THE BULGARS IN THE BALKANS AND THE OCCUPATION OF CORINTH IN THE SEVENTH CENTURY

BY KENNETH M. SETTON

The present paper will seek to present a synthesis of the sixth- and seventh-century activities of the Bulgars in the Balkans, and by bringing into apposition, in such a manner as has not been done before, certain historical and archaeological evidence, to suggest — for much historical discussion ‘suggest’ is a more fitting word than ‘prove’ — the extreme probability of the occupation of Corinth by the Onogur Bulgars in the middle of the seventh century. The fifteenth-century Greek ecclesiastic, Isidore, Metropolitan of Kiev (1437–1442), a prominent figure in the Councils of Ferrara and Florence, declares in a petition which he addressed about 1429 to the Patriarch of Constantinople, in behalf of the then Metropolitan of Monemvasia, that the Onogur Bulgars took Corinth without a struggle. This statement has never been taken seriously, but it seems to me that the weight of the evidence, which we shall examine as we proceed, is entirely in favor of the fundamental truth of Isidore’s statement, although he has, to be sure, erred in both the time and circumstances of the Bulgaric occupation of Corinth. We shall find it worthwhile in the pages that follow to detail certain of the more important facts concerning the early Bulgars, together with some peoples related to them, both in their homeland and in the Balkans; to show from the learned studies of Professor Gyula Moravesik of Budapest that the so-called Danube Bulgars were Onogurs; to outline the history of the first Hunnic (or rather Bulgaric), Slavic, and Avaric attacks upon the Balkan provinces of the Byzantine Empire and to depict the political circumstances under which they occurred; to deal with both the legends and facts in the career of the Bulgaric prince Kovrat, with the assistance of an instructive paper by Professor Grégoire; to consider, for what it may be worth, the pertinent evidence in the Chronicle of Monemvasia and in a well known Scholium of Arethas of Caesarea; to fit into the now known flow of events some important archaeological evidence from the seventh century at Corinth, erroneously interpreted by the archaeologists; and, finally, to show that our combined historical and archaeological evidence now points, it seems to me, to an Onoguric occupation of Corinth in the seventh century, to which fact, whatever his errors, Isidore of Kiev is obviously alluding. Isidore writes:

And now two sacks of Corinth were witnessed during the period of Roman domination over the Peloponnesus, one in the days of Justinian the Great, who on this account later fortified the Isthmus [and the other as a consequence of the Fourth Crusade], for in Justinian’s time three Scythian tribes, called the Kutrigurs, Utigurs, and Onogurs [Κουτρίγαροι, Ούττγαροι καὶ Ούνγαροι], having crossed the Danube, one of these tribes ravaged upper Moesia, Pannonia, and Dalmatia and the regions right up to the Ionia Sea in a single expedition, while the Utigurs ravaged all Thrace and the Hellespontine Chersonese and all the territories on this side of the Hebrus to the very walls of the city of Constantine, and these Belisarius checked, outwitting and crushing them, but the
Onogurs laying waste to Macedonia, Thessaly, Greece, and everything within Thermopylae, and pillaging even as far as Corinth, they straightway took the city without a single blow.1

In the fifth-century certain so-called Hunnic peoples, generally known as Bulgars, often accompanied apparently by the Slavs, began their raids upon the northernmost provinces of the Balkan peninsula, and these raids had become almost serious by the time of the Emperor Anastasius I (491–518).2 Largely responsible for these raids were the Bulgar tribes known as the Utigurs, who lived to the east, and the Kutrigurs, who lived to the west of the Don. In 489 the Emperor Zeno is said to have sought the aid of the Bulgars against the Ostrogoths,3 and from the 490’s on the Bulgar tribesmen made frequent raids upon Thrace, Moesia, and Illyricum.4 Less bellicose, perhaps, than the Bulgars were the Slavs, who proved to be, however, no less a menace to the Balkan provinces — and more of a menace to Greece — than the Bulgars, for the Slavs came in greater numbers, flowed in persistently and undramatically, seeking homes in which to settle. However, despite much controversy during the past century, there is now some agreement — among some scholars — that there were no significant Slavic settlements in Greece proper until the eighth and ninth decades of the sixth century.5 Byzantine writers in telling of events relating to the Huns, Bulgars, Avars, Antae, Slavs, and numerous other peoples, have created by general and careless descriptions much confusion in Byzantine and Balkan history, but in late years the valuable researches of Moravcsik and others have deepened our understanding of many important aspects of the early history of these peoples. Much doubt and much debate will, presumably, always attach themselves to particular peoples as well as to particular persons. Thus, assisting ‘Kouver,’ whom we believe to be the Bulgar Khan Kovrat, and to whom we shall return, in a bold intrigue against Thessalonica in the middle of the seventh century (as we believe) was a certain Mauros, apparently a Bulgar, who feigned flight to Thessalonica as a refugee seeking protection against his former lord. Mauros knew Greek, Latin, Slavonic, and Bulgarian (καὶ τὴν καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἐπιστάμενος γλῶσσαν καὶ τὴν Ρωμαιόν, Σκλάβων καὶ Βουλγάρων),6 but what really was his ‘nationality’? Can we not believe that in the turmoil of peoples milling back and forth in the Balkans Mauros had had more than once in the years preceding had occasion to change his nationality as danger required or convenience suggested?

The word ‘Hun’ is very generally and very carelessly used in both Byzantine and western sources, and may have, in fact, some twenty different meanings, referring to such diverse peoples as Avars, Bulgars (in general), Burugundi, Cumans, Goths, Hungarians (Magyars), Kutrigurs, Lombards, Onogurs, Ottomans, Sabirs, Seljuks, Turks (in general), Utigurs, and Uz.7 The Huns and Bulgars were cousins, but not brothers: the Huns were eastern Turks, while the Bulgars were western Turks, and spoke a language distinct from the common Turkish of the Huns. One cannot hope to differentiate too closely among the various Bulgar peoples, for all the Bulgar tribes and nations were of mixed racial stock, and the very name Bulgar, according to the great philologist J. Nemeth, is of Turkish origin, and meant ‘mixed,’8 and so denoted ‘ein Volk, das sich aus verschiedenen Elementen zusammengesetzt hatte.’9 There have been, however,
other interpretations of the word Bulgar and other attempts to depict the obscure history which lies behind it.\textsuperscript{10}

If the Huns, properly speaking, are to be distinguished from the Bulgars, the Hungarians must be kept apart from both of them. This is not always easy, for Moravesik has shown in some detail how close relations were between the Hungarians and the Onogur Bulgars. The linguistic evidence has, of course, proved the Finno-Ugrian origin of the Hungarians (or Magyars), but early in their history they had come in close contact with Bulgaro-Turks, i.e., especially the Onogurs, perhaps in the Ugric lands in western Siberia, east of the Urals, where they joined the Bulgaro-Turks in the fifth century in the westward movement which brought both groups of peoples to the northern and eastern shores of the Black Sea. From the Bulgaro-Turkish On-ogur, ‘ten arrows,’ comes the name Hungarian\textsuperscript{11} — the Onogurs and Magyars had long lived together as almost a single nation — the name ‘Hungarian’ was fastened upon the Magyars by the Slavs, for they had once been part of the Onogur nation, and the Slavs continued to call them ‘Onogurs’ (Ugré, Ungari). Although the Magyars, a very mixed people, were not originally of Turkish stock, they were or became close relatives of the Onogurs. The Magyars maintained, from the middle of the fifth to the middle of the seventh century, very close, indeed symbiotic, relations with the Onogur Bulgars, which explains the markedly Bulgaro-Turkish imprint apparent upon the Magyar language and early social organization.\textsuperscript{12}

The Onogurs established themselves in the northern-Caucasus region, between the Don and the Kuban (δ λεγόμενος Κώβις ποταμός), about the middle of the fifth century.\textsuperscript{13} They remained in their new homes near the Kuban throughout the sixth century, and they formed the basis of the power of Old Great Bulgaria (ἡ παλαιὰ Βουλγαρία μεγάλη), on Lake Maeotis, a barbarian empire established along the northeastern outposts of the Byzantine Empire by the great Onogur Kovrat in the early seventh century.\textsuperscript{14} When Great Bulgaria fell before the advance of the Khazars in the later seventh century, some of the Onogurs, and other peoples who dwelt with them, became subject to the Khazars and paid tribute to them, while other Onogurs moved into the Danube region, presumably under Kovrat’s famous son Asparuch.\textsuperscript{15} Here the Onogurs became known as the Danube Bulgars. (It is conceivable that there were certain groups of Kutrigurs now dwelling with them.) The Onogurs furnished the most numerous and strongest tribes in the new Bulgaria, for an eighth-century Byzantine source, describing the events of 713 when the Emperor Philip Bardanes fell from power, dwells on the depredations in Thrace perpetrated by the Empire’s dangerous new neighbors, who are specifically named the ‘Onogur Bulgars’ (ἡ ... ἔφοδος τοῦ γεννήτωρος ἔθνους τῶν Οὐνογούρων Βουλγάρων ...).\textsuperscript{16} Part of the Onogurs remained behind, however, in their now old home between the Crimea and the Caucasus, for the episcopal list of the ‘eparchy of Gothia’ (ἐπαρχία Γοθίας), contained in the so-called ‘Notitia of the Isaurians,’ provides for a ‘Bishop of the Onogurs’ (ὁ [ἐπίσκοπος ὃ Ουγούρων),\textsuperscript{17} a missionary suffragan of the Crimean Gothic Metropolitan.\textsuperscript{18} This list, which some scholars have dated between 733 and 746, has been recently connected by Vernadsky with the mission which Constantine the
Philosopher, later known as St Cyril (the Apostle to the Slavs), undertook to
Khazaria in A.D. 861 or 862, and Vernadsky believes that part of the Onoguric
peoples must have still been in the region east of the Sea of Azov as late as the
second half of the ninth century. The list of bishoprics constituting the Gothic
province is contained, as we have stated, in the so-called 'Notitia of the Isaurians,'
which has been the subject of much learned discussion, but whether the Gothic
list should be dated in the eighth or the ninth century, and whatever the dates
and sources of other sections of the Notitia, and whether the Gothic list itself
represents a real or merely an imaginary or desired organization, we seem to
have here valid evidence of the presence of the Onogurs in the Crimean region,
and this at a period considerably later than their establishment on the Danube.¹⁹

According to Theophanes and the Patriarch Nicephorus, whose accounts are
derived from some common source, the Danube Bulgars appeared in Thrace, to
remain, in the year 679.²⁰ The Bulgars had not been nomads, however, as Pro-
fessor Fehér has amply demonstrated, but even before the fifth century, long
before their settlement in the Balkans, the Bulgars had been 'un peuple établi,
s'occupant d'élevage en grand et d'agriculture.'²¹ Before 679, very likely, Bulgars
had occupied the Dobrudja and built the fortifications at Garac, between the
Sereth and the Pruth, just above the points where the rivers flow into the
Danube; at Nicolici, just south of the delta of the Danube; and upon sites even
far into Moesia.²² Old Great Bulgaria had been established early in the seventh
century by Kovrat (Kubrat) along the shores of Lake Maeotis and in the region
of the Kuban. Kovrat was the ruler (κύρος) of the Onogurs or Onogunduri,
according to the Patriarch Nicephorus (ed. de Boor, p. 24); and Theophanes
(ed. de Boor, i, 356) attributes to him lordship over 'the Onogundurs, Bulgars,
and Kutrigurs' (οἱ Οὐνογούντοροι, Βοῦγγαροι καὶ Κότραγοι).²³ Kovrat died in 642,
the second year of the reign (641–668) of the Emperor Constans II (Constantine
III); both Theophanes and Nicephorus tell the story of his leaving behind five
sons who separated despite his admonition that they should remain together
and preserve the unity of his realm. Of these alleged five sons only two seem
to have been historical figures, but the whole legend seems to have arisen from
the dissolution of Kovrat's Great Bulgaria between the Don and the Kuban into
groups of peoples. The first son Balan remained near the Kuban when, just
after the middle of the seventh century, the Khazars reduced him to the position
of a tribute-paying ally, and it is in this group of Onogurs that Moravcsik would
see one of the chief constituent elements in the later Magyars.²⁴ The third son,
Asparuch (Ἀσπάροχος), is also an historical figure. Upon the appearance of
the Khazars he moved westward across the Don, the Dnieper, and the Dniester,
with perhaps less than half the Onogurs, and settled in the Danube region in
679–680, and the history of modern Bulgaria was thus begun.²⁵ For seven cen-
turies Bulgaria remained a formidable neighbor to Byzantium, until it fell
before the Ottoman advance and became a Turkish province (1389–1396), and
such it remained for almost five hundred years.²⁶ The other three sons of Kovrat
are probably mythical figures. Kotragos, the second son, is said to have been the
leader of the Kutrigurs, but since the Kutrigurs were so named long before the
time of Kotragos, he must have received the name from them rather than they from him, but in any event he seems to belong to legend rather than to history. The fourth and fifth sons are nameless, and that is probably just as well. The fourth son is said to have gone to Pannonia and become subject to the dread Avars — at the beginning of the ninth century the great Khan Krum united the Bulgars in Pannonia with those under the khanate at Pliska — while the fifth is said to have gone into Italy. Moravesik has, however, ingeniously found the five groups of peoples into which the realm of Kovrat appears to have broken: 1) the Onogurs, or cousins of the Onogurs, under Bănăș, who remained on the Kuban, whence came, Moravesik thinks, the Hungarians of a later period; 2) the Onogurs under Asparuch, who became known as the Danube Bulgars; 3) the Kutrigurs, over whom Kovrat had once ruled; 4) the later Volga-Bulgars, who survived until the appearance of the Mongols; and 5) the Bashkirs, who were a part of the Hungarian people. This theory suggests that the Onogur tribes of Turkish origin, true Bulgars, went west to the Danube under Asparuch, while that part of the Onogurs of Finno-Ugrian origin remained by the Kuban and became subject to the Khazars just after the middle of the seventh century. The two groups of Onogurs had been, although close relatives, essentially different peoples; the ease with which they separated now becomes more intelligible; and, if Moravesik’s theory is true, the beginnings of Magyar history become a bit clearer. The Hungarians would now feel, less and less, the Onogur influence, but their chiefs, after Bănăș, remained still of Onogur-Bulgar descent; however, the Finno-Ugrian character of the people now became intensified, and they became Magyars, a name itself of Finno-Ugrian origin.

