger, and St. Paul burnt it up in the fire*.<sup>245</sup> Pappus said that there are four islands in Dalmatia: *Stragon and Isa [which are] off Dalmatia Minor [whose coast] extends to Koskida and Melana, opposite of the Gulf of Prizimon, at the mouth of the River Drilon*.<sup>246</sup> Constantine Porphyrogenitus, speaking of the Pagans and *Paganian* said: *Neighbour to them (sc. Pagans) are four islands Meleta, Kourkoura, Bratza and Pharos...From the River Zentina begins the country of Croatia*.<sup>247</sup> In another chapter of the *DAI* Constantine said regarding the Pagans: *Also they possess these islands: the large island of Kourkra or Kiker...Meleta...Phara...Bratzis*.<sup>248</sup> These similarities in a part of Pappus's work and the *DAI* strongly suggest that Constantine Porphyrogenitus was most probably familiar with this work in some form, and perhaps could explain the specific usage of *megalos/megali* by Constantine Porphyrogenitus designating an 'old' or 'former' country, province, or city – otherwise alien to the Greek language. Unfortunately the Greek original of Pappus's work did not survive, and there is no possibility to make throughout comparison with the Greek text of the *DAI*.<sup>249</sup>

It appears that Constantine's primary source on the Croats had already contained this information about White Croatia,<sup>250</sup> as the Pechenegs and the Hungarians (Turks) were neighbors of the White

<sup>243</sup> *DAI I*, c. 36.17 – 18.

<sup>244</sup> Hewsens, *Pappus*, 192. This, inserted sentence in Pappus's original work, is a gloss of the Armenian redactor; cf. Hewsens, *Pappus*, 192, n. 22.

<sup>245</sup> *DAI I*, c. 36.17 – 20.

<sup>246</sup> Hewsens, *Pappus*, 191 – 192. This is highly inaccurate description, since *Mljet* is not opposite of the Bay of Risan, and certainly not to the mouth of *Drilion* River (sc. *Drim* in Albania), but here must be related to the *Bojana* River, both situated much southward.

<sup>247</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.109 – 113.

<sup>248</sup> *DAI I*, c. 36.15 – 21.

<sup>249</sup> Pappus was also famous mathematician; cf. G. Downey, *Pappus of Alexandria on Architectural Studies*, *Isis* 38 (1948) 197 – 200.

<sup>250</sup> Note Pappus's information about the *White Ethiopians*; cf. Hewsens, *Pappus*, 195.

Croats to the east in the second half of the 9<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>251</sup> The Franks plundered Moravia during the same time, and White Croatia was a part of the Moravian kingdom of Svatopluk.<sup>252</sup> In other words, the situation described in this section could be placed from the ca. 870s to the 880s. Having all these details in plain sight, it must be concluded that this section had also belonged to Constantine's primary source on the Croats. This was not based on Constantine's own enquiry about the White Croats, but rather only on his primary source on the Croats. On the other hand, due to the term used to describe the Baltic Sea – *dark* – it is highly probable that this account had been provided by a native from that or adjacent region.<sup>253</sup> Since this informant provided such an incorrect distance from White Croatia to the Baltic Sea, it must be assumed that this informant had lived to the south of White Croatia (Bohemia?).

---

<sup>251</sup> The Hungarians attacked Louis the German for the first time in 862; cf. *Annales Alamannici*, MGH SS I, ed. G. Pertz, Hannoverae 1826, 50, s. an. 863: *Gens Hunnorum christianitatis nomen agressa est*. The same event is placed under the 862 in *Annales Bertiniani*, MGH SRG in usum scholarum, ed. G. Waitz, Hannoverae 1883, 60 (= *Ann. Bert.*): *Sed et hostes antea illis populis inexperti, qui Ungri vocantur, regnum eiusdem populantur*.

<sup>252</sup> See, *DAI II*, 130.

<sup>253</sup> *DAI II*, 130.



## THE STORY OF DALMATIA

### 2. Διήγησις περὶ τοῦ θέματος Δελματίας.

*Εἰ πᾶσιν ἡ γνῶσις καλόν, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἄρα τῶν πραγμάτων τὴν γνῶσιν καταλαμβάνοντες οὐ πόρρω τούτου γινόμεθα. Ὅθεν καὶ πᾶσι φανερὰν ποιούμεν τῶν μεθ' ἡμᾶς πῆ μὲν τούτων τὴν δῆλωσιν, πῆ δὲ ἑτέρων ἀξιολόγων τινῶν, ἵνα καὶ διπλοῦν ἐπακολουθῆ τὸ καλόν.<sup>254</sup>*

#### *The Story of the Province of Dalmatia*

*If knowledge is good for each man, then we too are not far away from it, because we achieved the knowledge about the events. For this reason we are giving, for the benefit of all who come after us, a plain account both of these matters and of certain others worthy of attention, so that the resulting good may be twofold.*

Note the term Διήγησις which has a broad meaning since it covers various terms, i.e. *story, narrative, telling*. This term is not bound exclusively to *history*, and indeed, Constantine did not tell the *history* of Dalmatia in this chapter, but only a summary of the events which took place from the beginning of the 7<sup>th</sup> until the last quarter of the 9<sup>th</sup> century (ca. 878). This title also does not provide any clue as to what kind of narrative the reader has to expect.

The title is followed by a short introduction to the reader (presumably to Constantine's son Roman), and has nothing to do with the main course of the narrative. It is just a grain of wisdom of the

---

<sup>254</sup> *DAII*, c. 30.1 – 5. This introduction is important, since it confirms that the author was an emperor, and not an anonymous, as shall be shown in the further discussion.

father to his son.<sup>255</sup> The repetition of the common topos, which can also be found in the introduction of chapter 43, where *beloved child* (i.e. Constantine's son Roman) is mentioned, regarding the *knowledge* and importance of the *knowledge* that had to be used to deal with oncoming events, is sufficient to prove that the introduction of chapter 30 had been written by the same person.<sup>256</sup> It is the same ideological pattern. This means that the author of both introductions is the same man, who is addressing his son. Such possible evidence that the author of the introduction of chapter 30 is an emperor may be hinted at in the sentence: *Ὅθεν καὶ πᾶσι φανεράν ποιούμεν τῶν μεθ' ἡμᾶς* (*For this reason we are giving, for the benefit of all who come after us*). On the other hand, since the whole introduction is rhetorical, this style could be expected to be used by any other person practicing rhetoric. However, this objection, namely that anyone practicing rhetoric could have written this sentence, should be neglected in such a case as this, since the author speaks about *political* matters in Dalmatia, and the final words of this same sentence: *that the resulting good may be twofold* – must be related to **his rule** and the **rule of his successors**. The supposed writer and reader of the introduction should be a person capable of **dealing with the matters in Dalmatia**, and not just to be merely informed about them. It is more than certain that the author of chapter 30 was an emperor – and that emperor was Constantine Porphyrogenitus himself.<sup>257</sup>

Additionally, the sentence: *...a plain account both of these matters and of certain others worthy of attention*, signalizes that *these things* are related to Dalmatia, and *certain others* to the Croats and Slavs of Dalmatia, in general. The story about Dalmatia is exposed in chapter 29, and the story about the Croats is exposed in 31. This means that Constantine, in other words, said here that he is making a new chapter of the *DAI* based on chapters 29 and 31. Therefore, this rhetorical introduction hides important information within it: 1. The authorship of Constantine Porphyrogenitus; 2. The confirmation that chapter 30 was created from chapters 29 and 31; 3. It partly proves that the earliest manuscript of the *DAI* is at least a second version; 4. It reveals Constantine's pattern of work.

<sup>255</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.2 – 5.

<sup>256</sup> *DAI I*, c. 43.2 – 4.

<sup>257</sup> Cf. Sode, *De administrando imperio*, 170 – 173.

2.1. Τοῖς οὖν καὶ τῆς Δελματίας τὴν παράληψιν ζητοῦσιν... Ἰδόντες οὖν οἱ ᾿Αβαρῆες καλλίστην οὖσαν τὴν τοιαύτην γῆν, κατεσκήνωσαν ἐν αὐτῇ.<sup>258</sup>

*Now they, who are inquiring into the taking of Dalmatia... The Avars, then, seeing this land to be most fair, settled down in it.*

This introductory note on Dalmatia is abbreviated from chapter 29 of the *DAI*. Since this part of the narrative of chapter 29 contained the story about the *Fall of Salona*, whose parts reappear in chapter 30 and 31, it is necessary to analyze the sections of chapter 29 related to this event.<sup>259</sup> Namely, chapter 29 is assembled from at least four different sources, or to say, a group of sources.<sup>260</sup> There is information from the Archives of the Imperial Palace from the late 870s and ca. 940s; an ancient Latin source which was focused on Diocletian and Salona, dated back to the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> century; a story about Soldan which originated in southern Italy; and finally Constantine's primary source on the Slavs (Croats/Serbs) of Dalmatia. These four sources (the one from the Archives of the Imperial Palace should be called more properly a group of sources) are the four pillars upon which Constantine built his narrative. There can hardly be any kind of other source outside of this circle. Since the story on the *Fall of Salona* is written in chapter 30 of the *DAI* as well, and in a different manner than in chapter 29, it should be of necessity to place identical or similar sections related to this story found in the two different chapters (29 and 30). In this way, Constantine's *modus operandi* will be able to be more accurately traced.

<sup>258</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.6 – 61.

<sup>259</sup> Bury, *Treatise*, 560, was more than right when he wrote: *The account of the Avar capture of Salona is exactly the same narrative as that in 29*. It is almost impossible to use the works of historians who have had different opinions about the story of Salona contained in chapters 29 and 30, since nobody has made a profound analysis of the *DAI* as Bury has. See, also, Pohl, *Awaren*, 243 – 244.

<sup>260</sup> See, T. Živković, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus' Source on the Earliest History of the Croats and Serbs*, *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu* 42 (2010) 119, n. 12.

3.1. Ἡ δὲ καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν Ῥωμάνων διακράτησις ἦν μέχρι τοῦ Δανούβεως ποταμοῦ, οἱ καὶ ποτε θελήσαντες τὸν ποταμὸν διαπερᾶσαι καὶ καταμαθεῖν, τίνες κατοικοῦσιν ἐκεῖθεν τοῦ ποταμοῦ, διαπεράσαντες εὗρον ἔθνη Σκλαβήνικα ἄοπλα ὄντα, ἅτινα καὶ Ἄβαροι ἐκαλοῦντο. Καὶ οὔτε οὗτοι ἤλπιζον ἐκεῖθεν τοῦ ποταμοῦ κατοικεῖν τινας, οὔτε ἐκεῖνοι ἔνθεν τοῦ ποταμοῦ. Διὰ οὖν τὸ ἀόπλους εὑρεῖν αὐτοὺς τοὺς Ἀβάρους οἱ Ῥωμᾶνοι καὶ πρὸς πόλεμον ἀπαρασκευάστους καταπολεμήσαντες, ἀνελάβοντο πραΐδαν καὶ αἰχμαλωσίαν καὶ ἀνεχώρησαν. Καὶ ἔκτοτε ποιήσαντες ἀλλάγια δύο οἱ Ῥωμᾶνοι ἀπὸ πάσχα ἕως πάσχα τὸν λαὸν αὐτῶν ἐνήλλασσον, ὥστε τῷ μεγάλῳ καὶ ἀγίῳ σαββάτῳ ἀλλήλοις συναντᾶν, τοὺς μὲν ἀποστρεφομένους ἀπὸ τοῦ παραμονίμου, τοὺς δὲ εἰς τὴν τοιαύτην δουλείαν ἀπερχομένους. Καὶ γὰρ πλησίον τῆς θαλάσσης ὑπὸ τὸ αὐτὸ κάστρον κάστρον ἔστιν, τὸ ἐπιλεγόμενον Σαλώνα, μέγεθος ἔχον τὸ ἥμισυ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, ἐν ᾧ πάντες οἱ Ῥωμᾶνοι συνήγοντο καὶ καθωπλίζοντο καὶ προσαπεκίνουν ἐκ τῶν ἐκεῖσε, καὶ πρὸς τὴν κλεισοῦραν ἀπήρχοντο, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ κάστρου ὑπάρχουσιν μίλια τέσσαρα, ἧτις καὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν καλεῖται Κλεῖσα διὰ τὸ συγκλείειν τοὺς διερχομένους ἐκεῖθεν. Καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐκεῖσε ἀπήρχοντο πρὸς τὸν ποταμόν.<sup>261</sup>

*The rule of these Romani used to extend as far as the river Danube, and once upon a time, being minded to cross the river and to discover who dwelt beyond the river, they crossed it and came upon unarmed Slavonic nations, who were also called Avars. Neither the former had expected that any dwelt beyond the river, nor the latter that any dwelt on the hither side. And so, since Romani found these Avars unarmed and unprepared for war, they attacked them and took booty and prisoners and returned. And from that time the Romani formed two alternating garrisons, serving from Easter to Easter, and used to change their men about so that on Great and Holy Saturday they who were coming back from the station and they who were going out to that service would meet one another. For near the sea, beneath that same city, lies a city called Salona, which is half as large as Constantinople,*

<sup>261</sup> DAI I, c. 29.14 – 32.

*in which all the Romani were mustered and equipped, and from which they used to march reaching the frontier pass, which is four miles from this same city, and is called Kleisa even to this day, from its closing in those who pass that way, and from there they advanced to the river.*

2.1a. Ἐκ παλαιοῦ τοίνυν ἡ Δελματία τὴν ἀρχὴν μὲν εἶχεν ἀπὸ τῶν συνόρων Δυρραχίου, ἤγουν ἀπὸ Ἀντιβάρεως, καὶ παρετείνετο μὲν μέχρι τῶν τῆς Ἰστρίας ὄρων, ἐπλατύνετο δὲ μέχρι τοῦ Δανουβίου ποταμοῦ.<sup>262</sup>

*In olden times, therefore, Dalmatia used to start from the confines of Dyrrachium, or to say from Antibari, and used to extend as far as the mountains of Istria, and spread out as far as the Danube River.*

2.1b. Ἦν δὲ ἅπαντα ἡ τοιαύτη περίχωρος ὑπὸ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἀρχὴν, καὶ ἐνδοξότερον τῶν ἄλλων ἐσπερίων θεμάτων τὸ τοιοῦτον θέμα ἐτύγγανε, πλὴν παρελήφθη παρὰ τῶν Σκλαβικῶν ἐθνῶν τρόπῳ τοιῷδε. Κάστρον ἐστὶν πλησίον Ἀσπαλάθου, ὃ Σαλῶνα λέγεται, ἔργον Διοκλητιανοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως, ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν Ἀσπάλαθος καὶ αὐτὴ παρὰ Διοκλητιανοῦ ἐκτίσθη, καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ βασιλικά ἐκεῖσε ἐτύγγανον, εἰς δὲ Σαλῶνα κατῴκουν οἱ τε μεγιστάνες αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ὄχλων ἱκανοί. Ὑπῆρχε δὲ τὸ τοιοῦτον κάστρον κεφαλὴ πάσης τῆς Δελματίας. Ἦθοιζοντο οὖν ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν κάστρον Δελματίας στρατιῶται ἔφιπποι, καὶ ἀπεστέλλοντο ἀπὸ Σαλῶνος μέχρι τῶν χιλίων, καὶ ἐφύλαττον εἰς τὸν Δανούβιν ποταμὸν ἕνεκεν τῶν Ἀβάρων. Οἱ γὰρ Ἀβάρεις ἐκεῖθεν τοῦ Δανουβίου ποταμοῦ τὰς διατριβὰς ἐποιοῦντο, ἔνθα ἀρτίως εἰσὶν οἱ Τοῦρκοι νομάδα βίον ζῶντες. Ἀπερχόμενοι δὲ οἱ Δελματίας κατ' ἔτος ἔβλεπον πολλάκις ἐκεῖθεν τοῦ ποταμοῦ τὰ τε κτήνη καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. Ἦδοξεν οὖν αὐτοῖς κατὰ τινα χρόνον διαπερᾶσαι καὶ ἐρευνῆσαι, τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ ἐκεῖσε τὴν δίαιταν ἔχοντες. Περάσαντες οὖν εὗρον τὰς γυναῖκας τῶν Ἀβάρων καὶ τὰ παιδιά μόνα, τοὺς ἀνδρας δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀκμάζουσαν ἡλικίαν ἐν ταξιδίῳ. Ἦφνω οὖν ἐπιπέσαντες ἠχμαλώτευσαν αὐτούς, καὶ ὑπέστρεψαν ἀταλαιπώρως, ἀποκομίσαντες τὴν τοιαύτην πρᾶϊδαν εἰς Σαλῶνα.<sup>263</sup>

<sup>262</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.8 – 11.

<sup>263</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.11 – 30.

*All this area was under the rule of the Romaioi, and this province was the most illustrious of all the provinces of the West; however, it was taken by the nations of the Slavs in the following manner. Near Spalato is a city called Salona, built by the Emperor Diocletian; Spalato itself was also built by Diocletian, and his palace was there; in Salona also dwelt his nobles and large numbers of common folk. This city was the head of the whole of Dalmatia. Now, every year a force of cavalry from the other cities of Dalmatia used to collect at, and to the number of a thousand be dispatched from, Salona, and they would keep guard on the Danube River, on account of the Avars. For the Avars had their dwellings on the other side of the Danube River, where the Turks are now, and led a nomadic life. Those who were coming from Dalmatia every year would often see the flocks and men on the other side of the river. Now, after some time, on one occasion, they decided to cross over and investigate who they were that had their abode there. So they crossed and found only the women and children of the Avars, the men and youths being on a military expedition. Falling suddenly upon them, therefore, they made them prisoner, and returned unmolested, carrying off this booty to Salona.*

3.2. Τὸ οὖν τοιοῦτον ἀλλάγιον ἐπὶ πολλοὺς χρόνους γινόμενον, οἱ ἐκεῖθεν τοῦ ποταμοῦ Σκλάβοι, οἱ καὶ Ἄβαροι καλούμενοι, καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἐσκόπησαν λέγοντες, ὅτι Ὅῤοιτοὶ οἱ Ῥωμᾶνοι, ἐπεὶ ἐπέρασαν καὶ εὐρον πραΐδαν, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν καθ' ἡμῶν οὐ μὴ παύσονται διαπερῶντες, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μηχανσόμεθα κατ' αὐτῶν." Οὕτως οὖν οἱ Σκλάβοι, οἱ [καὶ] Ἄβαροι, βολευσάμενοι, καὶ διαπερασάντων ποτὲ τῶν Ῥωμάνων, ποιήσαντες οὗτοι ἐγκρύμματα καὶ πολεμήσαντες, ἐνίκησαν αὐτούς. Καὶ ἀναλαβόμενοι τὰ τε ὄπλα αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ φλάμμουλα καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πολεμικὰ σημεῖα, διαπεράσαντες οἱ προειρημένοι Σκλάβοι τὸν ποταμόν, ἦλθον εἰς τὴν κλεισοῦραν, οὗς καὶ ἰδόντες οἱ ἐκεῖσε ὄντες Ῥωμᾶνοι, θεασάμενοι δὲ τὰ φλάμμουλα καὶ τὴν ἐξόπλισιν τῶν ὁμοφύλων αὐτῶν, τοὺς αὐτῶν ὁμοφύλους εἶναι νομίσαντες, ἠνίκα κατέλαβον οἱ Σκλάβοι οἱ προρηθέντες εἰς τὴν κλεισοῦραν, παρεχώρησαν αὐτοῖς διελθεῖν. Διελθόντων δὲ εὐθὺς τοὺς Ῥωμάνους οὗτοι ἐξήλασαν, καὶ τὴν Σαλώνα, τὸ προειρημένον κάστρον ἐκράτησαν. Καὶ κατοικήσαντες ἐκεῖσε, ἔκτοτε κατὰ

μικρὸν ἀρξάμενοι πραιδεύειν τοὺς Ῥομάνους, τοὺς εἰς τοὺς κάμπους καὶ εἰς ὑψηλότερα μέρη κατοικοῦντας, ἠφάνησαν καὶ τοὺς τόπους αὐτῶν κατεκράτησαν. Οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ Ῥωμάνοι εἰς τὰ τῆς παραλίας κάστρα διεσώθησαν, καὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν κρατοῦσιν αὐτά, ἅτινά εἰσιν τάδε κάστρα,<sup>264</sup> τὸ Ῥαούσιν, τὸ Ἀσπάλαθον, τὸ Τετραγγούρην, τὰ Διάδωρα, ἡ Ἄρβη, ἡ Βέκλα, καὶ τὰ Ὀψαρα, ὧντινων καὶ οἰκίταρες μέχρι τοῦ νῦν Ῥωμᾶνοι καλοῦνται.<sup>265</sup>

*Now, this garrison rotated like that during many years, and the Slavs on the other side of the river, who are also called Avars, thought it over among themselves, and said: "These Romani, since that they have crossed over and found booty, from now on will not cease coming over against us, and so we will devise a plan against them." And so, therefore, the Slavs, or Avars, took counsel, and on one occasion when the Romani had crossed over, they laid ambushes and attacked and defeated them. And after collecting their arms and standards and the rest of their military insignia the aforesaid Slavs crossed the river and came to the frontier pass. The Romani who were there saw them and beheld the standards and accoutrements of their own men they thought they were their own men, and so, when the aforesaid Slavs reached the pass, they let them through. Once through, they instantly suppressed the Romani and took possession of the aforesaid city of Salona. And after they settled there they began very soon to plunder Romani who dwelt in the plains and on the heights, and took possession of their lands. The rest of the Romani escaped to the coastal cities and possess them until now. These cities are: Ragusa, Spalato, Tetrangourin, Diadora, Arbe, Vekla and Opsara, the inhabitants of who are called the Romani up till now.*

2.1c. Ὡς οὖν ὑπέστρεψαν οἱ Ἄβαραις ἐκ τοῦ ταξειδίου καὶ τὸ γενόμενον ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθον, ἔμαθον ἐταράχθησαν μὲν, ἠγνόουν δὲ, ὁπόθεν αὐτοῖς ἡ τοιαύτη πληγὴ προσεγένετο. Ἔδοξεν οὖν παραφυλάξαι αὐτοῖς τὸν καιρὸν καὶ μαθεῖν τὸ πᾶν ἐξ αὐτοῦ. Ἐπεὶ οὖν κατὰ τὸ σύνηθες αὐθις οἱ ταξεῶται ἀπεστάλησαν ἀπὸ

<sup>264</sup> According to *Codex Parisinus gr. 2009*, f. 68r. *DAI I*, c. 29.50: τὰ Δεκάτερα.

<sup>265</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.32 – 53.

Σαλῶνος, ἦσαν δὲ οὐκ ἐκεῖνοι, ἀλλ' ἕτεροι, ταῦτ' ἐκείνοις καὶ οὗτοι κατὰ βουλὰς ἔθεντο. Διεπέρασαν οὖν κατ' αὐτῶν, ἐντυχόντες δὲ αὐτοῖς συνηγμένοις ὁμοῦ, ὄυχ, ὡς τὸ πρότερον, ἐσκορπισμένοις, οὐ μόνον οὐδὲν οὐκ ἐποίησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ πάντων δεινότατα ἔπαθον. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἐσφάγησαν, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐχειρώθησαν ζῶντες, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐκείνων τῶν χειρῶν ἐξέφυγεν. Ἐξετάσαντες δὲ αὐτούς, τίνες τε καὶ ὅθεν εἰσίν, καὶ ἀναμαθόντες, ὅτι ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔπαθον τὴν εἰρημένην πληγὴν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς ποιότητος τοῦ τόπου αὐτῶν ἐρευνήσαντες, καὶ ὅσον ἐξ ἀκοῆς ἀρεσθέντες, ἐκράτησαν τοὺς ζῶντας δεσμίους, καὶ ἐνεδύσαντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν, καθὰ ἐκεῖνοι, καὶ δὴ τοὺς ἵππους ἀναβάντες [λαβόντες] ἐπὶ χειρᾶς τὰ τε φλάμμουλα καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ σημεῖα, ἃ ἐπεφέροντο μετ' αὐτῶν, ἀπῆραν πάντες φοσσατικῶς καὶ κατὰ τῆς Σαλῶνος ὄρμησαν. Ὡς οὖν καὶ τὸν καιρὸν ἔμαθον ζητήσαντες, καθ' ὃν ταξεῖται ἐκ τοῦ Δανουβίου ὑπέστρεφον (ἦν δὲ τὸ μέγα καὶ ἅγιον σάββατον), ἦλθον καὶ κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἡμέραν. Καὶ τὸ μὲν πλήθος, ὅτε δήπου πλησίον ἐγένοντο, τοῦ φοσσάτου ἀπεκρύβη, μέγρη δὲ τῶν ἀκ, οἵτινες τοὺς τε ἵππους καὶ τὰς στολὰς εἰς ἀπάτην ἐκέκτηντο τῶν Δαλματινῶν, ἐξήλασαν. Ἄναγνωρίσαντες δὲ οἱ τοῦ κάστρου τὰ τε σημεῖα καὶ τὴν ἀμφίαισιν αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν, ὡς ἔθους ὄντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν ἐν αὐτῇ, ἠνοιξαν τὰς πόρτας, καὶ ὑπεδέξαντο αὐτούς μετὰ περιχαρείας. Ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἅμα τῷ εἰσελθεῖν τὰς τε πόρτας ἐκράτησαν, καὶ δήλην διὰ σημείου τὴν πρᾶξιν τῷ φοσσάτῳ πεποιηκότες, συνεισδραμεῖν καὶ συνεισελθεῖν παρεσκεύασαν. Κατέσφαξαν οὖν πάντας τοὺς τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἔκτοτε κατεκράτησαν πᾶσαν τὴν χώραν Δελματίας, καὶ κατεσκήνωσαν ἐν αὐτῇ. Μόνα δὲ τὰ πρὸς θάλασσαν πολίχνια οὐ συνέδωκαν αὐτοῖς, ἀλλὰ κατεῖχοντο παρὰ τῶν Ῥωμαίων διὰ τὸ εἶναι τὸν πόρον τῆς ζωῆς αὐτῶν ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης. Ἰδόντες οὖν οἱ Ἄβαραις καλλίστην οὖσαν τὴν τοιαύτην γῆν, κατεσκήνωσαν ἐν αὐτῇ.<sup>267</sup>

<sup>266</sup> According to *Codex Parisinus gr. 2009*, fol. 83v. *DAI I*, c. 30.50: χιλίων.

<sup>267</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.30 – 61.

*Now when the Avars came back from their military expedition and learnt of what had happened and of the extent of their losses, they became confounded, since they did not know from which direction this blow had come upon them. They therefore decided to bide their time and in this way to discover the whole. And so, when according to custom the garrison was once more dispatched from Salona, (not the same men as before but others), they too decided to do what their predecessors had done. So they crossed over against them, and found them massed together, not scattered abroad as previously, not only did they achieve nothing but actually suffered the most frightful defeat. For some of them were slain, and the remainder taken alive, and not one escaped the hand (of the enemy). By examining them as to who they were and from where they came, and having learnt that it was from them that they had suffered the aforesaid disaster, and having moreover found out by enquiry the nature of their homeland and taken a fancy to it as far as they might from hearsay, they took the captive survivors and dressed themselves up in their clothes, just as the others had worn them, and then, mounting the horses and taking in their hands the standards and the rest of the insignia which the others had brought with them, they all started off for Salona. And since they had learnt by enquiry also the time at which the garrison had to return from the Danube, (which was the Great and Holy Saturday), they themselves arrived on that same day. When they got near, the bulk of the army was placed in concealment, but up to a thousand of them, who had acquired the horses and uniforms of the Dalmatians, rode out in front. And those in the city, having recognized their insignia and dress, and also the day, for upon this day it was customary for them to return, opened the gates and received them with great joy. As soon as they were inside, they seized the gates and, signaling their exploit to the army, started to prepare to rejoin them, and to enter the city together. And so they slaughtered all in the city and thereafter made themselves masters of all the country of Dalmatia and settled down in it. Only the small towns on the coast did not surrender to them, and continued to be in the hands of the Romaioi, because they obtained their livelihood from the sea. The Avars, then, seeing this land to be most fair, settled down in it.*

The beginning of chapter 29 opens with the characteristic *oti*, however assembled from several sources, it is based on an ancient Latin source from the very end of the 4<sup>th</sup> century, and it was merely taken as an introduction about the province of Dalmatia.<sup>268</sup> Constantine's switch to the next source is marked by the sentence: Ἡ δὲ καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν Ῥωμάνων διακράτησις ἦν μέχρι τοῦ Δανούβειως ποταμοῦ, (3.1) which sharply cut off the previous narrative about Diocletian, Salona, and the palace of Diocletian. It is more obvious from the following narrative in which we meet the Avars and the Slavs: οἱ καὶ ποτε θελήσαντες τὸν ποταμὸν διαπερᾶσαι καὶ καταμαθεῖν, τίνες κατοικοῦσιν ἐκεῖθεν τοῦ ποταμοῦ, διαπεράσαντες εὗρον ἔθνη Σκλαβήνικα ἄοπλα ὄντα, ἅτινα καὶ Ῥάβαροι ἐκαλοῦντο.<sup>269</sup> Constantine's transition from one to another source is obvious – in the opening sentences he had spoken about late 4<sup>th</sup> century Dalmatia, and from this point he began to speak about the period ca. 600. However, in section 2.1a, Constantine described the boundaries of Dalmatia in more detail, probably due to the fact that he made a more careful transcription from his source. He said (in 2.1a) that Dalmatia started from Dyrrachium, or Antivari, and stretched along the Dalmatian coast to Istria and in its width up to the Danube River,<sup>270</sup> while in section 3.1 he just stated that Dalmatia went up to the Danube River. Here it can be noticed that these inaccurate borders of Dalmatia (Antivari was in the province of Praevalis, not in Dalmatia) are actually accurate if one observes the ecclesiastical organization of the time, since Dyrrachium was the only metropolitan seat effectively controlled by Byzantium on the eastern Adriatic coast, as is recorded in the earliest *Notitiae* of the Constantinople's Church, and the author of Constantine's source had not counted Dyrrachium as a city inside the borders of Dalmatia, but did so for Antivari.<sup>271</sup> Furthermore, the source stated that all this territory was under the rule of the *Romani* (3.1), not the *Romaioi*, as is written in 2.1b. This source also stated that Dalmatia was the *most illustrious province in the West* (2.1b), a statement which Constantine

<sup>268</sup> See, Živković, *Unknown Source*, 129 – 143.

<sup>269</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.14 – 18.

<sup>270</sup> In *De them.* 93.1 – 3.

<sup>271</sup> See, *Notitiae episcopatum ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, ed. J. Darouzes, Paris 1981, 3.20; 3.300; 7.42; 7.643 (= *Notitiae*).

did not include in chapter 29 of the *DAI*. Such a kind of statement could not have originated in Constantinople, since the *theme* of Dalmatia was officially recorded at the very end of the list of the provinces (*themes*).<sup>272</sup> This means that Dalmatia had never been considered as the *most illustrious province in the West* (i.e. of Byzantium) in Constantinople.<sup>273</sup> However, for a Latin author, for instance, Dalmatia could be the most prominent province of the West, since in Roman times (from the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> century) it had belonged to the *praefectura Italia*.<sup>274</sup> In regard to ecclesiastical matters, Dalmatia was organized, from the early stages of Christianity, with a Metropoly see in Salona.<sup>275</sup> It was probably recorded

<sup>272</sup> N. Oikonomidès, *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IX<sup>e</sup> et X<sup>e</sup> siècles*, Paris 1972 (= Oikonomidès, *Listes*) 105.23 (899); 247.29 (934 – 944). Therefore, the conclusion of Eggers, *Situation*, 22 – 23, about the Dalmatia in chapter 29 of the *DAI* cannot stand.

<sup>273</sup> For a different opinion, see, B. Ferjančić, *Dalmacija u spisu De administrando imperio – vrela i putevi saznanja*, ZRVI 29/30 (1991) 17 (= Ferjančić, *Dalmacija*); Idem, *Struktura*, 71 – 72. R. Novaković, *Neka zapažanja o 29. i 30. glavi De administrando imperio*, IČ 19 (1972) 12 (= Novaković, *Zapažanja*), that this statement could have only been made by a person from Constantinople.

<sup>274</sup> The *diocese* of Illyricum was a part of the *praefectura Italia* according to the late Roman *Notitia dignitatum*, ed. O. Seeck, Frankfurt am Main 1962<sup>2</sup> (reprint of the 1876<sup>th</sup> edition), 108.5 – 8; 109.28 – 34 (= *Notitia dignitatum*), it consisted of six provinces: *Pannonia Secunda*, *Sauia*, *Dalmatia*, *Pannonia Prima*, *Noricum Mediterraneum*, *Noricum Ripensis*. The eastern *praefectura Illyricum* was at that time also divided in two *dioceses*, Macedonia and Dacia (Praevalis was a province of the *diocese* Dacia); cf. *Notitia dignitatum*, 9.4 – 10.19. According to a source which originated some 40 years after the *Notitia dignitatum* (in 449), *Illyricum (praefectura)* was united into one administrative unit which consisted of 19 provinces – i.e. those which previously belonged to the *dioceses* of Illyricum and Italy, and those which belonged to the *praefectura Illyricum*; cf. *Polemii Silvii Laterculvs anni CCCCXLIX*, MGH AA IX, *Chronicorum minorum saec. IV. V. VI. VII.*, vol. I, ed. Th. Mommsen, Berolini 1892, 539. However, Mommsen warned that Polemius Silvius used inaccurate material for Illyricum and the East, and that his list of provinces had been out of date. On the other hand, *Notitia dignitatum* was dated in ca. 408; cf. A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire 284 – 602: A Social Economic and Administrative Survey*, Norman (Oklahoma) 1964, 1451, notes 5 and 7. More recently, P. MacGeorge, *Late Roman Warlords*, Oxford 2001, 35 – 36, argued with good reason that Polemius' list could be accurate.

<sup>275</sup> See, for instance the letters of Pope Gregory I: *Gregorii Ep.* 168.11 – 169. 6 (592); 249.1 – 28 (593); 404.16 – 405.23 (596); also, *HSM*, 76 – 85. The 6<sup>th</sup> century Archbishopric of Iustiniana Prima comprised the provinces of both Dacias (*Ripensis et Mediterranea*), *Dardania*, *Moesia*, *Macedonia Secunda*, *Pannonia Secunda*, and *Praevalis*; cf. *Corpus iuris civilis, Novellae*, ed. R. Schoell, Berolini 1912, *Novellae*, CXXXI, 655; Živković, *Crkvena organizacija*, 36.

in Constantine's primary source that Dalmatia was a land of Italy, information which Constantine preserved in the *De thematibus*.<sup>276</sup> It appears that the author of Constantine's source on Dalmatia/Croats/Serbs had insisted on the fact that Dalmatia once belonged to Italy.<sup>277</sup>

The short sentence in 2.1b, which follows the inserted story about Diocletian: *This city was the head of all Dalmatia*, must have also been from Constantine's Latin source, as this sentence begins exactly with *Historia Salonitana maior: Fuit autem metropolis civitas Dalmatiae Salona...*<sup>278</sup> and is almost verbally the same as the Greek sentence from 2.1b: Ὑπῆρχε δὲ τὸ τοιοῦτον κάστρον κεφαλὴ πάσης τῆς Δελματίας. It must be noticed that in the *HSM* it is said that Salona was the *metropolitan of the province* in the sense of being the head of its ecclesiastical organization, and not in the sense of it being the provincial capital. Again, traces of a common source/tradition used by Constantine are encountered, as well as by being much prior to Thomas of Spalato regarding Dalmatia and Salona, ca. 600.

It has been noted above that the statement of how the Roman province of Dalmatia extended as far as the Danube is incorrect.<sup>279</sup> This can be explained by the argument that a writer in the Early Middle Ages was not to be expected to be so accurate on such an issue, and that such a writer could say that the Danube was the northern frontier of Dalmatia.<sup>280</sup> This question is much more important than it appears to be at first glance. It should therein be examined why someone had the interest to write that the Roman province of Dalmatia (or Byzantine Dalmatia according to N. Klaić)<sup>281</sup> extended so far to the north.

<sup>276</sup> *De them.* 94.35 – 36: Ἡ δὲ Δαλματία τῆς Ἰταλίας ἐστὶ χώρα.

<sup>277</sup> The common source for the *DAI* (*DAI*, c. 29. 3 – 7; 30.14 – 15) and *De thematibus* is perhaps hinted at in *De them.* 94.36 – 39, where it is said that Diocletian originated from Dalmatia: ἀπὸ τινος χωρίου καλουμένου Σαλῶναι.

<sup>278</sup> *HSM*, 71; *HS*, 8.1. See also a similar example in another section of the same work: ...in *Salonam direxit, quae caput erat Dalmatiae*; *HSM*, 73; *HS*, 12.25.

<sup>279</sup> Cf. Novaković, *Zapažanja*, 11; Ferjančić, *Struktura*, 77. Klaić, *Najnoviji*, 47 – 48, argued that the author of chapter 30 had in mind the Byzantine province of Dalmatia, not the Roman one. However, Klaić forgot that neither Roman nor Byzantine Dalmatia extended up to the Danube river.

<sup>280</sup> Ferjančić, *Struktura*, 71, n. 15.

<sup>281</sup> Klaić, *Najnoviji*, 47 – 48.

Therefore, before it is concluded that an Early Medieval writer was poorly informed on the exact borders of Roman Dalmatia, the whole passage and contents in which *Greater Dalmatia* appears in this source must be examined. However, the second part of the first sentence regarding the borders of Dalmatia also hides a peculiarity in that the Slavs were also called the Avars. If the Byzantine 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> century sources are carefully examined (Procopius, Menander the Guardsman, Pseudo-Maurice, Agathias, and Theophylactes Symocatta), it can be concluded that these Byzantine writers – some of them even personally having seen either Avars or Slavs – never made such a kind of mistake. The Avars are clearly described as being the Avars, the Slavs under the rule of the Avars are clearly distinguished from the Avars proper, and the free Slavs from the Lower Danube are clearly called the Slavs.<sup>282</sup> If Constantine Porphyrogenitus had used at least one of these sources to acquire a general picture about the Slavs and the Avars in the 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> century, then he would have never written that the Slavs were also called the Avars. This could also mean that his source on this question had not originated in Byzantium. On the other hand, since Constantine titled this chapter (29): *On Dalmatia and on the Adjacent Nations in It*, and since he knew that the Slavs had lived there in his time, he probably thought that if he inserted the Slavs into the beginning of the story, he would have then been able to easily explain how Dalmatia came under the rule of the Slavs.<sup>283</sup> In fact, his primary source in these opening stages of its narrative had spoken only about the Avars.

The following narrative in the section 3.1 contained the naive statement of Constantine's source that neither side – the *Romani* or the Avars – knew who dwelled beyond the river. The same idea reappears in section 2.1b, and therefore it must be assumed that it had been part of the Constantine's source. Such comprehension sounds as if it had

---

<sup>282</sup> Cf. Živković, *Forging Unity*, 31 – 44.

<sup>283</sup> It is exactly the same principle applied by the 13<sup>th</sup> century writer from Spalato, Thomas the Archdeacon in his *Historia Salonitana maior* and *Historia Salonitana minor*. Namely, Thomas had to explain how the Goths became in fact the Slavs; cf. *HSM*, 89: *Igitur dux Gothus, qui toti preerat Sclavoniae...*; and *HSM*, 93: *Iussio etiam ad duces Gothorum et Sclavorum*. Thomas knew about Totila and the Goths of the 6<sup>th</sup> century in Dalmatia, but he also knew that the Slavs, not the Goths, lived in Dalmatia in his own time. Therefore, he had to adjust the antiquarian material with the situation contemporary to him.

been picked up from some popular beliefs and stories – lore and legend. The style and form by which the following story about the *Fall of Salona* is narrated, makes this assumption even more probable. Therein, Constantine's source provides very interesting information about how the victory was achieved against the *unarmed Avars* (Slavs), *And from that time the Romani formed two alternating garrisons, serving from Easter to Easter, and used to change their men about so that on Great and Holy Saturday they who were coming back from the station and they who were going out to that service would meet one another.*<sup>284</sup> In section 2.1b, the establishment of this rotating garrison is placed **before** the Roman attack on the Avars, and the garrison was created due to the Avars' threat. The successful attack was again described as it took the place during a time when the Avars were on a military expedition, and this is why the *Romaioi* found only the women and children of the Avars. It is possible that this section preserved the version much closer to the one of Constantine's source.

There is a late Roman source, *Notitia dignitatum*, composed at the beginning of the 5<sup>th</sup> century, in which one can find information about Dalmatian horsemen stationed in Pannonia.<sup>285</sup> The exact date of the rotation of the troops, given by the Church calendar, Easter and Holy Saturday, reveals that the author of this source should have been a member of the Church. This author also knew that this rotation took place somewhere called Kleisa, which is four miles from Salona, and from there they would advance to the river (Danube). Constantine made two insertions into this section: the first one was again taken from his main source on Diocletian, about Salona and its size described as being half of Constantinople, and the other insertion was from the Archives of Imperial Palace, where he updated the information about Kleisa, which is still called by the name *mehri to nun*. The end of Constantine's insertion is marked with a short sentence where he used again his source on the *Fall of Salona*: *Καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐκεῖσε ἀπέρχοντο πρὸς τὸν ποταμόν.*<sup>286</sup> Constantine actually left his source on the *Fall of*

<sup>284</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.22 – 25.

<sup>285</sup> According to the *Notitia dignitatum*, 189, *equites Dalmatae* served under the dux of *Pannonia Secunda*, and they were from the following cities: *Teutiborgio, Nova, Albano, Cornaco, Bonoriae, Cusi, Ricti, Burgentas*.

<sup>286</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.31 – 32.

*Salona* at the point when he inserted that *Salona* was half as large as Constantinople and that *Kleisa* was still called by the same name to his day, and it is here that he had to attach this short sentence, which originally was placed behind ὀπερχομένου, <sup>287</sup> making a logical end of this part of the narrative.

The further narrative of section 3.2 states that this exchange of the garrisons took place for a number of years – or better to say, many years – and that the Slavs, *who are also called Avars*, reconsidered the situation, arguing that they had to devise a plan against the *Romani*. This indirect speech is very interesting, since it certainly did not come from Constantine's own mouth, but from his source. It was Constantine who made the same mistake as in the previous narrative, trying to establish ethnic ties between the Avars and the Slavs. In the further narrative, since it is said that the Avars took counsel and laid ambushes, and attacked and defeated them (sc. the *Romaioi*), it was possible for Constantine to insert the Slavs and to preserve a grammatically correct sentence. Now, it is clear that the author of Constantine's source did not confuse the Avars with the Slavs, since the whole sentence is grammatically correct – *they*, sc. the Avars, in plural, attacked and defeated the *Romaioi*. In any case, the situation where the Avars and Slavs could have attacked *Salona* was possible only after 582, and the final days of *Sirmium*, the strongest Byzantine fortress to the north of the Sava River. The Byzantine defense line in the north held up to the last years of Maurice's rule (582 – 602), when the Byzantines had pushed upon the Avars and the Slavs on the whole front from the lower, up to the middle Danube, and the Tisa River in modern Vojvodina and Western Romania. After the death of Maurice and the rule of Phocas, the situation was briefly aggravated, but only until 604, when Phocas bought peace with the Avars. The next occasion when the Avars were again involved in a war with Byzantium, which was at the beginning of Heraclius' rule ca. 613, when Byzantine *limes* yielded to the intruders and the major cities of *praefectura Illyrici* were captured, destroyed, and actually ceased to exist – *Viminacium*, *Sigidunum*, *Naissus*, *Scupi*, *Ulpiana*, *Iustiniana Prima*. Therefore, the events described in

---

<sup>287</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.25.

Constantine primary source on the *Fall of Salona*, could only be placed after the first reigning years of Heraclius.<sup>288</sup>

The further narrative in the section 3.2 on the *Fall of Salona* describes the trickery by which the attackers successfully captured Salona. Allegedly, they had ambushed the *Romaioi* and took their standards and uniforms. Disguised in such a manner, they came upon Kleisa where the guard let them through. Then, they instantly expelled the *Romaioi* and took possession of the aforesaid city of Salona. The final sentences of this section describes how the *Romaioi* escaped to the cities on the coast, and how the newcomers began to gradually make plundering raids and destroyed those *Romaioi* who dwelled in the plains and on the higher grounds, and took possession of their land. The end of this section is marked by a list of the cities in which those *Romaioi* escaped – Ragusa, Spalato, Tetrangurion, Diadora, Arbe, Vekla and Opsara. At two points Constantine made the remark that these cities were still held by the same *Romaioi* and that they had lived there until the time he wrote.

In section 2.1c, Constantine repeated the story on the *Fall of Salona*, but supplied it with some additional information. The description of the disastrous defeat is given in a fuller account, and the whole plan of the Avars is given in much more detail. It is learned that the Avars had divided the army and concealed its larger part, whilst only one detachment appeared in front of the city's gate. When they had entered Salona, they opened the city's gate and the rest of the army swarmed into the city. In this part of the narrative it is remarked that the date of the exchanging of the garrisons was on the Great and Holy Saturday, and, exactly from this part of the narrative, Constantine displaced it into his first draft in chapter 29. However, at the very end of the narrative, there are no names of the cities in which the *Romani* lived after the fall of Salona. It was only stated that they held some *oppida* along the coast.

The narrative on the *Fall of Salona* told in chapters 29 and 30 reveals some interesting facts in regard to Constantine's way of

---

<sup>288</sup> About the settlement of the Slavs to the south of the Sava and Danube Rivers, see, Živković, *Južni Sloveni*, 128 – 139; 189 – 213; Idem, *Forging Unity*, 17 – 29; Curta, *Making*, 36 – 73; P. M. Barford, *The Early Slavs: Culture and Society in Early Medieval Eastern Europe*, London 2001, 68 – 77 (= Barford, *Slavs*); Dzino, *Croat*, 92 – 117.

working. It is obvious that he was retelling this story in chapter 29 merely by his own words, even though he definitely used his own words in chapter 30, as well: note the Greek term *basilika* for Diocletian's palace;<sup>289</sup> also πόλις for Salona instead of usual κάστρον.<sup>290</sup> Yet, in chapter 30, he came back to his primary source with much more scrutiny. Therefore, the version on the fall of Salona preserved in the sections 2.1a, 2.1b, and 2.1c, was much closer to Constantine's source. In both versions there are Constantine's insertions, but the bulk of the original text is better preserved in chapter 30. Since, in this chapter, there is an immediate connection between the narrative on the *Fall of Salona* and the arrival of the Croats, it must be assumed that in Constantine's primary source the story had been told exactly in this manner. At the beginning of this source, there was a story about Dalmatia and its boundaries, as well as the mentioning of Salona as being the metropolitan see. It was thereafter stated how the *Romani* provoked the Avars, how they destroyed Salona, and why the citizens fled to the islands and the *oppida* along the Dalmatian coast.<sup>291</sup> This was a sort of introduction to the main story – but just about the Croats.

There is one particular trace which could be valid evidence that the story on the *Fall of Salona* had not originated from an informant from Spalato or Dalmatia in general.<sup>292</sup> The only direct speech is preserved in the part of the narrative where the Avars made counsel of what to do against the *Romani*. Another important clue can be found in the moralization of these events. Namely, the *Romani* were those who started the enmity against the Avars, and, what was even worse, they did not defeat them in open combat, but cowardly slain and captured unprotected women and children. Such a description cannot originate from the mind of a man from Spalato or Dalmatia. The *Romani* are

<sup>289</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.16.

<sup>290</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.57 (*poleos*) and *DAI I*, cc. 29.26, 45 – 46; 30.14, 18; 31.29 – 30 (*kastron*).

<sup>291</sup> This means that the cities which the *Romaioi* fled to after the fall of Salona were added by Constantine; he did so according to the lists of the cities of Dalmatia found in the Archives of the Imperial Palace.

<sup>292</sup> Spalato's origin of this story has already been pointed out by Bury, *Treatise*, 556; see, also, Grafenauer, *Prilog*, 29, 32; Ferjančić, *Dalmacija*, 13; R. Katičić, *Vetustiores ecclesiae spalatensis memoriae*, SHP 17 (1988) 19; Dzino, *Croat*, 111. This opinion is generally accepted in historiography.

those which are depicted as being morally wrong, and, due to their misdoings, the Avars came upon Salona and destroyed it. It must be assumed that this story had been told by someone who belonged to the Avars. This is why Thomas of Spalato did not know anything about this tradition. According to Thomas, only the Goths were connected to the destruction of Salona,<sup>293</sup> and he did not know anything about the Avars.<sup>294</sup> If such a tradition (that the Avars destroyed Salona) existed in Dalmatia ca. 878, then it is very strange that it vanished without any trace until the middle of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. If it was a story of Dalmatian origin, then it would be expected to at least have a tiny trace in some sources of its Dalmatian origin from later centuries.<sup>295</sup> However, since the story about the Avars and Salona does not reappear in Dalmatian sources, there is an additional sign that the whole story most probably had not originated in Spalato or Dalmatia. It was the Avar tradition, not the Dalmatian one. Even more interesting is the fact that Thomas of Spalato speaks about the Goths and their role in the destruction of Salona and this tradition is related to the year ca. 535.<sup>296</sup> In other words, the local tradition of Spalato had kept the Goths in the story of the Fall of Salona up to 13<sup>th</sup> century, and, in turn, had completely forgotten about the Avars and their destruction of Salona in ca. 630. This means that the older layer of the legend about the final days of Salona (that

<sup>293</sup> *HSM*, 88 – 89; *HS*, 32.5 – 36.9. The contemporary to Thomas of Spalato, Thomas Tusci (sometimes called Thomas of Pavia), also repeated that Totila and his Goths destroyed Salona; cf. *Thomae Tusci Gesta imperatorum et pontificum*, ed. E. Ehrenfeuchter, MGH SS XXII, ed. G. H. Pertz, Hannoverae 1851, 491.18 – 19. The author of *Gesta regum Sclavorum* (c. 1296 – 1300) retold the story found in the works of Thomas of Spalato – *Historia Salonitana maior* and *Historia Salonitana minor*; cf. *GRS II*, 81 – 86.

<sup>294</sup> Cf. Klaić, *Najnoviji*, 50.

<sup>295</sup> For instance, in the works either preserved or lost (but used by the later authors): Thomas of Spalato, Michael Salonitano, Baltazaar of Spalato, Miha Madii, Mauro Orbini.

<sup>296</sup> The Armenian redactor of Pappus of Alexandria made an interesting gloss about Slavs, Goths, Dacia, and Thrace: *where [sc. Dacia] dwell the Slavs [who form] twenty-five tribes, and which fell into the control of the Goths who came from the island of Scandia, which is called Emios by the Germans. But the Slavs crossed the River Tanais and conquered the other regions of Thrace and Macedonia and entered Achaia and Dalmatia. The armies of Thrace were composed of Tantalidas, Sardians, Sicilidians, etc.* Cf. Hewsens, *Pappus*, 192, 194. There is no parallel to this passage in either Latin or Byzantine sources. This gloss appeared to be drawn from a Byzantine narrative source of unknown (military?) origin; note the composition of the troops.

related to the Goths) had been suppressed by the tenth century with a newer layer containing the Avars, and then, somehow mysteriously, the older layer resurfaced, but not until the middle of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, pushing the Avars into oblivion, this time conclusively. Such a development of any legend is impossible without profound social, political and demographic changes.

Another detail is very important – the information about the rotating garrison dispatched from Salona regularly each year, – and it is very interesting to note that the soldiers mobilized in those units were from many Dalmatian towns, having only gathered in Salona for the purpose of their annual duty. It is hard to believe that an Avar could have told this with such accuracy, especially if the evidence of the information about the Holy and Great Saturday, as the exact date for when garrisons alternated, is added. This kind of information should be known to a person from Dalmatia, i.e. Spalato, but, it is still hard to believe that the same story about the *Fall of Salona* was collected in two separate places – Pannonia and Spalato. The only possible answer is that the Avar informant knew all these things because their story preserved all these elements. It is said that the Avars **questioned** the captives and **learnt** everything important for their mission from them. The *Romaioi* told them the day when they had to come back to Salona, and, during the same interrogation, the Avars could have found out that those men had not only been from Salona, but also from some other Dalmatian towns too. The insertion in the main narrative, that the Avars appear in front of Salona on the exact date, is placed in the right place in 2.1c, and presents evidence that Constantine's primary source had run exactly in such a manner. It was Constantine who displaced this information in 3.1, due to the truncation and retelling of his source.

