MONUMENTA

MONUMENTA

СОДРЖИНА

MONUMENTA

MONUMENTA

Stojko Stojkov

THE TERM SCLAVINIA IN BYZANTINE SOURCES: RE-EXAMINATION OF THE CHRONOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Апстракт

Основна цел на оваа статија е да го разјасни прашањето со хронолшките и географски рамки на употреба на поимот Склавинија во византиските извори. Тезата што овде се аргументира е дека Склавинија не бил во употреба меѓу VI – VIII век. Еднократната појава на овој термин во Историјата на Теофилакт Симоката е дискутирана во рамките на дебатата водена во последно време околу прашањето дали е во прашање придавка или именка. Понудена е и трета можност дека зборот Склавинија може да е резултат од интервенција во текстот извршена во најстариот манускрипт во X век, од кој сите зачувани потекнуваат. Специјално внимание е обратено на начинот на кој е употребен поимот во Хронографијата на Теофан. Преку нејзина споредба со историјата ан патријархот Никифор и други извори се доаѓа до заклучок дека терминот влегол во употреба после времето во кое историјата на Никифор била завршена. Паралелно имиња слични на Склавинија се појавуваат во изворите (Велзитија, Веризтија). Поимот бил во интензивна и вообичаена употреба во првата половина на XIX век за Централните балкански територии, а во средината ан 10ти век – за Далмација. За последен пат поимот се употребува во XII в., но со веќе сменета смисла.

Клучни зборови: *Склавинија, византиски извори, Словенски области, терминологија, Теофилакт Симоката, Теофан Исповедник*

Abstract

The main goal in this article is to clarify the chronology of use and geographical frame of the term Sclavinia in Byzantine sources. The thesis argumented there is that term Sclavinia was not in regular or common use in VI – VIII centuries. The question of the only case of appearing of word Sclavinia in Theophylact History is discussed in light of later debate of it as noon or adjective in the science. The third possibility is also suggested that it can be later interventions in the oldest X[th] century manuscript from each all other depend. Special attention is paid to the way Sclavinia was used in Theophanes Chronography. By its comparison with Nicephorus Breve History and other sources conclusion is proposed that the term appeared after Nicephorus work was finished. In same time the names similar to Sclavinia also appeared in sources (Velzitia, Verzitia). Term was used intensively and as contemporary and current for territory of Central Balkan before 850, and in middle 10th for Slavic counties in Dalmatia. The last time term was used in XII century, but already with different meaning.

Key words: *Sclavinia, Byzantine source, Slavic regions, terminology, Theophylact Simocatta, Theophanes Confessor*

The term *Sclavinia* is very important for understanding of realities and process-es on the Balkans in the early middle age.[1] In the last decade, the debate about it become actual again, after Evangelos Chrysos article in 2007[2] and polemic which it aroused between Florin Curta and Andreas Gkoutziokostas, in which I also was unexpectedly involved.[3]

The goal of this article is to re-examine the chronology of use of the term *Sclavinia* in Byzantine sources. Traditional chronology was based on the use of the term in Miracula of Saint Demetrius (for the end of VI c.), History of Theophylact Simocatta (for 602), and Chronography of Theophanes (for 658, 689, 758, 810). After the critical edition of Miracula by Lemerle, it became clear that *Sclavinia* did not exist in the original.[4] The collapse of one of the three "pillars" on which the theory on the early use of the term relied rendered it problematic.[5]

Chrysos, followed by Gkoutzioukostas challenged the use of term *Sclavinia* in Theophylact Simocatta seeing it as adjective not a noon. Curta disagreed. The dilemma of the nature of word *sclavinia* in the History of Theophylact Simocatta - the only known Byzantine source, written between the 6th and 8th centuries, in which we find the word Σκλαυηνία for sure, will be the first examined question in this article.

Secondly, According to Chrysos *Sclavinia* in Theophanes, except for the 810 is metonymy. It is a problematic approach because it is difficult to prove in every situation if term is used as metonymy or not. It depends too much on the interpretation of the author making it rather subjective. Instead of traying to

---

[1] G. Ostrogorsky, *Byzantium and the South Slavs*,The Slavonic and East European Review, Vol. 42, No. 98 (Dec., 1963), 3.

[2] E. Chrysos, *Settlements of Slavs and Byzantine sovereignty in the Balkans*, Byzantina Mediterranea. Festschrift für Johannes Koder zum 65, Geburtstag, Vienna 2007, 123–135.

[3] F. Curta, *Sklaviniai and Ethnic Adjectives: A Clarification,* Byzantion Nea Hellás 30, Santiago, 2011, 85–98; A. Gkoutziokostas, *The term "Σκλαυηνία" and the Use of Adjectives which Derive from Ethnic Names in the History of Theophylact Simocatta*, Cyril and Methodius, Byzantium and the World of the Slavs, International Scientific Conference, Thessaloniki, 2015, 638–646; F. Curta, *Theophylact Simocatta revisited. A response to Andreas Gkoutzioukostas, Byzantion Nea Hellás* 35, Santiago 2016, 195–209 (There is used instead of the text published on Curta's site on Academia.edu and consequently the pages are from 1 to 14); A. Gkoutzioukostas, *"Sklavenia" ("Σκλαυινια") revisited: previous and recent considerations,* Παρεκβολαι, vol. 7 (2017), 1–12; F. Curta, *Sklavinia in Theophylact Simocatta, (hopefully) for the last time*, Porphyra, v. 27, anno XV, Venice, 2018, 5 – 15; С. Стојков, *„Склавинија" кај Теофилакт Симокаtа*, Историја, LIII, бр. 1, Скопје, 2018, 15 – 40.

[4] P. Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de saint Demetrus, I, Le texte,* Paris, 1979, I, 13, 117, 130, 134,₁₄. In the old edition of Miracula based on the manuscript Vatic. gr. 797 from the 10th century, in one place instead of Σκλαβηνῶν we find Σκλαβηνιῶν. It is transferred into translations made before publishing of the Lemerle edition (for example Ф. Баришић, *Miracula s. Demetrii II,* Византиски извори за историју народа Југославије т. 1, Г. Острогорски (ed.), Београд, 1955, 177, f. 7).

[5] E. Chrysos, *Settlements*, 123 – 135.

answer if it was used as metonymy or not,[6] I will concentrate my attention to more important question: whether the author of Chronography of Theophanes, who writes in the early 9th century, found the term *Sclavinia* in his sources or introduced himself a term from his own time.

Sclavinia in Theophylact Simocatta

Writing in 630th AD, Theophylact Simocatta mentions one planned Byzantine campaign in 602 north of the Danube against τῆς Σκλαυηνίας πληθύος.[7] It is considered the oldest case of the use of the word *Sclavinia*.[8] Its interpretation as a *noun* or *adjective* give us two different meanings: "the multitude of *Sclav*-

---

[6] Still some remarks are needed. As K.M. Setton (*The Bulgars in the Balkans and the Occupation of Corinth in the Seventh Century*, Speculum, Vol. 25, No. 4, Chicago, Oct., 1950, 522, 541, 542, f. 154) noticed *Sclavinia* in Theophanes "seems to mean absolutely the same thing in each case...". This uniformity in the use of the term in Theophanes Chronography speaks against the thesis of Chrysos, that all cases of the use of *Sclavinia* in Theophanes are actually examples of *metonymy*, with the exception of the last (810), in which *Sclavinia* was used for a concrete object (E. Chrysos, *Settlements,* 127–129). The fact that *Sclavinia* appeared in Theophanes Chronography not just in the singular, but also in the plural also speaks against the metonymy hypothesis. Chrysos' argument that later authors based on Theophanes such as Georgius Kedrenus, Leon Grammatikos and Joannes Zonaras replace *Sclavinia* because they recognize it as *metonymy* does not speak in favour of his thesis, because these authors, with exception of Kedrenus, replaced *Sclavinia* not only in cases of assumed "metonymy", but in all cases. I.e., for them the term *Sclavinia* itself was inadequate (see below). Kedrenus actually did not use the Theophanes Chronography but instead a Pseudo-Symeon Chronicle, for the time before 811, and Skylitzes after 811 (W. Treadgold, *The Middle Byzantine Historians,* Palgrave Makmillan 2013, 341; L. Neville, *Guide to byzantine historical writing*, Cambridge, 2018, 168). The part of Pseudo-Symeon Chronicle before 813, was a mixture of Theophanes Confessor and George the Monk, and has not been published (R. Browning, *op. cit*, 406, f. 40; G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, I, Leiden 1983, 501; L. Neville, *Guide* 118, 121), so it is not clear whether he used *Sclavinia* for this period following Theophanes, or threw it out following George the Monk. We know that he used it following Scriptor Incertus for 814 (Symeonis Magistri, *Annales*, I. Bekker (ed.), Corpus scriptorium historiae byzantinae, Bonnae 1838, 617, $_{10-13}$.). Pseudo-Symeon was writing in the middle of 10th century, time when the term *Sclavinia* become actual once more (see below). Therefore, it is very difficult to drive from this conclusion if Kedrenus understands Theophanes *Sclavinia* as metonymy or not, or simply copied Pseudo-Simeon's text.