The raids of Bulgars and other new barbarians upon the Byzantine Empire became increasingly dangerous from the first years of Justinian’s reign, and the contemporary historians Procopius and John Malalas, among others, are unhappy witnesses to the severity of their depredations. In 527 Bulgars, Slavs, and western Antae ravaged Illyricum and Thrace, perhaps the first historically certain attack by the Slavs, in force and in large numbers, upon the Empire (although for generations there had probably been a persistent infiltration into the northern Balkan provinces). Two years later, in 529–530, a Bulgaric horde invaded Scythia and Lower Moesia, and ravaged Thrace; another attack, in the next year, was driven back by Mundus, the Byzantine commander in Illyricum, who destroyed their army, captured much booty, and sent one of their chieftains in chains to the capital. Peace was then restored in Thrace, and fear seized the barbarians. In the fourth year of Justinian’s reign Chilibadius was appointed from the Emperor’s own household, to the office of magister militum in Thrace (Θάκης στρατηγός), ‘and was assigned to guard the river Ister [Danube], being ordered to keep watch, so that the barbarians of that region could no longer cross the river, since the Huns and Antae and Sclaveni had already made the crossing many times and done irreparable harm to the Romans.’ Chilibadius held the barbarians back beyond the Danube for three years, and often carried the war across the river to them, ‘and killed and enslaved the barbarians there,’
but rendered over confident by his exploits, in 533–534 he crossed the Danube with a small force, and the Slavs defeated and killed him. A half dozen years later, in 539–540, Procopius informs us that ‘a mighty Hunnic [Bulgarian] army crossing the Danube River fell as a scourge upon all Europe. . . . For from the Ionian Gulf these barbarians plundered everything in order as far as the suburbs of Byzantium. They captured thirty-two fortresses in Illyricum, and they carried by storm the city of Cassandria. . . . They pillaged Illyricum and Thessaly in another invasion (540), turned the fortified pass at Thermopylae, and ‘destroyed almost all the Greeks except the Peloponnesians,’ for the walls of the Isthmus checked their advance any further south. The disasters led Justinian to organize the vast series of fortifications throughout all the northern provinces of the Balkan peninsula, and in various other strategic places to the south, such as Thermopylae and Corinth: new forts were constructed, old ones were reconstructed, and they numbered, in all, some six hundred. Not long after the Bulgarian depredations of 540, the (western) Antae and certain groups of the Slavs became hostile to each other, and in an ensuing battle the Antae were defeated by their fellow Slavs. Justinian sought to divide and rule. He proposed to settle the Antae, an Eastern Slavic people, led, it is now suggested, by a Sarmatian ruling clan, in the abandoned Trajanic city and region of Turris, on the left bank of the lower Danube, where as foederati they might be employed against the Bulgars. Justinian seems thus to have removed the Antae from among his barbarian enemies, and in 545 the eunuch Narses, with a number of Heruli under him intended for the army in Italy, met and defeated a great horde of Slavs, who had crossed the Danube and were pillaging Thrace. Two or three years later, in 548–549, the Slavs again crossed the Danube; they ‘spread desolation throughout the whole of Illyricum as far as Epidamnus [Durrës], killing or enslaving all who came their way’; and the imperial commanders, with fifteen thousand men at their disposal, lacked courage enough ‘to get close to the enemy.’ In 549–550 about three thousand Slavs crossed the Hebrus River (the modern Maritza), divided into two parts, one ravaging Illyricum and the other Thrace, and defeated the Byzantine commanders, although the latter had caught them thus divided. The coastal city of Topirus in Thrace, opposite the island of Thasos, and but twelve days’ distance from the capital, was stormed by the invaders, whose terrible cruelties Procopius recounts in gruesome detail. In the summer of 550, or 551, a great body of Slavs appeared again on Roman soil: ‘they had come with the intention of capturing by siege both Thessalonica itself and the cities around it,’ but the formidable reputation of the Byzantine general Germanus, who was then in Sardica, and whom Justinian directed to defend Thessalonica, caused the Slavs to abandon their ambitious plan and, instead, to harass Dalmatia. Procopius, writing his Secret History about this time, gives us a depressing, even if much exaggerated, summary of conditions in the Balkans: ‘Illyricum and Thrace, from the Ionian Sea to the suburbs of Byzantium, were overrun almost every year since Justinian’s accession to the throne by Huns, Sclavenes, and Antae, who dealt atrociously with the inhabitants. In every
invasion I suppose that about 200,000 Roman subjects were killed or enslaved; the whole land became a sort of Scythian desert — but the invasions of the Balkans were just beginning: 'Ce n'était là qu'un prélude' (Dvorník).

The contemporary historian Agathias describes in stirring fashion the movement of the Bulgars known as the Kutrigurs under a chieftain named Zabergan in the winter of 558–559. The Kutrigurs, who got along badly with the Utigurs, who dwelt near them, sought wealth and adventure in the Byzantine empire, to which the Utigurs were bound by an alliance which Justinian had negotiated with them. Crossing the frozen Danube, the Kutrigurs under Zabergan made their way unchallenged through the provinces of Scythia and Moesia, and in Thrace they divided into three groups in order to pillage a larger area. The first group, under Zabergan himself, planned an attack upon Constantinople, but they were foiled and turned back by the courage and imagination of the veteran Belisarius; the second group tried to occupy the Thracian Chersonese, but were defeated by the Byzantine commander, Germanus; and the third group, sent into Greece, plundered Macedonia and Thessaly, but were stopped by the garrison at Thermopylae. When the Kutrigurs were at last forced to withdraw beyond the Danube, Justinian incited the hostile Utigurs against them; the Utigurs soon disappear from history, while the Kutrigurs had already fallen under Avaric domination.48

From the close of Justinian's reign (565) until the reign of the great soldier Heraclius (610–641) the history of the Balkan provinces is a tedious chronicle of death and destruction in which the Avars figure with most prominence. In 567 they helped the Lombards destroy the kingdom of the Gepids, and seized their lands, in Pannonia, for themselves (568), whereupon the Lombards were obliged to seek their fortunes in Italy.50 The Avars retained some hold upon this region, together with territories farther east, for almost two centuries and a half, until the famous campaigns of Charlemagne (791–799). Avaric envoys from the Caucasus had first waited upon Justinian in 558 and received costly gifts from him, and had thereafter defeated, in his behalf and their own, the Onogurs and Zali (ἐξεπολεμώθησαν Οὐνυγούρους, ἔτα Ζάλους, Οὐνυκώ φίλα); made the Kutrigurs their subjects; crushed the Sabirs; invaded the land of the Antae; and swept, in the middle 560's, up to the Elbe and menaced the Frankish kingdom of Austrasia.51 In 565 the Emperor Justin II haughtily refused to continue the tribute which Justinian had paid them.52 But Baian, the Khagan (χαγάνος) of the Avars, did not abate his claim to tribute, for it had previously been paid to the Utigurs and Kutrigurs, and to other peoples as well, and he insisted to the imperial government that, since Sirmium had been a possession of the Gepids, it now rightfully belonged to the Avars. In 568 he laid siege to Sirmium, 'and he ordered ten thousand Huns, who are called Kutrigurs [Bulgars] to cross the river Save and to ravage Dalmatia,' with the remark that, if they lost their lives in the undertaking, 'he would feel no sense of loss.'53 The Byzantine troops which were to dissuade Baian from giving further offense to the government were defeated, and peace was finally made in 573, the reluctant Justin II, whose stubborn refusal to treat with the Avars had prolonged hostilities through
several years, now having no alternative but to pay the tribute. Justin's co-ruler Tiberius Constantine, in 574–575, accepted as the amount to be paid each year the not inconsiderable sum of 80,000 pieces of gold (ὅγδονοντα χιλάδες εἰς ἑκατὸν νομίσματων), for which he hoped to find among the Avars forces that he might employ against the Persians in the eastern provinces and against the Slavs in the Balkans. Perhaps Tiberius had not miscalculated entirely for in 578, as we shall note again, when one hundred thousand Slavs ravaged Thrace and descended into Greece, the Avars assisted the Byzantine government against them, while Tiberius was himself occupied with an offensive against the Persians. But Baian now had the Emperor at a great disadvantage, and he pressed for the peaceful surrender of Sirmium, and when he was answered with a refusal, a period of three years of Avaric hostility and depredation against the empire was begun (579–582), in which the Balkan provinces suffered severely, and which ended in victory for the Avars: Baian received Sirmium, and the tribute was resumed, with the payment of some 240,000 nomismata, presumably, to cover the three-year period during which it had fallen into arrears (τριών κτών παρεκκεφιμένων χρυσίων). We owe most of what we know of these crucial years of Avaro-Byzantine history to the contemporary annalist Menander Protector, whose so-called Legationes furnish us with a succinct, intelligible, and apparently reliable account of the events we have just described.

In the year 578, as we have already noted, when Tiberius Constantine was in his fourth year as Caesar and co-ruler with Justin II, a horde of some hundred thousand Slavs, according to Menander, gathered in Thrace, which they ravaged, together with 'many other places.' They apparently forced the pass of Thermopylae, because they 'plundered Greece.' Tiberius, of course, was occupied with the Persians in the east, and the Balkan provinces were in the gravest peril (579–80), but Baian, the khagan of the Avars, when appealed to by Tiberius, entered the stricken provinces as their defender, for he bore much animus against the Slavs himself, and was pleased to assail them, and to relieve them of the booty they had accumulated. The opportunity was too good for Baian not to take advantage of the Emperor also; he now secured Sirmium which he had long coveted, together with three years' tribute (580–82), as we have seen, for Tiberius was loathe to add a prolonged struggle with the Avars to the other troubles that harassed him beyond endurance. An inscription from Sirmium (Mitrovitz), which dates almost surely from the Avaric wars of 579–582, contains the pitiful appeal: 'Lord Christ, help the city and smite the Avar and watch over Romania and the writer. Amen.'

The late sixth-century historian Evagrius, of Syrian Epiphania, declares that 'the Avars, having twice made inroads as far as the so-called Long Wall, besieged and enslaved Singidunum [Belgrade, which Justinian had restored and heavily fortified], Anchialus, and indeed all Greece [καὶ τὰν Ἑλλάδα πασαν], together with other cities and garrisons, destroying and burning everything, while most of the armed forces were engaged in the East. The contemporary historian John of Ephesus (507–586) has also left a lugubrious account of these years and these events, which, like the passage we have just noted from Evagrius, is
often quoted in the present connection: In the third year of the reign of the Emperor Tiberius (581), declares John of Ephesus, the accursed Slavs invaded the Empire, traversed all Greece, pillaged Thrace and Thessaly, took many towns and fortified places, and settled into the country as though it were their own. This went on for four years (581–584), during which time they moved about as they liked. Tiberius was fighting the Persians in the east. The Slavs ravaged and burned everything up to the outer walls of the capital; drove off the imperial herds and those of less exalted owners; and even as John was writing, in the year 584, Slavs (and Avars) lived without fear in the Balkan provinces. They had enriched themselves by rapine; they had gold and silver and horses; and their armed hordes had learned to fight better than the Romans. How many Slavs were able to remain behind, after about 580, in permanent settlements in Greece has been a much-disputed question since the early nineteenth century, but the numbers must have been not entirely inconsiderable. The Miracula S. Demetrii also furnishes evidence of the Avaro-Slavic devastation, at this time, of Illyricum and Thrace, and the more northern Balkan provinces would seem to have lost large numbers of their Greek inhabitants. These attacks of Slavs and Avars apparently began in 578–579, and continued in force until about 584–585, during which time the ethnographic character of northern Greece must have been permanently altered by a process of violent Slavonization, for in the course of the invasion of 578–585, according to the Miracula, the Greek natives of Illyricum and Thrace were transported north of the Danube, to the region around Sirmium, where they were ‘mixed with Bulgars, Avars, and other peoples,’ although they were returned to their homes, some sixty years later, about 640–641, by the Bulgaric Khan Kovrat, after he had defeated the Avars, and the once great empire of Balan had dissolved. The Greeks, together with Bulgars and others, were now resettled in the plain of Monastir and elsewhere, as the author of the Miracula informs us, as ‘a new people’ (ἐλλας νεος . . . λαός).