For the historical background of this story, any argument to support it can hardly be found. Recent studies, based on the findings of Heraclius' *folis* minted between 631 and 639, suggest that Salona was abandoned after this period.<sup>297</sup> Even more importantly, archaeological evidence has not provided any proof so far that Salona was destroyed.<sup>298</sup>

---

<sup>297</sup> See, I. Marović, *O godini razorenja Salone*, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku* 99 (2006) 253 – 273.

<sup>298</sup> Cf. Klaić, *Najnoviji*, 49, n. 115; F. Curta, *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Ages 500 - 1250*, Cambridge 2006, 101; Dzino, *Croat*, 155 – 156, n. 1. It is also interesting

Since the Avars, after they had suffered a heavy defeat under the walls of Constantinople in 626, warred against the Slavs only a few years before the Croats appeared in Dalmatia (allegedly as *foederati* of Byzantium), the whole story about the trickery of how the Avars captured Salona is only able to have historical background in a narrowed period of the early 630s. The whole story on the *Fall of Salona* leads one to the conclusion that the Avars at that time had been actually involved in a war against an unknown enemy, and their swift attack on Salona was merely a ride or punitive expedition rather than a well prepared long-lasting military action. This situation is only possible if it happened during the Pannonian Slavs uprising, which occurred after 626, – described briefly by George Pisidas (ca. 630) <sup>299</sup> and happened just before the Croats settled in Dalmatia (ca. 632 – 634). If this event was told two centuries after it had occurred to an unknown informant of the author of Constantine's primary source on the Croats, by an Avar or person who lived near the Avars in Pannonia (with its many details), it could be then that the story had more than a grain of truth.

The successful destruction of the most important military center of Byzantium in Dalmatia (and Salona is observed in Constantine's story primarily as being an important military center), could have been counted as a great military achievement of the Avars, and therefore have been remembered, retold many times, and enriched with many new details of a legendary nature over the course of two centuries. It could also just be a sort of heroic song about a handful of warriors who were able to outsmart and to defeat a much more powerful enemy. Additionally, if it were a genuine story, then it had been the last great success of the Avars against Byzantium, which may be the strong reason it had been preserved in Pannonian tradition (in songs or tales).<sup>300</sup>

---

that, H. M. Evans, *The Early Medieval Archaeology of Croatia A.D. 600 – 900*, Oxford 1989, 156 – 158 (Evans, *Archaeology*), made strong conclusion that there is complete absence of the archaeological evidence pointing out that anyone settled in Dalmatia between c. 650 and c. 800.

<sup>299</sup> *Georgii Pisidae Restitutio crucis*, ed. L. Sternbach, Wiener Studien 13 (1891) v. 78 – 81; *FB I*, 158.

<sup>300</sup> Priscus, the Byzantine diplomate who visited Attila's court in 448, left an interesting description about the singers who sang the songs in front of Attila celebrating his victories and deeds of valour in war. Moreover, Priscus described those (sc. Huns) who listened these songs: *some were pleased with the verses, others reminded of wars were*

For our analysis of Constantine's primary source, it does not matter whether the Avars truly had captured Salona in the manner described in the story of the *Fall of Salona*, or it was completely fictitious.<sup>301</sup> The main point is that in its basic structure this story put the Avars into their plan first, and stressed their righteous revenge.

2.2. Οἱ δὲ Χρωβάτοι κατόκουν τηνικαῦτα ἐκεῖθεν Βαγιβαρείας, ἔνθα εἰσὶν ἀρτίως οἱ Βελοχρωβάτοι.<sup>302</sup>

*The Croats at that time were dwelling beyond Bavaria, where the Belocroats are now.*

The obvious connections between this sentence with the previous account about the *Fall of Salona* derives from the words κατόκουν τηνικαῦτα, *dwelling at that time*, since *that time* must be related to the events described as the *Fall of Salona*. This is an additional sign that Constantine's primary source on the Croats had also contained the story about the *Fall of Salona*.

It is obvious that an observer who says that the White Croats lived beyond Bavaria cannot be based in Constantinople, not even in Dalmatia, since the region of the White Croats, which was allegedly *beyond Bavaria*, in both cases would have been much more towards the northwest and far away from Bohemia or southern Poland, where it must be expected the White Serbs and the White Croats lived. If the observer was based in Constantinople, he would have probably noticed that the White Croats lived beyond the Turks (Magyars) as is stated in chapter 31.<sup>303</sup> Therefore, how was it then possible that the same writer

---

*exicited in their souls, while yet others, whose bodies were feeble with age and their spirits compelled to rest, shed tears; cf. R. C. Blockley, The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire, Vol. II, Liverpool 1983, Priscus, Frg. 13.1, p. 286. About the epic tradition of Turkic people, see, K. Reichl, Singing the Past: Turkic and Medieval Heroic Poetry, New York 2000, 13 – 20.*

<sup>301</sup> For the general conclusion about the relations between a historical event and an epic poem, see, W. P. Ker, *Epic and Romance: Essays on Medieval Literature*, London 1908, 24: *The epic poem is cut loose and set free from history, and goes on a way of its own.*

<sup>302</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.61 – 63.

<sup>303</sup> *DAI I*, c. 31.3 – 6.

in two chapters of the same work thought differently about the geographical position of the White Croats? The only possible answer is that the information from chapter 30 came from one source and that the other information (see 1.1 above,) was the author's understanding based on his own knowledge of the geography in their own time. Therefore, this would be Constantine's updating as the result of the inquiry he had made about this issue.

The situation where the White Croats were beyond Bavaria matches perfectly if the observer had been in Venice, or in the north-eastern Italy.<sup>304</sup> The absence of the Turks, in chapter 30, points to the fact that this source, upon which Constantine based his story about the White Croats, had been composed before 896, i. e. the year when the Magyars arrived in Pannonia. If this section is displaced from Constantine's primary source on the Croats, then the White Croats were mentioned there too. If this is the case, then the last part of this sentence: ἔνθα εἰσὶν ἀρτίως οἱ Βελοχρωβάτοι, written in the *Present tense*, relates to the time of the composition of Constantine's source, and not to Constantine's own time. This is corroborated furthermore by the term ἄσπρων ἐπονομαζομένων in chapter 31 (see above 1.1), which is the Greek translation of the Slavic Βελοχρωβάτοι. In this section (2.2) there is none of the Greek translation, which suddenly reappears again in the section 2.5: λέγονται ἀρτίως Βελοχρωβάτοι, ἤγουν ἄσπροι Χρωβάτοι. Therefore, perfect insight in Constantine's primary source on the Croats can be found here: Οἱ δὲ Χρωβάτοι κατόικουν τῆνικαῦτα ἐκεῖθεν Βαγιβαρείας, ἔνθα εἰσὶν ἀρτίως οἱ Βελοχρωβάτοι, ἤγουν ἄσπροι Χρωβάτοι.

The orthography for Bavaria – Βαγιβαρείας – reveals its Latin source in the form of *Bagoaria* (less probably: *Baioaria*).<sup>305</sup> B. Grafenauer has already underlined the importance of this, even without

<sup>304</sup> Similarly, Hauptmann, *Dolazak*, 32; Grafenauer, *Prilog*, 37. It is interesting that this simple fact of 'beyond Bavaria' has been overlooked by some scholars. Consequently, it has led them to a different understanding of the whole section – i.e. who could write it and when; see, Klaić, *Najnoviji*, 51; *DAI II*, 116.

<sup>305</sup> *Baioaria*: *ARF*, 6, 8, 14, 80, 82, 108, 146, etc. *Annales Augienses*, ed. G. H. Pertz, MGH SS I, Hannoverae 1826, 67; *Ann. Bert.* 61, 75, 78, 84, 85; *Reginonis Chronicon*, ed. G. H. Pertz, MGH SS I, Hannoverae 1826, 591.13, 591.136. *Annales Fuldenses*, ed. F. Kurze, MGH SRG in usum scholarum, Hannoverae 1891, 29, 31, 32, 42, 65, 69, 72 – 75; etc (= *Ann. Fuld.*). The form *Bagoaria*, *De conversione*, 4.30, 7.1, 7.17, 9.23, 11.12; *Annales Laureshamenses, Alamannici, Guelfertbytani et Nazariani*, ed.

any further conclusion.<sup>306</sup> It is important to notice that the form Βαϊούρη, which corresponds to the Latin form *Baioaria*, was used in Byzantine diplomatic documents.<sup>307</sup> The existence of the Croats (White Croats) beyond the Magyars, i.e. in southern Poland, is confirmed by the writing of the English King Alfred the Great, who mentioned the Croats as the neighbors of the Serbs. According to King Alfred, the Croats (*Horoti*) had lived (around 889 – 893) to the north-east of the Moravians, and to the east of Daleminci, while the Serbs lived to the north of Daleminci.<sup>308</sup> This information, therefore, is contemporary to Constantine's source on the White Croats. The Arab writer Masoudi (10<sup>th</sup> century) had a similar description on the position of the Croats in that land (modern southern Poland).<sup>309</sup> The Russian Primary Chronicle mentioned the (White) Croats as the participants in Duke Oleg's expedition against Constantinople in 907.<sup>310</sup>

2.3. Μία δὲ γενεὰ διαχωρισθεῖσα ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἤγουν ἀδελφοὶ πέντε, ὃ τε Κλουκᾶς, καὶ ὁ Λόβελος καὶ ὁ Κοσέντζης καὶ ὁ Μουχλῶ καὶ ὁ Χρωβάτος καὶ ἀδελφαὶ δύο, ἡ Τουγά καὶ ἡ Βουγά, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτῶν ἦλθον εἰς Δελματίαν, καὶ εὔρον τοὺς Ἄβαρεις κατέχοντας τὴν τοιαύτην γῆν. Ἐπί τινας οὖν χρόνους πολεμοῦντες ἀλλήλους, ὑπερίσχυσαν οἱ Χρωβάτοι, καὶ τοὺς μὲν τῶν Ἀβάρων κατέσφαξαν, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς ὑποταγῆναι κατηνάγκασαν.<sup>311</sup>

G. H. Pertz, MGH SS I, Hannoverae 1826, 33 – 34 (*Bagoarii, Bagoariae*); 54 (*Bauguaoriis, Baugauriorum*).

<sup>306</sup> Grafenauer, *Prilog* 21.

<sup>307</sup> *Constantini Porphyrogeniti imperatoris De cerimoniis aulae Byzantine libri duo*, ed. I. Reiske, Bonnae 1829, II, c. 48, p. 689.5 (= *De cerim.*): εἰς τὸν ἤγα Βαϊούρη.

<sup>308</sup> *King Alfred's Anglo-Saxon Version of The Compendious History of the World by Orosius*, ed. J. Bosworth, London 1858, 37. For the position of the Serbs and Croats in Alfred's Geography, see, E. D. Laborde, *King Alfred's System of Geographical Description in His Version of Orosius*, *The Geographical Journal* 62 (1923) 134 – 135; K. Malone, *King Alfred's North: A Study in Mediaeval Geography*, *Speculum* 5 (1930) 153.

<sup>309</sup> *Al - Mas'ūdī, Muruj adh-dhahab*, V/2, Beirut 2005, 27 – 28.

<sup>310</sup> *Povest vremennyh let*, Sanktpeterburg 1910, 29.1-9 (= *Povest*). They are previously mentioned as the 'White Croats'; *Povest*, 5.10. There is also a brief information about the Croats in 992 when Duke Vladimer of Kiev warred against them; cf. *Povest*, 119.17 – 18. However, Dzino, *Croat*, 113, n. 86 considered these Croats as two different entities, i.e. 'eastern' and 'white' Croats.

<sup>311</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.63 – 67.

*From them split off a family, namely of five brothers, Kloukas and Lobelos and Kosentzis and Mouchlo and Chrobotos, and two sisters, Touga and Bouga, who came with their folk to Dalmatia and found this land under the rule of the Avars. After they had fought one another for some years, the Croats prevailed and killed some of the Avars and the remainder they compelled to be subject to them.*

This section appears as if it had been only verbally transcribed from Constantine's source. The reader should not be surprised here at this point by the appearance of the Avars – as the source had already spoken about them as being the inhabitants of Dalmatia. There are no *fine-seams* which could eventually show that Constantine retold this section. Additionally, the whole last sentence of this section, which is literally a translation from the *DCBC* gives more credit to our interpretation of this section as having been copied verbatim from Constantine's primary source on the Croats. Note the description of the Avar-Croat war: ...καὶ εἶρον τοὺς Ἄβαρεις κατέχοντας τὴν τοιαύτην γῆν. Ἐπὶ τινὰς οὖν χρόνους πολεμοῦντες ἀλλήλους, ὑπερίσχυσαν οἱ Χρωβάτοι..., versus the *DCBC*: *et illam possederunt regionem, quosque Franci ac Bagoarii cum Quarantanis continuis affligendo bellis eos superaverunt*. It appears that πολεμοῦντες ἀλλήλους, ὑπερίσχυσαν is literally a translation from the Latin *continuis affligendo bellis eos superaverunt*. Even the verb ὑπερίσχυσαν is the same as in the *DCBC* – *superaverunt*, not to mention being the same perfective aspect.

The origin of the names of the ancestors of the Dalmatian Croats is a matter of dispute among scholars. It is only certain that these names are not of Slavic origin.<sup>312</sup> It is important to note that the 9<sup>th</sup> century Croats, who were Slavs at that time, would hardly have been able to invent the non-Slavic names of their ancestors.<sup>313</sup> The only

<sup>312</sup> For the etymology, see *DAI II*, 116 – 117.

<sup>313</sup> Dzino, *Croat*, 113 – 114, argued that the *origo gentis* of the Croats, if it was part of Croat tradition, is a politically and ideologically motivated myth. Whether it was a myth or not it does not matter for the analysis of Porphyrogenitus's source about the Croats. The non-Slavic names of the ancestors of the Croats reflect actually antiquity

explanation must be that these names are genuine and that they were preserved in the tradition of the Croats. If this were the case, then someone had visited Croats of Dalmatia and made an inquiry into their origin. This story is in fact the earliest version of the *origo gentis* of the Croats, told by the Croats themselves.<sup>314</sup>

This section probably belonged to the same source Constantine had used in chapter 31 of the *DAI* (see 1.3 above). The obvious connection between the *DCBC* and the last sentence of this section is strong evidence in favor of this conclusion. Since traces of the source based on the *DCBC* is to be found in both chapters of the *DAI* (30 and 31) then it must be concluded that both chapters were based on the same source and written by the same author – Constantine Porphyrogenitus. From this point of view, the intriguing question arises: Which section is closer to Constantine's source? The name of Emperor Heraclius appears in chapter 31, but not in chapter 30. On the other hand, the name of Heraclius appears so often in the *DAI* in connection with the Serbs and other Slav principalities that it must be assumed that his name was recorded in one of Constantine's sources on the Slavs. Consequently, this means that it was Constantine who removed the name of Heraclius in chapter 30. If we bear in mind that chapter 30 was written after 951 or 952, then this new approach of the author to the question of the Croat settlement in Dalmatia can be easily explained. Namely, at that time *Vita Basilii* was composed and, in this panegyric to Basil I, he was credited as being the emperor who

---

of that myth itself. Pohl, *Awaren*, 266, considers these names as the *asiatische Einflüsse*. It is worth to mention that the Iranian names, for instance, were frequent among the Germans and Huns, as well; cf. O. J. Maenchen-Helfen, *Germanic and Hunnic Names of Iranian Origin*, *Oriens* 10 (1957) 280 – 283.

<sup>314</sup> For instance, *origo gentis* of the Longobards or Goths have no parallels with the *origo gentis* of the Croats; cf. *Paul. Hist.* 2.14 – 19 (mother, Gambara, and two sons, Ybor and Agio, who ruled over Longobards in their ancient homeland, the island of *Scadanan*); *De origine actibusque Getarum*, ed. Th. Mommsen, MGH AA V/1, *Iordanis Romana et Getica*, Berolini 1882, 60.7 – 13, where the Gothic kings are mentioned in linear succession, i.e. Berig, Filimer, or from the hero Gapt until the time of Vitiges (*Getica*, 76.17 – 77.11). See, also, P. Heather, *Cassiodorus and the Rise of the Amals: Genealogy and the Goths under Hun Domination*, *The Journal of Roman Studies* 79 (1989) 103 – 128. On the other hand, the Bulgars had a story about Kobratos who had five sons; cf. *Nikeph.* c. 36.6 – 8.

established Byzantine rule over the Dalmatian Slavs.<sup>315</sup> What was even more important however is that he was marked as the emperor who brought these Slavs back into Christendom.<sup>316</sup> Heraclius, who ruled 300 years before Constantine, was unimportant from the point of view of glorifying the Macedonian dynasty, and Constantine removed him from chapter 30. Constantine had several reliable documents related to Dalmatia from the time of Basil I: the list of the cities which had paid tribute to the Slavs, and an official report about the Croat/Serb envoy to Constantinople from ca. 870. He also had at his disposal the letter from Ragusa by which the Ragusans invited Michael III to help them against the Arabs, as well as Basil I's *keleusis* sent to the Dalmatian Slavs in regard to military actions against the Arabs of Bari. In other words, Constantine had first ranking testimonies from the Archives of the Imperial Palace about Dalmatian matters related to Basil I. The only source which had insisted upon Heraclius as being the emperor who invited the Croats and the Serbs to Dalmatia was Constantine's primary source on the Croats and the Serbs. Therefore, in the final version of the story about Dalmatia (chapter 30), the name of Heraclius was removed from the Croat original story about their settlement in Dalmatia due to the needs of glorifying the Macedonian dynasty.<sup>317</sup>

2.4. Ἐκτοτε οὖν κατεκρατήθη ἡ τοιαύτη χώρα παρὰ τῶν Χρωβάτων, καὶ εἰσὶν ἀκμὴν ἐν Χρωβατία ἐκ Ἰτουσσε τῶν Ἀβάρων, καὶ γινώσκονται Ἄβαρεις ὄντες.<sup>318</sup>

<sup>315</sup> Secular biography and secular panegyric appeared in Byzantium for the first time in connection with Basil I, i.e. in *Vita Basilli*; cf. P. J. Alexander, *Secular Biography at Byzantium*, *Speculum* 15 (1940) 194.

<sup>316</sup> *Theoph. Cont.* 291.1 – 292.13.

<sup>317</sup> *DAI II*, 4, argued that it does not seem probable that the book, such as the *DAI*, would emphasize the virtual abandonment of the coastal cities of Dalmatia to Slav overlordship by the author's grandfather (*DAI I*, c. 30.126 – 129). *Au contraire*, this information confirms that the *DAI* is the true mirror of the *Realpolitik*, and Basil I ('glorious emperor') was 'saved' as the great ruler by previous mentioning that he settled the dispute between the coastal cities of Dalmatia and the Slavs, and forced these cities to pay a sum of money (as a token of submission) to the *strategos*; cf. *DAI I*, c. 30.126 – 132. Pohl, *Awaren*, 268, explained very accurately the main character of the *DAI*: *De administrando imperio is eben keine bloß aus der Liebe zur Gelehrsamkeit entstandene Chronik, sondern hat vor allem eine praktisch-politische Dimension.*

<sup>318</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.69 – 71.

*And so from that time this land was possessed by the Croats, there are still descendants of the Avars in Croatia, and are recognized as Avars.*

This conclusion, marked with *oun*, naturally follows section 2.3, and it appears to have been from the same source. The content of this section, an ethnological observation as it has already been noticed in historiography, cannot be drawn from the Croat tradition.<sup>319</sup> What is more important is that, this kind of information cannot be from the time of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, ca. 950, since all other sources from the 10<sup>th</sup> century, which are chiefly Western, did not know anything about the Avars in Pannonia at that time. It would be odd that someone, for instance a Byzantine official based in Dalmatia (Iadera), who had the task to gather information about the Croats in the middle of the 10<sup>th</sup> century, would have made such an observation. It would mean that this official, supposedly sent on this task by Constantine himself, would have traveled, not only along the Dalmatian coast, which probably would not be a problem, but to the interior, as well. Other information about the interior of Dalmatia in the *DAI* is usually sporadic and with less accuracy, which would mean that the bulk of its information had been gathered in the coastal areas of Dalmatia.<sup>320</sup> On the other hand, the information is given with such confidence that the first conclusion of a modern historian should be that it was written by the one who personally saw the Croats and the Avars still living side by side in Pannonia. This situation never occurred in Dalmatia proper, as the Avars never lived there.<sup>321</sup> This information should have been then from

---

<sup>319</sup> Ferjančić, *Struktura*, 73.

<sup>320</sup> Cf. Ferjančić, *Struktura*, 76.

<sup>321</sup> Živković, *Južni Sloveni*, 394, n. 866. See also, M. Petrinec, *Groblja od 8. do 11. stoljeća na području ranosrednjovjekovne hrvatske države*, Split 2009, passim. For the settlements of the Avars in Pannonia, see, T. Vida, *Conflict and Coexistence: The Local Population of the Carpathian Basin Under Avar Rule (Sixth to Seventh Century)*, *The Other Europe in the Middle Ages, Avars, Bulgars, Khazars and Cumans*, II, ed. F. Curta – R. Kovalev, Leiden 2008, 13 – 46; P. Stadler, *Avar Chronology Revisited, and the Question of Ethnicity in Avar Qaganate*, *The Other Europe in the Middle Ages, Avars, Bulgars, Khazars and Cumans*, II, ed. F. Curta – R. Kovalev, Leiden 2008, 47 – 82.

the same source used by Constantine in which he found information about the Pannonian principedom of the Croats (see 2.7 below).

If it is assumed that this information comes from the same source as it does for the two previous sections (2.2 and 2.3) then it seems that this source belongs to the 9<sup>th</sup> century. The Anonymous Bavarian priest from the archbishopric of Salzburg,<sup>322</sup> who composed the *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum* around 871, provides a very important clue: *Franci ac Bagoarii cum Quarantanis continuis affligendo bellis eos (sc. Hunos) superaverunt. Eos autem qui obediebant fidei et baptismum sunt consecuti, tributarios fecerunt regum, et terram quam possident residui, adhuc pro tributo retinent regis **usque in hodiernum diem**.*<sup>323</sup> For this Anonymous Bavarian priest, the **Avars were still dwelling** in his own time (ca. 871) in their land as they had been before (ca. 800). This is important information, which goes alongside Constantine's statement that the Croats and the Avars were dwelling in the same region, i. e. Pannonia. This means that Constantine's source was almost certainly contemporary to the author of the *DCBC*, or at least did not originate much afterwards.<sup>324</sup>

2.5. Οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ Χρωβάτοι ἔμειναν πρὸς Φραγγίαν, καὶ λέγονται ἀρτίως Βελοχρωβάτοι, ἤγουν ἄσπροι Χρωβάτοι, ἔχοντες ἴδιον ἄρχοντα? ὑπόκεινται δὲ Ὡτω, τῷ μεγάλῳ ἠγὶ Φραγγίας, τῆς καὶ Σαξίας, καὶ ἀβάπτιστοι τυγχάνουσιν, συμπενθερίας μετὰ τοὺς Τούρκους καὶ ἀγάπας ἔχοντες.<sup>325</sup>

<sup>322</sup> For the authorship of the *DCBC*, see, Kos, *Gradivo*, 14; Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 193 – 197.

<sup>323</sup> *De conversione*, 6.19 – 7.4.

<sup>324</sup> In the famous *Souda lexicon* there is an interesting description of the Avars who once upon a time ruled over the Bulgarians, but consequently, due to the overall corruption of their society, lost power; cf. *Souda* 233 – 234. The explanation of the Avars' disaster is given as the personal account of an Avar, who replied in detail about what happened to them (sc. the Avars). It is also an *oti*-section, taken verbatim from *Souda*'s source. This testimony is evidence that even a small group of Avars living in Bulgaria (or under the rule of Bulgarians in Pannonia) was self-conscious about their origin, even in the middle of the 10<sup>th</sup> century (a century and half after the Bulgarian *khan* Krum defeated them); cf. *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A. P. Kazhdan, I – III, Oxford 1991, I, 237.

<sup>325</sup> *DAI* I, c. 30.71 – 75.

*The rest of the Croats stayed over near Francia, and are now called the Belocroats, that is, the White Croats, and have their own archon; they are subject to Otto, the great king of Francia, which is also Saxony, and are unbaptized, and intermarry and are friendly with the Turks.*

The composition of this section, which covers several issues, appears to be the consequence of Constantine's retelling from at least two documents. Note the 'piling up of information' (coordinate structure, or asyndeton): ... καὶ λέγονται, ... ἔχοντες, ... ὑπόκεινται, ... καὶ ἀβάπτιστοι τυγχάνουσιν, ... συμπενθερίας. This impression is further strengthened by the fact that different pieces of data belong to different timelines, from the 7<sup>th</sup> to the middle of the 10<sup>th</sup> centuries. The author's comprehension of the White Croats reveals that he retold his original source about the Croats. Namely, in section 1.1 Constantine said that the Croats who live in Dalmatia are the descendants from the unbaptized Croats, also called 'White' -, while in section 2.5, he says that part of the Croats (non-White Croats) stayed over against Francia and that now they are called White Croats. While in section 1.1, he copied from his original source that the Croats are descendants from the White Croats, in section 2.5 it was retold in reverse that the Croats who stayed in their ancient homeland are **now** called the White Croats. This example is additional evidence (albeit circumstantial) that the White Croats were part of Constantine's primary source on the Croats.<sup>326</sup>

<sup>326</sup> It is strongly suggested by Grafenauer, *Prilog*, 38, that the White Croatia was not a construct of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, but rather it had been taken from the Croat tradition. In fact, as argued above, the Croat *tradition*, which preserved the name of the White Croatia, had been written down in Constantine's primary source on the Croats. However, Klaić, *O problemima*, 254, 258, strongly rejected that the Croats of Dalmatia could have had some memories of their ancient homeland in the southern Poland – i.e. White Croatia. Klaić argued that the Croats came into Dalmatia from Carantania; cf. Klaić, *O problemima*, 261 – 262; Štih, *Karantanija*, passim. It was A. Pavić, *Cara Konstantina VII Porfirogenita De administrando imperio glave* 29 – 36, Zagreb 1906, 15 – 16, who proposed that the Croats came from Carantania in the time of emperor Heraclius. The view of Nada Klaić about the 'mythical character' of White Croatia in the *origo gentis* of the Croats, was recently supported by, Barford, *Slavs*, 74 – 75, 98 – 99; Evans, *Archaeology*, 76 – 77; and Dzino, *Croat*, 113 – 114. About the Croats, as the social category formed inside the Avar qaganate, see, N. Budak, *Die südslawischen Ethnogenesen an der östlichen Adriaküste im*

Further evidence that this section was actually assembled from several sources and Constantine's deductions, can be found in his statement that the rest of the Croats (i.e. White Croats) lived next to Francia at that time. The 7<sup>th</sup> century White Croatia, if it had existed at that time, could not have been neighbor to Francia – since the Frankish borders had been far more towards the west.<sup>327</sup> If White Croatia had become the neighbor of Francia, it would have not been before the year 846, and submission to the Moravian (and Bohemian) ruler, who presumably ruled over the White Croats, to Eastern Francia.<sup>328</sup> The most certain date of Bohemia's submission to East Francia is 869, when, according to *Annales Fuldensis*, the Bohemians were pacified.<sup>329</sup> Otto I ruled the Moravians only from 950, and the White Croats were also part of the Moravian state, at least from 929.<sup>330</sup> Therefore, the mentioning of the Franks as the masters of the White Croats could not have originated before the early 950s, and this information must have been contemporary to Constantine.<sup>331</sup> On the other hand, the White Croats could have been the neighbors of the Franks as early as 846 or 869, respectively, when Bohemia was firmly under the control of Eastern Francia.<sup>332</sup>

The mentioning of the non-baptized White Croats is another clue, which places Constantine's primary (Latin) source before the end

---

*frühen Mittelalter*, Typen der Ethnogenese unter besonderen Berücksichtigung der Bayern, Vol. I, Wien 1990, 129 – 136. Similar, Pohl, *Awaren*, 261 – 267.

<sup>327</sup> Around the year 741, the Frankish kingdom included Thuringia and Alemannia to the east; cf. R. McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms Under the Carolingians, 751 – 987*, London – New York 1993, 19 (= McKitterick, *Frankish Kingdoms*). See, also, Klaić, *O problemima*, 255.

<sup>328</sup> *Ann. Fuld.* 36.

<sup>329</sup> *Ann. Fuld.* 67 – 68.

<sup>330</sup> See, Bury, *Treatise*, 556 – 561, 574; Grafenauer, *Prilog*, 28; G. Vernadsky, *Great Moravia and White Chorvatia*, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 66/4 (1945) 257 (= Vernadsky, *Moravia*); Živković, *Južni Sloveni*, 194.

<sup>331</sup> For the meaning of Otto's title *meas rex*, see, *DAI II*, 118; T. C. Lounghis, *Les ambassades byzantines en Occident depuis la fondation des états barbares jusqu'aux Croisades (407 – 1096)*, Athens 1980, 208 (= Lounghis, *Ambassades*); Belke – Soustal, *Byzantiner*, 162, n. 329; Živković, *Južni Sloveni*, 195; K. Leyser, *The Tenth Century in Byzantine-Western Relationships*, *Relations Between the East and West in the Middle Ages*, ed. D. Baker, Edinburgh 2009, 40.

<sup>332</sup> On the other hand, Moravia maintained its independence towards the East Francia from 874, and onward; see, McKitterick, *Frankish Kingdoms*, 177.

of the 9<sup>th</sup> century. According to *Vita Methodii* the Croat prince (they must be the same pagans from the Visla River mentioned in *Vita Methodii*) refused to be baptized while he was independent (ca. 870), and Christianity made some progress there only after 955.<sup>333</sup>

Constantine inserted the information on the White Croats, Otto I, and the Turks in the main narrative, because he had updated his information about White Croatia. The mention of the Turks clearly shows that this information is from a source after the 896, and most probably from Constantine's own time. This sentence, which contains different information, shows that Constantine wrote this after he had gathered all available sources for this chapter. His source was well founded since he knew such a detail that the White Croats had been intermarrying with the Turks. There is another chapter of the *DAI* (8), speaking of the Byzantine envoy, cleric Gabriel, to the Magyars, as well as another chapter (41) about the land of Moravia and prince Sphendoplokos.<sup>334</sup> These two accounts are based on some sources from the Archives of the Imperial Palace – the reports of the various envoys to these regions from the first half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century. Therefore, section 2.5 is based on diplomatic material related to Byzantine-German and Byzantine-Hungarian relationships, as well as of Constantine's primary source on the Croats, which served as the basis upon which he added contemporary information. The conclusion is that Constantine's primary source on the Croats most probably had stated that the Croats of Dalmata originated from *unbaptized* White Croatia which was the neighbor of Frankia – but based on the situation contemporary to that source, ca. 870's.

2.6. Ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν Χρωβάτων, τῶν ἐλθόντων ἐν Δελματία, διεχωρίσθη μέρος τι, καὶ ἐκράτησεν τὸ Ἰλλυρικὸν καὶ τὴν Παννονίαν· εἶχον δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἄρχοντα αὐτεξούσιον, διαπεμπόμενον καὶ μόνον πρὸς τὸν ἄρχοντα Χρωβατίας κατὰ φιλίαν.<sup>335</sup>

<sup>333</sup> *Žitije Metodija*: Constantinus et Methodius Thessalonicenses, ed. F. Grivec – F. Tomšić, Radovi Staroslovenskog instituta 4, Zagreb 1960, c. 11.2 – 5 (= CMT); see also, *DAI II*, 118.

<sup>334</sup> See, *DAI I*, cc. 8.1 – 35, 40.1 – 25.

<sup>335</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.75 – 78.

*From the Croats who came to Dalmatia, a part split off and took rule of Illyricum and Pannonia. They too had an independent archon, who would maintain friendly contact, though through envoys only, with the archon of Croatia.*

It seems that here Constantine relied again on his primary source on the Croats. This is easy to understand, not only because of the context of the main narrative, which follows a well-established sequence of the events (the origin of the Croats; their arrival in Dalmatia; their split off of the newcomers into two principalities), but also from the usage of the term Illyricum. Namely, a Byzantine writer would have never denominated Illyricum as the western part of the Balkans, in fact the former Roman *diocese* of Illyricum, which comprised the province of Pannonia too.<sup>336</sup> The *diocese* of Illyricum had nothing to do with the Byzantine *praefecture* of Illyricum which was well known from 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> century Byzantine sources. For this reason, here Constantine's Latin source is again met, which used the term Illyricum as having the meaning of the former Roman *diocese*.<sup>337</sup> Therefore, without any doubt, Constantine's Latin source had contained the information that the Croats were settled between the Sava and the Drava Rivers (Lower Pannonia) as well.<sup>338</sup> Whether this information is reliable or not is another question.

It is important to note that Constantine himself, when speaking of the principdom of the Pannonian Croats, considered this tiny state to not have existed in his own time, or, most probably, even having not

<sup>336</sup> See, Živković, *Crkvena organizacija*, 36.

<sup>337</sup> The term Illyricum in the *DAI* was only used in this chapter. The term Pannonia was used twice; in chapter 25 – that Goths held Pannonia, and in chapter 27 – the Longobards held Pannonia. Both accounts were based on Constantine's sources. For another opinion, that Illyricum relates to the region of modern eastern Srem, see, H. Gračanin, "Od Hrvata pak koji su stigli u Dalmaciju odvojio se jedan dio i zavladao Ilirikom i Panonijom", *Razmatranje uz DAI c. 30, 75 – 78*, *Povijest u nastavi* 6 (2008) 73.

<sup>338</sup> That is why in *Vita Basilii* there is mention of Pannonia and Dalmatia as the territories in which the rebellious Slavs lived (it is followed by their specific names: Croats, Serbs, Zachlumians, etc.); cf. *Theoph. Cont.* 288.18. Since chapter 30 of the *DAI* was written after *Vita Basilii* had been written, this means that Constantine's source on the Croats had this information about the Croats in Pannonia, but Constantine did not use it in chapter 31.

been in existence already at the time when his primary source had been composed. If the information provided by the *Annales regni Francorum* related to the last years of the 8<sup>th</sup> century and the second decade of the 9<sup>th</sup> century is connected (the mention of the (Slav) Duke Voinomer of Pannonia in 796, and the uprising of the (Slav) Duke Liutowid of Pannonia in 818),<sup>339</sup> within Constantine's narrative, it can be deduced that Voinomer was in fact the duke of the Pannonian Slavs – firstly under Avar suzerainty, then as a Frankish vassal, and Liutowid was his heir, having been also a vassal of the Franks.<sup>340</sup> Careful analysis of the text does not provide enough data to conclude that the ruling families of the Croats in Dalmatia and Pannonia were actually related. They came to war because of the different policies their rulers had been conducting. Liutowid, in Lower Pannonia, originally the Frankish vassal, but now after having rebelled, was supported by the Byzantines, and Borná, another Frankish vassal, in Dalmatia (Croatia), acted on behalf of the Franks.<sup>341</sup>

Constantine's primary source on the Croats obviously had the intention to place Pannonia under the ecclesiastical rule of Rome; and to achieve this, the author of this source would have needed political power to rely on. He could not have chosen the Carantanians or Moravians for such a role, since they were under the rule of the Franks, but only those nations free, at that moment, from the Franks. This is why the author had had to invent the Croats of Pannonia, to be able to claim the ecclesiastical rights of Rome in Pannonia through their political exponents – the Croats. While the author was able to precisely provide the names of five brothers and two sisters who led Croats to Dalmatia, he did not know the names of those who had settled from Dalmatia to Pannonia. While the *origo gentis* of the Croats was genuine, taken from the Croat tradition, the story about one family which had resettled from Dalmatia to Pannonia appears to be invented.<sup>342</sup> On the other hand, the statement that the Croats of Pannonia were not used to sending envoys to foreign countries, but

---

<sup>339</sup> *ARF*, 98, 149.

<sup>340</sup> Similar, Kos, *Conversio*, 21; *DAI II*, 118 – 119; Goldstein, *Hrvatski*, 159 – 160.

<sup>341</sup> See, Goldstein, *Hrvatski*, 166 – 171; Živković, *Južni Sloveni*, 238. The account of this conflict is preserved in *ARF*, 150 – 155, 158, 161.

<sup>342</sup> Both, Grafenauer, *Prilog*, 30 and Ferjančić, *Struktura*, 75, thought that this story about the Pannonian Croats could not have derived from the Croat tradition. On the other

rather only to the *archontes* of the (Dalmatian) Croats – seems rather naive and is partly evidence that this could have been a forced statement. If it was a genuine story, i.e. from the Croat tradition, then it would be in collision with the previous statements that Dalmatia had stretched up to the Danube in Ancient times – since, in this case, it would have not been necessary to settle the Croats twice: once in Dalmatia and then again in Pannonia – if this territory had already been designated as the same province, i.e. Dalmatia.<sup>343</sup> It seems that the author of Constantine's source on the Croats had had the intention to adjust historical events in accordance to the needs of Rome.

2.7. Μέχρι δὲ χρόνων τινῶν ὑπετάσσοντο καὶ οἱ ἐν Δελματία ὄντες Χρωβάτοι τοῖς Φράγγοις, καθὼς καὶ πρότερον ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ αὐτῶν.<sup>344</sup>

*Until quite recently<sup>345</sup> the Croats of Dalmatia also were subject to the Franks, as they had formerly been in their own country.*

This sentence has usually been considered as being important evidence that the Croats arrived in Dalmatia around 800. This conclusion, which has made a severe impact on modern Croatian historiography, is based on the misinterpretation of this section.<sup>346</sup> Namely, here Constantine contracted his primary source, passing over at least a century and a half of the earliest history of the Croats. It is well known from the *Annales regni Francorum* that the Dalmatian Croats came under the rule of the Franks around 803.<sup>347</sup> The same holds true for the Pannonian Slavs (795/796).<sup>348</sup> In 812 the Aachen peace

---

hand, Klaić, *Najnoviji*, 51 – 52, even though she criticized Ferjančić, did not offer an opinion. See also, Fine, *Ethnicity*, 20 – 21; Eggers, *Situation*, 25 – 26.

<sup>343</sup> Cf. Novaković, *Zapažanja*, 34.

<sup>344</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.79 – 80.

<sup>345</sup> *DAI I*, 143: *For a number of years.*

<sup>346</sup> See, Margetić, *Konstantine Porfirogenit*, 23 – 25; 60 – 61; Idem, *Još o pitanju*, 235 – 239; Klaić, *O problemima*, 255, 258.

<sup>347</sup> Cf. Manojlović, *Pomorje*, 21 – 22; *DAI II*, 118.

<sup>348</sup> In 795, an unnamed *tudun* defected from the Avars to the Franks; cf. *ARF*, 96. This is, most probably, the same Wonomyro (Voinomer) mentioned in *ARF*, 98 (796); see, also, Kos, *Conversio*, 21.

treaty between the Franks and Byzantium was concluded, according to which the interior of Dalmatia (the Croats) belonged to the Franks, and the coastal cities to Byzantium.<sup>349</sup> Five years later Byzantine envoys negotiated boundaries between the Slavs (the Croats) and Byzantine possessions in Dalmatia. In the charter of the Croat Duke Terpmir from 852 (or 837?), it is written: *In Italia piissimo Lothario, Francorum rege* – reliable evidence that the Croat duke recognized Frankish supreme rule.<sup>350</sup> This situation lasted a year or two before 871, when Louis II wrote a letter to Basil I complaining to the Emperor that Byzantine ships had attacked *his Slavs* while they were involved in the siege of Bari in southern Italy.<sup>351</sup>

The last few words of section 2.7 clearly show that this section had been compiled from different sources, which represent, in fact, Constantine's interpretation based on the political situation between the White Croats and Franks at that time, since he knew that in his own time the White Croats were subjects to the Franks. Therefore, Constantine had simply concluded that the White Croats of the 7<sup>th</sup> century were subject to the Franks as well, and the last part of this sentence – καθὼς καὶ πρότερον ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ αὐτῶν – must be his insertion. The semicolon at the end of this section suggests also some kind of intervention in the original source. In fact, according to section 2.5, it appears that Constantine's primary source only mentioned the White Croats as the neighbors of the Franks (ca. 870).

Since Constantine's source never stated directly that the Croats were under the rule of the Franks in their old homeland, it appears that

<sup>349</sup> *Einhardi Vita Karoli Magni*, SRG in usum scholarum, ed. G. Waitz, Hannoverae et Lipsiae 1911, 18.19 – 22: *...exceptis maritimis civitatibus, quas ob amicitiam et iunctum cum eo foedus Constantinopolitanum imperatorem habere permisit.*

<sup>350</sup> *CD I*, N° 3. Terpmir is attested as being the ruler of the Croats on an inscription discovered in 1891, by, F. Bulić: *Pro duce Trepim[ero]*; cf. Šišić, *Priručnik*, 122; Lj. Karaman, *Iz kolijevke hrvatske prošlosti*, Zagreb 1930, 80, 198; Klaić, *Povijest*, 228; Goldstein, *Hrvatski*, 199; V. Delonga, *Latinski epigrafički spomenici u ranosrednjovjekovnoj Hrvatskoj*, Split 1996, 127 – 129. About the same time the Frankish preacher Gottschalk called him: *Tripemirus, rex Sclavorum*; cf. Katić, *Gottschalk*, 8 – 11; see, T. Živković – B. Radovanović, *Titre de Trpimir selon les dires de Gottschalk*, *IC* 58 (2009) 33 – 42.

<sup>351</sup> *Ep. VII*, 392.15 – 24, *...eisdem Sclavenis nostris cum navibus suis apud Barim...consistentibus*. Basil I and Louis II actually exchanged letters in regard to, above all, the imperial title of the Frankish ruler; cf. J. Muldoon, *Empire and Order: The Concept of Empire 800 – 1800*, New York 1999, 48 – 50.

the beginning of this section: Μέχρι δὲ χρόνων τινῶν, could mean that Constantine's source placed the settling of the Croats in connection with Frankish politics, and, as is able to be noticed, this source only speaks at the opening stages of its narrative about the *Romani*, Avars, and Croats. The appearance of this sentence could be explained in three possible ways: 1. Constantine could have retold a portion of his original source to make some type of introduction to the further narrative about the uprising of the Croats against the Franks; 2. This sentence is translated imperfectly from Latin to Greek; 3. The original Latin text which presumably followed section 1.7 had been skipped over by Constantine, and it would have contained some references as to how the Croats in Dalmatia came under the rule of the Franks.

If it were Constantine's retelling, then he had to have had some basis to comprehend that the Croats had been under the rule of the Franks since the time of their settlement in Dalmatia. However, the evidence of this basis cannot be traced in chapters 29 to 31 – on the contrary, Heraclius is marked as the one who settled the Croats into Dalmatia. The missing part of Constantine's Latin source, which probably was placed between sections 2.6 and 2.7, can be found in section 1.8, partly in 1.10, and just fragmentarily in 1.12 of chapter 31.

In regard to an imperfect translation, the phrase Μέχρι δὲ χρόνων τινῶν has, beyond any doubt, been translated by many philologists as *for a number of years*. The English translation (as translations in any modern languages tend to do) in fact repeats the Latin translation of the phrase Μέχρι δὲ χρόνων τινῶν based on: *per aliquot vero annos*.<sup>352</sup> This phrase *for a number of years* does not mean anything – since it does not relate to the line of the previous text of chapters 29 – 31, nor even corresponds to the period during which the Croats were truly under the rule of the Franks (ca. 800 to ca. 875), which cannot be by any means described as *for a number of years* or *einige Jahre*.<sup>353</sup> It is interesting to note that this phrase: *mehri de hronon tinon* does not appear in a single Byzantine source known to modern Byzantology. If this phrase truly means: *For a number of years*, then it should be found in almost every possible historical work of Byzantine authors.

<sup>352</sup> Bekkerus, *De adm. imp.*, 144.

<sup>353</sup> *DAI I*, 143; Belke – Soustal, *Byzantiner*, 162.

Therefore, it must be here that the abridgement of Constantine's original source is encountered, wherein something had originally been said about the political relations between the Croats (of Dalmatia) and the Franks, and it was followed by the content of section 2.8 (see below). In light of this interpretation, the second possibility – that the imperfect translation of the phrase *mehri de hronon tinon* is for a number of years – has to be reconsidered, since it could have another meaning in its original Latin text. It could have the meaning: lit. *until few years ago*, i. e. *until quite recently*, or similar. The most probable Latin phrase should be: *dum nuper*.<sup>354</sup> Note also the phrase: Ἐπί τινας οὖν χρόνους – *Now, for some time*, preserved in the section 2.3.<sup>355</sup> The phrases *epi tinas oun hronous* and *mehri de hronon tinon*, cannot be translated in the same way: i. e. *for some years* vs. *for a number of years*.<sup>356</sup> The phrase *epi tinas oun hronous* in 2.3 truly means that something had lasted for some time (not *for some years* as it is put in Jenkins' translation), and this is why the phrase *mehri de hronon tinon* cannot be of the same meaning, but rather designate that something lasted *until recently* (a few years ago). If this new understanding presented here is correct, then it is an important testimony from the anonymous author of Constantine's primary source on the Croats, since he stated that the Croats of Dalmatia had rose up against the Franks just several years before he started to write.

2.8. τοσοῦτον δὲ ἐσκληρύνοντο οἱ Φράγγοι πρὸς αὐτούς, ὅτι τὰ ὑπομάσθια τῶν Χρωβάτων φονεύοντες προσέριπτον αὐτὰ σκύλαξιν.<sup>357</sup>

<sup>354</sup> See for instance, *S. Bonifatii et Lulli epistolae*, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Epistolae Merovingici et Karolini aevi I, Berolini 1892, 252.14 – 15: ...*dum nuper de transmarinis partibus ad istas pervenit regions...*; *Flodoardi Historia Remensis ecclesiae*, ed. Ioh. Heller – G. Waitz, MGH SS XIII, Hannoverae 1881, 593.51 – 53: *Item dum nuper ad prememoratam villam...quidam clericorum...perrexerunt*; and 598.27 – 28: *Sed dum nuper gens Barbara Nordmannorum saevitura se Galliis infudisset...*; For the possible phrase *donec nuper*, see, *Manegoldi ad Gebehardum liber*, ed. K. Francke, MGH Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum saeculis XI et XII conscripti I, Hannoverae 1891, 342.26.

<sup>355</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.67.

<sup>356</sup> See Jenkins' translation in *DAI I*, 143.

<sup>357</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.80 – 82.

*the Franks treated them with such brutality that they used to murder Croat babies and cast them to the dogs.*<sup>358</sup>

This kind of description could have only been from the Croat tradition and Constantine had found it, most probably, in his Latin source. The semicolon in front of this section, behind αὐτῶν at the end of the section 2.7, indicates a possible abridgement of Constantine's source. It is obvious that this source had not been inclined towards the Franks, and such an account, depicting the Franks in such a dark manner, could have originated either in Croatia, after the expulsion of the Franks (after ca. 875), or in Italy (also after the August of 875, the death of Louis II).<sup>359</sup>

2.9. Μὴ δυνάμενοι δὲ οἱ Χρωβάτοι ταῦτα παρὰ τῶν Φράγγων ὑφίστασθαι, διέστησαν ἀπ' αὐτῶν, φονεύσαντες καὶ οὐδ' εἶχον ἄρχοντας ἐξ αὐτῶν. Ὅθεν ἐστράτευσαν κατ' αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Φραγγίας φοσσᾶτον μέγα, καὶ ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ χρόνους πολεμήσαντες ἀλλήλοις, ὧσὲ καὶ μόγις ὑπερίσχυσαν οἱ Χρωβάτοι, καὶ ἀνεῖλον τοὺς Φράγγους πάντας καὶ ἄρχοντα αὐτῶν Κοτζίλιν καλούμενον.<sup>360</sup>

<sup>358</sup> Jenkins' translation in *DAI I*, 145: *But the Franks treated them....*, is based on the translation of the previous phrase *mehri de hronon tinon* as: *for a numer of years*, which forced him to translate the particle *de* in the section 2.8 as *but*. However, by introducing *but*, Jenkins made a causal sentence to justify his translation of *mehri de hronon tinon*. In fact, the particle *de* in this section (2.8) only suggests that this sentence is logically connected with the previous statement that the Croats were under the rule of the Franks until recently, when was written. The particle *de* in this case only has to be rendered as the postpositive.

<sup>359</sup> It is well known that Constantine Porphyrogenitus regarded Franks "as worthy partners of imperial 'Romans'"; cf. J. Shepard, *A Marriage too Far? Maria Lekapena and Peter of Bulgaria*, *The Empress Theophano: Byzantium and the West at the Turn of the First Millennium*, ed. A. Davis, Cambridge 1995, 122, n. 4. Therefore, it seems impossible that Constantine Porphyrogenitus would describe the Franks in this section of the *DAI* in such a dark manner.

<sup>360</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.82 – 87. Note the similar expression: Ἐπὶ τινὰς οὖν χρόνους πολεμοῦντες ἀλλήλους, ὑπερίσχυσαν οἱ Χρωβάτοι, in section 2.3, versus: ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ χρόνους πολεμήσαντες ἀλλήλοις, ὧσὲ καὶ μόγις ὑπερίσχυσαν οἱ Χρωβάτοι (2.9). It is assumed here that both expressions come from the same source, based on the *DCBC*: *...seu quomodo Huni Romanos et Gothos atque Gepidos de inferiori*

*The Croats, unable to endure such treatment from the Franks, revolted from them, and slew those of them whom they had for archontes. Because of this, a large army from Francia marched against them, and after they had fought one another for seven years, at last, and with hardship, the Croats managed to prevail and killed all the Franks and their archon, called Kotzil.*

This section is entirely based on Constantine's Latin source, and it was an integral part of the previous section (2.8). Constantine truncated this section, which is evident by the repetition of the conjunction *kai* four times in the second sentence. There is also an interesting detail in the first sentence of this section, where it is stated that the Croats had *archontes* (whether natives or Franks, it is not clear) who were obviously enforced upon them by the Franks. The plural form for these *archontes* is also intriguing since, as it is known from some other sources, there should have only been one *archon* at the time.<sup>361</sup> Therefore, the *archontes* mentioned in this section should be understood as Frankish military commanders, and not as rulers (*archon, dux*) of Croatia. Such a situation could be possible only if it is understood that section 1.12, in which the much shortened story about the turmoil in Croatia is found, had been positioned in its original text before this section (2.9). If this is the case, than *Ban Pribina* who had deposed the *Archon Miroslav*, actually imposed some type of military rule in Croatia by appointing men loyal to him and generally to the Franks as their commanders.<sup>362</sup> Then, the Franks who are mentioned in

---

*Pannonia expulerunt et illam possederunt regionem, quosque Franci ac Bagoarii cum Quarantanis continuis affligendo bellis eos superaverunt;* cf. *De conversione*, 6.22 – 7.2. On the other hand, Constantine used the verb *ὑπερισχύω* in another two chapters of the *DAI* (*DAI I*, cc.36.6; 39.5) and there is actually a prolonged fight in both cases, but he never used the phrase *πολεμήσαντες ἀλλήλοις* with this verb again.

<sup>361</sup> For instance: *Dux glo[rriosus] Sed[esclavus]*; cf. F. Bulić, *Hrvatski spomenici u kninskoj okolici uz ostale suvremene dalmatinske iz doba narodne hrvatske dinastije*, Zagreb 1888, 25; Šišić, *Priručník*, 122; then, *[tempore ducis] Branimiri...*, and *Temporibus domno Branimero dux Slavorum*; cf. Šišić, *Priručník*, 123 – 124; Goldstein, *Hrvatski*, 262 – 264.

