

ГЛАСНИК



Главен и одговорен уредник: проф. Д-р Драги Ѓоргиев, директор на ИНИ
Главен редактор на изданието: проф. д-р Владимир Јанев
Редакција: проф. д-р Македонка Митрова, проф. д-р Катерина Мирчевска
проф. д-р Драган Зајковски, проф. д-р Силвана Сидоровска - Чуповска
проф. д-р Ленина Жила, проф. д-р Лариса Вакнина (Украина),
проф. д-р Хуснија Камберовиќ (Босна и Херцеговина),
проф. д-р Марија Проскурнина (Русија),
проф. д-р Ирена Ставови-Кафка (Полска), проф. д-р Филип Шашко (САД)
Секретар: проф. д-р Лидија Ѓурковска
Лектор: Лилјана Гушевска
Ракописите се примаат во печатена и во електронска форма на адреса:
Институт за национална историја (За редакцијата на „Гласник“)
ул. Григор Прличев бр. 3, п.ф. 591, 1000 Скопје, Република Македонија;
contact@ini.ukim.mk
Излегува двапати годишно
Компјутерска подготовка: Европа 92 - Кочани
Печат: Европа 92 - Кочани
Тираж: 250 примероци

Editor-in-Chief: Prof. Dragi Ćorgiev Ph.D., Director of the INH
Editor-in-Chief for this edition: Prof. Vladimir Janev, PhD
Editorial Board: Prof. Makedonka Mitrova Ph.D., Prof. Katerina Mircevska Ph.D.
Prof. Dragan Zajkovski PhD, prof. Silvana Sidorovska - Cupovska PhD.
Prof. Lenina Zila PhD, Prof. Larisa Vaknina (Ukraine) Ph.D.,
Prof. Husnija Kamberović Ph.D. (Bosnia and Herzegovina),
Prof. Marija Proskurnina Ph.D. (Russia),
Prof. Irena Stawowy-Kawka Ph.D. (Poland), Prof. Filip Šaško Ph.D. (USA)
Secretary: Prof. Lidija Gjurkovska Ph.D.
Proofreading: Liljana Gusevska
Manuscripts in printed and electronic form to be sent to: Institute of National History
(Editorial Board of „Glasnik“), Str. Grigor Prličev 3, P.O.Box 591, 1000 Skopje,
Republic of Macedonia; contact@ini.ukim.mk
Printed twice a year
Typesetting and layout: Evropa 92 – Kočani
Printing: Evropa 92 – Kočani
Printed copies: 250

УДК 93/99

ISSN 0583-4961

ИНСТИТУТ ЗА НАЦИОНАЛНА ИСТОРИЈА

ГЛАСНИК

СОДРЖИНА – TABLE OF CONTENTS

СТАТИИ - ARTICLES

<i>Стефан Пановски, Војислав Саракински: За совладетелството на Деметриј II.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Stefan Panovski, Vojislav Sarakinski: On the Co-regency of Demetrius II.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Елвира Речица: Улпијана – центар за економија и рударство.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Elvira Rečica: Ulpiana-Center of Economy and Mining.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Stojko Stojkov: Some Observations on the Appearance and Use of the Term Sclavinia in the Middle Ages.....</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>Стојко Стојков: Некои забелешки за појавата и за употребата на поимот Склавинија во средниот век.....</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>Драган Ѓалевски: Структурата и воениот капацитет на Самоиловата армија.....</i>	<i>59</i>
<i>Dragan Gjalevski: Structure and Military Capacity of Samuel's Army.....</i>	<i>59</i>
<i>Јасмина Шаранац Стаменковиќ, Ирена Љубомировиќ: Енкомионите од Михаил Псел посветени на августата Евдокија Макремволитиса.....</i>	<i>75</i>
<i>Jasmina Šaranac Stamenković, Irena Ljubomirović: The Encomiums by Psellos Dedicated to the Augusta Eudokia Makrembolitissa.....</i>	<i>75</i>
<i>Виктор Недески: Архиепископот Генadiј Охридски: Нови моменти од неговата биографија.....</i>	<i>91</i>
<i>Viktor Nedeski: Archbishop Gennady of Ohrid: New Moments From his Biography.....</i>	<i>91</i>
<i>Владимир Јанев: Еврејската економска активност во македонските градови во XIX век како форма на трансфер на знаење.....</i>	<i>103</i>
<i>Vladimir Janev: Jewish Economic Activity in Macedonian Cities in the 19th Century as a Form of a Knowledge Transfer.....</i>	<i>103</i>
<i>Силвана Сидоровска – Чуповска: Српската дипломатија и случајот со црквата „Св. Никола“ во Куманово од 1898 година.....</i>	<i>113</i>
<i>Silvana Sidorovska – Čupovska: Serbian Diplomacy and Case with St.Nikola Church in Kumanovo in 1898.....</i>	<i>113</i>

<i>Исамедин Азизи: Делегацијата на Кралството СХС на Париската мировна конференција и албанското прашање</i>	127
<i>Isamedin Azizi: SKS Kingdom Delegation at the Conference of Paris and the Albanian Issue</i>	127
<i>Александар Манојловски: Битолските Евреи низ фотообјективот на браќата Јанаки и Милтон Манаки</i>	141
<i>Aleksandar Manojlovski: Bitola Jews Through the Photo Lens of the Brothers Manaki</i>	141
<i>Салим Кадри Ќерим: По повод 66-годишнината од масовното иселување на турското население од НР Македонија во Република Турција</i>	163
<i>Salim Kadri Kerim: On the Occasion of the 66th Anniversary of the Mass Emigration of the Turkish Population From PR Macedonia to the Republic of Turkey</i>	163

МАТЕРИЈАЛИ - PAPERS

<i>Александар Трајановски: Милостива грамота од Ватопедскиот манастир до руските цареви Јоан и Пјотр Алексеевич Романови од 1682 година</i>	175
<i>Aleksandar Trajanovski: Merciful Decree from the Vatopedi Monastery to the Russian kings Ivan V and Peter I Alekseyevich Romanov From 1682</i>	175
<i>Јетон Доко: Два италијански документи за иселувањето на Албанците од Македонија од 1932 и од 1935 година</i>	187
<i>Jeton Doko: Two Italian Documents for the Eviction of Albanians From Macedonia From 1932 and 1935</i>	187

ПРИКАЗИ – РЕЦЕНЗИИ – СООПШТЕНИЈА REVIEWS – SURVEYS – ANNOUNCEMENTS

<i>Марија Пандевска: Македонка Митрова, Дискурсот на српската интелектуална елита за османлиска Македонија, Институт за национална историја, Скопје 2017</i>	193
<i>Maria Pandevska: Makedonka Mitrova, Ottoman Macedonia in the Discourse of the Serbian Intellectual Elite, Institute of National History, Skopje 2017</i>	193
<i>Фатима Салифоска: Македонија на годишната генерална дебата на Генералното собрание на Обединетите нации (1993 – 2018), Институт за јавни политики, Скопје 2018</i>	195
<i>Fatima Salifoska: Macedonia at the Annual General Debate of the United Nations General Assembly (1993-2018), Institute for Public Policy, Skopje 2018</i>	195

- Драган Зајковски: Ангел Николов, *Меѓу Рим и Константинопол. Од антикатоличката литература во Бугарија и во словенскиот православен свет (XI – XVIIIв.)*, Фондација – Бугарско историско наследство, Софија 2016..... 197
- Драган Зајковски: Ангел Николов, *Между Рими Константинопол. Из антикатолическата литература в България и славянския православен свят (XI–XVII в.)*, Фондация – Българско историческо наследство, София 2016197
- Драги Ѓоргиев: *Романски дипломатски документи за Македонија (1880-1900)*, том I, превод и редакција Благој Зашов, Државен архив на Република Македонија, Скопје 2018..... 200
- Dragi Gjorgiev: *Romanian Diplomatic Documents for Macedonia (1880-1900)*, Volume I, Translation and Editing Blagoj Zashov, State Archive of the Republic of Macedonia, Skopje 2018. 200
- Невен Радически: Катерина Мирчевска, Љубица Јанчева, *Македонскиот феникс: Документи за обновата и изградбата на Скопје по земјотресот од 1963 година*, Институт за Национална Историја, Скопје 2018..... 204
- Neven Radiceski: Katerina Mircevska, Ljubica Janceva, *The Macedonian Phoenix: Documents for Reconstruction and Construction of Skopje after the 1963 Earthquake*..... 204
- Александар Трајановски: Ѓорѓија Сајкоски, *Кичево и Кичевско 1893 – 1904*, Сојуз на историчарите на Република Македонија, Скопје 2017..... 206
- Aleksandar Trajanovski: Gjorgjija Sajkoski, *Kicevo and Kicevsko 1893 –1904*, Association of the Historians of the Republic of Macedonia, Skopje 2017.....206
- Катерина Младеновска: Вера Битракова Грозданова, *Лихнид и Десаретија*, Македонска академија на науките и уметностите / Книгоиздателство „Матица македонска“, Скопје 2017.....211
- Katerina Mladenovska: Vera Bitrakova Grozdanova, *Lychnidos et Dassaretie*, Académie Macédonienne des sciences et des arts / Linraire “Matica makedonska”, Skopje 2017211
- Antonio Nedelkovski: Ian Worthington, *Ptolemy I: King and Pharaoh of Egypt*, Printed by Sheridan Books, Inc., United States of America, New York: Oxford University Press, 2016 213
- Антонио Неделковски: Јан Вортингтон, *Птолемај I: Крал и фараон на Египет*, објавено од „Шеридан букс“, Соединети Американски Држави, Њујорк: Оксфорд јуниверзити прес, 2016..... 213

<i>Драган Ѓалевски: Драган Зајковски: Христијанството во Македонија: седум слова за почетоките и етаблирањето, Институт за национална историја, Скопје, 2018.</i>	216
<i>Dragan Gjalevski: Dragan Zajkovski: Christianity in Macedonia: Seven Letters for Beginnings and for the Establishment, Institut for National History, Skopje, 2018.</i>	216
<i>Неџад Мехмедовиќ: Меѓународна тркалезна маса Кодове на времето-историческа памет по повод 75-годишнината од раѓањето на доц. Катерина Венедикова (Софија, 26 април 2018 година)</i>	219
<i>Nezat Mehmedovik: International Round Table Codes of the Time-the Historic Memory of the Letters on the Occasion of the 75 Anniversary of the Birth of Doc.Katerina Venedikova (Sofia, 26 april 2018).</i>	219

INMEMORIAM

<i>Драги Ѓорѓиев: Блаже Ристовски (1931 – 2018)</i>	221
<i>Dragi Gjorgiev: Blaze Ristovski (1931 –2018)</i>	221

СТАТИИ

УДК: 94"653"(093)

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE APPEARANCE AND USE OF
THE TERM SCLAVINIA IN THE MIDDLE AGES*Stojko Stojkov*

associate professor of medieval and byzantine studies in the Institute of History and
Archaeology at the Goce Delcev University, Stip, Republic of Macedonia

Abstract

This article attempts to shed light on the emergence of *Sclavinia* as a term in the medieval sources. In the old Slavic written tradition *Sclavinia* never appeared, which shows that it was an external name. In majority of cases, *Sclavinia* was a term used by imperial elites and on courts in Byzantium and in the West. It seems to have appeared simultaneously in the East and in the West in 780th when many Slavic tribes were included in the Frankish and Byzantine sphere of influence and dominance. Despite some differences, in general the term was used in the same way in Byzantium and in the West: for Slavic entities put in the process of subjugation to the empires. The reason for this similarity could be found in intentionally followed imperial examples and terminology in the West.

Sclavinia was the official “imperial” border-zone term, for the area between the Slavic word and Christian empires, and was bound with the existence of these contact zones. It was not usually used for the territory deeply behind these borders, for non-imperial Slavic neighbours or for independent powerful Slavic states. As a term, *Sclavinia* lost its relevance with the disappearance of the small Slavic formations in imperial border zones, when they were assimilated into empires or evolved into larger independent state formations established under their own well-known names.

Created from the demonym in a way very common in the Middle Ages, *Sclavinia* was still relatively rarely used. Although a suitable collective term, its weakness was its too general and uncertain meaning. In the West it was used far more and longer than in Byzantium, and there it could be found outside of the imperial court, which was not the case in the Eastern empire. It was used with some differences – only in singular in the West, and usually in plural in Constantinople.

Keywords: Sclavinia, term, border zone, Byzantine, West, East, ethnonym, sources, middle age, Christian empires.