[7] Theophylacti Simocattae, *Historiarum libri octo*, Im. Bekerus (ed.), Bonnae 1834, VIII, 5, $_{9, 10,}$ p. 323.

[8] Moreover, many authors consider it not only the first use of the word σκλαυνία, but also the first use of the toponym *Sclavinia*: O. Pritsak, *"Sklavinia"*, The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, vol. 3, A. Kazhdan (ed.), Oxford – New York, 1991, 1910–1911; Г. Литаврин, О.В. Иванова, *Византия и Славяни*, Раннефеодальные государства на Балканах, VI-XII вв., Г. Литаврин, (ed.), Москва 1985, 85; С. Антолјак, *Нашите Склавинии*, Средновековна Македонија I, Скопје 1985, 121; Idem, *Македонските Склавинии*, Средновековна Македонија, т. 1, Б. Павловски (ed.), Скопје 1985, 127; С.А. Иванов, *Феофилакт Симоката*, Свод древнейших письменьых известий о славянах, т. 2, (VII – IXвв), Г. Литаврин (ed.), Москва 1995, 63, f. 151; F. Curta, *Sklaviniai* 88, 89. The word πληθύς / πληθύος translates as: crowd, horde, multitude; equivalent words in Latin sources are: multitude, exercitus (E. Chrysos, *Settlements* 126; F. Curta *Sklavinia in Theophylact Simocatta,* 6 - 8).

inia" or "Slavic multitude". Discussions conducted on this issue did not come to a consensus.[9]

The main weakness of the adjective thesis is that this otherwise linguistically decent possibility is, at the same time, unique: no other Byzantine author has used σκλαυηνία as an adjective.[10] A similar problem, however, appears in the interpretation of *Sclavinia* as a *noun*: it would be the only known case in sources in the 6th and 7th centuries, and also the only case within Theophylact's History. In the past, this was not a problem because it was thought that Theophylact simply used a popular term for contemporaries to denote the area north of the Danube as a *land of the Slavs*, and Miracula served as a proof of it.[11] Such an explanation no longer stands and therefore the creation and the one-time use by Theophylact of a term not used from others known contemporary authors turns into a serious problem, for which no satisfactory explanation is offered.

The following explanations were suggested: first, Theophylact's desire to clarify that the campaign in 602 was against the independent Slavs, or that Romans encamped in the southern bank of Danube opposite of Slavic land; second, "to avoid monotony and repetition".[12] Theophylact created several new words in his history, and the proposal is to include *Sclavinia* in that order, created in a similar fashion to other geographic terms derived from ethnic names such as *Scythia, Germania, Sarmatia*.[13]

The monotony argument should be rejected as obviously inaccurate. One term used only once in a long narrative cannot serve to avoid monotony or repetition.[14] However, even Theophylact's presumed desire appears fictitious because

---

[9] E. Chrysos, *Settlements,* 124–126; F. Curta, *Sklaviniai,* 8 – 98; A. Gkoutziokostas, Σκλαυηνία, 638–646; F. Curta, *Theophylact,* 195–209; Gkoutziokostas, *Sklavenia,* 1–12.

[10] F. Curta, *Sklaviniai,* 89; Idem, *Theophylact*, 2, Cf. A. Gkoutziokostas, Σκλαυηνία, 644, f. 63.

[11] Г. Баласчевъ, *Най-старата словенска държава на Балканския полуостровъ VII – VIII век и нейният етнически съставъ,* София, 1924, 3; Г. Литаврин, *Славинии VII–IX вв. Социально-политические организации славян,* Этногенез народов Балкан и Северного Причерноморья, Л.А. Гиндин (ed.), Москва 1984, 195, 197; Г. Литаврин, О.В. Иванова, *Византия и Славяни*, 85; Иванов, *Феофилакт,* 63, ф. 151; A. Berger, *"Sclavinia"*, Brill's New Pauly, Antiquity volumes, C. Hubert, S. Helmuth (eds.), First print edition: (York 1991), First published online: 2006, Retrieved on 05 July 2016, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e1115200; Н.И. Щавелева, *Древняя Русь в «Польской истории» Яна Длугоша* (Книги I—VI), Москва 2004, 366, f. 6.

[12] F. Curta, *Sklaviniai,* 91, 93; Idem, *Theophylact,* 9. Idem, *Sklavinia in Theophylact Simocatta,* 9 – 12.

[13] F. Curta, *Sklaviniai,* 91, 93; Idem, *Theophylact,* 9; С.А. Иванов, *Феофилакт*, 63, f. 151; Г. Литаврин, *Славинии*, 195.

[14] F. Curta, *Theophylact*, 9 précised that using *Sclavinia* was necessary "especially if Theophylact wanted to avoid repeating the circumlocution 'the lands of the Sclavenes' (τῶν Σκλαυηνῶν χώραις)". But Σκλαυηνῶν χώραις also appeared just once in Theophylact Simocatta's History and after τῆς Σκλαυηνίας πληθύος, which makes this argument inaccurate.

he did not have any problem with being monotonous and repetitive when writing about the Slavs.[15] In two Byzantine campaigns north of the Danube, he uses for them only the term *barbarians*: against Musokious (11 times) and against Piragastos (6). In addition, if τῆς Σκλαυηνίας πληθύος was used to avoid repetition, this would mean that it is equivalent to τῶν Σκλαυηνῶν πλήθη, which was used on seven previous occasions, and should mean that Σκλαυηνία was used as an *adjective*. Using *Sclavinia* as an adjective would have been no less serviceable for achieving his alleged goal of avoiding repetition.[16]

Of course, to create the term itself was not difficult. But even though Theophylact created several new words, he did not create a geographical term from the contemporary ethnonym. He obviously did not feel the need of either Anthia or Avaria.[17] And why would he create a new term to use it only once?

The uniqueness of the term Σκλαυηνία is a serious challenge against the clarity argument. An unexplained term cannot be used for clarification. How could the only use of the at that time unusual term *Sclavinia* help to create clarity for the 7th-century readers when it managed to create serious confusion among far better-informed historians in the 20th and 21st centuries?[18] Moreover, as has been noted,[19] the argument for a need for clarification at this point in Theophylact's text appears in science more in order to justify the use of *Sclavinia* as a toponym, rather than being caused by objective vagueness in the source, which at this point is clear.[20] It is also problematic if the term *Sclavinia* was appropriate for naming

---

[15] Theophylact employs the following terms for Slavs: 37 times *Barbarians*, 13 times *Slavs*, 3 times *Getty*, 7 times Σκλαυηνῶν πλήθη, 5 times βαρβάρων πλήθε.

[16] A. Gkoutzioukostas, *Sklavenia*, 8.

[17] F. Curta, *Sklaviniai,* 93, 94; Idem, *Theophylact*, 7, explains the absence of the term Avaria with the fact that its territory stretched over the Roman land, so it was ideologically unacceptable to call it a separate country. However, on the one hand, the same should apply to the lands of the Slavs (once Roman Dacia), and on the other – this cannot explain the absence of terms such as Anthia. Later Byzantine authors had no problem using *Bulgaria*. See also A. Gkoutzioukostas, *Sklavenia*, 6, 7.

[18] It is noticeable that, contrary to his insistence that the reason for using *Sclavinia* is obvious from the context, Curta devoted near 4 pages in first two articles to explain such an obviousness (F. Curta, *Sklaviniai,* 90; Idem, *Theophylact,* 3, 8, 9), but in the third article completely changed offered explanation (F. Curta, *Sklavinia in Theophylact Simocatta,* 9 – 12). N. Malinovska, on contrary, estimate Theophylact description as „very vague, lacking the proper territory definition" (N. Malinovská, *Geographical concepts of Sclavinia in historical sources from the sixth to the fourteenth century, with an emphasis on the Moravian-Pannonian and South Slavic traditions*, Slovensko a Chorvátsko. Historické paralalely a vzťahy do roku (1780), Bratislava-Zagreb 2013, 61.

[19] A. Gkoutzioukostas, *Sklavenia*, 7, 8.