<sup>362</sup> There is vast literature about the uprising of the Croats. Basically, the common opinion is that this uprising of the Croats is the same one which led Liutowid, in the Lower Pannonia 819 – 822; cf. B. Grafenauer, *Vprašanje konca Kocljeve vlade v Spodnji*

section 2.8 as being the murderers of Croat infants must be considered as those same Frankish *archontes* who were slain by the Croats at the beginning of the revolt. This detail actually is some evidence that sections 2.8 and 2.9 had once belonged to the same document. Furthermore, it also leads towards the identification of Pribina and Kotzil from the *DAI*, with the Franksih *duces* who ruled over Lower Pannonia.<sup>363</sup>

On the other hand, the exact number of years during which the struggle between the Franks and Croats lasted (seven years), could be evidence that Constantine's source had been chronologically very close to the events described.<sup>364</sup> The story appears to have been written down not too long after the events had occurred. Alongside this interpretation is the precisely quoted name of the Frankish lord, Kotzil, who was killed during the war.<sup>365</sup> If this source had originated much later, these details probably would not have appeared in the Croat tradition.

It is probable that the Croat Duke Terpimer defeated the Bulgarians ca. 853, during the Bulgarian-Frankish war. The war between the Franks and the Bulgarians had broken out, according to

---

*Panoniji*, Zgodovinski časopis 6/7 (1953) 171 – 190; Klaić, *Povijest*, 137 – 138, 169, 209; P. Štih, *Karantanija – stara domovina Horvatov*, Zgodovinski časopis 41/3 (1987) 544; Pohl, *Awaren*, 261; Belke - Soustal, *Die Byzantiner*, 158; Litavrin, *Ob upravljenii*, 372, n. 22; Maksimović, *Pokrštavanje*, 170. However, Šišić, *Povijest*, 358 – 360, thought that this uprising was in ca. 876. This opinion was accepted by Klaić, *O problemima*, 267 – 270; Koščak, *Pripadnost*, 292; *DAI II*, 119 considered that Constantine was speaking about three different events: 1. The Uprising of Liutowid 2. The baptism during the rule of Borna 3. The conflict between the Kotzil, the dux of the Lower Pannonia, and the Dalmatian Croats in 876.

<sup>363</sup> This has been proposed by, Grégoire, *L'origine*, 94, n. 7.

<sup>364</sup> The appearance of the *Biblical number seven* could mean that the anonymous author of Constantine's major source on the Croats, probably adjusted the duration of this war in accordance with the Bible, which could have lasted five or six years. This could be additional circumstantial evidence of the ecclesiastical provenience of the source and of its author as being a member of the clergy.

<sup>365</sup> The last mentioning of Kotzil is from 873; cf. *Fragmenta registri Iohannis VIII. Papae*, rec. E. Caspar, MGH Epistolarum VII, Karolini aevi V, ed. P. Kehr, Berolini 1928, 282.10 – 15; 283.7 – 10 (= *Fragmenta*). In a document issued **after** 876, Kotzil is mentioned as being dead; cf. *Gradivo za zgodovino Slovencev v srednjem veku II*, ed. F. Kos, Ljubljana 1906 (= Kos, *Gradivo II*) N° 276 (...*quod Chezil dux quondam ad s. Emmerammum condonavit iuxta amnem Raba*). See, also, P. Štih – V. Simoniti – P. Vodopivec, *A Slovene History: Society – Politics – Culture*, Ljubljana 2008, 51 (= *Slovene History*).

*Annales Bertiniani*, when Charles the Bald bribed the Bulgarians to attack Louis the German in 853.<sup>366</sup> As it is known that Terpimer dated his charter by the name of his senior, King Lothar, in 852, it is clear that the uprising of the Croats was after the rule of Terpimer.<sup>367</sup>

The next Croat ruler known from the sources is Domagoi. He is mentioned for the first time in 864, when the Venetian Doge Urso led a successful naval expedition against him.<sup>368</sup> Domagoi had recognized Frankish rule at least until 870, as it is known from the letter (871), which has already been mentioned, of Emperor Louis II (855 – 875), to Basil I. The possibility for a Croat uprising against the Franks would then be after 870, and, during the last reigning years of the Duke Domagoi (d. 876). It probably was connected with the policy of Byzantine Emperor Basil I (867 – 886) towards Dalmatia.

John the Deacon, the Venetian Chronicler, wrote that *His diebus Sedesclavus, Tibimiri ex progenie, imperiali fultus presidio Constantinopolim veniens, Sclavorum ducatum arripuit filiosque Domagoi exilio trusit*.<sup>369</sup> A more accurate date of this usurpation is possible to precisely reveal according to a letter which Pope John VIII directed to Zdeslav (*Sedesclavus*) at the beginning of 879, in which he asked him to help the papal envoy on his route to the Bulgarian Duke Michael.<sup>370</sup> From another letter from Pope John VIII in the June of 879, it is well known that Duke Branimer ruled Croatia.<sup>371</sup> John the Deacon mentioned that in *these days some Slav by the name Branimer, usurped*

<sup>366</sup> *Ann. Bert.* 43: *Bulgari, sociatis sibi Sclavis, et, ut fertur, a nostris muneribus invitati, adversus Lodowicum, Germaniae regem, acriter permovetur, sed Domino pugnante vincuntur*. The allied Slavs are most probably the Moravians; cf. Goldberg, *Struggle*, 242.

<sup>367</sup> Charles the Bald took some diplomatic steps before he invited the Bulgars to attack Louis the German. He met with King Lothar (of Italy) in 852, at modern Saint Quentin where: *fraterne suscipit, honorifice afficit, germane tractat, regaliter munerat, redeuntemque benigne deducit*; cf. *Ann. Bert.* 41. During the next year (853) Charles the Bald bribed the Bulgarians to attack East Francia, but Louis the German defeated them. If Terpimer was involved in this war, then Lothar actually aided Louis the German. That is probably why Charles the Bald paid a visit to Lothar in 854 *in vico Leutico*, where they renewed their friendship; cf. *Ann. Bert.* 44.

<sup>368</sup> *Diac.* 130.

<sup>369</sup> *Diac.* 140.

<sup>370</sup> *CD I*, N° 9.

<sup>371</sup> *CD I*, N° 11.

*the Slav dukedom after he killed Zdeslav.*<sup>372</sup> According to all these sources, it is clear that the liberation of the Croats under Frankish rule should be placed before 878, and, hence, the usurpation of Zdeslav. In other words, if Zdeslav had come to power being helped by Constantinople, it would have meant that Frankish influence in Croatia, was, at least, already badly shaken, if it had not disappeared entirely.

An entry in the Chronicle of John the Deacon could be the key to determining the year the Croats began their uprising. The Venetian Chronicler said that Arabs from Crete had devastated some Dalmatian towns and the island of Bracia in May of 872. The Venetian doge sent a ship towards Istria to spy on the Arabs, but the Slavs attacked this small ship, manned by only 14 sailors.<sup>373</sup> This would mean that the Croats, since they had been attacking Venetian ships, were still out of the political reach of Constantinople. Nevertheless, this would not necessarily mean that they were under Frankish rule.<sup>374</sup>

This uprising of the Croats had been described in length in Constantine's Latin source. This can be deduced from the fragments used by Constantine in chapter 31, in which he mentions the turmoil in Croatia after the rules of Terpimer, Krasimer, and Miroslav. If the Venetian Chronicle stated that Zdeslav had come from Constantinople, and that he was *Tibimiri ex progenie*, then it would have meant that Byzantium had been involved in Croat matters already at the time when Miroslav was deposed by *Ban Pribina* (ca. 861).

Terpimer died ca. 855, very soon after his short war with the Bulgarians. He was succeeded by his son Krasimer, whose baptismal name was Peter, as is preserved in the *Evangelium de Cividale*: *Petrus filius domno Tripemero*.<sup>375</sup> His rule lasted briefly, just for a year or two, and his son Miroslav – probably still under-age, succeeded him. It is possible that he was removed by *Ban Pribina* (see 1.12 above), as the Frankish response to the Byzantines who had started to interfere with Croat matters. *Ban Pribina*, well known from western sources, could

<sup>372</sup> *Diac.* 142: *His diebus quidam Sclavus, nomine Brenamir, interfecto Sedescavo, ipsius ducatum usurpavit.*

<sup>373</sup> *Diac.* 132.

<sup>374</sup> F. Šišić, *Genealoški prilozi o hrvatskoj narodnoj dinastiji*, VHAD 13 (1914) 38 – 42, thought that the Croat uprising happened exactly during 871 – 879.

<sup>375</sup> *Documenta*, 383.

have only been the dux of Lower Pannonia, who, allegedly, disappears from all sources before March 861, and was succeeded by his son Kotzil,<sup>376</sup> – obviously the same one mentioned by Constantine Porphyrogenitus.

The life of Pribina is very interesting.<sup>377</sup> He appeared in ca. 833, as a refugee from Nitra, after having been expelled by the Moravian Duke Moimer. He found shelter at the Duke Ratbod in Friuli.<sup>378</sup> It was Ratbod who introduced him to Louis the German, who baptized him and sent him back to Ratbod.<sup>379</sup> After some time, he became estranged from Ratbod and went to the Bulgarians, who were at that time in the possession of the region of Srem, and from there he went together with his son Kotzil (*Chozil*) to Duke Ratimer, who ruled over the lands between the Sava and Drava Rivers, and who was under the protection of the Bulgarians at that time.<sup>380</sup> In the same year (838), Louis ordered Ratbod to attack Ratimer and bring back his land under the rule of the Franks. Even though Pribina had fought on the side of Ratimer, he escaped to Ratbod and succeeded in making peace with him.<sup>381</sup> Already in 840, he gained land in a fiefdom from Louis the German around the Lake Balaton, Lower Pannonia, where he founded a town, and conducted various industrious efforts to make that wild region suitable for agriculture and pleasant for living.<sup>382</sup> From that year on, Pribina became an important Frankish lord who, in 850, had built a large church in his town (*civitas Priwinae*) in the presence of 15 Slav and 17

<sup>376</sup> Kos, *Gradivo*, N° 174: *quidam comes Sclavis nomine Chezul omnem rem quam habuit prope Pilozsuuve in uilla quae dicitur Uuampaldi.*

<sup>377</sup> See a brief summary of Pribina's political life in, *Slovene History*, 47 – 48.

<sup>378</sup> *De conversione*, 11.20 – 22: *In cuius spacio temporis quidam Priwina exulatus a Moimaro duce Maravorum supra Danubium venit ad Ratbodum.* About Pribina, see, P. Štih, *Pribina: Slawischer Fürst oder fränkischer Graf?*, *Ethnogenese und Überlieferung: Angewandte Methodien der Frühmittelalterforschung*, ed. K. Brunner – B. Merta, Vienna 1994, 209 – 222.

<sup>379</sup> *De conversione*, 11.22 – 24: *Qui statim illum praesentavit domno regi nostro Hludowico, et suo iussu fide instructus baptisatus est in ecclesia sancti Martini loco Treisma nuncupato, curte videlicet pertinenti ad sedem Iuvavensem.*

<sup>380</sup> *De conversione*, 11.24 – 27.

<sup>381</sup> *De conversione*, 11.27 – 12.2.

<sup>382</sup> *De conversione*, 12.3 – 7. Later on, in 848, Louis the German confirmed this fief as being hereditary to Pribina, except the lands that belonged to the archbishopric of Salzburg; cf. *De conversione*, 13.3 – 8.

German dignitaries, as well as the archbishop of Salzburg.<sup>383</sup> In this same town, between 853 and 859, he founded a large cathedral and the archbishop of Salzburg personally sent him various craftsmen for such an immense effort. When this church was finally finished, he placed the relics of Saint Hadrian there.<sup>384</sup> In February 860, Pribina asked Louis the German for permission to give some lands to the monastery of St Maurice. In this correspondence there is mention of his title: – *Briuinus fidelis dux noster*.<sup>385</sup> His life ended in obscurity before the 25<sup>th</sup> of December 864; and all that was said is that he was killed during a campaign against the Moravians, *quod illi\* (Cheziloni) successit moriente patre suo Priwina quem Maravi occiderunt*.<sup>386</sup>

The date of Pribina's death is uncertain. According to the charter from the 21<sup>st</sup> of March 861, it appears that his son Kotzil had already succeeded him at that time. On the other hand, the *DCBC* provides reliable information that Kotzil ruled over Lower Pannonia in December 864. The problem is that it is not known whether Kotzil granted the land to the Church of St. Mary on the 21<sup>st</sup> of March 861, as a ruler, or just as the second in power of Lower Pannonia, next to his father. Namely, in 850, Kotzil had already made donations to one church, and in the same manner as described in the charter from the 21<sup>st</sup> of March 861.<sup>387</sup> At that time, his father was very much alive. The information from the *DCBC*, that the Moravians killed Pribina, could

<sup>383</sup> *De conversione*, 12.8 – 20.

<sup>384</sup> *De conversione*, 12.25 – 32.

<sup>385</sup> *Sakcinski*, N° 63.

\* It should be *quod ille*.

<sup>386</sup> *De conversione*, 14.5 – 6; Kos, *Conversio*, 96; I. Wood, *The Missionary Life: Saints and the Evangelisation of Europe, 400 – 1050*, New York 2001, 171. *Slovene History*, 48, takes 861 as the date of Pribina's death.

<sup>387</sup> *De conversione*, 12.20 – 28: *Indeque rediens idem pontifex et cum eo Chezil consecravit ecclesiam Sandrati presbyteri, ad quam Chezil territorium et silvam ac prata in praesentia praefatorum virorum tradidit et circumduxit hoc ipsum terminum. Tunc quoque ad ecclesiam Ermperhti presbyteri quam memoratus praesul consecravit, tradidit Chezil sicut Engildeo et filii eius duo et Ermperht presbyter ibi haberunt, et circumduxit praefatos viros in ipsum terminum. Transactis namque fere duorum aut trium spatiis annorum ad Salapiugin consecravit ecclesiam in honore sancti Hrodberti quam Priwina, cum omni supra posito tradidit Deo et sancto Petro, atque sancto Hrodberto perpetuo in usum fructuarium viris Dei Salzburgensium habendi. Postmodum vero roganti Priwinae...*

be related to the year 864, as well. According to the *Annales of Fulda*, that year: *Hludowicus rex mense Augusto ultra Danubium cum manu valida profectus Rastizen in quadam civitate, quae lingua gentis illius Dowina dicitur, obsedit. At ille, cum regis exercitibus congregari non auderet atque loca sibi effugiendi denegata cerneret, obsides, quales et quantos rex praecepit, necessitate coactus dedit; insuper cum universis optimatibus suis fidem se cunctis diebus regi servaturum esse, iuramento firmavit, licet illud minime servaverit.*<sup>388</sup> In December 864, the Archbishop Adalwinus came to Kotzil and had spent Christmas there: *Anno igitur 865 venerabilis archiepiscopus Iuvavensium Adalwinus nativitatem Christi celebravit in castro Chezilonis, noviter Mosapure vocato, quod ille successit moriente patre suo Priwina, quem Maravi occiderunt.*<sup>389</sup> Therefore, the archbishop came to Kotzil because Pribina had been killed; he probably came to support and to strengthen Kotzil's position as a new ruler. In this way, it can be concluded that Pribina was killed during the military campaign of Louis the German against the Moravians; not in 861, but in August 864.

If Dux Pribina from Frankish sources is the same mentioned by Constantine Porphyrogenitus,<sup>390</sup> then it can be assumed that Terpimer had already died in 854, and that his son Peter Krasimer ruled after him for only a few years – until ca. 857/858, and was succeeded by his son Miroslav, who was to be overthrown after his four years of reign, in ca. 861/862, by *Ban* Pribina. This was followed by turmoil in Croatia, and, in the year 864, Domagoi became the sole ruler of the Croats, and Zdeslav, most likely the second son of Krasimer, fled to Constantinople (see 1.12 above). In light of this interpretation, Domagoi must have been from another noble family and loyal to the Franks. Most probably he was proclaimed to be the Croat ruler as the Frankish candidate.<sup>391</sup>

<sup>388</sup> *Ann. Fuld.* 62.

<sup>389</sup> *De conversione*, 14.4 – 6.

<sup>390</sup> For another identification of Pribina as a Croat *ban*, see, *DAI II*, 130; also, for both Kotzil and Pribina not being the same persons from the *DAI*, see, H. Wolfram, *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum: das Weissbuch der Salzburger Kirche über die erfolgreiche Mission in Karantanien und Pannonien*, Wien 1979, 53 – 55, 144.

<sup>391</sup> Klaić, *Povijest*, 244 – 245, thought that Domagoi was installed as the pro-Byzantine ruler.

His pro-Frankish course can be traced until the spring of 870, when his navy seized a papal ship returning from Constantinople, carrying the Acts of the Council held in Constantinople (869/870).<sup>392</sup> This act of piracy and particular interest in political matters marked by the idea to steal the Synodical documents must be interpreted to be that Domagoi had already allied himself with Byzantium at that time.

The political context appears to be clear, even though the sources are fragmentary and almost silent – Byzantium had been involved in Croatia by supporting Terpimer's sons and descendants, while the Franks intervened and imposed their candidate Domagoi to the Croat throne. Major evidence in support of this thesis is Zdeslav's appearance in Croatia from Constantinople in 877. It is evident that Constantine Porphyrogenitus (or rather his source) is talking about two different events. The first describes it as *turmoil*, which followed the death of Krasimer and the deposition of his son Miroslav by Pribina, and the second as the *uprising* of the Croats, which occurred during the second half of Domagoi's reign (after 870). A possible proof that the Croats had already been warring against the Franks during the early 860's came from the Frankish poet Sedulius. In one of his poems he praised Eberhard, the duke of Furlania, (d. 865), *of whom the mighty Slavs were trembling: te tremit armipotens Sclavus*.<sup>393</sup> Eberhard's history of struggling with the Slavs (probably the Narentans ca. 840) is confirmed by another source: *Multa fatigatio Langobardi et oppressio a Slavorum gens sustinuit, usque dum imperator Foriulanorum fines Ebherardo principem constituit*.<sup>394</sup>

The further development of political relations between Byzantium and the Franks in the area of Dalmatia can be traced back from 868, when the strong Byzantine fleet sailed off to Bari in southern Italy to help in the siege of the town, where Louis II had already sent his troops together with his Croat vassals.<sup>395</sup> After a short appearance in

<sup>392</sup> *Lib. Pontif. II*, 184.24 – 185.3. See, also, *The Lives of the Ninth-Century Popes (Liber pontificalis)*, ed. R. Davis, Liverpool 1995, 287 - 288, notes 126 and 127 (= Davis, *Lives*).

<sup>393</sup> Kos, *Gradivo II*, N° 198, and p. 151. n. 1.

<sup>394</sup> *Andreae Bergomatis Historia*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH SSRL, Hannoverae 1878, 226.35 – 37; cf. Manojlović, *Pomorje*, 21.

<sup>395</sup> In *Chronica monasterii Casinensis*, MGH SS 34, ed. H. Hoffmann, Hannover 1980, 98.25 – 99.22, it is stated that Louis II sent his legates in 866, to all the parts of his kingdom, ordering the gathering of the army: *Tunc rex Ludovvicus motus his nunsiiis*

front of Bari, with a fleet of 400 ships, the Byzantine admiral Niketas Ooryphas, withdrew to Corinth.<sup>396</sup> The following year the same admiral appeared in Dalmatia and attacked Croats (869). In 871, Louis II wrote to Basil I protesting this incursion and explicitly stating that Byzantium attacked *his Slavs*.<sup>397</sup> It is probably due to these events, a Byzantine embassy came to Regensburg in January 872. Both sides exchanged gifts, but no details are known about any negotiations.<sup>398</sup> In November 873, archbishop Agathon appeared in Regensburg, and according to *Annales of Fulda*, this embassy had come to renew an old friendship.<sup>399</sup> Four years later, another Byzantine embassy was directed to the lords of Benevento, Salerno and Capua to discuss a joint policy against the Arabs.<sup>400</sup> The Byzantines also kept diplomatic relations with Venice, since a Byzantine embassy came to Venice in 879. On this occasion, according to John the Deacon, Doge Urso Particiaco (846 – 881) received the dignity of *protospatharios*.<sup>401</sup> The Venetian doges had, from 840 onward, the dignity of *spatharios*,<sup>402</sup> and this elevation to the dignity of *protospatharios* actually shows that Venice became much more important to Byzantium.

This overview on the diplomatic efforts of Byzantium, during the period of 868 – 879, shows without any doubt that the conflict

---

*generale editum in universas regni sui partes direxit, ut nullus omnino esset, qui se ab hac expeditione subtraheret; sicque immenso valde congregato exercitu simulque cum...* It is obvious that Louis II had a plan to besiege Bari, even before Basil I had learned that the Arabs were besieging Ragusa. According to *Ann. Bert.* 81, Louis II had already been on the march against the Arabs of Benevento in 866. The Croats were included in this army, since in 871 Louis II stated that in his letter to Basil I; see note 397.

<sup>396</sup> *Ann. Bert.* 105 – 106; *DAI I*, c. 29.103 – 106.

<sup>397</sup> *Ep. VII*, 392.15 – 24: *Et Niceta quidem patricius...multas praedas ab ipsis Sclavenis abstulit et quibusdam castris dirructis eorum homines captivos adduxit; ...ut eisdem Sclavenis nostris cum navibus suis apud Barim in procinctu communis utilitatis consistentibus*. It should be noted that, in his letter to Basil, Louis II described the events which had taken place in the course of the three previous years; cf. B. M. Kreutz, *Before the Normans: Southern Italy in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, Philadelphia 1996, 43 (= Kreutz, *Normans*).

<sup>398</sup> *Ann. Fuld.* 75.

<sup>399</sup> *Ann. Fuld.* 81.

<sup>400</sup> *Erchemperti Historia Langobardorum Beneventanorum*, ed. G. Waitz, MGH SSRL, Hannoverae 1878, 249.18 – 19.

<sup>401</sup> *Diac.* 140 – 142.

<sup>402</sup> *Diac.* 124.

between the Byzantines and the Franks was, in fact, profound and that many sides were involved. Byzantine diplomacy had made an alliance to the Longobards' duchies in southern Italy. Most probably, they incited the Croats and supported them in expelling the Franks from Dalmatia, and they pressed upon Venice to leave their temporarily alliance with the Franks.

The end of the Croat-Frankish struggle was marked by Constantine's source with the death of Kotzil. He disappeared from Frankish sources before 876.<sup>403</sup> The unnamed sons of Domagoi, which succeeded their father in 876, had been able to keep power only until (at the utmost) the second half of 877, when Zdeslav, backed by Byzantium, expelled them. After this, the Croats would never come again under the dominion of the Franks. During the uprising of the Croats, Domagoi warred at sea, too. It was probably his fleet which made havoc in Istria in 875: *Tunc Sclavorum pessime gentes et Dalmacianorum, Ystriensem provinciam depredare ceperunt. Quattuor videlicet urbes ibidem devastaverunt, id est Umacus, Civitas nova, Sipares atque Ruinius.*<sup>404</sup> John the Deacon described the consequences of this attack: *Et propter hoc fedus inter Sclavos et Veneticos olim fuerat, disruptum est.*<sup>405</sup> Pope John VIII wrote to Domagoi in 874 or, more probably in 875, that he had to take measures against the pirates who were plundering in his name: *qui sub pretextu tui nominis in christicolos debachantur, tanto uehementius accendaris, quanto illorum prauitate famam tui nominis obfuscatam fuisse cognoscis...*<sup>406</sup> If Domagoi had still been a vassal of Louis II, the Pope would have written to him to complain about Domagoi, but such a letter does not exist, nor is it hinted at in any other letter directed from the Pope to the Frankish emperor.

The beginnings of the Croats' uprising should be connected with the appearance of the Byzantine fleet in Dalmatia in 869, which could have triggered further events that led to the war with the

---

<sup>403</sup> See, Šišić, *Povijest*, 357, note 33.

<sup>404</sup> *Diac.* 136.

<sup>405</sup> *Diac.* 138.

<sup>406</sup> *CD I*, N° 8.

Franks.<sup>407</sup> The Franks were probably the initiators of the plot in Domagoi's court in 873/874, which he also discovered. Pope John VIII asked Domagoi to spare the conspirators' lives, but Domagoi did not obey him, and executed all of them.<sup>408</sup> Very soon after these events, probably in 874, Domagoi fended off the Frankish offensive and killed their Duke Kotzil.<sup>409</sup> In 875, his ships were already plundering the northern Adriatic, hitting the interests of Venice hard.<sup>410</sup> Venice was, at that time, an ally of the Franks.<sup>411</sup> Consequently, the overall policy of Domagoi after 871, must be observed as being an extended arm of Byzantine offensive policy against the Franks. On August 12<sup>th</sup> 875, Louis II died, and his death probably was crucial for the final success of Domagoi's uprising. In 876, Domagoi died, too, and his sons succeeded him. Another strong man of that time, Louis the German, king of East Francia, died on August 28<sup>th</sup> 876. The struggle for the emperorship in both Francia (East and West) and the kingship over Italy, which still continued onward after 876, was beneficial for the success of the Croat uprising.

According to the interpretation presented here of the events that occurred in Croatia between the death of Terpimer (ca. 854), and the

<sup>407</sup> It is interesting that *Lib. Pontif. II*, 184, accused Domagoi and his Slavs as those who had stolen the Acts of the Council held in Constantinople in 869 (...in *Sclavorum deducti Domagoi manus*). Fine, *Ethnicity* 43, marks the Narentans (Pagans) as the perpetrators.

<sup>408</sup> *CD I*, N° 7.

<sup>409</sup> Note the name of the same Kotzil in *Vita s. Clementis*: Κοτζέλης, in *Vita s. Clementis episcopi Bulgarorum graece*, ed. Fr. Miklosich, Vindobonae 1847, 6; *Žitie na Kliment Ohridski*, ed. I. Iliev, *Fontes Graeci historiae Bulgaricae* 9, *Fontes Historiae Bulgaricae*, Sofia 2001, c. 30, 16 (=Žitie na Kliment Ohridski), versus Κοτζίλιν (nominative should be Κοτζίλης) in *DAI I*, 30.87.

<sup>410</sup> Therefore, John the Deacon did not write without a good reason: *Dehinc mortuo Domagoi Sclavorum pessimo duce...*; *Diac.* 138.

<sup>411</sup> The Venetian fleet won a victory against the Arabs at the Taranto front in 868, having been sent there, presumably, by the order of Louis II; the title *dominus*, which is in front of Louis II's name in the sources which John the Deacon used for his Chronicle, is also significant; *Diac.* 132: *Interea Baris civitas domni Lodovici regis...*(871); *Diac.* 134: *Eodem vero tempore dum Lodovicus imperator* (874). Note the absence of the same title when speaking of Frankish rulers before ca. 863; cf. *Diac.* 126: *Lodovicus Francorum rex*; *Diac.* 128: *Lodovicus Longobardorum rex*; *Lodovico Longobardorum regi*.

death of Domagoi (876), it must be assumed that Constantine Porphyrogenitus had had a source at his disposal, which described at length the political situation in Croatia during that time. He shortened his source, and from two different events – the turmoil after the death of Krasimer, followed by the deposition of his son Miroslav and the uprising ca. 870 – he created only one event in section 1.12. His statement that the Croats warred for seven years against the Franks fits approximately into the period from 870 to 875. It was Domagoi who led the Croats against the Franks. In Constantinople, it seems that his sons had not been considered as being capable of preserving the new political course, and the decision was made to favor Zdeslav becoming the Croat duke. The best explanation would be that Domagoi already had become an independent ruler, out of the reach of either the Franks or Byzantium – this is, most likely, why Byzantium sent Terpimer's son Zdeslav to claim the throne of Croatia as a Byzantine ally.

2.10. Ἐκτοτε δὲ μείναντες αὐτοδέσποτοι καὶ αὐτόνομοι, ἐξητήσαντο τὸ ἅγιον βάπτισμα παρὰ τοῦ Ῥώμης, καὶ ἀπεστάλησαν ἐπίσκοποι, καὶ ἐβάπτισαν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ Πορίνου, τοῦ ἄρχοντος αὐτῶν.<sup>412</sup>

*From that time they remained independent and autonomous, and they requested holy baptism from Rome, and bishops were sent and baptized them in the time of their Archon Porinos.*

The opening words of this section are most probably Constantine's conclusion, since he used the terms – *independent* and *autonomous* – in some other chapters of the *DAI*. It is his typical phrase.<sup>413</sup> The possible sign of Constantine's retelling is traceable in the repetition of the conjunction *kai*: καὶ ἀπεστάλησαν ἐπίσκοποι, καὶ ἐβάπτισαν αὐτοὺς, as well as by the position of the preposition *epi* (ἐπὶ Πορίνου, τοῦ ἄρχοντος αὐτῶν) at the end of the sentence. Entire section 2.11 appears to be written in a manner of collation of facts. It is

<sup>412</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.87 – 90.

<sup>413</sup> αὐτόνομος – *DAI I*, cc. 6.11; 50.30; αὐτοκέφαλος – *DAI I*, cc. 29.62; 44.28; αὐτοδέσποτος – *DAI I*, cc. 45.131; 50.30; αὐτεξούσιος – *DAI I*, cc. 34.10; 45.131; 50.186; ιδιόρρυθμος – *DAI I*, cc. 25.79, 84; 29.66; 50.8.

actually much more contracted in its content in relation to section 1.5 (see above). However, it is very clear that here Constantine based it on the content of his Latin source, as it is only possible in the Latin source to find that the Croat *archon* asked the Pope for baptism on his own. It was a time of great struggle between the patriarchs of Constantinople and the Roman Popes for supreme spiritual leadership, which was reflected in Bulgaria, as well.<sup>414</sup> Therefore, if it is known that this spiritual and theological struggle had been going on for some two decades (since ca. 860), it is quite unexpected that the Latin source presented the **arrival** of the bishops from Rome in Croatia **as the baptism**, since it is known that the Croat *archontes* had been Christians for a long time before this event and this fact was well known in Rome.<sup>415</sup> In fact, it was just a turnout of the Croat *archon* in ecclesiastical matters; he simply turned away from Constantinople's Church, to which Croatia had been bound for a short time during the rule of Zdeslav (877 – 879), to the Church of Rome.<sup>416</sup> Therefore, there had been no second baptism of the Croats, as has been understood in historiography based on this section of Porphyrogenitus' narrative.<sup>417</sup> The same holds true for the Serbs, since Pope John VIII had already tried to convince the Slav (Serbian) *Archon* Mutimer to revert to the Roman church (ca. 873): *Johannes episcopus Montemero duci*

<sup>414</sup> See, for instance, L. Simeonova, *Diplomacy of the Letter and the Cross, Photios, Bulgaria and the Papacy 860s – 880s*, Amsterdam 1998, passim.

<sup>415</sup> Pope John X (914 – 928) wrote in his letter to the Croat Duke, Tomislav that the Slavs (Croats) were not Christians from *novo tempore*, i.e. from the time of Pope Gregory IV, 827 – 844, as the Saxons were. For the Popes, the Slavs (of Dalmatia) were Christians from a long time hence; cf. *HSM*, 97: *Quis enim ambigit Slavinorum regna in primitie apostolice et universalis ecclesie esse conumerata, cum a cunabulis escam predicationis apostolice ecclesie perceperunt cum lacte carnis, sciuti Saxones novo tempore a nostro antecessore, pie memorie Gregorio papa, doctrinam pariter et literarum studia...manebat.*

<sup>416</sup> The Roman Church in Croatia did not know the Frankish system of a proprietary church; cf. *DAI II*, 126. It is silent witness that the baptism of the Croats had nothing to do with the Franks. About the proprietary church, see, S. Wood, *The Proprietary Church in the Medieval West*, Oxford 2006, esp. pp. 33 – 48. The system of proprietary church was not entirely foreign to the East (i.e. Byzantium) but it was not dominant in the structure of the Church; cf. A. P. Vlasto, *The Entry of the Slavs into Christendom*, Cambridge 1970, 72 (= Vlasto, *Entry*).

<sup>417</sup> See the overview in, Maksimović, *Pokršćavanje*, 164, notes 40 and 41.

*Sclauonicae...Admonemus te, ut progenitorum tuorum secutus morem, quantum potes, ad pannoniensium reuerti studeas dioecesim: et quia iam illic, Deo gratias, a sede beati Petri apostoli episcopus ordinatus est, ad ipsius pastorem recurras sollicitudinem.*<sup>418</sup>

It has often been argued that the name of the Croat *archon*, Porinos, most probably derives from the Latin form for the Slav name Bran: Branimer.<sup>419</sup> If this interpretation is correct, then there must be only one Croat duke of this name, well known from various sources: *Branimirus*.<sup>420</sup> His rule, which began in the late Spring of 879, comes chronologically after the Croat uprising against the Franks. It is also well known that Branimer had been pursuing a strong ecclesiastical policy of trying to establish the bishop of Nin as the archbishop of Spalato. His letters to the Pope are not preserved, but the Pope's responses, are. According to these letters, it is evident that the Pope praised Branimer because he had come back, together with his people, to the Roman church.<sup>421</sup> A few days later, on the 10<sup>th</sup> of June 879, the Pope sent *archipresbyter Iohannes* to Branimer.<sup>422</sup> Even though Branimer had not been able to achieve his main goal of posting his bishop of Nin, Theodosius, as the archbishop of Split (consecrated by the Pope), this same Theodosius still became the archbishop of Split (ca. 886) after the death of the Archbishop Marin, having been consecrated by Walpertus, the patriarch of Aquileia.<sup>423</sup> Branimer, therefore, had a very strange relationship with the Pope. On one hand,

<sup>418</sup> *Fragmenta*, 282.25 – 30. This Mutimer is often misinterpreted as the Croatian duke of the same name; most recently it is done by, D. Kalhous, *The Significance of the Sirmian and Apostolic Tradition in Shaping Moravian Episcopal Organization*, *Early Medieval Europe* 17 (2009) 269. For scholarly dispute which Mutimer is mentioned in the letter of John VIII, see, Živković, *Južni Sloveni*, 407, n. 1006. The Croat Duke Mutimer ruled from c. 891 (after Duke Branimer, 879 – c. 891). Branimer is attested as the ruling duke on an inscription from 888; cf. M. Zekan, *Pet natpisa kneza Branimira sa posebnim osvrtom na nalaz iz Otrisa*, *Kačić* 25 (1993) 412 – 413.

<sup>419</sup> Šišić, *Povijest*, 386, n. 20. For other opinions, that Porin was in fact Pribina, see, *DAI II*, 120; *FB II*, 41, n. 118.

<sup>420</sup> Note the form of the name Pribislau in the *Evangelistarium de Cividale, Bribislau*; cf. Rački, *Documenta*, 384.

<sup>421</sup> *CD I*, N° 10 (June 7, 879).

<sup>422</sup> *CD I*, N° 13.

<sup>423</sup> *CD I*, N° 17.

he maintained good relations with him, binding himself to Rome, but on the other, he was looking to find another ecclesiastical center from which he would eventually obtain consecration for his bishop of Nin as the archbishop of Spalato. Therefore, he could not have been considered as a true ally of the Pope, or, at least, not profoundly loyal to Rome. However, it must be noted that his policy regarding the papacy was not the same one at the beginning and in the later years of his rule. Finally, at the end of this section, Constantine mentions him in the *Past tense*, which could mean that either Constantine's source already had done so, or it was Constantine's understanding from his chronological point of view. Since it is assumed that Constantine's primary source on the Croats was composed ca. 878, it is impossible that here Croat Duke Branimer is met.

This section is, in fact, compiled from Constantine's primary source on the Croats, and I believe that this was Constantine's interpretation of the final version of the chapter on the Croats. Namely, the conjunction καὶ, which Constantine used twice in the second part of this sentence, and then ἐπὶ, to clarify the timeline with the introduction of the ruler's name, Porin, appears to be evidence of retelling the previous stories on the baptism of the Croats. This section had not originally been in Constantine's source, but rather his own interpretation of the facts related to the Croats based on his primary Latin source. Therefore, Porga and Porin are actually the same names as well as the same person, but they are not related either to Borna (ca. 817 – 821), the duke of Dalmatian Croatia, or to Branimer (879 – ca. 891), but to the same Porga, who had been already mentioned in chapter 31, the son of the *archon* who led the Croats into Dalmatia in the 7<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>424</sup> This means that Constantine decided, in his final version of the chapter on the Croats, not only to remove Heraclius from the narrative related to the arrival of the Croats, but also to erase any memory on Heraclius regarding the baptism of the Croats.

2.11. Διμερίσθη οὖν ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν εἰς ζουπανίας ἰά, ἥγουν ἢ Χλεβίανα, ἢ Τζένζηνα, τὰ ῥημοτα, ἢ Πλέβα, ἢ Πεσέντα,

<sup>424</sup> It is interesting to note that Grafenauer, *Prilog 27*, came to the same conclusion even though it was based on different evidence.

ἡ Παραθαλασσία, ἡ Βρεβέρη, ἡ Νόνα, ἡ Τνήνα, ἡ Σίδραγα, ἡ Νίνα· καὶ ὁ βοάνος αὐτῶν κρατεῖ τὴν Κρίβασαν, τὴν Λίτζαν καὶ τὴν Γουτζησκά.<sup>425</sup>

*Their country was divided into 11 zupanias, namely: Chlebiana, Tzenzina, Imota, Pleba, Pesenta, Parathalassia, Breberi, Nona, Tnina, Sidraga, Nina, and their ban rules over Kribasa, Litza and Goutziska.*

This section had come either from the Archives of the Imperial Palace or from Constantine's primary source on the Croats, and definitely had not belonged to the time of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. This is obvious due to the opening word Διεμερίσθη - *was divided*. If Constantine had preserved the original text of his source, which the adverb *oun* signalizes, as it is closing the section, then it must be expected that this excerpt was displaced from his primary source on the Croats. Otherwise, the adverb *oun* should not be there, since there is no apparent connection between the previous sentence in section 2.11 about the baptism of Porin and the administrative division of Croatia. The appearance of *ban* (*their ban*), the rank mentioned for the first time in 1.12, where the short remark on *Ban Pribina* was made, and his specific role as the governor of the three regions in the north-eastern corner of Croatia (Lika, Krbava, and Gacka), suggests that the explanation of this rank and its holder position should have somehow been connected with the story about Pribina and his military action in Croatia.

It is possible that this section had been originally positioned after the story about Pribina and his military intervention in Croatia, which ended with the deposition of *Archon* Miroslav. After his initial success, Pribina probably rearranged the administrative division of Croatia, annexing the territories bordering his possessions adjacent to the southern borders of Lower Pannonia, so that he would have been able to prevent any Croat incursions into his territories. Since he came from Pannonia, where the Avar tradition regarding military ranks and titles had already existed for centuries, it would easily explain the introduction of the title of *ban* in Croatia.<sup>426</sup> If this is the case, the

<sup>425</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.90 – 94.

<sup>426</sup> The title of *ban* is probably close to the personal name of Bayan (Avar) and should be of Turkic origin; cf. *DAI II*, 121. However, the title of *ban* among the Avars has

adverb *oun* in this section suggests that this sentence, almost certainly, belonged to the end of section 1.12. Therefore, this division of Croatia is related to the period between ca. 862/863 and 870, and since it is very precisely given – eleven names of the *zupanias*, and three separate regions in the north-eastern corner of Croatia – the writer of this account had not been distant from the events described. It should be added that the uncommonly accurate information known to the same author about the duration of the war between the Franks and the Croats (seven years), as well as the preserved name of the Frankish lord, Kotzilis, who found death in that struggle, are further evidence that he did not write his account much after ca. 875, when the Croats' uprising against the Franks ended.

The rest of this chapter, straight to the end, is based on Constantine's Byzantine sources, most probably from the Archives of the Imperial Palace and various reports of Byzantine officials. The boundaries between Croatia, Serbia, Terbounia, Zachlounia, Diocleia and Pagania, could be partially from the time of Basil I, as well as from Constantine's own time.<sup>427</sup> Note the point of view of the observer for whom Serbia is situated *at the front* of Croatia, and *at the front of Croatia* is the Serbian border. If one were to have stated this, one would have had to be located in Constantinople, since *at the front* demonstrates that the observer was to the east in both cases. However, for an observer from Italy (Rome) the principalities of Pagania, Terbounia, Zachlounia, Diocleia, and Croatia, should have stated that Serbia was *behind*, not *at the front*.<sup>428</sup> The exact tribute that Dalmatian towns had to pay to the Slavs comes also from the Archives of the Imperial Palace, but it cannot be said whether it had still been imposed in Constantine's own time.<sup>429</sup> The only section, which may be partially based on the same Latin source about the Croats, is the following:

---

never been attested to in historical sources, only *qagan*. It is probable that *ban* was a military commander of a high rank, similar to that of *tudun* mentioned in the *ARF* in 795, 796, 811; cf. *ARF*, 96, 98, 135. An Iranian origin of this word should not be ruled out – *ban* = *keeper, guard*; cf. H. G. Lunt, *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*, Berlin 2001, 256. Whether the Avars introduced this title into Europe, or the Croats and the Serbs (due to their highly probable Iranian origin) remains yet to be solved.

<sup>427</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.94 – 117.

<sup>428</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.103 – 104.

<sup>429</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.132 – 142.

2.12. Ἐπειδὴ οὖν οἱ εἰρημένοι Σκλάβοι, κατεκράτησαν πᾶσαν τὴν περίχωρον Δελματίας· ἠργάζοντο δὲ τὰ κάστρα τῶν Ῥωμάνων τὰς νήσους, καὶ ἔζουν ἐξ αὐτῶν· ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν Παγανῶν καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαιχμαλωτιζόμενοι καὶ ἀφανιζόμενοι κατέλιπον τὰς τοιαύτας νήσους, βουλόμενοι εἰς τὴν ἡπειρον ἐργάζεσθαι. Ἐκωλύοντο δὲ παρὰ τῶν Χρωβάτων· οὐπω γὰρ ἐτέλουν αὐτοὺς φόρους, ἀλλὰ πάντα, ἅπερ ἀρτίως παρέχουσι τοῖς Σκλάβοις, τῷ στρατηγῷ ταῦτα παρεῖχον.<sup>430</sup>

*After the aforesaid Slavs had settled down, they took rule of all the surrounding territory of Dalmatia; but the cities of the Romani took to cultivating the islands and living off them; since, however, they were permanently enslaved and destroyed by the Pagani, they deserted these islands and resolved to cultivate the mainland; then the Croats were molesting them; for they were not yet tributary to the Croats, and used to pay to the strategos all that they now pay to the Slavs.*

The insertion of this section into the main narrative of Constantine's primary source, based on different source(s), is marked by Ἐπειδὴ οὖν (*since, after*) and actually appears to have been somewhat a conclusion on the part of Constantine.<sup>431</sup> It is here he used the same section of his primary source that he had already used in chapter 29 (see section 3.2 above), and for the purpose of his conclusion, he had to have made a connection between this source and the information he had found elsewhere in his attempt to make an overview of Dalmatian events from the 7<sup>th</sup> century up to his own time.<sup>432</sup> The same context of this narrative, with some alternation and being much more extensive, can be found in the work of Thomas of Spalato (d. 1268).<sup>433</sup> The retelling is obvious with the appearance of the Slavs, mentioned at the beginning of this section, which replaced the Avars

<sup>430</sup> *DAI I*, c. 30.119 – 126.

<sup>431</sup> Note the appearance of the *Romani*, instead of the *Romaioi*; cf. *DAI I*, c. 30.121 (τῶν Ῥωμάνων). This is, most probably, due to Constantine's haste, since he had overlooked this term from the primary source on the Croats he used.

<sup>432</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.46 – 53.

<sup>433</sup> *HS*, 42.1 – 17; 44.1 – 46.8.

from Constantine's primary source. The Pagans and the Croats are described as the enemies of the Romans and there are *Romani* (Ῥωμαίων) instead of *Romaioi* as a consequence of Constantine's slip. The last two sentences, in which the Croats are presented as the enemies of the Romans, are in opposition to previous statements that the Croats had settled in Dalmatia at the command of Heraclius (see 1.3 above). Right here, quite to the contrary, they appear to be enemies. The reason for this confusion must have been in Constantine's recapitulation of the events, which were connected to the time of Basil I. This is why he had to clarify that at that time *they (sc. Romani) were not tributary to the Croats*. This would mean that Constantine had been trying to connect information from his sources into a chronologically and logically coherent narrative. However, the most convincing evidence here that he had been partially using his primary source on the Croats is the term *Romani* instead of *Romaioi*. The number of semicolons, three of them, is also a testimony of Constantine's rather hasty retelling based on several sources.



## THE STORY OF THE SERBS

The same work characteristics of the author that have been mentioned in the title of chapter 31 can be equally applied to the title of chapter 32. The basic idea of the author was the same: collection of all available material he had on the Serbs, under one title. Unfortunately, the *DAI* we have today did not preserve Constantine's first draft of this chapter, where his primary sources would have probably been much more recognizable, as is the case for the Croats in chapter 31. Therefore, it will be much more difficult to establish what kind of sources Constantine had used for the composition of this chapter.

However, the story about the Serbs is composed from three parts.<sup>434</sup> The first one, and it represents the bulk of the text, had been compiled from different sources – Constantine's primary source on the Serbs<sup>435</sup> and the Archives of the Imperial Palace.<sup>436</sup> Two, far smaller sections at the end of this chapter are, as shall be shown momentarily, exclusively from Constantine's primary source on the Serbs. The common title *peri ton*, joint with the opening words *isteon oti*, suggests that this chapter had not been considered finished by the author, which is corroborated even further with the appearance of two isolated sections opened by *oti* at the end of this chapter. Judging by the degree of Constantine's compiling of the information from at least two different types of sources (the primary source and the Archives of the Imperial Palace) in the main narrative, makes this version of the history of the Serbs at least the second one, written ca. 949/950.

---

<sup>434</sup> Cf. Margetić, *Porfirogenit*, 9 – 10. See for slightly different views, *DAI II*, 4; Maksimović, *Struktura*, 26; Ferjančić, *Dolazak*, 126.

<sup>435</sup> This term 'primary source', which is often referred to in this chapter, is the same one that has been used in the previous chapters about the Croats and Dalmatia. It should be taken as mere *terminus technicus* for a hypothetical source.

<sup>436</sup> Maksimović, *Struktura*, 27 – 28, already stressed that the author of the *Serbian Chronicle* had used several sources; see also, *DAI II*, 4 – 5, 100, who considered *DAI I*, 32.1 – 81 to have come from an older source.

However, Constantine did advance his methodology in the Serbian chapter. When he had exhausted his primary source, which had not covered the period after ca. 856, Constantine turned his attention to the other documents from the second half of the ninth and first decades of the tenth centuries, according to which he was able to extend the narrative about the Serbs until ca. 935.<sup>437</sup> He applied exactly the same principle to chapters 43, 44, 45, and 46, updating the events until the time of his predecessor Roman.<sup>438</sup> This kind of work is clearly preserved in chapter 44: *Of the country of Apachounis and of the city of Manzikert and Perkri and Chliat and Chaliat and Arzes and Tibi and Chert and Salamas and Tzermatzou.*<sup>439</sup> This chapter is opened with an *isteon oti*, just as in chapter 32 on the Serbs, but the whole chapter is actually group of notes opened by *oti*. The genealogy of the rulers of Manzikert, updated to his own time<sup>440</sup> and placed in separate sections opened by *oti*, suggests that this had been extracted from the diplomatic documents. It is evident from the facts which were well known to the author, such as: two rulers (brothers) submitted to the emperor and paid tribute, but in turn were awarded with the ranks; the third brother also did the same; the rulers are generally recognized by the emperor, etc...<sup>441</sup> This kind of information is typical for diplomatic letters, or even imperial *keleusis*. Therefore, chapter 44 is based on the Archives of the Imperial Palace and provides perfect insight into how it was possible from these diplomatic letters and imperial *keleusis* to create a type of genealogy of rulers or short history of a specific region. It is herein assumed that Constantine's story of the Serbs related to the events after ca. 856, was assembled exactly in such a manner.<sup>442</sup>

<sup>437</sup> See the commentary of section 4.12 below.

<sup>438</sup> *DAI II*, 4, noticed that this passage of the Serbian history, starting at line 80 and ending at line 145, narrates about the imperial diplomatic relations with Serbian rulers in 'just the same way that relations with Taronite rulers are narrated in *DAI I*, c. 43.89 – 133.

<sup>439</sup> *DAI I*, c. 44.1 – 5.

<sup>440</sup> *DAI I*, c. 44.79 – 80.

<sup>441</sup> *DAI I*, c. 44.43 – 46; 55 – 60.

<sup>442</sup> It was only, L. Waldmüller, *Die ersten Begegnungen der Slawen mit dem Christentum und den christlichen Völkern vom VI. bis VIII. Jh.*, Amsterdam 1976, (= Waldmüller, *Begegnungen*) 308, n. 314, who argued that chapter 32 was based exclusively on the material from the Archives of the Imperial Palace.

The most important question in regard to Constantine's sources on the Serbs is to find out in which section he had ceased to use his primary source on the Serbs, and from that point he started using the material from the Archives of the Imperial Palace.<sup>443</sup>

4. Περὶ τῶν Σέρβλων καὶ ἧς νῦν οἰκοῦσι χώρας.

*Of the Serbs and of the country they now dwell in.*

This should be the same title which Constantine created when he made his first draft of this chapter. Due to the relation between the *Peri ton* in the title and the words *Isteon, oti*, at the beginning of this chapter, as well as due to the two *oti*-sections at the end of this chapter, it can be safely concluded that Constantine did not consider this chapter as complete. However, according to its composition, which contains strong evidence of the author's great effort to gather and to connect various documents, especially in its second part, it can be concluded that chapter 32 had been brought almost to its final version.

There is also the interesting manner in which the name of the Serbs is written: οἱ Σέρβλοι.<sup>444</sup> The letter *lambda* actually corresponds to the name of *the Serbs* in the plural form attested to in Medieval Cyrillic documents: СРЪВАКМЪ, СРЪВАКХЪ.<sup>445</sup> It is also important to note that *the Serb* in singular is also written with a *lambda* on two occasions in the *DAI*: ὁ Σέρβλος, τοῦ Σέρβλου.<sup>446</sup> The same form for the singular

<sup>443</sup> This section (*DAI I*, c. 32.1 – 81) is already marked in *DAI II*, 100, as being based on an olden source. Maksimović, *Struktura*, 28, n. 15, denied that.

<sup>444</sup> *DAI I*, cc. 29.55, 57, 63; 31.9, 84, 61; 32.1, 2, 6, 12 – 13, 15, 17, 26, 36, 40, 47, 49, 51, 108, 137; 33.9; 34.4; 36.6, 10.

<sup>445</sup> See, for instance, some examples in: *Monumenta Serbica spectantia historiam Serbiae, Bosnae, Ragusii*, ed. Fr. Miklosich, Viennae 1858 (= *Monumenta Serbica*), N<sup>os</sup> 112 (1347); 115 (1348); 116 (1348); 117 (1348); 119 (1348); 123 (1349); 124 (1349); 125 (1349); 141 (1357); 143 (1357). See, also, *Selected Charters of Serbian Rulers (XII – XV Century) Relating to the Territory of Kosovo and Metohia I*, ed. T. Živković – S. Bojanin – V. Petrović, Athens 2000, N<sup>os</sup> 7 (1321): ЗАКОНЪ СТАРЫ СРЪВЛЕМЪ – *The Old Serbian Law*; 11: КНЕЗЪ ЛАЗАРЪ СРЪВЛЕМЪ (1381); 16: Г(ОСПОДИ)НЬ ВСЕМЪ СРВАКМ(Ъ) (1411).

<sup>446</sup> *DAI I*, cc. 29.109; 32.31.

is also attested to in Medieval Serbian documents: **СРЪВЛИНЬ/СРЪВЛЬ** (nominative), **СРЪВЛИНОУ** (dative).<sup>447</sup> The evidence from Serbian Medieval documents in fact corroborates that the form Σέρβλος/Σέρβλοι had not been misused in the *DAI*, and its persistency is somewhat of proof that the author of the *DAI* (as well as of the Constantine's primary source on the Serbs) had some documents in front of him which had been composed as a consequence of close relations with the Serbs.