This article attempts to shed some light on emergence and spreading of *Sclavinia* in Middle ages. This term is well known in historiography,¹ and in last decade become focus of special debates.² However, the goal is not to investigate the concept of *Land of Slavs*, neither synonymic words in other medieval languages like *Slovyanskaya zemlya*, *Dar as-sakaliba* and ctr.,³ but it is strictly about the term *Sclavinia*. The reason to avoid these possible aspects of meanings of term *Sclavinia* is that there are some differences between them – every *Sclavinia* was a land inhabited by Slavs, but not every *Slavic land* is called *Sclavinia*.

Sclavinia appeared mostly in Latin sources, and there it has more forms than in Byzantium, where we find only one form, although it was written differently.⁴ Based

¹ Peter Charanis, Observations on the History of Greece During the Early Middle Ages, *Balkan Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 1, (1970), 11–14; Геннадий Литаврин, Славинии VII–IX вв. Социально-политические организации славян, Этногенез народов Балкан и Северного Причерноморья, ed. Л. А. Гиндин. Москва 1984, 193–203; Omeljak Pritsak, *Sklavinia*, *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, Vol. 3, ed. Aleksander Kazhdan. Oxford – New York 1991, 1910–1911.

² Curta, *The Making of the Slavs*, 112; Evangelos Chrysos, Settlements of Slavs and Byzantine sovereignty in the Balkans”, *Byzantina Mediterranea. Festschrift für Johannes Koder zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. K. Belke, E. Kislinger, A. Külzer and Maria Stassinopoulou, Vienna 2007, 123 – 135; Florin Curta, *Sklaviniai and Ethnic Adjectives: A Clarification*, *Byzantion Nea Hellás*, 30 / 2011, 85 – 98; Andreas Gkoutzioukostas, 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; Florin Curta, Theophylact Simocatta revisited. A response to Andreas Gkoutzioukostas, *Byzantion Nea Hellás*, 35 / 2016, 195–209; Andreas Gkoutzioukostas, “Sklavenia” (“Σκλαυινία”) revisited: previous and recent considerations, Παρεκβολαι, An electronic journal for Byzantine literature, 7 / 2017, 1 – 12; Florin Curta, *Sklavinia in Theophylact Simocatta*, (hopefully) for the last time, *Porphyra*, v. 27, anno XV, 2018, 5 – 15. This discussion focused more on the use of the term *Sclavinia* in Theophylakt Simokata and in the Life of Willibald. Three articles by Nora Malinovská appeared independently: Nora Malinovská (Verešová), 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 paralely a vzťahy do roku (1780)*, Bratislava/Zagreb, 2013, 60 – 65; Nora Malinovská, The Development of the Concept of *Sclavinia* in the 12th Century and its Reflexion in the Polish Chronicle of Gallus Anonymus, *Nové historické rozhlady*, roč. 5, 1 / 2015, 43 – 53 (Text is used from <https://uniba.academia.edu/NoraMalinovska> and quoted numbers of pages are according this document: 1 – 12); Н. Малиновска, «Regnum Sclavorum» Святополка как источник средневековых славянских концепций «склавинии», *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Petropolitana*, № 1 (21). Январь—Июнь (2017), 21–38, as well as one my presentation at the last Byzantine Congress in Belgrade (Stojko 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, 1–5).

³ Malinovská, Concepts, 60–65.

⁴ Σκλαβηνια, Σκλαυινια in byzantine Greek. In Latin: *Sclavinia*, *Sclavania*, *Sclavenia*, *Slawinia*, *Slavia*, *Sclauia* (Gjula Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, v. II, Berlin, 1983, 278; Pritsak, *Sklavinia*, 1910–1911; Paul Bradford, *The early Slavs*, New York, 2001, 28), and also synonyms as *Wenedonia*, *Windia*.

on its form, it is a toponym derived from an ethnonym (demonym) of the same type as *Scythia*, *Germania*, *Arabia*, *Sarmatia*, etc.⁵ Such types of terms could have been created easily, but a toponym was not derived from every ethnonym (for example, there is no Avaria in the West or Anthia in the East).⁶ The term *Sclavinia* was not used consistently and not for all Slavic regions. We find it in quite a small portion of the Byzantine and Latin medieval sources. Even in these sources, it is usually used only once. Thus, *Sclavinia* was a term that could be easily constructed, but despite this, it was very rarely used. One consequence of this observation is that we cannot be always sure what an exact meaning put a concrete medieval author into *Sclavinia*. The existence of a territory inhabited or ruled by the Slavs does not mean that it will be called *Sclavinia*. On the contrary, in most cases that was not done. The terms *Sclavinia*, and *Slavic land* had the weaknesses of the term *Slavs* itself – there are too much generalisation in them, so the authors sometimes feel the need to explain: “in partibus Sclavaniae, quorum vocabulum est Wiltze”.⁷

Sclavinia in historiography

Using as a starting point the fact that not all territories inhabited by Slavs were called *Sclavinia* in the sources, some historians concluded that it had to be the name of one or more geographical regions named after its population. Several attempts have been made to locate such a region: in the north of the Danube during the 6th–7th centuries, in Macedonia in the 7th–9th centuries, or in Dalmatia.⁸ This line of

⁵ Литаврин, Славинии, 195; Сергей А. Иванов, Феофилакт Симоката, Свод древнейших письменных известий о славянах, т. 2, (VII–IX вв), ed. Г. Литаврин. Москва 1995, 63, f. 151; Curta, *Sklaviniai* 91, 93; Albrecht Berger, *Sclavinia*, *Brill's New Pauly, Antiquity volumes*, ed. H. Cancik and H. Schneider, Print edition: York 1991, online: 2006, Retrieved on 05 July 2016, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e1115200; Antun Dabinović, Early Balkan Migration, *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 16, No. 47, Jan., 1938, 400.

⁶ In the case of the Avar khaganate it is remarkable because some western authors certainly felt the need of such a term and even created the toponym Hunia for this purpose, but still not Avaria (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (MGH) SS, v. I. ed. G. Pertz, Leipzig 1825, 13, 17, 18, 45).

⁷ *Annalium Laurissensium Continuatio* (MGH 1, 174), cf. Einhardi Annales: “in terram Sclavorum, qui vocantur Beheimi” (MGH 1, 192, ₃₁), “in terram Sclavorum qui dicuntur Sorabi” (MGH 1, 193, ₂₆).

⁸ It is typical for the older historiography: M. VASMER, *Die Slaven in Griechenland*. Leipzig 1970, 176; Марин Дринов, Заселение балканского полуострова славянами, Избрани съчинения, т. 1, ed. Иван Дуйчев София 1971, 322; Марин Дринов, Поглед върху произхождението на българския народ и началото на българската история, The same edition, 268; Константин Иречек, История на българите, София 1999, 103, 141; Георги Баласчевъ, Най-старата словенска държава на Балканския полуостровъ VII–VIII век и нейният етнически съставъ, София 1924, 3; Alexander Vasiliev, An Edict of the Emperor Justinian II, September, 688. *Speculum*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (Jan. 1943), 9; Мила Рајковић, Теофан, Византиски извори за историју народа Југославије т. 1, ed. Г. Острогорски. Београд 1955, 222 f. 9; however, it appears in modern historiography too: Timothy Gregory, *A History of Byzantium*, Blackwell 2005, 172 (“Sklavenia”, as the Balkans were then called”).

thinking has not been fruitful but rather problematic. First, in Byzantium *Sclavinia* was used mostly in the plural form which contradicts the idea that it is the name of a concrete geographical region.⁹ In the West it was clearly used for more than one region. More importantly, the term shows a tendency to move along with changes in the political situation.

Because of this, other authors considered the term as equating to “Slavic lands in general or any one of them”.¹⁰ From this point of view every territory inhabited by Slavs was a *Sclavinia*, and the non-use of the term for some Slavic territories should be considered purely formal, accidental due to the absence of sufficient sources.¹¹ However, as we will see, the sources we possess are sufficient to conclude that the term was not used randomly, but that there was a certain tendency in its use.

Moreover, treatment of the term *Sclavinia* as a simple reflection of the existence of Slavs and their territories had serious consequences. Instead of exploring the formations named in the Byzantine and Latin sources as *Sclavinias* (“*Historical Sclavinias*”), by proclaiming all Slavic formations to be *Sclavinias* (including the majority that have never been called this in the sources),¹² a new subject of research was generated (“*Historiographical Sclavinias*”), which replaced the original. As a result, instead of analysing the term itself, its original meaning, and the ways it was used, *Sclavinia* was interpreted instead through the constructed subject, which means that it was explained on the basis of all the pieces of information we have for different Slavic populations and territories, whether they were called *Sclavinia* or not. The resulting definition was then extended to all *historical* and *historiographic Sclavinias*.¹³ Through this, the *historiographic Sclavinias* were artificially constructed

⁹ According to Литаврин, Славинии 198, the use of the term derived from the ethnonym in the plural is unique and there is no parallel in the Byzantine sources from the 6th–10th centuries.

¹⁰ Thomae Archidiaconi Spalatensis, *Historia Salonitanorum atque Spalatensium pontificum*, ed. D. Karbić et al. New York – Budapest 2006, 38, f. 2; John Fine, *The Early medieval Balkans, A critical survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*, Michigan 1991, 332: “Sclavinia.... refers to every one of numerous regions throughout the Balkans where the Slavs were”; George Ostrogorsky, Byzantium and the South Slavs, *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 42, No. 98 (Dec. 1963), 3; Н. И. Щевелева, Древняя Русь в «Польской истории» Яна Длугоша (Книги I–VI). Москва, 2004, 366, f. 6: Sclavinia was a generic term for all Slavic regions.

¹¹ Литаврин, Славинии, 199.

¹² Trpimir Vedriš, *Balkanske sklavinije i Bugarska, Nova zračka u europskom svjetlu. Hrvatske zemlje u ranome srednjem vijeku (oko 550–oko 1150)*, ed. J. Z. Nikolić (*Povijest Hrvata, sv. 1*) Zagreb 2015, 582–585 included even Bulgaria in the *Sclavinias* on the basis of its supposed “slavisation” but also noted that *Sclavinias* “in linguistic terms often included non-Slavic societies” (583).

¹³ See as examples: Литаврин, Славинии 199, who after defining the term as the “socio-political organization of the Slavs”, classified as *Sclavinias* all Slavic entities, including Severians and Seven tribes, and considered the fact that they were never called *Sclavinias* as merely formal. Similarly, Malinovská will extend the term *Sclavinia* to communities that are not called so in the sources (Great Moravia and Kievan Russia), after defining it as equating to a “Slavic country” (Malinovská, *Concepts* 62, 64; Malinovská, *Development* 1, 2; Малиновска, *Regnum Sclavorum*, 21, 22, 24).

as a homogeneous group, which was facilitated by the scarcity of information for most of them and the influence of certain modern ideologies and intellectual movements such as pan-Slavism and Slavophilism.¹⁴ However, the *historiographic Sclavinias* were not something homogeneous, but included phenomena at different stages of development from tribes to states and from political to geographical categories. Their treatment as a group of similar phenomena was and is misleading.

The treatment of the term *Sclavinia* as a simple reflection of the existence of Slavic countries and formations limited and even excluded important questions about the reasons for the occurrence, use and disappearance of the term in the sources. These questions became unnecessary because it seemed obvious that the term appeared and disappeared with the objects it signified.

Equating the term to what was in a reality a heterogeneous group of phenomena (which Slavic tribes, countries, states, etc. actually were) led further to different and even contradictory definitions of *Sclavinia* in historiography. We find it defined simply as “Slavic country” or “country inhabited by Slavs”,¹⁵ but it is often also related to social and political organization, whereby the territorial aspect is marginalized or even ignored.¹⁶ Between the two poles of understanding a series

¹⁴ The treatment of all Slavic communities as a homogeneous phenomenon finds support in some claims in the sources: Maurice: “The nations of the Slavs and the Antes live in the same way and have the same customs” (*Das Strategikon des Maurikios*, ed. G. T. Dennis [CFHB 17], Wien 1981, XI 4 p. 370, 1–2); Leo The Wise: “The Slavic nations have shared the same customs and way of life with each other” (*The Taktika of Leo VI*, ed. G. Dennis [CFHB 49] Washington 2010, C.18, & 93, p. 470, ⁴⁴¹). However, what comprised “Slavic nations” for each of these authors (cf. *Maurice’s Strategikon, Handbook of Byzantine Military Strategy*, ed. and tr. G. Dennis, Philadelphia 1984, 120 f. 4) and what is understood by it by a modern person could be quite different.