[20] It is clear from the text where the Byzantine army passed through the Danube when it came back from the Slavic territory (Palastol), and which places it passed when it decided to return there again (Asim and Kurisk), i.e. the space between the confluence of the River Iskar with the Danube and the city of Nikopol (Simocattae, VIII, 6, $_3$, p. 324, 325). It is the same space in which Peter's first campaign against Piragastos was conducted in 594 (С.А. Иванов, *Феофилакт,* 64,

the area north of the Danube for readers in Constantinople at the moment when this History was written (circa 630–640), a time when the Slavs were already settled in the Balkans.[21]

It is difficult to explain the reason for naming the heterogeneous and territorially undefined space north of the Danube with a unified notion such as *Sclavinia*, when it contradicts the terminology used and the description that Theophylact gave of the Slavic territories. There is nothing united and homogeneous north of the Danube in his description, neither in a political nor in a geographical sense. The territory inhabited by the Slavs was "barbaric territory" (a *barbaric country*, a *barbarian region* – in the singular), and not a "Slavic country", but *Slavic regions* (plural) inhabited by Slavic clans, each region with its own leader (Ardagastos, Piragastos, Musokious), each of them leading his own multitude.[22] They act independently of each other and do not constitute something united except as potential enemies of the empire. In contrast to that unifying element, they also exhibit a different degree of commitment to the Avar khagan – ranging from subordination or alliance to hostility.

In his last answer of this topic Curta presents a new argument – that to move the camp "against *Sclavinia* plethius" could be understood most logically not as "opposing" (as in a battle), but as "opposite" (related to direction), so Petros encamped on the southern bank of the Danube opposite the land of Slavs (*Sclavinia*).[23] Such an explanation will make this information too generalised, because Romans would encamp opposite the land and its people (multitudes) that occupied hundreds kilometres on the northern bank of the Danube. In this way *Sclavinia* could not serve any purpose of clarity. Petros most likely moved his camp to the place on the Danube where Slavic hordes usually crossed the river,[24] so he encamps there against some preparation to cross the river by the Slavic horde or against any such horde which eventually would try to cross onto Roman territory, and he made the camp base for the attacks of the Slavic hordes to the

f. 161), and for which, instead of *Sclavinia,* Theophylact uses only "barbarians" and "a multitude of barbarians".

[21] M. Whitby, *The emperor Maurice and his historian: Theophylact Simocatta of Persian and Balkan Warfare,* Oxford 1988*,* 39, 40, 50, 51.

[22] It is characteristic that in such cases Theophylact associated terms in the singular such as *land* or *region* with the adjective "barbaric" but not with "Slavic" (βαρβάρου γῆς: Simocattae, VI.10, p. 260, $_{18}$, βαρβάρων γῆς (VIII. 6, p. 325, $_{183}$), βάρβαρων χώραν (VI. 11, p. 264, $_{3-4}$). In the only case where he linked a territorial term with the adjective *Slavic*, it is in the plural (τῶν Σκλαυηνῶν χώραις – VIII. 6, p. 324, $_{5-6}$). This area was populated by "Slavic clans" (Σκλαυηνῶν γένη), there are several regions, led by different leaders, each with his own multitude; compare: Πειράγαστος φύλαρχος δὲ οὗτος τῆς πλεθούς ἐκείνης τῶν βαρβαρῶν (VII. 4. p. 227, $_{24}$–228, $_1$), or for attack against τὸν Ἀρδάγαστον διατέμνονται χώραν when Romans killed πλήθη Σκλαυηνῶν (VI, 7, p. 253, $_{5, 18, 19}$).

[23] F. Curta, *Sklavinia in Theophylact Simocatta,* 9 – 12.

[24] С.А. Иванов, *Феофилакт,* 64, f. 161.

north of the Danube. So, understanding this place as taking position against any enemy - the Slavic hordes generally look quite acceptable.

Sclavinia was used to describe the purpose of a Byzantine military campaign, but during the campaign and immediately after it a different terminology was implemented. Immediately after the campaign against τῆς Σκλαυηνίας πληθύος was successfully concluded, the army was commanded not to remain in Sclavinia or even in a Slavic country, but ἐν ταῖς τῶν Σκλαυηνῶν χώραις: there the contradiction between the plural ("Slavic regions") and singular ("Sclavinia") is visible as was mentioned by Curta.[25] The second contradiction is as follows: the army refuses to spend the winter in the "area on other side of Istar (τὴν χώραν τὴν ἀντιπέραν τοῦ Ἴστρου), because the multitudes of barbarians (τὸ πλήθη βαρβάρων) flood it like waves".[26] Again not in Sclavinia and there was not one but many barbarian hordes.

The primary element in all military operations that Theophylact describes is people (Slavs, Getts, Barbarians), not the country they live in.[27] People are mentioned seven times more often than the territory. In such a context, naming the space north of the Danube with the unique term of Sclavinia and the people there as its attribute (multitude of Sclavinia) stands unnaturally and erroneously in Theophylact's vision and terminology. By contrast, the use of Sclavinia as an adjective would fit appropriately: it would be similar to τῶν Σκλαυηνῶν πλήθη and τῶν βαρβάρων πλήθε, which were used for the Slavs on 12 previous occasions.

An additional light may also be cast on this issue by checking of the authors who used the work of Theophylact Simocatta. None of his predecessors or contemporaries use the term Sclavinia, but it appeared that no one took it from him either. Patriarch Nicephorus, who created his history as a continuation of the work of Theophylact, did not use Sclavinia at all.[28] Author of Theophanes Chronography, who in the beginning of the 9th century used Sclavinia five times, and who based his narrative for the time of Emperor Maurice on Theophylact, does not use "Sclavinia" at the point where Theophylact did.[29] Theophanes did

---

[25] F. Curta, Sklaviniai, 92.

[26] Simocattae, VIII, 6, p. 324, 9, 10.

[27] E. Chrysos, Settlements, 126 thinks that even in the places for which Sclavinia was used, "it is obvious that what is meant here is not a geographical or political unit but a group of people, the Slavene crowd." Curta principally agrees with that, but he makes an objection that plethe is not always applied to the army (F. Curta, Theophylact 4), but the alternatives offered by him also apply to the people, not to the land. Compare also A. Gkoutzioukostas, Sklavenia, 3.

[28] Nicephori Patriarchae Constantinopolitani, Breviarum Historicum, C. Mango (ed.), Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantiniae, XIII, Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, 1990, 7; L. Neville, Guide, 72.

[29] Theophanis Chronographia, vol. 1, Textum graecum continens, C. de Boor (ed.), Lipsiae 1883, 284, 6–25. Of course, this may be due to the summary way in which this passage is transmitted,

not use *Sclavinia* in the section based on Theophylact at all and would use it for the first time for the events of 658.

Therefore, we do not have any indications that Theophylact had taken *Sclavinia* from someone else, or that anyone took it from him either![30] This, along with the fact that σκλαυινία had never been used as an adjective in Byzantium, could lead to a third possibility, namely that the word σκλαυινία did not even exist in the original text of Theophylact, but *τῆς Σκλαυηνίας πληθύος* appeared as a result of modification of the original phrase "a multitude of Slavs" performed by one of the copyists in the oldest surviving manuscript from the 10th century from which all survived manuscripts originated.[31] At the beginning of the 10th century Leo the Wise expressed the idea that the Slavs had "their own country" (τῇ ἰδία χώρᾳ) when they lived "across the Danube", but obviously not after moving to the Balkans and maybe such an attitude was reflected in the oldest copy of Theophylact's History.[32]

---

but that does not change the fact: in the section based on Theophylact Theophanes does not use *Sclavinia* at all.

[30] Another sign that nobody borrowed *Sclavinia* from Theophylact is the fundamentally different way in which Byzantine authors later used it. Theophylact would have *Sclavinia* in the singular – an undefined area consisting of several "Slavic regions", each with its own leader. However, in the Byzantine sources it was mainly used in the plural, and in cases when it was singular (Gregory Dekapolites), this refers to a particular Slavic region with its leader, i.e. the same thing that Theophylact Simocatta calls not "Sclavinia", but a *Slavic / barbaric region* or the region of some Slavic leader (as Ardagastos).

[31] As was already suggested (S. Stojkov, *Sclavinia: byzantine invention or western influence?*, 23rd International Congress of Byzantine studies, Belgrade, 24 august, 2016, Retrieved on 11 November 2017, https://www.academia.edu/28093261/THE_TERM_SCLAVINIA_-_BYZANTINE_INVENTION_OR_WESTERN_INFLUENCE, 1, 2). This hypothesis is based on two facts. First, nobody borrowed the term *Sclavinia* from Theophylact. Second, four of the five preserved manuscripts originated from the same manuscript from the mid-10th century Vaticanus Graecus 977 (С.А. Иванов, *Феофилакт* 13, which quoted Schreiner's edition of Theophylact (p. 22, 23). Th. Olajos, Remarques sur la tradition manuscripte de l'Histoire Universelle de Théophylacte Simocatta, *Revue d'Histoire des Textes* 9 (1979), 261, 264 and Neville, Guide, 48 dated this text to the 12th century, but Neville corrected herself on p. 73. There is a real possibility that the term has been added to the oldest manuscript, or even was a product of a simple mistake or modification, which was further transmitted to others. A similar case can be seen with the modification in one of Miracula manuscripts from the 10th century (Vaticanus Graecus 797), where in one place, instead of Σκλαβηνῶν, we find Σκλαβηνιῶν (P. Lemerle, *Miracula* I, 13, 117, p. 130, 134, ₁₄; F. Curta, *Sklaviniai*, 88). We have a time match with the oldest manuscript of the History of Theophylact, both are found at just one place in the texts, in both cases it was used in relation to Slavs who were somehow connected or allied to the Avars and who would have been used for a great attack on Byzantium. This was also the only time when terms *Avars* and *Slavs* were closely associated: ἔθνη Σκλαβήνικα ... καὶ Ἄβαροι ἐκαλοῦντο; Σκλάβοι, οἱ καὶ Ἄβαροι καλούμενοι (Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio* (CFHB 1), G. Moravcsik (ed.), Washington 1967, 29, ₁₇, ₃₃ ₚ. 122) Of course, this is a possibility that cannot be proven or excluded for now.