4.1. Ἰστέον, ὅτι οἱ Σέρβλοι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀβαπτίστων Σέρβλων, τῶν καὶ ἄσπρων ἐπονομαζομένων, κατάγονται, τῶν τῆς Τουρκίας ἐκεῖθεν κατοικούντων, εἰς τὸν παρ' αὐτοῖς Βοῖκι τόπον ἐπονομαζόμενον, ἐν οἷς πλησιάζει καὶ ἡ Φραγγία, ὁμοίως καὶ ἡ μεγάλη Χρωβατία, ἡ ἀβάπτιστος, ἡ καὶ ἄσπρη προσαγουρευομένη ἐκεῖσε τοίνυν καὶ οὗτοι οἱ Σέρβλοι τὸ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κατόκουν.<sup>448</sup>

*It should be known that the Serbs are descended from the unbaptized Serbs, also called 'white', who live beyond Turkey, in a region called by them Boiki, where their neighbor is Francia, as is also Megali Croatia, the unbaptized, also called 'white'. In this place, then, these Serbs also dwelt from the beginning.*

There is a great similarity in regard to the general features of the narrative about the origin of the Croats and the Serbs,<sup>449</sup> since it appears to be the product of the same mind and thoughts.<sup>450</sup> This probably could mean that both stories had been contained in the same source.<sup>451</sup> The

<sup>447</sup> *Monumenta Serbica*, N° 145 (1357).

<sup>448</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.2 – 7.

<sup>449</sup> *DAI I*, 32.2 – 5, about the Serbs is almost identical with *DAI I*, 31.3 – 6, about the origin, old homeland, and neighbors of the Croats.

<sup>450</sup> Hauptmann, *Seobe*, 48 – 50; Grafenauer, *Prilog*, 24, and Margetić, *Porfirogenit*, 75 – 80, thought that Constantine constructed the introductory part of the Serbian chapter based exclusively on the Croat story. For the opposite opinion, see, *DAI II*, 132; M. Čorović-Ljubinković, *Odnosi Slovena centralnih oblasti Balkana i Vizantije od VII do XII veka*, Materijali 9 (1972) 88 – 90; Waldmüller, *Begegnungen*, 306 – 307; Katičić, *Uz početke*, 52; Ferjančić, *Dolazak*, 149; Maksimović, *Pokrštavanje*, 157 – 158; Živković, *Južni Sloveni*, 197.

<sup>451</sup> See, for a somewhat different view, Bury, *Treatise*, 558 – 559. It is still unmatched in later historiography.

repetition about the unbaptized Croats and the Serbs called the “White” (see 1.1 above) must be noticed. It seems that the first part of the section (up to κατάγονται) had been extracted verbally from Constantine’s source. Then, there is an insertion τῶν τῆς Τουρκίας ἐκεῖθεν κατοικούντων, according to Constantine’s information from his own time (see above, 1.1). After this insertion, it appears that the rest of the section was drawn from Constantine’s source. It is important to note that his source stressed that *a place Boiki is called by them* (i.e. the White Serbs) – εἰς τὸν παρ’ αὐτοῖς Βοῖκι τόπον ἐπονομαζόμενον.<sup>452</sup> The position of northern Serbia seems to have been known to another Latin author since the beginning of the 10<sup>th</sup> century. Namely, in the document written between ca. 900 and 921, it is said that *the Hungarians moved to Pannonia from Serbia (Ungarorum gens a Servia egressa in Pannoniam)*.<sup>453</sup> This Servia is able to be only the same White Serbia as mentioned by Constantine Porphyrogenitus. It is possible that informant who had known that the Serbs called the land of their origin *Boiki*, could have drawn that information from the White Serbs, and not from the Balkan Serbs. The tradition of the land *Boiki* never appears in the Balkan Serbs’ tradition. Therefore, here are two separate accounts on the Serbs. The first one is from Constantine’s primary source on the Serbs (and the Croats), and the other one is based on information after 896, and the arrival of the Hungarians in Pannonia. If the informant who recorded the story about the White Serbs was from the 9<sup>th</sup> century (at least before 896, in any case), then he would have been familiar with those regions to the north/northeast of Moravia and the Slav tribes settled there – especially with the White Croats and the White Serbs. This is twofold information in regard to the Serbs: at one moment it appears that someone had gathered information among the Serbs, and in the following section it appears as if he had gathered information on the Serbs in Bulgaria (see 4.10 below), which repeats in chapter 32 several times. Sometimes the story runs from the Serbs to the outer lands, and sometimes from neighboring countries (i.e. Bulgaria) to Serbia. This is a very important observation and could be of essential importance to understand who this anonymous informant could have been.

<sup>452</sup> For the dispute about the position of the land of *Boiki*, see, Hauptmann, Seobe, 46 – 48; Grafenauer, *Prilog*, 23; *DAI II*, 130 – 131; Ferjančić, *Dolazak*, 127 – 128.

<sup>453</sup> Kos, *Gradivo II*, N° 334.

There is an interesting source from the second half of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, the so-called Bavarian Geographer, who made a list of the Slav tribes of central and eastern Europe, and enumerated the cities in each land they possessed. It is stated in this source that the first neighbors of *Hehfeldi* are the Serbs (*Surbi*) *in qua regione plures sunt quae habent civitates L.* However, there is another tribe of *Zeriuani quod tantum est regnum ut ex eo cunctae gentes Sclavorum exortae sint et originem sicut affirmant ducant.*<sup>454</sup> These *Zeriuani* could also mean the Serbs. According to the Bavarian Geographer, it appears that the Slavs in general claimed to be descended from the Serbs. Whether this claim was legendary or was based on some common memories of the Slavs is not so important; rather, it is much more important that the Serbs and Croats in the 9<sup>th</sup> century *could have had* some thoughts about their northern origin.<sup>455</sup> Finally, according to Bavarian Geographer, it was *à la mode* at that time (ca. 870) for the Slavs to claim their tribal origin from the Serbs.

4.2. Δύο δὲ ἀδελφῶν τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς Σερβλίας ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς διαδεξαμένων, ὁ εἷς αὐτῶν τὸ τοῦ λαοῦ ἀναλαβόμενος ἡμῖς, εἰς Ἡράκλειον, τὸν βασιλέα Ῥωμαίων, προσέφυγεν, ὃν καὶ προσδεξάμενος ὁ αὐτὸς Ἡράκλειος βασιλεὺς, παρέσχεν τόπον εἰς κατασκήνωσιν ἐν τῷ θέματι Θεσσαλονίκης τὰ Σέρβλια, ἃ ἔκτοτε τὴν τοιαύτην προσηγορίαν ἀπέειληεν.<sup>456</sup>

*Now, after the two brothers succeeded their father in the rule of Serbia, one of them, taking one half of the folk, came as the refugee to Heraclius, the emperor of the Romaioi, and the same Emperor Heraclius received him and gave him a region in the theme of Thessalonica to settle in, namely Serblia, which from that time has acquired this denomination.*

<sup>454</sup> <http://idrisi.narod.ru/geo-bavar.htm>.

<sup>455</sup> Similar: Bury, *Treatise*, 559; also, *DAI II*, 114 – 116, 131 – 133; Ferjančić, *Dolazak*, 138 – 139. On the other hand, Grafenauer, *Prilog*, 24; Klaić, *O problemima*, 254, 258, denied the possibility that the Serbs (and the Croats, Klaić) could have had any knowledge about their ancient homeland in the middle of the 10<sup>th</sup> century. Also see the commentary of section 5.4 in this book.

<sup>456</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.7 – 12.

The whole passage appears to have been transcribed literally from Constantine's primary source on the Serbs. Constantine's insertion in this *origo gentis* could be, at first glance, the explanation for the name of *Serblia*, who allegedly acquired this denomination according to the *Serbloi*, who settled there.<sup>457</sup>

The Greek term *theme* is equivalent to the Latin *provincia*. The Byzantine *theme* of Thessalonica had not existed in the 7<sup>th</sup> century, and had not even existed up to the very end of the 8<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>458</sup> Therefore, the term *theme* of Thessalonica was used anachronistically either by Constantine or his anonymous source. In both cases this source could not have originated before the end of the 8<sup>th</sup> century, the most probable date when the *theme* of Thessalonica was created.<sup>459</sup>

It is worth mentioning that there are two places in the vicinity of Servia, which seem to be named after the Serbs: Σερβοχώρι (38 km northeast from Servia) and Ζέρβη (44 km northwest of Servia).<sup>460</sup> Stephen of Byzantium, who wrote ca. 550, even though had recorded hundreds of place-names in what is today modern Greece, did not mention Servia.<sup>461</sup> His contemporary Hierocles, who wrote prior to 535, did not mention Servia among the cities listed in *Macedonia Prima*.<sup>462</sup> Constantine Porphyrogenitus, in his *De thematibus*, did not mention Servia either.<sup>463</sup> The late 7<sup>th</sup> century anonymous author of Ravenna also

<sup>457</sup> For the Serb settlement in *Serblia*, see, P. Skok, *Konstantinova Srbica na Bistrici u Grčkoj*, Glas SKA 176 (1938) 243 – 284 (= Skok, *Srbica*).

<sup>458</sup> See, A. Stavridou-Zafraka, *Slav Invasions and the Theme Organization in the Balkan Peninsula*, *Byzantiaka* 12 (1992) 172, thought that the theme of Thessalonica was established before 783. Oikonomidès, *Listes*, 352, argued that this theme existed before 824. W. Treadgold, *The Byzantine Revival 780 – 842*, Stanford 1988, 190, dated it during the rule of Nicephor I (802 – 811). Živković, *Forging Unity*, 139, n. 75, after the campaign of Stauracios in 783, i.e. during the second half of 780s.

<sup>459</sup> Constantine Porphyrogenitus knew that the city of Thessalonica was the seat of the former province of Macedonia; cf. *De them.* 89.5 – 7.

<sup>460</sup> Cf. T. Živković, *Sloveni i Romeji*, Beograd 2000, 96, n. 296.

<sup>461</sup> *Stephani Byzantii EΘNIKΩN quae supersunt*, ed. A. Westermann, Lipsiae 1839.

<sup>462</sup> *Le Synekdèmos d'Hiéroklès et l'opuscule géographique de Georges de Chypre*, ed. E. Honigmann, Brussels, 1939.

<sup>463</sup> *De them.*, 88.33 – 44. And, what is more important, the *De thematibus* was written at least four or five years after the *DAI*.

had no knowledge of Serbia.<sup>464</sup> It seems that Serbia is recorded for the first time in the Chronicle of Iohannes Scylitzes, during the war between Bulgaria and Byzantium in ca. 1000.<sup>465</sup> Since Porphyrogenitus obviously knew of this city, his information on Serbia can be considered as being earliest.<sup>466</sup>

Since not a single Byzantine or Latin author from the 6<sup>th</sup> century had known of the name of the town of Serblia/Servia, this gives some credit to Constantine's account about the origin of this name. It is also very important to note that Constantine mentioned τόπος, not the city or town, but rather *the place* in the sense of the *region*.<sup>467</sup> The whole story is, again, twofold. Namely, it could be understood that the Serbs themselves had told this story to an informant, and it also appears as if it was a local story from the vicinity of Servlia/Servia or Thessalonica. However, the information preserved in the following section of 4.3, which explains the Latin etymology of the Serbs' name, could be confirmation that it does not mean that Serbs had told this story to an informant, but rather it was an informant's knowledge about the Serbs, Serblia/Servia, and Thessalonica, based on the local (Slav?) tradition.<sup>468</sup>

4.3. Σέρβλοι δὲ τῆ τῶν Ῥωμαίων διαλέκτῳ ῥοῦλοι ᾿προσαγορεύονται, ὅθεν καὶ ῥέρβυλα ᾿ ἡ κοινὴ συνήθεια τὰ δουρικὰ φησιν ὑποδήματα, καὶ ῥζερβουλιανούς ᾿ τοὺς τὰ εὐτελεῆ καὶ πενιχρὰ ὑποδήματα φοροῦντας. Ταύτην δὲ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἔσχον οἱ Σέρβλοι διὰ τὸ δοῦλοι γενέσθαι τοῦ βασιλέως Ῥωμαίων.<sup>469</sup>

<sup>464</sup> *Ravennatis Anonymi Cosmographia et Gvidonis Geographica*, ed. M. Pinder – G. Parthey, Berolini 1860.

<sup>465</sup> *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum*, Corpus fontium historiae Byzantinae 5, rec. I. Thurn, Berlin – New York 1973, 344, 364.

<sup>466</sup> About the possible reasons why Heraclius could have settled the Serbs to the south of Thessalonica, see, Živković, *Južni Sloveni*, 199 – 200. See, also, *DAI II*, 131 – 132. Grafenauer, *Prilog*, 24 – 25, rejected the double settlement of the Serbs.

<sup>467</sup> See, Skok, *Srbica*, 252 – 254.

<sup>468</sup> The story about the Serbs' settlement in the vicinity of Thessalonica is subject of some dispute; see, Ferjančić, *Dolazak*, 129, notes. 46 – 47; Živković, *Južni Sloveni*, 196. Pohl, *Awaren*, 267, thinks that the whole story about the settlement of the Serbs came from Byzantine perspective.

<sup>469</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.12 – 16.

*Serbs, in the language of the Romaioi, is the word for ‘servants’, whence the colloquial ‘serbula’ for menial shoes, and ‘tzerboulianoi’ for those who wear cheap, shoddy footwear. This name the Serbs acquired from their being servants of the emperor of the Romaioi.*

Constantine stated that the name of the *Serbloi* had derived from the word *serboula*, for menial shoes, and *tzerboulianoi* for those who wear cheap, shoddy footwear. *This name*, Constantine explains, *the Serbs acquired from their being slaves of the emperor of the Romaioi.*<sup>470</sup> The word σέρβουλα in Byzantine texts appears only in this section of the *DAI*. It is obviously a paraethymology which could have been inspired by the Greek word ἄρβυλα. The further explanation of *servoula* being equal to *tzerboulianoi* is again Constantine’s invention,<sup>471</sup> most probably having been inspired by the common knowledge that cheap shoes were called *tzerboulia* in his own time.<sup>472</sup> Therefore, this section (4.3), up to φοροῦντας, could be observed as Constantine’s original contribution to the earliest history of the Serbs.<sup>473</sup> However, the last sentence in which the *Serbloi* acquired their name from being slaves to the emperor of the *Romaioi* is a trace from Constantine’s source – since there is no logical connection with the previous statement that they had acquired their name from their type of shoes. It must therein be assumed that Constantine found that the Serbs had been under the rule of the emperors of *Romaioi* in his source (see

<sup>470</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.13 – 15.

<sup>471</sup> Constantine often provides translations of foreign words or etymologies; for instance: *DAI I*, cc. 9.25 – 26; 9.45 – 46; 9.40 – 41; 9. 58 – 59; 9.64 – 65; 9.61; 9.107; 14.33 – 36; 27.69 – 70; 27.93 – 94; 29.81 – 82; 29.217 – 219; 29.237; 29.260 – 261; 29.263 – 264; 31.6 – 8; 33.10 – 11; 33.15; 34.12 – 13; 34.16 – 17; 36.11; 37.60 – 61; 37.68 – 70; 42.24; 46.3 – 4; 53.500. It is important to note that his etymologies or paraetymologies had not found their place in the Byzantine Encyclopedia – *Souda*. This could be circumstantial evidence that most of the etymologies found in the *DAI* had actually been Constantine’s ingenuities. Those etymologies by which Constantine referred to ancient authors (for instance in chapter 23 on Iberia and Spain) have been excluded.

<sup>472</sup> See, T. Dawson, *Propriety, Practicality and Pleasure: the Parameters of Women’s Dress in Byzantium A.D. 1000 – 1200*, Byzantine Women: Varieties of Experience A.D. 800 – 1200, ed. L. Garland, London 2006, 58.

<sup>473</sup> See, Curta, *Making*, 66, n. 69, that the name of the Serbs, deriving from *servi* is plainly wrong; also, Eggers, *Situation*, 41 – 42.

below 4.5 and 4.13) and that is why the last sentence of section 4.3 is preserved in this *etymological exercise*.

4.4. Μετὰ δὲ χρόνον τινὰ ἔδοξεν τοὺς αὐτοὺς Σέρβλους εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἀπελθεῖν, καὶ τούτους ἀπέστειλεν ὁ βασιλεὺς. Ὅτε δὲ διεπέρασαν τὸν Δανούβιν ποταμόν, μετὰμελοι γενόμενοι ἐμήνυσαν Ἡρακλείῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ διὰ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ, τοῦ τότε τὸ Βελέγραδον κρατοῦντος, δοῦναι αὐτοῖς ἕτεραν γῆν εἰς κατασκήνωσιν.<sup>474</sup>

*Then, after some time these same Serbs decided to depart to their own homes, and the emperor sent them off. And so, when they had crossed the Danube River, they changed their minds and sent a request to the Emperor Heraclius, through the strategos then holding Belgrade that he would grant them other land to settle.*

The beginning of this section: *Μετὰ δὲ χρόνον τινὰ*, is an evident indication that Constantine's source was not so accurate regarding the Serbs' settlement, as it was in the case of the Croats'. However, since the whole section was, most probably, based on Constantine's primary source on the Serbs, the weakness of the source at this place could mean that the author have had no means to collect the Serbian *origo gentis* directly from the Serbs. The anonymous author had been trying to preserve the pattern established in the Croat chapter regarding the *origo gentis*, but the material he had did not allow him to do so properly. The mention of the military commander of Belgrade is odd. The Slav name for Belgrade, the former Singidunum, was recorded for the first time in the letter of the Pope John VIII (16 April 878) to Michael, *Bulgarorum regi*.<sup>475</sup> Such a detail, that the Serbs had asked for another land through the military commander of Belgrade, hardly could have originated from Constantine's own thoughts. On the other hand, the overall weakness of the Serb *origo gentis* leads to the following conclusions: 1) it is not plausible that the Croat tradition of *origo gentis* survived in the collective memory and

<sup>474</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.16 – 20.

<sup>475</sup> *Sakcinski*, N° 72. However, in *Acta et diplomata res Albaniae mediae aetatis illustrantia*, ed. L. Thallóczy – C. Jireček – E. de Sufflay, Vindobonae 1913, N° 55, it was understood by the editors that Belgrade (Berat, Pulcheriopolis) was in Albania.

that the Serb tradition almost completely vanished; 2) the Serb *origo gentis* is told from a different angle than the Croat version, as it appears that someone is speaking in the name of the Serbs, while the Croats speak for themselves; 3) the informant on the Serbs, according to the fact, knew the Serb history only until ca. 856, (probably had provided information he could have only recollected in ca. 877/878). It is the most probable reason why the Serb *origo gentis* is contracted – the informant told what he had known about the Serbs from before. This conclusion will be more supported through the analysis of Anonymous' informants (see below).

It is usually stated in historiography that the *strategos* of Belgrade (i.e. the military commander) had not existed since the early 7<sup>th</sup> century, after ca. 615, and the whole story of the second settlement of the Serbs therefore gains little credence.<sup>476</sup> However, it must be stressed that Byzantium held the Danube frontier at least until 679/680, when Asparuch's Bulgarians made their advance to the south.<sup>477</sup> The Byzantine cities along the Danube were able to communicate *via* this river, regardless of the losses to the territory south of Belgrade, and settled Slavs after ca. 615. Archaeological data from below the fortress of Singidunum has revealed that the Slavs lived near the *Romaioi* for some time during the 7<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>478</sup> The term *strategos* also does not necessarily mean the *strategos of the theme*, in the sense of the provincial *themes*' administration of the 7<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup> centuries, but rather *commander, officer*. Furthermore, throughout Byzantine history, Belgrade had never been the seat of a *theme*.<sup>479</sup> The appearance of Belgrade, which was a town held by the Bulgarians during the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> centuries, in the story about the Serb settlement, could be an

<sup>476</sup> *FB II*, 49, n. 151. However, F. Barišić, *Vizantiski Singidunum*, ZRVI 3 (1955) 12, had warned that this information must not be dismissed all at once; similar, *DAI II*, 133; the overview of historiography given, Ferjančić, *Dolazak*, 130 – 131, notes 50 – 55.

<sup>477</sup> *Theoph. I*, 356 – 359.

<sup>478</sup> G. Marjanović – Vujović, *Najstarije slovensko naselje u Beogradu*, *Godišnjak grada Beograda* 25 (1978) 7, 12 – 13; M. Bajalović – Hadži-Pešić, *Slovenska keramika na teritoriji Beograda*, *Materijali* 9 (1972) 140.

<sup>479</sup> See, T. Wasilewski, *Le thème byzantin de Sirmium. Serbie au XIe et XIIe siècles*, ZRVI 8 (1964) 465 – 482; also, V. Laurent, *Le thème byzantin de Serbie au X<sup>e</sup> siècle*, REB 15 (1957) 185 – 195; Lj. Maksimović, *Organizacija vizantijske vlasti u novoosvojenim oblastima posle 1018. godine*, ZRVI 36 (1997) 31 – 43.

additional sign that the whole story had been invented by someone who had knowledge about the geography and history of the *praefectura Illyricum*. The Serbs of the 9<sup>th</sup> or 10<sup>th</sup> centuries could have hardly connected Bulgarian Belgrade with their adventures from 300 years ago when that town had been called Singidunum. The Serbs simply would not have been able to remember the name of Belgrade, since it had never existed in the 7<sup>th</sup> century. Finally, the Serbs had to fit their story about the arrival into **Roman** Dalmatia in the historico-geographical frame. There is too much historical knowledge for mere popular tradition. Therefore, this must have been the “learned” interpretation of the Anonymous author or his informant.

4.5 Καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἡ νῦν Σερβλία καὶ Παγανία καὶ ἡ ὀνομασθεῖσα Ζαχλούμων χώρα καὶ Τερβουνία καὶ ἡ τῶν Καναλιτῶν ὑπὸ τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ βασιλέως Ῥωμαίων ὑπῆρχον, ἐγένοντο δὲ αἱ τοιαῦται χῶραι ἔρημοι παρὰ τῶν Ἀβάρων (ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκεῖσε γὰρ Ῥωμάνους τοὺς νῦν Δελματίαν καὶ τὸ Δυρράχιον οἰκοῦντας ἀπέλασαν), {καὶ} κατεσκήνωσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τοὺς αὐτοὺς Σέρβλους ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις χώραις, καὶ ἦσαν τῷ βασιλεῖ Ῥωμαίων ὑποτασσόμενοι,<sup>480</sup>

*And since what is now Serbia and Paganía and the so-called country of the Zachlumians and Terbounia and the country of the Kanalites were under the dominion of the emperor of the Romaioi, and since these countries had been made desolate by the Avars (for they had expelled from those parts the Romani who now live in Dalmatia and Dyrrachium), the emperor settled these same Serbs in these countries, and they were subject to the emperor of the Romaioi.*

This section, as it appears to be, is Constantine’s understanding of the settlement of the Serbs based on all the available sources he had had at his disposal. It has the characteristic *fine-seam* Καὶ ἐπειδὴ at the beginning of the section, followed immediately with the adverb νῦν, which is usual when Constantine referred to his own time. Constantine’s retelling is also marked by the inserted sentence: ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκεῖσε γὰρ

<sup>480</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.21 – 27.

Ῥωμάνους τοὺς νῦν Δελματίαν καὶ τὸ Δυρράχιον οἰκοῦντας ἀπέλασαν. Then, there are two consequent *fine-seams*, καὶ κατεσκήνωσεν, and καὶ ἦσαν. Note that the inserted sentence about the inhabitants of Dalmatia – *Romani*, as well as in 1.3, while in chapter 30, (see 2.1c above) they are *Romaioi*.<sup>481</sup> Chapter 30 is finished, and Constantine carefully replaced *Romani* with *Romaioi*, but chapters 31 and 32 are unfinished, and this is why the appearance of *Romani* in chapter 32 is more circumstantial evidence that Constantine had used an older source on the Serbs (as well as the Croats). The term *Romani* for the inhabitants of Dalmatia would have been usual for a Western, Latin source recorded in the nominative plural – *Romani*.

This section is almost identical with 1.3 (see above) in which the settlement of the Croats in Dalmatia is described. The crucial differences between 1.3 and 4.5 are: 1. the Croats fought the Avars on the command of Heraclius (1.3), but the Serbs did not (4.5); 2. the Serbs were subject to the emperor of the *Romaioi* (4.5), which is not said explicitly for the Croats in 1.3, but is said in 1.9. All other details in these sections are congruent: 1. the Serbs (4.2) and the Croats (1.3) came as refugees to Heraclius; 2. Heraclius settled them in the land where they live today; 3. the Romans (*Romani*) had lived in Dalmatia before the Avars expelled them. Both sections are similar to such a degree that it must be assumed that either there had been a common source for both stories, or Constantine invented both stories in a similar manner. Since it has already been concluded in the analysis above of chapter 30 and 31, that the Croat story had been taken from the so-called primary source on the Croats, then it must also be concluded that the story about the settlement of the Serbs had been preserved in the same fashion in that source. Therefore, because of Constantine's retelling in both sections of 1.3 and 4.5, some lines of the original text were perhaps omitted. For 1.3, it could be the statement that the Croats were subject to the emperor of the *Romaioi*, and, for 4.5, that the Serbs also fought the Avars. Note the absence of Diocleia in this narrative as lands not occupied by the Serbs. In chapter 35 of the *DAI*, *On Diocletians*, Constantine did not mention **the tribal origin of the Diocletians** either.<sup>482</sup> This narrative is not just

<sup>481</sup> *DAI* I, 31.11 – 15.

<sup>482</sup> *DAI* I, 35.1 – 9..

the confirmation that he did not omit emphasizing their tribal origin (in 4.5), but rather that it had not been recorded in his primary source. The mention of the other Slav principalities, as allegedly being inhabited by the Serbs, should not be rendered as being Constantine's interpretation of the political situation from his time, but rather it had been the consequence of the usage of his primary source on this matter.<sup>483</sup> It must be noted that Dioclea was not part of the province of Dalmatia, neither Roman, nor Byzantine – Dioclea belonged to the province of Praevalis. This must be one of the main reasons why the Serbs (which are observed as the inhabitants of Dalmatia) had not been mentioned in Constantine's source as the primogenitors of the Diocletians.

Finally, there is an important detail that both the Croats and the Serbs had come as refugees to Heraclius. In the *DCBC*, it is stressed that Pribina was exiled from his homeland and found shelter with Ratbod who introduced him to the Louis the German – effectively having placed him under Louis' protection: *In cuius* (sc. Ratbod) *spacio temporis quidam Priwina exulatus a Moimaro duce Maravorum supra Danubium venit ad Ratbodum. Qui statim illum praesentavit domno regi nostro Hludowico, et suo iussu fide instructus baptizatus est in ecclesia sancti Martini loco Treisma nuncupato, curte videlicet pertinenti ad sedem Iuvavensem.*<sup>484</sup> After a short quarrel between Pribina and Ratbod, Pribina received land from Louis the German: *Aliqua vero interim occasione percepta, rogantibus praedicti regis fidelibus praestavit rex Priwinae aliquam inferioris Pannoniae in beneficium partem circa fluvium qui dicitur Sala.*<sup>485</sup> In the *DAI*'s story about the settlement of the Serbs, the *archon* is in the center of the plot, not the Serbs as the *natio*. The similarities between Pribina and the *archon* of the Serbs are striking: they are both refugees, both are received by the emperor/king, baptized by him, and then are granted new land. It appears that the case of Pribina had served as the model for the anonymous author who wrote about the arrival of the Serbs into Dalmatia.

<sup>483</sup> Ferjančić, *Dolazak*, 138, thought that the Serbs, according to Porphyrogenitus, settled in a wider region – i.e. not only in Serbia proper. Klaić, *Povijest*, 212 – 213, advanced the thesis that Porphyrogenitus applied the political reality of his time to the times of the Slavic settlement in Dalmatia. Similar, *DAI II*, 139; Katičić, *Uz početke*, 58 – 60.

<sup>484</sup> *De conversione*, 11.20 – 24.

<sup>485</sup> *De conversione*, 12.3 – 5.

4.6 οὗς ὁ βασιλεὺς πρεσβύτας ἀπὸ Ῥώμης ἀγαγὼν, ἐβάπτισεν, καὶ διδάξας αὐτοὺς τὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας τελεῖν καλῶς, αὐτοῖς τὴν τῶν Χριστιανῶν<sup>486</sup> πίστιν ἐξέθετο, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ Βουλγαρία ὑπὸ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἦν τῶν Ῥωμαίων.<sup>487</sup>

*And the emperor brought priests from Rome and baptized them and taught them fairly to perform works of piety and expounded to them the faith of the Christians, at the time when Bulgaria was under the rule of the Romaioi.*

This section I have separated from 4.5 due to its specific issue: the baptism of the Serbs.<sup>488</sup> The comma at the front of this section, as well as the *fine-seam* οὗς (an otherwise well written sentence) is evidence that Constantine attached this sentence to the previous narrative which had been based on a more extent source. The same emperor who gave to the Serbs new land had also sent priests to baptize them. It is the same pattern as in the story about the baptism of the Croats (see 1.5 above). Here again, the emperor was the one who sent the priests from Rome. There is also a chronological gap between the settlements and baptism of both tribes (1.5 and 4.6). Note the absence of the archbishop, bishops, and clergy, who are mentioned in the story about the baptism of the Croats.<sup>489</sup> This is important, since if Constantine was the one who invented this story, he would have had

<sup>486</sup> *Codex Parisinus gr. 2009*, fol. 94v: τὴν τῶν χρόνων πίστιν ἐξέθετο. It was most probably a copyist who had wrongly solved the possible abbreviation for Χριστιανῶν (i.e. χρνῶν).

<sup>487</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.26 – 30. In the Moravcsik-Jenkin's edition there is a full stop behind ἐξέθετο, then followed by the new sentence: Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ Βουλγαρία ὑπὸ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἦν τῶν Ῥωμαίων. Consequently, since the words: αὐτοῦ οὖν τοῦ ἄρχοντος τοῦ Σέρβλου, do not make sense with such a beginning of the sentence the editors have indicated that text is corrupted in this spot. On the contrary however, the text is well preserved, and one has only to follow the interpunction marks in the manuscript itself.

<sup>488</sup> For the baptism of the Serbs in the time of Heraclius, see, *DAI II*, 126; D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth, Eastern Europe, 500 – 1453*, New York 1971, 59 – 60; Maksimović, *Pokrštavanje*, 160 – 162.

<sup>489</sup> *DAI I*, c. 31.21 – 24.

probably, by following the same story about the Croats, just repeated the same pattern: archbishop, bishops, clergy. On the contrary, the scanty of the data is a sign in fact that he has had followed his source on this matter. This could mean that the baptism of the Serbs had been described in such a manner, briefly, in Constantine's primary source. The last sentence of this section: ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ Βουλγαρία ὑπὸ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἦν τῶν Ῥωμαίων, is of the same nature as the one at the end of the 1.5 about the baptism of the Croats – εἶχον δὲ τῷ τότε καιρῷ οἱ τοιοῦτοι Χρωβάτοι ἄρχοντα τὸν Ποργᾶ – with the purpose of establishing the timeline before 680, since the name of the *archon* of the Serbs had been unknown to Constantine's primary source on the Serbs. It is also obvious that either Constantine or his supposed major source insisted upon the fact that Bulgaria once upon a time had been under the rule of the *Romaioi*.<sup>490</sup>

Another sentence of the *DCBC* is even more similar to the *DAI*'s narrative about the baptism of the Serbs, than the one related to the baptism of the Croats (see above 1.5): *Post expletam legationem ipse imperator praecepit Arnoni archiepiscopo pergere in partes Sclavorum et providere omnem illam regionem et ecclesiasticum officium more episcopali colere, populusque in fide et christianitate praedicando confortare. Sicut ille fecit illuc veniendo, consecravit ecclesias, ordinavit presbyteros, populumque praedicando docuit.*<sup>491</sup>

This narrative in its structure is very close to section 4.6: ...οὗς ὁ βασιλεὺς πρεσβύτας ἀπὸ Ῥώμης ἀγαγὼν ἐβάπτισεν, καὶ διδάξας αὐτοὺς τὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας τελεῖν καλῶς, αὐτοῖς τὴν τῶν Χριστιανῶν πίστιν ἐξέθετο.<sup>492</sup> There are just πρεσβύτας and not the hierarchy of Church dignitaries, as is in the case of the Croats, and there is the explanation that those priests taught the Serbs *to perform*

<sup>490</sup> It seems that the Bulgarians had been mentioned in the Constantine's major source on the Croats and the Serbs, since the Bulgarians were not an object of interest for Constantine in the *DAI*. The only exception can be found in *DAI I*, c. 13.146 – 160, but in a specific context. Namely, Constantine had to explain why the Emperor Roman Lacapenos gave his grand-daughter to the Bulgarian ruler Peter, and how his son Roman had to use that specific case in defense of eventual further marriage proposals from barbarians.

<sup>491</sup> *De conversione*, 10.4 – 8.

<sup>492</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.27 – 29.

*works of piety and expounded to them the faith of the Christians* –, which is exactly the same as in the *DCBC*: *populusque in fide et christianitate praedicando confortare...ordinavit presbyteros, populumque praedicando docuit*. It is also important to underline the fact that the term *presbyteros* is used only here in the *DAI*. The initiator of baptism is the same political power: in the *DCBC* it is Charlemagne (*ipse imperator praecepit*, and it is Heraclius in the *DAI* – who was the emperor of the *Romaioi*. These identical texts, and the common political message which they share, cannot be accidental by any means, but must be rather strongly connected and suggest, beyond any doubt, that the author of the Constantine’s primary source on the Croats (and the Serbs) did not have only the *DCBC* in front of him, but also he had used it **as the pattern** for his work. Sections 1.5 and 4.6 about the baptism of the Croats and the Serbs in comparison with their baptism recorded in the *Vita Basilii* have nothing in common – neither, lexically nor contextually.<sup>493</sup> While the *DAI* and the *DCBC* reflect a strong political bias – as baptism is a technical issue of establishing church hierarchy and routine preaching – the *Vita Basilli* presents it more ecclesiastically – ὡς ἴν̄ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων τοῦ ψυχικοῦ τούτους κινδύνου ἐξέληται καὶ πρὸς τὴν προτέραν πίστιν ἐπανασώσεται καὶ τῶν ἐξ ἀγνοίας ἢ ἀνοίας ἀπαλλάξει πλημμελημάτων αὐτούς. While the language in the *DAI* and the *DCBC* is “cold”, technical, the language used in the *Vita Basilii* is “warm” and patristic.

The whole story of the baptism of the Croats in the *DAI* is told in detail, since the same matter regarding the Serbs is very modest. The abundance of information is richest in the western portion of the Balkans, along the Adriatic, and becomes scarce towards the east. If the

<sup>493</sup> The sections 1.5: Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ἡράκλειος ἀποστείλας καὶ ἀπὸ Ῥώμης ἀγαγὼν ἱερεῖς καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ποιήσας ἀρχιεπίσκοπον καὶ ἐπίσκοπον καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους, τοὺς Χρῶβάτους ἐβάπτισεν and 4.6: οὗς ὁ βασιλεὺς πρεσβύτας ἀπὸ Ῥώμης ἀγαγὼν, ἐβάπτισεν, καὶ διδάξας αὐτοὺς τὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας τελεῖν καλῶς, αὐτοῖς τὴν τῶν Χριστιανῶν πίστιν ἐξέθετο, versus, καὶ αὐτὸς τούτους προσήκατο καὶ ἀνεδέξατο, καὶ ἱερεῖς εὐθέως μετὰ καὶ βασιλικοῦ ἀνθρώπου σὺν αὐτοῖς ἐξαπέστειλεν, ὡς ἴν̄ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων τοῦ ψυχικοῦ τούτους κινδύνου ἐξέληται καὶ πρὸς τὴν προτέραν πίστιν ἐπανασώσεται καὶ τῶν ἐξ ἀγνοίας ἢ ἀνοίας ἀπαλλάξει πλημμελημάτων αὐτούς; *Theoph. Cont.* 291.19 – 292.4, shows a completely different kind of perception of the baptism as such.

informant had been in Constantinople, we should expect a completely different flow of information – abundant from the east (Serbs) and more scarce towards the west (Croats). In this manner, a perfect picture can be seen that the anonymous author of Constantine’s primary source on the Serbs and Croats had been based in the West. The importance of Rome for the baptism of both tribes had also been stressed on several occasions in that source, which in turn designates its author as a man who belonged to the Western Christianity, i.e. to the Roman Church. If the story about the baptism of the Croats (1.3) and its striking similarities with the *DCBC* and the conversion of the Carantanians are looked at clearly, then it must be assumed that Constantine’s primary source on the Croats and the Serbs had actually been titled *De conversione Croatorum et Serborum (DCCS)*.

4.7 Αὐτοῦ οὖν τοῦ ἄρχοντος τοῦ Σέρβλου, τοῦ εἰς τὸν βασιλέα προσφυγόντος, τελευτήσαντος, κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἤρξεν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ πάλιν ὁ ἕγγων, καὶ οὕτως ἐκ τῆς γενεᾶς αὐτοῦ οἱ καθεξῆς ἄρχοντες. Μετὰ δὲ χρόνους τινὰς ἐγεννήθη ἐξ αὐτῶν ὁ Βοϊσέσθλαβος, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὁ Ῥοδόσθλαβος, καὶ ἀπ’ ἐκείνου ὁ Προσηγῆς, καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνου ὁ Βλαστίμηρος, καὶ μέχρις αὐτοῦ τοῦ Βλαστιμήρου μετὰ τῶν Σέρβλων εἰρηνικῶς διετέλουν οἱ Βούλγαροι, ὡς γείτονες καὶ συνορίται ἀγαπῶντες ἀλλήλους, ἔχοντες δὲ δούλωσιν καὶ ὑποταγὴν εἰς τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῶν Ῥωμαίων καὶ εὐεργετούμενοι παρ’ αὐτῶν.<sup>494</sup>

*Now, when that same Serbian archon died who came as a refugee to the emperor, his son ruled in his succession, and thereafter his grandson, and in like manner the succeeding archontes from his clan. After some years Voïslav was begotten of them, and of him Radoslav, and of him Prosigoï, and of him Vlastimer; and up to this Vlastimer the Bulgarians lived at peace with the Serbs as close neighbors, and they were friendly one toward another, and were in servitude and submission to the emperors of the Romaioi and kindly entreated by them.*

<sup>494</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.29 – 38. For the intervention in the Moravcsik-Jenkins’ edition of this section, see note 487.

The beginning of this section, Αὐτοῦ οὖν, demands that a coherent narrative was told previously in the text, which was followed by this new entry opened with *oun* (*now*). The absence of *de* also means that what is to follow is not directly connected with previous narrative either. This could mean that Constantine's source had reached its boundaries about the earliest history of the Serbs. This could also be corroborated on further with the appearance of the *fine-seam*: Μετὰ δὲ χρόνους τινὰς (in 4.7). It is exactly the same narrative approach that appears in 1.8 (Μετὰ δὲ χρόνους πολλοὺς). For the Croats (1.8), the author was confident that *many years passed*, but for the Serbs he was not so certain – *after some time*. This is nothing more than additional evidence that Constantine's source had been much better informed about the Croats.

The summary of the un-named rulers which belonged to the same ruling family of the Serbs then follows. After this, comes a short list of the named rulers: Voïslav, Radoslav, Prosigoï, and Vlastimer. Such a list of Serbian rulers could have been provided either by a Serb or a person who had been among them. In both cases, this is a Serbian story about their first rulers. Again, we can see a similar pattern in the *DCBC*: *Tunc primus ab imperatore constitutus est confini comfina comes Goterammus, secundus Werinharius, tertius Albricus, quartus Gotafridus, quintus Geroldus. Interim vero dum praedicti comites orientalem procurabant plagam, aliqui duces habitaverunt in illis partibus ad iam dictam sedem pertinentibus. Qui comitibus praefatis subditi fuerunt ad servitium imperatoris; quorum nomina sunt Priwizlauga, Cemicas, Ztoimir, Etgar. Post istos vero duces Bagoarii coeperunt praedictam terram dato regum habere in comitatum, nomine Helmwinus, Albgarius et Pabo.*<sup>495</sup> The main point to be drawn here is that a *Conversione* was able to contain such information, and therefore, the supposed *De conversione Croatorum et Serborum* (*DCCS*) would have been able to follow the same pattern. In the *DAI*, as it is the case in the *DCBC*, it is emphasized that these rulers were *under the rule of the emperor* – in the *DCBC* it is the Frankish emperor, and in the *DAI*, it is the Byzantine emperor. This sole example could have also been by

<sup>495</sup> *De conversione*, 11.13 – 20.

accident, but if it is observed together with other similarities between the *DCBC* and the *DAI*, it gains more ground.

The author of the *DCBC* had to protect the ecclesiastical rights of the Archbishopric of Salzburg over Pannonia by using serious political power. This is why he made it clear that the Bavarians and the Carantanians/Slavs of Pannonia were the terrestrial powers which were working on the behalf of Salzburg Church, backed by the Emperor of the Franks. The author of the *DCCS* applied exactly the same principle. The Serbs and Croats were the local political powers who enabled Rome to rule over Pannonia and Dalmatia in ecclesiastical matters, backed by another emperor – the Byzantine one. In both cases, the terrestrial world belonged to an emperor: for the *DCBC* it belonged to the Frankish emperor and for the *DCCS* to the Byzantine emperor. It was then maintained through their vassals: the Bavarians and the Carantanians, as well as the Pannonian Slavs under Frankish suzerainty in the *DCBC*, and the Serbs and Croats in the *DCCS*. There was no room in the *DCCS* for such an architectural concept of the ecclesiastical rule of Rome over the territories to the east of Dalmatia (those same territories that once belonged to the *praefectura Illyricum*) and for which Rome had had strong aspirations during the 860's and 870's (especially for Bulgaria). This question was carefully placed aside.

It is worth mentioning that both the *origo gentis*, of the Serbs and of the Croats, do not preserve the name of the first *archon*, the one who led them to the south of the Danube, in Dalmatia. The absence of the name of the first *archon* is probably due to the fact that it followed the same pattern of the narrative, and the probable reason for the omission could be the same. It does not seem likely that the Serbs and Croats had forgotten the name of the founder of their dynasties. The pagan societies of the Early Middle Ages, even when they are converted into Christianity, usually had at least some type of picture about their origin and their most prominent ancestors, even though it might not have been accurate. It is useful to be reminded of the Hungarian Anonymous the author of the *Gesta Hungarorum*, who had based all of his knowledge on the earliest past of the Hungarians on their tradition from pagan times.<sup>496</sup>

---

<sup>496</sup> See, for instance, the *Gesta Hungarorum*, ca. 1200; *Anonymi Belae regis notarii de Gestis Hungarorum liber*, ed. S. L. Endlicher, *Rerum Hungaricarum, Monumenta Arpadiana I*, Sangalli 1849, 1 – 54.

Constantine also recorded the ancient ancestors of the Hungarians, and he had known the name of the first *archon*.<sup>497</sup> In both cases, there is a very important distinction in regard to the Serbs/Croats: the Hungarians were still pagans in Constantine's time. It is my opinion that the omitting of the name of the first *archon* of the Croats had been made intentionally in the Constantine's source. It was an unbaptized ruler, and, perhaps for this reason, the author of the *DCCS* had to eradicate his name in order to perform *damnatio memoriae*. His concept of ecclesiastical rule over Dalmatia and Pannonia demanded a baptized ruler. Even if he had known the name of the first Croat *archon*, it would not have been important for the concept of his work. However, the absence of the name of the Serbian ruler cannot be explained in the same manner, since they settled and were baptized during the reign of the same *archon*. Henceforth, it seems that author of the *DCCS* had actually invented the whole story about the baptism of the Serbs.<sup>498</sup>

4.8. Ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ αὐτοῦ Βλαστιμήρου ἦλθεν μετὰ πολέμου Πρεσιάμ, ὁ ἄρχων Βουλγαρίας, κατὰ τῶν Σέρβλων θέλων αὐτοὺς ὑποτάξαι, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τριετίαν πολεμήσας, οὐ μόνον οὐδὲν ἤνυσεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ λαὸν αὐτοῦ πλείστον ἀπώλεσεν.<sup>499</sup>

*During the rule of this same Vlastimer, Presiam, the archon of Bulgaria, came with war against the Serbs, with the intent to reduce them into submission; though he fought them three years, not only did he not achieve anything, but he also lost most of his army.*

This section is an introduction in the very extensive account about the First Serb-Bulgarian war that occurred ca. 848.<sup>500</sup> The war is described briefly, just saying that it had lasted for three years and that Presiam had lost many of his troops. However, even in this short account, the author of the description left a clue about the cause of the war saying that Presiam have had wished to submit the Serbs. The opening words of this section *epi de*, follow the logical narrative of the

<sup>497</sup> *DAI I*, c. 40.12.

<sup>498</sup> M. Whittow, *The Making of Byzantium, 600 – 1025*, Berkley – Los Angeles 1996, 263, dismissed the whole *DAI*'s story about the Croats and the Serbs altogether.

<sup>499</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.38 – 42.

<sup>500</sup> For the date of this war, see, Živković, *Južni Sloveni*, 258 – 259, and n. 1318.

previous section, in which it was stated that the Serbs and Bulgarians had lived in peace with each other until the time of the *Archon Vlastimer*. The exact duration of the war, three years, could be a sign that Constantine's source had not been chronologically much distant from the event it described. The semicolon behind ὑποτάξαι could be the consequence of Constantine's abbreviation of his source – perhaps a plain explanation why the war had been actually waged. The second part of the section, opened with another *fine-seam*, ἀλλ' ἐπι, comes as the conclusion about this war.

4.9. Μετὰ δὲ θάνατον Βλαστιμήρου τοῦ ἄρχοντος διεδέξαντο τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς Σερβλίας οἱ τρεῖς υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ, ὁ Μουντιμήρος καὶ ὁ Στροϊμήρος καὶ ὁ Γοϊνικός, μερισάμενοι τὴν χώραν.<sup>501</sup>

*After the death of Archon Vlastimer his three sons, Mutimer and Stroïmer and Goïnik, succeeded to the rule of Serbia and divided up the country.*

The story runs logically and without interruption. There is no mention of any peace between the Serbs and the Bulgarians. The division of land is not clear. It had been an internal matter of Serbia, and the informant would have been familiar with this kind of policy. It appears that this anonymous author, or better, his informant, have had insight into the political events in Serbia. The phrase *meta de* suggests that this section of the text could have been related also to some other missing portion of the original source, and not only to the preserved one in 4.8 (see 6.2 and 6.3 below).

4.10. Ἐπὶ τούτων παρεγένετο ὁ τῆς Βουλγαρίας ἄρχων, Μῆχαήλ ὁ Βορίσης, θέλων διεκδικῆσαι τὴν ἦτταν Πρεσιάμ, τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ πολεμήσας, εἰς τοσοῦτον αὐτὸν ἐπτόησαν οἱ Σέρβλοι, ὥστε καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ Βλαδίμηρον ἐκράτησαν δέσμιον μετὰ καὶ βοιλιάδων ἰβ'<sup>502</sup> μεγάλων. Τότε δὴ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ θλίψει καὶ

<sup>501</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.42 – 44.

<sup>502</sup> According to *Codex Parisinus gr.* 2009, fol. 95v. *DAI I*, c. 32.48: δώδεκα.

μη θέλων ὁ Βορίσης εἰρήνευσε μετὰ τῶν Σέρβλων. Μέλλων δὲ ὑποτρέφειν ἐν Βουλγαρίᾳ καὶ φοβηθεὶς, μήποτε ἐνεδρεύσωσιν αὐτὸν οἱ Σέρβλοι καθ' ὁδόν, ἐπεζήτησεν εἰς διάσωσιν αὐτοῦ τὰ τοῦ ἄρχοντος Μουντιμήρου παιδιά, τὸν Βόρενα καὶ τὸν Στέφανον, οἱ καὶ διέσωσαν αὐτὸν ἀβλαβῆ μέχρι τῶν συνόρων, ἕως τῆς Ῥάσης. Καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς τοιαύτης χάριτος δέδωκεν αὐτοῖς Μιχαὴλ ὁ Βορίσης δωρεὰς μεγάλας, καὶ ἐκεῖνοι ἀντέδωκαν αὐτῷ χάριν ξενίων ψυχάρια δύο, φαλκῶνια δύο, σκυλία δύο καὶ γούνας π<sup>503</sup> ὅπερ λέγουσιν οἱ Βούλγαροι εἶναι πάκτον.<sup>504</sup>

*In their time, the archon of Bulgaria, Michael Boris, came up, wishing to avenge the defeat of his father Presiam, and made war, and the Serbs discomfited him to such an extent that they even captured his son Vladimer, together with twelve great boyars. Then Boris, out of grief for his son, perforce made peace with the Serbs. But, being about to return to Bulgaria and afraid that the Serbs might ambush him on the way, he asked the sons of Archon Mutimer, Boren and Stephen for his protection, who escorted him safely as far as the frontier at Rasi. For this favour Michael Boris gave them handsome presents, and they in return gave him, as guestly presents, two slaves, two falcons, two dogs and eighty furs, which the Bulgarians consider as tribute.*

The above description of the Second Serb-Bulgarian war is abundant in detail.<sup>505</sup> Some very interesting information has been recorded there, such as: the name of the Bulgarian commander – Vladimer, the son of Boris; the double name of the Bulgarian *archon*, Michael – Boris, which may be the evidence that this war had occurred before he became the Christian “Michael” in 864, (otherwise, it would not be necessary to mention his old, pagan name); the exact number of *boyars* captured – twelve; the place where the ransom of the captured *boyars* took place – Ras, the frontier town between Serbia and

<sup>503</sup> According to *Codex Parisinus gr.* 2009, fol. 96r. *DAI I*, c. 32.56: ὀγδοήκοντα.

<sup>504</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.44 – 57.

<sup>505</sup> This war was dated differently. *FB II*, 51, n. 163, between 852 and 867; J. Moïsidou, *To Βυζάντιο καὶ οἱ βόρειοι γείτονές του τον 10' αἰώνα*, Αθήνα 1995, 314, n. 34, in 860; Lj. Maksimović, *O vremenu pohoda bugarskog kneza Borisa na Srbiju*, *Zbornik Filozofskog fakulteta* 14/1 (1979) 75, around 880 or later.

Bulgaria; the exact kind of gifts and their amount that the Serbs had delivered to the Bulgarians; the twofold understanding on the meaning of these gifts – for the Serbs they represented just a gesture of their friendship, and for the Bulgarians they represented a tribute. Finally, the author knew that the Serbian *archon* had sent two of his younger sons as a guarantee that Vladimer would safely reach the frontier at Ras. There is also an interesting mistake in the *Codex Parisinus* – the name of Vladimer is replaced by that of Vlastimer.<sup>506</sup> This may not only be due to a mistake upon the part of the 11<sup>th</sup> century copyist, but also it could be a trace left of Constantine's abbreviation of his source and haste.

This description, rich in this type of detail, would not have been able to be found in the Archives of the Imperial Palace, since there had been no Byzantine involvement in this conflict, at least not any recorded by Constantine, himself. The events described are exclusively related to the Serb-Bulgarian relationship, and yet, Constantine knew much about it. Actually, Constantine's source had known this in detail, and this is the reason why it is important to understand the nature of this description.