¹⁵ Lubor Niederle, *Slovanske starozitnosti*, t. II, 1, Praga, 1908, 421; Alexis Vlasto, *The Entry of The Slavs into Christendom, An introduction, The Medieval History of The Slavs*, New York, 1970, 156 („Sclaviniae (nominally Byzantine territories settled by Slavs)”; Степан Антољјак, *Нашите Склавинии, Средновековна Македонија*, т. I, Скопје 1985 г., 121, 123; Andrew Louth, *Justinian and his legacy (500–600), The Cambridge history of The Byzantine Empire*, ed. Johnathan Shepard, Cambridge University Press, 2008, 99 – 129, 126, 231 („the regions settled by the Slavs (Sklaviniai)”; Malinovská, *Development...*, 1, 2, 9, 10 („certain area populated by the Slavs, the Slavic landscape“); Ostrogorsky, *Byzantium 3*; George Ostrogorsky, *The Byzantine Empire in the World of the Seventh Century*, DOP, Vol. 13 (1959), 6; Thomae Archdeaconi, 38, f. 2; Moravcsik, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De Administrando Imperio* [CFHB 1], Washington 1967, 308 (Slavonic regions). However, such a meaning is not always accepted as the only or a satisfying one, even when the emphasis is placed on it; Пајковић, Теофан 222 f. 9; Charanis, *Observations* 11; John Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century, The Transformation of Culture*, Cambridge 1997, 56, and f. 45.

¹⁶ Mark Whittow, *The Making of Byzantium, 600–1025*, Great Britain, 1996, 275 (“small Slav tribal units”); Berger, *Sclavinia* (“warlike tribal associations without fixed territorial borders.”); Gkoutziokostas, *Σκλαωνία* 638, f. 1 (“politically organized groups of Slavs within a specific area of the Byzantine territory”); Dennis Hupchick, *The Bulgarian Byzantine Wars for Early Medieval Balkan Hegemony*, Palgrave Macmillan 2017, 12 (“single or multi-tribal territorial entities”).

of concessions exists.¹⁷ We find it interpreted by the absence of any authority and, conversely, as a (pre-) state with existing institutions and organization.¹⁸

A serious influence on the way *Sclavinia* was understood in the historiography was the generally accepted chronological framework of the use of the term in Byzantium. According to this, the term appears in the end of the 6th and falls out of use in the 9th and 10th centuries.¹⁹ This chronological framework coincided with the period after the Slavs appeared on the Byzantine border through to the disappearance of Slavic tribal formations. Hence the identification of the term *Sclavinia* with the independent (or only formally dependent on Byzantium) Slavic non-state formations seemed inevitable.²⁰ Combined with the understanding of history as a history of people seeking to create states, this led to the identification of the term *Sclavinia* with a pre-state stage in the development of Slavic societies, regardless of the fact that there are also some states named in the sources as *Sclavinia*: Croatia, Serbia, Poland. (Thus, in science, on the one hand, the term was expanded to cover subjects that were never named *Sclavinias* in the sources, and on the other hand, the subjects so named in the sources were excluded by definition from *Sclavinias*).

Therefore, the term *Sclavinia* was often treated as an evolutionary stage and identified with the internal development of the Slavic formations in the process of

¹⁷ Chrysos, Settlements 124, 125, 135); Pritsak, Sklavinia, 1910–1911; Horace G. Lunt, What the Rus' Primary Chronicle tells us about the origin of the Slavs and of Slavic Writing, Камень Краєжгльнь: Rhetoric of The Medieval Slavic World (*Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 19) 199), 338; Геннадий Литаврин, О. В. Иванова, Византия и Славяни, Раннефеодальные государства на Балканах, VI–XII вв., ed. Г. Литаврин, Москва 1985, 85, 87; Геннадий Литаврин, Склавиниите од VII–IX в. како социјално-политичка организација на Словените, Историја, 21/2 (1985), 27.

¹⁸ This first interpretation is supported by: Ostrogorsky, Byzantium 3; Ostrogorsky, Seventh Century 6; Dmitrii Obolensky, Byzantium and the Slavs. New York 1994, 31, 32; Дмитрий Оболенски, Византийската общност. Източна Европа 500–1453, София 2001, 79, 80. For the opposing view see: Баласчевъ, Най-старата 7 (*Sclavinia* in the Balkans consist of “independent political units”); Александър Каждан, Геннадий Литаврин, Очерки истории Византии и южных славян (второ дополнето издание), Санкт Петербург, 1998, 51 (“true principality”); Литаврин, Славинии 196, 199; Vedriš, Sklavinije 583, 585 (“proto-state formations”); Zbigniew Kobylinski, The Slavs, The New Cambridge Medieval History, Volume 1 c. 500 – c. 700, ed. Paul Fouracre, Cambridge 2008, 543 (“a Slavic tribal territory independent of imperial rule, with their own political structures”). Similarly: Адиевски, Македонија во средниот век, 822; Щевелева, Древняя Русь, 366, f. 6; Fine, *When ethnicity*, 40, 41.

¹⁹ For sources which used *Sclavinia* see: Charanis, Observations, 11, 12.

²⁰ Charanis, Observations, 11; Ostrogorsky, Byzantium 3; Ostrogorsky, Seventh Century 6; Каждан, Литаврин, Очерки, 51; Obolensky, Byzantium and the Slavs 31, 32; Оболенски, Византийската общност 79, 80; Warren Treadgold, The Byzantine revival (780–842). Stanford California 1988, 19; Kobylinski, Slavs 543, FINE, Balkans 332; Hupchick, Bulgarian 12.

conversion into a state.²¹ Despite the lack of source material, attempts were made to find traces of such evolution into *Sclavinias*. Thus, some authors perceive the evolution between the territorial and political meaning of the term.²² Attempts have been made to see differences in meaning between the singular and the plural forms of the term: the *territorial* meaning in the *singular*, and the *socio-political* meaning in the *plural*.²³ The desire to extract from the sources more information than they contain sometimes leads to quite unnecessary complications and neglect of obvious and simple solutions.²⁴

The rare use, mobility, and the existence of certain tendencies in the use of the term in the sources shows that *Sclavinia* cannot be considered as a simple reflection of the reality of the existence of Slavs and their territories. The connection between the ethnonym (the demonym) *Slavs* and the term *Sclavinia* need not always be direct. Its uses can be due to factors external to the Slavs and their formation. This follows inevitably from the fact that *Sclavinia* appears only as an external term – we do not find it in the Slavic sources.

²¹ Литаврин, Иванова, Византия и Славяни 85; Литаврин, Склавиниите од VII–IX в. 27, 28; Литаврин, Славинии 199 (“*Sclavinias* were the ancestral forms of early-feudal states”). Litavrin interpreted the appearance of territorial terms such as *Verzitia* as a sign that this community was on the threshold of turning into a state (Славинии 200, 201). Геннадий Литаврин, А. П. Новосельцев Константин Багрянородный “Об управлении империей”, Москва 1989, 317, f. 21, saw there a tendency towards conversion into a state, a process that led to the creation of Serbia and Croatia, but the same process was stopped by the Byzantines in Thrace, Greece and the Peloponnese. Јоханес Кодер, Византиски свет. Увод у историску географију источног Медитерана током византијске епохе. Београд 2011, 102: *Sclavinias* were destroyed during the 9th–10th centuries by “being annexed to ... Byzantium or Bulgaria or gradually developing quasi-state alliances and eventually becoming states.”

²² Литаврин, Славинии 197, 198. Curta also sees this binary meaning in the term, primarily a territorial, and later, a political one, but for him it is bound with the process of submission of *Sclavinias* to the Byzantines (Curta, *Sklaviniai* 87, 91, 93), and not to the inner evolution of the Slavic communities.

²³ Литаврин, Славинии 196. The problem is complicated by the fact that in some cases there is no unity among translators on whether the term is used in the singular or plural in the original Byzantine text. Such is the case with Constans’ campaign in 658, where some translate *Sclavinia* in the singular (Cyril Mango, *Nicephori Patriarchae Constantinopolitani, Breviarum Historicum* (CFHB XIII), Washington 1990, 484, f. 1; Harry Turteldove, *The Chronicle of Theophanes*, Philadelphia 1982, 46; Chrysos, *Settlements* 127–129), but others in the plural – *Sclavinias* (Веселин Бешевлиев, Г. Цанкова-Петков, Теофан Изповедник, Гръцки извори за българската история, т. 3, eds. Ив. Дуйчев et al. София 1960, 260; Рајковић, Теофан 222; Геннадий Литаврин, Феодан Исповедник, Свод древнейших письменных известий о славянах, т. 2, (VII–IXвв) ed. Г. Литаврин. Москва 1995, 273).

²⁴ For example, unlike Byzantium, where *Sclavinia* was used mainly in the plural in the Latin sources, the term exists only in the singular. The difference in the size and total number of Slavic formations for which the authors of the West were supposed to write (a smaller number of large formations) and those in Byzantium (many small formations) seems a far simpler and more acceptable explanation than attempting to see a qualitative rather than just a quantitative difference between the singular and the plural of the term.

Sclavinia was not used in the oldest Slavonic texts written in Great Moravia and on the Balkans in IX – X century. Even more – the closest equivalent to the term *Sclavinia* in the old Slavonic language – словѣнская земля (Slavic land) did not appear in the oldest Slavonic texts either. This is striking because these texts used in the same time terms such as *Panonian land*, *Moravian land*, *Moravian region* („моравьска областъ“).²⁵ The closest form we can find in IX – X century texts is странамъ словѣнские (*Slavic countries* or more literally: *Slavic sides, parts*),²⁶ and the term страна was used equally for states and for geographical regions.²⁷ *Slavic land* appeared latter and in old Slavonic it may include people as well as land²⁸ but it certainly excludes states with not Slavic origin and rule. In the sources from VII – X century, Bulgaria was not called *Sclavinia* (in Greek and Latin texts) or *Slavic land* (in Slavonic) despite the fact that the majority of its populations was probably Slavic.²⁹ In contrast, Bohemia and Poland were called *Sclavinia* (in Latin) and *Slavic lands* (in Slavonic and Latin).³⁰ Finally, *Sclavinia* was not just a non-existing word in Slavonic texts, but it was also not accepted or was accepted difficultly and later from the Slavic speaking authors that wrote in other languages.³¹ The term *Sclavinia* did not originate from *Sclavinias* themselves, and was an outside name, used to describe some states or tribes with Slavic rule and origin. In some cases, this *outsiderness* of the term *Sclavinia* can be clearly noticed.³²

²⁵ Ѓорги Поп-Атанасов, Старословенски Кирилometодиевски извори, Скопје, Менора, 2011, 54, 83, 85, 86, 87, 100, 127.

²⁶ According to Life of Saint Methodius: Pope wrote to Kotzel that Methodius was sent not just to him, but also to all Slavic countries („всѣмъ странамъ словѣнскимъ“), and also wrote to Moravians that all Slavic countries (всѣа словѣнскія страны) were given in the hands of Methodius, Поп-Атанасов, Старословенски Кирилometодиевски извори, 51, 56. Similarly in Priceworthy speech for saints Cyril and Methodius Pope Hadrian sent Methodius as archbishop of „страны словѣскія“ (Климент Охридски, Събрани съчинения, I, София, 1970, 487).

²⁷ For example, *Thessaloniki region* (Селунскою странною), *Danube regions* (страны Дунаискія) in Priceworthy speech for saint Cyril (Поп-Атанасов, Старословенски Кирилometодиевски извори, 49, 57).

²⁸ Lunt, *The Rus' Primary Chronicle* ..., 228, f. 10.

²⁹ Стојко Стојков, Свети Климент како наш и каков?, Меѓународна научна конференција Климентовото дело, Штип, 2016, 127, f. 23

³⁰ *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Scriptorium, t. I, ed. G. H. Pertz, Hanoverae, 1826, 411, ₄ (MGH, S I); *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, CSS, t. 3, ed. G. H. Pertz, Hanover, 1839, 46, _{7, 8}, 66, _{48, 49}, 67, ₂₆, 80, ₂₂.

³¹ Duklian priest – Slavic speaking person writing in Latin not earlier than XII century did not use *Sclavinia* for Dalmatia (or for any other Slavic land) despite the fact that Dalmatia already was widely known as *Sclavinia* or *Slavonia*. Instead, he used “populus terrae Sclavorum” and “terram Duraciorum” (Vladimir Mosin, *Ljetopis popa Dukljanina*, Zagreb, 1950, 71, 92). The first Slavic author to use the term was writing in Latin, Magister Vincentius at the end of XII c. in Poland.

³² From the office of Saxonian and Bavarian dux Henry the Lion, between 1154 and 1174, 7 documents originated for 3 bishopric seats: Lübeck, Ratzeburg and Schwerin established between the rivers Elba and Oder in freshly conquered Slavic lands. Four documents say that these seats were in “Transalbina Sclauia” (trans-Elbian Sclavia), 3 - in “terra Sclauorum Transalbina”. The first four were written in the Saxonian town Artlenburg on Elba, the last three – in Schwerin, i.e. in the Slavic land itself (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica* 500 - 1500, *Diplomatum regum et imperatorum Germaniae*, Heinrich der Löwe, ed. K. Jordan, Leipsig 1941, 41, ₃₃, 119, ₂₆, 121, ₄₁, 133, _{24, 25}, 136, ₉, 138, ₃₇, 155, ₃₉₋₄₁).