Much of the Slavonization of the Balkans and of Greece itself was undoubtedly brought about by a process of peaceful penetration, unknown numbers of Slavs coming at unknown times and under unknown circumstances. It is not possible to say how numerous and how important the permanent Slavic settlements were in Greece following Kovrat’s settlement in 640, but a century later, in 746–747, a great plague resulted in large numbers of Slavs being brought into Greece, and even scholars, like Professor Zakythinos, who have been very loath to see Slavic settlements in Greece proper before the time of Constantine V (741–775) acknowledge that after 746 there are permanent Slavic settlements to be found in lands once dear to the gods and heroes of classical antiquity. Possibly it was Constantine V himself who peopled the open country with Slavs, after the fashion of Heraclius’ alleged settling the Croats and Serbs in Illyricum, but the cities still remained pretty much untouched, and the Slavs in continental Greece and the peninsula tended their flocks and tilled the soil, and paid the imposts laid upon them by the imperial government. They came, that is, but they had not conquered. They erected no states in Greece that we know of, although late in the eighth century a Slavic prince such as Akamir (Ἀκάμηρος), lord of Belzeta
in southern Thessaly, was powerful enough apparently to plot the rescue of theive sons of Constantine V, exiled to Athens by the Empress Irene, with the
ambitious hope, it is said, of setting one of these last Isaurians upon their father's
throne. But such a display of Slavic enterprise was very rare in Greece, and
Akamir is one of the few Slavic princes (in Greece) whose names are preserved
in the records. There are two classic texts for the Slavonization of Greece, sup-
plied by Constantine Porphyrogenitus and the tenth-century scholiast on
Strabo's Geography, and we cite them solely that the reader may not be disap-
pointed at not finding them somewhere in this article. Porphyrogenitus says
that 'all the [open] country [χώρα] was slavonized and became barbarian, when
the fatal pestilence ravaged all the world [in the year 746], when Constantine V
Copronymus wielded the scepter of the Roman Empire,' and the scholiast on
Strabo says that 'the Scythian Slavs now hold all Epirus and almost all Greece,
together with the Peloponnesus and Macedonia.' It must be remembered,
however, in the present connection, that Constantine V could help restore the
population of Constantinople, decimated by the plague, by the transportation of
Greeks to the capital 'from the islands and Greece and the lower regions',
(ἐκ τῶν νήσων καὶ Ἑλλάδος καὶ τῶν κατωτίκων μερών). The population of Greece
was far from exterminated by plagues, its cities far from destroyed by earth-
quakes, and the racial characteristics of the Greek people far from submerged in
Slavism. Professor C. S. Coon has written, indeed, of the ethnography of present
day Greece: 'It is my personal reaction to the living Greeks that their continuity
with their ancestors of the ancient world is remarkable. . . . ' Be this as it may,
the strength of Greek culture was enormous. In the Tactica attributed to Leo
the Wise occurs an interesting passage on the Slavs. When the Slavs had lived in
their own country beyond the Danube, they had been free, refusing to serve
another or submit to his leadership; when they had crossed the Danube, however,
and were obliged to submit to discipline, they preferred subjection to a ruler
of their own race (φυλή), rather than to accept the rule and laws of Byzantium.
A numerous people, our informant calls them, patient and hardy, they easily
endured privation. The Emperor Basil I, with help from heaven (and from the
Church), prevailed upon them to give up their ancient ways, and having made
Greeks of them (γράμματα), subjected them to rulers after the Byzantine fashion,
converted them to Christianity, 'and freed them from servitude to their own
rulers, and taught them to fight against peoples hostile to the Byzantines.'
Nevertheless, there were, through generations, plagues and famines, earthquakes,
wars, and barbarians. The historical picture of the Balkans and of Greece is never
a simple black-and-white drawing: rather it is a canvas crowded with too many
figures, painted with bright colors and dull ones, and marred by too much
confusion. The Avars created their full share of confusion in the sixth and
seventh centuries, and we must return to them.

When the Emperor Maurice came to the throne in August of 582, the ravages
of the Avars began again or simply continued, and Thrace suffered until the
tribute was renewed and increased, but since Maurice was constantly occupied
with the Persians, Baian continued to seek his advantage amid the trials and troubles which harassed the Byzantine state. The Slavs were again pushed into the Balkan provinces, sought to lay siege to Thessalonica (586), and some of them reached the Long Wall. According, indeed, to a notice in the twelfth-century Chronicle of Michael the Syrian, Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch (1166–1199), the Slavs even took the city of Corinth.\textsuperscript{76} In any event the Avars pillaged Moesia, but the government now turned with surprising energy to the defense of the northern provinces, and the Slavs were driven from Thrace, and the Avars hurled back beyond the Danube, after being defeated in a battle at Adrianople (587).\textsuperscript{77} At long last, in 591, peace was made with Persia, and Maurice, free to deal with the Avars and Slavs, placed his ablest commander Priscus in charge of sufficient troops to meet the hordes of Baian (592). There now began a decade of bitter warfare during which Priscus, except for a period in which he was relieved of his command (596–598), was charged with the onerous task of carrying the war into the Avaric lands beyond the Danube.\textsuperscript{78} Baian is said to have set a hundred thousand Slavs, apparently already in the peninsula, to undertake the capture of the great city of Thessalonica, which escaped only by the miraculous intervention of St Demetrius (597),\textsuperscript{79} and in the years that followed Thessalonica owed its salvation more than once to the unfailing vigilance of its militant patron. On the other side of the peninsula, Dalmatia was threatened by the Slavs, and Pope Gregory wrote, in July of 600, to Bishop Maximus of Salona of the terrible anxiety he felt in behalf of the bishop and his flock. Gregory also mentioned that the Slavs were finding their way into Italy.\textsuperscript{80}

Other Byzantine successes were achieved, with or without celestial assistance, and in 600 a truce was arranged between the Avars and the imperial government, which neither side intended to keep, but according to which the Danube was declared to be the boundary separating their respective lands, and another tribute of 20,000 pieces of gold was to be paid to the Avars.\textsuperscript{81} But the war was renewed in the following year, and Priscus now crossed the Danube in force, carried the war to Baian, diminished his strength in five fierce encounters, and finally thrust the Avars beyond the river Theiss. Avaric power seemed to have been reduced to the point of dissolution when the victorious Priscus was once more relieved of his command by the Emperor Maurice, early in 602, and the mutiny, some months later, of part of the army on the Danube resulted in the fall and death of Maurice in November of 602.\textsuperscript{82}

The wretched rule of the tyrant Phocas prolonged the period of Avaric strength in the Balkans and moved the Persians to renewed attacks upon the eastern possessions of the Empire.\textsuperscript{83} Although the great Heraclius succeeded Phocas in October of 610, the fragmentation of imperial authority in the eastern provinces, once begun, proved impossible to check. A decade of disaster followed; the story is too well known to bear retelling here. Syria and Palestine fell to the Persians; Asia Minor was overrun, Chalcedon becoming a Persian outpost; and Egypt, the granary of the capital, passed under Persian control when Alexandria was captured (618–619).\textsuperscript{84} The Danube frontier could not be maintained, and the apparent powerlessness of the imperial government made inevitable further
irruptions of the Slavs and Avars. The new Avaric Khagan, a son of the re-
doubtable Bašan, was looking upon the walls of Constantinople on 5 June 617,
and the environs of the capital were pillaged, especially the suburb of Blachernae. But the zeal and courage of Heraclius entirely justified his elevation to the
imperial throne. He planned and prepared for months and years, with the aid of
the Patriarch Sergius, for those great campaigns which were to destroy for ever
the power of the Sassanids and Persia (622–629). Chosroes II, whom the world
had come to look upon in the second decade of the century as a Cyrus or Darius
or at least a Shapur, now experienced an anxiety which gradually mounted into
desperation, as he contemplated the effects and the possibilities of Heraclius’
brilliant offensive. In an effort to divert the Emperor’s attention and to deflect
some of his blows, Chosroes effected, in 626, a military rapprochement with the
Avars, who advanced once more to the walls of Constantinople in June of this
year, but the Avaric attacks upon the capital were repulsed (29 July–7 August
626), and the Khagan abandoned the last Avaric siege of the great city, and
prayers of thanksgiving were offered up within the walls which had withstood
the assault, for the Panagia of Blachernae had not abandoned her people during
those days of direst peril. For almost sixty years the Avars had been an almost
annual menace to the Balkan provinces, but after 626 their decline was rapid, and other enemies, most notably the Arabs, came to occupy the chief attention
of the Byzantine Emperor and the Empire.

After 626 the Slavs and Bulgars were also free of subjection to the Avars, who
were now contained by the forces of the famous Samo (623–658), Frankish ruler
of the new Slavic empire in the west, and by those of Kovrat, Khan of the
Bulgars in the east, the latter being allied with Heraclius from 635–636. Heraclius
was, of course, unable to drive the Slavic peoples from his northern Balkan prov-
inces, where they had settled in permanent habitations from the time of the
Emperors Maurice and Phocas. Moreover, there is a legend to the effect that he
settled the Croats and Serbs, apparently the same people, in Dalmatia, Illyricum,
and Pannonia, in order to help the imperial government to hold the Avars in
check. This legend may be true.

It is now time to deal with some other texts, more difficult to work with than
Menander and Evagrius, concerning the Avaro-Slavic attacks upon Greece,
for they gave rise to much controversy in the nineteenth century, and the
report was long believed that the Avars occupied the Peloponnesus for 218 years
[i.e. about 587–805], so that no Roman durst enter it. Thus a synodal letter
of the Patriarch Nicholas III Grammaticus (1084–1111), addressed in 1084 to
the Emperor Alexius I Comnenus, and dealing with the rights of metropolitans
over suffragan bishoprics, declares that the Emperor Nicephorus I (802–811)
granted metropolitical authority to the archiepiscopal see of Patras over certain
bishoprics, because of the miraculous intervention of St Andrew, chief of the
Apostles and patron saint of Patras, after the catastrophic success of the Avars
had wrenched the whole of the Peloponnesus from Roman control for two
hundred and eighteen years, so that no Roman could even set foot in the Pelop-
ponnesus,’ but in a single hour the Avars were crushed when St Andrew appeared,
and the whole territory was thus restored to Roman rule. This happened in 805 or, possibly, in 807. We have a detailed account of St Andrew's raising of the siege of Patras in Constantine Porphyrogenitus, and it is not often that such a good story is so well told: While Nicephorus I was Emperor, the Slavs in the Peloponnesus planned and executed an attack upon their Greek neighbors. They laid siege to the city of Patras, 'having with them both Africans and Saracens.' The inhabitants of the city soon felt the effects of hunger and thirst. Since, however, the governor (στρατηγός) of the province (Θῆμα) was then in the castle of Corinth (ἐν κάστρῳ Κορινθίων) and had been informed of the irruption of the Slavs, the Patrenses expected immediate aid from him, and so sent a scout to discover whether he was already on his way to assist them. If the governor was on his way, the scout was to let the besieged know by inclining his banner as he returned; otherwise he was to hold the banner up high, so that the Patrenses need not continue to look for help from that quarter. The scout departed. He was soon returning with his banner held aloft, for he had not seen the governor coming with help for the imperilled city. By the will of God, however, and at the intercession of St Andrew the Apostle, his horse stumbled; the banner was abruptly lowered; the Patrenses believed that help was coming, and so they made a sortie from their walls against the Slavs. Help was indeed coming, for St Andrew was now seen clearly, mounted on horseback, charging upon the barbarians, who were overwhelmed with terror, and fled pell mell from the city they had hoped to take. St Andrew had saved Patras. Three days later the governor arrived; he was told of the exploit of the Apostle, and rendered a full account thereof to the Emperor Nicephorus. The Emperor ordered that the Slavs should be assigned to the (now) metropolitan Church of Patras, and promulgated a decree to this effect (δεδωκὼς περὶ αὐτῶν καὶ σιγγίλων). Constantine Porphyrogenitus, however, now goes out of his way to declare that there was no written record of these events—having just mentioned the imperial 'seal,' which was apparently still extant in the eleventh century, for the Patriarch Nicholas III alludes to it and some later confirmations of it—the elders of Patras had simply informed their children of that eventful day, so that each generation might know of the miracle thus wrought by the Apostle, and might not forget the benefits which God had bestowed upon them by his intercession.