What had the intention of the anonymous author been? He said in section 4.7 that the Serbs had never been at war with the Bulgarians, and then, in the 4.8 and 4.10 he described the war between the Serbs and the Bulgarians as a result of the Bulgarian's policy of conquest. The Serbs must have been in the author's favor, since the Bulgarians are depicted as the cause of all troubles. If this information had come to Constantine from an informant of his own time, it should then not be expected that all these details would be found. For instance, the informant had exactly known the state of mind of Boris-Michael, in fact, that he *perforce made a peace* (his grief for his son's destiny could be a topos); he had known that Ras was the frontier town between Bulgaria and Serbia, or the number of captured *boyars*. Therefore, it must be assumed that this report came from a man who was well informed and contemporary to these events. His account sounds as if it were the report of an eyewitness. To the contrary of the Croat-Bulgarian war described in 1.9, where nothing was said about the reasons of that war or its course, nor about the gifts exchanged at the

---

<sup>506</sup> *Codex Parisinus gr. 2009*, fol.95v.

peace agreement, the description of the Serb-Bulgar war is given in detail. Furthermore, both wars were waged at the same time – ca. 853 – 854, and the Bulgarian ruler was also named by his old pagan name – Boris (see, 1.9, *Michael Boris*). On the other hand, there is much more information about the Croats during the ca. 860's – 870's, while there is nothing at all about the Serbs in the same period. It seems that the Croat-Bulgarian war was based on a secondary account, considerably later after it had happened, while the Serb-Bulgar war was told from a first-hand account. However, if there had been a pattern of the author of the *DCCS* to create “twin-chapters” on the Croats and Serbs – then it is much more probable that the Serb-Bulgarian war would have had served as the model for the alleged Croat-Bulgarian conflict.<sup>507</sup>

4.11 Μετὰ μικρὸν δὲ ἐγένοντο κατ' ἀλλήλων οἱ αὐτοὶ τρεῖς ἀδελφοί, οἱ ἄρχοντες Σερβλίας, καὶ γενάμενος ἐπικρατέστερος ὁ εἷς αὐτῶν, ὁ Μουντιμήρος, καὶ θέλων μόνος τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπέχειν, κρατήσας παρέδωκεν τοὺς δύο ἐν Βουλγαρίᾳ, μόνον τὸ παιδίον τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀδελφοῦ, Γοϊνίκου, Πέτρον ὀνόματι, παρ' ἐαυτῶ κρατήσας καὶ ἐπιμελούμενος, ὅστις καὶ φυγὼν ἦλθεν ἐν Χρωβατία, περὶ οὗ μετ' ὀλίγον ἠθήσεται. Ὁ δὲ προρρηθεὶς ἀδελφὸς ἐν Βουλγαρίᾳ, Στροΐμηρος εἶχεν υἱὸν τὸν Κλονίμηρον, ᾧ καὶ γυναῖκα παρέσχευεν ὁ Βορίσης Βουλγάρων. Ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεννᾶται ἐν Βουλγαρίᾳ ὁ Τζέεσθλαβος.<sup>508</sup>

*A short while after, the same three brothers, the archontes of Serbia, fell out, and one of them, Mutimer, gained the upper hand and, wishing to be sole ruler, he seized the other two and handed them over to Bulgaria, keeping by him under his tutorship only the son of the one brother, Goïnik, Peter by name, who fled to Croatia, and of whom we shall speak in a moment. The aforesaid brother Stroïmer, who was in Bulgaria, had a son Klonimer, to whom Boris gave a Bulgarian wife. Of him was begotten Tzeeslav, in Bulgaria.*

The opening words, *meta mikron*, make a logical connection to the previous narrative. It seems that the original source had been

<sup>507</sup> See note 190.

<sup>508</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.57 – 65.

composed in such a manner until καὶ φυγὼν ἦλθεν ἐν Χρωβατία. Constantine's insertion is that he *shall speak about him* (Peter) *in a moment*. Then, he turned back to his primary source, in which he had found that Klonimer was married to a Bulgarian wife due to Boris' choice. Note the name of the Bulgarian *archon* – his old, pagan name (Boris), has been mentioned only. The last short sentence may have also been Constantine's insertion based on his knowledge about Tzeeslav from some other source (see commentary of 4.12 below). At this point, the boundaries of Constantine's primary source on the earliest history of the Serbs have been reached.

The name of Mutimer could be very important as a possible trace from Constantine's source. He is always recorded as Μουντιμηρος in the *DAI*, and in the Slav language it had to have been Mutimer.<sup>509</sup> The palatalization of the letter *t* was common in the Latin language between 4<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> centuries, this is why it was written as *nt*, to be pronounced more softly, closer to *ch*.<sup>510</sup> There is a name of another Mutimer, the *archon* of Croatia from the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, and his name is also written as *Muncimir* (*diuino munere iuuatus Croatorum dux*), in the charter he had personally issued.<sup>511</sup> Finally, there is a letter of Pope John VIII to *Montemero duci Sclauonicae*, directed in 873, most probably to the same Mutimer mentioned in the *DAI*.<sup>512</sup> Unfortunately, besides the *DAI* there is no other Greek source which could corroborate further on the manner of writing of Mutimer's name in Greek, to allow a scholar in making a more thorough analysis.

Regarding this peculiarity about the palatalization of the letter *t* in Latin, it is also worth mentioning the term κονδοῦρα, which the copyist of the *DAI* had firstly wrote as κοντοῦρα and then having erased the letter *t*, he replaced it with *d*.<sup>513</sup> If Constantine's source had been originally written in Latin, in Rome, then the spelling of Mutimer's name as is found in the *DAI* would be expected. If

<sup>509</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.43, 52, 59, 65.

<sup>510</sup> About the same phenomenon, see E. Kountoura-Galaki, *Η "Εικονοκλαστική" Νοτίτια 3 και το λατινικό πρότυπό της*, *Symmeikta* 10 (1996) 59 – 60, n. 78.

<sup>511</sup> *Sakcinski*, N° 87.

<sup>512</sup> See note 379. See, also, the opinion of Eggers, *Situation*, 44, who considered this Mutimer to be a Moravian *archon*.

<sup>513</sup> See, *DAI I*, 31, apparatus, line 74.

Constantine's source was written originally in Byzantium, then the appearance of *nt* in Mutimer's name should not be expected.<sup>514</sup>

4.12 Ὁ δὲ Μουντιμῆρος, ὁ τοὺς δύο ἀδελφοὺς διώξας καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν δεξάμενος, γεννᾷ υἱοὺς τρεῖς, τὸν Πριβέσθλαβον καὶ τὸν Βράνον, καὶ τὸν Στέφανον, καὶ μετὰ τὸν αὐτοῦ θάνατον διαδέχεται αὐτὸν ὁ πρῶτος υἱὸς ὁ Πριδέσθλαβος.<sup>515</sup>

*Mutimer, who had expelled his two brothers and taken rule, begat three sons, Prvoslav and Bran and Stephen, and after he died, his eldest son Prvoslav succeeded him.*

This is actually repetition of what was said in section 4.10, where the two sons of Mutimer are mentioned – Bran and Stephen. It is here that another name is encountered, Prvoslav, the Mutimer's oldest son. This does not necessarily mean that the name of Prvoslav had existed in Constantine's primary source on the Serbs, but rather that Constantine introduced him based on more contemporary source. Note the form of Bran's name in 4.10, τὸν Βόρενα and in 4.12, τὸν Βράνον.<sup>516</sup> The first form is, as has been assumed, from the *DCCS*, and it has very interesting characteristics. Firstly, the accusative ending is not in Greek, but in the Slavic language. Secondly, this form keeps the Slavic semi-vowel between *vita* and *rho*, through the usage of *omikron*.<sup>517</sup> These two peculiarities point out that the informant of the author of the *DCCS* had been familiar with the Slavic language, if not a Slav himself.

The interesting situation here is that after the death of Mutimer there is no division of the land between the brothers, as is stated in the 4.9. There is also a gap of more than 30 years between the events from the previous section, the marriage of Klonimer with his Bulgarian wife (ca. 856) and the death of Mutimer (891). And, the opening words of this section Ὁ δὲ Μουντιμῆρος appear to be evidence of a new entry. This is why Constantine had to reintroduce the names of Mutimer's

<sup>514</sup> In such a case his name would be: Μουντιμῆρος.

<sup>515</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.65 – 68.

<sup>516</sup> Also in *DAI I*, c. 32.72: Βράνος.

<sup>517</sup> In Slavic, it should be: Бѣрань.

sons, to make a connection between the two sources. If this section marks the beginning of another source(s), then the previous narrative about the Serbs had not described events after ca. 856, since everything mentioned occurred during the first few years of Boris' rule and, in any case, before he had become a Christian.

In regard to the second part of the so-called Serbian Chronicle, which is clearly separated from the first part with the repetition of the fact that Mutimer had three sons, it has herein been emphasized that it had been compiled from some other sources. The whole narrative shows traces of diplomatic and political relationships between Constantinople and Serbia, but through the observation of Serbo-Bulgarian affairs.<sup>518</sup> This means that the point of view of the narrator was from Constantinople. Constantine knew that strategos of Dyrrachion had negotiated an alliance with *Archon* Peter;<sup>519</sup> he knew that Peter had controlled Paganiania *at that time*;<sup>520</sup> he knew that Peter had been deposed by Simeon through the plot of the *archon* of Zachlunia, Michael;<sup>521</sup> he knew exactly how Peter had been captured by Bulgarians; he knew that the *Archon* Zacharias had been sent to take over Serbia from Constantinople on the command of the Emperor Roman Lacapenos;<sup>522</sup> he knew that Zacharia had sent his emissaries to Constantinople; he knew that the *Archon* Zacharias had sent the heads of the killed Bulgarian generals to the Roman Lacapenos;<sup>523</sup> he knew that the Serbs, after Simeon had subdued Serbia (ca. 926), sought refuge in Croatia;<sup>524</sup> he knew that Tzeeslav had escaped from Bulgaria and that the Roman Emperor Lacapenos supported him in various ways;<sup>525</sup> and finally, he knew that Tzeeslav had been confirmed (βεβαιωθείς) by the emperor as the legitimate ruler of the Serbs.<sup>526</sup>

<sup>518</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.68 – 145.

<sup>519</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.81 – 86.

<sup>520</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.84 – 85.

<sup>521</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.86 – 90.

<sup>522</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.100 – 102.

<sup>523</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.112 – 114.

<sup>524</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.119 – 120.

<sup>525</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.128 – 145.

<sup>526</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.145.

All this knowledge could have come from diplomatic letters and official documents which contained information about the outcomes of the agreement made through Serb and Byzantine diplomatic agents – either those who travelled from Serbia to Constantinople, or *vice versa*. Constantine used exactly the same methodology in chapter 44: *Of the country of Apachounis and of the city of Manzikiert...*, which was left unfinished. The analysis of chapter 44 clearly shows that the bulk of material for the history of these regions had come from diplomatic documents. In this chapter however, Constantine did not connect information which he had marked as being important for his work, and all entries were marked by *oti*. In chapter 44, it can be clearly seen how Constantine had worked with this diplomatic material. It can also be seen that it was possible to create a relative chronology, as he had done in chapter 32: *one year after, three years after, two years after, three years after, seven years after.*<sup>527</sup> Note the *oti*-sections in chapter 44: *The second brother of Aposebatos, Apolesphouet, and his nephew and step-son Achmet took possession of the city of Chliat...and they too submitted themselves to the emperor of the Romaioi and came beneath his dominion and paid tribute....as did the eldest brother Aposebatos;*<sup>528</sup> *The third brother of Aposebatos and Apolesphouet, Aposelmis, was in possession of the city of Tzermatzou...and he too submitted himself to the emperor of the Romaioi and paid tribute...;*<sup>529</sup> *This Achmet too was servant of the emperor, as has been said above, and paid tribute....*<sup>530</sup>

These few examples represent just a part of the information drawn from diplomatic documents. It is easy to understand that the members of the ruling family often quarreled among themselves and constantly complained to the emperor, asking for his support. The whole of material in chapter 44 reveals the persistent and deep connections between Constantinople and these regions to the east. This chapter, unfinished as it appears to be, would be most probably have been eventually rewritten in a manner where the *oti*-sections would have been attached to each other by introducing appropriate *fine-seams*

<sup>527</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.68 – 69; 32.72; 32.74; 32.100; 32.105; 32.128.

<sup>528</sup> *DAI I*, c. 44.55 – 60.

<sup>529</sup> *DAI I*, c. 44.61 – 65.

<sup>530</sup> *DAI I*, c. 44.110 – 111.

such as: *meta de* – the same which is used frequently in chapter 32.<sup>531</sup> The number of *meta* prepositions could also point out the number of exchanged diplomatic letters or embassies, at least to the majority of them.

Having had a base from diplomatic letters and reports of diplomatic agents, Constantine was able to create the *Serbian Chronicle* that seemed to be a genuine work, which he had just found and incorporated in the *DAI*, as Ostrogorsky understood it.<sup>532</sup> There is further evidence in the *De cerimoniis* showing the way the diplomatic material had been arranged in the Archives of the Imperial Palace. The imperial *keleusis* were kept in respect of geographical division to the countries Byzantium had contacts with.<sup>533</sup> The insight into the *DAI*'s material preserved in chapter 32 and 44 reveals how Byzantine's administration had kept and organized their diplomatic letters. It is also important to notice that their diplomatic letters were not dated by year, i.e. absolute chronology, but with *indiction*,<sup>534</sup> which is a perfect solution for relative chronology.

4.13. Ὅτι ὁ ἄρχων Σερβλίας ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ἦγουν ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας Ἡρακλείου τοῦ βασιλέως, δουλικῶς ἐστὶν ὑποτεταγμένος τῷ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεῖ, καὶ οὐδέποτε τῷ ἄρχοντι Βουλγαρίας καθυπετάγη.<sup>535</sup>

*(It should be known) that the archon of Serbia has from the beginning, that is, ever since the reign of the emperor Heraclius, been in servitude and submission to the emperor of the Romaioi, and has never been subject to the archon of Bulgaria.*

<sup>531</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.68, 72, 74, 81, 105, 128, 132.

<sup>532</sup> Ostrogorski, *Hronika*, passim.

<sup>533</sup> See, J. Ferluga, *Lista adresa za strane vladare iz knjige O ceremonijama*, ZRVI 12 (1970) 161.

<sup>534</sup> For instance, μηνὶ ἀπριλλ(ίῳ) ἰνδ. β'; see, F. Dölger, *Byzantinische Diplomatik*, Ettal 1956, 2, 207 – 208; also, F. Dölger – J. Karayannopoulos, *Byzantinische Urkunden-Lehre*, München 1968, 89 – 94; T. C. Lounghis, *Byzantine Foreign Policy Documents*, Byzantine Diplomacy: A Seminar, ed. S. Lampakis, Athens 2007, 28, 68, 70. Only in the late Byzantine period is there an exact year at the end of the letters.

<sup>535</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.146 – 148.

Constantine had previously stated that Serbia was subjugated to Bulgaria during the last years of Simeon's reign, and presumably for another five or six years after his death.<sup>536</sup> Therefore, the following section 4.13 is not in accordance to this statement, since he said in this section that the *archon* of the Serbs *has never been subject to the archon of Bulgaria*. This is why I suspect that this section had originally belonged to the Constantine's primary source on the Serbs, as well as the following section about the *kastra oikoumena* (4.14). The insertion ἤγουν ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας Ἡρακλείου τοῦ βασιλέως, could have been either due to Constantine's retelling and therefore a repetition of what he had found in a previous passage of his primary source (see 4.5 and 4.7 above), or it was repeated again in his primary source. The whole section is written in both the *Present tense* and the *Passive voice*, and it must have been due to the original text of his source, since Constantine could not have otherwise said that the Serbs had never been under the rule of the Bulgarians when he immediately before had said that Simeon kept the Serbs' *Archon* Tzeeslav in captivity. Exactly the same sentence is preserved in regard to the Croats: Ὅτι ὁ ἄρχων Χρωβατίας ἐξ ἀρχῆς (see above 1.9). It is additional evidence that Constantine's primary source had already stressed this, and, consequently, the name of Heraclius had not been Constantine's insertion. What is even more important, when the alleged *Serbian Chronicle* is dismissed as Constantine's source, is that the *DCCS* surfaces as the only (known) source in which earliest history of the Serbs is recorded.

4.14. Ὅτι ἐν τῇ βαπτισμένη Σερβλίᾳ εἰσὶν κάστρα οἰκούμενα: τὸ Δεστινίκον, τὸ Τζερναβουσκέν, τὸ Μεγυρέτους, τὸ Δρεσνεήκ, τὸ Λεσνήκ, τὸ Σαληνές καὶ εἰς τὸ χωρίον Βόσωνα τὸ Κάτερα καὶ τὸ Δεσνήκ.<sup>537</sup>

*(It should be known) that in baptized Serbia there are kasta oikoumena of Destinikon, Tzernabouskei, Megyretous, Dresneik, Lesnik, Salines,<sup>538</sup> and in the territory of Bosona, Katera and Desnik.*

<sup>536</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.124 – 126.

<sup>537</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.149 – 151.

This is a section from the *DCCS*. It has already been explained in the commentary of section 1.10. There is an additional confirmation here that the list of *kastra oikoumena* in this source had come to its end. This would mean that sections 4.13 and 4.14 came after the story of Mutimer. This was, most probably, the end of the *DCCS*. It is important to note that the *DCBC* has a similar ending, enumerating the churches consecrated in Lower Pannonia, i.e. Kotzilis' realm.<sup>539</sup> At the very end, there is an important repetition of the role of Charlemagne who had actually established the rule of Salzburg's Church over Pannonia: *A tempore igitur quo dato et praecepto domni Karoli imperatoris orientalis Pannoniae populus a Iuavensibus regi coepit praesulibus usque in praesens tempus sunt anni 75...*<sup>540</sup> Sections 4.13 and 4.14 are actually of the same context as the last two paragraphs of the *DCBC*, and it is highly probable that the *DCCS* had the same ending as the *DCBC*.

---

<sup>538</sup> Only Salines is able to be identified as modern Tuzla in Bosnia and Herzegovina; see, Živković, *Južni Sloveni*, 187, n. 808; See also the alternative opinion of Eggers, *Situation*, 42, that *Salines* could be *eines serbischen Tuzla*.

<sup>539</sup> *De conversione*, 14.4 – 21.

<sup>540</sup> *De conversione*, 14.22 – 26.

## THE DISPLACED SECTIONS OF CONSTANTINE'S PRIMARY SOURCE ON THE CROATS AND THE SERBS

Chapters 33 to 36 of the *DAI* are related to the smaller Slavic principalities: Zachlunia, Terbounia, Diocleia, and Pagania. It was assumed while researching Constantine's term *kastra oikoumena* that these chapters contained at least one common piece of data extracted from Constantine's Latin source – those about the towns which belonged to the ecclesiastical organization of the Roman Church.<sup>541</sup> The list of the towns preserved in these chapters had once belonged to the same primary source upon which Constantine based his story about the settlement, baptism, and early history of the Croats/Serbs. Because he had come across the names of these principalities, perhaps not only in his primary source (the *DCCS*) but as well in some other posterior sources of Byzantine provenience, he decided to create separate chapters on these principalities. Under each title he intended to place all the information he could gather, and to further elaborate on the content of these chapters. However, even though these chapters are short and consist of brief notes, there is a visible effort by Constantine to connect pieces of information in as many coherent sections as possible. These chapters were written only after he had gathered all the material about the Croats and the Serbs, and this is why he was able to merge information from various sources inside specific *oti*-sections. It can also be concluded that these chapters are most probably first drafts, and Constantine would have had rewritten them and supplied them with some additional information for the intended final version of the *DAI*.

---

<sup>541</sup> See, Živković, *Kastra oikoumena*, 26 – 27.

## Zachlunia

5. Περὶ τῶν Ζαχλούμων καὶ ἧς νῦν οἰκοῦσι χώρας.<sup>542</sup>

*Of the Zachlumians and of the country they now dwell in.*

5.1 Ὅτι ἡ τῶν Ζαχλούμων χώρα παρὰ τῶν Ῥωμαίων πρότερον ἐκρατεῖτο, Ῥωμάνων δὴ φημι, οὓς ἀπὸ Ῥώμης Διοκλητιανὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς μετόκισεν, καθὼς καὶ εἰς τὴν τῶν Χρωβάτων ἱστορίαν εἴρηται περὶ αὐτῶν. Ὑπὸ τῷ βασιλεῖ δὲ Ῥωμαίων ἢ τῶν Ζαχλούμων αὕτη χώρα ὑπῆρχεν, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τῶν Ἀβάρων αἰχμαλωτισθεῖσα ἢ τε χώρα καὶ ὁ ταύτης λαὸς τὸ παράπαν ἠρήμωται. Οἱ δὲ νῦν οἰκοῦντες ἐκεῖσε Ζαχλούμοι Σέρβλοι τυγχάνουσιν ἐξ ἐκείνου τοῦ ἄρχοντος, τοῦ εἰς τὸν βασιλέα Ἡράκλειον προσφυγόντος.<sup>543</sup>

*(It should be known) that the country of the Zachlumians was previously possessed by the Romaioi, I mean, by those Romani whom Diocletian the emperor settled from Rome, as has been told of them in the history of the Croats. This land of the Zachlumians was beneath the emperor of the Romaioi, but when this land and its folk were enslaved by the Avars, became wholly desolate. The Zachlumians, who live there now, are Serbs from the time of that archon who refuged to the emperor Heraclius.*

This is a repetition of the material found in sections 1.2 and 4.5, and partially merged with the information exposed in chapter 29.<sup>544</sup> The information about Diocletian and his settlement of veterans in Dalmatia served as the pattern which Constantine applied to all Slav principalities. Note the term *Romaioi* and Constantine's explanation, *I mean... Romani*. This is a clear trace of retelling in his own words and terms. The adverb *nun*, usually designates Constantine's updating to his own time, and this is an additional evidence that he had made an inquiry about Zachlunia. It is interesting to see how Constantine made

<sup>542</sup> *DAI I*, c. 33.1 – 2.

<sup>543</sup> *DAI I*, c. 33.3 – 10.

<sup>544</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.1 –2; 29.54 – 58.

his conclusion that the Zachlumians were the Serbs. He applied the same pattern to Pagans and Terbounians (see below), but not to the Diocleians. In the *De cerimoniis*, there is a list of the orders directed to the *archontes* of the Slavic principalities, and all of them are listed as separate political entities, including Kanali and Moravia, which did not even exist in Constantine's time.<sup>545</sup> If section 4.5 had been literally transcribed from Constantine's primary source on the Serbs, where the lands of Terbounia, Zachlunia, and Paganía, are mentioned as the regions of Serb settlement, then the mystery would vanish – Constantine could have made a conclusion about the ethnical origin of these tribes as Serbs based exactly on this section of his primary source.

5.2. Ζαχλοῦμοι δὲ ὠνομάσθησαν ἀπὸ ὄρους οὕτω καλουμένου Χλοῦμου, καὶ ἄλλως δὲ παρὰ τῆ τῶν Σκλάβων διαλέκτῳ ἐρμηνεύεται τὸ Ζαχλοῦμοι ἤγουν ὀπίσω τοῦ βουνοῦ, ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῷ τοιοῦτῳ χωρίῳ βουνός ἐστὶν μέγας, ἔχων ἄνωθεν αὐτοῦ δύο κάστρα, τὸ Βόνα καὶ τὸ Χλούμ, ὀπισθεν δὲ τοῦ τοιοῦτου βουνοῦ διέρχεται ποταμὸς καλούμενος Βόνα, ὃ ἐρμηνεύεται ἑκατόν.<sup>546</sup>

*They were called the Zachlumians from a so-called mount Chlum and indeed, in the language of the Slavs, Zachlunia means 'behind the mountain', since in that territory is a great mountain with two cities on the top of it, Bona and Chlum, and behind this mountain runs a river called Bona, which means 'good'.<sup>547</sup>*

It is impossible to clarify from which source this information had come to Constantine. Since the cities of Bona and Chlum are not listed as the *kastra oikoumena* of Zachlunia, it appears that this information had not originated from Constantine's primary source on

<sup>545</sup> *De cerim.*, II, c. 48, p. 691.8 – 11 (=). For the possible time when this Moravia ceased to exist, see, Živković, *Južni Sloveni*, 242.

<sup>546</sup> *DAI I*, c. 33.10 – 15.

<sup>547</sup> In *Codex Parisinus gr. 2009*, fol. 101v, there is a marginal note: Πίθ(εν) λέγω(ν)ται Ζαχλοῦμοι, in the same place as in the Croat chapter – i.e. related to the etymology of the tribal name. These kind of marginal notes signalize author's switch to another source.

the Croats/Serbs. The meaning of the names of Bona (*good*) and Zachlunia (*behind the mountain*) is correct, and the one who provided this information must have been familiar with the Slavic language, or at least had been to the place in question. This kind of information, related to fortified cities, could have been due to military inquiry. If this is the case, since Michael of Zachlunia had been Simeon of Bulgaria's ally at least since ca. 910 to 925, Byzantine authorities could have then tried to establish some information about his military strength and the major fortifications in his principality.<sup>548</sup>

5.4 Ὅτι ἡ γενεὰ τοῦ ἀνθυπάτου καὶ πατρικίου Μιχαήλ, τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Βουσεβούτζη, τοῦ ἄρχοντος τῶν Ζαχλούμων, ἦλθεν ἀπὸ τῶν κατοικούντων ἀβαπτίστων εἰς τὸν ποταμὸν Βίσλας, τοὺς ἐπονομαζομένους Διτζίκη, καὶ ὤκησεν εἰς τὸν ποταμὸν, τὸν ἐπονομαζόμενον Ζαχλούμα.<sup>549</sup>

*(It should be known) that the clan of the anthypatos and patrikios Michael, son of Visevitz, archon of the Zachlumians, came from the unbaptized inhabitants on the Visla River, called Litziki, and they settled on the river called Zachluma.*

Michael of Zachlunia is well known from three independent sources – the Chronicle of John the Deacon, the Acts of the Church Council held in Spalato in 925, and from *Annales Barenses* (also from *Lupus Protospaharios*, and *Annales Beneventani*).<sup>550</sup> This accurate information about the origin of Michael, his family, and his Byzantine titles – *anthypatos* and *patrikios*, suggest that here words spoken by Michael himself are met. Namely, to become a *patrikios* he would have had to follow the procedure which is described in detail in the *De*

<sup>548</sup> For Michael of Zachlunia, see, T. Živković, *Portreti srpskih vladara*, Beograd 2007, 59 – 66 (=Živković, *Portreti*). Also, Malamut, *Adresses*, 609 – 610.

<sup>549</sup> *DAI I*, c. 33.16 – 19.

<sup>550</sup> *Diac.* 150 (ca. 910); *HSM*, 96: ...*Michaeli, excellentissimo duci Chulmorum* (925); *Annales Barenses*, *Lupus Protospatrius*, MGH SS V, ed. G. H. Pertz, Hannoverae 1844, 52.35 – 38 (July 927); 54.1 – 2 (926); *Annales Beneventani*, MGH SS III, ed. G. H. Pertz, Hannoverae 1839, 175.23 – 24: *Michael, rex Sclavorum comprehendit Sypontum* (926).

*cerimoniis*.<sup>551</sup> He would have had to come to Constantinople, to be presented not only to the patriarch and the emperor, but also to other dignitaries and people of Constantinople, and only after that would he be promoted. These steps were necessary and point out that the personal information about Michael came from his mouth when he had visited Constantinople and presented himself to the emperor. Therefore, here is the perfect evidence that Constantine placed the information from the Archives of the Imperial Palace in this *oti*-section.<sup>552</sup> Another piece of evidence, which suggests that this section is based on another source, is the subchapter of this chapter of the *DAI: About the Family of Michael*.<sup>553</sup>

Furthermore, it should be noted that Michael does not mention his Serbian origin, and it is this that gives credit to my conclusion that the ethnical belonging of the Zachlumians was Constantine's conclusion based on section 4.5. It is also important to note that it was possible for a member of the ruling family of the Southern Slavs to be able to know the place of his tribal origin, even though some 300 hundred years passed since they had left their homeland. On the other hand, this independent information about the northern origin of the ruling family of the Zachlumians is further evidence that both the Serbs and the Croats could have also had some thoughts on their northern origin, and that the general story about their migration could be genuine, but not necessarily its political context.

5.5 Ὅτι ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ τῶν Ζαχλούμων εἰς ἵνα κάστρα οἰκούμενα· τὸ Σταγνόν, τὸ Μοκρισκίικ, τὸ Ἰοσλή, τὸ Γαλουμαήνικ, τὸ Δοβρισκίικ.<sup>554</sup>

<sup>551</sup> *De cerim. I*, c. 48, p. 251.15 – 255.8.

<sup>552</sup> Cf. *De cerim. I*, c. 48.254.11 – 16: ...καὶ μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὸν κωδῖκελλον, τιθεῖ ὁ πατρίκιος τὸ ἀποκόμβιον ἐν τῷ ἀντιμισίῳ. Michael was also promoted into the rank of *anthypatos* and this promotion certainly took place in Constantinople in a similar way as that of *patrikios*; cf. *De cerim. I*, c. 49, p. 255.10 – 257.8. At the end of the ceremony, the promoted person received a *diploma* of his new rank; cf. *De cerim. I*, c. 49, p. 256.16 – 18: ...εἶτα λαβὼν τὸ πορφυροῦν τετράδιον παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως, ἤγγουν τὸ ἀνθπατίκιον.

<sup>553</sup> *Codex. Par. Gr.* 2009, f. 102r. It is clearly marked with the specific sign: × Ὅτι ἡ γενεὰ...

<sup>554</sup> *DAI I*, c. 33.20 – 21.

*(It should be known) that in the horion of the Zachlumians are the kastra oikoumena of Stagnon, Mokriskik, Iosli, Galoumainik, Dobriskik.<sup>555</sup>*

This is a list of ecclesiastical centers of Zachlunia, which belonged to the *DCCS*. The term *horion* must be paid attention to, which is different from the term *hora*, reordered at the beginning of the section 5.1. This same kind of *mistake* is repeated in chapter 34 on the Terbounians and Kanalites. This is, most probably, due to the different origin of Constantine's sources. It must be assumed that Constantine's primary source on the Croats/Serbs had reordered this term in the list of the *kastra oikoumena* as a *horion*; this could have only been done according to the original Latin term – *territorium*.<sup>556</sup>

### **Terbounia**

6. Περὶ τῶν Τερβουνιωτῶν καὶ τῶν Καναλιτῶν καὶ ἧς νῦν οἰκοῦσι χώρας.<sup>557</sup>

*Of the Terbounians and Kanalites and of the country they now dwell in.*

This chapter is also a draft, and its title shows that Constantine would have foldered in everything of the value on the historical and contemporary knowledge of Terbounia and Kanali. The marginal note immediately next to the title of this chapter should be noted: Πε(ρὶ) ἑτέρ(ων) ἔθν(ων).<sup>558</sup> This is again, most probably, the author's reminder for another source he had used.

<sup>555</sup> For the possible ubication of these *kastra oikoumena*, see, Živković, *Kastra oikoumena*, 11, notes 20 – 24.

<sup>556</sup> For the terms *hora* vs. *horion* in the *DAI*, see, I. Goldstein, “*Zemljica Bosna – “τὸ χωρίον Βόσωνα” u “De administrando imperio” Konstantina VII. Porfirogenita*, Zbornik o Pavlu Anđeliću, ed. M. Karamatić, Sarajevo 2008, 97 – 109.

<sup>557</sup> *DAI I*, c. 34.1 – 2.

<sup>558</sup> *Codex Parisinus gr. 2009*, fol. 102v.

The *DCCS* mentions only Terbounia as a political unit under the rule of Serbia (see below 6.1, 6.2, 6.3), but not Kanali. It was Constantine who had found that Terbounia and Kanali were one country in his time. This is supported even further by the list of the *kastra oikoumena* of Terbounia and Kanali, since not a single of these cities was identified in Kanali – all of them were in Terbounia (see below, 6.5).

6.1 Ὅτι ἡ τῶν Τερβουνιωτῶν καὶ τῶν Καναλιτῶν χώρα μία ὑπάρχει. Ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἀβαπτίστων Σέρβλων οἱ ἐκεῖσε οἰκοῦντες κατάγονται, ἐξ ἐκείνου τοῦ ἄρχοντος τοῦ εἰς τὸν βασιλέα Ἡράκλειον προσφυγόντος ἀπὸ τῆς ἀβαπτίστου Σερβλίας, μέχρι τοῦ ἄρχοντος Σερβλίας τοῦ Βλαστιμήρου.<sup>559</sup>

*(It should be known) that the country of the Terbounians and the Kanalites is one. The inhabitants are descended from the unbaptized Serbs, from that archon who refuged to the Emperor Heraclius from unbaptized Serbia, until the time of Vlastimer archon of Serbia.*

The first sentence is Constantine's conclusion which he had reached through research on the subject. He knew that these two countries had been separated previously, and he had to mention here that they were united in his own time.<sup>560</sup> The following sentence reveals the chronological boundaries of Constantine's primary source on the Serbs, since he mentions Vlastimer, the same Vlastimer whose rule was described in detail in chapter 32. The missing text of chapter 32 is encountered here; namely, behind the word Ἡράκλειον, there should be a full stop, since the following part of this sentence would otherwise not make any sense: *until the time of Vlastimer, archon of Serbia*. What then was until the time of Vlastimer – the Terbounians and Kanalites descended from the unbaptized Serbs, but *only* until the time of *Archon* Vlastimer? This is obviously a mistake and it can be seen from the contents of the following section, that *until the time of Vlastimer,*

<sup>559</sup> *DAI I*, c. 34.3 – 7.

<sup>560</sup> He could have also come to the conclusion that Kanali was once an independent principality based on the lists of the *archontes* who had received *keleusis* from the emperor; cf. *De cerim.* 691.9 – 10.

*archon of Serbia*, must be related to the political issue that these two principalities were under the rule of the Serbian *archon*, until the time of *Vlastimer, archon of Serbia*. If this is the case, the following passage makes sense:

6.2 Οὗτος οὖν ὁ ἄρχων Βλαστίμηρος τῇ ἰδίᾳ θυγατρὶ δέδωκεν ἄνδρα Κραΐνᾶν, τὸν υἱὸν Βελάη, τοῦ ζουπάνου Τερβουνίας. Θέλων δὲ οὗτος τὸν ἴδιον γαμβρὸν δοξάσαι, ὠνόμασεν αὐτὸν ἄρχοντα, ποιήσας αὐτὸν αὐτεξούσιον. Ἐξ ἐκείνου δὲ ὁ Φαλιμέρης ἐγεννήθη, καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνου ὁ Τζουζήμερις.<sup>561</sup>

*Now, this Archon Vlastimer gave his daughter Kraina, son of Belae, zupan of Terbounia, for a husband. And, desiring to ennoble his son-in-law, he gave him the title of archon and made him independent. Of him was begotten Falimer, and of him Tzuzimer.*

I believe that this information had originally been part of the primary source on the Serbs and here it was displaced by Constantine, since it was suitable to describe the earliest history of Terbounia. The specific evidence that this section actually had been part of a longer text comes from the *Outos oun*, the *fine-seam* which usually designates the end of a narrative – a kind of conclusion. For this section, the usage of an *outos oun* would come too soon, since the previous sentence is too short to be taken as the base for the conclusion. This curiosity shall be explained in section 6.3.

The additional information of the son and grandson of Kraina, Falimer and Tzuzimer, from Ἐξ ἐκείνου, could have either been from the same primary source on the Serbs, or have been extracted from diplomatic letters from the Archives of the Imperial Palace. If it had actually been in Constantine's primary source, which did not surpass ca. 856, for the Serbs, then this marriage should be placed in ca. 820, and probably at the beginning of Vlastimer's rule. There is not a *fine-seam* seen here which would lead one to the conclusion that Constantine had switched here to another source. The whole narrative runs smoothly and is logically connected.

<sup>561</sup> *DAI I*, c. 34.7 – 11.

6.3 Ἦσαν δὲ οἱ τῆς Τερβουνίας ἄρχοντες ἀεὶ ὑπὸ τὸν λόγον τοῦ ἄρχοντος Σερβλίας. Τερβουνία δὲ τῇ τῶν Σκλάβων διαλέκτῳ ἐρμηνεύεται ἰσχυρὸς τόπος· ἡ γὰρ τοιαύτη χώρα ὀχυρώματα ἔχει πολλά.<sup>562</sup>

*The archontes of Terbounia have always been under the command of the archon of Serbia. Terbounia in the language of the Slavs means 'strong-place', for this country has many strong fortifications.*

The beginning of this section does not make any sense with the previous section. Namely, in 6.2 Constantine said that the *archon* of Terbounia had been independent from the time of the marriage between Kraina and Vlastimer's daughter. Therefore, why would he had written in the following sentence that the *archontes of Terbounia have always been under the command of the archon of Serbia*? This is, evidently, a sentence which had belonged to section 6.1, and followed the story about the Terbounians, which came in the time of Heraclius, and preceded to the senseless mutilated sentence: *until the time of Vlastimer, archon of Serbia*. Now, it can be said with much more credence that behind *Heraclius* in 6.1 was a full stop, and then was followed by the sentence: Ἦσαν δὲ οἱ τῆς Τερβουνίας ἄρχοντες ἀεὶ ὑπὸ τὸν λόγον τοῦ ἄρχοντος Σερβλίας μέχρι τοῦ ἄρχοντος Σερβλίας τοῦ Βλαστιμήρου.<sup>563</sup> If it were written as such, the whole narrative would have then sounded logical – the Terbounians were under the rule of the *archontes* of Serbia until the time of the *archon* of Serbia Vlastimer. It was then followed by the story of the noble marriage and how they became independent (Οὗτος οὖν ὁ ἄρχων Βλαστίμηρος...). Now, this can also explain the sudden appearance of *outos oun* in the 6.2.

<sup>562</sup> *DAI I*, c. 34.11 – 14.

<sup>563</sup> Note the same beginning of a sentence in the letter of Pope Hadrian II to Patriarch Ignatius from 871: Ἦσαν τοῦ Φωτίου...; cf. *Hadriani II. papae epistolae*, ed. E. Perels, MGH Epistolarvm VI, Karolini Aevi IV, Berolini 1925, 762.15 (= *Ep. VI*). The most probable author of this letter should be Anastasius the Librarian. It is assumed that Anastasius the Librarian wrote papal letters, especially in Greek; see, F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism: History and Legend*, Cambridge 1948, 105 (= Dvornik, *Schism*).

The second part of this section is of pure etymological character, and cannot be traced through today's known sources.<sup>564</sup> It falls within the range of Constantine's usual etymological exercises.

6.4 Ὅτι ἐστὶν καὶ ἕτερα χώρα ὑπὸ ταύτην τὴν χώραν Τερβουνίας, Καναλή προσαγορευομένη. Τὸ δὲ Καναλή ἐρμηνεύεται τῇ τῶν Σκλάβων διαλέκτῳ ᾠμαξία, ἐπειδὴ διὰ τὸ εἶναι τὸν τόπον ἐπίπεδον πάσας αὐτῶν τὰς δουλείας διὰ ἀμαξῶν ἐκτελοῦσιν.<sup>565</sup>

*(It should be known) that there is another land subordinate to this country of Terbounia, called Kanali. Kanali means in the language of the Slavs 'wagon-load', because, the place being level, they carry on all their labours by the use of wagons.*

This had been, most probably, a piece of information from the Archives of the Imperial Palace. The Kanalites were mentioned in the *Vita Basilii* and the *DAI* among the Slavs who shook off the reins of Byzantine rule during the rule of Michael II (820 – 829).<sup>566</sup> The Kanalites are also mentioned among the Slavic tribes who took part in the siege of Bari on the command of the emperor Basil I in 868.<sup>567</sup> The *archon* of Kanali is also recorded in the *De cerimoniis*, as being the one who received the imperial *keleusis*.<sup>568</sup> This is why Constantine would have been able to find some records about Kanali in the Archives of the Imperial Palace. The etymology for Kanali could either come from the Latin *canalis* or *canabulae*.<sup>569</sup>

<sup>564</sup> For the etymology of the name of Terbounia, see, *FB II*, 62; *DAI II*, 140.

<sup>565</sup> *DAI I*, c. 34.15 – 18.

<sup>566</sup> *Theoph. Cont.* 288.20; *DAI I*, 29.64.

<sup>567</sup> *DAI I*, 29.109.

<sup>568</sup> *De cerim.* 691.9 – 10. Malamut, *Adresses*, 612, thought that the mentioning of Kanali as an independent principality in the *De cerimoniis* was either from the time of Leo VI (886 – 912) or the Roman Lacapenos (920 – 944). Similar, Bury, *Book*, 226. For a different view, see, Živković, *Južni Sloveni*, 241 – 242 (between ca. 829 to ca. 870).

<sup>569</sup> See, *DAI II*, 140; *FB II*, 62, n. 222. Loma, *Sprachgut*, 125, considered it as *phantastich*.

6.5 Ὅτι ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ Τερβουνίας καὶ τοῦ Καναλή εἰσὶ κάστρα οἰκούμενα· ἡ Τερβουνία, τὸ Ὀρμός, τὰ Ῥίσενα, τὸ Λουκάβετα, τὸ Ζετλήβη.<sup>570</sup>

*(It should be known) that in the horizon of Terbounia and Kanali are the kastro oikoumena of Terbounia, Ormos, Risenā, Lukavetai, Zetlibi.*<sup>571</sup>

This information had been extracted from the *DCCS*. Note that Kanali already had existed in the source as a separate entity. Chronologically, it goes alongside the information from the *Vita Basilii*, where they are also mentioned as a separate principality, at least until 870.<sup>572</sup> The *archon* of Kanali is also mentioned in the *De cerimoniis*.<sup>573</sup> Diplomatic material, which is related to the *keleusis* sent by Byzantine emperors to various Slavic *archontes*, and was independent from Constantine's primary source on the Serbs/Croats, in which Kanali is still mentioned as a separate entity, actually is valid evidence that this source could not have originated after the last quarter of the 9<sup>th</sup> century.

## Diocleia

7. Περὶ τῶν Διοκλητιανῶν καὶ ἧς νῦν οἰκοῦσι χώρας.<sup>574</sup>

*Of the Diocletians and of the country they now dwell in.*

This chapter is also a draft, and its title shows that Constantine would have foldered in everything of the value on the historical and contemporary knowledge of Diocleia.

<sup>570</sup> *DAI I*, c. 34.19 – 20.

<sup>571</sup> For the ubication of these *kastro oikoumena*, see Živković, *Kastro oikoumena*, 12, notes 26 – 30.

<sup>572</sup> *Theoph. Cont.* 288.20.

<sup>573</sup> *De cerim.* 691.9 – 10.

<sup>574</sup> *DAI I*, c. 35.1 – 2.

7.1 Ὅτι ἡ Διοκλείας χώρα καὶ αὐτὴ πρότερον παρὰ τῶν Ῥωμάνων ἐκρατεῖτο, οὐδὲ ἀπὸ Ῥώμης μετώκησεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Διοκλητιανός, καθὼς καὶ εἰς τὴν περὶ τῶν Χρωβάτων ἱστορίαν εἴρηται, ὑπὸ δὲ τὸν βασιλέα Ῥωμαίων ὑπῆρχεν. Παρὰ δὲ τῶν Ἀβάρων καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ χώρα αἰχμαλωτισθεῖσα ἠρήμωται, καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ Ἡρακλείου, τοῦ βασιλέως ἐνφκίσθη, καθὼς καὶ ἡ Χρωβατία καὶ ἡ Σερβλία καὶ ἡ τῶν Ζαχλούμων καὶ ἡ Τερβουνία καὶ τοῦ Καναλή. Διόκλεια δὲ ὀνομάζεται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν τῇ τοιαύτῃ χώρᾳ κάστρου, οὗπερ ἔκτησεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Διοκλητιανός, νυνὶ δὲ ἐστὶν ἐρημόκαστρον μέχρι τοῦ νῦν ὀνομαζόμενον Διόκλεια.<sup>575</sup>

*(It should be known) that the country of Diocleia was also previously possessed by the Romani whom the emperor Diocletian had settled from Rome, as has been said in the story about the Croats, and was under the emperor of the Romaioi. This country was enslaved by the Avars and made desolate, and repopulated in the time of Heraclius the emperor, just as Croatia and Serbia and the country of the Zachlumians and Terbounia and the country of Kanali were. Diocleia is called by the city in this country that the emperor Diocletian had founded, but now it is a deserted city, though it is still called Diocleia.*

This whole section is Constantine's retelling based on the material which had already been used for chapter 29.<sup>576</sup> The only exception is the mention of the town of Diocleia which is deserted, but still called Diocleia, something that would have been contemporary to Constantine. Note the repetition of *nun*, νυνὶ δέ, μέχρι τοῦ νῦν, in the last sentence about the city of Diocleia, which was Constantine's usual term to designate his updating to his own time.

It is interesting to note that even though Diocleia had been geographically closest to the Byzantine stronghold of Dyrrachion and the *theme* of the same name, Constantine did not provide any kind of evidence regarding diplomatic activities between Constantinople and the *archontes* of Diocleia.

<sup>575</sup> *DAI I*, c. 35.3 – 11.

<sup>576</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.54 – 58.

7.2. Ὅτι ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ Διοκλείας εἰσὶ μεγάλα κάστρα οἰκούμενα: τὸ Γράδεται, τὸ Νουγράδε, τὸ Λοντοδόκλα.<sup>577</sup>

*In the country of Diocleia are the megala kstra oikoumena of Gradetai, Nougrade, Lontodokla.*<sup>578</sup>

This section is based on the *DCCS*. Note the term *hora*, instead of *horion* in the chapters about the Terbounians and the Zachlumians, in regard to the list of *kastra oikoumena*. There is also an important difference in regard to the *kastra oikoumena*. Namely, only for Diocleia are these cities *megala kstra oikoumena*.<sup>579</sup> According to my previous research, this would mean that the Roman Church considered the Slavic cities in Diocleia to be the earliest part of the ecclesiastical organization under Rome. This would have been possible, especially if it is kept in mind that along the Diocleian coast there was a large concentration of cities in a relatively small territory: Decatera, Butua, Rosa, Ulcigno, and Antibari, all of which were strongholds of the Roman Church during the Early Middle Ages and onward. It appears that Diocleia had been treated differently from other Slavic principalities by the author of the *DCCS*. Firstly, the baptism of the Diocleians was not presented as if it had happened during the rule of Heraclius, but as it happened in a previous, more ancient time (hence: *megala kstra oikoumena*). Secondly, only the Diocleians are not mentioned as being Serbs – since they did not live in Dalmatia, but in Praevalis. Thirdly, Diocleia had not been mentioned in the *DCCS* as a land enslaved by the Avars, since Constantine had to insert an explanation: καθὼς καὶ εἰς τὴν περὶ τῶν Χρωβάτων ἱστορίαν εἴρηται. This insertion means that he had not known anything about the settlement of the Slavs in Diocleia, and that he drew this conclusion based on the *DCCS*. He did exactly the same in chapter 29, where he added Diocleians based on: ...καθ' ὃν μέλλει τρόπον ἠθήσεσθαι ἐν τῇ περὶ τῶν Χρωβάτων καὶ Σέρβλων συγγραφῇ...Διοκλητιανοὶ.<sup>580</sup>

<sup>577</sup> *DAI I*, c. 35.12 – 13.

<sup>578</sup> For the ubication of these *kastra oikoumena*, see Živković, *Kastra oikoumena*, 12, notes 32 – 34.

<sup>579</sup> Not *the large inhabited cities*, as it is in *DAI I*, 165.

<sup>580</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.55 – 58.

There is no mention of the Diocleians in the chapters about the Croats and the Serbs, only the Terbounians, the Zachlumians, the Pagans and the Kanalites.

## Paganía

8. Περὶ τῶν Παγανῶν, τῶν καὶ Ἄρεντανῶν καλουμένων, καὶ ἧς νῦν οἰκοῦσι χώρας.<sup>581</sup>

*Of the Pagans, also called the Arentans, and of the country they now dwell in*

This chapter is also a draft, and its title shows that Constantine would have foldered in everything of the value on the historical and contemporary knowledge of Paganía.

8.1 Ὅτι ἡ χώρα εἰς ἣν νῦν οἰκοῦσιν οἱ Παγανοί, καὶ αὐτὴ πρότερον παρὰ τῶν Ῥωμαίων<sup>582</sup> ἐκρατεῖτο, οὗς ἀπὸ Ῥώμης ὁ βασιλεὺς Διοκλητιανὸς μετοίκησας ἐν Δελματία ἐνώκησεν. Οἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ Παγανοὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀβαπτίστων Σέρβλων κατὰγονται ἐξ ἐκείνου τοῦ ἄρχοντος τοῦ εἰς τὸν βασιλέα Ἡράκλειον προσφυγόντος. Παρὰ δὲ τῶν Ἀβάρων καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ χώρα αἰχμαλωτισθεῖσα ἠρήμωται, καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ Ἡρακλείου τοῦ βασιλέως ἐνωκίσθη.<sup>583</sup>

*(It should be known) that the country in which the Pagans now dwell had also been previously possessed by the Romaioi whom the emperor Diocletian had transferred from Rome and settled in Dalmatia. The same Pagans are descended from the unbaptized Serbs, of the time of that archon who claimed the protection of the emperor Heraclius. This country also was enslaved by the Avars and made desolate and repopulated in the time of Heraclius the emperor.*

<sup>581</sup> *DAI I*, c. 36.1 – 2.

<sup>582</sup> According to *Codex par. gr.* 2009, fol. 104r. *DAI I*, c. 36.4: Ῥωμάνων.

<sup>583</sup> *DAI I*, c. 36.3 – 9.

This is the same approach that Constantine had in regard to chapters 33 through 35. It is mostly a retelling based on section 4.5, and the material from chapter 29. Note that in section 5.1 Constantine wrote Ῥωμαίων, and then he explained Ῥωμάνων δὴ φημι, and in this section (8.1) he did not repeat this explanation. This is the evidence of gradual work of the same author, from chapter 31 to chapter 36.

8.2 Παγανοὶ δὲ καλοῦνται διὰ τὸ μὴ καταδέξασθαι αὐτοὺς τῷ τότε καιρῷ βαπτισθῆναι, ὅτε καὶ πάντες οἱ Σέρβλοι ἐβαπτίσθησαν. Καὶ γὰρ Παγανοὶ τῇ τῶν Σκλάβων διαλέκτῳ ἄβαπτιστοὶ ἑρμηνεύονται, τῇ τῶν Ῥωμαίων δὲ διαλέκτῳ ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν Ἄρεντα καλεῖται, ἐξ οὗ κἀκεῖνοι παρὰ τῶν αὐτῶν Ῥωμαίων Ἄρεντανοὶ καλοῦνται.<sup>584</sup>

*The Pagans are so called because they did not accept baptism at the time when all the Serbs were baptized. For Pagans in the language of the Slavs means unbaptized, but in the language of the Romaioi their country is called Arenta, and so they themselves are called Arentans by these same Romaioi.*

This was, most probably, Constantine's investigation. It is true that the Pagans were baptized only in ca. 830, when one of their leaders was baptized in Venetia.<sup>585</sup> Therefore, the information provided by Constantine is generally correct. In turn, this means that the Pagans were not the part of the Serb tribe, since it was stated in the *DAI* that the Serbs had been baptized much earlier, and therefore, the Pagans could not have belonged to the Serb tribe. There is information in chapter 32, that the Serbs controlled Paganía in ca. 895, during the rule of the *Archon* Peter, and from this political situation Constantine would have been able to write that the Pagans belonged to the Serbian tribe. Constantine could have reached the same conclusion based on section 4.5, which derived from the *DCCS*. The whole story about the later baptism of the Pagans seems to have an etymological background.

<sup>584</sup> *DAI I*, c. 36.9 – 13.

<sup>585</sup> *Diac.* 120: *Circa haec tempore missus Sclavorum de insula Narrentis, ad domnum Iohannem ducem veniens, ab eo baptizatus est, pacem eo instituens, licet minime perdurasset.*

Constantine had to explain their name, and therefore, he had to say that they had not been baptized at the same time with the Serbs.