Genesis of the term

The fact that *Sclavinia* derived from the Greek form of the ethnonym of Slavs - *Sklavini* may suggest that the term *Sclavinia* itself was a Byzantine “invention”, which afterwards spread to the West because of the great Imperial cultural authority in the same way the word *Sclavi(ni)* previously did.³³ This possibility is strengthened by the common belief that *Sclavinia* appeared earlier in Byzantium (VII c.) and was used in Byzantine sources in VII and VIII centuries.³⁴ The oldest examples of *Sclavinia* in the West are from the end of VIII century, so chronology speaks for itself.

We have to be very cautious with the first argument because there were many similar and synonymous forms or variations related to the term *Sclavinia* that were clearly created in the West – like those created from the short form of the ethnonym for Slavs: *Slavia*, *Sclavia* (something never noticed in Byzantine sources), or missing the “Greek” ‘k’ in the toponym *Slavonia*, *Slauia*, or adding unusual letters in the term *Sclavania*, *Sclavonia*, or, finally, using a non-existing in Byzantium form of ethnonym of Slavs for creating toponyms: *Wenedonia*, *Windia*. This shows that the West was well capable to create, and actually created its own artificial form without Byzantine assistance. Finally, the oldest examples of using *Sclavinia* in the West are in majority different from the Byzantine forms: *Slawinia*, *Sclavania*.³⁵ Thus, the practical need for the term in the West is obvious and its emergence and spread could not be only the result of the Byzantine cultural influence.

Sclavinia in Byzantium

The belief that the term *Sclavinia* appeared firstly in Byzantium is based on the appearance of the word *Sclavinia* in Theophylact's History, also in one manuscript of Miracles of Saint Demetrius and the supposed *existing* of the term in some sources from VII - VIII century used later in the Chronicle of Theophanes the Confessor.

The dominant thesis in science today is that the term *Sclavinia* was first mentioned in the history of Theophylact Simokatta³⁶ written in Constantinople circa 630, about

³³ In the West, the name of Slavs was used mostly in its Greek form *Sclavini* (see for Byzantine influence of western terminology and portraying of Slavs: Curta, Making of the Slavs..., 42 - 48, and f. 22).

³⁴ Геннадий Литаврин, Славинии VII – IX вв. Социально-политические организации славян, Этногенез народов Балкан и Северного Причерноморья, Москва, 1984, 198; Curta, Theophylact, 206; Антолјак, Нашите Склавинии, 121.

³⁵ Willibald: “Slawinia terrae” (Свод древнейших письменных известий о славянах, II, (VII – IX вв), Москва 1995, 440). For Charlemagne expedition in 789 are used followed form: *partibus Sclavaniae* (Annales regni Francorum), *in Sclavania* (Fragmentum Analum Chesnii, Anallum Laurissensium Continuatio), *Wenedonia* (Annalium Sancti Amandi Continuatio altera), *in Wilcia, Wltiam, patriam Wilciorum* (Annalium Petavianorum pars Secunda, Annalium Alamanicorum Cont., Annalium Guelferbytanorum. cont., Analium Nazariani, cont..). We find the “proper” byzantine-like form just in Annales Tiliani: *partibus Sclaviniae*, and in one manuscript of Anallum Laurissensium Continuatio (MGH, S I, 12, 17, 44, 175, ^{17, 18} 221, ⁷⁵)

³⁶ Pritsak, Sklavinia, 1910-1911; Литаврин, Иванова, Византия и Славяни, 85; Антолјак, Нашите Склавинии, 121; Степан Антолјак, Македонските склавинии, Средновековна Македонија, т. I, Скопје 1985 г., 127; (Свод..., 63, f. 151); Curta, Sklaviniai, 88, 89; Malinovská, Development, 1.

the Byzantine military expedition north of the Danube in 602. There we find the words: τῆς Σκλαυηνίας πληθούς.³⁷ It has been debated lately whether he used it as a noun or an adjective.³⁸ If the second is true, then this example is disabled. Unusual and rather unique use of *Sclavinia* with the word *plethius* gives strength to this opinion.³⁹

Another possibility that I think is worth having in mind is that the word *Sclavinia* even might not have existed in Theophylact's original work. The oldest manuscript of his History is from X c. (*Vaticanus Graekus* 977), when the term *Sclavinia* was already well affirmed - all other Theophylact's manuscripts depended on this one. In Theophylact's text, the word *Sclavinia* is used only in one place, at the very end, and in a way that made it unclear for his contemporary readers. None of his contemporary writers used it, and there are no signs that anybody borrowed it from him. Patriarch Nicephorus, who wrote his history as a continuation of Theophylact's in the late VIII⁴⁰, did not know the term *Sclavinia* at all. In Chronography of Theophane the Confessor, written between 818 - 814⁴¹, where a big parts from Theophylact's History are incorporated, the term *Sclavinia*

³⁷ Theophylacti Simocatae, VIII, 5, p. 323, γ.

³⁸ Chrysos, Settlements, 124 – 126, Curta, Sklaviniai, 85 – 98, Gkoutzioukostas, Term “Σκλαυηνία”..., 638 – 646, Curta, Theophylact, 195 – 209; Gkoutzioukostas, “Sklavenia”..., 1 – 12. As noun translated in Баришић (Византијски извори за историју народа Југославије, I, Београд 1955 г., 125); Schreiner, Свод..., 63, f. 151); accepted by Pritsak, Sklavinia, 1910-1911; Malinovská, Geographical concepts, 61 and Curta. As adjective understood and translated in: Beker (Theophylacti Simocatae, *Historiarum libri octo*, ed. Bekker, Bonnae 1834, 323); Теофилакт Симокатта, История, ed. С. П. Кондратьев, Москва 1957, 180; *The History of Theophylact Simocatta*, ed. and tr. Michael and Mary Whitby, New York 1997, 217; Теофилакт Симокатта, Гръцки извори за българската история, т. II, ed. and tr. Веселин Бешевлиев, София, 1957, 333; accepted by Chrysos and Gkoutzioukostas. For different translations see Malinovská, Geographical concepts, 61, f. 2 and Gkoutzioukostas, Term “Σκλαυηνία”..., 638, 639.

³⁹ In his article from 2017 Gkoutzioukostas included me among the supporters of “noon hypothesis” on the basis of my presentation on the Byzantine Congress in 2016 in Belgrade, which is an obvious misunderstanding (Gkoutzioukostas, “Sklavenia”..., 2). In my presentation I did not express an opinion about this matter.

⁴⁰ Cyril Mango, Nikephoros, Patriarch of Constantinople: *Short History*, ed. and tr. Cyril Mango, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, XIII, Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1990, 8-12 (before 780 г.); Litavrin (Свод... 222, between 775 – 787); Harry Turtledove, *The Chronicle of Theophanes*, University of Pennsylvania press, Philadelphia, 1982 xii (between 775 и 797 most probably before 787); Leslie Brubaker, John Haldon, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era, c. 680-850. The Sources*, Ashgate, 2000171 (probably 780thies). The most argued seems Warren Treadgold, *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, Palgrave Macmillan UK, 201327, 35 (“probably soon after 790“, but certainly before 797).

⁴¹ For the authorship of Chronography and used sources see: Leslie Brubaker and John Haldon Leslie Brubaker – J. F. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era, c. 680-850. The Sources*, Ashgate 2000, 168 – 171; Warren Treadgold, *Trajan the Patrician, Nicephorus, And Theophanes*, Bibel, Byzanz und Christlicher Orient, Festschrift für Stephen Gerö zum 65. Geburtstag, 2011, 589 – 621; Warren Treadgold, *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2013, 3 – 16, 38 – 77. For dating see Мила Рајковић, Теофан, Византијски извори за историју народа Југославије, I, Београд 1955, 217 (810 – 815); Turtledove, *Chronicle...*, viii – ix; Treadgold, *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, 35 (810 – 814); Cyril Mango, R. Scot (ed. and tr.), *The Chronicle of Theophanes the Confessor*, Oxford 1997, XLIV.

is widely used, but not in the sections based on Theophylact. *Sclavinia* appeared in his Chronicle for the first time for 658. Therefore, it is possible that *Sclavinia* did not exist in the original of *Theophylact's History* but actually was an interpolation, or even a mistake made by the copyist in the oldest X c. manuscript that spread through the next copies. Similar was the case of the second example that once was used in the historiography – the term *Sclavinia* in *The Miracle of Saint Demetrius*, which in meanwhile was proven to have appeared in just one manuscript from X century.⁴² Of course, the presented idea cannot be proved right⁴³ or wrong. It is what it is – a relevant possibility.

Moreover, even if Theophylact really used this term as a noun (which does not look obvious to me)⁴⁴, and even if he was the first who used it, this still does not prove that the term was already in regular use in his time. No other source from VI and VII century used it. Therefore, *Sclavinia* in Theophylact's history, if it really existed, was, at best, an isolated case without known consequences.

So, there is only one more argument: the supposition that the term *Sclavinia* existed in the sources used in Theophane the Confessor's Chronicle for the events of VII – VIII centuries. However, patriarch Nicephorus used majority of these sources, but he did not use *Sclavinia* in his Brave History even once. There are six common pieces of information concerning Slavs in both texts but just in one of them *Sclavinia* is used by the author of Chronography (the expedition of Justinian II against the Slavs).⁴⁵ In majority of other cases where Slavs are mentioned in Chronography and which are independent from Nicephorus, *Sclavinia* is still not used.⁴⁶ In Chorography *Sclavinia* appeared also in some parts based on eastern Syrian sources - information that Nicephorus did not mention at all, like expeditions against *Sklaviniai* in 658 and 758.⁴⁷ Finally, the author of Chronography used *Sclavinia* for his own time too (810)⁴⁸. All this, together with the unified and coherent way the term is used in this Chronicle, suggests that the author himself put it in there and did not borrow it from

⁴² In one manuscript of *Miracula* we find Σκλαβηνιῶν instead of Σκλαβηνῶν. See Paul Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint Démétrius et la pénétration des Slaves dans les Balkans*, I: Le Texte, Paris 1979, 130, 134,¹⁴ Curta, *Sklaviniai*..., 88.

⁴³ Gkoutzioukostas, "Sklavenia"..., 8.

⁴⁴ Стојко Стојков, „Склавинија“ кај Теофилакт Симоката, *Историја*, LIII, бр. 1, 2018, 15 – 40.

⁴⁵ Nicephori, Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani, *Opuscula Historica*, ed. Carolus de Boor, Lipsiae, 1880361, ⁶⁻²¹; Theophanis *Chronographia*, I, ed. Carolus de Boor, Lipsiae, 1883, 364, ⁵⁻¹⁸. It was not used for the foundation of the Bulgarian khanat (681), Tervel's intervention in favour of Justinian II (705) war against Bulgarian khan Teletzius (763) deserting of many Slavs from Bulgaria (763). Nicephori, 68, ²⁷—69, ², 69, ¹⁴⁻¹⁵; Theophanis, p. 374. ⁶⁻⁸.

⁴⁶ Theophanis, 436, ⁹⁻²⁴ 447, ¹⁰⁻²⁶ 456 ²⁵—457, ¹, 457, ¹⁻¹¹, 473, ³²—474, ⁵, 491, ¹⁷⁻²².

⁴⁷ Theophanis, 347, ⁶⁻⁷ 430, ²¹⁻²². For Syrian connections see: E. W. Brooks, The sources of Theophanes and the Syriac chroniclers, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 15 (2) / 1906, 578 – 586; Рајковић, Теофан, 221, f. 8; Mango, Nikephoros, 12, 14, 15; Свод..., 223; *The Seventh Century in the West-Syrian Chronicles introduced*, ed. and trans. A. Palmer, Liverpool University press, 1993, 95, 96; Treadgold, *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, 40 - 45.

⁴⁸ Theophanis, 486, ¹⁷⁻²²

the earlier sources. It is logical to conclude that the term did not exist in common sources of Brave History and Chronography, and most likely the term *Sclavinia* was not used in Constantinople when Nicephorus wrote his history and it appeared later before the time when Theophanes' Chronicle was written (808 – 814).⁴⁹ Two other sources from IX century that used *Sclavinia* in 811 and in 814 – *Scriptor incertus* and *Anonymous Vatican Narration*⁵⁰, seem to support this conclusion, and the letter of Emperor Michael to Louis the Pious from 824 gives us final proof that the term *Sclavinia* was known well enough, and was even officially used in Constantinople in the second and third decade of IX century.