The letter of the Patriarch Nicholas III states, as we have seen, that St Andrew's activity brought immediately to an end 218 years of Avaric domination in the Peloponnesus; this was an important text for Fallmerayer, and he dated the Avaro-Slavic destruction of ancient Greece from 588–589, which thus accorded with St Andrew's appearance at Patras and the Byzantine recovery of the whole region in the year 807. (As a result of his contentions Fallmerayer met a shower of abuse from the newspapers during a stay in Athens, and, what was more serious for him, certain diplomatic circles took a dim view of an historian who, in the years following the peace of Adrianople, declared the Greeks, as Slavs, to be close cousins of the Russians.) Zinkeisen soon disputed Fallmerayer's general view, but he did not venture to impugn the validity of the Patriarch Nicholas's evidence so much as to assert that the passing of persons
and things Hellenic was achieved by a process of general liquidation rather than of quick destruction. The great Greek nationalist historian Const. Paparrigopoulos next sought to show that the letter of the Patriarch Nicholas was based upon the historian Evagrius. It obviously stems, however, from the historical record or tradition, to which we shall come in a moment, of which the Chronicle of Monemvasia and an intriguing Scholium, written in 932, of Arethas of Caesarea are a part. The views of these early scholars still retain a peculiar interest, but they have become, by and large, rather a part of the history of scholarship than of scholarly history. We have seen something of the extent and character of the great Avaro-Slavic irruption of 578–585, described by Menander Protector, Evagrius, John of Ephesus, and others, an event of high importance for the subsequent history of Greece. Although we may, and perhaps truly, claim to understand the nature and effects of the barbarian irruptions into the Balkan provinces and Greece rather better today than our predecessors in the nineteenth century, we must inevitably entertain grave misgivings on the score of any reconstruction of events that we may be able to make on the basis of the confused medley of facts at our disposal. The problem of the Peloponnesus remains especially baffling. Interest in the alleged Avaro-Slavic occupation of the Peloponnesus, and settlement therein, has in no way diminished with the passing of the years, and it has been treated in several recent studies. One of the chief sources, concerning which much doubt is still entertained, is the now almost famous, but apparently misnamed, Chronicle of Monemvasia. The text of this chronicle now survives in three or four versions. The earliest known version was published in 1749 from a manuscript in the library of the University of Turin by Giuseppe Passini and his colleagues Rivautella and Berta. The Turin text (designated T) was republished in 1884 by Sp. P. Lampros, who also edited two other versions of the Chronicle which he discovered in two manuscripts in monasteries on Mt Athos, which manuscripts are designated by the names of the monasteries to which they belonged. One of these texts is called the Koutloumousiac, i.e., of Koutlumus (K), which supplies a text very similar to the Turin manuscript (T), while the other Athonite text (from the monastery of Iveron), known as the Iberitikon (I), is a more detailed version of the original source, and does not extend in its content beyond the first decade of the ninth century. The I text is apparently complete in itself, however, and not a broken fragment; it ends, as it was presumably intended to end, with a doxology. All three texts were republished, with some emendations, by Professor N. A. Bees in 1909. The manuscript in Turin and that in Koutlumus furnish us with versions of the Chronicle obviously written between 1340, the date of the last event mentioned in T and K, and the sixteenth century, the date, by and large, of the manuscripts themselves. In 1912 Professor Lampros published a fourth version from a manuscript in the Gregorian College in Rome (designated R). A dozen paper pages, from the sixteenth (or fifteenth) century, prefixed to a thirteenth-century manuscript on parchment, contain the last third of the Chronicle (on pp. 11r f.). We have, then, these four versions of the Chronicle, three of which (T, K, and R) are much the same, although R possesses
only the material in the last third of $T$ and $K$. The remaining text, $I$, stands apart from the other three; and, as we have noted, it is the most complete of the four versions for the period which it covers.

There has been some controversy concerning the Iberitikon. Professor Lampros asserted that $I$ belonged to an older tradition than $T$, $K$, and $R$, having been based upon some earlier collection of historical materials,\textsuperscript{108} while Professor Bees was formerly inclined to assign its redaction to the Peloponnesian family of the Likinioi in the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{109} Professor S. B. Kougeas, having discovered that a lengthy passage in the Chronicle, largely dealing with the alleged Avaro-Slavic occupation of the Peloponnesus, was almost word for word the same as a scholium written by Arethas of Caesarea in 932, came to the conclusion that the Chronicle (version $I$) was written during or immediately after the reign of Nicephorus II Phocas (963–969).\textsuperscript{110} Before we proceed any farther, it may be well to say just a word about Arethas of Caesarea, who has been the subject of considerable interest in late years. He was born in Patras, perhaps about 850, and became, rather early in the tenth century, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia. He had been, like many of his learned contemporaries, a student of Photius, and possessed an intelligent interest in classical literature and theology. He was also, be it noted again for future reference, a native of Patras.\textsuperscript{111}

The text of the Iberitikon, or $I$ version of the so-called Chronicle of Monemvasia, is the one upon which chief dependence must be placed for such information as this work supplies us for the alleged Avaro-Slavic invasion of, and settlement in, the Peloponnesus. A common source seems to lie behind the Chronicle of Monemvasia (especially version $I$), the Scholium of Arethas, the letter of the Patriarch Nicholas III, and, conceivably, the Monemvasiote petition of 1429.\textsuperscript{112} Lampros, however, has called attention to the division of the material in versions $T$ and $K$ into three parts: 1) the history of the Avars up to the reign of Maurice; 2) the description of the attack of the Avars and Slavs upon the Peloponnesus, together with their conversion to Christianity by the Emperor Nicephorus I and some notices concerning the church of Patras until Nicephorus' time; and 3) the notices concerning the metropolitan churches of Monemvasia and Lacedaemonia. Of the three parts possessed by both $T$ and $K$, $R$ has only the third part, and $I$ has only the first two parts. There is a very definite break here, suggesting, as Lampros says, τὰ δόξο πρῶτα συναπήρτισαν ἐν παλαιστέροις χρόνοις τὸ δλογ, that these two first parts had previously constituted the whole, the third part of $T$ and $K$ and the material in $R$ being obviously a later addition. The $I$ version thus seems to represent, without doubt, the older form of the so-called Chronicle.\textsuperscript{113} Most scholars have discarded the Chronicle of Monemvasia as a source of dubious value, and, even since Kougeas has thrust its date back into the tenth century, have regarded it as being untrustworthy in its record of an Avaro-Slavic occupation of the Peloponnesus. Professor Peter Charanis, however, has recently asserted that, since the publication by Kougeas (in 1912) of the Scholium of Arethas written in 932, 'which confirms, as far as it goes, almost word for word what the chronicle has to say . . . , there remains virtually nothing
in the chronicle that cannot be confirmed by other sources, and it can now be affirmed in unmistakable and unambiguous terms that the *Chronicle of Monemvasia* is absolutely trustworthy and constitutes one of the most precious sources of the history of the Byzantine Empire.\textsuperscript{114} The present writer believes that this extreme and categorical statement is unwarranted;\textsuperscript{115} he does, however, agree with Charanis to the extent of seeing an historical substance of some importance, at least, in the so-called *Chronicle of Monemvasia*. It is, however, ludicrous to believe in an Avaro-Slavic domination of the Peloponnese that endured for 218 years. The Scholium of Arethas and the *Chronicle* are derived, as we have noted, from a common source, a written chronicle, presumably, itself based upon Menander Protector, Evagrius, Theophanes, and Theophylact Simocatta, together with at least one unknown source, which we may call, for convenience, *Q*.\textsuperscript{116} It is from *Q* that the statement comes that the Avars took possession of the Peloponnese, settled in it, and prolonged their rule over it for 218 years, obeying neither the Roman emperor or any other person.\textsuperscript{117} It is, therefore, from *Q* that the '218 years' passed, in one way or another, into our unknown chronicle, whence it passed into Arethas, the *Chronicle of Monemvasia*, the letter of the Patriarch Nicholas III, and into the works of Fallmerayer and our modern literature. But what was the nature of *Q*? This we do not know, but I think that something may be suggested as to its provenience, if not as to its nature. Arethas, who knows *Q*, most likely indirectly through our assumed chronicle, was a native of Patras. The Patriarch Nicholas III employs the statement emanating from *Q* in his assertion of the metropolitical rights of Patras. The Avaric or Avaro-Slavic domination of the western Peloponnese is said to have come to an end, after 218 years, with the Byzantine reconquest of Patras. Clearly the place to look for *Q* is Patras. *Q* could, of course, be a life of the Apostle St Andrew, patron and savior of Patras. It is also barely conceivable that *Q* could be a chrysobull, genuine or spurious, whereby Nicephorus I was said to have raised Patras to metropolitan rank,\textsuperscript{118} and to have extended its authority, as indicated by Arethas, the *Chronicle of Monemvasia*, and the Patriarch Nicholas III. *Q* could be a forgery of ecclesiastical origin, perpetrated by or in behalf of the Metropolitan of Patras. One immediately recalls, in the west, how Constantine the Great bestowed the patrimony of St Peter upon Pope Sylvester as well as other 'pious forgeries,' like the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, in which ambitious churchmen in the eighth and ninth centuries sought to give legal effect to actual or desired conditions. This is submitted merely as a bare possibility. Nothing is here affirmed beyond the high probability that *Q* must be associated with Patras, but we still do not know the nature of *Q* — nor, of course, the extent of its trustworthiness. Charanis should not regard such a source as 'absolutely trustworthy.' The *Chronicle of Monemvasia* seems, in fact, to be a medley of some fact and some fiction. It should be used with caution.

Both the *Chronicle* and the Scholium of Arethas contain, in more or less parallel accounts, a description of the Avaric or Avaro-Slavic invasions — in the time of the Emperor Maurice — of Thrace, Macedonia, Thessaly, Epirus, the island of Euboea, and Attica, after which the Avars 'launched an attack on
the Peloponnesus, seized it, and driving out and destroying the Greek peoples of noble lineage, they themselves settled down in the land.\textsuperscript{119} The Chronicle expressly states, concerning the Avars, that ‘those who could escape their bloodstained hands fled, some to one place, some to another.’\textsuperscript{120} All the Greeks, therefore, in the (western) Peloponnesus, according to the Chronicle, either fled or were killed. This is absurd. However, the natives of Patras fled to Rhegium in Calabria; the Argives went to the island called Orobe [but Euboea was already devastated]; and the Corinthians are declared to have sought refuge on the island of Aegina. The Laconians abandoned their native soil, and some sailed off to Sicily, ‘and they are still there in a place called Demena, and are called Dementiae instead of Lacedaemonians \[Δεμενίται ἀντὶ Λακεδαιμονίτων κατονομαζόμενοι\], and they still preserve their native Laconian speech.’ Other Laconians discovered an inaccessible place on the seashore, where they built a strong city which they called Monemvasia because it had but one approach from the land [i.e., \(μονή ἔμβασι\)], and they settled in this city with their own bishop.\textsuperscript{121} Thus the Avars occupied the Peloponnesus, settled there, and prolonged their rule over the land for two hundred and eighteen years, subject neither to the Roman Emperor nor to anyone else, that is to say from the 609th year of the Creation, which is the sixth year of the reign of Maurice (A.D. 587–588), until the year 6313, which is the fourth year of the reign of the elder Nicephorus (A.D. 805–806) . . . .\textsuperscript{122} ‘Only the eastern part of the Peloponnesus from Corinth to Cape Malea, because it is rugged and inaccessible [which, for the most part, it is not] remained free from the Slavs,\textsuperscript{123} and the Emperor continued to send a governor to this region.’ One of these governors, a man from Lesser Armenia, who belonged to the family of the Skleroai, becoming embroiled with the Slavs, conquered them and destroyed them completely [\ldots \(συμβάλων τῷ Σκλαβηνῷ ἦνει πολέμικός ἐλέ ὡς καὶ ἱδρύει], and thus made possible the restoration of their own lands to the original inhabitants.\textsuperscript{124} When the Emperor Nicephorus was informed of Skleros’ victory over the Slavs, he was overjoyed, and immediately planned the re-establishment of the cities and churches destroyed by the barbarians, ‘and to make Christians of the barbarians themselves’ [whom Skleros had already ‘destroyed completely’]. Nicephorus resettled the Patrenses, who had so long lived in Rhegium in Calabria, in their ancient city of Patras, together with their pastor Athanasius: Patras and its churches were thus reconstructed while Tarasius (died 18 February 806) was still Patriarch of Constantinople. Lacedaemon was also rebuilt and was repopulated with Kapheroi, Thracesians, Armeniacs, and others assembled from diverse places. Reorganized as a bishopric, Lacedaemon was made suffragan to the new Metropolitan of Patras.\textsuperscript{125}