8.3 Ὅτι ἐν Παγανία εἰσὶν κάστρα οἰκούμενα· τὸ Μόκρον, τὸ Βερούλλια, τὸ Ὅστρωκ καὶ ἡ Σλαβίνετζα. Κρατοῦσιν δὲ καὶ ταύτας τὰς νήσους· νῆσος μεγάλη ἡ Κούρκρα ἥτοι τὸ Κίκερ, ἐν ἧ ἔστιν καὶ κάστρον· νῆσος ἑτέρα μεγάλη τὰ Μέλετα, ἥτοι τὸ Μαλοζεάται, ἣν ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ ἅγιος Λουκᾶς μέμνηται Μελίτην ταύτην προσαγορεύων, ἐν ἧ καὶ ἔχισ τὸν ἅγιον Παῦλον ἀπὸ τοῦ δακτύλου προσήψατο, ἣν καὶ τῷ πυρὶ ὁ ἅγιος Παῦλος κατέφλεξεν· νῆσος ἑτέρα μεγάλη τὸ Φάρα· νῆσος ἑτέρα μεγάλη ὁ Βράτζης. Εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι νῆσοι, αἱ μὴ κρατούμεναι παρὰ τῶν αὐτῶν Παγανῶν· νῆσος τὰ Χώραρα, νῆσος Ἰης, νῆσος τὸ Λάστοβον.<sup>586</sup>

*The katra oikoumena of Mokron, Beroullia, Ostrok and in Slavineza are in Paganian. Also, they possess these islands: the large island of Kourkra, or Kiker, on which there is a city; another large island, Meleta, or Malozeatai, which St Luke mentions in the Acts of the Apostles by the name of Melite, in which a viper fastened upon St. Paul on his finger, and St Paul burnt it up in fire; another large island, Phara; and another large island, Bratz. There are other islands not in the possession of these same Pagani: the island of Choara, the island of Ies, and the island of Lastovon.*

This list of the katra oikoumena had belonged to the DCCS, but the additional information about the islands which were, and were not in the possession of the Pagans, suggests that it would have been Byzantine (from the Pagans' relationships) and therefore it must have been derived from the Archives of the Imperial Palace. This was the situation, most probably, from the time of Basil I. The short anecdote on St. Paul probably had been derived from another source, since there is a marginal note in the manuscript (Περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Λουκᾶ καὶ Παύλου),<sup>587</sup> which suggests that Constantine noted it to remember that it had been taken from another source – in this case the Acts of the Apostles.<sup>588</sup>

<sup>586</sup> *DAI I*, c. 36.14 – 23.

<sup>587</sup> *Codex Parisinus gr. 2009*, fol. 104v.

<sup>588</sup> It is based completely on the *Acts*, 28:1 – 3.

## CONCLUSIONS

As it has already been concluded, Constantine's primary source on the Croats and the Serbs was most probably titled, in its original Latin version, the *De conversione Croatorum et Serborum*.<sup>589</sup> The analysis of chapters 29 to 36 has provided the conclusion that the *DCCS* was, in fact, the main source upon which Constantine was able to construct his narrative about the Croats and the Serbs.<sup>590</sup> Such a source, which

---

<sup>589</sup> For the title of Constantine's main source for the earliest history of the Croats and the Serbs, the *De conversione Croatorum et Serborum*, my main arguments are the following: 1. The *DCBC* served as the pattern for the author of the Constantine's source about the earliest history of the Croats and the Serbs (the *DCCS*); 2. The strong interest about the baptism of the Croats is expressed from the point of view of Rome (the priests were sent from Rome, the Croats gave oaths to the pope, the holy man Martin bounded the Croats again to Rome, the *kastra oikoumena* are the ecclesiastical centers of the Roman Church); 3. The *Conversio* as a literary genre did not exist in Byzantium – which rules out the possibility that such a kind of work could have been written in Byzantium; 4. The principle of “twin” nations which were baptized from Salzburg, the Bavarians and the Slavs (Carantanians and Pannonian Slavs) was repeated in the *DCCS* as the Croats and the Serbs. 5. The short history of Pannonia from the Roman times in the *DCBC* corresponds to the short history of Dalmatia in the *DCCS* – especially the role of the emperor in the course of reconquest of these territories, Pannonia and Dalmatia – Charlemagne and Heraclius; 6. The *DCBC* insisted that the Bavarians and the Carantanians were in submission and servitude of the Frankish emperor, which is repeated in the *DCCS* regarding the Croats and the Serbs; 7. Political issues were regularly mentioned in the *DCBC* as well as in the *DCCS* – especially the conflict of the Franks and the Croats against the Avars, the conflict between the Bulgarians and the Franks, as well as between the Croats/Serbs against the Bulgarians.

<sup>590</sup> Here are the most striking similarities between the *DCBC* and the supposed *DCCS*:

*DCBC: Antiquis enim temporibus ex meridiana parte Danubii in plagis Pannoniae inferioris et circa confines regiones Romani possederunt, (De conversione, 9.3 – 4).*

*DAI, c. 29: Ἡ δὲ καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν Ῥωμάνων διακράτησις ἦν μέχρι τοῦ Δανούβειος ποταμοῦ (DAI I, c. 29.14 – 15).*

*DCBC: Qui (sc. Romani, T. Ž) etiam Gothos et Gepidos suae ditioni subdiderunt. Sed post annos nativitatis domini CCLXXVII et amplius Huni ex sedibus*

contained such an amount of interesting information, probably attracted Constantine's attention, and eventually encouraged him to search for additional information about these tribes. This information, which Constantine had found mostly in the Archives of the Imperial Palace, allowed him not only to update his primary source, but also to make insertions, explanations of terms, names, and some political events. He used and combined various sources, taking into account those reports that seemed most reliable to him, while discarding other sources he considered less worthy of attention, to create as accurate picture about the history of these tribes as possible. Therefore, incorrect

---

*suis in aquilonari parte Danubii in desetis locis habitantes, transfretantes Danubium expulerunt Romanos et Gothos atque Gepidos...Tunc vero Sclavi post Hunos inde expulsos venientes coeperunt istis partibus Danubii diversas regiones habitare. Sed nunc qualiter Huni inde expulsi sunt, et Sclavi inhabitare coeperunt, et illa pars Pannoniae ad diocesim Iuvavensem conversa est, edicendum putamus (De conversione, 9.6 – 10).*

*DAI: Παρά δὲ τῶν Ἀβάρων ἐκδιωχθέντες οἱ αὐτοὶ Ῥωμαῖοι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ αὐτοῦ βασιλέως Ῥωμαίων, Ἡρακλείου, αἱ τούτων ἔρημοι καθεστήκασιν χώραι. (DAI I, c. 31.15 – 17).*

*DCBC: Nunc adiciendum est qualiter Sclavi qui dicuntur Quarantani et confines eorum fide sancta instructi christianique effecti sunt, seu quomodo Huni Romanos et Gothos atque Gepidos de inferiori Pannonia expulerunt et illam possederunt regionem, quosque Franci ac Bagoarii cum Quarantanis continuis affligendo bellis eos superaverunt. Eos autem qui obediebant fidei et baptismum sunt consecuti, tributarios fecerunt regum, et terram quam possident residui, adhuc pro tributo retinent regis usque in hodiernum diem. (De conversione, 6.20 – 7.4).*

*DAI: ((Οἱ Χρωβάτοι).. ἦλθον εἰς Δελματίαν καὶ εὔρον τοὺς ἄβαραις κατέχοντας τὴν τοιαύτην γῆν. Ἐπὶ τινὰς οὖν χρόνους πολεμοῦντες ἀλλήλους, ὑπερίσχυσαν οἱ Χρωβάτοι, καὶ τοὺς μὲν τῶν Ἀβάρων κατέσφαξαν, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς ὑποταγῆναι κατηνάγκασαν. Ἐκτοτε οὖν κατεκρατήθη ἡ τοιαύτη χώρα παρὰ τῶν Χρωβάτων, καὶ εἰσὶν ἀκμὴν ἐν Χρωβατίᾳ ἐκ τοὺς τῶν Ἀβάρων, καὶ γινώσκονται ἄβαραις ὄντες. (DAI I, c. 30.66 – 71).*

*DAI: Ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν Χρωβάτων, τῶν ἐλθόντων ἐν Δελματία, διεχωρίσθη μέρος τι, καὶ ἐκράτησεν τὸ Ἰλλυρικὸν καὶ τὴν Παννονίαν...(DAI I, c. 30.75 – 77).*

*DCBC: Peractis aliquantis temporibus praenominatus dux Carantanorum petiit Virgilium episcopum visitare populum gentis illius, eosque in fide fimiter confortare. Quod ille tunc minime adimplere valuit, sed sua vice misso suo episcopo nomine Modesto ad docendam illam plebem, et cum eo Wattonem, Reginbertum, Cozharium, atque Latinum presbyteros suos, et Ekihardum diaconum cum aliis clericis, dans ei licentiam ecclesias consecrare et clericos ordinare iuxta canonum diffinitionem (De conversione, 7.29 – 35).*

conclusions, chronologies, and conflicting statements – all are chiefly due to the fact that Constantine had to comprehend and explain information which had come from different sources and from different times. His primary source on the Serbs and Croats was coherent and assembled well. It was Constantine who discomposed its natural narrative, since he had used it only as one of his sources on the Serbs and the Croats. Essentially, he probably had already excluded some sections of this source in his first draft, while for other sections, he displaced them according to his own needs and narrative course. The

---

**DAI:** Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ἡράκλειος ἀποστείλας καὶ ἀπὸ Ῥώμης ἀγαγὼν ἱερεῖς καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ποιήσας ἀρχιεπίσκοπον καὶ ἐπίσκοπον καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους, τοὺς Χρωβάτους ἐβάπτισεν· εἶχον δὲ τῷ τότε καιρῷ οἱ τοιοῦτοι Χρωβάτοι ἄρχοντα τὸν Ποργᾶ (DAI I, 31.21 – 25).

**DCBC:** *Interim contigit anno videlicet nativitatibus domini DCCXCVIII, Arnonem iam archiepiscopum a Leone papa accepto pallio remeando de Roma venisse ultra Padum eique obviasse missum Caroli cum epistola sua, mandans illi ipso itinere in partes Sclavorum ire et exquirere voluntatem populi illius et praedicare ibi verbum dei. Sed quia hoc facere nequivit antequam responsum referret suae legationis, festine perrexit ad imperatorem, et retulit ei quicquid per eum dominus Leo papa mandavit. **Post expletam legationem ipse imperator praecepit Arnoni archiepiscopo pergere in partes Sclavorum et providere omnem illam regionem et ecclesiasticum officium more episcopali colere, **populusque in fide et christianitate praedicando confrotare.** Sicuti ille fecit illuc veniendo, consecravit ecclesias, ordinavit presbyteros, **populumque praedicando docuit.***** (De converisone, 10.1 – 8).

**DAI:** ...οὗς ὁ βασιλεὺς πρεσβύτας ἀπὸ Ῥώμης ἀγαγὼν ἐβάπτισεν, καὶ διδάξας αὐτοὺς τὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας τελεῖν καλῶς, αὐτοῖς τὴν τῶν Χριστιανῶν πίστιν ἐξέθετο (DAI I, 32.27 – 29).

**DCBC:** *Tunc primus ab imperatore constitutus est confini comfimi comes Goterammus, secundus Werinharius, tertius Albricus, quartus Gotafridus, quintus Geroldus. Interim vero dum praedicti comites orientalem procurabant plagam, aliqui duces habitaverunt in illis partibus ad iam dictam sedem pertinentibus. **Qui comitibus praefatis subditi fuerunt ad servitium imperatoris; quorum nomina sunt Priwizlauga, Cemicas, Ztoimir, Etagar.*** (De converisone, 11.13 – 18).

**DAI:** Αὐτοῦ οὖν τοῦ ἄρχοντος τοῦ Σέρβλου, τοῦ εἰς τὸν βασιλέα προσφυγόντος, τελευτήσαντος, κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἤρξεν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ πάλιν ὁ ἕγγων, καὶ οὕτως ἐκ τῆς γενεᾶς αὐτοῦ οἱ καθεξῆς ἄρχοντες. **Μετὰ δὲ χρόνους τινὰς ἐγεννήθη ἐξ αὐτῶν ὁ Βοϊσέσθλαβος, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὁ Ῥοδόσθλαβος, καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνου ὁ Προσηγῆς, καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνου ὁ Βλαστίμηρος, καὶ μέχρις αὐτοῦ τοῦ Βλαστίμηρου μετὰ τῶν Σέρβλων εἰρηνικῶς διετέλουν οἱ Βούλγαροι, ὡς γείτονες καὶ συνορίται ἀγαπῶντες ἀλλήλους, ἔχοντες δὲ δούλωσιν καὶ ὑποταγὴν εἰς τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῶν Ῥωμαίων καὶ εὐεργετούμενοι παρ' αὐτῶν...** (DAI I, c. 32.30 – 38).

most major omissions of the original text Constantine had made were in those sections related to the situation in Croatia, after the death of the *Archon* Terpimer. Therefore, he had to remove all explicit information about any Byzantine involvement in the political struggles in Croatia during the rule of Michael III, since he painted this emperor in black due to his primary need to promote his grandfather Basil I as the peacemaker and an outstanding statesman.<sup>591</sup>

The primary question is – who was then the author of Constantine’s primary source on the Croats/Serbs. If the exact name of the author were able to be found, then many other questions would be revealed, such as; when and why the *DCCS* was composed. Even though my own assumption is that the most probable author of the *DCCS* is Anastasius the Librarian, an inquiry cannot be conducted in one way only and based on the term of *kastra oikoumena* as being major evidence that Anastasius was the author. Rather by examining all three questions simultaneously – who could have authored the text, as well as when, and why would the text have been written – the author could be gradually revealed. The right way to conduct this inquiry would be to identify the peculiar parts of the narrative, even specific words, which could reflect the style of the author, the author’s way of political thinking, and generally the author’s intentions. Another, very important question is, whether the author of the *DCCS* had personally collected the material on the South Slavs, or if they had gathered the information from one, or more informants. The answers to all these questions are in sight, since the author of the *DCCS* left enough clues to follow, regardless if it were indeed Anastasius, or someone else.

The appearance of a *Conversio paganorum* in a specific place, time, and its designation to a specific nation, could not have been done by accident. This kind of work is a type of manual for diocesan authorities and the confirmation of their ecclesiastical rule, as well as the spiritual leadership over a nation of a particular country.<sup>592</sup> The writing of a *Conversio* probably does not mean that someone wished to preserve a short history of a specific nation, but rather to underline and

<sup>591</sup> For Michael III as the anti-hero in *Vita Basilii*, see: Kazhdan, *Literature*, 140 – 141.

<sup>592</sup> The term *nation* is used in Latin – *natio*.

emphasize their belonging to an ecclesiastical center. Such a text must contain some evidence related to the political intentions of the author, the traces of possible informant(s), and should be set in for a specific political frame. These three items are of the utmost importance in the search for the author of the supposed *DCCS*.

### **The Political Intentions of the *DCCS***

1. The author of the *DCCS* observed Rome as the spiritual center of the Croats and the Serbs. He also insisted upon the pact between Rome and the Croats, and upon the oaths which the Croats gave to the pope (sections 1.5, 1.7, 2.11, and 4.6).

2. For the author of the *DCCS*, the role of Emperor Heraclius in the baptism of the Serbs and the Croats is confirmation that the Serbs and the Croats had been politically under the rule of Byzantium – then, and in his own time (sections 1.3, 1.7, 4.2, 4.4, and 4.13).

3. It was the author of the *DCCS* who insisted on several occasions that the Bulgarians had never ruled over the Croats and the Serbs, and furthermore, both, the Croats and the Serbs, had recognized the political supremacy of Byzantium over the Bulgarians, but stayed silent on the matter of Bulgarian baptism (sections 1.9 and 4.7) and their spiritual guidance.

4. According to the list of the *kastra oikoumena*, the author of the *DCCS* stressed that the ecclesiastical organization in the territories of the South Slavic principalities in the former Dalmatia was run by the Roman Church (sections: 1.10, 4.14, 5.5, 6.5, 7.2, and 8.3).

5. The author of the *DCCS* considered the Franks to be the trouble-makers in Dalmatia, and it justifies the Croat rebellion (section 2.9).

6. Even though the author of the *DCCS* stressed that both the Croats and the Serbs had once been at war with the Bulgarians, he insisted on a peaceful solution through their mutual exchange of gifts,

and he attempted to describe this situation merely as if it were an accident, which should have prevailed in the most peaceful manner (sections 1.9 and 4.10). The most probable message is that Rome (in some way) could have controlled the Croats and the Serbs in the matters of war and peace – especially against the Bulgarians.

7. Dalmatia is extended to the north, as far as to the Danube River, which cannot be justified as an accident, or due to the author's unawareness of the provincial administrative division of the Late Roman times (section 2.1a). Since it has nothing to do with Byzantine external politics in ca. 950, it must be considered as a political issue important to the author of the *DCCS* or the political center which he represented.

The overview of these seven points, that may eventually reveal the political intentions of the author of the *DCCS*, provides some important clues. The author was a person who knew the political situation between the Bulgarians and the Serbs between the late 840's and up to ca. 856, perfectly well; the author was also familiar with the political situation between the Franks and Byzantium, and probably between Byzantium and Bulgaria. Since it has already been underlined that the author described the political situation until the late 870's, in regard to Croatia and up to the middle 850's, in regard to Serbia, the *DCCS* was composed during the most turbulent period of the religious relationship between Rome and Constantinople.<sup>593</sup> Furthermore, the chronological frame of its narrative – which differs for the Serbs by ending around 856, and extends to 878, for the Croats – would have been a consequence of the author's ability to gather information on the Croats from 856 to 878, and his inability to describe the situation in Serbia up to 878. It is also worth mentioning that the *DCCS* is compiled

---

<sup>593</sup> There is an enormous amount of literature about these events. For a general overview see, for instance: Dvornik, *Schism*; Vlasto, *Entry*; Simeonova, *Diplomacy*; Chadwick, *East and West*; E. J. Goldberg, *Struggle for Empire: Kingship and Conflict Under Louis the German 817 – 876*, New York 2006; F. Curta, *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Ages 500 – 1250*, Cambridge 2006, 166 – 179; Louth, *Greek East*; P. Sommer – D. Třeštík – J. Žemlička, *Bohemia and Moravia*, Christianization and the Rise of Christian Monarchy: Scandinavia, Central Europe and Rus' c. 900 – 1200, ed. N. Berend, Cambridge 2007, 221 – 223.

better than the *DCBC*, even though the *DCBC* incorporated some official documents (i.e. charters, letters, reports about the consecration of churches) in the main text, which makes the information more valuable.<sup>594</sup> However, the course of narrative and internal coherency are on the side of the *DCCS*.

On the other hand, the *DCBC* started with the exact name of the clergymen who were involved in the process of the baptism of the Bavarians; then speaks about the political relations between the Bavarians and the Franks; then about the baptism itself; then about the territory in which they lived and who had ruled over it in the past; then repeats the same approach in regard to the Carantanians; then makes a digression about the Avars; then carefully develops a narrative about Lower Pannonia and its dukes Pribina and Kotzil, and finally accuses Methodius and his doctrine as the cause of the problems in this area.<sup>595</sup> All this information is supported by the exact names of the clergymen, the names of the places in which the churches were consecrated, and the names of the local rulers.<sup>596</sup> The *DCCS* made the flow of the narrative much more coherent, but evidently based on much humble data. The names are usually missing – even such names which one would expect to find in it: the name of the pope who sent priests to the Croats and the Serbs; the name of the pope whom the Croats made a peace agreement with; the name of Porga's father or the name of *archon* who had ruled over the Serbs in the time of their baptism. The absence of these names strongly suggests that the author of the *DCCS* had been heavily dependent on the information gathered from *extra Romam*. Therefore, it should be concluded that the author was forced to create his narrative using those sources which were less reliable than the sources which had been used by the author of the *DCBC*. This conclusion leads towards the assumption that the whole story in the *De conversione Croatorum et Serborum* had been based merely on the accounts of verbal provenience, and, while looking more closely

---

<sup>594</sup> *De conversione*, 9.40 – 10.2; 10.12 – 19; 12.3 – 5; 12. 10 – 17; 12. 28 – 32; 13.12 – 17; 14.8 – 11.

<sup>595</sup> For a detailed analysis of the *DCBC*, see, Kos, *Conversio*, 17 – 100; H. Wolfram, *Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich: Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum und die Quellen ihrer Zeit*, Wien - München 1995, 227 – 336 (= Wolfram, *Salzburg*).

<sup>596</sup> *De conversione*, 4.30 – 31; 5.8 – 9; 6.9 – 11; 7.5 – 6; 7.15; 7. 32 – 8.2; 8.11 – 12.2; etc.

through “magnifying glass”, the facts about the earliest history of the Croats and the Serbs must be re-examined.

The idea of the author of the *DCCS* was magnificent. The author had to show that the Serbs and the Croats were part of the Roman Church from the time they had settled in Dalmatia, Pannonia and (diocese of) Illyricum. The specific problem the author had to struggle with was the fact that he had to find a way to present this as a joint effort between Rome and Constantinople. Such a person could not have been a simple monk or priest, but a prominent dignitary of the Church who would have created ideology rather than following it. The author must have made an immense effort to gather all popular stories about the origin of the Serbs and the Croats, then he proceeded to investigate how Christianity had progressed among them, and then finally had to record the cities which were part of the *oecoumena* in his own time. At the end of this brief summary of the peculiarities of the author’s work, it must be noted that he did not like the Franks at all, and that any political connotation should not be put aside. Furthermore, it had to have been a person well acquainted with the *De conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*, who knew this source well, following the composition of this source as the blueprint for his own work. Based on the narrative of this source, he was able to draft his instructions and questionnaire to his informants. Based on the aforementioned analysis, the author of the *DCCS* had most probably a whole network of active informants. The accurate transliterations of the Slavic place-names lead to the conclusion that some of these informants were, in fact, Slavs. The most valuable information gathered by the informant(s) about the Croats and the Serbs could be summarized as follows:

1. The *origo gentis* of the Croats, especially the non-Slavic names of their ancestors (Kloukas, Lobelos, Kosentzis, Mouchlo, Chrobotos, Touga and Bouga).

2. The accurate list of the cities where ecclesiastical organization existed (*kastra oikoumena*) could have hardly originated through one informant who supposedly would have had to travel through Croatia, Bosnia, Serbia, Pagania, Terbounia, Zachlunia, and Diocleia. This list is rather based on the official records of the Roman Church, and was extracted from the written material available in Rome.

3. The informant who provided the insight into the relations between Serbia and Bulgaria ca. 848 – 856, appears to have actually witnessed as these events took place. This informant knew many details such as: the politics of Vlastimer towards Terbounia; the policy of Presiam against Serbia, as well as of his successor, Boris; and he knew the exact place where captives were exchanged and the exact amount of the various gifts which the Serbs had given to Boris. Furthermore, the informant was able to notice that these gifts were in fact a tribute to the Bulgarians, and, for the Serbs, merely a sign of friendship; this informant had an understanding into Boris' thoughts, since it is said that he had made a peace *perforce*. He knew the names of *Archon* Mutimer's sons who escorted Boris' son Vladimer to the frontier town of Rasi; he knew that Mutimer had exiled his brothers to Bulgaria, and that Boris had given a Bulgarian woman to Klonimer, the son of Mutimer's brother Stroïmer, to take as his wife. The credibility of this story about Stroïmer, his son Klonimer and his marriage is further supported by the recently published golden seal of Stroïmer.<sup>597</sup>

4. The author was well informed about the events which took place between ca. 850 (the appearance of the holy man Martin at Terpmier's court) and ca. 878, (the aftermath of the Croat uprising against the Franks) in Croatia.

5. The author/informant knew about the unbaptized White Croats and the unbaptized White Serbs.

The variety of information on the Serbs and the Croats, as well as the geographical dispersion of the regions included into the narrative (Thessalonica, Belgrade, White Croatia, White Serbia, Pannonia, Dalmatia) point out that it was not possible for one informant to have known all these things. It is not easy to understand what was first hand information and what was compiled by the author due to his political or ecclesiastical needs which were of the greatest importance for his work (the *DCCS*). The most valuable information that can be gleaned from the then *recent* end of the Croat uprising against the Franks (875) is that the *DCCS* was written in the time of intensive preparations for the Council of Reconciliation between Rome and Constantinople (held from November 879 to March 880), ca. 876 – 878.

<sup>597</sup> T. Živković, *The Golden Seal of Stroimir*, IČ 55 (2007) 23 – 29.

However, there is no need to repeat the well known facts which have been the object of research for over a century about the ecclesiastical struggle between Salzburg and Rome, the mission of Constantine (Cyril) and Methodius in Moravia, or about the conflict between Rome and Constantinople over ecclesiastical rights in Bulgaria.<sup>598</sup> It is enough to say that everything became much different after the death of Emperor Louis II (August 875), and King Louis the German (August 876), when Pope John VIII came into position to arbitrate who the new Emperor in the West would be.

On the more mundane agenda, the Arab menace threatened Rome, and the pope asked Louis II and Basil I for help.<sup>599</sup> An alliance

<sup>598</sup> See note 593.

<sup>599</sup> J. Gay, *L'Italie méridionale et l'empire byzantin depuis l'avènement de Basil I jusqu'à la prise de Bari par les Normands 867 – 1071*, Paris 1904, 91 – 93, 99 – 100, thought that the initiative for the alliance between the Franks and Byzantium came from Basil I; similar, *FB II*, 18, n. 30; Lounghis, *Ambassades*, 191, 192, n. 4; Kreutz, *Normans*, 43 – 44. It is explicitly stated in *DAI I*, 29.103 – 106, and in *Theoph. Cont.* 293.9 – 13, and probably was based on some genuine document (i.e. Basil's letters) which could be his responses on the demands for help by Louis II and the pope, just informing them that Byzantine fleet is under its way and that he expects their cooperation (in accordance with the previous agreement). However, the initiative for the alliance should have come from the Pope, since the Arabs were above all a threat to papal possessions in southern Italy and Rome itself, and he would have been able to involve the Franks and Byzantines for *causa eius*. This is why I believe that the alliance was created on the initiative of Pope Hadrian II. Already in his letter to Louis II from February, 868, Pope Hadrian II urged him for help against Arabs in southern Italy; cf. *Ep. VI*, 703.13 – 28. There is no reason to doubt *Chronicon Salernitanum*'s statement that it was Louis II who sent legates to Basil I asking for the support of Byzantine fleet: *Set ut cognovisset ille imperator; ut minime Varim expugnere valeret, eo quod non haberet marinas hostes, statim Constantinopolim Basilio imperatori legationem misit, quatenus sine mora navales exercitus mitteret, ut Varim una cum ipso posset attribere; Chronicon Salernitanum*, MGH SS III, ed. G. Pertz, Hannoverae 1839, 521.4 – 7. According to *Ann. Bert.* 98 – 99, the Byzantine fleet of 200 ships was sent by *rex Grecorum* (sc. Basil) *in auxilium contra eosdem Sarracenos*, in 869. *In auxilium* could only mean that the initiative came from Louis II. Therefore, it could be concluded that Basil I and Louis II, after the pope 'involved' them into his anti-Arab plans, sought to use this alliance for their own political and military goals. It is important to note that some other documents, i.e. letters and charters, are quoted in the Chronicle of Salerno, and it is often based on good sources, albeit the narrative itself is weak; see, M. Manitius, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters, II: Von der Mitte des 10. Jahrhunderts bis zum Ausbruch des Kampfes zwischen Kirche und Staat*, München 1976 (first ed. 1923), 197 – 203.

was formed in 868, and joint Franko-Byzantine forces, supported by the Slavs of Dalmatia, besieged Bari in southern Italy (869), which was an important center of the Arabs at that time (since 840).<sup>600</sup> However, this alliance soon disintegrated, and the Byzantine fleet retreated to Corinth<sup>601</sup> only to come back in 870, to attack the Frankish vassals, the Croats of Dalmatia.<sup>602</sup> This sequence of events provides evidence that Byzantine policy towards the West had been taking a completely new course and it was directed to prevent further Frankish influence in both Italy and Dalmatia. Pope John VIII was on very good terms with Louis II, but when the latter died, in August 875, the Pope entered the midst of the political struggle for Louis' heir. He opted for Charles the Bald, the youngest son of Emperor Louis the Pious, and crowned him as Emperor at Christmas, 875.<sup>603</sup>

<sup>600</sup> It is interesting that Constantine Porphyrogenitus used an Italian source for the episode about Soldan and generally about the affairs in southern Italy c. 868 - c. 876; cf. *DAI II*, 105 – 106. Note the orthography of Louis' II name in the *DAI I*, c. 29.104, 117, 122, 126, 136, 152, 162, 164, 169, - Λοδόιχος, (also in *Theoph. Cont.* 293.10) which corresponds to the Latin, *Lodogicus* used in *Chron. Salern.* 521.15, 18, 22. Louis' name is usually transcribed as *Hludowicus* in Frankish sources; cf. *Ann. Bert.* 106. For the orthography of the names of Louis the Pious and Louis II preserved in the Italian inscriptions, see, N. Gray, *The Paleography of Latin Inscriptions in the Eighth, Ninth, and Tenth Centuries in Italy*, Papers of the British School at Rome 16 (1948) Nos 62, 67, 162 (*Hlodouvic, Lodowico*). It is also interesting that in the earliest manuscript of the *DAI* the copyist (or it was already Constantine?) repeatedly wrote (four times): Δολοίχος; cf. *Codex Parisinus gr. 2009*, fol. 71v, 72r, 72v(x2). On the other hand, in chapter 26 (*The genealogy of the illustrious King Hugh*), Louis' name is transcribed correctly - Λοδόϊκος; cf. *DAI I*, c. 26.17. These differences are signaling the use of two different Latin sources.

<sup>601</sup> According to *Ann. Bert.* 105 – 106, the Byzantine fleet of 400 ships, led by *patricius* (sc. Nicetas Ooryphas), arrived a front of Bari with the specific task to embark Louis' II daughter as the promised bride for Basil's I son, Constantine. Then, something went wrong and *patricius molestus*, left to Corinth; see, also, Kreutz, *Normans*, 44. It is interesting that the size of Byzantine fleet involved in the Adriatic operations 868/869 varied in sources from 100 ships (*DAI I*, 29.96 – 98) commanded by Nicetas Ooryphas who lifted the Arab siege of Ragusa, to 200 ships which arrived a front of Bari in 869, in *Ann. Bert.* 98, and finally 400 ships, also according to *Ann. Bert.* 105. The gradual increase of these numbers could mean that it was either truly a huge fleet, which contemporaries exaggerated, or it means that Basil I expanded his primary politics in Adriatic regardless to his alliance with Louis II. *Theoph. Cont.* 293.2 – 19, did not provide the exact number of the Byzantine ships involved in the siege of Bari.

<sup>602</sup> See note 391 (the letter of Louis II to Basil I from 871).

<sup>603</sup> *Ann. Fuld.* 85.

Meanwhile, John VIII enjoyed Byzantine military aid. In 874, probably due to the help of Byzantine sailors, he defeated 18 Arab ships and released 600 Christian captives.<sup>604</sup> John VIII, to whom the Arabs were a major menace, had to play a careful diplomatic game.<sup>605</sup> Having been in the midst of a theater where many interests intersected, and where the most powerful states of the Early Middle Ages were struggling for dominance, he could not rely on one unique policy, but rather only conduct a broad range of multiple policies.

The Emperor Louis II died on August 12<sup>th</sup>, 875, and the unfortunate Emperor Charles the Bald died on October 6<sup>th</sup>, 877. Therefore Carloman, the son of Louis the German who had died on August 28<sup>th</sup>, 876,<sup>606</sup> came to Italy to claim the crown. He imprisoned the pope with the help of the duke of Spoleto, but the pope refused to offer the crown to Carloman and fled to Provence.<sup>607</sup> He crowned Louis the Stammerer, the son of Charles the Bald, in September 878, but when he died in April 879,<sup>608</sup> Pope John VIII then (in 879) recognized Charles the Fat, the second son of Louis the German as the king of Italy, and in 880 (December, 25<sup>th</sup>), crowned him emperor (880 – 887).<sup>609</sup> Meanwhile, the Byzantine army disembarked to Southern Italy in 880, which was most probably part of the agreement arranged at the Council of Constantinople in March 880. The following year, after their initial success, the Byzantine army was annihilated by the Arabs.<sup>610</sup>

<sup>604</sup> *Ep. VII*, 303.7 – 14.

<sup>605</sup> In April 877, Pope John VIII wrote to Basil I, asking for 10 ships of war (*chalandia*) against the Arabs; cf. *Ep. VII*, 45.31 – 34. See, also, F. E. Engreen, *Pope John the Eighth and the Arabs*, *Speculum* 20 (1945) 324.

<sup>606</sup> *Ann. Fuld.* 86.

<sup>607</sup> *Ann. Fuld.* 91.

<sup>608</sup> *Ann. Bert.* 148; *Ann. Fuld.* 92.

<sup>609</sup> *Ann. Bert.* 151; It seems that John VIII was not so eager to crown Charles the Fat; cf. *Ep. VII*, 235.20 – 236.8.

<sup>610</sup> *Theoph. Cont.* 305.5 – 306.21. It is interesting that the Slavs were mentioned as the part of this Byzantine army as those who were killed together with the supreme commander of the Byzantine army – Procopius. I believe that this episode – when the Slavs were involved in the military operations of Byzantium in the Southern Italy, actually is the same one which Constantine Porphyrogenitus displaced to 869 and the siege of Bari. However, there is an opinion that the Slavs in this expedition were from Peloponnese; cf. H. Ditten, *Ethnische Verschiebungen zwischen der Balkanhalbinsel und Kleinasien vom Ende des 6. bis zur zweiten Hälfte des 9. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin

Yet, on top of all these political affairs, there was a constant struggle between the pope and Frankish clergy, especially with the archbishops of Salzburg, Ravenna, Aquileia, and Rheims.<sup>611</sup> Only in the spring of 873, did Pope John VIII learn that Methodius was imprisoned in Bavaria and ordered Adalwin, the archbishop of Salzburg, to give his immediate release.<sup>612</sup> Methodius returned to his missionary work in Moravia in 873, and there he encountered a completely new situation, different from that which he left when he went to Rome in 869. Namely, while Methodius was away, Svatopluk, the nephew of Duke Rastislav, made an alliance with Carloman in 870, and very soon had orchestrated Rastislav's capture and delivered him to Carloman.<sup>613</sup> Having been the usurper, Svatopluk had to rely on his new Frankish ally, and therefore he had to accept Frankish clergy in return. Therefore, Methodius found himself to be in a completely different situation in 873, and his work now became much more difficult.

The date of the composition of the *DCBC* (871) corresponds to the period when Methodius was imprisoned in Bavaria. Even though Pope Hadrian II ordained him as the archbishop of Pannonia<sup>614</sup> (with the intended seat being in Dmitrovica,<sup>615</sup> the modern town of Sremska

---

1993, 260 – 261, 357 – 358. For the arguments that these Slavs were most probably from the Dalmatian coast, see, Živković, *Južni Sloveni*, 246 – 247. For the date of this expedition (880), see, F. Winkelmann, *Quellenstudien zur herrschenden Klasse von Byzanz im 8. und 9. Jahrhundert*, Berlin 1987, 119; also, *Byzantine Armies in the West (5<sup>th</sup> – 11<sup>th</sup> c.). Studies on the Operations on Land and at Sea: Composition and Mission of the Byzantine Task Forces in the West*, ed. St. Lampakis – M. Leontsini – T. Lounghis – V. Vlyssidou, Athens 2008, 318 – 320 (V. Vlyssidou).

<sup>611</sup> *Ep. VII*, 47.1 – 21; 53.34 – 54.22; 54.30 – 36; 55.8 – 17; 58.15 – 22; 94.25 – 95.31. For the genesis of this conflict, see, R. J. Belletzkie, *Pope Nicholas I and John of Ravenna: The Struggle for Ecclesiastical Rights in the Ninth Century*, Church History 49 (1980) 262 – 272.

<sup>612</sup> *Ep. VII*, 283.11 – 12.

<sup>613</sup> *Ann. Fuld.* 70 – 71.

<sup>614</sup> See, I. Boba, *The Episcopacy of St. Methodius*, Slavic Review 26/1 (1967) 85 – 93.

<sup>615</sup> The fact that Methodius' seat was in Dmitrovica (former Sirmium) was among the key arguments of Imre Boba to locate Moravia to the south; see, Boba, *Defense*, 178. However, Boba's thesis is based on the wrong interpretation of this act, since the pope could not have ordained Methodius in Svatopluk's Moravia where an ancient ecclesiastical centre did not exist. The pope had to avoid open conflict with Salzburg which controlled Passau and Nitra with its Frankish clergy, and yet, to establish Methodius in a place with a strong ecclesiastical tradition. The choice of Sirmium was the only possible solution for the pope.

Mitrovica in Vojvodina, Serbia) in 869, the archbishop of Salzburg confined him and kept him imprisoned for some two and half years. It has been proposed that the *DCBC* was actually written for the purpose of Methodius' trial at Regensburg in 870, or immediately after that.<sup>616</sup> The composing of the *DCBC* due to Methodius' trial does not seem likely,<sup>617</sup> as such a work would have had a much wider purpose and would have supported the more important needs of the Archbishopric of Salzburg, rather than just to fight a single person.<sup>618</sup> Moreover, the last sentence of the *DCBC* – which actually accuses Methodius of being a trouble-maker,<sup>619</sup> is the only accusation of him, and it is written down merely to almost timidly present that, in fact, the whole work was induced due to Methodius' ecclesiastical work among the Slavs of Pannonia. This sentence represents the key for understanding why it had been necessary for the Church of Salzburg to compose such a work. It was written carefully, without any wish to make any open confrontation with the pope. Note the way in which the author of the *DCBC* introduced Methodius at the closing section of his narrative: *...usque dum quidam Graecus Methodius nomine noviter inventis Sclavinis litteris linguam Latinam doctrinamque Romanam atque litteras auctoriales Latinas philosophicae supreducens vilescere fecit...*<sup>620</sup> For the author of the *DCBC*, Methodius is *quidam*, he is *Graecus*; both are terms used to disqualify Methodius,<sup>621</sup> and to

<sup>616</sup> Vlasto, *Entry*, 69. See also, F. Lošek, *Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum und der Brief des Erzbischofs Theotmar von Salzburg*, MGH Studien und Texte 15, Hanover 1997, 5 – 8.

<sup>617</sup> See also a radical view of C. R. Bowlus, *Franks, Moravians, and Magyars: the Struggle for the Middle Danube, 788 – 907*, Philadelphia 1995, 165 – 169, that Methodius was never brought to Regensburg for trial.

<sup>618</sup> See, Kos, *Conversio*, 101 – 105, with the general conclusion that the *DCBC* was written in 871, as the information to the Archbishop Adalwin regarding his ecclesiastical rights over his territory, and presented to Louis the German. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 193 – 197, argued that the *DCBC* was written in 870, for Louis the German and against Methodius, probably by Archbishop Adalwin himself. However, since the author of the *DCCS* used the *DCBC* as the model for his work, and he was, most probably, in Rome – it means that the *DCBC* had been, in fact, sent to Rome.

<sup>619</sup> *De conversione*, 14.27.

<sup>620</sup> *De conversione*, 13.26 – 14.1.

<sup>621</sup> Similar, I. Ševčenko, *Three Paradoxes of the Cyrillo-Methodian Mission*, *Slavic Review* 23 (1964) 221.

underline that such a person could not have been set on his mission on the authority of the pope, since this person is *linguam Latinam doctrinamque Romanam...vilescere fecit*. However, in the very last sentence of the *DCBC* a hidden message was sent and it was not directed to the archbishop of Salzburg or to Louis the German, but to those who gave support to Methodius, and that was the pope of Rome – *Hoc enim ibi observatum fuit usque dum nova orta est doctrina Methodii philosophi*<sup>622</sup> In this last sentence, the author of the *DCBC* unveiled that he had known very well that Methodius was called the Philosopher, and this is why the previous statement where Methodius is *quidam, Graecus* must have been intentionally written to present him as an adventurer who could not have possibly enjoyed the support from the pope.

In the meantime, the relationships between Rome and Constantinople had been improving gradually. In 874, Anastasius the Librarian wrote a letter to John the Deacon,<sup>623</sup> arguing that the Latins were being misrepresented as teaching that the Son is an originating cause or *principium* of the Holy Spirit, and he explained that misunderstanding between Rome and Constantinople is merely due to language barrier (*...dificultatem exprimendi de alterius in alterius lingua proprietatem significans*).<sup>624</sup> This was done in preparation for the reconciliation and overcoming of the *Filioque* dispute between Rome and Constantinople. This new tone would become the solid ground upon which the Council of 879/880, would be held. Rome had to find a way to approach Photius and Basil I in a manner which would ensure

---

<sup>622</sup> In his letter to Louis the German, Pope John VIII argued (May 873) Pannonia to be an ancient Apostolic See and alluded to the number of years as irrelevant to the topic; cf. *Fragmenta*, 281.1 – 12. This is circumstantial evidence that John VIII had already read the *DCBC* because in it he would have been able to find that Salzburg administrated Pannonia for 75 years (that is from 796 until 871); cf. Kos, *Conversio*, 105. However, since Kos denies the possibility that the *DCBC* had been intended to the pope, he also thinks that the pope could have learnt about this number of years from the letter of Louis the German.

<sup>623</sup> John the Deacon (Hymonides) was a monk from Monte Cassino, who also lived in Rome. Anastasius the Librarian considered him to be a very experienced (learned) man; cf. *Ep. VII*, 439.4: *...et maxime viro peritissimo Iohanne diacono...*

<sup>624</sup> *Ep. VII*, 425.19 – 27.

the Byzantine's military aid in Italy against the Arabs,<sup>625</sup> and to solve the Bulgarian issue in Rome's favor. To achieve these goals that were at the heart of the papal policy, Anastasius, who did hold all strings of papal policy, had to devise a wise plan. He played a political game by which he would give Byzantium something that was, in fact, of no value or interest to Rome, being able to obtain something more valuable – ecclesiastical rights over Bulgaria.

Alongside the act of this new approach to Constantinople, the deposition of the Bishop Formosus of Portua, which occurred at the Synod held in Rome on April 19<sup>th</sup> 876, must be understood: in his letter to *all the archbishops and bishops, and people in the lands of Gaul and Germany*, Pope John VIII announced that Formosus corrupted the heart of Boris and had plans to become a pope himself.<sup>626</sup> In fact, Formosus, who led the papal legates back to Bulgaria in 866, was very anti-Byzantine for the taste of the new papal policy regarding the issue of Bulgaria, and especially regarding the forthcoming Council of Constantinople and intended reconciliation. The deposition of Formosus should be explained as one of the measures taken in the direction of reconciliation between Rome and Constantinople. If Formosus truly had any intention to become a pope, then John VIII killed two birds with one stone.

However, in addition to these acts of the re-approaching between Rome and Constantinople, Anastasius needed something else to find a way to show that Rome considered Byzantium as the true political leader in Illyricum and Dalmatia. He had to give something which was painless to Rome, and yet, that concession had to be perceived as a great and unique offering of Rome to Constantinople: something Constantinople would not be able to refuse.

By the year 873, John VIII had probably received the *DCBC*.<sup>627</sup> It became clear that Salzburg considered its missionary work among the Pannonian Slavs as their exclusive right and they were not going to allow the papacy to interfere with it. Louis II was still alive and powerful, and the pope needed him against the Arabs; therefore,

---

<sup>625</sup> In 879, John VIII congratulated Gregory, *spatharios*, Theophylactus, *turmarches*, and Diogen, *comitis*, on their victory over Arabs near Naples; *Ep. VII*, 214.15 – 30.

<sup>626</sup> *Ep. VII*, 327.21 – 328.4.

<sup>627</sup> See notes 618 and 622.

Anastasius could not do anything to prevent the policy of Salzburg at that moment. Carloman was at his peak of power, having just crushed Rastislav (871), and subdued Svatopluk. Furthermore, Anastasius knew that the pope would only be able to prevail if he played diplomacy carefully, supporting the Italian and Frankish rulers according to their political needs. In fact, Anastasius was aware that the *DCBC* was nothing more than a *story* that had no effective power or consequences. It was not an official document, even though the author had included some genuine documents in it to strengthen the narrative as a whole, but was in reality merely a list of the wishes of Adalwin, the Archbishop of Salzburg.<sup>628</sup> The political situation changed in August 875, when Louis II died, and when the pope became the one who would make the choice of who the new Frankish emperor was to be. It is here that the crucial year in which the idea of the origin of the *DCCS* most probably took shape is reached. The basic idea was that Dalmatia had to be recognized as a political dominion of Byzantium, and that spiritual leadership in the past was to be shared between Rome and Constantinople.

The uprising of the Croats against the Franks, which ended in 875, was marked by the death of Duke Kotzil of Lower Pannonia, and the final defeat of the Franks, which he had led against the Croats, made this idea possible. However, (*praefectura*) *Illyricum*, in which Bulgaria was situated, was put aside in the *DCCS*.<sup>629</sup> This is why there is no mention of Bulgaria regarding ecclesiastical matters in the *DCCS*. There was only the recognition that Bulgaria was under the rule of the

<sup>628</sup> For instance, the *DCBC* is silent about the work of the Archbishopric of Aquileia among the Carantanians; cf. Kos, *Gradivo II*, N° 37 (811): *Nam Ursus patriarcha antiquam se auctoritatem habere asserebat, et quod tempore, antequam Ytalia a Longobardis fuisset invasa, per synodalia gesta que tunc temporis ab antecessoribus suis Aquilegensis ecclesie rectoribus agebantur, ostendi posse predictae Karantane provincie civitates ad Aquilegiam esse subiectas*. Also, Kos, *Gradivo II*, N° 59 (819).

<sup>629</sup> The official position of Rome towards Bulgaria is expressed in the letter of Anastasius to the Pope Hadrian II from 871: *...Vulgarum patriam, quae in Hyllirico constituta est, dioecesi Constantinopolitanae subiciendam, cum ab olim in utraque Hepiro, Dardania, Dacia, Thessalia et ceteris in Hyllirico sitis provinciis semper sedis apostolicae dispositio facta clareat, sicut diversae historiae vel pontificum Romanorum a Damaso papa per easdem provincias missae testantur epistolae, et has Grecorum principes sola vi faventibus sibi Constantinopolitanis praesulibus, causa dumtaxat quam superius annotavimus, extortas ab apostolica sede subegerint*; cf. *Ep. VII*, 413.30 – 35.

Byzantine emperor; spiritual questions were not even touched. It was intended to be solved on another occasion – the Great Council of Reconciliation in Constantinople, which would take place from November 879 until March 880.

Meanwhile, however, John VIII was pursuing the same old policy towards Bulgaria – he was writing on a regular basis to Boris Michael, always repeating the same phrases: *come back to the Roman Church* and *do not obey the Church of Constantinople*.<sup>630</sup> This was something of diplomatic pressure, rather than *Realpolitik*. In this manner, Rome maintained its permanent pressure on Bulgaria, almost to the beginning of the Council of 879, and sent the message to Constantinople in turn that the issue of Bulgarian was still of primary interest to the pope. By maintaining this kind of pressure, the value of the *DCCS* would grow even higher – it would become a *Deus ex machina*, which would show the readiness of Rome to ease its dispute with Constantinople. Therefore, it can be assumed that the *DCCS* was a work which Anastasius the Librarian had prepared for the intended Council of Reconciliation.<sup>631</sup>

When Anastasius is observed to be the one who composed the *DCCS*, then the purpose of this work is easily recognizable. It stated that the Croats and the Serbs had received their baptism through the joint efforts of Rome and Constantinople; it insisted that the Serbs and the Croats had always been under the rule of Byzantium, as well as Bulgaria; and it considered the Franks as being those who were the trouble-makers. The message was plain – Rome and Byzantium did not

<sup>630</sup> *Ep. VII*, 58.19 – 22 (April 876); 146.22 – 30 (May 879); 154.15 – 26 (June 7, 879).

<sup>631</sup> At the Council of 879/880, an agreement between Rome and Constantinople regarding Bulgaria was reached. The legates of John VIII, having learned that Emperor Basil I would ultimately leave Bulgaria to Rome, agreed to support Photius; cf. See, J. M. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, Oxford 1990, 83 – 84 (= Hussey, *Orthodox Church*). Once installed, the archbishop of Bulgaria had to be consecrated. Both sides agreed that Boris should ask Rome for consecration. Photius knew that Boris, after he received his archbishop, would never ask Rome for consecration – a very important detail which seems to have sneaked by the legates of John VIII. This was exactly how it eventually took place. The letters of John VIII directed to Boris after 880, were never answered, and the expected legates from Bulgaria never arrived in Rome; cf. *Ep. VII*, 260.9 – 12 (881 – 882); 266.34 – 267.29 (882).

have any dispute over Dalmatia regarding ecclesiastical issues. It was an offer of friendship that gave something which Rome did not actually possess – political power over the Slavs of Dalmatia and Bulgaria. In other words, *I give you something which I actually do not possess*. In this manner, the famous proverb *quid pro quo* turned into *nihil pro quo*. However, there was another far more important message embodied into the *DCCS*: the Croats and the Serbs – who fought successfully against the Avars, the Bulgarians, and the Franks –, were under the spiritual guidance of Rome, and consequently controlled by Rome in the matters of war and peace.<sup>632</sup> It was a type of warning to Constantinople. On the second level, the *DCCS* fought back against Salzburg's claims over Pannonia, by settling part of the Croats in Pannonia and (the diocese of) Illyricum, as far as to the Danube River, and by introducing the White Croats and the White Serbs as unbaptized tribes, the Author reserved any future missionary work among them to be directed from Rome.

### The Author and His Informants

The only Church which could have had a well developed network of fieldworkers among the Slavs was the church run by Methodius. As the Archbishop of Pannonia (and Moravia),<sup>633</sup> effectively from May 873, he was able to develop a Slavonic liturgy in the vast areas of the Central-East Europe populated by the Slavs. His disciples could be sent elsewhere, to Pannonia, Croatia and Dalmatia. He was a high dignitary of the Roman Church, who could have easily provided the kind of information needed for a *Conversio Croatorum et*

<sup>632</sup> That is why it was necessary for the Author of the *DCCS* to describe the invented pact between the Croats and the pope in detail; see sections 1.7 and 1.8. For the same reason, the Author of the *DCCS* had needed to present a formidable Croat army; see section 1.11.

<sup>633</sup> In the letter of Pope John VIII from 879, (June – July) to Methodius, he is: *Reverentissimo Methodio archiepiscopo Pannoniensis ecclesiae*; cf. *Ep. VII*, 161.6 – 21. From the same date, there is the letter of John VIII to Svatopluk, from which can be seen that the diocese of Methodius comprised Moravia too; cf. *Ep. VII*, 200.28 – 29: *Quia Methodius vester archiepiscopus ab antecessore nostro, Adriano scilicet papa, ordinatus*. However, in another letter to Methodius from March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 881, John VIII called him only *Methodio archiepiscopo*; cf. *Ep. VII*, 243.33 – 244.19.

*Serborum*. His protector was Anastasius, a major political figure in the Roman Church. It was Anastasius who had led the papal policy towards the Slavs of Moravia. It was Anastasius who had decided to support the Slavonic liturgy, and in turn became the one who maintained close relations to Methodius.<sup>634</sup> Anastasius was that great mastermind of the ecclesiastical policy of Rome. If this specific role of Anastasius in regard to ecclesiastical matters in Moravia and Pannonia and his ties to Methodius is kept in mind, then the information contained in the *DCCS* must be filtered through those who belonged to the inner circle of Methodius. Constantine was a philosopher in Constantinople<sup>635</sup> and his brother Methodius was a governor of a Slavonic principality in the vicinity of Thessalonica.<sup>636</sup> Their father Leo also had held the military rank of *droungarios* in the *theme* of Thessalonica.<sup>637</sup> They both had good command of the Slavic language,<sup>638</sup> and Methodius' administrative position among the Slavs was able to provide him with the possibility to learn more about them.<sup>639</sup> The Thessalonica brothers' close associate, even before their mission to Moravia, was Clement<sup>640</sup> – a native Bulgarian,<sup>641</sup> who could have had some knowledge of the Serb-Bulgarian relations during the first reign of Presiam and the first years of Boris-Michael's reign. He returned from Moravia to Bulgaria (via Belgrade) only after 885.<sup>642</sup> Since it is known that the *DCCS* was written in ca. 878,<sup>643</sup> and that Clement was not in Bulgaria between ca. 860 and 885, this can explain why the narrative about Vlastimer's rule and the

<sup>634</sup> The role of Anastasius as the protector of the Slavonic liturgy is hinted at in CMT, *Žitije Konstantina*, c. 17.9.

<sup>635</sup> *Žitije Konstantina*, c. 4.1 – 5.

<sup>636</sup> *Žitije Metodija*, c.2.4 – c. 3.3.

<sup>637</sup> *Žitije Konstantina*, c. 2.1.

<sup>638</sup> *Žitije Metodija*, c. 5.8.

<sup>639</sup> *Žitije Metodija*, c. 3.1.