If this is correct, Theophane Chronography is the first known Byzantine source that without doubt used the term *Sclavinia*.

Sclavinia in the West

In this situation, the oldest source in which we find the term *Sclavinia* is maybe not Byzantine but a western one: *Life of Willibald*, written in 778, in Bavaria.⁵¹ We find there that, when in 723 the Saint travelled from Italy to the Holy land, he passed nearby the city of Monemvasia (in Peloponnese) which was in *Slawinia terrae*.⁵² A suggestion is made that he learnt this term in Constantinople based on an unprovable presumption that the term *Sclavinia* already existed and was widely popular in Byzantium in the early VIII century.⁵³ According to the *Life*, the boat was not Byzantine, and it happened 3 or 4 years before the Saint visited Constantinople. In addition, in this source the term is not in its Byzantine form – *Sclavinia*, but *Slawinia*. It was also argued that there the word *Slawinia* was used as an adjective and not as a noun.⁵⁴ 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 at some level the idea of *land*. We can even speculate that *Slawinia terrae* was a literal translation from Slavic словѣнская земля, or the vulgar form of the common terminology in Langoabrdian Italy (Slavic lands, Slavic province) which is also supported by non-classical and close to Slavic form of the term without

⁴⁹ The position that term *Sclavinia* was not used in time before Theophanes was argued by Chrysos in a different way – he interprets all mentions of *Sclavinia* in VII and VIII centuries as metonymy and just the last one – from 810 as a toponym (Chrysos, *Settlements...*, 126 - 128). The interpretation of one and the same term by the same author and work in two different ways does not look very convenient.

⁵⁰ Henri Gregoire, *Les sources epigraphiques de l'histoire bulgare, Byzantion*, 9 / 1934, 768; Henri Gregoire, *Un Nouveau fragment di "Scriptor incertus de Leone Armenio"*, *Byzantion*, 11 / 1936, 427, ¹¹⁻¹³.

⁵¹ Curta, *Sklaviniai...*, 86, 87

⁵² *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptorum*, v. XV, 1, ed. G. Pertz, Hanoverae, 1887, 93, ^{12, 13}; *venerunt ultra mare Adria ad urbem Manafasiam in Slawinia terrae*.

⁵³ В. К. Ронин, *Свод древнейших письменных известий о славянах*, т. 2, (VII – IXвв) (Москва 1995), 44; Curta, *Sklaviniai...*, 86.

⁵⁴ Chrysos, *Settlements*, 130. See debate between Curta and Gkoutzioukostas: Curta, *Theophylact*, 203 – 205 with quoted literature; Gkoutzioukostas, "Sklavenia"..., 8, 9, and: Term "Σκλαυηνία"..., 644 – 646, and f. 68 with quoted literature.

“c” which usually appears in Greek, Latin and Arabic texts.⁵⁵ The appearance of forms without “c” in the West could be understood as use of more native instead of classical form that happened near Slavic borders, where local people were more familiar with the Slavic original form of the ethnonym. In Byzantium, all known uses of *Sclavinia* are by high-ranking officials in Constantinople⁵⁶ so they are in official Greek form, not “spoiled” by spoken Slavic. Willibald did not meet any worth of mentioning figures in Constantinople,⁵⁷ which again makes it improbable that he learned it there.

Nevertheless, even if Willibald’s *Slawinia* is an adjective, the earlier doubtless appearance of the term still could be in the West. Few Chronicles from the end of VIII and the beginning of IX century used it about events of 789 in northern Slavic borders of Frankish kingdom, close to time when *Life of Willibald* was written.

We can divide the sources describing 789 campaign in 3 groups. The first was created in some Belgium monasteries and they used the terms *Wenedonia* and *Wilcia* but not *Slavs* or *Sclavinia*.⁵⁸ The second is represented by Murbach group where we find *Wilcia*, *Wiltiam*, *patriam Wilciorum*, and for the people *Sclavini* and *Winidi*.⁵⁹ The last consists of texts closely related to the Carolingian court and there we find “*partibus Sclaviniae (Slavania, Sclaviniae, Sclauinia) quorum vocabulum est Wilze*”.⁶⁰

All these authors did the same thing – they created toponyms from some kind of ethnonyms; the difference was the base they chose for building the toponym – *Sclavini*, *Wiltzi* or *Wenedoni*. Therefore, they created these toponyms not just from actual ethnonyms but also from artificial names (*Wenedony*). In the same way they called Avarian khaganate *Hunia*, or closer to reality, when they used the word

⁵⁵ Partly similar with the way in which educated Slavs writing in Latin exchanged classical *Sclavonia* or *Sclavinia* with *Terrae Sclavorum* (Mosin, *Ljetopis popa Dukljanina*, 71).

⁵⁶ Литаурин, Славинии 195; Литаурин, Иванова, Византия и Славян..., 97.

⁵⁷ MFG SS v. XV, 1, 101; C. H. Talbot, *The Anglo-Saxon Missionaries in Germany, Being the Lives of SS. Willibrord, Boniface, Leoba and Lebuin together with the Hodoeporicon of St. Willibald and a selection from the correspondence of St. Boniface*, London and New York, Sheed and Ward, 1954, 171; *The hodoeporicon of Saint Willibald*, translated by Canon Brownlow, Palestine Pilgrims’ Text Society, London 1891, 28, 29

⁵⁸ *Annalium Sancti Amandi*: “contra Wilzis in Wenedonia”, *Annalium Petavianorum* “in Winnetes, in Wilcia” (MGH I SS, 12, 17)

⁵⁹ *Annales Alamannici*: „in Sclavos, in Wilcia“; *Anales Guelferbytany*: „super regem Sclavorum ... et ipsius Wiltiam“; *Anales Nazariani*: „in patriam Wilciorum“ MGH SS I, 44; Свод 2, 451.

⁶⁰ *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum ex Monumentis Germaniae Historicis separatim editi*, t. 6 *Annales regni Francorum inde a. 741 usque ad 829*, qui dicuntur *Annales Laurissenses maiores et Einhardi*, Hannoverae, 1895, 84; identical texts in *Annales Tiliani* (MGH SS I, 221, ₇₅ – 222, ₁), *Annalium Laurissensium (Minores)* „partibus Sclavaniae (= sclaviniae), quorum vocabulum est Wiltze“ (MGH SS I, 174, ₂₁). A partly different text is presented in the so called fragment of Diushen related to the Lorch annals: in “*Slavania*” where Carl met „reges Sclavaniarum“ and „reges Winidorum“ (Свод 2, 447, 464, 466, 467, 471 f. 5. Антољак, Македонските склавинии, 128; Антољак, Нашите Склавинии, 122, 123; Жан Фавие, Карл Велики, Софија, 2002, 426, 427).

Frankia.⁶¹ So, in the case of 789 war it is clear that different authors created different terms to describe the same land, people and event.

Still we can make some important observations. The term *Scлавиния* appeared not in all texts, but only in texts connected with the Frankish court, and, accordingly, *Scлавиния* did not appear spontaneously in every province close to Slavs - there were preferred different types of toponyms. Moreover, it would prove to be a pattern of the way that *Scлавиния* would be used in the West. In the majority of cases we find *Scлавиния* in documents created in the chancelleries of Frankish and later German emperors. It would even be part of the official emperor title of Louis the Pious in 824 and 830.⁶² In 871 Louis II, in a letter to Basil I, mentioned Croatia of Domagoy as “*Scлавения nostra*”.⁶³

Furthermore, *Scлавиния* was used in the official documents of Otto II (961 – 983), Otto III (983 - 1002),⁶⁴ Henry II 1002 – 1024,⁶⁵ Lothar III in 1136 (*provinciarum Scлауie*),⁶⁶ Conrad III (1138–1152: *Scлауonia*),⁶⁷ Fredrich Barbarossa (*Scлауam*),⁶⁸ and Fredrich II (*Scлауia*).⁶⁹ The term found its place in Germanic law in Saxon Mirror

⁶¹ MGH, S I, 13, 14, 17, 18, 45. *Annalium Sancti Amandi Continuatio altera* (Hunia, Frankia), *Analium Laubacensium Continuatio Altera* (Hunia), *Annalium Petavianorum pars Secunda* (Francia, Burgundia, Saxonia, Bawaria Hunia), *Annalium Guelferbytany* (Hunia). For parallel, Theophanes did the same when created *Berzitia* from the name of the tribe *Berzitoi*. Theophanis, 447, ^{10–26}.

⁶² MGH, *Leges, Formulae Merowingici et Karolini aevi* (Formulae Merowingici et Karolini aevi), 1: *Formulae Merowingici et Karolini aevi*, Hanoverae 1886, 314, ³⁴. *Scлаuinina* is mentioned in title in last place immediately after Bavaria (*fidelibus nostris partibus ... Baioarie et Scлавanie commeantibus*). See also Chrysos, *Settlements*, 131; *Curta, Sklaviniiai*, 86 f. 3. *Scлаuinia* appeared also in official documents under 837 (MGH, *Diplomata* (DD), *Diplomata regum Germaniae ex stirpe Karolinorum*, t. I, *Ludowici Germanici, Karlomanni, Ludowici Ivnioris Diplomata*, Berlin, 1934, 30, ²⁸.

⁶³ MGH, *Epistolarum tomus VII, Karolini aevi*, V, Berlin, 1928, 392, ^{20 21}; John V. A. Fine, *When ethnicity did not matter in the Balkans*, The University of Michigan Press, 2009, 36

⁶⁴ MGH *Diplomatum regum et imperatorum Germaniae*, t. I, *Conradi I, Henrici I et Ottonis I diplomata*, Berlin 1879, 618, ³; MGH, *Diplomatum regum et imperatorum Germaniae*, t. II, *Ottonis II, et III diplomata*, Berlin 1888, ^{123, 21, 221, 39, 222, 33, 223, 26}

⁶⁵ MGH, *Diplomatum regum et imperatorum Germaniae*, t. III, *Heinrici II et Ardvini Diplomata*, Berlin 1900 – 1903, 104, 83 a 35, 83 b 33

⁶⁶ MGH, *Diplomatum regum et imperatorum Germaniae t. VIII, Lothari III Diplomata nec non et Richenzae Imperatricis Placita*, Berlin 1927, 142, 34, 35.

⁶⁷ MGH, *Diplomatum regum et imperatorum Germaniae t. IX, Conradi III et filii eius Heinrici*, Berlin, 1969, 31, ⁴.

⁶⁸ MGH *Diplomatum regum et imperatorum Germaniae t. X, p. IV, Friderici I Diplomata*, Brlin 1990, F I,4: *Friedrich I. 4: 1181-1190 (DD F I)*, 155, ⁶.

⁶⁹ MGH *Diplomatum regum et imperatorum Germaniae t. XIV, pars II, Friderici II diplomata*, Berlin, 2007, 203, ³³.

in XIII c. as *Sclavia* (but in the medieval German translations *Wenden*).⁷⁰ Still not all emperors used this term⁷¹, and even these who used it often preferred synonym terms as *Slavic land*, *province* or *region*.⁷² Possibly, under imperial influence, the popes also adopted *Sclauia* in XIII century, making a difference between *Sclavia* northern of Elba, and *Sclavonia* - Dalmatia.⁷³

The connection of the term *Sclavinia* with the existence of imperial courts and pretensions in the West can also be noticed in the gap in the usage of the term *Sclavinia* between 895 and 975. It coincides with the time without emperors in the West (between the death of the last Carolingian emperor Berengar I in 924 and the resurrection of the empire from Otto I in 962). It was still used by the last emperor who had a Slavic periphery under his rule - Arnulf (+999) and reappeared again under the second Ottonian emperor Otto II. Before and after this, the term was used nearly regularly.⁷⁴

On the other hand, *Sclavinia* was not used in pre-Franks Langobardian Italy, despite its close contacts with the neighbouring Slavs, which supports the conclusion that the emerging of the term was not related to the simple existence of Slavic territories nearby. Also, in some cases of non-imperial use of the term, we can observe a non-classical forms as *S(c)lavia*, *Wilcia* or *Win(e)d(on)ia*. It suggests that the term *Sclavinia* was “promoted” by the emperor’s court which tried to stay close to the classical high Byzantine form, rather to local barbarised forms.⁷⁵

⁷⁰ MGH Leges, Fontes iuris Germanici antiqui, Nova series (Fontes iuris N.S.) 2,1: Auctor vetus de beneficiis. Teil 1: Lateinische Texte, Hannover 1964, 64; MGH Leges, Fontes iuris Germanici antiqui, Nova series (Fontes iuris N.S.) 2,2: Auctor Vetus de beneficiis. Teil 2: Archetypus und Görlitzer Rechtsbuch, Hannover 1966, 23, ¹¹.