It has been claimed that Navarino, scene of one of the most memorable events in the modern history of Greece, preserves to this day the name and memory of the Avars in Messenia: this is apparently an erroneous derivation ([I]Avarinos), but in any event the name Navarino is of Slavic origin (\*Avorbno, [a place of] ‘maples’?), and is one of hundreds of such place names, recently treated for us by Professor Max Vasmer, which testify to the presence of the Slavs both in continental Greece and the Morea.\textsuperscript{126}
The raising of Patras to metropolitan status, as described by Arethas, the *Chronicle*, and the Patriarch Nicholas III, would be a most important change in the ecclesiastical organization of Greece. It would break the predominant position of the Church of Corinth, but this would probably make little difference to the Corinthians, if we could follow our sources to the point of believing that they fled *en masse* to the island of Aegina. About two years, however, after the date of this alleged Avaro-Slavic invasion of the Peloponneseus, and the occupation of Corinth, Pope Gregory the Great, in February 591, wrote the Archbishop Anastasius of Corinth of his elevation to the Holy See, and some four years later, in July 595, we find Gregory writing to John, Anastasius’ successor as Archbishop of Corinth. Although Pope Gregory seems well informed concerning the affairs of the Church of Corinth, and holds up to opprobrium the Archbishop Anastasius, whose conduct he had had investigated by one Secundinus, he does not mention the disaster which our sources declare to have fallen upon the city: if Corinth had been taken by the Avars, Gregory would have known it; if he had known it, he would not have failed to mention it; we are, therefore, forced to the conclusion that Arethas and the *Chronicle* are not here dealing with fact, but have deviated into fancy. It was apparently very easy for a Roman ‘to set foot in the Peloponneseus,’ in the very decade following the alleged Avaro-Slavic invasion of 588. We may follow the history of the Corinthian Church in after years a bit farther, but a mere list of names, dates, and unrelated facts do not supply the materials from which intelligible—or at least reliable—history can be written. Thus we know that Stephen, Bishop of Corinth, was present at the Sixth Oecumenical Council held in Constantinople in 680–681, but Corinth was apparently not represented at Nicaea at the Seventh (787), although the Metropolitan Hilarion of Corinth appears at the famous ninth session of the Eighth Oecumenical Council (12 February 870), and his signature appears among those who subscribed to the acts of the Council. However, despite the continuance of Corinth as a metropolitan center, in the ecclesiastical sense, Patras does seem to have been elevated to metropolitan rank during the reign of the Emperor Nicephorus I, and there are reasons for believing that Athens was also made a metropolis about the same time, for the Abbot Hilduin of St Denis, who was writing about the year 835, and could have got his information from the Byzantine embassies sent to the court of Louis the Pious in 824 and 827, says that Athens was made a metropolis during the patriarchate of Tarasius (784–806). Even a superficial comparison of what is said concerning the freeing of Patras from the Slavs in the accounts of Constantine Porphyrogenitus on the one hand and Arethas and the *Chronicle of Monemvasia* on the other reveals some serious discrepancies, which the reader will doubtless have noted, and so it seems best to acknowledge that we do not have precise knowledge of what led to the elevation of the see of Patras to metropolitan rank, although the fact was attested by imperial *sigilla* apparently still extant in the time of the Patriarch Nicholas III. The new status of Patras was probably necessitated by the ecclesiastical reorganization of Greece, of which the similar elevation of Athens was also a part. There is very likely some truth in the account furnished
us by Arethas and the author of the Monemvasiote Chronicle, but it stands rather like wreckage cast upon the shore, and the historian should not seek in this case, any more than the beachcomber, to reproduce the lines of the ship from the battered remains of the pilot-house and the quarter-deck.

To most modern historians, therefore, this story of the Avaro-Slavic occupation of the Peloponnesus has been unconvincing. Professor Zakythinos has very recently refused to place any credence in it, and, years ago, Gregorovius wrote: 'The barbarians never possessed Corinth and Patras, Nauplion and Argos, Chalcis, Thebes, and Athens. There always maintained themselves, in these places, Byzantine authority and the Greek people.'\textsuperscript{137} It has been recently asserted, however, that archaeological evidence confirms, to some extent, the statements in the \textit{Chronicle of Monemvasia}, especially as to the Greek abandonment of Corinth. Some very important finds of apparently non-Byzantine origin, such as buckles, weapons, ornaments and the like, have been made in two graves which were discovered some years ago in a square tower below the west entrance to Acrocorinth, and the same sorts of things have been found on various other sites in and around Corinth. These buckles, weapons and ornaments date from the first half of the seventh century, and are exactly like those familiar from similar graves of the same era which have been excavated at Keszthely, on the western end of Lake Balaton, in Hungary.\textsuperscript{138}

It has been suggested that the finds at Corinth are from the graves of Kutrigur (i.e., Bulgar) warriors, whom the Avars might have forced to precede them in battle, or might have sent on an advance raid, as Menander describes the Khagan Baïan doing in a great campaign.\textsuperscript{139} In any event these graves do not seem to be those of Avars (often difficult to tell from Kutriguric graves in Hungary), and no evidence seems to be forthcoming of Avaric burials at Corinth.\textsuperscript{140}

The evidence then points to the Corinthian graves as containing the bodies of Bulgaric warriors. Horváth has identified them as Kutrigurs, although it seems better to me to regard them as Onogurs, since Isidore of Kiev obviously preserves a reminiscence of a Peloponnesian tradition to precisely this effect, which he may have found in a literary source no longer extant, but which he has, unfortunately, carelessly adapted to his argument in the Monemvasiote petition of 1429.\textsuperscript{141} In any event, in the time from which these graves date, the Onogur prince Kovrat ruled over the Kutrigurs as well as over the Onogurs, and some of his people were apparently settled in the plain of Monastir. There is another text in the petition of 1429 relating to the fall of Corinth, which we had best consider at this point, both because of its great interest and because Professor Zakythinos has irrellevantly associated it with the Avaro-Slavic or Onoguric attacks upon Corinth.

The text in question is cited by Isidore from the act of the Holy Synod of 1397, whereby Maine and Zemena were to be taken from Monemvasia and restored to Corinth (the \textit{Praxis of Corinth}): the synodal act itself quotes this text, however, from an 'old manuscript,' produced at the Synod in 1397, and said to date back to the elevation of Monemvasia to metropolitan rank (which would make the 'old manuscript' no older than 1261): 'The most holy metropolis
of Corinth,' runs the tenor of the old manuscript, 'having fallen by siege, and its inhabitants having been scattered everywhere, the then Bishop of Monemvasia — for this was previously a bishopric of Corinth [as the Greek taktika amply testify] — displaying every zeal, not only saved some of the Corinthians and settled them in the Peloponnesus, but also, having summoned many others of the inhabitants, he settled them there in various places [ἐγκατέστησε ταύτη], and thus again did he colonize the Peloponnesus.'142 The old manuscript attributes these events to the Fourth Crusade.143 The whole picture is not easy to reconcile with what we know of Moreote history following the Fourth Crusade, which may have led Zakythinos, nodding for a moment, to associate this statement with the alleged Avaro-Slavic attack upon Corinth.144 Corinth fell to Geoffrey I de Villehardouin in 1210, after a five years' siege; the Greeks had already removed the treasure of the Corinthian Church to Argos (which also fell in 1212); it is quite probable that some Corinthians did flee to Monemvasia in 1210, but the city of Corinth was far from being abandoned, and remained through the thirteenth century a rather active commercial center.145 Monemvasia did not fall to the Latins until 1248, but its Bishop was never in any position, during the years preceding, to 'colonize the Peloponnesus,' which was almost entirely in Latin hands. After 1261, however, when Monemvasia was recovered by Michael VIII Palaeologus, and raised to metropolitan rank, the Metropolitan of Monemvasia would be in a position to help 'recolonize' the Peloponnesus. It is to the beginning years of the Greek Reconquesta, then, that the 'old manuscript' refers; it has nothing to do with Avars and Bulgars, of course, and it has nothing directly to do with the Fourth Crusade.146 The text in question has carried us six centuries from our subject, but some brief comment upon it has seemed necessary.

The finds made in the two Corinthian graves, which we had been discussing before the preceding digression, seem to me to indicate a Bulgaric attack upon the city in the first half of the seventh century, and the historical record and numismatics may allow us to fix this attack, and perhaps a brief period of occupation, about the middle of the century, very likely in the late 640's. Professor Grégoire has recently made Kovrat, the Onogur Khan, the subject of a most interesting paper.147 Grégoire has demonstrated, again, that Kovrat (or Kubrat) led the Croats — and Serbs — against the Avars, and is the eponymous hero from whom the Croats derived their name (Χροβάτο); he has now established beyond much doubt that the Kouver (Κούβε) of the Acta or Miracula S. Demetrii Martyris is the Onogur Kovrat, as Th. Uspeksii and Lubor Niederle had already asserted, and that the Onogurs and their Khan were very active in the northern Balkan provinces of the Empire,148 as we have already had ample occasion to observe. Kovrat had negotiated an alliance in 635–636, when he struck at the Avars, with the Emperor Heraclius, whom he had known since 619: we are expressly told that this Bulgaro-Byzantine alliance lasted until Heraclius's death in 641.149 In fact, it led Kovrat to support Heraclius's widow, the Empress Martina, against Constantine III and his son Constans II. Thus, previously the ally of the Byzantine government, Kovrat became an enemy in 641–642, a threat to Constantinople and to Thessalonica.150

It was some time after 641–642 that a detachment of Onogur Bulgars, whether
under, conceivably, one of the sons of Kovrat, or under some other lieutenant, attacked and captured Corinth. It is the remains of these warriors, their weapons and ornaments, that have been discovered, I believe, in the graves at Corinth, marked as Nos. II and III by Miss Davidson. Isidore of Kiev’s statement possesses archaeological confirmation. It was also at the time of the Onogur occupation of Corinth, apparently, that the Corinthians were, for the most part, dispersed, and presumably settled in various places in the Peloponnese. Numismatic evidence, as we shall see, suggests that the Onogurs could not have held Corinth much more than fifteen years or so, if indeed they held the city that long. If the present reconstruction of events is acceptable, we may believe that the Onogurs were expelled from Corinth by the Emperor Constans II. Constans is known to have made an expedition, in 657–658, ‘into Scelvinia, and he took many prisoners, and subdued the land.’ M. Bréhier states, simply and truly, ‘On ignore dans quelle région eut lieu cette expédition. On suppose qu’elle dégagea Thessalonique.’ It is tempting to believe that in Theophanes’ reference to the expedition of 657–658 ‘Scelvinia’ means the Peloponnese, as Hopf, Zakythinos and others have tried to interpret the word in another passage in Theophanes.

I do not succumb to the temptation, but I believe it to be most likely that one effect of part, at least, of the military preparations of 657–658 was the relief of Corinth, which must have suffered so much from its capture by the Onogurs and its recapture by the Byzantines that it may have ceased to exist as an inhabited community. The archaeological evidence suggests that Corinth was deserted some time in the first half of the seventh century, but the numismatic evidence enables us, I think, to fix the date of the virtual abandonment of Corinth precisely in the reign of Constans II. Coins of Constans II which have been found at Corinth are more numerous than those of any other emperor since the reign of Justin II (d. 578); this is quite intelligible if he or some of his commanders actually made an appearance here; following Constans II there is a very sudden falling off in the numbers of Byzantine coins recovered, and those of Constans’ own successor, Constantine IV (668–685), are very rare; in fact, ‘the reigns of the eighteen emperors who ruled between the years 668 (the first year of Constantine IV) and 829 (the last year of Michael II) have yielded only sixteen coins [up to 1937].’ Coins from the first half of the seventh century have thus been found in rather large numbers, but chiefly on Acrocorinth (they are rare in the lower town), indicating that this period was one of danger in Corinth, and that the inhabitants dwelt within the protection of the precipitous heights of the citadel. In the lower town, however, coins are found from the first half of the ninth century, but rarely, it is striking to note, in the upper town, suggesting that, contrary to the account in Constantine Porphyrogenitus, there was no military commandant and garrison on Acrocorinth in 805–807 at the time of St Andrew’s defeat of the Slavs. There is thus some reason to believe that Acrocorinth was not the location of a garrison command in the late eighth and earlier ninth centuries, but, from the reappearance of the coins, was re-established as such in the time of Leo VI (886–912), ‘the remnants of the Byzantine buildings destroyed by the Slavs [or, as I think, by the Bulgars] furnishing the necessary
Belt Buckles from Athens.