<sup>640</sup> It is stated that he was at first in the Bythinian Olympus; cf. *Krátky život sv. Klimenta*, Magnae Moraviae fontes historici II, ed. D. Bartoňková – L. Havlík – J. Ludvíkovský – Z. Masařík – R. Večerka, Brno 1967, 270 (= *Krátky život sv. Klimenta*).

<sup>641</sup> *Krátky život sv. Klimenta*, 270.

<sup>642</sup> *Žitie na Kliment Ohridski*, 29 – 30.

<sup>643</sup> The strongest evidence is the number of the Croat soldiers and ships in their fleet, written in the *Present tense* from ca. 877/878, as well as the statement that the Croats were under the rule of the Franks *until recently*; see sections 1.11 and 2.7 above.

beginnings of Mutimer's rule is rich in detail, as well as why it is interrupted ca. 856. In the *Short Life of St Clement*, written by the Archbishop of Ochrid Dimitrios Homatenos (1216 – 1234), there is a brief list of the countries in which Clement allegedly traveled – Pannonia, Dalmatia, Thrace, and Illyricum.<sup>644</sup> On the other hand, Gorazd must also not be forgotten. He was a native Moravian,<sup>645</sup> who would have been able to personally know of the White Serbs and the White Croats. They were the first neighbors of the Moravians to the north. He was *very learned* and also fluent in the Slavic and Greek languages.<sup>646</sup> All these men, centered around Methodius, could provide at least some information about the Croats and the Serbs, or the White Croats and the White Serbs. However, the general political message of the *DCCS* rested entirely upon its author – Anastasius the Librarian.

If the preserved letters of Anastasius are observed, it can easily be seen that he was the one who wrote the *DCCS*. The main evidence of Anastasius' authorship is hidden behind the term *kastra oikoumena*. As has already been pointed out, this specific term which designated those towns which were included in ecclesiastical organization could not have originated in a Greek's mind, since not a single Byzantine source had ever used such a term. On the other hand, there is the actual confirmation from Anastasius himself that he learned the explanation for *oikoumena* as having been not only for the Christian world from the Byzantines in 869, but also for designating each inhabited Christian place as well. No other contemporary source, as far as we know, had used this term – only Anastasius. Therefore, this is overwhelmingly strong evidence that Anastasius not only wrote his original *DCCS* in Latin, but he was the one who translated it into Greek.

It is known that Anastasius, *vir dubiae famae*,<sup>647</sup> expressed a strong interest into Methodius' work prior to the 870's. In his letter to Bishop Gaudericus (ca. 870), Anastasius mentioned that he was personally informed about Methodius' mission to Hazaria, by

<sup>644</sup> *Krátky život sv. Klimenta*, 270.

<sup>645</sup> *Žitie na Kliment Ohridski*, 25 (Γοράσδος..ὄν ἐκ Μοράβου γενόμενον).

<sup>646</sup> *Žitie na Kliment Ohridski*, 25 (καὶ ἄμφω τῷ γλώττα τὴν τε σθλοβενικὴν ὄντα καὶ τὴν γραικικὴν ἰκανώτατον).

<sup>647</sup> *CMT*, 51.

Constantine (Cyril) himself.<sup>648</sup> The evidence from this letter suggests that Anastasius was well informed about Constantine's/Methodius' work from the earliest days of their acquaintanceship (866/867). Furthermore, there is an additional glimpse into Cyril's interests: he was not just a priest or missionary, but a collector of various notes from the lands where he stayed during the different stages of his life. There is also no doubt that his brother, Methodius, shared similar interests. Methodius, in fact, replaced his brother in each aspect of his work. It is known, according to his *Vita*, that he did not suffer from a lack of energy at all. Finally, in the last years of his life, Methodius visited Constantinople upon the invitation of Emperor Basil I.<sup>649</sup> This time he could have left some additional material in the form of reports which could have contained various notes from the lands he had visited for the purpose of Byzantine's diplomatic activities and needs, which could have been kept in the Archives of the Imperial Palace. Constantine Porphyrogenitus would have been able to use this information for some other chapters of the *DAI*.<sup>650</sup>

It can be assumed that the *DCCS* was presented as a special gift to Photius in the November of 879. At that time, the political situation in Croatia had already reverted since May 879, and *Archon* Branimer had become an independent ruler. This means that the *DCCS* had become obsolete even before it reached those to whom he had to confirm his political rights over the Croats (and the Serbs as well). On the other hand, it was not written after the May of 879, and Branimer's usurpation in Croatia. Therefore it must be assumed that Anastasius perfected his Greek translation of the *DCCS* during the last months of 878, or the January-March of 879. Since his position as librarian was taken by Zacharias of Agnani before March 29<sup>th</sup>, 879, it can be safely

<sup>648</sup> *Ep. VII*, 436 – 438.

<sup>649</sup> CMT, *Žitije Metodija*, c. 13.5 – 6.

<sup>650</sup> I believe that Methodius' reports can be detected in the various chapters of the *DAI*. It appears that chapter 37 contains at least a part of the material gathered by Cyril and Methodius. The term *erimokastr*a which is used in relation to the cities on the Dniester River that were out of the reach of any ecclesiastical organization (*DAI I*, c. 37.58 – 67) must be noted here. Throughout chapter 39 (*DAI I*, c. 39.2 – 14); chapter 40, where the Kabaroi clans were mentioned as they had separated from the Chazars (*DAI I*, c. 40.3 – 7), some of the geographical information is contained in chapter 42, especially that about the journey from Thessalonica to Belgrade (*DAI I*, c. 42.15 – 18).

concluded that Anastasius probably died in the short span between the January and March of 879.<sup>651</sup> The information on the Croats is congruent with the possible date of Anastasius' death, all which does not surpass ca. 877/878.

The date of the composition of the *DCCS* could be narrowed down with the help of some additional evidence. In the autumn of 877, Emperor Basil I wrote to Pope John VIII urging the pope to send his legates to Constantinople, since the death of the Patriarch Ignatius was expected. Truly, Ignatius did die on October 23<sup>rd</sup>, 877, and Photius ascended to the patriarchal throne on October 26<sup>th</sup>.<sup>652</sup> The papal legates, Eugenius, bishop of Ostia, and Paul, bishop of Ancona, were sent *via* Bulgaria to Constantinople, towards the end of April 878 (April 28?).<sup>653</sup> If this were the case, the *DCCS* would have been composed and translated into Greek, during the last months of 877, and the first months of 878. Meanwhile, Basil I sent his own legates to Rome, *via* Benevento and Capua (May 879), but it is not known whether the pope gave them a letter or any other document of any kind for Basil I.<sup>654</sup> However, on August 16<sup>th</sup>, 879, Pope John VIII did send letters to Basil I and Photius respectively, and these letters were dispatched through his legate the Presbyter Peter.<sup>655</sup> The Presbyter Peter carried the papal responses *quaedam scriptis, quaedam autem verbis iniunximus*.<sup>656</sup> These responses were merely related to some sort of papal decisions upon the request of Photius. Then, in the another letter to his legates, Eugenius, bishop of Ostia, and Paul, bishop of Ancona at Constantinople, Pope John VIII (August 16<sup>th</sup>, 879) informed them that even though they did not obey him and came back to Rome to inform him on the developments in Constantinople, they still were able to be called his legates, but this time the main role of his legation would fall upon the shoulders of the Presbyter Peter: *familiarique nostro sociamus*.<sup>657</sup> This

<sup>651</sup> Zachary of Anagni is mentioned as being the librarian for the first time in a document dated March 29<sup>th</sup>, 879; cf. Davis, *Lives*, 297, n. 4. See also, *Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für Deutschland und Italien I*, Berlin 1968, 214.

<sup>652</sup> See, Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, 83.

<sup>653</sup> *Ep. VII*, 66.16 – 67.5; 67.12 – 27.

<sup>654</sup> *Ep. VII*, 142.17 – 36; 148.8 – 17.

<sup>655</sup> *Ep. VII*, 166 – 187.

<sup>656</sup> *Ep. VII*, 186.8 – 12.

<sup>657</sup> *Ep. VII*, 188.10 – 190.4.

reversal of papal attitude towards his legates in Constantinople and his decision to send the Presbyter Peter, obviously a close associate of him, having been induced by some acts of the legates, which were not alongside the instructions they had received back in Rome, could have been induced by the new material which Peter had to deliver to Photius. Among this new material, there could have been the *DCCS*. It seems that the *DCCS* was composed and translated into Greek after the departure of Eugenius and Paul to Constantinople (April 878), and the person which would have been able to deliver the *DCCS* to Photius must have been the Presbyter Peter in the September of 879.

Anastasius was a man of extraordinary education and working energy.<sup>658</sup> If one takes a look at the list of the ecclesiastical and historical works he had read and translated from Greek to Latin, then one would likely assume that Anastasius had rarely slept. It can be noticed that his work as a translator went on until the June of 876 (see note 658), when he stopped with this type of work. A possible answer to this interruption in his translating could be explained by the assumption that he had begun preparation for his major work – the *De Conversione Croatorum et Serborum* – since June of 876. The Passions of St Demetrius of Thessalonica and his Miracula are among the last Greek texts he translated.<sup>659</sup> This would mean that Anastasius had been familiar with the narrative of Miracula related to the 7<sup>th</sup> century Slavs around Thessalonica.<sup>660</sup>

<sup>658</sup> Anastasius translated several works from Greek into Latin among which include: the Life of St John Calybitas, the Life of St Basil of Neocaesarea, the Life of St John the patriarch of Alexandria; The Chronicle of Theophanes the Confessor (partially), The Passions of St Kyr and John, *Translationes Sancti Stephani*, The Passions of St Peter of Alexandria and The Passions of the 1,480 Martyrs; commentary on the Greek sermons of Dionysius Areopagita; The Passions of St Demetrius of Thessalonica; the sermons of Theodore Stoudita; cf. *Ep. VII*, 402.8 – 12 (868); 399.10 – 11 (858 – 867); 395.31 – 396.4 (858 – 862); 421.11 – 23 (871 – 874); 426.24 – 26 (875); 427.28 – 428.6; 429. 9 – 430.1 (875/876); 431.7 – 13 (875); 439.3 – 5 (876); 441.28 – 442.4 (870 – 879). He personally stated that he knew the works of: St Jerome, Gregory of Nyssa, Sozomen, Eusebius, Theodoretus, Socrates, the History of the Patriarch Ignatius (now lost), and the History of the Patriarch Nicephor; cf. *Ep. VII*, 399.26 – 400.2; 400.7; 419.25 – 27; 420.2; 420.24 – 27.

<sup>659</sup> *Ep. VII*, 439.1 – 20 (Anastasius' letter from March 25<sup>th</sup>, 876, to Charles the Bald).

<sup>660</sup> It is from the Miracles of Saint Demetrios that Anastasius could have learned about the time of the Slavic settlement of Illyricum; cf. *Les plus anciens recueils des Miracles*

Finally, the issue of the Greek language needs to be addressed: Anastasius' command in Greek was excellent and the common opinion that he learned Greek from the Greek monks in Rome needs to be re-examined.<sup>661</sup> While it is possible that this gifted man could have learnt any foreign language excellently, and even to have become as fluent as a native speaker would have been,<sup>662</sup> in Anastasius' case, the reason for his profound knowledge of Greek would be much more easily explained if he was partially of Greek origin. It could also explain his passion for the literal translation from Greek into Latin, so that he would have been able to preserve the meaning of the Greek text within his Latin translation most accurately, and this is something which is characteristic for all of his translations from Greek into Latin.<sup>663</sup> It is important to notice that Anastasius' Greek (as seen through his Latin translations) is of the same quality throughout all stages of his literary work, which implies that here is a man who did not learn Greek, but

---

*de saint Démétrius*, I – II, ed. P. Lemerle, Paris 1979, I, 126.8; 134.14; 175.4. The settlements of the Slavs in the vicinity of Thessalonica recordered in *Miracula* most probably allowed Anastasius to make the Serb settlement more historical, and then to resettle them to Dalmatia. If this were the case, then the double settlement of the Serbs had been the idea of Anastasius, not of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Furthermore, it would be further confirmation that Anastasius had not had any information about the arrival of the Serbs.

<sup>661</sup> R. Pummer, *Early Christian Authors on Samaritan and Samaritanism*, Tübingen 2002, 417; W. de Vries, *The "College of Patriarchs"*, Reading in Church Authority: Gifts and Challenges from Contemporary Catholicism, ed. C. Mannion – R. Gaillardetz – J. Kerkhofs – K. Wilson, Aldershot 2003, 213. This opinion is common in works of many scholars. However, it is interesting that *The General Biographical Dictionary*, Vol. II, revised and enlarged by A. Chalmers, London 1812, 157, considered Anastasius the Librarian "a native of Greece."

<sup>662</sup> Anastasius made some corrections in Eriugena's translation of the *Mystical Theology scholia*, where his strong command of the Greek language can be observed; for instance: Anastasius retains the Greek genitive absolutes rather than turning them into Latin ablative absolutes; when Eriugena translates the Greek ἀμύστων (*uninitiated*) as *ardentibus* (*firebrands*), Anastasius adds his own scholium: *where the translator puts "firebrands", the Greek has "unimbued" or "uninitiated" – that is "unhallowed"*. See, *A Thirteenth-Century Textbook of Mystical Theology at the University of Paris*, ed. L. M. Harrington, Leuven 2004, 26 – 27.

<sup>663</sup> For Anastasius' literalism, see, B. Neil, *Anastasius Bibliothecarius' Latin translation of Greek Documents Pertaining to the Life of Maximus the Confessor*, Ann Arbor 1998, 83.

knew this language since his birth. Otherwise, if he had learned Greek in his youth, the progressive improvement of his Greek throughout the decades of his translation work should be expected and this is not the case with Anastasius' knowledge and use of Greek.<sup>664</sup>

I suggest that Anastasius was half-Greek by birth. His Greek background is hinted in the name of his uncle, Arsenius, bishop of Orte, whose name is typically Greek. If Arsenius (*avunculi mei*, in Anastasius' own words)<sup>665</sup> was the brother of Anastasius' mother – which is the primary meaning of the Latin word *avunculus*, his mother was then of Greek origin, and Anastasius' excellent command in Greek is therefore understandable. The son of Arsenius was Eleutherius, and this is another typical Greek name.<sup>666</sup> The Greek names of Anastasius' closest relatives, in connection with his profound knowledge of the Greek language leads to the only possible conclusion: Anastasius was, in fact, half-Greek by birth, through his mother's lineage, and he was therefore bilingual.<sup>667</sup>

When the autorship of the *DCCS* is in question, Anastasius the Librarian seems to be its most probable author. He was in the heart of papal policy towards Byzantium. He knew even the smallest details about the beginning of the conflict from the time of Pope Nicholas I. He was personally in Constantinople and Thessalonica, where he had conversations with a number of Greek priests. He knew the general political agenda of Constantinople regarding Bulgaria and the Slavs perfectly well. On the other hand, he knew equally well the position of the papacy about the same questions. He was a person who wrote many (political) letters on behalf of popes (Hadrian II, John VIII) to the rulers of the Franks, Byzantium, and the Slavs. He is the one who supported Methodius and his liturgy. It was Anastasius who was the first in the

<sup>664</sup> In fact, if the letter of Pope Hadrian II to Patriarch Ignatius from 871 was truly written by Anastasius the Librarian, then we have at least one sample of his writing in Greek; cf. *Ep. VI*, 762.10 – 21.

<sup>665</sup> *Ep. VII*, 401.16 – 17.

<sup>666</sup> *Ann. Bert.* 92: *Arsenii filius eius, Eleutherius; Eleutherius, consilio ut fertur fratris sui Anastasii quem bibliothecarium Romanae ecclesiae in exordio ordinationis suae Adrianus constituerat.*

<sup>667</sup> See an interesting detail in *Ann. Bert.* 120: *...cum quibus et Anastasius bibliothecarius Romanae sedis, utriusque linguae, Graecae scilicet et Latinae, perrexit.* It is intriguing that Greek language is mentioned at the first place.

West to translate the Chronicle of Theophanes and *Miracula sancti Demetrii*, where one was able to find much interesting information about the Slavs and Byzantium. The overall ecclesiastical policy of Rome, especially during the pontificate of John VIII, was in his hands. In his letter to Pope Hadrian II, it was Anastasius who described the territories of the former *praefectura* Illyricum which had belonged to the Holy See, and those territories were carefully avoided in the *DCCS*. Finally, the term *kastra oikoumena*, is his specific fingerprint as the author of the *DCCS*. Therefore, having all these things in mind, we must conclude that the authorship of the *DCCS* belongs to none other than Anastasius the Librarian.



## SOURCES

- Acta et diplomata res Albaniae mediae aetatis illustrantia*, ed. L. Thallóczy – C. Jireček – E. de Sufflay, Vindobonae 1913.
- Agnelli qui et Andreas Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatis*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH SRL, Hannoverae 1878, 265 – 392.
- Al - Mas'ūdī, Muruj adh-dhahab*, I/2, Beirut 2005.
- Andreae Bergomatis Historia*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH SRL, Hannoverae 1878, 220 – 231.
- Annales Alamannici*, MGH SS I, ed. G. Pertz, Hannoverae 1826, 22 – 60.
- Annales Augienses*, ed. G. H. Pertz, MGH SS I, Hannoverae 1826, 67 – 69.
- Annales Baresenses*, MGH SS V, ed. G. H. Pertz, Hannoverae 1844, 51 – 56.
- Annales Bertiniani*, MGH SRG in usum scholarum, ed. G. Waitz, Hannoverae 1883.
- Annales Fuldenses*, ed. F. Kurze, MGH SRG in usum scholarum, Hannoverae 1891.
- Annales Laureshamenses, Alamannici, Guelfertbytani et Nazariani*, ed. G. H. Pertz, MGH SS I, Hannoverae 1826, 19 – 39.
- Annales regni Francorum inde ab a. 741. usque ad a. 829 qui dicitur Annales Laurissenses maiores et Einhardi*, rec. F. Kurze, MGH SRG in usum scholarum, Hannoverae 1895.
- Anonymi Belae regis notarii de Gestis Hungarorum liber*, ed. S. L. Endlicher, Rerum Hungaricarum, Monumenta Arpadiana I, Sangalli 1849, 1 – 54.
- Antapodosis*, Liutprandi opera, MGH SRG in usum scholarum, ed. J. Becker, Hannoverae – Lipsiae 1915, 1 – 158.
- R. C. Blockley, *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire*, Vol. II, Liverpool 1983.
- Chronica monasterii Casinensis*, MGH SS XXXIV, ed. H. Hoffmann, Hannover 1980.
- Chronica patriarchum Gradensium*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH SRL, Hannoverae 1878, 392 – 398.
- Chronicon Salernitanum*, MGH SS III, ed. G. Pertz, Hannoverae 1839, 467 – 561.

- Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae I*, ed. I. Kukuljević Sakcinski, Zagreb 1874.
- Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Sclavoniae I*, ed. M. Kostrenčić, Zagreb 1967.
- Constantine Porphyrogenitus De administrando imperio I*, ed. R. J. H. Jenkins – Gy. Moravcsik, Washington D. C. 1967.
- Constantine Porphyrogenitus De administrando imperio II - Commentary*, ed. F. Dvornik – R. J. H. Jenkins – B. Lewis – Gy. Moravcsik – D. Obolensky – S. Runciman, London 1962.
- Constantini Porphyrogeniti imperatoris De cerimoniis aulae Byzantine libri duo*, ed. I. Reiske, Bonnae 1829.
- Constantino Porfirogenito De thematibus*, ed. A. Pertusi, Vatican 1952.
- Constantinus et Methodius Thessalonicenses*, ed. F. Grivec – F. Tomšić, Radovi Staroslovenskog instituta 4, Zagreb 1960.
- Corpus iuris civilis, Novellae*, ed. R. Schoell, Berolini 1912.
- De conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum libellus*, ed. D. W. Wattenbach, MGH SS XI, ed. G. H. Pertz, Hannoverae 1854, 1 – 15.
- Documenta historiae Chroaticae periodum antiquam illustrantia*, ed. F. Rački, Zagrabiae 1877.
- Dujam Hranković, Braciae insulae descriptio*, Legende i kronike, ed. V. Gligo – H. Morović, Split 1977, 217 – 220.
- Einhardi Vita Karoli Magni*, SRG in usum scholarum, ed. G. Waitz, Hannoverae et Lipsiae 1911.
- Erchemperti Historia Langobardorum Beneventanorum*, ed. G. Waitz, MGH SRL, Hannoverae 1878, 231 – 265.
- Excerpta Historica iussu imperatoris Constantini Porphyrogeniti*, ed. U. PH. Boissevain – C. De Boor – Th. Büttner-Wobst, I – IV, Berolini 1903 – 1910.
- Flodoardi Historia Remensis ecclesiae*, ed. Ioh. Heller – G. Waitz, MGH SS XIII, Hannoverae 1881, 405 – 600.
- Fontes Byzantini Historiam populorum Jugoslaviae spectantes II*, rec. B. Ferjančić, Beograd 1959.
- The Geography of Ananias of Sirak (ASXARHAC'OYC) – The Long and the Short Recensions*, ed. And trns. By R. H. Hewsens, Wiesbaden 1992.
- Georgii Pisidae Restitutio crucis*, ed. L. Sternbach, Wiener Studien 13 (1891) 4 – 8.

- Gesta episcoporum Neapolitanorum*, ed. G. Waitz, MGH SRL, Hannoverae 1878, 398 – 436.
- Giovanni Diacono Istoria Veneticorum*, ed. L. A. Berto, Bologna 1999.
- Gradivo za zgodovino Slovencev v srednjem veku II*, ed. F. Kos, Ljubljana 1906.
- Gregorii I papae registrum epistolarum I*, libri I – VII, ed. P. Ewald – L. M. Hartmann, MGH Epistolarum I, Berolini 1891.
- Hadriani II. papae epistolae*, ed. E. Perels, MGH Epistolarvm VI, Karolini Aevi IV, Berolini 1925, 691 – 765.
- Historia Salonitana maior*, ed. N. Klaić, Beograd 1967.
- Historia Salonitana Thomae Archidiaconi*, ed. O. Perić – M. Matijević-Sokol – R. Katičić, Split 2003.
- Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum*, Corpus fontium historiae Byzantinae 5, rec. I. Thurn, Berlin – New York 1973.
- Iohannis VIII papae registrvm*, ed. E. Caspar, MGH Epistolarvm VII, Karolini Aevi V, Berolini 1928, 1 – 272.
- King Alfred's Anglo-Saxon Version of The Compendious History of the World by Orosius*, ed. J. Bosworth, London 1858.
- Konstantin Bagrùnorodný Ob upravlenu imperiey*, ed. G. G. Litavrin – A. P. Novoselôcev, Moskva 1989.
- Les plus anciens recueils des Miracles de saint Démétrius*, I – II, ed. P. Lemerle, Paris 1979.
- Liber pontificalis I – III*, ed. L. Duchesne, Paris 1955.
- The Lives of the Ninth-Century Popes (Liber pontificalis)*, ed. R. Davis, Liverpool 1995.
- Lupi Protospatarii Annales*, MGH SS V, ed. G. H. Pertz, Hannoverae 1844, 52 – 63.
- Manegoldi ad Gebhardum liber*, ed. K. Francke, MGH Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum saeculis XI et XII conscripti I, Hannoverae 1891, 300 – 430.
- Monumenta Serbica spectantia historiam Serbiae, Bosnae, Ragusii*, ed. Fr. Miklosich, Viennae 1858.
- Nikephoros Patriarch of Constantinople Short History*, ed. C. Mango, Washington DC 1990.
- Notitia dignitatum*, ed. O. Seeck, Frankfurt am Main 1962.
- Notitiae episcopatum ecclesiae constantinopolitanae*, ed. J. Darouzès, Paris 1981.

- Opusculum LV capitulorum, Die Streitschriften Hinkmars von Reims und Hinkmars von Laon 869 – 871*, ed. R. Schieffer, MGH Concilia IV, Supplementum II, Hannover 2003.
- Pauli Historia Langobardorum*, ed. L. Bethmann – G. Waitz, MGH SRL, Hannoverae 1878, 12 – 188.
- Polemii Silvii Laterculvs anni CCCCXLIX*, MGH AA IX, Chronicorum minorvm saec. IV. V. VI. VII., vol. I, ed. Th. Mommsen, Berolini 1892, 511 – 615.
- Povest vremennyh let*, Sanktpeterburg 1910.
- Procopii Caesariensis Opera omnia*, vol. II: *De bellis libri V – VIII*, ed. G. Wirth, Lipsiae 1963.
- Ravennatis Anonymi Cosmographia et Gvidonis Geographica*, ed. M. Pinder – G. Parthey, Berolini 1860.
- S. Agathonis papae epistolae*, ed. J. – P. Migne, PL 87 (1851) col. 1161 – 1259.
- S. Bonifatii et Lulli epistolae*, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Epistolae Merovingici et Karolini aevi I, Berolini 1892, 215 – 433.
- Selected Charters of Serbian Rulers (XII – XV Century) Relating to the Territory of Kosovo and Metohia I*, ed. T. Živković – S. Bojanin – V. Petrović, Athens 2000.
- Suidae Lexicon*, rec. I. Bekkerus, Berolini 1854.
- Stephani Byzantii EΘNIKΩN quae supersunt*, ed. A. Westermann, Lipsiae 1839.
- Das Strategikon des Maurikios*, ed. T. Dennis – E. Gamillscheg, Wien 1981.
- Le Synekdèmos d'Hiérokès et l'opuscule géographique de Georges de Chypre*, ed. E. Honigmann, Brussels, 1939.
- Astronomus, Vita Hludowici imperatoris*, MGH SRG 64, ed. E. Tresp, Hannover 1995, 279 – 555.
- Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Camaeniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*, ed. I. Bekker, Bonnae 1838.
- Thomae Tusci Gesta imperatorum et pontificum*, ed. E. Ehrenfeuchter, MGH SS XXII, ed. G. H. Pertz, Hannoverae 1851, 483 – 528.
- Vita s. Clementis episcopi Bulgarorum graece*, ed. Fr. Miklosich, Vindobonae 1847.
- Žitie na Kliment Ohridski*, ed. I. Iliev, Fontes Graeci historiae Bulgaricae 9, Fontes Historiae Bulgaricae 30, Sofia 1994, 11 – 41.

## REFERENCES

- H. Ahrweiler, *Sur la date De thematibus de Constantine VII Porphyrogénète*, TM 8 (1981) 1 – 5.
- P. J. Alexander, *Secular Biography at Byzantium*, Speculum 15 (1940) 194 – 209.
- P. J. Alexander, *The Strength of Empire and Capital as Seen Through Byzantine Eyes*, Speculum 37 (1962) 339 – 357.
- S. S. Alexander, *Heraclius, Byzantine Imperial Ideology, and the David Plates*, Speculum 52 (1977) 217 – 237.
- M. Ančić, *Imperija na zalasku. Nestanak bizantske vlasti na istočnoj obali Jadrana u 9. stoljeću*, Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru 41 (1999) 1 – 20.
- M. Bajalović – Hadži-Pešić, *Slovenska keramika na teritoriji Beograda*, Materijali 9 (1972) 139 – 148.
- P. M. Barford, *The Early Slavs: Culture and Society in Early Medieval Eastern Europe*, London 2001.
- F. Barišić, *Vizantiski Singidunum*, ZRVI 3 (1955) 3 – 13.
- I. Bašić, *Venerabilis presul Iohannes. Historijski Ivan Ravenjanin i začetci crkvene organizacije u Splitu u VII. stoljeću*, Povijesni prilozi 29 (2005) 7 – 22.
- J. Bačić, *Slav: The Origin and Meaning of the Ethnonym*, Slovene Studies 9 (1987) 33 – 41.
- K. Belke – P. Soustal, *Die Byzantiner und ihre Nachbarn, Die De administrando imperio genannte Lehrschrift des Kaisers Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos für seinen Sohn Romanos*, Wien 1995.
- R. J. Belletzkie, *Pope Nicholas I and John of Ravenna: The Struggle for Ecclesiastical Rights in the Ninth Century*, Church History 49 (1980) 262 – 272.
- E. Bernheim, *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode und der Geschichtsphilosophie*, Leipzig 1908.

- V. Beševliev, *Die Protobulgarischen Inschriften*, Berlin 1963.
- I. Boba, *The Episcopacy of St. Methodius*, *Slavic Review* 26/1 (1967) 85 – 93.
- I. Boba, *In Defense of Constantine Porphyrogenitus*, *Ungarn-Jahrbuch* 19 (1992) 175 – 197.
- C. R. Bowlus, *Franks, Moravians, and Magyars: the Struggle for the Middle Danube, 788 – 907*, Philadelphia 1995.
- T. S. Brown, *The Church of Ravenna and the Imperial Administration in the Seventh Century*, *EHR* 94 (1979) 1 – 28.
- T. S. Brown, *Romanitas and Campanilismo – Agnellus of Ravenna's View of the Past: The Inheritance of Historiography*, ed. C. Holdsworth – P. Wiseman, Exeter 1986, 107 – 114.
- N. Budak, *Die südslawischen Ethnogenesen an der östlichen Adriaküste im frühen Mittelalter*, Typen der Ethnogenese unter besonderen Berücksichtigung der Bayern, Vol. I, Wien 1990, 129 – 136.
- N. Budak, *Prva stoljeća Hrvatske*, Zagreb 1994.
- F. Bulić, *Hrvatski spomenici u kninskoj okolici uz ostale suvremene dalmatinske iz doba narodne hrvatske dinastije*, Zagreb 1888.
- J. B. Bury, *The Treatise De administrando imperio*, *BZ* 15 (1906) 517 – 577.
- J. B. Bury, *The Ceremonial Book of Constantine Porphyrogenetos*, *English Historical Review* 22 (1907) 209 – 227.
- Byzantine Armies in the West (5<sup>th</sup> – 11<sup>th</sup> c.). Studies on the Operations on Land and at Sea: Composition and Mission of the Byzantine Task Forces in the West*, ed. St. Lampakis – M. Leontsini – T. Lounghis – V. Vlyssidou, Athens 2008.
- D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, Grand Rapids 1991.
- H. Chadwick, *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church, from Apostolic Times Until the Council of Florence*, Oxford 2003.
- K. N. Chitnis, *Research Methodology in History*, New Delhi 2006.
- E. Chrysos, *Zum Landesnamen Langobardia*, *Die Langobarden – Herrschaft und Identität*, ed. W. Pohl – P. Erhard, Wien 2005, 429 – 438.
- F. Curta, *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Ages 500 - 1250*, Cambridge 2006.
- S. Ćirković, “*Naseljeni gradovi*” *Konstantina Porfirogenita i najstarija teritorijalna organizacija*, *ZRVI* 37 (1998) 9 – 32.
- Mirjana Ćorović-Ljubinković, *Odnosi Slovena centralnih oblasti Balkana i Vizantije od VII do XII veka*, *Materijali* 9 (1972) 81 – 100.

- A. Dabinović, *Državnopravni odnos Hrvata prema istočnom carstvu*, Rad HAZU 270 (1941) 49 – 148.
- T. Dawson, *Propriety, Practicality and Pleasure: the Parameters of Women's Dress in Byzantium A.D. 1000 – 1200*, *Byzantine Women: Varieties of Experience A.D. 800 – 1200*, ed. L. Garland, London 2006, 41 – 74.
- V. Delonga, *Latinski epigrafički spomenici u ranosrednjovjekovnoj Hrvatskoj*, Split 1996.
- J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, Oxford 1954.
- H. Ditten, *Ethnische Verschiebungen zwischen der Balkanhalbinsel und Kleinasien vom Ende des 6. bis zur zweiten Hälfte des 9. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 1993.
- F. Dölger, *Byzantinische Diplomatie*, Ettal 1956.
- F. Dölger – J. Karayannopoulos, *Byzantinische Urkunden-Lehre*, München 1968.
- G. Downey, *Pappus of Alexandria on Architectural Studies*, *Isis* 38 (1948) 197 – 200.
- D. Dzino, “*Becoming Slav*”, “*Becoming Croat*”: *New Approaches in the Research of Identities in Post-Roman Illyricum*, *Hortus artium medievalium* 14 (2008) 1 – 5.
- D. Dzino, *Becoming Slav, Becoming Croat: Identity Transformations in Post-Roman and Early Medieval Dalmatia*, Leiden 2010.
- M. Eggers, *Das De administrando imperio des Kaisers Konstantinos VII. Porphyrogenetos und die historisch-politische Situation Südosteuropas im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert*, *Ostkirchliche Studien* 56 (2007) 15 – 100.
- A. J. Ekonomou, *Byzantine Rome and the Greek Popes*, Plymouth 2007.
- F. E. Engreen, *Pope John the Eight and the Arabs*, *Speculum* 20 (1945) 318 – 330.
- H. M. Evans, *The Early Medieval Archaeology of Croatia A.D. 600 – 900*, Oxford 1989.
- B. Ferjančić, *Struktura 30. glave spisa De administrando imperio*, *ZRVI* 18 (1978) 61 – 80.
- B. Ferjančić, *Dalmacija u spisu De administrando imperio – vrela i putevi saznanja*, *ZRVI* 29/30 (1991) 9 – 21.
- B. Ferjančić, *Dolazak Hrvata i Srba na Balkansko poluostrvo*, *ZRVI* 35 (1996) 117 – 154.

- B. Ferjančić, *Vasilije I i obnova vizantijske vlasti u IX veku*, ZRVI 36 (1997) 9 – 30.
- J. Ferluga, *Vizantijska uprava u Dalmaciji*, Beograd 1957.
- J. Ferluga, *Vizantija i postanak najranijih južnoslovenskih država*, ZRVI 11 (1968) 55 – 66.
- J. Ferluga, *Lista adresa za strane vladare iz knjige O ceremonijama*, ZRVI 12 (1970) 157 – 178.
- J. Ferluga, *Vizantijsko carstvo i južnoslovenske države od sredine X veka*, ZRVI 13 (1971) 75 – 107.
- U. Fiedler, *Bulgars in the Lower Danube Region: A Survey of the Archaeological Evidence and of the State of Current Research*, *The Other Europe in the Middle Ages, Avars, Bulgars, Khazars and Cumans*, II, ed. F. Curta – R. Kovalev, Leiden 2008, 151 – 236.
- J. V. A. Fine, Jr., *The Early Medieval Balkans*, Ann Arbor 1991.
- J. V. A. Fine, Jr., *When Ethnicity Did Not Matter in the Balkans: A Study of Identity in Pre-nationalist Croatia, Dalmatia, and Slavonia in the Medieval and Early-modern Periods*, Ann Arbor 2006.
- A. Garsky – C. Heil – T. Heike – J. E. Amon, *Documenta Q, Reconstructions of Q Through Two Centuries of Gospel Research Excerpted, Sorted and Evaluated*, ed. Carruth, Leuven 1997.
- J. Gay, *L'Italie méridionale et l'empire byzantin depuis l'avènement de Basil I jusqu'à la prise de Bari par les Normands 867 – 1071*, Paris 1904.
- D. Georgacas, *The names of Constantinople*, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 78 (1947) 347 – 367.
- I. Goldstein, *Hrvatski rani srednji vijek*, Zagreb 1995.
- I. Goldstein, “*Zemljica Bosna – “τὸ χωρίον Βόσωνα” u “De administrando imperio” Konstantina VII. Porfirogenita*”, *Zbornik o Pavlu Anđeliću*, ed. M. Karamatić, Sarajevo 2008, 97 – 109.
- B. Grafenauer, *Prilog kritici izvještaja Konstantina Porfirogenita o doseljavanju Hrvata*, HZ 5 (1952) 1 – 56
- B. Grafenauer, *Vprašanje konca Kocljeve vlade v Spodnji Panoniji*, *Zgodovinski časopis* 6/7 (1952/1953) 171 – 190.
- H. Gračanin, “*Od Hrvata pak koji su stigli u Dalmaciju odvojio se jedan dio i zavladao Ilirikom i Panonijom*”, *Razmatranje uz DAI* c. 30, 75 – 78, *Povijest u nastavi* 6 (2008) 67 – 76.

- N. Gray, *The Paleography of Latin Inscriptions in the Eight, Ninth, and Tenth Centuries in Italy*, Papers of the British School at Rome 16 (1948) 38 – 162.
- H. Grégoire, *L'origine et le nom des Croates et des Serbes*, Byzantion 17 (1945) 108 – 118.
- P. Grierson, *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection, vol. II/2*, Washington D.C. 1968.
- Lj. Hauptmann, *Dolazak Hrvata*, Zbornik kralja Tomislava, Zagreb 1925, 86 – 127.
- Lj. Hauptmann, *Konstantin Porfirogenit o porijeklu stanovništva Dubrovačkog zaleđa*, Zbornik iz Dubrovačke prošlosti M. Rešetara, Dubrovnik 1931, 17 – 24.
- Lj. Hauptmann, *Seoba Hrvata i Srba*, JIČ 3 (1937) 30 – 61.
- P. Heather, *Cassiodorus and the Rise of the Amals: Genealogy and the Goths under Hun Domination*, The Journal of Roman Studies 79 (1989) 103 – 128.
- R. H. Hewsen, *The Geography of Pappus of Alexandria: A Translation of the Armenian Fragments*, Isis 62 (1971) 186 – 207.
- J. Howard-Johnston, *The De administrando imperio: A Re-examination of the Text and a Re-evaluation of its Evidence about the Rus*, Les centres proto-urbains russes entre Scandinavie, Byzance et Orient, ed. M. Kazanski – A. Nercessian – C. Zuckermann, Paris 2001, 301 – 336.
- J. Howard-Johnston, *Byzantine Sources for Khazar History*, The World of the Khazars, ed. P. B. Golden – H. Ben-Shammai – A. Róna-Tas, Leiden 2007, 163 – 194.
- P. Huby, *Theophrastus of Eresus, Sources of his Life, Writting, Thought & Influence*, Commentary, vol. 4, Psychology, Leiden 1992.
- J. M. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, Oxford 1990.
- M. Jarak, *Toma Arhiđakon i vrijeme osnutka splitske mitropolije*, Opuscula archaeologica 27 (2003) 543 – 548.
- R. J. H. Jenkins, *The Imperial Centuries A. D. 610 – 1071*, Toronto 1987.
- A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire 284 – 602: A Social Economic and Administrative Survey*, Norman (Oklahoma) 1964.
- W. E. Kaegi, *Heraclius, Emperor of Byzantium*, Cambridge 2003.

- D. Kalhous, *The Significance of the Sirmian and Apostolic Tradition in Shaping Moravian Episcopal Organization*, *Early Medieval Europe* 17 (2009) 268 – 285.
- Lj. Karaman, *Iz kolijevke hrvatske prošlosti*, Zagreb 1930.
- L. Katić, *Saksonac Gottschalk na dvoru kneza Trpimira*, Zagreb 1932.
- R. Katičić, *Vetustiores ecclesiae spalatensis memoriae*, *SHP* 17 (1988) 17 – 51.
- R. Katičić, *Uz početke hrvatskih početaka*, Split 1993.
- A. Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature (850 – 1000)*, ed. C. Angelidi, Athens 2006.
- J. N. D. Kelly, *Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, Oxford 1996.
- W. P. Ker, *Epic and Romance: Essays on Medieval Literature*, London 1908.
- N. Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata u ranom srednjem vijeku*, Zagreb 1971.
- N. Klaić, *O problemima stare domovine, dolaska i pokrštanja dalmatinskih Hrvata*, *Zgodovinski časopis* 29/4 (1984) 253 – 270.
- N. Klaić, *Najnoviji radovi o 29, 30. i 31. poglavlju u djelu De administrando imperio cara Konstantina VII. Porfirogenita*, *SHP* 15 (1985) 31 – 60.
- E. Kountoura-Galaki, *Η "Εικονοκλαστική" Νοτιτεια 3 και το λατινικο προτυπο της*, *Symmeikta* 10 (1996) 45 – 73.
- V. Koščak, *Pripadnost istočne obale Jadrana do splitskih sabora 925 – 928*, *HZ* 33 – 34 (1981) 291 – 355.
- B. M. Kreutz, *Before the Normans: Southern Italy in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, Philadelphia 1996.
- H. Kunstmann, *Wer waren die Weisskroaten des byzantinischen Kaisers Konstantinos Pophyrogenetos?*, *Die Welt der Slaven* 29 (1984) 111 – 122.
- E. Kvaternik, *Istočno pitanje i Hrvati*, Zagreb 1868.
- E. D. Laborde, *King Alfred's System of Geographical Description in His Version of Orosius*, *The Geographical Journal* 62 (1923) 133 – 138.
- G. Labuda, *Pierwsze państwo slowianskie, Państwo Samona*, Poznan 1949.
- St. Lampakis – M. Leontsini – T. Loungis – V. Vlyssidou, *Βυζαντινά στρατεύματα στη Δύση (5ος - 11ος αι.)*, Αθηνά 2008.
- V. Laurent, *Le thème byzantin de Serbie au X<sup>e</sup> siècle*, *REB* 15 (1957) 185 – 195.

- P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin*, Paris 1971.
- K. Leyser, *The Tenth Century in Byzantine-Western Relationships, Relations Between East and West in the Middle Ages*, ed. D. Baker, Edinburgh 2009, 29 – 63.
- M. Lončar, *Porfirogenitova seoba Hrvata pred sudom novije literature*, *Diadora* 14 (1992) 375 – 448.
- A. Loma, *Serbisches und Kroatisches Sprachgut bei Konstantin Porphyrogennetos*, *ZRVI* 38 (2000) 81 – 161.
- K. Loudova, *Discourse Markers in Early Byzantine Narrative Prose*, *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 29, Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, School of Philology, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, May 10 – 11, 2008, Thessaloniki 2009, 296 – 312.
- T. C. Lounghis, *Sur la date du De thematibus*, *REB* 31 (1973) 299 – 305.
- T. C. Lounghis, *Les ambassades byzantines en Occident depuis la fondation des états barbares jusqu'aux Croisades (407 – 1096)*, Athens 1980.
- T. Lounghis, *Κωνσταντίνου Ζ' Πορφυρογεννήτου, De administrando imperio*, Thessalonike 1990.
- T. C. Lounghis, *La theorie de l'oecumène limitée et la revision du Constitutum Constantini*, *Obshtoto i spetsifichnoto v balkanskite kulturi do kraja na XIX vek*, ed. H. Dzurova – G. Bakalov, Sofia 1999, 119 – 122.
- T. C. Lounghis, *Byzantine Foreign Policy Documents, Byzantine Diplomacy: A Seminar*, ed. S. Lampakis, Athens 2007.
- A. Louth, *Greek East and Latin West: The Church AD 681 – 1071*, New York 2007.
- H. G. Lunt, *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*, Berlin 2001.
- C. A. Macartney, *The Magyars in the Ninth Century*, Cambridge 1968.
- P. MacGeorge, *Late Roman Warlords*, Oxford 2001.
- O. J. Maenchen-Helfen, *Germanic and Hunnic Names of Iranian Origin*, *Oriens* 10 (1957) 280 – 283.
- Lj. Maksimović, *O vremenu pohoda bugarskog kneza Borisa na Srbiju*, *Zbornik filozofskog fakulteta* 14/1 (1979) 69 – 76.
- Lj. Maksimović, *Struktura 32 glave spisa De administrando imperio*, *ZRVI* 21 (1982) 25 – 32.
- Lj. Maksimović, *Pokrštavanje Srba i Hrvata*, *ZRVI* 35 (1996) 155 – 174.

- Lj. Maksimović, *Organizacija vizantijske vlasti u novoosvojenim oblastima posle 1018. godine*, ZRVI 36 (1997) 31 – 43.
- É. Malamut, *Les adresses aux princes des pays slaves du sud dans le livre des Cérémonies, II, 48, interprétation*, TM 13 (2000) 595 – 615.
- K. Malone, *King Alfred's North: A Study in Mediaeval Geography*, *Speculum* 5 (1930) 139 – 167.
- M. Manitius, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters, II: Von der Mitte des 10. Jahrhunderts bis zum Ausbruch des Kampfes zwischen Kirche und Staat*, München 1976 (first ed. 1923).
- G. Manojlović, *Jadransko pomorje 9. stoljeća u svjetlu istočno-rimske (bizantinske) povijesti*, Rad JAZU 150 (1902) 1 – 102.
- G. Manojlović, *Studije o spisu De administrando imperio cara Konstantina VII. Porfirogenita*, I – IV, Rad JAZU 182 (1910) 1 – 65, Rad JAZU 186 (1911) 35 – 103, 104 – 184, Rad JAZU 187 (1911) 1 – 132.
- L. Margetić, *Konstantin Porfirogenit i vrijeme dolaska Hrvata*, Zbornik Historijskog zavoda JAZU 8 (1977) 5 – 88.
- L. Margetić, *Još o pitanju vremena dolaska Hrvata*, Zgodovinski časopis 42 (1988) 234 – 240.
- A. Maricq, *Notes sur les Slaves dans le Péloponnèse et en Bythynie et sur l'emploi de "Slave" comme appellatif*, *Byzantion* 22 (1952) 337 – 355.
- G. Marjanović – Vujović, *Najstarije slovensko naselje u Beogradu*, Godišnjak grada Beograda 25 (1978) 1 – 13.
- I. Marović, *O godini razorenja Salone*, VAPD 99 (2006) 253 – 273.
- R. McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms Under the Carolingians, 751 – 987*, London – New York 1993.
- J. Moissidou, *Το Βυζάντιο και οι βόρειοι γείτονές του τον 10<sup>ο</sup> αιώνα*, Αθήνα 1995.
- Gy. Moravcsik, *The Role of the Byzantine Church in Medieval Hungary*, *American Slavic and East European Review* 6 (1947) 134 – 151.
- R. Novaković, *Neka zapazanja o 29. i 30. glavi De administrando imperio*, IČ 19 (1972) 5 – 54.
- D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth, Eastern Europe, 500 – 1453*, New York 1971.

- N. Oikonomidès, *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IX<sup>e</sup> et X<sup>e</sup> siècles*, Paris 1972.
- G. Ostrogorski, *Porfirogenitova hronika srpskih vladara i njeni hronološki podaci*, IČ 1 – 2 (1948) 24 – 29.
- The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A. P. Kazhdan, I – III, Oxford 1991.
- A. Pavić, *Cara Konstantina VII Porfirogenita De administrando imperio glave 29 – 36*, Zagreb 1906.
- M. Petrincec, *Groblja od 8. do 11. stoljeća na području ranosrednjovjekovne hrvatske države*, Split 2009.
- S. Pirivatrić, *Vizantijska tema Morava i “Moravije” Konstantina VII Porfirogenita*, ZRVI 36 (1997) 173 – 201.
- W. Pohl, *Die Awaren: Ein Steppenvolk in Mitteleuropa 567 – 822 n. Chr.*, München 1988.
- V. S. Poythress, *The Use of the Intersentence Conjunctions de, oun, kai, and Asyndeton in the Gospel of John*, *Novum Testamentum* 26/4 (1984) 312 – 340.
- K. Reichl, *Singing the Past: Turkic and Medieval Heroic Poetry*, New York 2000.
- E. J. Richard, *First and Second Thessalonians*, *Sacra Pagina* 11, ed. D. J. Harrington, Collegeville 1995.
- S. Sakač, *Ugovor pape Agatona s Hrvatima*, Zagreb 1931.
- J. Shepard, *Byzantine Diplomacy, A.D. 800 – 1204: Means and Ends*, *Byzantine Diplomacy*, ed. J. Shepard – A. Franklin, Ipswich 1995, 41 – 71.
- J. Shepard, *A Marriage too Far? Maria Lekapena and Peter of Bulgaria*, *The Empress Theophano: Byzantium and the West at the Turn of the First Millennium*, ed. A. Davis, Cambridge 1995, 121 – 149.
- J. Shepard, *Byzantine Soldiers, Missionaries and Diplomacy under Gibbon's Eyes*, *Edward Gibbon and Empire*, ed. R. Mc Kitterick – R. Quinault, Cambridge 2002, 78 – 100.
- J. Shepard, *The Uses of “History” in Byzantine Diplomacy: Observations and Comparisons*, *Porphyrogenita: Essays on the History and Literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in Honour of Julian Chrysostomides*, ed. J. Chrysostomides – C. Dendrinis – J. Herrin, Aldershot 2003, 91 – 115.

- L. Simeonova, *Diplomacy of the Letter and the Cross, Photios, Bulgaria and the Papacy 860s – 880s*, Amsterdam 1998.
- P. Skok, *Kako bizantski pisci pišu slovenska mjesna i lična imena*, SHP 1 (1927) 60 – 76; 161 – 196.
- P. Skok, *Konstantinova Srbica na Bistrici u Grčkoj*, Glas SKA 176 (1938) 243 – 284.
- C. Sode, *Untersuchungen zu De administrando imperio Kaiser Konstantins VII. Pophyrogennetos, Varia V*, ed. T. Pratsch, Poikila Byzantina 13, Bonn 1994, 147 – 260.
- P. Stadler, *Avar Chronology Revisited, and the Question of Ethnicity in Avar Qaganate, The Other Europe in the Middle Ages, Avars, Bulgars, Khazars and Cumans, II*, ed. F. Curta – R. Kovalev, Leiden 2008, 47 – 82.
- A. Stavridou-Zafraka, *Slav Invasions and the Theme Organization in the Balkan Peninsula*, Byzantiaka 12 (1992) 165 – 179.
- P. Stephenson, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier: A Political Study of the Northern Balkans, 900 – 1204*, Cambridge 2004.
- I. Ševčenko, *Three Paradoxes of the Cyrillo-Methodian Mission*, Slavic Review 23 (1964) 220 – 236.
- I. Ševčenko, *Storia letteraria, La civiltà bizantina dal IX all' XI secolo. Aspetti e problemi*, Bari 1978, 89 – 127.
- I. Ševčenko, *Re-reading Constantine Porphyrogenitis, Byzantine Diplomacy*, ed. J. Shepard – S. Franklin, Ipswich 1995, Papers from the Twenty-fourth spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990, 167 – 195.
- F. Šišić, *Genealoški prilozi o hrvatskoj narodnoj dinastiji*, VHAD 13 (1914) 1 – 93.
- F. Šišić, *Priručnik izvora hrvatske istorije*, Zagreb 1914.
- F. Šišić, *Ime Hrvat i Srbin i teorije o doseljenju Hrvata i Srba*, Godišnjica Nikole Čupića 35 (1923) 1 – 49.
- F. Šišić, *Povijest Hrvata u vrijeme narodnih vladara*, Zagreb 1925.
- P. Štih, *Karantanija – stara domovina Horvatov*, Zgodovinski časopis 41/3 (1987) 529 – 549.
- P. Štih – V. Simoniti – P. Vodopivec, *A Slovene History: Society – Politics – Culture*, Ljubljana 2008.
- A. Toynbee, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus and His World*, London 1973.
- W. Treadgold, *The Byzantine Revival 780 – 842*, Stanford 1988.

- V. Vachkova, *Danube Bulgaria and Khazaria as Parts of the Byzantine Oikoumene*, *The Other Europe in the Middle Ages, Avars, Bulgars, Khazars and Cumans*, II, ed. F. Curta – R. Kovalev, Leiden 2008, 339 – 362.
- G. Vernadsky, *Great Moravia and White Chorvatia*, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 66/4 (1945) 257 – 259.
- T. Vida, *Conflict and Coexistence: The Local Population of the Carpathian Basin Under Avar Rule (Sixth to Seventh Century)*, *The Other Europe in the Middle Ages, Avars, Bulgars, Khazars and Cumans*, II, ed. F. Curta – R. Kovalev, Leiden 2008, 13 – 46.
- A. P. Vlasto, *The Entry of the Slavs into Christendom*, Cambridge 1970.
- L. Waldmüller, *Die ersten Begegnungen der Slawen mit dem Christentum und den christlichen Völkern vom VI. bis VIII. Jh.*, Amsterdam 1976.
- T. Wasilewski, *Le thème byzantin de Sirmium-Serbie au XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, *ZRVI* 8/2 (1964) 465 – 482.
- M. Whittow, *The Making of Byzantium, 600 – 1025*, Berkley – Los Angeles 1996.
- F. Winkelmann, *Quellenstudien zur herrschenden Klasse von Byzanz im 8. und 9. Jahrhundert*, Berlin 1987.
- H. Wolfram, *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum: das Weissbuch der Salzburger Kirche über die erfolgreiche Mission in Karantanien und Pannonien*, Wien 1979.
- H. Wolfram, *The Image of Central Europe in Constantine VII Porphrogenitus*, *Constantine VII Porphrogenitus and His Age*, Second International Byzantine Conference, Athens 1989, 5 – 14.
- H. Wolfram, *Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich: Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum und die Quellen ihrer Zeit*, Wien - München 1995.
- I. Wood, *The Missionary Life: Saints and the Evangelisation of Europe, 400 – 1050*, New York 2001.
- S. Wood, *The Proprietary Church in the Medieval West*, Oxford 2006.
- P. A. Yannopoulos, *Histoire et légende chez Constantin VII*, *Byzantion* 57 (1987) 158 – 166.
- M. Zekan, *Pet natpisa kneza Branimira sa posebnim osvrtom na nalaz iz Otresa*, *Kačić* 25 (1993) 405 – 420.
- T. Živković, *Sloveni i Romeji*, Beograd 2000.