[32] *The Taktika of Leo VI*, ed. George Dennis, Dumbarton oaks texts 12, Washington 2010, C. 18 & 93, p. 470, ₄₄₃.

The main question here is if the term *Sclavinia* was common in this time, so, the only use of the *word Sclavinia* in Theophylact's work, even if it was a noon, by itself, is not sufficient argument that the term *Sclavinia* was already in common use in the 6th and 7th centuries. Without other examples from 7th – 8th centuries it could be at most an exception that proves the rule.

"Sclavinia" from Theophylact to Theophanes.

We do not find the term *Sclavinia* in any other Byzantine source from the 7th and 8th centuries, including the second collection of Miracula and the history of Patriarch Nicephorus, which speak of Slavs many times. Of course, it is not sufficient proof that the term was not used – preserved sources are few and not all that existed. One possible argument to suggest that the term was in use in the 7th and 8th centuries is that we find it five times in Theophanes Confessor's Chronography, for events in 658, 689/690, 758 and 810.[33] Did the author take the term from his sources and, accordingly, was the term in use from the middle of the 7th century and afterward?[34] Did he instead insert into his narrative one new term used at the time when he was writing (807–815)?[35] If it is the latter, this would lead to the conclusion that *Sclavinia* was not in use in Byzantium in the 7th and 8th centuries.

In resolving this question, it can be helpful to compare Theophanes' Chronography with the history of Patriarch Nicephorus, written at the end of the 8th century and based in general on the same Byzantine sources as Theophanes for the period 668–769.[36] There is no mention of *Sclavinia* in Nicephorus' work. Did the

---

[33] Once for Constans' expedition in 658, twice for the campaign of Justinian II in Thrace and Thessalonica (689/690), once for the campaign of Constantine V in 758/9 and once for the settlement of colonists in the *Sclavinias* by emperor Nicephorus in 810 (Theophanes, 347, $_{6-7}$, 364, $_{5-9, 11-18}$, 430, $_{21-22}$, 486, $_{17-22}$.

[34] С. Антолјак, *Нашише Склавинии*, 121; F. Curta, *Theophylact,* 11, 12.

[35] A. Gkoutzioukostas, *Σκλαυηνία,* 646; N. Malinovská, *Concepts*, 61. For the time when the Chronography was written see: H. Turtledove, *The Chronicle of Theophanes,* Philadelphia 1982, VIII – IX; М. Рајковић, М. Томић (eds. and trs.), *Пашријарх Нишифор*, Византиски извори за историју народа Југославије т. 1 Георгиј Острогорски (ed.), Београд 1955, 217 (810–815); W. Treadgold, *Historians,* 35, 39 (started in 807, and finished between 813–815). For the authorship of the Chronography see: W. Treadgold, *Historians,* 44–49.

[36] С. Mango (ed.), *Nicephori,* 15, 16; Г. Литаврин, *Феофан Исшоведник*, Свод дрвнейших писменьх известий о славянах, т. 2, (VII – IXвв), Г. Литаврин (ed.), Москва 1995, 223; H. Turtledove, *Chronicle*, XV; М. Рајковић, М. Томић *Пашријарх Нишифор*, 239. For the time when Nicephorus' work was written: С. Mango (ed.), *Nicephori,* 8_12 (before 780 г.); Г. Литаврин, *Пашриарх Никифор*, Свод древнейших писменьх известий о славянах, т. 2, (VII–IXвв), Г. Литаврин (ed.), Москва 1995, 222 (between 775–787); H. Turtledove, *Chronicle*, XII, (between 775–797, probably before 787); L. Brubaker, J. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era, c. 680–850. The Sources,* Ashgate, 2000, 171 (probably in 780). The best argued seems to be the opinion of W. Treadgold*, Historians,* 27, 35 "probably soon after 790", "about 791" "but

patriarch, known for his brevity, remove the existing term from his sources or was it Theophanes who added it? Unfortunately, neither of them adhered strictly to their sources, although it seems that in science more trust is given to Nicephorus.[37] In any case, *Sclavinia* was the shortest existing alternative to the commonly-used terms like "Slavic regions", "Slavic country", Slavic nations", "Slavic clans", etc.

In Nicephorus we find only one of four events for which Theophanes used *Sclavinia:* the campaign of Justinian II against *Sclavinia and Bulgaria* in 689/690. Here Theophanes used *Sclavinia* twice, and Nicephorus *Slavs* and *Slavic clans*.[38] A comparison of the two texts shows that the substitution of the term *Sclavinia* could not help to achieve a greater conciseness for Nicephorus – his terminology for Slavs was no shorter than Theophanes' – it was just different.

There are four other common events for both authors connected to Slavs: the founding of the Bulgarian khanat in 681, Tervel's aid for Justinian in 705, the escape of 208 000 Slavs from Bulgaria to Byzantium (763) and the war against Khan Teletzius (763). Theophanes did not use *Sclavinia* there. Nicephorus and Theophanes used respectively: for 681: *Slavic nations*; for 705: *Slavs* (Theophanes) or *nothing* (Nicephorus); for 763: *multitude of Slavs* (Theophanes), *Slavic clans* (Nicephorus); for 763 (Teletzius): Theophanes omitted the word *Slavs* and used "surrounding nations" instead, and Nicephorus spoke about the *multitude of Slavs*. In general, it was the usual terminology for the Slavs in Byzantine sources from the 6th and 7th centuries. There the only exception is Theophanes' *Sclavinia*.

Therefore, in the five events related to Slavs common to both authors, Theophanes used *Sclavinia* only for one, and Nicephorus did not use it at all.

For other cases in which the author of Chronography used *Sclavinia*, he had another sources unknown to Nicephorus. Leaving aside the case of 810, to which he was contemporary, the other two cases are important to us: the campaigns of 658 and 758. Their description is extremely similar, and for the information about 758 is quite possible that it did not exist in the Byzantine sources used by Nicephorus and Theophanes.[39] For these periods in the Chronography, the Syrian

---

certainly before 797", because only his version explains the ending of the history of Nicephorus in 769. See also L. Neville, *Guide*, 73.

[37] W. Treadgold, *Historians*, 9, f. 35 and pages 16, 17, 30; P. Charanis, *Nicephorus I, The savior of Greece from Slavs (810 A.D.)*, Byzantina- Metabyzantina, vol. I, part I, New York, 1946, 82; М. Рајковић, *Теофан,* 217, 218; L. Brubaker, J. Haldon, *Byzantium*, 168, 170, 171; C. Mango (ed.), *Nicephori*, 16), is one of the few to see Theophanes as more accurate and less biased than Nicephorus. In any case, greater accuracy and precision should be expected from a secretary like Nicephorus than from a monk and a former military like Theophanes, or even a patriarchal syncellus like George.

[38] Nicephori, Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani, *Opuscula Historica*, C. de Boor (ed.), Lipsiae 1880, 36, $_{18-20}$; Theophanes, 364, $_{5-9}$.

[39] Constans's campaign in 658 falls in the period for which Nicephorus had no information at all (641–668), but the patriarch knows nothing about the campaign of 758 either. This mysterious

sources were particularly important.[40] Although it was argued that "reference to a campaign against the Slavs in 658 ... seems unlikely to have come from an oriental source"[41] such scepticism is unfounded. This campaign has been noticed in some Syrian sources in a style and content that apparently corresponds to that of Theophanes. For the year 658, Elia Metropolitan of Nisiba announces that: *Eo Constans rex Romanorum regiones Sclavorum ingressus proelium fecit cum rege eorum et vicit eum et cum victoria exiit*.[42] For the great campaign of Constans to the West in the year 658, another Syrian source provides information, mixing it with the departure of the emperor to the west a few years later.[43] The two Syrian chronicles are independent of one another.[44] Besides, it cannot be said that Elia

_____

absence of information about the campaign of 758 in Nicephorus, led Mango to conclude that the information given by Nicephorus for the counter-attack in 756, led by the emperor against the Bulgar invaders in Thrace to the Long Wall, was the same as Theophanes' campaign against the *Sclavinias in Macedonia* in 758/9 (C. Mango (ed.), *Nicephori*, 219 f. 9). However, Nicephorus is very clear that this war was against *Bulgars* not *Slavs*, and it happened in Thrace, not Macedonia. Theophanes puts this Bulgarian invasion under 755/756, and the campaign against the Slavs in 758/759, i.e. 3 years later. Therefore, either the information about the campaign in 758 did not exist in the common sources of Theophanes and Nicephorus or Nicephorus omitted it.