The second and third buckles of the top row (American Agora Collection, inventory numbers B282 and B309 respectively), which are the same as some of the buckles found at Corinth, are regarded in the present study as Bulgaric. (The photograph was taken by Miss Alison Frantz.)
materials." Following the expulsion of the Onogur Bulgars Corinth was a deserted village.

We may pursue, just a bit farther, the belief that Constans II expelled the Onogurs from what was left of Corinth, and that the expedition of 657–658, which may have also driven the Slavs (and Bulgars?) from Thessalonica, included a plan, which was successfully executed, to regain Corinth. Two years later, in 660, Constans II left Constantinople for the last time, for his great enterprise in southern Italy and Sicily. In 660–661, however, before his departure for the west, Constans II lived for a considerable time in Thessalonica and Athens (662), the two places where he might check up on the final results of the expedition of two years before.

Certain buckles found at Corinth seem to me to be peculiarly interesting in the present connection, for I believe them to be the buckles which fitted on the 'Bulgarian belts' referred to in two very important contemporary texts. These belts were worn, as we shall see, by Byzantine soldiers in the time of Constans II — one of those barbarian fashions so obnoxious to Roman patriots from the time of the first Augustus — and they were also, a fortiori, worn by the Bulgars. Buckles like those in the graves at Corinth have been found with suspicious regularity along the entire route of Constans II. The latter, as is well known, fought with the Lombards in Italy; plundered Rome (as Johannes Diaconus tells us) for twelve days; and thereafter went on to Sicily, where he was finally murdered, in Syracuse, on 15 July 668. Bulgarič buckles, let us call them so for the moment, have been found not only in Corinth, but also in Thessalonica, in Athens (one of the two Athenian buckles bearing a Christian monogram), and at Aphiona on the island of Corfu. Similar buckles have been found in Lombard graves in Italy, and others, with a Christian monogram, very like the one in Athens, have also been found in Sicily, at Taormina and at Syracuse. Taormina is not far north of Syracuse, and it lies on the coast road from Messina, a road much used by the soldiers of the Emperor Constans II, who lived himself at Syracuse. The Emperor's route, then, from Constantinople to Tarentum — for our sources all mention that he hugged the shore — lay through Thessalonica, Athens, Corinth, and Corfu, thence into southern Italy, and finally into eastern Sicily; in all these places we find Bulgarič buckles. Indeed, aside from the buckles found, as we have noted, in graves in Hungary, and an occasional find in the Crimea, near the old homeland of the Bulgars, the buckles found along the route of Constans II include, perhaps, most of the examples thus far known to us, for the rare discovery of such a buckle in southern Spain or in a German grave will be explained by the tricks of fortune to which any little object is so easily exposed. It remains, however, to answer the questions why these buckles should be regarded as Bulgarič if Byzantine soldiers wore them, and why they should be so comparatively numerous along the route travelled by Constans II. Two important contemporary texts, which have not yet, as far as I know, been brought into connection with these buckles of much-disputed origin, will help answer the first question, after which we may proceed to the second.

A Vienna papyrus from the Fayum in Egypt (P. Erzherzog Rainer, inv. no.
gr. 2132 [347]) contains the receipt of a Byzantine commander (στρατηγάτης) named Cyril, confirming the delivery of a certain number of 'Bulgarian belts' (βουλγαρικοὶ καρφαλάμια), which would imply, I should think, the accompaniment of 'Bulgarian buckles.'162 This papyrus is to be dated in the early seventh century; it must, of course, antedate the Arabic occupation of Egypt (641). It comes, in other words, from almost exactly the same period as the buckles found at Corinth, and it was not without some astonishment that I learned that a buckle similar to those found at Corinth was actually discovered in the Egyptian Fayum.163 Furthermore, Professor Moravcsik supplies us with a text from the Tactica of the Pseudo-Maurice, also to be assigned to the end of the sixth or the early seventh century (again, be it observed, the same date as the Corinthian buckles): the Pseudo-Maurice prescribes the wearing by foot-soldiers of 'simple belts, and not Bulgarian belts, and military cloaks' (ξυνάρχια δὲ λιτὰ καὶ οὐ βουλγαρικὰ, σαγία).164

Thus we find a Byzantine military writer condemning the use of Bulgarian belts and a Byzantine military commander purchasing them, the latter in the restricted area of the Fayum, where one of the buckles under discussion has been found. Professor Hans Zeiss, as we have had occasion more than once to observe in our notes, believes that all these buckles are of Byzantine origin; although some of them may well be of Byzantine manufacture, their origin appears to have been Bulgarian, if there is truth in the suggestion that these buckles go with the 'Bulgarian belts' mentioned in the Erzherzog Rainer Papyrus and in the Tactica of the Pseudo-Maurice. If the Greeks wore Bulgarian belts, so, a fortiori, did the Bulgars; if the French export perfume, they also use it. However, these buckles are so peculiarly numerous along the route of the Emperor Constans II, to seek the answer to the second question asked above, because Constans was in direct contact with the Bulgars at Thessalonica, possibly at Athens, and finally at Corinth, where he left behind him also, as a memento of his presence, the unusually large number of his coins which the archaeologists have found there, and some of the buckles found in Lombard graves in central and southern Italy and in other graves in Sicily are buckles acquired by Byzantine soldiers in this campaign against the Bulgars in Greece. We must remember, too, that Constans II had an especial reason for hating the Onogur Bulgars, for their Khan Kovrat, as we have seen, had sought to aid the widow of Heraclius to exclude him from the throne in 641–642. I should never have suggested a Bulgaric occupation of Corinth on the archaeological evidence alone; this evidence gains in significance, nevertheless, when it is put into its place in the pattern of known historical events. The Corinthian graves are those of soldiers (weapons were found with them); Miss Davidson and Dr Horváth have believed them not to be Byzantine. The historical record, in my opinion, confirms their belief. (My reasons for believing in the Bulgaric occupation of Corinth would not be invalidated, however, if the Corinthian graves were actually those of Byzantine soldiers wearing the apparel of which the Pseudo-Maurice disapproved — but this seems in any event not to be the case.) These graves are not, however, Avaric, as Miss Davidson has stated; nor do they seem to be those of Kutrigur
Bulgars, as Horváth has thought; I know of no historical evidence that would indicate the likelihood of a Kutrigur attack upon Corinth as late as the 640's. Professor Grégoire has shown once more that the Onogur Bulgars were in the plain of Monastir, in continental Greece, just before the middle of the seventh century. After the death of Heraclius there was every reason for an Onogur attack, from that convenient location, upon what was, presumably, the chief city of the Peloponnesus, and every reason for Constans II to take the field in person against those who had made themselves his personal enemies. If, as Isidore of Kiev declares, 'the Onogurs took Corinth without a single blow,' we may believe that these graves date from the more violent Byzantine expulsion of the Onogurs in 657–658. Be that as it may, from the obscure annals of the early mediaeval history of Greece, Isidore preserves for us the dim memory of the Onoguric occupation of Corinth, and it is my hope that this paper may have shown that there is every reason for believing him.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

1 The text is in Sp. P. Lampros, Δίος ἀναφορά μητροπολίτου Μονεμβασίας πρὸς τὸν πατριάρχη, in the Νεοί Ἐλληνομυθεία (hereafter cited as Neos Hellen., xii (1915), 286: . . . Οὐνιγαροὶ δὲ Μακεδονίαν καὶ Θεσπόλιαν καὶ Ἐλλάδα καὶ τὰ ἐν τοῖς Θερμοπυλῶν ληστάμενοι πάντα καὶ μέχρι Κορίνθων φθάναντες, εἰς τοὺς παραχρήμα τῆς πόλεως καὶ αὐτοῦ. The document in which this text occurs is the second of two petitions addressed to the Patriarch Joseph II of Constantinople; it was published by Lampros from a fifteenth-century manuscript, Cod. Palatin. gr. 226, 115r–133v (on which see Giovanni Mercati, Scritti d'Isidoro il cardinale Buteno, e codici a lui appartenenti che si conservano nella Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana [Studi e Testi, 46, Rome, 1926], pp. 7–8). The claims of the archiepiscopal see of Monemvasia to metropolitan authority over the bishopric of Maine (and that of Zemen) are asserted in this document in opposition to those of the Metropolitan of Corinth (cf. Neos Hellen., xii, 274 ff., 280–282, 288 ff., et passim, 308–309). The latter claimed that the suffragan sees had been taken from him under conditions of emergency in the past, but should now be restored to him, for the necessity which had attached them to Monemvasia in the past no longer obtained, and that Corinthian rights were being violated by the continued submission of Maine to Monemvasia. The situation is as follows: In 1395 Corinth had been reoccupied by the Greeks, under the Despot Theodore I Palaeologus of Mistra (cf. K. M. Setton, Catalan Domination of Athens, 1311–1388, [Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1948], pp. 188–199), and the Metropolitan Theognostus of Corinth had promptly reclaimed the ancient (Corinthian) suffragan sees of Maine and Zemen, the latter being the modern Zemen, to the west of Corinth. This Holy Synod had ruled, in 1397, that, upon the death of the Metropolitan Acacius of Monemvasia, the two sees in dispute should return to Corinth. Acacius died in 1413, but his successor, Cyril, reopened the case, and enlisted the services of Isidore, who prepared the two petitions for him, from the second of which comes the text quoted above. Isidore's venture into Corinthian history 'in the days of Justinian the Great' preserves, I think, something of an early historical tradition, which he has obviously and perhaps deliberately muddled, like some of his other references, but the circumstantial exactitude of which is noteworthy, and may be derived from a literary source no longer extant, for it is quite apparent that Isidore read widely in the preparation of his brief. The occupation of Corinth by the Onogurs was, of course, irrelevant to any consideration of the elevation of Monemvasia to metropolitan rank (one of the important issues); in the seventh century Monemvasia was a very insignificant bishopric; the Greek taktika show Monemvasia subject to Corinth from the beginning to the tenth century until almost, the time of the Fourth Crusade. Although Isidore argues that when Monemvasia fell into the hands of Geoffrey II de Villehardouin in 1248, it was 'then a metropolis and not a bishopric' (Neos Hellen., xii, p. 288, ll. 11–12), he is still in error, although he may not have known it, but Monemvasia was almost certainly made a metropolis by Michael VIII Palaeologus in 1261 (Franz Dölger, Regesten d. Kaiserurkunden d. oström.
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Reiches, pt. 3 [1982], no. 1897a, p. 39; V. Laurent, in the Echos d’Orient, xxxix [1980], 185; and St. Binon, ibid., xxxvii [1988], 277–278. Be all this as it may, however, Isidore insists, most energetically, that the establishment of Monemvasia as a metropolitan see, together with its jurisdiction over Maine, was unconnected with the disasters which had befallen Corinth when it was captured by the Onogurs in the seventh century (in the days of Justinian the Great) and, later, when it was captured by the so-called Fourth Crusaders (in 1210). Concerning the date of the two petitions in question, with the second and longer and more important of which we are alone concerned, Cardinal Mercati has written: ’While the petitions, written in the person of a Metropolitan of Monemvasia, are from about the year 1429 and consequently addressed to Joseph II, who died in Florence toward the end of the Council, and was Patriarch from 21 May 1416 to 10 June 1439, the petitioner is one who, not a native of the Peloponnesus, had held the episcopacy for about 16 years or from about 1415 [Neos Hellen., xi, 277]. The time is revealed from the fact that in the petitions recent patriarchal orders are contested, especially a synodal “sigillion” first issued thirty-two years before, under the Patriarch Antonius (1391–1397), whereby the bishoprics of Maine and Zemena were ordered restored to Corinth, i.e., the Πράξεις τοῦ Κοπίσιου of the year 1397, fortunately extant and printed in the Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana [eds. F. Miklosich and Jos. Müller], ii [1862], 287–292. Hence, the first and principal date — the year 1429 — which reveals the other dates...’ (Scritti d’Isidoro, p. 9). The petition was written for the Metropolitan by Isidore, later Metropolitan of Kiev (1437–1442), who Mercati believes was a native of the Peloponnesus, although he was educated in Constantinople (op. cit., pp. 10–14, cf. 59, 102–108). In the passage quoted above Isidore has confused the Bulgars (Kutrigur) attacks upon the empire in 558–559 under Zabergan [on which see, infra, p. 508] with, as I think, an Onogur attack upon Corinth almost a century later, and has thus produced a sort of historical contaminatio, both episodes in the drama, however, being true. Isidore ‘of Kiev’ became a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church (18 December 1439), was very active in the service of Pope Nicholas V, and died in Rome on 23 April 1463 (see Adolf Ziegler, Die Union des Konsils von Florenz in der russischen Kirche [Würzburg, 1938], esp. pp. 56 ff.).