- 
- T. Živković, *Crkvena organizacija u srpskim zemljama*, Beograd 2004.
- T. Živković, *Južni Sloveni pod vizantijskom vlašću 600 – 1025*, Beograd 2007.
- T. Živković, *Contribution to the New Reading about the Constantine Porphyrogenitus' Statement on the Numbers of Croat Horsemen, Foot Soldiers and Sailors in Early 10<sup>th</sup> Century*, *Byzantinoslavica* 65 (2007) 143 – 151.
- T. Živković, *Portreti srpskih vladara*, Beograd 2007.
- T. Živković, *Forging Unity, The South Slavs Between East and West: 550 – 1150*, Belgrade 2008.
- T. Živković, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus' kastrá oikoumena in the South Slavs Principalities*, *IČ* 58 (2008) 7 – 26.
- T. Živković, *Sources de Constantin VII Porphyrogénète concernant le passé le plus éloigné des Serbes et des Croates*, *Byzantina Symmeikta* 20 (2010) 11 – 37.
- T. Živković, *An Unknown source of Constantine Porphyrogenitus*, *Byzantinoslavica* 68 (2010) 129 – 143.
- T. Živković, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus' Source on the Earliest History of the Croats and Serbs*, *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu* 42 (2010) 117 – 131.
- T. Živković – B. Radovanović, *Titre de Trpimir selon les dires de Gottschalk*, *IČ* 58 (2009) 33 – 42.

## INDEX OF PERSONAL NAMES

- Achmet** – 177  
**Adalwin** (Adalwinus), archbishop – 135, 209, 210, 213  
**Agathias**, writer – 103  
**Agathon**, pope (678 – 681) – 66  
**Agathon**, archbishop – 137  
**Agio**, son of Gambara – 115  
**Agnellus** of Ravenna – 59  
*Ahrweiler H.* – 33  
**Albargius**, dux Bagoarii (of Bavaria) – 167  
**Albricus**, comes – 167, 199  
*Alexander P. J.* – 85, 116  
*Alexander S. S.* – 53, 59  
**Alfred the Great**, English king – 113  
*Amon J. E.* – 46  
*Anagnostakis Ilias* – 11  
**Ananias** of Sirak – 87  
**Anastasius the Librarian** – 69, 78, 79, 85, 189, 200, 211-214, 216-223  
*Ančić M.* – 20  
**Andreas**, writer – 59  
*Angelidi C.* – 27  
**Apachounis** – 177  
**Apolesphouet**, brother of Aposebatos – 150, 177  
**Aposebatos** – 177  
**Aposelmis**, brother of Aposebatos – 177  
**Arabs** – 24, 31, 53, 116, 132, 137, 139, 206-208, 212  
**Argyrus**, strategos of Charsianon – 26  
**Arno**, archbishop – 164, 199  
**Arpad** – 45  
**Arsenius**, bishop of Orte – 222  
**Asparuch**, Bulgarian ruler – 159  
**Attila**, ruler of the Huns – 110  
**Avars** – 48-51, 80, 93-97, 99, 100, 103-111, 113, 114, 116-118, 124, 126, 144-146, 160, 161, 182, 192-194, 197, 203, 215  
**Baasakios** – 26  
*Bačić J.* – 86  
*Bajalović – Hadži-Pešić M.* – 159  
*Bakalov G.* – 52  
*Baker D.* – 120  
**Baltazaar** of Spalato, writer – 108  
*Barford P. M.* – 106, 119  
*Barišić F.* – 159  
*Bartoňková D.* – 216  
**Basil I**, emperor (867 – 886) – 31, 32, 37, 44, 52, 62, 80, 115, 116, 122, 125, 131, 137, 145, 147, 165, 190, 196, 200, 206-208, 211, 214, 218, 219  
*Bašić I.* – 57  
**Bavarians** (Bagoarii, Baugauri) – 51, 113, 129, 168, 197, 198, 203  
*Becker J.* – 63  
*Bekker I.* – 31, 87, 126  
**Bela**, archon of Terbounia – 28, 168, 188  
*Belke K.* – 31, 33, 47, 54, 120, 126  
*Belletzkie R. J.* – 209  
*Ben-Shammai H.* – 22  
*Berend N.* – 202  
**Berig** – 115  
*Bernheim E.* – 21  
*Berto L. A.* – 52  
*Beševliev V.* – 56  
*Bethmann L.* – 60  
*Blockley R. C.* – 111  
*Boba I.* – 84, 86, 209  
*Boissevain U. PH.* – 27  
*Bojanin S.* – 151  
*Boor C. De* – 27  
**Boren**, son of archon Mutimer – 171  
**Boris – Michael**, Bulgarian duke – 70, 74-76, 131, 158, 170-174, 176, 205, 212, 214, 216  
**Borna**, the duke of Dalmatian Croatia (ca. 817 – 821) – 54, 55, 123, 130, 143

- Bosworth J.* – 113  
 Bouga – 113, 114, 204  
 Boulzous, third archon and karchas of Turkey – 46  
*Bowlus C. R.* – 210  
 Branimer (Branimirus, Bran), Croat duke (879 – ca. 891) – 55, 66, 67, 129, 131, 142, 143, 175, 218  
 Bretons – 72  
*Brown T. S.* – 59  
*Brunner K.* – 133  
*Budak N.* – 34, 55, 119  
 Bulgarians (Bulgari) – 55, 74-76, 85, 114, 115, 118, 130-133, 159, 164, 166, 170-172, 176, 179, 197, 201, 202, 205, 214, 215  
*Bulić F.* – 125, 129  
*Bury J. B.* – 19, 21-23, 27-33, 35-40, 45, 93, 107, 120, 152, 154, 190  
*Büttner-Wobst Th.* – 27  
 Byzantines – 105, 123, 138  
  
 Carantanians (Quarantani) – 51, 114, 118, 123, 129, 166, 168, 197, 198, 203, 213  
 Carloman, son of Louis the German – 208, 209, 213  
*Carruth S.* – 46  
*Carson D. A.* – 46  
*Caspar E.* – 66, 130  
 Cemicas, dux – 167, 199  
*Chadwick H.* – 78, 202  
*Chalmers A.* – 221  
 Charlemagne (Karolus), ruler of Francia – 180, 197  
 Charles the Bald, son of Louis the Pious – 131, 207, 208, 220  
 Charles the Fat, son of Louis the German – 208  
 Chezil, dux see Kotzil  
*Chitnis K. N.* – 21  
 Chrobatos – 113, 114, 204  
*Chrysos E.* – 86  
*Chrysostomides J.* – 35  
 Clement (Kliment Ohridski) – 139, 216, 217  
 Comicino, župan – 55  
 Constans II (Heraclius Constantine), emperor (641 – 668) – 59-61, 65, 66, 73  
 Constantine, son of Basil I – 207  
 Constantine (Constantinus Thessalonicensis, Cyril) – 121, 206, 216, 218  
 Constantine I the Great, emperor (306 – 337) – 52, 53, 85  
 Constantine IV, emperor (668–685) – 59, 65, 66  
 Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, writer, emperor (944 – 959) – 9-11, 19, 21-29, 31-33, 35-41, 43-53, 55-67, 69-71, 73-86, 88, 89, 91-93, 100-107, 109-130, 132, 133, 135, 136, 138, 140, 141, 143-147, 149-153, 155-158, 160-165, 167-170, 172, 174-179, 181, 183, 185-200, 207, 208, 218, 221  
 Cosma Pragensis, writer – 86  
 Cozharius, priest – 58, 198  
 Croats (Horoti) – 9, 10, 19-21, 24, 25, 30-41, 43-51, 53-76, 79-82, 84, 86, 88, 89, 92, 93, 102, 107, 110-121, 123-132, 135-138, 140, 141, 143-147, 149, 152-154, 158, 159, 161-169, 173, 179, 181, 182, 184-186, 191, 192, 194, 197, 199-205, 207, 213-219  
*Curta F.* – 33, 47, 86, 106, 109, 117, 157, 202  
 Cypriots – 24  
  
*Ćirković S.* – 20, 78  
*Ćorović-Ljubinković M.* – 152  
  
*Dabinović A.* – 19  
 Dado of Rouen, bishop – 72  
 Dalmatians (Dalmaciani) – 98, 99, 113  
 Damasus, pope (366 – 384) – 213  
*Darouzés J.* – 100  
*Davis A.* – 128  
*Davis R.* – 136, 219  
*Dawson T.* – 157  
*Delonga V.* – 125  
*Dendrinos C.* – 35  
*Dennis T.* – 69  
*Denniston J. D.* – 46, 48, 64

- Dimitrios Homatenos, archbishop of Ochrid – 217  
*Dindorf L.* – 85  
 Diocleians (Diocletians) – 50, 183, 191, 193, 194  
 Diocletian, emperor (284 – 305) – 38, 48, 49, 52, 62, 93, 95, 96, 100, 102, 104, 161, 162, 182, 192, 194  
 Diogen, comitis – 212  
 Dionysius Areopagita, writer – 220  
*Ditten H.* – 208  
*Dölger F.* – 178  
 Domagoi, Croat archon (ca. 864 – 876) – 67, 131, 135, 136, 138-140  
*Downey G.* – 88  
*Duchesne L.* – 61  
*Dümmler E.* – 127  
*Dvornik F.* – 19, 189, 202  
*Dzino D.* – 35, 55, 59, 107, 109, 113, 114, 119  
*Dzurova H.* – 52
- Eberhard (Ebherardus), the duke of Furlania – 136  
*Eggers M.* – 20, 22, 26, 48, 54, 74, 81, 86, 101, 124, 157, 174, 180  
*Ehrenfeuchter E.* – 108  
 Einhard, writer – 55, 125  
 Ekihardus, deacon – 58, 198  
*Ekonomou A. J.* – 65  
 Eleutherius, son of Arsenius – 222  
*Endlicher S. L.* – 168  
 Engildeus – 134  
*Engreen F. E.* – 208  
 Epetiani, citizens of Epetium (Stobreč) – 59  
*Erhard P.* – 86  
 Eriugena – 221  
 Ermperhtus, priest – 134  
 Etgar, dux – 167, 199  
 Eugenius, bishop of Ostia – 219, 220  
 Eusebius, writer – 220  
*Evans H. M.* – 110  
*Ewald P.* – 78  
 Ezeritai, strategos – 25
- Falimer, son of Kraina – 188  
*Ferjančić B.* – 7, 20, 31-34, 66, 101, 102, 107, 117, 123, 149, 153, 154, 156, 159, 162  
*Ferluga J.* – 19, 80, 178  
*Fiedler U.* – 86  
 Filimer – 115  
*Fine J. V. A. Jr.* – 31-33, 35, 53, 82, 124, 139  
 Florus, priest – 59  
 Foriuliani, citizens of Forum Iulii – 136  
 Formosus of Portua, bishop – 212  
*Francke K.* – 127  
*Franklin A.* – 20, 27  
*Franklin S.* – 20  
 Franks (Franci) – 51, 62, 69, 71, 74, 82, 83, 87, 89, 114, 118, 120, 122, 124-130, 132, 133, 135, 136, 138-142, 145, 168, 197, 198, 201-206, 213-216, 222
- Gabriel, cleric, Byzantine envoy – 121  
*Gaillardetz R.* – 221  
 Gambara – 115  
*Gamillscheg E.* – 69  
 Gapt – 115  
*Garland L.* – 157  
*Garsky A.* – 46  
 Gaudericus, bishop – 217  
*Gay J.* – 206  
 Gebehardus – 127  
*Georgacas D.* – 85  
 George Pisidas (ca. 630), writer – 110  
 George, monk – 24  
 Georgius Monachus, writer – 31  
 Gepidos – 51, 128, 197, 198  
 Germans – 108, 115  
 Geroldus, comes – 167, 199  
 Giovanni Diacono, writer – 52  
*Gligo V.* – 60  
 Goïnik, archon of Serbia – 170, 173  
*Goldberg E. J.* – 131, 202  
*Golden P. B.* – 22  
*Goldstein I.* – 34, 53, 56, 123, 125, 129, 186  
 Gorazd, duke – 217  
 Gotafriidus, comes – 167, 199

- Goteramms, comes – 167, 199  
 Goths (Gothi) – 51, 53, 65, 84, 103, 108, 109, 115, 122, 128, 197, 198  
 Gottschalk of Orbais – 68, 69, 71, 73, 125  
 Gottschalk (Young), Gottschalk of Orbais' disciple – 69  
 Goutziska (Gacka), zupania – 144  
*Gračanin H.* – 122  
*Grafenauer B.* – 19, 21, 23, 32, 33, 36, 44, 54, 59, 107, 112, 113, 119, 120, 123, 129, 143, 152-154, 156  
*Gray N.* – 207  
 Greci – 206  
*Grégoire H.* – 47, 130  
 Gregory, spatharios – 212  
 Gregory I, pope (590 – 604) – 78, 101  
 Gregory IV, pope (827 – 844) – 141  
 Gregory of Nyssa, writer – 220  
*Grierson P.* – 59  
*Grivec F.* – 121  
 Guardsman, writer – 103  
 Gvido, writer – 156
- Hadrian II**, pope (867 – 872) – 78, 189, 206, 209, 213, 222, 223  
*Harrington D. J.* – 46  
*Harrington L. M.* – 221  
*Hartmann L. M.* – 78  
*Hauptmann Lj.* – 19, 32, 33, 54, 55, 66, 112, 152, 153  
*Havlik L.* – 216  
 Hazars (Chazars) – 24, 218  
*Heather P.* – 115  
 Hehfeldi – 154  
*Heike T.* – 46  
*Heil C.* – 46  
*Heller Ioh.* – 127  
 Helmwinus, dux Bagoarii (of Bavaria) – 167  
 Hemaxobii, tribe – 87  
 Heraclius I, emperor (610 – 641) – 21, 30, 37, 38, 40, 48-50, 52-54, 56-61, 63-66, 73-75, 105, 106, 109, 115, 116, 119, 126, 143, 147, 154-156, 158, 161-163, 165, 178, 179, 182, 187, 189, 192-194, 197, 201  
 Heraclius Constantine see Constans II  
 Heraclius Constantine III, emperor (641) – 59  
 Heraclonas, emperor (638 – 641) – 65  
*Herrin J.* – 35  
*Hewsen R. H.* – 87, 88, 108  
 Hincmar of Reims – 79  
*Hoffmann H.* – 136  
*Holder-Egger O.* – 52, 59, 136  
*Holdsworth C.* – 59  
*Honigmann E.* – 155  
*Howard-Johnston J.* – 22, 29  
 Hranković Dujam – 60  
*Huby P.* – 46  
 Hungarians (Magyars) – 45, 46, 88, 89, 111, 121, 153, 168, 169  
 Huns (Huni) – 51, 110, 115, 128, 197, 198  
*Hussey J. M.* – 214, 219
- Iachnoukas**, son of Manuel of Tekis, strategos of Nicopolis – 25  
 Iberians – 53  
 Ignatius I, patriarch of Constantinople (847 – 858; 867 – 877) – 189, 219, 220, 222  
*Iliev I.* – 139  
 Iohannes, archipresbyter – 142  
 Iohannes, dux – 195  
 Iohannes of Ravenna, archbishop of Spalato – 57, 59  
 Iohannes Cameniata, writer – 31  
 Iohannes Scylitzes, writer – 156  
 Ismael – 26  
 Iuvanenses – 79, 162, 198
- Jarak M.* – 57  
*Jenkins R. J. H.* – 19, 22, 43, 65, 127, 128, 163, 166  
*Jireček C.* – 86, 158  
 Johannes, bishop – 141  
 John, son of Manuel of Tekis – 25  
 John V, emperor (1341-1391) – 61  
 John the Deacon (Hymonides), monk from Monte Cassino – 211  
 John the Deacon, the Venetian chronicler – 131, 132, 137, 138, 139, 184

- John (Iohannis), patriarch of Constantinople (582 – 595) – 78, 79
- John (Iohannes, Joannes) IV, pope (640 – 642) – 57, 61, 65
- John (Iohannes) VIII, pope (872 – 882) – 66, 67, 69, 70, 78, 79, 84, 130, 131, 138, 139, 141, 142, 158, 174, 206-209, 211, 212, 214, 215, 219, 222, 223
- John X, pope (914 – 928) – 141
- John Ducas, caesar – 35
- Jones A. H. M.* – 101
- Justinian I, emperor (527 – 565) – 52
- K**abaroi, clans – 218
- Kaegi W. E.* – 58
- Kalhous D.* – 142
- Kanalites – 47, 160, 186, 187, 190, 194
- Karaman Lj.* – 125
- Karamatić M.* – 186
- Karayannopulos J.* – 178
- Kärcher E.* – 86
- Katić L.* – 69, 70, 125
- Katičić R.* – 56, 57, 107, 152, 162
- Kazanski M.* – 29
- Kazhdan A. P.* – 27, 31, 118, 200
- Kehr P.* – 130
- Kelly J. N. D.* – 78
- Ker W. P.* – 111
- Kerkhofs J.* – 221
- Klaić N.* – 20, 31-34, 57, 59, 102, 108, 109, 112, 119, 120, 124, 125, 130, 135, 154, 162
- Klonimer, son of archon Stroimer – 173-175, 205
- Kloukas – 113, 114, 204
- Kobratos – 115
- Kolias Taxiarchis* – 11
- Kos F.* – 118, 123, 124, 130, 133, 134, 136, 153, 203, 210, 211, 213
- Kosentzis – 114, 115, 204
- Kostrenčić M.* – 55
- Košćak V.* – 20, 130
- Kotzil (Kotzilis, Chozil), Frankish archon, dux of Lower Pannonia – 129, 130, 133-135, 138, 139, 145, 180, 203, 213
- Kountoura-Galaki E.* – 174
- Kovalev R.* – 86, 117
- Kraina, son of Belae – 28
- Kraina, daughter of archon Vlastimer – 188, 189
- Krasimer (Peter), son of Terpimer, Croat archon – 67, 68, 70, 81, 82, 132, 135, 136, 140
- Kreutz B. M.* – 137, 206, 207
- Krikorikios – 26
- Krum, Bulgarian khan – 118
- Krusch B.* – 72
- Ktenas, cleric – 26
- Kukuljević Sakcinski I.* – 69, 134, 158, 174
- Kunstmann H.* – 47, 84
- Kurze F.* – 55, 112
- Kvaternik E.* – 86
- Laborde E. D.* – 113
- Labuda G.* – 33
- Lampakis S.* – 178, 209
- Latinus, priest – 58, 198
- Laurent V.* – 159
- Lemerle P.* – 26, 36, 221
- Leo, father of Methodius and Constantine – 216
- Leo I Magnus, pope (440 – 461) – 84
- Leo III, pope (795-816) – 199
- Leo IV, papa (847 – 855) – 70
- Leo VI, emperor (886 – 912) – 22, 38, 190
- Leontsini M.* – 209
- Lewis B.* – 19
- Leyser K.* – 120
- Litavrin G. G.* – 19, 22, 34, 47, 130
- Liutowid, duke of Pannonia – 123, 129, 130
- Liutprandus – 63
- Livanos Nikos* – 11
- Ljudemisl – 55
- Lobelos – 113, 114, 204
- Loma A.* – 47, 77, 190
- Lončar M.* – 31, 48
- Longobards (Langobardi) – 64, 115, 122, 136, 138, 213
- Lošek F.* – 210
- Lothar, Frankish king – 125, 131

- Loudova K.* – 46  
 Louis II (Lodogicus, Hludowicus), king of Italy (855 – 875) – 69, 125, 128, 131, 136-139, 206-208, 212, 213  
 Louis the German (Ludovicus, Lodovicus, Hludowicus), Frankish ruler – 89, 131, 133-135, 139, 162, 206-208, 210, 211  
 Louis the Pious, king of Aquitaine – 52, 207  
 Louis the Stammerer, son of Charles the Bald – 208  
*Lounghis T. C.* – 19, 20, 33, 52, 53, 120, 178, 206, 209  
*Louth A.* – 78, 202  
 Ludovico, župan – 55  
*Ludvikovsky J.* – 216  
*Lunt H. G.* – 145  
 Lupus Protospatharios, writer – 186
- Macartney C. A.* – 33  
*MacGeorge P.* – 101  
*Maenchen-Helfen O. J.* – 115  
 Magyars see Hungarians  
*Maksimović Lj.* – 20, 38, 40, 141, 149, 151, 152, 159, 163, 171  
*Malamut É.* – 33, 47, 184, 190  
*Malone K.* – 113  
 Manegoldus – 127  
*Mango C.* – 85  
*Manitius M.* – 206  
*Mannion C.* – 221  
*Manojlović G.* – 19, 22, 27, 81, 82, 124, 136  
 Manuel of Tekis, protospatharios – 25  
*Margetić L.* – 20, 32-35, 46, 53, 59, 124, 149  
 Maria Lekapena – 128  
 Marin, archbishop – 142  
*Marjanović – Vujović G.* – 159  
*Marović I.* – 109  
 Martin I, pope (649 – 653) – 73  
 Martin, abbot – 61, 65, 67, 68, 70-72, 197, 205  
*Masařík Z.* – 216  
 Masoudi, Arab writer – 113  
*Matijević-Sokol M.* – 57  
 Maurice, emperor (582 – 602) – 105  
 Mauro Orbini, writer – 108
- Maurus, archbishop of Ravenna – 59  
*McKitterick R.* – 120  
 Melias – 26  
 Melingoi, strategos – 25  
 Menander the Guardsman, writer – 103  
*Mereinos Gerasimos* – 11  
*Merta B.* – 133  
 Methodius Thessalonicensis – 121, 203, 206, 209-211, 215-218, 222  
 Michael, archon of Zachlunia – 176  
 Michael Boris see Boris – Michael  
 Michael I, emperor (811 – 813) – 44  
 Michael II, emperor (820 – 829) – 31, 52, 190  
 Michael III, emperor (842 – 847) – 116, 200  
 Michael of Zachlunia – 41, 184, 185  
 Michael Salonitano, writer – 108  
*Migne J. – P.* – 66  
 Miha Madii, writer – 108  
*Miklosich Fr.* – 139, 151  
 Miroslav, son of archon Krasimer, Croat archon – 81, 82, 129, 132, 135, 136, 140, 144  
 Modestus, bishop – 58, 198  
 Moimer (Moimarus), Moravian duke – 133, 162  
*Moisidou J.* – 171  
*Mommsen Th.* – 101, 115  
*Moravcsik Gy.* – 19, 22, 43, 46, 163, 166  
 Moravians – 113, 123, 131, 134, 135, 162, 217  
*Morović H.* – 60  
 Mouchlo – 113, 114, 204  
 Moudaphar, son of Manuel of Tekis – 25  
*Muldoon J.* – 125  
 Mutimer (Montemerus, Muncimir), Croat duke – 142, 174  
 Mutimer, Serbian archon – 141, 170, 171, 173-176, 180, 205, 217  
*Mützell J.* – 86
- Narentans – 136, 139; also see Pagans  
 Negutia župan – 55  
*Neil B.* – 221  
 Nemustlo, župan – 55  
*Nercessian A.* – 29

- Nicephor I, emperor (802 – 811) – 155  
 Nicephor (Nikephoros), patriarch of Constantinople (806–815) – 85, 86, 220  
 Nicholas I (858 – 867), pope – 78, 222  
 Niketas, strategos – 26  
 Niketas Ooryphas, Byzantine admiral – 137, 207  
 Nordmanni – 127  
*Novaković R.* – 101, 102, 124  
*Novoselôcev A. P.* – 19
- Obolensky D.* – 19, 163  
*Oikonomidès N.* – 101, 155  
 Oleg, Russian duke – 113  
 Orbini, Mauro see Mauro Orbini  
 Orosius, writer – 113  
*Osborne G. R.* – 46, 56  
*Ostrogorski G.* – 19, 38, 40, 178  
 Otilo, Bavarian duke – 70  
 Otto I, king of Francia – 118-121
- P**abo, dux Bagoarii (of Bavaria) – 167  
 Pagans (Pagani, Arentans) – 41, 47, 50, 84, 88, 139, 146, 147, 183, 194, 195  
 Pankratoukas, son of Manuel of Tekis, strategos of the Boukellarioi – 25  
 Pannonienses – 215  
 Pappus of Alexandria (c. 290 – c. 350), writer – 87, 88, 108  
*Parthey G.* – 156  
 Particiaco Urso, doge (846–881) – 131, 137  
 Paul, bishop of Ancona – 219, 220  
 Paul the Deacon, writer – 60, 61, 64  
*Pavić A.* – 119  
 Pazounis – 26  
 Pechenegs – 23, 24, 83, 88  
*Perels E.* – 189  
*Perić O.* – 57  
*Pertusi A.* – 33  
*Pertz G. H.* – 51, 89, 112, 113, 184, 206  
 Peter, archon – 173, 174, 176, 195  
 Peter, Bulgarian ruler – 128, 164  
 Peter, presbyter – 219, 220  
 Peter Krasimer see Krasimer (Peter)  
*Petrinec M.* – 117  
*Petrović V.* – 151  
 Phocas, emperor (602 – 610) – 105  
 Photius, patriarch of Constantinople (858 – 867; 877 – 886) – 70, 84, 211, 214, 218-220  
*Pinder M.* – 156  
 Pippinus, Frankish ruler – 70  
*Pirivatrić S.* – 84  
*Pohl W.* – 47, 55, 86, 93, 115, 116, 120, 130, 156  
 Polemius Silvius, writer – 101  
 Pope Gregory IV, Pope (827 – 844) –  
 Porin (Porinos, Porga), Croat archon – 52, 54, 56, 140, 142-144, 203  
*Poythress V. S.* – 46, 48, 64, 65  
*Pratsch T.* – 19  
 Presiam, archon of Bulgaria – 169-171, 205, 216  
 Pretilia, župan – 55  
 Pribina (Priwina), ban, dux of Lower Pannonia – 79, 81, 82, 129, 130, 132-136, 142, 144, 162, 203  
 Priscus, Byzantine diplomate – 110, 111  
 Priwizlauga, dux – 167, 199  
 Procopius, commander of the Byzantine army – 208  
 Procopius of Caesarea, writer – 53, 103  
 Prosigoi, Serbian archon – 166, 167  
 Prvoslav, son of archon Mutimer – 175  
 Pseudo-Maurice, writer – 69, 103  
*Pummer R.* – 221
- Rački F.* – 54  
 Radoslav, Serbian archon – 166, 167  
*Radovanović B.* – 125  
 Ragusans – 116  
 Rastislav, duke – 209, 213  
 Ratbod (Ratbodus), duke – 133, 162  
 Ratimer, duke – 133  
 Reginbertus, priest – 58, 198  
*Reichl K.* – 111  
*Reiske I.* – 113  
*Richard E. J.* – 46  
 Romaioi, inhabitants of Byzantium – 48, 49, 95, 96, 98-100, 104-107, 109,

- 146, 147, 154, 156, 157, 159-161, 163-165, 166, 177, 178, 182, 192, 194, 195
- Roman I Lacapenos, emperor (920 – 944) – 23, 39, 150, 164, 176, 190
- Roman II, emperor (959 – 963) – 23, 35, 36, 91, 92, 164
- Romani (Romans), inhabitants of Dalmatia – 38, 48-51, 59, 62-64, 73, 74, 94-97, 100, 103-107, 126, 128, 146, 147, 160, 161, 182, 192, 197
- Róna-Tas A.* – 22
- Runciman S.* – 19
- Russians – 23
- Saint Hadrian – 134
- Sakač S.* – 54, 71
- Salonitans, citizens of Salona – 59
- Salzburgenses, citizens of Salzburg – 70, 134
- Samonas, parakoimomenos – 26
- Sanctus Hrodbertus – 134
- Sandratus, priest – 134
- Sardians – 108
- Sarraceni – 206
- Saxons – 141
- Schieffer R.* – 79
- Schoell R.* – 101
- Sedulius, Frankish poet – 136
- Seeck O.* – 101
- Serbs – 9, 10, 19-21, 28, 31, 37-41, 44, 46-55, 58, 61, 64, 66, 67, 74-76, 79, 80, 82, 83, 93, 102, 113, 115, 116, 122, 145, 149-176, 179, 181-188, 191, 193-197, 199-205, 214-218, 221
- Shepard J.* – 20, 26, 27, 35
- Sicilidians – 108
- Simeon of Bulgaria (893 – 927) – 39, 75, 176, 179, 184
- Simeonova L.* – 141, 202
- Simoniti V.* – 130
- Skok P.* – 54, 155, 156
- Slavs (Sclavi, Slavi) – 20, 21, 25, 32-34, 44, 49, 50, 51, 55, 58, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 69, 79, 80, 92, 93, 95-97, 100, 103-106, 108, 110, 114-116, 122-125, 129, 131, 132, 136-139, 141, 145, 146, 153, 154, 159, 164, 168, 184, 189, 190, 193-195, 197-199, 207-210, 212, 215, 216, 220-223; also see Sout Slavs
- Socrates, writer – 220
- Sode C.* – 19, 92
- Soldan – 44, 93, 207
- Sommer P.* – 202
- Souda, writer – 118, 157
- Soustal P.* – 31, 33, 47, 54, 120
- South Slavs – 19, 22, 31, 32, 40, 41, 74, 185, 200
- Sozomen, writer – 220
- Sphendoplokos, prince of Moravia – 121
- St Basil of Neocaesarea – 220
- St Demetrius of Thessalonica – 220
- St Eligius (588 – 660) – 72, 73
- St Jerome – 220
- St John Calybitas – 220
- St John, the patriarch of Alexandria – 220
- St Kyr – 220
- St Luke, apostle – 87, 88, 196
- St Martinus Podsusedski, preacher – 71
- St Paul, apostle – 66, 67, 88, 196
- St Peter, apostle – 63, 64, 66, 67, 72, 134, 142
- St Peter of Alexandria – 220
- Stadler P.* – 117
- Stavridou-Zafraka A.* – 155
- Stephen, son of archon Mutimer – 171, 175
- Stephen of Byzantium, writer – 155
- Stephen the Mathematician, writer – 52
- Stephenson P.* – 22
- Sternbach L.* – 110
- Stroimer (Ztoimir), archon of Serbia – 167, 170, 173, 199, 205
- Sufflay E. de* – 158
- Svatopluk, Moravian ruler – 89, 209, 213, 215
- Symeon Magister, writer – 31
- Ševčenko I.* – 20, 26, 31, 36, 210
- Šišić F.* – 21, 47, 54, 65, 66, 125, 129, 130, 132, 138, 142
- Štih P.* – 119, 130, 133

- Tantalidas** – 108  
**Terbounians** – 47, 50, 183, 186, 187, 193, 194  
**Termatzous**, grandson of Arpad – 45  
**Terpimer**, archon (ca. 840 – ca. 854) – 55, 67-71, 73, 76, 81, 82, 125, 130-132, 135, 136, 139, 140, 200, 205  
*Thallóczy L.* – 158  
**Theodore Stoudita**, writer – 220  
**Theodoretus**, writer – 220  
**Theodosius**, archbishop of Split – 142  
**Theophanes**, writer – 24, 29, 35, 128, 223  
**Theophanes Continuatus** – 31, 35, 116, 122, 165, 190, 191, 206-208  
**Theophanes the Confessor**, writer – 85, 86  
**Theophylactes Symocatta**, writer – 103  
**Theophylactus**, turmarches – 212  
**Thomas of Spalato**, archdeacon of Spalato (d. 1268) – 57-59, 65, 103, 108, 146  
**Thomas Tusci** (Thomas of Pavia), writer – 108  
*Thurn I.* – 156  
**Tiberius**, son of Constans II – 65  
*Tomašić N.* – 23  
*Tomek W. W.* – 86  
**Tomislav**, Croat duke – 141  
*Tomšić F.* – 121  
**Totila**, king of Ostrogoths – 103, 108  
**Touga** – 113, 114, 204  
*Toynbee A.* – 19  
*Treadgold W.* – 155  
*Trempe E.* – 62  
*Tréštik D.* – 202  
**Turks** – 23, 24, 83, 88, 95, 96, 111, 112, 118, 119, 121  
**Tzeeslav**, archon – 173, 174, 176, 179  
**Tzuzimer**, son of Falimer – 188  
  
*Vachkova V.* – 86  
*Večerka R.* – 216  
*Vernadsky G.* – 120  
*Vida T.* – 117  
**Virgilius**, bishop – 58, 198  
**Virgilius**, pious man – 70  
  
**Visevitz**, archon – 184  
**Vitalianus**, pope (657 – 672) – 60, 61  
**Vitiges** – 115  
**Vladimer**, Bulgarian commander, son of Boris – 170-172, 205  
**Vladimer**, duke of Kiev – 113  
**Vladislav** – 55  
**Vlastimer**, archon of Serbia – 28, 166, 167, 169, 170, 187-189, 205, 216  
*Vlasto A. P.* – 141, 202, 210  
*Vlyssidou V.* – 209  
*Vodopivec P.* – 130  
**Voinomer** (Wonomyro), duke of Pannonia – 123, 124  
**Voislav**, Serbian archon – 166, 167  
*Vries W. de* – 221  
  
*Waitz G.* – 60, 61, 89, 125, 127, 137  
*Waldmüller L.* – 150, 152  
**Walpertus**, the patriarch of Aquileia – 142  
*Wasilewski T.* – 159  
*Wattenbach D. W.* – 51  
**Watto**, priest – 58, 198  
**Werinharius**, comes – 167, 199  
*Westermann A.* – 155  
**White Croats** (Belocroats) – 44-46, 77, 83, 88, 89, 111-113, 118-121, 125, 153, 205, 215, 217  
**White Serbs** – 46, 77, 83, 111, 153, 205, 215, 217  
*Whittow M.* – 169  
*Wilson K.* – 221  
*Winkelmann F.* – 209  
*Wirth G.* – 53  
*Wiseman P.* – 59  
*Wolfram H.* – 118, 135, 203, 210  
*Wood I.* – 134  
*Wood S.* – 141  
  
*Yannopoulos P. A.* – 53  
**Ybor**, son of Gambará – 115  
  
**Zacharias** (Zahary) of Agnani – 218, 219  
**Zacharias**, archon – 176

- 
- Zachlumians – 47, 50, 122, 160, 182-186, 192-194  
Zarsata, župan – 55  
Zdeslav (Sedesclavus), son of Terpimer, Croat duke (877 – 879) – 131, 132, 135, 136, 138, 140, 141  
*Zekan M.* – 142  
Zenon, emperor (474 – 475; 476 – 491) – 52  
*Zuckermann C.* – 29
- Žemlička J.* – 202  
*Živković T.* – 21, 29, 40, 44, 49, 54, 57-59, 63, 65, 66, 77, 80-82, 86, 93, 100, 101, 103, 106, 117, 120, 122, 123, 125, 142, 151, 152, 155, 156, 169, 180, 181, 183, 184, 186, 190, 191, 193, 197, 205, 209

## INDEX OF GEOGRAPHICAL TERMS

- Aachen – 124  
Achaia – 108  
Adriatic coast – 100  
Adriatic sea – 31, 61, 69, 139, 165  
Albania – 88, 158  
Albano, city – 104  
Alemannia – 120  
Alexandria – 87, 108, 220  
Ancona – 219  
Antibari (Antivari, Bar) – 95, 100, 193  
Antioch – 87  
Aquilaia – 142, 209, 213  
Aquitaine – 87  
Arbe, island, city – 87, 97, 106  
Armenia – 87  
Armenia Maior (Armenia Prima) – 85, 87  
Armenia Minor (Armenia Secunda) – 85, 87  
Arzes, city – 150  
Asia Minor – 87  
Athens – 9, 11  
Avar qaganate – 119
- B**alaton, lake – 133  
Balkans – 20, 122, 165  
Baltic Sea – 83, 89  
Bari – 116, 125, 136, 137, 160, 207, 208  
Bavaria (Bagoaria, Baioaria) – 111-113, 167, 209  
Beatuseschirichun, toponym – 79  
Belgrade (Singidunum) – 53, 76, 105, 158-160, 205, 216, 218  
Belitzin, city (kastron oikoumenon) – 76  
Benevento – 137, 219  
Berat – 158  
Beroullia – 196  
Bettobia, toponym – 79  
Bohemia – 21, 89, 111, 120  
Boiki, region – 152, 153  
Bojana, river – 88
- Bona, city – 47, 183, 184  
Bona, river – 183  
Bonoriae, city – 104  
Bosnia – 204  
Bosnia and Hertzegovina – 180  
Bosona – 179  
Boukellarioi – 25  
Bratz (Bracia, Bratza, Brač), island – 59, 88, 132, 196  
Breberi zupania – 144  
Bulgaria (Boulgaria, Voulgaria, Vulgaria) – 39, 55, 74, 75, 85, 86, 118, 128, 141, 153, 156, 163, 164, 168-173, 176, 178, 179, 202, 205, 206, 212-216, 219, 222  
Burgentas, city – 104  
Businiza, toponym – 79  
Butua, city – 193  
Byzantium, Byzantine Empire – 21, 32, 39, 40, 49, 50, 53, 54, 62, 74-76, 100, 101, 103, 110, 116, 125, 128, 132, 136-138, 140, 141, 156, 175, 178, 197, 201, 202, 206, 208, 212-214, 217, 222, 223
- Caesarea – 53  
Cappadocia Prima – 85  
Cappadocia Secunda – 85, 87  
Capua – 137, 219  
Carantania – 58, 119  
Cilicia, Second – 87  
Chaliat, city – 150  
Charsianon – 26  
Chert, city – 150  
Chios, island, city – 87  
Chlebena, city (kastron oikoumenon) – 76  
Chlebiana, zupania – 143, 144  
Chliat, city – 150, 177  
Chlum (Chulmi, Hum), city, region – 47, 183

- Chlum, mount – 183  
 Choara, island – 196  
 Cibotus, mountain – 87  
 Civitas nova (Novigrad), city – 138  
 Constantinople – 26, 32-35, 38, 41, 44, 46, 52, 54, 61, 65, 78, 84, 85, 94, 101, 104, 105, 110, 111, 113, 132, 135, 136, 139-141, 145, 166, 176, 177, 185, 192, 202, 204-206, 208, 211-216, 218-220, 222  
 Constantinopolitana, dioecesis – 100, 125  
 Corax, river – 87  
 Corinth – 78, 207  
 Cornaco, city – 104  
 Cos, island – 87  
 Crete, island – 78, 132  
 Croatia (Hrovatia) – 59, 67, 68, 71, 73, 74, 76, 77, 80-84, 86, 88, 116, 117, 121, 122, 128, 129, 131, 132, 135, 136, 139-141, 143-145, 152, 173, 174, 176, 192, 200, 202, 204, 205, 215, 218  
 Cusi, city – 104
- D**acia – 101, 108, 213  
 Dacia Mediterranea, provincia – 101  
 Dacia Ripensis, provincia – 101  
 Daleminci – 113  
 Dalmatia, provincia – 19-21, 23, 25, 30, 32-34, 36-38, 40, 44-46, 49-54, 57-62, 65, 66, 68, 69, 71, 79, 80, 84, 88, 91-93, 95, 96, 98-100, 102, 103, 107-111, 113-117, 119, 121-124, 126, 127, 131, 136-138, 141, 143, 146, 147, 149, 160-162, 168, 169, 182, 193, 194, 197, 201, 202, 204, 205, 207, 212, 213, 215, 217, 221  
 Dalmatia Minor – 87, 88  
 Danube (Danubium, Danubius), river – 51, 55, 94-96, 98-100, 102-106, 124, 133, 135, 158, 159, 162, 168, 197, 198, 202, 215  
 Dardania, provincia – 101, 213  
 Decatera, city – 47, 193  
 Desnik – 179
- Destinikon, city (kastron oikoumenon) – 179  
 Diadora – 47, 97, 106  
 Diocleia (Dioclea) – 40, 41, 77, 145, 161, 162, 181, 191-193, 204  
 Diocletian's palace – 107  
 Dmitrovica (former Sirmium, Sremska Mitrovica) – 105, 209, 210  
 Dniester, river – 218  
 Dobriskik, city (kastron oikoumenon) – 185, 186  
 Dowina, civitas – 135  
 Drakon, river – 87  
 Drava, river – 122, 133  
 Dresneik, city (kastron oikoumenon) – 179  
 Drim (Drilon), river – 88, 89  
 Dupleipin, toponym – 79  
 Dyrrachium (Durrachion) – 78, 95, 100, 160, 176, 192
- E**mios, island see Scandia  
 England – 61  
 Europe – 145, 154, 215
- F**rance – 68  
 Francia (Frankish state) – 44, 55, 67, 68, 71, 84, 86, 87, 118-121, 129, 139  
 Francia, East – 120, 131, 139  
 Furlanij (Friuli, Forum Iulii) – 68, 133, 136  
 Fulda – 135, 137
- G**acka – 144  
 Galoumainik, city (kastron oikoumenon) – 185, 186  
 Gamappius, village – 73  
 Gaul (Galliae), provinces – 87, 127, 212  
 Germany – 87, 212  
 Gradetai – 193  
 Greece (Grecia) – 11, 155, 213
- H**azaria – 217  
 Hepirus, provinciae – 213  
 Hum, city of Zachlunia see Chlum  
 Hungary – 83

- Iadera (Zadar) – 117  
 Iberia – 157  
 Ies, island – 196  
 Illyricum (Hylliricum) – 101, 121, 122, 168, 204, 212, 213, 215, 217, 223  
 Imota zupania – 143, 144  
 Iosli, city (kastron oikoumenon) – 185, 186  
 Isa, island – 88  
 Isangrimeschirichum, toponym – 79  
 Istria – 68, 71, 95, 100, 138  
 Italy (Italia) – 52, 60, 64, 65, 101, 102, 112, 125, 128, 136, 138, 139, 145, 206-208, 212, 213  
 Iustiniana Prima – 78, 101, 105
- K**anali – 183, 186, 187, 190-192  
 Katera (Kotor) – 179  
 Keisi, toponym – 79  
 Kiev – 113  
 Klaboka, city (kastron oikoumenon) – 76  
 Kleisa, city – 94, 95, 104-106  
 Kori, city (kastron oikoumenon) – 76  
 Korkyra (Kiker, Korčula), island – 84, 196  
 Koskida, island – 88  
 Kourkra (Kiker, Kourkoura), island, city – 87, 88  
 Kribasa (Krbava), zupania – 144
- L**arissa – 79  
 Lastovon, island – 196  
 Lesnik, city (kastron oikoumenon) – 179  
 Libya, Entos (Inner) – 87  
 Lindolveschirchun, toponym – 79  
 Litza (Lika), zupania – 144  
 Liuprammus, toponym – 79  
 Lontodokla – 193  
 Lower Pannonia – 51, 122, 123, 129, 130, 133, 134, 144, 180, 203, 213  
 Lukavetai – 191  
 Libya, Entos (Inner Libya) – 87
- M**acedonia – 101, 108, 155  
 Macedonia Prima – 155  
 Macedonia Secunda, provincia – 101  
 Manzikiert – 150, 177
- Megyretous, city (kastron oikoumenon) – 179  
 Melana, island – 88  
 Meleta (Malozeatai, Mljet), island – 84, 88, 196  
 Mljet see Meleta  
 Moesia, provincia – 101  
 Mokriskik, city (kastron oikoumenon) – 185, 186  
 Mokro – 77  
 Mokron – 196  
 Monte Cassino, monastery – 211  
 Moravia – 23, 46, 84, 86, 89, 120, 121, 153, 183, 206, 209, 215, 216  
 Mosapurc, castrum – 135  
 Mysia – 87
- N**aissus – 105  
 Naples – 212  
 Narrenta (Neretva), river – 195  
 Neocaesarea – 220  
 New Capua – 45  
 New Rome see Constantinople  
 Nicopolis – 25, 78  
 Nin – 77, 142, 143  
 Nina zupania – 144  
 Nitra – 133, 209  
 Nona, city (kastron oikoumenon) – 76  
 Nona, zupania – 144  
 Noricum Mediterraneum, provincia – 101  
 Noricum Ripensis, provincia – 101  
 Nougrade – 193  
 Nova, city – 104  
 Nyssa – 220
- O**chrid – 217  
 Oder, river – 83  
 Opsara, island, city – 87, 97, 106  
 Orbais – 68  
 Ormos – 191  
 Orte – 222  
 Ostia – 219  
 Ostrok – 196  
 Otachareschirchun, toponym – 79

- P**agania (Arenta)– 40, 68, 69, 77, 88, 145, 160, 176, 181, 183, 194-196, 204  
 Paldmunteschirchun, toponym – 79  
 Pannonia – 46, 51, 80, 104, 109, 110, 112, 117, 118, 121-124, 129, 130, 133, 134, 144, 153, 162, 168, 169, 180, 197, 198, 204, 205, 209-212, 215-217  
 Pannonia Prima, provincia – 101  
 Pannonia Secunda, provincia – 101, 104  
 Parathalassia, zupania – 144  
 Passau – 209  
 Peloponnesus – 25, 208  
 Perkri, city – 150  
 Persia – 53  
 Pesenta, zupania – 143, 144  
 Phara (Pharos, Hvar), island – 88, 196  
 Pilozsue – 133  
 Pleba, zupania – 143, 144  
 Poland – 21, 83, 111, 113, 119  
 Portuga – 212  
 Praevalis, provincia – 100, 101, 162, 193  
 Prague – 86  
 Prizimon, gulf – 88  
 Provence – 208  
 Pulcheriopolis – 158  
  
**Q**uinqve basilicae, toponym – 79  
  
**R**aba, river – 130  
 Ragusa – 69, 97, 106, 116, 137, 207  
 Ras (Rasi) – 171, 172, 205  
 Rastizen, civitas – 135  
 Ravenna – 57, 59, 155, 209  
 Regensburg – 137, 210  
 Reims (Rheims) – 79, 209  
 Ricti, city – 104  
 Risan (Risena) – 88, 191  
 Romania – 105  
 Rome – 30, 38, 40, 48, 49, 56, 61, 63, 67, 71-73, 78, 79, 84-86, 123, 124, 140, 141, 143, 145, 163, 166, 168, 174, 182, 192-194, 197, 199, 201, 202, 204-206, 209-216, 219-221, 223  
 Rosa, city – 193  
 Rouen – 72  
 Ruinius (Rovinj), city – 138  
  
**S**aint Quentin, city – 131  
 Sala, river – 162  
 Salamas, city – 150  
 Salapiugin – 134  
 Salerno – 137, 206  
 Salines (Tuzla), city (kastron oikoumenon) – 179, 180  
 Salona – 44, 53, 57, 62, 65, 93-111  
 Salzburg – 118, 133, 134, 168, 180, 197, 206, 209-213, 215  
 Samus, island, city – 87  
 Sancti Hrodberti, church – 134  
 Sancti Iohannis baptistae, church – 79  
 Sancti Martini, church – 133, 162  
 Sauia, provincia – 101  
 Sava, river – 105, 106, 122, 133  
 Saxony – 118, 119  
 Scadanan, island – 115  
 Scader – 79  
 Scandia (Emios), island – 108  
 Slavonia – 57, 103  
 Scupi – 105  
 Second Rome see Constantinople  
 Serbia (Servia) – 28, 48-50, 70, 77, 145, 153-156, 160, 170-173, 176, 178, 179, 187-189, 192, 202, 205, 210  
 Sidraga, zupania – 144  
 Singidunum see Belgrade  
 Sipares, city – 138  
 Sipont (Sypont) – 64, 184  
 Sirmium see Dmitrovica  
 Skordona, city (kastron oikoumenon) – 76  
 Slavineza – 196  
 Spain – 24, 157  
 Spalato (Split) – 47, 57-59, 62, 65, 69, 95-97, 102, 103, 106-109, 142, 143, 146, 184  
 Spoleto – 208  
 Srem – 122, 133  
 Sremska Mitrovica see Dmitrovica  
 St Mary, church – 134

- St Maurice, monastery – 134  
 Stagnon, city (kastron oikoumenon) – 185, 186  
 Staro Město – 86  
 Stauracios – 155  
 Stepiliperc, toponym – 72, 79  
 Sterpiniacus, toponym – 72  
 Stolpon, city (kastron oikoumenon) – 76  
 Ston – 77  
 Stragon, island – 88  
  
 Tanais, river – 108  
 Taranto – 139  
 Taronite – 150  
 Tekis – 25  
 Tenin, city (kastron oikoumenon) – 76  
 Terbounia – 28, 40, 41, 70, 77, 145, 160, 181, 183, 186-192, 204, 205  
 Tetrangourion (Trogir) – 47, 97, 106  
 Teutiborgio, city – 104  
 Theon Ochema, mountain – 87  
 Thessaly (Thessalia) – 87, 213  
 Thessalonica – 78, 154-156, 205, 216, 218, 220-222  
 Thrace – 108, 217  
 Thuringia – 120  
 Tibi, city – 150  
 Tisa, river – 105  
 Tnina, zupania – 144  
 Trapezunt – 25  
 Trebinje – 77  
 Treisma, toponym – 133, 162  
 Turkey – 44, 46, 152  
 Tuzla see Salines  
 Tzenzina, zupania – 143, 144  
 Tzermatzou, cizy – 150, 177  
 Tzernabouskei, city (kastron oikoumenon) – 179  
  
 Ulcigno, city – 193  
 Ulpiana – 105  
 Umacus (Umag), city – 138  
 Ussitin, toponym – 79  
 Uuampaldi, toponym – 133  
  
 Vekla, island, city – 87, 97, 106  
 Venetia – 195  
 Venice – 23, 67-69, 87, 112, 137-139  
 Viminacium – 105  
 Visla (Vistula, Litziki), river – 83, 121, 184  
 Vojvodina – 105, 210  
  
 White Croatia – 88, 89, 119-121, 205  
 White Serbia – 153, 205  
 Wiedhereschirichun, toponym – 79  
  
 Ystriensis provincia – 138; also see Istria  
  
 Zachluma, river – 184  
 Zachlunia (Zachlounnia) – 40, 41, 47, 77, 145, 176, 181-184, 186, 204  
 Zentina, river – 88  
 Zetlibi – 191

Tibor Živković

**DE CONVERSIONE CROATORUM ET SERBORUM  
A Lost Source**

*Publisher*

The Institute of History Belgrade

*Editor-in-chief*

Srđan Rudić, Ph.D.

Director of the Institute of History

*Index*

Slavica Merenik

*Secretary of the Editorial Board*

Snežana Ristić

*Layout and Cover Design*

Slobodan Simić

*Printing House*

Čigoja štampa

Studentski trg 13, Beograd

e-mail: office@chigoja.com

*Circulation*

500

ISBN 978-86-7743-096-2

CIP - Каталогизacija u publikaciji, Narodna biblioteka Srbije, Beograd

94(=163.41)

94(=163.42)

94(495.02)

ŽIVKOVIĆ, Tibor, 1965-

De Conversione Croatorum et Serborum : a lost source / Tibor Živković. -

Belgrade : Institute of History, 2012 (Beograd : Čigoja štampa). - 255 str. ; 24 cm.

- (Monographs / Institute of History ; vol. 62)

Tiraž 500. - Abbreviations: str. 13-18. - Napomene i bibliografske reference uz tekst.

- Sources: str. 225-228. - References: str. 229-240. - Registri.

ISBN 978-86-7743-096-2

a) Срби - Историја b) Хрвати - Историја

COBISS.SR-ID 190965516