[40] M. Debié, *Theophanes' "Oriental source": what can we learn from Syriac historiography?,* Studies in Theophanes, M. Jankowiak, F. Montinaro (eds.), Travaux et Memoires 19, Paris 2015, 378; C. Mango (ed.), *Nicephori,* 1, 2, 14, 15. For the active exchange between the Byzantine and Syrian authors in the 7th century see A. Palmer, *The Seventh Century in the West-Syrian Chronicles,* Liverpool, 1993, L, LI, 95, 97; L. Brubaker, J. Haldon, *Byzantium,* 169, f. 8; L.I. Conrad, *Theophanes and the Arabic historical tradition: some indications of intercultural transmission,* Byzantinische Forschungen 15, Amsterdam 1990, 1–44. That Theophanes used Syrian sources translated into Greek: H. Turteldove, *Chronicle,* xv. See also W. Treadgold*, Historians*, 41–43; M. Debié, *Oriental source*, 365–382; M. Conternp, *Theophilos, "the more likely candidate"?, Towards a reappraisal of the question of Thephanes' "orlental source(s)"*, Studies in Theophanes, M. Jankowiak, F. Montinaro (eds.), Travaux et Mémoires 19, Paris, 2015, 383–400.

[41] W. Treadgold, *Nikephoros, Patriarch of Constantinople: Short History*, C. Mango (ed. and trans.), review in: *Speculum*, Vol. 67, No. 4, Chicago, Oct., 1992, 1021.

[42] Eliae Metropolitae Nisibensi, *Opus Chronologiqum*, I, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Scriptores Syri, Series III, Tomus VII, L-B. Chabot, I. Guidi, H. Hyvernat (eds.), Romae – Parisis – Lipsiae, 1910, 68.

[43] *Chronicon Anonymum*, Chronika minora, pars 1, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Scriptores Syri, Series Tertia – Tomus IV, ed. I. Guidi, Parisis – Lipsiae, 1903, 55: "*Ipse quidem multum iratus reliquit filium suum Constantinum super solium suum, sumpsit sumpsit imperatricem et universum exercitum Romanorum pugnae capacium, et profectus est ad Sepdestentrionem adversus populos extraeneos*". Attention was paid to this by М. Рајковић, *Теофан*, 221, f 8. These events are presented as a consequence of the execution of the emperor's brother Theodore (which actually happened in 660). The close time and the fact that the trip was in the West with the Emperor visiting Thessaloniki seems to have led to merging both events into one. However, the date 658, identical to that of Elia and Theophanes, shows that this author also knew of the western campaign in 658.

[44] The two Syrian chronicles differ in the order in which the campaign of 658 and the killing of the emperor's brother were given, as well as the interpretation of the murder. While Metropolitan justifies Constans, Anonymous conveys the news, which we find later in Theophanes, that the people hated the emperor and began to call him Cain. Elia does not announce the departure of Constans to the West but is precise when he talks about the purpose of the campaign in 658 (*Slavic regions*), while Anonymous does not mention Slavs at all.

is dependent on Theophanes, but seems to have used the same Syrian source as him.[45] The telegraphic style in which the campaign was described, and which, in fact, had serious consequences,[46] was suitable for writers who wrote far from the Balkans, and contrasts with far more detailed news for the Slavs based on the Byzantine sources we found in Chronography (those for 681, 689, 773, 783, 799). The "eastern connection" is also visible for the campaign of 758, which Theophanes puts in a series of news related to the east.[47]

However, that information in the Chronography for 658 and 758 was based on the eastern sources does not mean that the very term *Sclavinia* was taken from there. In Syriac, the words for the *Slavs* and *Slavic countries* did not differ graphically,[48] which means that the translator had great freedom to use terms such as *Slavs, Slavic countries, Slavic regions*, etc. In the two quoted Syrian sources we find "regions Sclavorum" and "populous extraeneos". Besides, Theophanes used *Sclavinias* for 689 and for his own time – 810, and he could not take these from Syrian chronicles. The term *Sclavinia* is distributed in Theophanes' text in such a way that it appears simultaneously in the news based on the Byzantine sources, on the Syrian sources, but also in news from his own time. And it leads us to the most logical conclusion – the term was put there by author of Chronography, not borrowed from his sources.

This conclusion is supported by the uniform way in which the term is used.[49] The great similarity in the description of the campaigns in 658 and 758 cannot be due to use of a common source, whether it is Eastern or Byzantine. It

---

[45] This can be noticed through the following important difference – Elia mentioned "their king" (of the Slavic regions) in this campaign. But he did not mention a series of other important information about the Slavs that we find in Theophanes, including that in which the term *Sclavinia* was used. That information about Constans' campaign in 658 existed in the Syrian sources before the time of Theophanes is obvious from what we have in Anonymous, which is older than the Chronography (*Chronicon Anonymum*, 13).

[46] See: G. Ostrogorsky, *The Byzantine Empire in the World of the Seventh Century*, DOP, Vol. 13 (1959), 5. The first Byzantine coins after the Slavic settlement found in Macedonia (Valandovo, Prilep) were from the time of Constans and his heirs (И. Миклучиќ, *Средновековни градови и тврдини во Македонија,* Скопје 1996, 32). Coins from Constans were also found in the Morava Valley and Kosovo (И. Бугарски, М Радишић, *Централни Балкан у раном средњем веку: археолошка сведочанства о променама*, Процеси византинизације и српска археологија, В. Бикић (ed.), Београд, 2016, 93).

[47] In the period between the summer of 756 and the summer of 760, if we do not count the campaign against the "Macedonian Sclavinias", Chronography only reports news related to Christians in Syria and Palestine and the Caliphate policy, with even the two Arab campaigns against Byzantium being given from an Eastern perspective.

[48] On the fact that *Sclavinia* and *Slavs* are graphically identical in Syrian, see: Н.И Сериков, *Иоанн Эфесский*, Свод древнейших письменных известий о славянах t. I: (I–VI вв.), Л.А. Гиндин, Г. Литаврин (eds.), Москва 1994, 289, f. 50. Similarly, in Arabian the word *Sakaliba* was used equally for people and for the country: A. Nazmi, *Commercial Relations between Arabs and Slavs (9th–11th centuries),* Warsaw 1998, 74–76.

[49] K.M. Setton, *The Bulgars in the Balkans*, 522, 541, 542, f. 154.

is not known that there was a Byzantine source to cover both dates. Although survived Syrian sources know about the campaign in 658, they did not mention anything about the campaign in 758.[50] The similarity must therefore be a result of editorial processing and style. The way of using *Sclavinia* in Chronography was not chaotic: it only applies to the relations of Byzantium with the Slavs and is not once used for the relations between the Slavs and Bulgaria, the Avar khaganate or the Caliphate. *Sclavinias* are used only for Slavic communities that are objects of subjugation from the empire – they are the goal of campaigns, plundering, tax imposition and colonization. All of it speaks for conscious, editorial use of the term, and not for simply borrowing from his sources, where it could be used in a different sense and context.

The non-use of *Sclavinia* for Slavic communities under Bulgarian rule in the Chronography poses a serious challenge to the thesis that the term *Sclavinia* had previously been in widespread and unofficial use in Byzantium for any of the Slavic communities in the Balkans.[51]

Some other observations lead us to the same conclusion. The term *Sclavinia* contains in itself the idea of a Slavic territory. It was basically equal to terms derived from the names of specific Slavic "nations"(ethne) such as Croatia, Serbia or Verzitia and Subdelitia. However, such terms for the Slavs in the Balkans could not be found in Byzantine historical texts in times before Theophanes. In Miracula many geographic determinants were used to describe where the Slavs were living; but even two generations after the Slavs becoming their neighbours, Thessalonians still did not orient themselves geographically according to the names of the tribes, but rather vice versa, they determined where the tribes were located according to other geographical determinations.[52] The Slavs had "their places" of living, but they did not form recognizable and fixed geographical units in the consciousness and terminology of the Thessalonians.[53]

---

[50] In this light, the idea that the author of the information about 758 was the born in East Georgius Sinkelus, who translated and continued the Theophilus Chronology from 750 to 780, could be considered a good solution (W. Treadgold, *Historians,* 41–45).