8 Among recent works, see especially Denis A. Zakythinos, ΟΙ ΣΛΑΒΟΙ και ΕΛΛΑΣ (Athens, 1945; hereafter commonly cited as Slavs in Greece), pp. 20 ff.; Zakythinos does not, however, believe in Slavic settlements in Greece at so early a date; he discusses individual Slavic tribes and peoples in some detail (pp. 29 ff.). There are learned and sensible summaries and evaluations of older points of view in the work of the learned Czech historian Lubor Niederle, Manuel de l’antiquité slave [abridgment of his Slovanšte Staroživotnosti, ‘Slavic Antiquities,’ 1902–1924] (Paris, 1928–1926), 1, 42 ff., 59 ff., 98 ff. Cf. V. N. Zlatarski, Istoriya, i, 1, pp. 7 ff., et alibi, and his article, published posthumously, on ‘Die Besiedelung der Balkanhälfte durch die Slaven,’ Revue internationale des études balkaniques, iv, 4 (1936), 358–375, esp. 363–364 (without refs. to sources); one may read with profit N. Iorga, ‘Époque et caractère de l’établissement des Slaves dans la Péninsule des Balkans,’ Revue historique du Sud-est européen, vii (1930), 1–17 (a lively and instructive address; does not touch upon Greece); Fr. Dvornik, Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au IXe siècle (Paris, 1926), pp. 2–5; A. A. Vasiliev, Hist. Byz. Emp., i (1928), 113, 137–138, 140, 143, and particularly his older study ‘Slavs in Greece’ (in Russian), in the Vizantistiki Vremennik, V (1898), 404–488, 626–670; and Maximilian Braun, Die Slaven auf dem Balkan bis zur Befreiung von der türkischen Herrschaft (Leipzig, 1941).

The name Slav (Σλαβον) first appears as such in the Greek sources at the end of the first quarter of the sixth century, in the second dialogue of the Pseudo-Csararius of Nazianzus (Caes., Dial. II, Interrogatio CX, in PG 38, col. 985), on which note J. Peisker, in Cambr. Med. Hist., ii, 482; J. B. Bury,
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Later Roman Empire, Π (1923), 292 ff.; Const. Amantos, in the Proceedings of the Academy of Athens, vii (1892), 531 ff., and Max Vasmer, 'Die Slaven in Griechenland,' in the Abhandlungen der preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften, Philos.-hist. Kl., xii (Berlin, 1941), pp. 11-12. Bury, Vasiliev, Vasmer, Zakythinos, and most scholars today reject as groundless the old theory of Pavel J. Šafarík, Slavische Alterthümer (trans. M. von Aehrenfeld, and ed. Heinrich Wuttke, Leipzig, 1843-1844), i 213 ff., 245-249, and ii, 159-162, and of the Bulgarian historian M. S. Drinov, The Slavie Occupation of the Balkan Peninsula (in Russian, Moscow, 1873), that the Slavs had begun to settle in the Balkan peninsula in the third, and even in the later second, century A.D., a theory which Const. J. Šireček (in his earlier work), Geschichte der Bulgaren (Prague, 1876), p. 94, supported, asserting that Slavic inroads began in the third century, 'and continued for some four hundred years.' In his earlier work Lubor Niederle also accepted for the most part the theory of Šafarík and Drinov (Slov. Starožitnosti, Π (1906), 174 ff.), although he subsequently abandoned it as untenable (Manuel, i, 50). Šafarík, however, put the expansion of the Slavs into the Peloponnesus as late as the period between 746, the year of the famous plague, and 799, the year of the Slavic prince Akamir's attempt to rescue the five Isaurian princes exiled by the Empress Irene to Athens (Slavische Alterthümer, Π, 192-193).

Although chiefly concerned, of course, with Bulgaro-Turkish history, there is much recent bibliography concerning the Slavs also in the first volume of Moravciský's Byzantinoturcica, and numerous other works are mentioned in the notes to the present study, although the bibliography is too vast to seek to make notices of it anything like complete. (See, infra, especially note 105.) There is a rather full bibliography of works published between 1918 and 1942 by Bulgarian scholars dealing with their own history, in Ivan Dujčev, 'Die bulgarische Geschichtsforschung während des letzten Vierteljahrmhunderts,' in the Südost-Forschungen, 1942-1943 (?), pp. 546-573, with numerous notices of works dealing with the First Bulgarian Empire (pp. 550-557). (I have read an undated offprint of Dujčev's article very kindly loaned to me by Professor Robert L. Wolff.)

6 S. Demetrii Martyris Acta, Π, cap. 5, 198 (PG 116, col. 1368A); A. Tougaard, De l'histoire profane dans les actes greco des Boltandites (Paris, 1874), Thessalonique, 113 (p. 190).


8 Nemeth, 'La provenance du nom bulgar,' Symbolae grammaticae in honorem Ioannis Rozvadowski, Π (Cracow, 1927), 217-222 (ref. from Moravcsik); bibliography in Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica, Π; Die byzantinischen Quellen der Geschichte der Türkvolker (Budapest, 1942), pp. 52 ff. Cf. K. H. Menges, in Byzantion, xvii (1944-45), 271.


10 A. D. Keramopoulos, The Greeks and Their Northern Neighbors, Athens, 1945, summarized in Stilpon P. Kyriakidis, Bulgars and Slavs in Greek History (both works in Greek, Thessalonika, 1946), pp. 7-16, and ff., derives the name Bulgars from burgarii, βωργάρως, i.e., those who maintain the forts, ἐπιβίωσαν, πόρος, along the northern boundaries of the Balkan provinces, and elsewhere in the empire, first mentioned in Greek in an inscription dated a.d. 202, found between Philippopolis and Tatar Pazardzik (and last published in Wilhelm Dittenberger's Sylyge inscriptionum graecarum, 3 ed., vol. Π (1917), no. 880, l. 51, p. 598). The burgarii received land for cultivation from the government, and provided therefor, along the northern borders, protection against marauding bands and brigands, but they were servi, i.e., qui corporibus servivant, rather than milites (cf. Codex Theodosianus, xi, 19, 2). A medley of barbarian peoples were settled as burgarioi (cf. Isidore, Etym., ix, 4, 28, in PL 82, 351B), sometimes on special terms as foederati, in the frontier provinces, and they caused two regions in which they were particularly numerous to be called Bourgariai, according to Keramopoulos (and doubted by Kyriakidis, op. cit., pp. 16 ff.); by a not uncommon metabole Bourgarioi is said to have become Boulgaroi, Bulgars, and Burgaria is said to have become Boulgaria, Bulgaria. Those peoples in the Balkans who happened to live further from the Greek-speaking provinces, as the Serbs and Croats, and so did not hear themselves called Bourgarioi by the Greeks, did not so call themselves, and preserved or acquired other names, whereas the Bulgars, the most prominent ethnic group (although Keramopoulos denies them any real ethnic homogeneity) having common boundaries with the Greeks in 'Bulgaria,' land of the Bourgarioi, living in and around forts or in the fundi
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limitrophē (τὰ στρατιωτικὰ), came to call themselves by the name applied to them by the Greeks. The garrison existence of so many ‘Bulgars,’ in isolated military colonies, without women, led to their being bougres and practicing bougerie (cf. DuCange, Gloss. lat., 1 [réimpr. 1837], p. 779, s.v. Bulgar). This theory seems to explain an embarrassing reference or two to Bulgaria before the seventh century, as when John of Nikiu speaks of the rebel Vitalianus, in the time of the Emperor Anastaius, retreating into ‘the province of Bulgaria’ (Chron., lxxix, 75, trans. R. H. Charles, London and Oxford, 1916, p. 130, on which cf., infra, note 31). However, since John of Nikiu wrote towards the end of the seventh century, we had best assume that he is referring to the political geography of his own time. Keramopoulos’ theory is rejected by Const. I. Amatos, History of the Byzantine Empire (in Greek), Π (Athens, 1947), 429–430, but it is given very serious consideration by Kyrkakidis, in his Bulgars and Slavs in Greek History, D. Detschew derives the word Bulgar from what he believes to be the East Germanic *Bulgāres, meaning homines pugnae (‘Der ostgermanische Ursprung des bulgarischen Volksnamens,’ Zeitschrift f. Ortsnamenforschung, Π [1927], esp. pp. 199–201, 212–216).


Onogur, in Greek ‘Οὔγγαρος, whence Οὔγγαρος, Hungarians (the word Magyar is of Finno-Ugrian origin): Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica, ΙΙ, 189–190, 194–196, cf. 199 ff. (Οὔγγαρος), and cf. 270 (s.v. Ταιγεάτις-3. ‘Ungarn’). The Onogurs first appear in Byzantine historiography in a fragment of Priscus where they are declared to have sent an embassy, together with the Saragurs and the Ogurs, about 463 to Constantinople, after they had been driven out of their homes by the Sabirs, themselves hard pressed by the Avars (from the History of Priscus, 14, in Excerpta de legationibus [ed. Carl de Boor, Berlin, 1908], pars Π, p. 586, and cf. Suidas, sub verbos ‘Ašapos, Lex. ed. Ada Adler, Ι [Leipzig, 1928], p. 4, on which texts see Moravcsik, Ung. Jrhr., Χ, 54 ff., Byzantinoturcica, Ι, 301, cf. 320). The three peoples had moved westward towards the Empire from western Siberia; had first met the Byzantines in the region north of the Caucasus; and had despatched their embassies from the Greek cities lying along the eastern shores of the Maeotsis (Moravcsik, Ung. Jrhr., x, 50–60, 65). For some two centuries, from the late fifth to the late seventh century, the Onogurs in large numbers remained in their new homes, north of the Caucasus, east of Maeotsis, near the river Kuban, their nearest neighbors being the Sabirs and Alans (Ung. Jrhr., x, 65).


14 Theophanes (ed. de Boor), Ι, 357. The belief of Zlatarski, Istoriia, Ι, 1, pp. 87, 89, 91–92, accepted by Steven Runciman, First Bulgarian Empire, pp. 15–16, that the Utigurs formed the basis of Old Great Bulgaria must be abandoned in the light of Moravcsik’s researches. (Although Great Bulgaria lay in the Kuban region, contrary to the contentions of certain Bulgarian nationalist historians, Henri Grégoire has again demonstrated that Kovrat was active in the Balkans and in continental Greece a generation before the final settlement of the Bulgars on the Danube in 679 [on which see infra]: I accept, although with some misgivings, the identification, long ago made by Jireček, of the Kurt in the list of Bulgar khans with the Kovrat of the Byzantine writers [on which also see infra]. Cf. Jul. Koulakovskii, Istoriia Vizantii, ΙΙΙ [Kiev, 1915], 376 ff.)

15 The locus classicus, describing all these events is, of course, Theophanes (ed. de Boor), Ι, 356–358. (Moravcsik has assembled Theophanes’ references to the Bulgars [Byzantinoturcica, Ι, 385–386].) Despite the heroic efforts of Moravcsik and numerous other scholars to get at the historical facts in Theophanes, the latter’s notices on the early Bulgars remain a confused medley of traditions that do not fit together with much consistency.

16 Agathon Diaconus (a contemporary source and an excellent one), Epilogus (on the Emperor Philip Bardanes and the sixth Oecumenical Council), in J. D. Mansi, Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio [hereafter cited as ‘Mansi’], xxi (Florence, 1766), col. 193 B; cf. the accounts in Theophanes, Chron. (ed. de Boor), Ι, pp. 382–388, and in the Patriarch Nicephorus, Chron. (ed. de Boor), pp. 48–49, on which texts see Moravcsik, Ung. Jrhr., x, 66–68, and Am. Slav. Rev., v, nos. 14–15 (1946), 41, 43. The ‘Οὔγγαρος and the ‘Οὔγγαρος are thought by some scholars to be the same people (cf. Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica, ΙΙ, 190, 205), and cf. the important notes of B. von Arnim, ‘Tur-
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20 Theophanes, Chronographia (ed. de Boor), i, 356–359; Nicephorus, Opuscula historica (ed. de Boor, Leipzig, 1880), pp. 33–35. See V. N. Zlatarski, Istoriya, i, 1, pp. 96 ff. On the attack of the Emperor Constantine IV Pogonatus upon the Bulgars in 679–680, its subsequent failure and the consequent rout of the Byzantines, and the Bulgarian movement in force across the Danube and up to the Balkan Mts. (681), see Géza Fehér’s valuable study of Les Monuments de la culture proto-bulgare et leurs relations hongroises (Budapest, 1931), pp. 12, 18, 24, 164, and the acute study of the texts and the demonstration (contrary to V. N. Zlatarski’s view) that the Bulgars in 679–681 had actually subjugated rather than merely combined with the so-called ‘seven Slavic tribes’ in IV. Dujčev, ‘Protobulgares et Slaves: Sur le problème de la formation de l’Etat bulgare,’ Annales de l’Institut Kondakos, x (1988), 145–154. Ju. Trifonov has shown that there is some reason for setting Asparuch’s victory over the Byzantines in the spring of 681 and the peace towards the end of the same year, which would make the beginning date of the First Bulgarian Empire 681, and not 679 (for which see Dujčev, Südost-Forschungen, 1942–1943, p. 552).