⁷¹ Otto I (936 – 973) terra Sclavorum, provintia Sclavorum, patria Sclavorum (MGH Diplomatum I, 91, ⁵, 189, ¹⁰, 247, ¹⁰). The Bavarian king Carloman: partibus Carentaniae Sclauinisque regionis (MGH, DD, I, 304, ³¹).

⁷² Louis II (825 – 875) also used “terra Sclauorum” for the territory between Main and Rednitz in Bavaria (MGH Diplomata regum Germaniae ex stirpe Karolinorum, t. III, Arnoldsfi diplomata, Berlin 1940, 102, ⁷);

⁷³ Pope Honirus III call in 1217 Sclauia the land conquered by Danish king Canute VI north of Elba and in Pomerania (MGH, Epistolae Saeculi XIII e regestis pontificum romanorum selectae, t. I, Berlin, 1883, ^{12, 11}). Gregory IX (1227 - 1241), Istria, Dalmatia, Bosna, Croatia, Serbia and the other parts which constituted “Sclavonie” (468, ⁵, 487, ³⁰, 703, ¹), and *Sclavia* between Elba and Rügen (657, ^{20, 21}). Inocenty IV on 6 February 1254 wrote about a church in “Slavia” near Lübeck (MGH, Epistolae saeculi XIII e regestis pontificum Romanorum selectae, t. III, Berlin, 1894, 222, ¹⁸).

⁷⁴ The years for which or in which the term was used to the beginning of XI c. are: 788, 789, 813 – 820, 828, 837, 839, 847, 844, 845, 891, 893, 895, 975, 985, 986, 992, 999, 1000, 1007, 1010, 1013.

⁷⁵ Wenedonia was the land of Wiltzes (Annalium Sancti Amandi, MGH 1, 12), but Wenedi / Winidi also were called peoples in Great Moravia (MGH 1, Hincmari Remensis Annales, 492, ^{27, 28}, under 871: Resticii, qui principatum Winidorum) and Bohemia (Flodoardi Annales, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptorum, t. 3, ed. Georg Pertz, Hanoverae, 1839, 400, ⁹, under 950: Otto rex, qui quondam Wenedorum (Winedorum) magnam obsederat urbem, nomine Proadem (Praidam, Praidem, fus. 78 Pragm).

Except by the emperor's court, the term was also used by a few imperial vassals most famous of which was Henry the Lion, duke of Saxony and Bavaria, who used it in some documents about lands on the other bank of Elba (*Transalbina Slavia*⁷⁶ but also *terra Sclauorum Transalbina*).⁷⁷

Most often, the term was used in documents created *in* or *for* Bavaria and Saxony.

Saxonian neighbourhood: Sclauia Transalbina

The Land between Elba and Oder and especially the land of Slavic Velety (Wiltzes) and later Lutici was the first territory that was named as *Sclauinia* in the West under 789. The term would be often used for this region to the XIII century, but it would change its form in *Sclauia*.⁷⁸ One possible reason for this could be that term *Sclavinia* had a broader meaning and use. We can find it in some sources from IX – XI century also used for Great Moravia,⁷⁹ Bohemia⁸⁰ and Poland (see below). Maybe the emerging of the “political concept” of *Sclauinia* circa 1000 played some role in this. Immediately after the creation of this concept at the beginning of XI century, the term *Sclavia* appeared and some German sources started to make a difference between *Sclauinia* and *Sclauia*. First it happened in Saxony in *Annales Quedlinburgenses* (written 1008 – 1030) in which *Sclavia* was called Great Moravia (under 844) and Bohemia (986, 999), and as *Sclavonia* - the region between Elba and

⁷⁶ MGH, *Diplomatum regum et imperatorum Germaniae* t. Leipsig 1941, Heinrich der Löwe (DD HL), 41, ³³, 119, ²⁶, 121, ⁴¹, 155, ³⁹⁻⁴¹

⁷⁷ MGH, DD HL, 133, ^{24, 25}, 136, ⁹, 138, ³⁷.

⁷⁸ It is Sclauonia in documents written under Otto II (MGH, *Diplomatum* II, 123, ²¹, 221, ³⁹, 222, ³³, 223, ²⁶; MGH *Diplomatum* I, 618, 3), Otto III (MGH, *Diplomatum* II, 435, ³⁸, but also *terram Sclauiniam* (403, 7a 17, 7b 16), Henry II (MGH, *Diplomatum* III, 104, 83 a 35, 83 b 33), Conrad III (“*castro Lubece in Sclauonia*”, MGH, *Diplomatum* IX, 31, ⁴). From XII century it changed in favour of Sclavia: Lothar III in 1136: *quatuor provinciarum Sclauiein Tribsees* (MGH *Diplomatum* VIII, 142, ^{34, 35}); Friedrich Barbarossa Sclauam (MGH *Diplomatum* X, 155, ⁶), but also “*Sclauorum provinciam*” (351, ²³) and *terra Sclauorum* (155, ³³); Friedrich II (MGH *Diplomatum* XIV, 203, ³³); Innocent IV on 6 February 1254 spoke about a church in Slavia near Lübeck (MGH, *Epistolae saeculi* XIII, t. III, 222, ¹⁸), and Gregory IX (1227 - 1241) for Sclavia between Elba and Rügen (MGH, *Epistolae Saeculi* XIII, 657, 20, 21); Alexander Minorita (last redaction c. 1250) for baptisation of the Slavs in “*totam Sclaviam*” circa 1125 (Alexander Minorita, *Expositio in apocalypsis*, MGH *Weitere Reihen, Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters* (QQ zur Geistesgesch.), 1: Alexander Minorita, *Expositio in Apocalypsim*, Weimar 1955, 334, ¹⁵, 337, ^{5-8, 16} and also *regionem Sclaviae*, (417, ¹⁵) and in Saxon Mirror in XIII c. as Sclavia in Latin and Wenden in German (MGH *Leges*, 2, 1, 64; MGH *Leges*, 2, 2, 23, ¹¹).

⁷⁹ Only one unclear use under 844 - MGH CSS 3, 46, ^{7, 8}

⁸⁰ *Annales Fuldenses* under 895 (MGH 1, 411, ⁴; *de Sclavania omnes duces Boemanimorum*); *Annales Hildesheimenses* partly based on lost *Annales Hildesheimenses maiores*, *Sclavia* under 844, 985, 986, 1000 (MGH CSS t3, 46, ^{7, 8}, 66, ^{48, 49}, 67, ²⁶ (*Sclaviam*), 92, ²⁻⁴ (“...Otto ... tempore Sclaviam intravit urbe Sclavorum Praga”)).

Oder (1007, 1010, 1013)⁸¹ and such a use also could be noticed later.⁸² However, in XII century *Slcavia* began to change its meaning and to be used for the land between the Elba and the Oder, clearly excluding Bohemia and Poland, which then belonged to *Sclavinia*.⁸³ With the assimilation of Slavic communities in *Slavia Transalбина* into the empire in the late XII c. the term went out of use.

Bavarian neighbourhood

The other space candidate for an earlier appearance of the term *Sclavinia* is Bavaria. We find it in sources written in Bavaria or for Bavarian subjects as the name of some neighbouring Slavic lands. Even if we ignore the example in Life of Saint Willibald written there in 778 as arguable, we can still find there other early examples. Louis II (king of Bavaria, Italy and Middle Frankia) on 25 July 845 confirmed to the church in Wurzburg in Bavaria the rights to organize the church in *terra Sclauorum* between the rivers Main and Rednitz.⁸⁴ *Sclavinia* could be found in *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum* written in 871 used about Carinthia under 799, for Carinthia, Pannonia and West Austria under years 824 (“in finibus Sclavinie”), 828 (*in Sclaviniam in pare videlicet Quarantanis atque inferioris Pannonise*), and 837.⁸⁵ Still other terms were also used.⁸⁶ Last about *Sclauinia* speak some documents from emperor Arnulf of Carinthia under 891 and 893.⁸⁷ It seems to be the final known use of term *Sclavinia* for Bavarian neighbourhood.

Sclavinia in Dalmatia and Italy

Instead of *Sclavinia* in Langobardian kingdom the following terms were used: *Sclaborum provinciam*, *Sclavorum regionem*, *Sclavorum patriam*.⁸⁸ Also in Italy

⁸¹ MGH CSS 3, 46, ^{7, 8,} 66, ^{42,} 67, ^{26, 27, 42 – 44,} (Sclaviam), 79, ^{26, 27} 80, ²² 82 (Sclavoniae)

⁸² Vincentius Kaldbuka XII / XIII “Slaviae ... monarchia” is Poland (Щавелева Н. И. Польские латиноязычные средневековые источники, Москва, 1990, 86)

⁸³ Saxon Mirror in XIII c. as *Sclavia* (which is something different than the form Bohemia and Poland (“in Poloniam, Sclaviam et Bohemiam”), MGH Leges, 2,1, 64; MGH Leges, 2,2, 23, ¹¹.

⁸⁴ MGH DD I, 56, ^{27, 35}.

⁸⁵ Анто́лјак, Нашите Склавинии, 124, 125; Chrysos, Settlements, 131.

⁸⁶ In 837, the Salzburg church was granted with “territorium in Sclauinia” from the emperor (MGH, DD, I, 30, ²⁸); in 878 one document of king Carloman mentioned land “in partibus Carentaniae Sclauinisque regionis” (MGH DD I, 304, ³¹).

⁸⁷ In 891 he granted some Bavarian churches domus “in Sclauinie partibus” (MGH, DD, I, 134, ¹³, 289, ³) and to the archbishopric church in Salzburg the lands “in partibus Sclauiniensibus” (287, ²⁰). In 893 he confiscated lands in Bavaria and Sclaviniarum locis from some non-loyal vassals and granted them to the church (176, ²⁵).

⁸⁸ MGH, Scriptores 3, Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum, saec. VI – IX, ed. Georg Waitz, Hannoverae, 1878: Pauli Historia Langobardorum, lib. IV, 118, ⁷, (Sclaborum provinciam / Slavorum provincia), 132, 3 (Sclavorum habitation in illi locis), 132, 22 (Sclavorum regionem quae Zellia appellatur), libri VI, 182, 30, 183, ^{10, 11} (Sclavorum patriam), Gesta Episcoporum Neapolitanorum, pars I, 422 (Sclavorum patriam).

Venetia was used, but in the whole Middle age it would there mean only Venice or the former Roman province.⁸⁹

The first mentions for Dalmatia as Sclavinia were noticed in 871, not in a local source but in the already mentioned emperor's letter.⁹⁰ It was also used in 871 for the lands between the rivers Sava and Drava and for the whole territory west of the Drava to the Danube under 824 and 828 in *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*.⁹¹

Later such a use would also be adopted in Italy. The exact time is uncertain. John the Deacon, the secretary of the Doge of Venice, who wrote at the end of X century, based on some older documents used Sclavenia for Dalmatia between 813 and 820, and for the land of the Narentines (Pagania) under 839.⁹² However, it does not necessarily mean that Sclavinia existed in his sources. We cannot find it in sources written in Italy before the end of X century. It is also worth noticing that in the documents of Otto III written in Italy there was no Sclavinia, unlike the documents written in Germany. Maybe for the first time it was used in Italy was the *Chronicon Salernitanum* at the end of X century (for Dalmatia).⁹³ From XI century, it became common in Italy. In "Acta Sanctorum," at the beginning of XI c. near Istra was the land of king Budislav named "Slavonia."⁹⁴ In the *Chronicle of Monte Casino* from the end of XI c. we find Slavonia under 992 and 1096 and it meant Dalmatia and Croatia.⁹⁵ It further appeared in Raimond D'Agiler,⁹⁶ Petar Tudebot,⁹⁷ Idrisi,⁹⁸ Tomas Archdeacon.⁹⁹ In some of them, the term is not used for all but only for a part of Dalmatia.¹⁰⁰ In XIII century, it was used by popes. The land between the Sava and the Drava officially became known as Slavonia after the

⁸⁹ MGH, SS rer. Lang, 627.

⁹⁰ Антолјак, Нашите Склавинии, 123.

⁹¹ Антолјак, Нашите Склавинии, 124, 125

⁹² Cronache Veneziane, ed. Giovanni Monticolo, vol I. Istituto Storico Italiano, Fonti Per La Storia D'italia, Roma, 1890, 107, ⁷, 113, ².

⁹³ In letter from Niceta patricij to pope Hadriano MGH S 34, Hannoverae, 1980 526, 1, 3 *populis Sclaveniae nostrae*.

⁹⁴ Fine, *When ethnicity did not matter in the Balkans*, 37, 42- 44, 60, 61.