[51] I.e. my argument for the non-use of the *Sclavinia* in the 7th–8th centuries essentially differs from that of Chrysos, which proves the same thesis by disclaiming as *metonymy* all cases in Theophanes for the 7th and 8th centuries and accepting only one for 810 (E. Chrysos, *Settlements,* 126, 127). The claim that Theophanes used the term in two different ways does not seem to be sustained. It is much more logical that he implemented one term for the present and the past and with the same meaning in all cases. That the term appears in the time of Theophanes see also A. Gkoutzioukostas, *Σκλαυηνία* 646.

[52] See, for example, "the area of Teba and Dimitriada to the nation of the Velegezites" (P. Lemerle, *Miracula II*, 4, 254, p. 214, $_{11, 12}$), "Barbarians ... from river Strymon" (II, 4, 257, p. 215, $_{13}$); "whole Slavic nation … from Rinhina and from Strymon" (II, 4, 232, p. 209, $_{10,11}$); "Σκλαβίνων ἔθνη... from Strymon and Rinhina" (II, 4, 242, p. 211, $_{15}$); "Σκλαβίνων ἔθνει into northern (regions)" (II, 4, 249, p. 213 $_{11, 12}$).

[53] Usually "τοπος" was used: P. Lemerle, *Miracula II*, 4, 234, 241, 265, pp. 209, $_{28}$, 211, $_{8}$, 217, $_{21, 22}$).

The reason for not using such terms in the 7th–8th centuries cannot be explained as a consequence of imperial ideology which treated territories on the Balkans as Roman by right: Nicephorus had no problem in using "Bulgaria" for khanate and "their lands" for the Slavs under it.[54] However, Nicephorus did not use *Sclavinia* or the toponyms derived from the names of Slavic tribes (we do not have *Severia* or *Septageneia* for example). By contrast, in Theophanes, besides *Sclavinia*, we find toponyms derived from "Slavic nations" such as *Verzitia* and *Velzitia* (Βερζιτίαν, Βελζητίας). Such toponyms were not used in the part common with Nicephorus i.e. before 769, and they appeared for the time afterwards: one under 773/4 (Verzitia) and the other under 799 (Velzitia). It shows that toponyms of the *Sclavinia* type become common terminology in Byzantium later, after the history of Nicephorus was finished, they did not exist in the sources used by Nicephorus and Theophanes, and were inserted into the Chronography, namely by its author.

As argument for use of term *Sclavinia* in Constantinople in the beginning of 8th century was presented *The Life of Willibald*, written in 778, in Bavaria.[55] We find there that when in the 723 the Saint travelled from Italy to the Holy land he passed nearby city of Monemvasia (in Peloponnese) which was in *Slawinia terrae*.[56] Suggestion is that he learn this term in Constantinople. This is rather a circular argument using unprovable presumption that the term *Sclavinia* already existed and was widely popular in Byzantium in the early VIII century to prove the same. According to the *Life* the boat was not byzantine, and it happened 3 or 4 years before the Saint visited Constantinople. Also, in this source the term is not in a Byzantine form – *Sclavinia*, but *Slawinia*. It was also argued that there the word *Slawinia* was used like an adjective and not a noun.[57] This is supported by the fact that *Slawinia* is followed by *terrae* an unusual and not a necessary words combination, even tautology because *Sclavinia* itself includes in some level the idea of *land*.

Therefore, my conclusion is that the term *Sclavinia* did not exist or was not in common use in Byzantium before the end of 8th century.

---

[54] Nicephori, 75, $_{1,2}$ (Σκλαβῶν γένη ... τῆς ἑαυτῶν ... γῆς), 79, $_{10'11}$. Byzantine were very aware that Bulgarian lands are former Romans – as Roman Lakapenos remind Symeon in his letter, probably in 923, Théodore Daphnopatès Correspondance, J. Darrouzès and L.G. Westerink (ed. and trans.), Paris 1976, letter 5. 116-124.

[55] F. Curta, *Sklaviniai*, 86, 87; В.К. Ронин, *Свод древнейших письменых известий о славянах, т. 2, (VII – IXвв),* Москва, 1995, 440.

[56] *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptorum*, v. XV, 1, G. Pertz (ed.), Hanoverae 1887, 93, $_{12,13}$: venerunt ultra mare Adria ad urbem Manafasiam in Slawinia terrae.

[57] J. Koder, *Sklavinien*, in: Lexikon des Mittelalters VII, München 1995, 1988; E. Chrysos, *Settlements*, 130. See debate between Curta and Gkoutzioukostas: F. Curta, *Theophylact*, 203 – 205 with quoted literature; A. Gkoutzioukostas, *"Sklavenia"*, 8, 9; Idem, *Term "Σκλαυηνία"*, 644 – 646, and f. 68 with quoted literature.

Sclavinia as a contemporary term (9th–10th c.)

For the first time *Sclavinia* was definitely used for contemporary written events in 810 (Chronography). Two other sources from the first half of the 9th century also used it for contemporary events. The first was the letter from Michael II to Ludwig the Pious from 10.04.824, which mentioned the participation of *circumiacentibus Sclavinii* in the uprising of Toma the Slav in 823;[58] the second was the Life of Saint Gregory Dekapolites by Ignatios the Deacon, written in 840th.[59] Two other texts known as the *Chronicle of 811* and *Scriptor Incertus de Leone Armenio*, clearly based on eyewitness accounts, mentioned *Sclavinias* under 811 and 814 as Krum allies.[60]

---

[58] Monumenta Germanica Historiae, Legum Sectio III, tomi II, pars II, 2,2, Concilia aevi Karolini [742–842]. Teil 2 [819–842], A. Werminghoff (ed.), Hannoverae at Lipsiae 1908, 2,2, 477, [10, 11.]

[59] F. Dvornik, *La Vie de Saint Gregoire le Decapolite, et les Slaves Macedoniens au IXe siècle*, Paris, 1926, 61, [20]–62, [4] It spoke about a "not small rebellion" led by the *egzarchon* of one *Sclavinia* near Thessalonica in 836. Here Σκλαβηνῶν μερῶν and Σκλαβηνίας were equated to one another. The Life was written after the death of the saint (November 20, 841 or 842) and before 847. In 847/848 one of the two informants of Ignatius dies, and he himself was last recorded alive in 847 (A. Kazhdan, N.P. Ševčenko, *Gregory of Decapolis*, The Oxford dictionary of Byzantium, t. 2, A. Kazhdan (ed.), New York 1991, 880; C. Mango, *On re-reading the life of St. Gregory the Decapolite*, Byzantina, Vol. 13, No. 1, Thesaloniki, 1985, 644, 645; W. Treadgold, *Historians*, 104; L. Brubaker, J. Haldon, *Byzantium*, 211).

[60] H. Gregoire, *Un Nouveau fragment di "Scriptor incertus de Leone Armenio"*, Byzantion, t. XI, Bruxeles, 1963, 423: τὰς πέριξ Σκλαβηνίας was leased from Krum in 811; H. Gregoire, *Les sources epigraphiques de l'histoire bulgare*, Byzantion 9, Bruxelles, 1934, 768: in 814 in Constantinople a rumour was heard that Krum collected an army of πάσας τὰς Σκλαβινίας. Gregoire thought that these are part of common source also used by Theophanes (*Scriptor incertus* 417–419). According to Mango and Treadgold, these seems to be parts of the History of Sergius the Confessor, written between 833 and 835 (C. Mango, *The Two Lives of St. Ioannikios and the Bulgarians*, Harvard Ukrainian Studies Vol. 7, Washington, 1983, 400; W. Treadgold, *Historians*, 92, 95, 96, 97). However, more modern historians do not agree that these are two fragments of same author (see for this L. Neville, *Guide*, 78, 81). Dates for their writing are proposed until the time of Nicephorus Phokas (for discussion in the literature on this topic see: P. Stephenson, *"About the Emperor Nikephoros and How He Leaves His Bones in Bulgaria": A Context for the Controversial "Chronicle of 811"*, DOP, Vol. 60, Washington, 2006, 93–100), but in general early dating dominated. For our research it is sufficient to limit ourselves to the following considerations. Whenever the last editions of these "fragments" were made, they inevitably come from witnesses or contemporaries of the events (L. Brubaker, J. Haldon, *Byzantium*, 179, 180). Then we have no reason to doubt that the term *Sclavinias* existed in the original (or its processing if it was made before 850). On the one hand, circa 850 Byzantine sources ceased to use the term *Sclavinia* until the middle of the 10th century. On the other hand, for the Byzantine authors in the second half of the 9th century there was simply no category "Slavs" in Bulgaria, and the term Slavs was removed even in describing the Bulgarian past. For example, George the Monk removed the word *Slavs* from all of Theophanes' information relating to Bulgaria (Georgii Monachi Chronicon vol. II, C. de Boor (ed.), Lipsiae 1904, 728, [15]–729, [16], 732, [13-18], 775, [11]). According to him no *Slavic archons* but instead τους αρχοντας των Βουλγαρων drank from Nicephorus' skull (Georgii Monachi, 775, [8-11]). This change was related to the process of taking away the "autonomy" of the Slavic communities in Bulgaria in the 820s and thereafter, which makes Sergius the Confessor chronologically the last possible author of these "fragments". It does not seem possible that the *Sclavinias* in Scriptor Incertus were a product of a time after the mid-9th century, and especially

From the middle of the 9th century we notice clear signs that *Sclavinia* falls out of use. George the Monk created a history based mainly on Theophanes and other sources, and completely discarded the word *Sclavinia* from his work.[61] After that we could not find *Sclavinia* in sources that speak widely about the Slavs such as John Kaminiates, Leo the Wise and the Chronicle of Monemvasia.

Abandoned by Byzantine authors between 850 and 950, the term appears again in a few sources in the middle of the 10th century. One (Pseudo-Symeon) simply transmits information from an old text.[62] *Sclavinia* also appeared in one manuscript of the Miracula (*Vaticanus Graecus* 797), and in the oldest manuscript of Theophilact History (*Vaticanus Graecus 977*). Most important is Constantine Porphyrogenitus, who used it many times and mostly for his own time.[63] The only serious difference was the place which it was used for: Dalmatia, instead of the interior of the Balkans.

This was the last actual use of the term in Byzantium.

---

of the time and surroundings of Constantine Porphyrogenitus – the last author who often uses the term *Sclavinia* for entities on the borders of Byzantium. For him, too, there were no Slavs in Bulgaria, and even more so because for him *Avars* and *Slavs,* as already was noticed, are the same category, not different as in Scriptor Incertus. Compare: ἔθνη Σκλαβήνικα ... καὶ Ἄβαροι ἐκαλοῦντο; Σκλάβοι, οἱ καὶ Ἄβαροι καλούμενοι (Porphyrogenitus, 29, $_{17,33}$ p. 122) with Ἀβάρους καὶ τὰς πέριξ Σκλαβηνίας, Ἀβάρεις καὶ πάσας τὰς Σκλαβινίας into "fragments". This practically identical way of using the *Sclavinias* in both "fragments" ("Avars and the surrounding *Sclavinias*", "Avars and all *Sclavinias*"), which is different from that of Theophanes (*Sclavinias* in Scriptor Incertus is a term related to Bulgaria, and in Theophanes only to Byzantium) suggests that even if they were not parts of the same text, they are at least derived from a common primary source. See more on this topic in: R. Browning, *Notes on the "Scriptor Incertus de Leone Armenio"*, Byzantion Vol. 35, No. 2, Bruxelles, 1965, 389–411; A. Markopoulos, *La Chronique de l'an 811 et le Scriptor incertus de Leone Armenio: problèmes des relations entre l'hagiographie et l'histoire*, Revue des études byzantines, 57, Paris, 1999, 255–262; J. Wortley, *Legends of the byzantine disaster of 811*, *Byzantion* Vol. 50, No. 2, Bruxelles, 1980, 533–562.

[61] Compare description of the campaign of Justinian II, which was against *the Slavs* and *the Slavic clans* (Nicephorus), or against *Sclavinia* (Theophanes), but according to Georg the Monk Justinian "headed for a trip to the western regions, conquered the *great multitudes (plethe) of Slavs*" (Georgii Monachi, 729, $_{18}$–730, $_{4}$) For the time his History was written, see: L. Neville, *Guide*, 87 (first version written in 846/ 847); L. Brubaker, J. Haldon, *Byzantium*, 172 (probably before 867) and W. Treadgold, *Historians*, 115, 116 ("after 867 but before 882" "and most probably between 870–875").

[62] Symeonis Magistri, *Annales*, 617, $_{10–13}$.

[63] De administrando, 9, $_{107–110}$, 29, $_{68}$, 30, $_{94, 95}$ pp. 62, 124, 144.

End of the term Sclavinia

We do not find the term *Sclavinia* in 11th century sources. In addition, the term Slavs was rapidly exiting from the sources in the 10th and the 11th centuries.[64] Still the term *Slavs* will appear again in the 12th century.[65] The same will happen with the term *Sclavinia*, which we find in George Kedrenus, the Lexicon of Zonara and the Ethimologia Magna.[66] It is the last return of these terms before their final disappearance from the Byzantine sources.

Kedrenus borrowed the term *Sclavinias* from the sources he used (Pseudo-Simeon).[67] This example shows us that *Sclavinia* could still be used as a term for the past and we can put it in context with the reactivation of the term Slavs at the same time.

In the Lexicon of Zonara *Sclavinia* was explained by another term – *Bulgaria*, which at the time meant only the dioceses of the Ohrid Archbishopric.[68] At this time, this archbishopric was the only institution in Byzantium in which the Old Slavonic language was in use. This, together with the insistence of the

---

[64] E. Mühle, *Die Slaven im Mittelalter*, Berlin/Boston, 2016, 13, 14.

[65] Anna Comnena speaks about δύο βαρβάρων Σθλαβογενῶν and renders μεγάλην Πρισθλάβαν as a mixed name, partly ἀπὸ τῶν Σθλαβογενῶν (Annae Comnenae, *Alexias*, vol. I, R. Diether, A. Kambylis (ed.), Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae XL/1, Berlin, 2001, p. 55, II, 3, 1, $_{20, 21}$; p. 210, VII, 3, 4, $_{25, 26}$). Nicephorus Bryenius wrote that "the ethnos of the Slavs rejected Roman rule and desolated and plundered Bulgaria" (Nicephori Bryennii, Historiae libri quattuor, Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae IX, ed. Pail Gautier, Brussel, 1975, p. 213, III, 3, $_{15-18}$). Michael from Thessaloniki wrote about του παριστρίου Σθλαβίνου και του ὁμόρου Πάννονος, του Σθλαβίνου, τη τών Σθλαβίνων πολύς (W. Regel, N. Novossadsky, *Fontes rerum byzantinarum* I, Rhetorum saeculi XII, orations politicae, Petropoli, 1892, 174, $_{18, 22, 23}$, 175, $_4$). Later Choniat will call Dalmatia τῶν Σκλαβίνων ... χώρας (Nicetae Choniatae Historia, I Bekker (ed.), Bonnae 1835, 224, $_{24}$). In some of these cases the notion is obviously an ethnic one, but in others it is disputed, and it is possible that the term also appeared as an archaism.

[66] Iohannis Zonarae, *Lexicon*, tommus posterior, ed. Tittmann, Iohannes, Lipsiae, 1808, col. 1653; *Etymologicon magnum,* ed. Friderici Sylburgii, Lipsiae, 1816, 225, $_{48}$; Georgius Cedrenus *Compendium Historiarum*, I [CSHB 8], E. Bekker (ed.), Bonnae, 1838, 771, $_{23}$–772, $_1$.

[67] For sources of Kedrenus see: L. Neville, *Guide*, 162; A. Kazhdan, *Kedrenos*, ODB, II, 1118.

[68] Zonarae Lexicon, col. 1653: Σκλαβινία, ἡ Βουλγαρία. Г. Литаврин, *Славинии* 201, incorrectly connects *Bulgaria* in this place with the former Bulgarian state, which was never referred to as a *Sclavinia* in the Byzantine sources or labelled as a Slavic country before and at the time the Lexicon was written it had not existed for a long time to serve as an explanatory term (see С. Стојков, *„Ѩзыкъ словѣнскый" во старословенските текстови (IX – XIV век),* Историја 50-51/1 (2015/2016), 131, 132; as an example of treating Bulgaria as *Sclavinia* in historiography see: T. Vedriš, *Balkanske sklavinije i Bugarska, Nikolić Jakus Zrinka, Nova zraka u europskom svjetlu*, Hrvatske zemlje u ranome srednjem vijeku (oko 550 – oko 1150), Povijest Hrvata, sv. 1, Zagreb, 2015, 582–584. Πανονία, ἡ Βουλγαρία in the Lexicon (Col. 1507) also suport identifucation of this Bulgaria with Ohrid Archbishopry: the main city of Panonia – Sirmium in the 12th century was a bishop's see in the Ohrid diocese. For the use of the term *Bulgarians* in this period, see П. Коматина, *Појам Бугарске у XI и XII веку и територија Охридске Архиепископије,* Охридска архиепископија у византијском свету, Византијски свет на Балкану, Београд, 2012, 41–56.