⁹⁵ MGH S 34, Hannoverae, 1980 = Hartmut Hoffmann, *Die Chronik von Montedassino*, Hanover 1980, 201, ⁹, 201, ²⁶, ²⁷ 464, ³⁹, 476, ¹⁴ (Slavonia), but also "Sclavorum terra" (477, ¹⁶)

⁹⁶ Raimundi de Aguilers, *Recueil des historiens des Croisades, Historiens occidentaux*, III, Paris 1866, 235 A (Slavonia).

⁹⁷ Petri Tudebodi Historia, *Recueil des historiens des Croisades, Historiens occidentaux*, III, Paris 1866, 16, 18

⁹⁸ Fine, *When ethnicity did not matter in the Balkans*, 101.

⁹⁹ Антолјак, Нашите Склавинии, 124.

¹⁰⁰ Cronache Veneziane, 113, ². Also in Codex of Corcula (late XII) was mentioned by king Svuinimir (Zvonimir) of Slavonia, Croatia, and Dalmatia (Fine, *When ethnicity did not matter in the Balkans*, 60, 61.

Hungarian conquest, when an administrative region with this name was created.¹⁰¹ Slavonia was used also in XV c.¹⁰²

In that way *Sclavinia* / *Slavonia* was used for lands in the ancient province of Dalmatia from IX - XV c. starting with Frankish emperors in IX century spreading from late X century in Venice and different Italian and Dalmatian cities, Crusaders, Pope state, Neapolitan kingdom, Croatian kings, and in Hungary.¹⁰³ It found its way even in Roger Bacon's *Opus Majus*.¹⁰⁴ Therefore, *Sclavinia* was used for Dalmatia longer than for any other place in Europe, and it is one of the very few places where it was partly accepted by local Slavic elites. The only other place this can be noticed is Poland after XII century (see below). Still, this acceptance of foreign nomenclature would be very limited.

“Political concept” of Sclavinia XI – XV c.

In the Reichenau Gospel (1000) *Sclavinia* is pictured as one of the four imperial provinces together with Germany, Gaul and Roma paying homage to Otto III.¹⁰⁵ This was a short living idea of this emperor for the *renovation imperii Romanorum*¹⁰⁶ on the West putting the Polish ruler Boleslav on head of the province *Sclavinia* as a vasa king of the emperor.¹⁰⁷ What was meant by *Sclavinia* there is not very clear. Some authors think that this *Sclavinia* was simply Poland with eventually

¹⁰¹ Е. П. Наумов, Возникновение этнического самосознания раннефеодальной хорватской народности, Развитие этнического самосознания славянских народов в эпоху раннего средневековья, Москва, АН СССР, 1982, с. 176. Антолјак, Нашите Склавинии ۱۲°, propose that Slavonia was for the first time used in ۱۰۹۱ and not just for Slavonia but also for Croatia. See also Fine, *When ethnicity did not matter in the Balkans*, 70.

¹⁰² Natonius de Bonfinis, *Rerum Hungaricarum Decades*, written circa 1498, states that Slavs conquered Istria and Dalmatia and these land were called after their name Sclavoniam (Латински извори за българската история т. 5, Унгарски латиноезични извори, част 1, Наративни извори, БАН, София, 2001, 123).

¹⁰³ Fine, *When ethnicity did not matter in the Balkans*, 79, 83 and f. 70, 84, 90, 91, 94 – 99, 103, 106, 107, 113, 116.

¹⁰⁴ Roger Bacon, The “Opus Majus” of Roger Bacon. London: Williams and Norgate, 1900, 374, 375 (“Bounding Macedonia, Thessalonica, and Bulgaria on the west is Slavonia”), 365, 367, 376 (“Illyrians used to live between Dalmatia and Istria, the present region of Slavonia, of Forum Julii [Cividale] and the land of the Venetians”).

¹⁰⁵ Katherine B. Powell, Observations on a Number of Liuthar Manuscripts, in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 34 (1971), p. 5, Karl J. Leyser, Concepts of Europe in the Early and High Middle Ages, in *Past & Present*, No. 137, The Cultural and Political Construction of Europe (Nov., 1992), Oxford University Press, p. 45, Gerhart B. Ladner, The Holy Roman Empire of the Tenth Century and East Central Europe, *The Polish Review*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (Autumn 1960), 9.

¹⁰⁶ Herwig Wolfram, New Peoples around the Year 1000, *Europe around the Year 1000*, ed, Przemysław Urbańczyk. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2001, 391-409, f. 19

¹⁰⁷ Vlasto, *The Entry of The Slavs*, 127. For Otto's plans for *renovation imperii* see also Muller-Mertens, The Ottonians, 257, 257; Janet Nelson, Rulers and government, *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, Volume III c. 900 – c. 1024, ed. by Timothy Reuter, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2008, 95, 96; Strzelczyk, Bohemia and Poland, 524.

some of its neighbours.¹⁰⁸ We could be fairly sure that this *Sclavinia* did not include territories southern than Poland and Bohemia, because at the same time Otto III and his pope granted the king title and archbishopric seat to Hungary and the title *dux Dalmatorum* to the Venetian doge.¹⁰⁹ The genesis of this idea is not certain but most probably it was not created by Slavs themselves¹¹⁰; such a concept was not noticed in Great Moravia and Bohemia before.¹¹¹ It is also worth noticing that Otto III was

¹⁰⁸ For Jerzy Strzelczyk, Bohemia and Poland: two examples of successful Slavonic state-formation, *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, Volume III c. 900 – c. 1024, ed. by Timothy Reuter, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2008, 525 it was simply Poland, which to this time was not known under its own name. Vlasto, *The Entry of The Slavs*, 356, f. 133 clearly thought that “‘Sclavinia’ may not have been intended as strictly limited to the Slavs within the Polish dominions” but very possibly Bohemia and the land near Elba with the purpose to create a big balancing power against “Germany” in which he did not enjoyed sympathy but rather strong opposition (Francis Dvornik, *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe*, Boston, 1965, 265). Still including *Sclavinia* Slavs around the Elba and the Baltic Sea in this is questionable because Otto III politics against them was following the Voitech’s idea of peaceful conversion (Dvornik, *Central and Eastern Europe* 260, 261). For Chrysos, *Settlements*, 131 “In this case of Sclavinia it is apparently the region of what is today East Germany.” For different interpretation, see Malinovská, *The Development of the Concept of Sclavinia*, 7, 8.

¹⁰⁹ Dvornik, *Central and Eastern Europe*, 262; Eckhard Muller-Mertens, *The Ottonians as kings and emperors*, *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, Volume III c. 900 – c. 1024, ed. by Timothy Reuter, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2008, 258).

¹¹⁰ Cf. Malinovská, *The Development of the Concept of Sclavinia*, 7, “Such a Sclavinia already reflects the consciousness of the Slavs’ community, which is beginning to grow into the common idea of the united “Slavs”. What is essential, this initiative comes from the Slavs themselves”, were she referred to Adalbert Woitech, the spiritual adviser of the emperor as creator of the idea. It is not clear if he himself was the creator of this concept. Dvornik saw Adalbert’s influence in Otto III Slavic politic only in the idea of peaceful conversion of Slavs instead of forceful conversion and subjugation which proved to be unsuccessful (Dvornik, *Central and Eastern Europe*, 260, 261). Wolfram, *New Peoples*, f. 19 stated that “The main protagonists of the Renovation were the Emperor himself”, and put the name of Woitech as creator in quotes : “*Voitech’s*” *Sclavinia*. It seems that the initiative came to Slavs from outside – it appeared in Poland later, the first one who used it there was not a native Polish (Gallus Anonymus), others that followed were educated in France and Italy.

¹¹¹ Contrary to by itself innovative and interesting idea proposed by Malinovská (H. Малиновска, “Regnum Sclavorum” Святополка как источник средневековых славянских концепций “Склавинии”, *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Petropolitana*, 2017. № 1 (21). Январь—Июнь, 25 – 27; Malinovská, *The Development of the Concept of Sclavinia*, 8 – 10), according to which *Sclavinia* was the concept for united Slavic land born in Great Moravia and its ruler Svyatopolk. However, Great Moravia was not called *Sclavinia* in contemporary Latin sources. Similarly in Slavic sources created in its territory, and in the Balkans from expelled from Moravia students of Saint Methodius as was already noticed there are no terms as *Sclavinia*, or *Slavic land*, and neither idea of One Slavic Land (we find Slavic parts/saids in plural). The comparison Malinovská made with some other sources as Ibrahim ibn Yajub who visited court of Otto I in 965 r., *Povest’ vremennykh let* and Gallus Anonymus does not look convincing: *Slavic land* or *Sclavinia* in these 3 sources are significantly different things. Ibrahim ibn Yajub included in Slavic lands Bulgaria but not Russia, *Povest’ vremennykh let* included Russia and excluded Bulgaria, Gallus Anonymus excluded both but included Hungary.

the son of a Byzantine princess and under strong influence of the Byzantine imperial ideas.¹¹²

Practical reasons behind this idea were probably the need to find a new way to deal with Slavs neighbourhood after the debacle of Otto II politics of Christianization and subjugation of Slavs between the Elba and the Baltic shore alongside with fast growing power of Poland under Mesko I and Boleslaw and the support it received from the Pope.¹¹³ Actually, this is one of the moments when we can see that the main idea behind *Sclavinia* was the intent of putting independent Slavs under imperial control, when there was not enough power to directly conquer them. To that very moment, in sources Poland was not called *Sclavinia*, and shortly after, it was powerful enough to be affirmed under its own name.¹¹⁴

This idea of Otto III had little influence outside his “inner circle” and it died in the empire with him.¹¹⁵ Still, it seems to have had some resonance in Poland later. Krakow’s bishop Mathew in 1147 stated that Poland and Bohemia together are called *Sclavonia*. The first native Polish chronicler magister Vincentius (end of XII - beginning of XIII c.) mentioned “Slaviae ... monarchia” equal to Poland. Two other examples that are given as connected with Otto III *Sclavinia* seem to represent different approach in rethinking what *Sclavinia* had to mean. Gallus Anonymus’ *Sclauinia* (1107 – 1113) included all former western imperial Slavic lands from the Adriatic to the Baltic sea, but not the lands of Slavs per se.¹¹⁶ Polish History of Yan Dlugosz from XV century followed Gallus Anonymus; it also uses *Sclavia* in the meaning of today’s Slavonia.¹¹⁷

Sclavinia after Sclavinias

When the object disappeared, the term usually also disappeared. However, in some cases, it continued its existence but had to change its meaning. The same can be observed with the term *Sclavina*. In majority of cases it disappeared with the dependent to empires Slavic territories, but in some rare situations it tended to survive or revive as was the case in Poland after XI century, or in Byzantium in XII

¹¹² Dvornik, *Central and Eastern Europe*, 256 – 258, 263, 264; Vlasto, *The Entry of The Slavs*, 124

¹¹³ Dvornik, *Central and Eastern Europe*, 112, 113.

¹¹⁴ Krystyna Łukasiewicz, “Dagome Iudex” and the first conflict over Succession in Poland, in *The Polish Review*, Vol. 54, No. 4 (2009), 18; Strzelczyk, *Bohemia and Poland*, 524, 525. Failure of Otto III politics and its abandonment after his death together with continued growth of Poland strength led to its affirmation in sources under its own name.

¹¹⁵ Vlasto, *The Entry of The Slavs*, 125

¹¹⁶ *Gesta principum Polonorum*, The deeds of the princes of the Poles, tr. Paul W. Knoll, Frank Schaer, Central European University Press, Budapest New York, 2003, 12 – 15. There Poland is the northern part of *Sclauinia* which is equal to “terra Sclauonica” including lands from Denmark to Sarmatian - Gets, Thrace, Epirus and the Adriatic sea which clearly exclude all eastern and half of Balkan Slavs, but included former Slavic lands of Hungary and today’s Romania.