"archbishops of whole Bulgaria" on finding the apostolic foundations of their church through the expropriation of the Slavic mission of St. Cyril and Methodius led some Byzantine authors to simply equate these terms *Slavs* and *Bulgarians*.[69]

The Etymologicum Magnum, a text characterized by "freely abbreviated, transposed and modified" information, mentioned *Sclavinias* once in an article that explains the word *beard* (Γένειον).[70] The text is confusing enough, but one thing is beyond doubt: the ethnic meaning of the word *Slavs*, as well as the former meaning of the term *Sclavinia*, have been forgotten. They were given in small letters (τὰς σκλαβηνίας, οἱ σκλάβοι unlike other ethnonyms in the article: Λογγίβαρδοι, Ῥωμαίοι) and were connected with the emergence of the name *Langobardoi*. It is even possible that here *Slavs* and *Sclavinia* meant *slaves* and *slavery*.[71] That could mean that this example is one of the new and relatively rare practice for 12th-century Byzantium of using the word *Slav* in the sense of a *slave*.[72]

These last three cases relate closely to the three ways in which the term Slavs was interpreted in the 12th century. The first is as an archaism (Kedrenus). The other two try to connect it with some new realities and meanings: one with the Ohrid Archbishopric, and the other probably with the meaning *slavery*. None of them used it with its former meaning or for their own time.

* * *

---

[69] See for example: Theophylact of Ohrid in the Life of Saint Clement of Ohrid: τῶν Σθλαβενῶν γένος εἴτουν Βουλγάρων (А. Милев, *Гръцкиⷮе жиⷮия на Клименⷮ Охриⷣски,* София, 1966, 81), or in the Life of Saint George Hagioritus: Bulgares que l'on appelle Slaves (B. Martin-Hisard, *La Vie de Georges l'Hagiorite (1009/1010-29 juin 1065), Introduction, traduction du texte géorgien, notes et éclaircissements,* Revue des études byzantines, Paris, 2006 64-65, p. 63, 139, ₇₉₀). This phenomenon was purely Byzantine, and there was no parallel in the Slavic sources until the 13th–14th centuries, when it appeared under Byzantine influence (С. Стојков, *Свеⷮи Клименⷮ како „наш" и каков*?, Меѓународна научна конференција Климентовото дело, Д. Кузмановска, С. Петровска (eds.), Штип 2016, 13–16; С. Стојков, Свети Климент од епископа словѣнска до ἐπισκόπου Βουλγαριας, трансформација во разбирањето на категориите Словени и Бугари во византиските извори, Милениумското зрачење на Св. Климент Охридски, Скопје, 28 – 29 октомври 2016 година, МАНУ, Скопје, 2018, 219 – 238).

[70] R.B., *Etymologica*, The Oxford dictionary of Byzantium, t. 2, ed. A. Kazhdan. New York 1991, 735.

[71] *Etymologicon magnum*, 225, ₄₈.

[72] This meaning is first found in Byzantium in the late 11th century, from South Italy and Sicily where it first appeared in Latin and Arabic texts (H. Köpstein, *Zum Bedeutungswandel von Σκλάβος / Sclavus*, Byzantiniscshe Forschungen, VII. (1979), 67, 71, 72, 76, 77, 83–85, 87; Д.Е. Мишин, Сакалиба, Славяне в исламском мире. Москва 2002, 13, 20). In the 12th century Byzantine sources it is not always possible to distinguish whether the word Slavs was used as an ethnonym or meaning a "slave" (compare: Tzetzae, 93 (ed. T. Pressel, *Ioannis Tzetzae, Epistolae*, Tubingae 1851); А. Каждан, *Анноⷮация: Joannis Tzetzae Historiae*, ed. P. A. M. Leone, Napoli 1968, Византийски временик, т. 34, Москва, 1973, 289.

Therefore, the chronology of use of the term *Sclavinia* in Byzantine sources should be changed. It seems that it was not used (or at least - not in noticeable way) there from 6th, to the end of 8th century, from the middle of 9th to the middle of 10th, in 11th, and in 13th – 15th century. The term *Sclavinia* in Byzantium had its actual use and for contemporary events in two short periods between the end of 8th – the middle of 9th century (predominantly for Macedonia) and in the middle of 10th – for Dalmatia. The term reappeared in 12th in the way which demonstrated that *Sclavinia* had already lost its usual meaning and use.

Стојко Стојков

ПОИМОТ СКЛАВИНИЈА ВО ВИЗАНТИСКИТЕ ИЗВОРИ: ПРЕИСПИТУВАЊЕ НА ХРОНОЛОШКАТА РАМКА

Резиме

Ова статија е посветена на хронологијата на употреба на поимот Склавинија во византиските извори – тема која стана актуелна повторно во последната декада. Традиционалната хронологија го идентификува поимот со постоењето словенски територии и племиња и како таков го врзува со самиот почеток на појавата на Словените на византиските граници. Меѓутоа единствениот автор кај кој го наоѓаме пред почетокот на 9 век е Теофилакт Симоката и тоа само еднаш. По прашањето дали тој го користи како придавка или именка се разви детална дебата без да се постигне консензус. И двете интерпретации имаат како своја слабост тоа што би била во прашање уникатна употреба – единствена употреба на Склавинија како придавка воопшто, или единствена употреба како именка кај Теофилакт. Во првиот дел се анализираат понудените аргументи, како тоа дека авторот го употребил овој поим со цел избегнување монотонија, како појаснување и сл., покажувајќи ја нивната неоснованост. Како алтернатива е понудена можноста поимот воопшто да не постоел во оригиналниот текст, туку да е продукт на модификација извршена во најстариот манускрипт во 10 в. од кој сите други потекнуваат. Во секој случај еднократната употреба на зборот Склавинија од страна на Теофилакт не може да служи како доказ дека истиот бил во некоја редовна употреба, туку најмногу да биде исклучок што го потврдува правилото. Никој друг познат извор во VI, VII и VIII век не го употребува овој поим и нема знаци дека некој го има земено од кај Теофилакт исто.

Второто главно прашање кое се разгледува овде е поимот Склавинија во Теофановата Хронографија. Истиот е разгледан од аспект дали авторот го зел од изворите што ги користел, или самиот го додал во своето истражување. Одговор на тоа прашање е побаран преку споредба со Кратката историја на патријархот Никифор базиран врз истите византиски извори за периодот 668 – 769, споредба со сириските хроники како евентуален извор на две од информациите во кои го наоѓаме поимот Склавинија кај Теофан, како и внатрешна анализа на самиот текст –начинот на кој се употребува кај него Склавинија и слични поими. Сите заклучоци водат во ист правец – поимот

Склавинија не постоел во користените извори туку е внесен во текстот од авторот на Хронографијата. Даден е и краток коментар на хипотезата дека Склавинија во ова дело е метонимија во сите случаи освен во еден – последниот.

Третиот дел е посветен на употребата на поимот како актуелен и современ. Првиот таков случај е имено во Хронографијата на Теофан и се однесува на 810 г. – времето на нејзиното пишување. Следат уште два – писмо на василевсот Михаил II до императорот Лудовик Благочестивиот од 823 г. и во Житието ан св. Григориј Декаполит напишано во 840-те г. Во нивниот број би требало да се вклучат уште два други примери кои се однесуваат на настани од 811 и 814 - во така наречениот Скриптор инцертус и Анонимната хроника, кои се базирани на сведоштва на учесници во настаните.

Поимот го снемува од византиските извори во периодот 850 – 950 г. за да се појави повторно во неколку извори во средината на X век. Некои од нив го користат едноставно повторувајќи стари извори (Псевдо-Симеон), други пак го вметнуваат во стари извори во кои не постоел (еден ракопис на Чудата на св. Димитрија Солунски (Vaticanus Graecus 797), а можеби ист е случајот и со најстариот ракопис на Теофилактовата историја (Vaticanus Graecus 977). Далеку поважен од нив е Константин Порфирогенит кој употребува Склавинија повеќе пати за современи и минати настани во De Administrando imperio. Единствената разлика е местото за кое се употребува – наместо Македонија и генерално Јужниот Балкан како е кај постарите извори, сега се употребува за просторот на некогашната провинција Далмација и за таму населените словенски племиња. Тоа е последната актуелна употреба на поимот за современи настани.

Поимот Склавинија се појавува во уште три византиски извори од 12 век но веќе со сменета смисла или само како анахронизам. Како анахронизам го наоѓаме кај Ѓорѓи Кедрен кој едноставно го копира Псевдо-Симеон. Во Лексиконот на Зонара се прави обид да се актуелизира поимот давајќи му сосема ново толкување кое го поврзува со современа реалност - со поимот Бугарија, односно територијата на Охридската архиепископија. Третиот - Етимологија Магна, покажува дека поимот целосно ја има изгубено својата оригинална смисла и се користи во статијата која го објаснува зборот „брада", можеби поврзувајќи го со зборот „роб". Последните два примери јасно покажуваат дека поимот ја има изгубено својата смисла во тоа време. Тоа се и последните примери на негова употреба во византиските извори.

Базирајќи се на направената анализа се доаѓа до заклучок дека поимот Склавинија бил во актуелна употреба во Византија во првата половина на XIX век за Јужниот дел на Балканот, а во средината на следниот век – за Далмација, но не и надвор од посочените периоди.