¹¹⁷ Щавелева, Польские, 33, 39, 42, 76, 77, 86, 160; Щавелева Н. И. Древняя Русь в «Польской истории» Яна Длугоша (Книги I—VI). — Москва.: Памятники исторической мысли, 2004, 68.

century. In some cases there were attempts of revival of its archaic meaning which led to creating of never existing before artificial use (Gallus Anonymus) or was rethought and connected with new realities (Etymologicon Magnum and Zonara).¹¹⁸ Partly similar to the change of meaning of the term Slavs in some parts of the Mediterranean (Islamic countries, Byzantium) after XI century where it started to be used for servants and slaves.¹¹⁹

Sclavinia as transitional term

The term was not just bound to western imperial tradition but also had its specific way of usage. It was not used for all Slavic lands or principalities and not all the time. As a rule, it was used for autonomic Slavic territory put under the imperial high authority. As such, the term appeared for the territories in the transitional process of losing their independence to complete assimilation into the empire.¹²⁰ It seems that resentful to imperial authority Great Moravia, which successfully defended its independence, was never called Sclavinia in contemporary sources. Bohemia was called Sclavinia between 895 and 1000, which was actually the time from its separation from the collapsing Great Moravia and subordination to the empire in 895, to the moment it became a vasa part of the empire in 1004. Carinthia was named Sclavinia after Bavaria was subjugated to the Frankish kingdom in 788 to the end of IX century when emperor's throne was shortly left empty. It was not called Sclavinia after Ottonian resurrection of the empire because in 976 it was made one of the duchies in the Holy Roman Empire. The territory behind Elba were called Sclavinia from 789 to the end of XII century. This is the period when the Empire put great efforts to subjugate it with changing success. In the second half of XII c., this land was gradually absorbed into the Empire and Danish kingdom and its Slavic rulers gone extinct to the end of century and the term Sclavinia (Sclavia) also disappeared.¹²¹ The first time Poland was called Sclavinia was exactly in imperial plans to make it a part of the Empire circa 1000. The abandonment of this plan in

¹¹⁸ *Etymologicon magnum*, ed. Friderici Sylburgii, Lipsiae 1816, 225, ⁴⁸ mentioned *Sclavinias* once in an article that explained the word beard (Γένειον). In Iohannis Zonarae Lexicon, ed. Iohannes Tittmann, tomus posterior, Lipsiae 1808, col. 1653: Σκλαβινία, ἡ Βουλγαρία), i.e. the Ohrid archbishopric (cf. Πανονία, ἡ Βουλγαρία Col. 1507, the main city of Panonia – Sirmium in the XII century was a bishop's seat in the Ohrid diocese. For the use of the term *Bulgarians* in this period, see Коматина, Појам Бугарске, 41–56. Bulgarian state was never called *Sclavinia* in Byzantine sources (Стојков, Стојко, “ЈАНЗЫКЪ СЛОВѢНСКЫЙ” во старословенските текстови (IX – XIV век), Историја, 50-51/1 (2015/2016), 131, 132).

¹¹⁹ Helga Köpstein, Zum Bedeutungswandel von Σκλαβος / Slavus, *Byzantinische Forschungen*, VII, Amsterdam, 1979, 66-88, 71, 72, 76, 77, 83–85, 87; Д. Е. Мишин, Сакалиба, Славяне в исламском мире. Москва, 2002, 13, 20.

¹²⁰ Cf. Chrysos, Settlement, 130 – 133: “areas with Slavic population under imperial sovereignty”. The only difference there is that *Sclavinia* was not an integral part of the Empire, but rather a transitional stage that finished with becoming an integral part of the empire. The entirely submitted and integrated territories inhabited by Slavs were not called *Sclavinia*.

¹²¹ The only document using it for this territory after 1200 is one letter of the Pope from 1217 concerning the conquest of these lands in the time of Canute VI: MGH, Epistolae Saeculi XIII I, 12, ¹¹.

parallel with the transformation of Poland into a great independent kingdom through XI century would lead to the abandonment of the term Sclavinia and its replacement with the name Poland. Sclavinia would still return for Poland in some later sources, but already for different reasons and meaning. Only in Dalmatia the term would survive because on the one hand there this transitional process was never completely finished: Croatia entered into a personal union with Hungarian kings in 1102 and continued to exist as a such kingdom through the middle age; on the other – part of this territory was named Slavonia so it become part of official nomenclature.

It seems that the same was the case with Byzantine where *Sclavinia* was used from the end of VIII c. to the middle of IX for Slavic lands in Macedonia and Hellas, and in the middle of X c. for Slavic parts in Dalmatia. With the disappearance of these half-dependant territories, or their evolution into independent states, or with disappearance of imperial borders with them the term also disappeared.¹²²

Therefore, in the West *Sclavinia* was used from the end of VIII c. to the XV c. mostly for the Slavic regions on borders to Saxony and Bavaria, but also and for a longer time for Dalmatia. It is clear that in the West the term *Sclavinia* was used more and longer than in Byzantium where we can find *Sclavinia* at most in 10 sources from VII (?), IX, X, XII century. Eight of them used it just once, two may be interpolations or mistakes, and just one was an official document.¹²³ In the West, we found *Sclavinia* in far more sources. It was used in the official documentation of western emperors, kings, dukes and popes between IX – XIII century at least 28 times in contrast to the Byzantine one. *Sclavinia* was used in the West to the end of the Middle Ages, but in Byzantium it practically disappeared after X century, at least in its usual sense. The term appeared in the West in more forms than in Byzantium. In addition, its uses in the West in forms that differ from the Byzantine base, like *Slavia*, *Slavinia*, *Sclavania*, *Slavonia* were more numerous than all cases of using *Sclavinia* in Byzantium together. In Byzantium *Sclavinia* was created just from the long form of the ethnonym for Slavs (Sclavini), but in the West it was created from both short and long form. The appearance of deviation forms in the West had nothing

¹²² Литаврин, Новоселцев, Константин Багрянородны, 317, f. 21; Коцер, Византиски свет 102.

¹²³ Theophylacti Simocattae, VIII, 5, p. 323, ⁹; Theophanis, 347 ⁶⁻⁷, 364, ^{5-9, 11-18*} 430, ^{21-22*} 486, ^{17-22*}; Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Legum Sectio III, tom. II, pars II, 2,2, Concilia aevi Karolini [742-842]. Teil 2 [819-842], Hannoverae at Lipsiae, 1908, 477, ¹⁰, Gregoire, Les sources epigraphiques, 768; Henri Gregoire, Un Nouveau fragment di ¹¹“Scriptor incertus de Leone Armenio”, *Byzantion*, t. XI, 1963, 423; Fransis Dvornik, *La Vie de Saint Gregoire le Decapolite, et les Slaves Macedoniens au IXe siècle*, Paris, 1926, 61, ²⁰ – 62, ⁴; Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administriando imperio*, G. Moravcisk, R. J. H. Jenkins (ed. and tr.), *Dumbarton oaks texts one*, Washington, 1967, 9, ^{10*}, ^{107*}, 28, ^{19*}, 29, ^{68*}, 30, ^{94*}; Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus, ed. I Bekker, Bonnae, 1838, 617, ^{12*}. See also *Sclavinia* in Latin translation of Theophanes Chronicle Anastasii Bibliotecari, *Chronographia tripartita*, rec. Carolus de Boor, vol. 2, Lipsiae, 1885, 218, ¹⁰ (658: Sclaviniam), 231, ^{15, 16, 17} (689: Scavinias, Sclaviniam), 282, ^{20, 21} (758: Sclavenias penes Macedoniam), 325, ¹⁷ (810: Sclavinias).

to do with the distance from Constantinople, but more with local traditions.¹²⁴ Two regions *Sclavinia* were used most often for – northern from the Elba and in Dalmatia gives us the majority of deviations from the classical (Byzantine) forms. Finally, in the West under imperial influence the term was accepted from some Slavic rulers, something that never happened in Byzantium.

Even though it was used more and longer in the West, this does not mean that it was created there or that the Byzantine Empire had not a role in it at all. It is not just the Byzantine classical Greek form of the term that was mostly used even in the West, but also the time-coincidence when the term appeared and the similar way it was used for Slavic lands in the transitional process of their incorporation into the empire. It is very unlikely that two parts of Europe developed the same term at near the same time for the same process independently.

The fact that *Sclavinia* was used for tribal societies like VIII c. Vltzies and for states like X – XIII c. Bohemia and Poland excludes the possibility that the emergence and disappearance of the term was a reflection of some changes inside Slavic societies. As an *outside term*, *Sclavinia* appeared when the literate neighbours came into contacts with the Slavic tribes. However, it did not happen in every situation when Slavic tribes become neighbours to Christian societies, but just when it was empires. As it was already noticed, the term was bound with the imperial court in the West, and the same was in Byzantium.

The change of the geopolitical situation in VIII – IX c. put many Slav communities in Central Europe and the Balkans in the sphere of influence and domination of the great empires. It happened at nearly the same time in the East and the West. In Byzantium, the process started with the expedition of Stauracius in 783, and in the West, after destroying the Saxons and especially with the expedition in 789 when some Slavic entities were subordinated. Exactly this change was reflected in some Byzantine and western sources with the appearance of the term *Sclavinia*. These changes for first time create the Frankish – Slavic border zone, and at the same time make the already existing Byzantine – Slavic borders much longer. *Sclavinia* was clearly a border zone term.¹²⁵ We cannot find it deeply behind these border zones.¹²⁶ The same challenge led to a similar answer and the two states

¹²⁴ Such is the case with Wenedonia / Windia used in IX c. and resurrected again in XII c. after Canute VI conquered Pomerania.

¹²⁵ It was the same in Byzantium where *Sclavinias* were described as neighbouring to the themes “circumiacentibus Sclavinii” in the letter of Michael II or τὰς περίξ Σκλαβηνίας in Chronicle of 811 (*MGH*, Legum Sectio III, tomi II, pars II, 2, 2, Concilia aevi Karolini [742-842]. Teil 2 [819-842] ed. Werminghoff, Hannoverae at Lipsiae, 1908 477, ^{10, 11}; Henri Gregoire, Un Nouveau fragment di “Scriptor incertus de Leone Armenio”, *Byzantion*, t. XI, 1963, 423).

¹²⁶ The only exception that confirms the rule is Constantine Porphyrogenite naming *Sclaviniai* some Slavic tribes in Russia in X century (Porphyrogenitus, *De AdminIstriando*, 9, ^{10, 107, 108}).

tended to create borders with “zonal nature”.¹²⁷ But, this clearly does not need a creation of the same term for it.

At the end of VIII century, contacts between the Franks and the Byzantines intensified. Greater authority of Byzantium, strong tendency in the Charlemagne courts after 789 to act as emperors and in imperial fashion, and wishes to recreate the lost Roman empire in the West with the only existing example in Byzantium - all this could lead to a deliberate imitation of some Byzantine practices and terminology in the Carolingian court¹²⁸ and it possibly led to the use of the term *Sclavinia* there, even when in Frankish provinces different terms were preferred. It is worth to notice that in Frankish kingdom *Sclavinia* appeared in the same year Charlemagne started to behave as an emperor - 789.¹²⁹ Thus, the use of *Sclavinia* in the West could be part of *imitation imperii*. At least we find *Sclavinia* as the term in correspondence between both empires (824, 871), and especially in letter of Louis II “*Sclavenia nostra*” clearly shows understanding that there are Frankish and Byzantine *Sclavinia*.¹³⁰

One consequence of this link between the term and the Slavic *border zone* in the process of submission is that it followed the fate of those border zones. It moved with them and disappeared with them. When these zones survived longer, *Sclavinia* also was used longer like in territory between the Elba and the Oder, or in Dalmatia. The same pattern can be noticed in Byzantium: in IX c., *Sclavinias* were in Macedonia, but in X c. they were already in Dalmatia. Moving Byzantine borders and political changes in South-East Europe ended with a near disappearance of Byzantine - Slavic border zones in XI – XII century. Slavic communities became parts of the empires or evolved into independent states. Then the ethnonym Slavs itself disappeared in Byzantine sources.¹³¹

Therefore, we need to make a difference in the way the term *Sclavinia* is used in *historiography* and in the *sources*. In the sources it was not used for *independent Slavs*, not just for *Slavic lands*, and with rare exceptions – not for *Slavic states*. It was not a consequence of the inner development in the Slavic communities either, but rather of their political fate. *Sclavinia* was used for the neighbouring Slavs from the Slavic’s imperial neighbours. *Sclavinia* was used for such territories if they were put in the process of subjugation under Christian empires but were still not entirely part of them. The use of term reflected not just political reality and processes but also the way they were viewed and labelled by contemporary imperial courts.

¹²⁷ Julia M.H. Smith, *Fines imperil: the marches*, *The new Cambridge Medieval History*, t. II, Cambridge university press, 2006, 179. “In much the same manner as the Byzantines secured their frontiers, the Frankish emperor attempted wherever possible to establish a ring of friendly client rulers in the immediate periphery of his territory.” (169).

¹²⁸ Фавие, Карл Велики, 521 – 528: “From Byzantium already are borrowed some signs of equality with the basileus. Clearly fixation in this direction was strong. The example is provided by the chancellery...” (524).

¹²⁹ It started with *Admonitio generalis* in 789 and continued with *Libri Carolini* (see Фавие, Карл Велики, 521 – 524).

¹³⁰ Chrysos, *Settlement*, 131.

¹³¹ E. Mühle, *Die Slaven im Mittelalter*, Berlin/Boston 2016, 12, 13.