24 Moravcik, Ung. Jhrbr., x, 84 ff.

25 Moravcik, Ung. Jhrbr., x, 71 ff., and bibliography in Byzantinoturcica, i, 52 ff.


28 Theophanes, Chron. (ed. de Boor), i, 357–358; Nicephorus, Hist. (ed. de Boor), pp. 33–34.

29 Moravcik, Ung. Jhrbr., x, 84 ff. (The Bashkirs are now a partly Mongolized people living especially in the Kazan district and the southern Urals [C. S. Coon, The Races of Europe, New York, 1989,
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30 Moravcsik, *Ung. Jhrb.*, x, 85–87; quite a different view in Fehér, *Les Monuments de la culture protobulgare*, p. 163 (Fechér had not yet seen Moravcsik’s study).


34 John Mal., *ibid.*, lib. xviii (Bonn, p. 451; *PG* 97, 661). The ‘Huns’ came ‘with a great multitude of different barbarians’ (*μετὰ πολλῶν ξένων διαφόρων βαρβάρων*). Cf. Zlatarski, i, 1, p. 54.

35 John Mal., loc. cit.: *καὶ ἐκ τούτου φόβος κατεχόμεθα τὰ βάφθαρα θύμις.*


38 *Procop., Bell. pers.*, ii, 4, 4–5 (Dewing, Loeb, ii, 267): *... μεγά ... στράτευμα Οθωμάνο ...*

39 *Procop., ibid.*, ii, 4, 10–11 (Loeb, ii, 289).


42 *Procop., Bell. Goth.*, iii, 14, 7 and 32–33 (Loeb, iv, 265, 273–274).


44 *Procop., ibid.*, iii, 13, 24–25 (Loeb, iv, 261, 263).

45 *Procop., ibid.*, iii, 29, 1–8 (Loeb, iv, 309, 401).

46 *Procop., ibid.*, iii, 38, 1–8, and 9 ff. (Loeb, v, 21, 23 ff.).


49 On Zabergan and the Kutrigurs, see esp. Agathias Scholasticus, *Hist.*, v, 11–13, 20, 23 ff. (*PG* 88,
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The Uighurs pass out of the ken of the Byzantine historians after the sixth century; the attempt to see in them the important Onogurs, or to believe in the absorption of the Uighurs by the Onogurs, is dangerous. On the Uighurs and the no less difficult problem of the Kutrugins, and the latter’s relations with the Onogurs or ‘Danube Bulgars,’ see Moravcsik, ‘Zur Gesch. d. Onoguren,’ Ung. Jhbr., x (1890), 75–80.


57 Menander, Legat. ad Rom., 1–4 (PG 113, cols. 792–793, 796; ed. de Boor, pp. 442–444), and cf. Legat. ad gent., I (PG 113, 849, 852; ed. de Boor, p. 170). Bury, Later Roman Empire, II (1929), 315; Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica, i, 255. In 562 the Avars sent a second embassy to Justinian, as described by Menander, ed. de Boor, pp. 443–444.

58 Men., Legat. ad Rom., 5 (PG 113, cols. 797, 800; ed. de Boor, op. cit., pars II, pp. 444–446).


59 Men., Legat. ad gent., 15 [16 in PG] in PG 113, 908A; ed de Boor, pars I, p. 408; ... κεραιοφέρου τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ τὸν Ἐκκλησίαν ... . The contemporary historian John of Ephesus, Hist. eccl., II, 25 (trans. J. M. Schöpfel, Die Kirchengeschichte d. Johannes v. Ephesus, Munich, 1862, pp. 119–120), says that, when the Emperor Tiberius succeeded Justinian, he was threatened on all sides, and was especially beset by the accursed tribes of Slavs and Avars, who gave him no rest (I have not had access to E. W. Brooks’ edition of John of Ephesus’ history). Note, however, Zakythinos, Slaves in Greece, pp. 19–20, who believes the Slavic attacks were chiefly upon northern Greece, against which see Marquart, Osteuropäische u. ostasiatische Streifzüge, pp. 243–245. There are some important notices in John of Bical and in Isidore of Seville: John of Bical (late 6th century), Chronica (ed. Mommsen, MGH, Auct. Antiquiss., xi [1894]), ad ann. 576 (?): ‘Sclavini in Thracia multas urbes Romanorum pervadunt,


65 Evagrius, *Hist. eccl.*, vi, 10 (eds. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, London, 1898, p. 228; PG 86, 2860A), an important text for Fallmerayer; cf. Procopius (on the fortifications of Singidunum), *De aedificiis*, iv, 5, 12–16; and cf. the *Chronicle of Monemvasia* [on which see infra], text i, in *Byzant* (in Greek), i (1909), pp. 64–65, 80. Zakythinos, *Slaves in Greece*, pp. 18–19, insists that ‘Hellas’ in Evagrius means only the northern region, between Singidunum and Anchialus, which is also the view of Karl Hopf and Const. Amantos. For an archaeological notice of the Avaro-Slavic invasions into northern Greece, see G. A. Soteriou, ‘Ανασκαφαὶ Νέας Αγγέλου, in the *Proceedings [Πρακτικά] of the Archaeological Society* of Athens, 1935, pp. 62–64.


71 Const. Porphyry, *De Thematibus*, ii, 53 (PG 113, 125A). Cf. Zakythinos, *Slaves in Greece*, p. 43. St Willibald and his companions, on their way to the Holy Land, about 725, are said to have found Monemvasia ‘in Slavinae terra’ (as the text should apparently read), in *Vita Willibaldi Episcopi Eichstetensis*, 4 (MGH, SS, xv, pt. 1 [1887], p. 93), a text which, as Gregorovius, *op. cit.*, i, 113, observes (against Hopf), is worth some consideration, while Zakythinos, *op. cit.*, p. 44, believes that the *Vita Willibaldi* is too ill-informed for this testimony to be of any value.


73 Theophanes, A.M. 6247, ed. de Boor, i, 429. On the plague itself, which spread ‘from Sicily and Calabria like a fire in Monemvasia and Greece and the neighboring islands,’ see, *ibid.*, A.M. 6238, ed. de Boor, i, 422–423. When Constantine V was restoring the aqueduct of Valentinian, destroyed by the Avars, he imported workmen from various places in the Empire, including 500 ‘from Greece
and the islands' (ibid., A.M. 6258, ed. de Boor, i, 440). Such workmen naturally came from the cities where there were still plenty of Greeks.

74 Coon, *The Races of Europe*, p. 607.

75 Leo, *Tactica*, const. xviii, 99–101 (PG 107, 968D–969A), and cf. Zakythinos, *Slavs in Greece*, p. 35: ‘The inhabitants of the lands of the Slavs were made Greeks [ηγερακωθησαν], and thus did Hellenism show, yet again, its great civilizing strength.’


82 Our chief account of these events is in Theophylact Simocatta, *Historiae* (old text in PG 113), ed. de Boor (for refs, see under Αβασαοι in de Boor’s index on p. 315, and Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, i 344–345). The historian Theophanes becomes our important source from the reign of Phocas on. Theophanes’ material concerning the Bulgar-Turks, Avars, and Slavs, treating and fighting with the Emperor Maurice and his predecessors, is largely drawn from Theophylact Simocatta (Theophanes, *Chronogr.*, ed. C. de Boor, i, 245, 252–254, 257–259, 262, 264–284, et alii). However, Theophanes has also preserved notices, not known from other sources, of the Hunnic invasions of Thrace in 474–475 and 561–562 (ed. de Boor, i, 120, 236–237), the Bulgar attack of 501–502 (i, 143), together with some miscellaneous details concerning the Avaro-Byzantine wars (i, 246, 252, 280, 290): I have taken these references from Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, i, 335.

83 Cf. Theophanes, *Chronogr.*, A.M. 6096 (ed. de Boor, i, 292).

84 Thus famine and pestilence beset Constantinople in 619 (Nicephorus, *Opuscula historica*, ed. C. de Boor, p. 12).
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89 See G. Vernadsky, 'The Beginnings of the Czech State' [found by Samo], Byzantion, xvii [1944–45], 315–328.

90 Nicephorus, De rebus post Mauricium gestis, ad ann. 634 [635–636], in PG 100, 916, and ed. C. de Boor, p. 24; cf. J. Marquart, Osteuropäische u. ostastatische Streifzüge, p. 126.

91 See the corrupt and repetitious notices in Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De administrando imperio, 29 (PG 113, 249C, 252A, 256A), 30 (372 ff.), 31 (382 ff.), 32 (288C ff.), et sqq. Moravcsik is especially valuable on Constantine Porphyrogenitus (Byzantinoturcica, i, 204–229). Among secondary accounts, cf. Fr. Dvornik, Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au IXe siècle, pp. 6–8; Bréhier and Aigrain, in Fliche and Martin, Hist. de l'église, v, 146–149; and above all, the interesting study of Henri Grégoire, 'L'Origine et le nom des Croates et des Serbes,' in Byzantion, xvii (1944–45), 88–118.

The Slavic Croats (and Serbs) were led against the Avars by the Bulgarian Khan Kovalat, who is actually the eponymous hero, according to Grégoire, from whom they derive their name (Χρωβάτοι). The Croats and Serbs are the same people, the difference between them growing solely out of their different histories from the seventh century on (cf. Eugène Pittard, Les Races et l'histoire [Paris, 1924], pp. 350 ff., 'Les Serbes et les Croates constituaient primitivement un groupe unique'). The views of Grégoire in this connection are not new, and are those, for example, of H. H. Howorth, expressed in a series of articles published some seventy years ago in the Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland (see especially xi [1882], 224–230). As for the name Serb, Grégoire believes that Const. Porphyrogenitus was stating the fact when he declared that Σαρσός . . . τήν ῥωμαϊκήν διάλεκτον Δόλοι (i.e. Latin Serbi) προσαχθήσαντα (De adm. imp., 32, in PG 113, 389A).

I should have thought that Grégoire, like Howorth, would derive the name of the Serbs from the Sabiri (see pp. 226–227 of Howorth's article).


94 The numismatic evidence, on which see infra, suggests that this account as given by Constantine Porphyrogenitus may not be accurate. There is need, however, of further excavation on Acrocorinth.

95 Const. Porphyr., De adm. imp., 49 (PG 118, cols. 369, 372); cf. J. B. Bury, Eastern Roman Empire from Irene to Basil I (London, 1912), pp. 376–378. The signature of Nicephorus I raising Patras to a metropolis is alleged to have been confirmed by some of his successors (on which see Kyriakidis, Byzantine Studies, vi: The Slavs in the Peloponnesus [in Greek, Salonika, 1947], pp. 22, 23–24).

96 J. P. Fallmerayer, Gesch. d. Halbinsel Morea, i, 188–185, 218–222.

97 See Karl Hopf, loc. cit., lxxxy, 98–99, 100–108 (a withering attack upon Fallmerayer, with refs. to his several works). Hopf's own view that the Slavs were dominant only from 750 to 807 was immediately challenged by A. v. Gutschmid in a review of his work in the Literar. Centralblatt, 1888, pp. 641 ff., and reprinted in Gutschmid's Kleine Schriften, v (1894).

98 An interesting appraisal of the works of J. Ph. Fallmerayer (1790–1861), in relation to the politics of his day, was published by H. Warner in the North American Review for July 1864 (pp. 281–287). For a scholarly analysis of the origins of Fallmerayer's theories, see N. M. Petrovskii, in the
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Russian Journal of the Ministry of Public Instruction, new series, XLVIII (1913), 104–147, which discusses the influence of Leake upon Fallmerayer and the latter’s debt to Kopitar, and the recent work of H. Seidler, Jacob Ph. Fallmerayers geistige Entwicklung: Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Geistesgeschichte des 19. Jahrhundertis (Munich, 1947).

92 J. P. Fallmerayer, Gesch. d. Halbinsel Morea, i, 183–185, 221, and cf. the famous effusion, ibid., pp. iii–vii (on which see Hopf, op. cit., LXXXV, 100 ff., and Vasiliev, Hist. Byz. Emp., i, 218–214); J. W. Zinkeisen, Gesch. Griechenlands, i (1892), 689–690, 701 ff.; and cf. G. F. Hertzberg, Gesch. Griechenlands, i (1876), 120–130. In 1880 Const. Sathas had claimed that “historically there is no Slavic question, the Slavs, such as modern ethnology conceives them, never having penetrated into the Peloponnese at all [!]” (refs. in Gregorovius-Lampros, Athens [in Greek], i, 180), which brought objection from Gustav Meyer, ‘Constantin Sathas u. die Slavenfrage in Griechenland,’ in Essays u. Studien zur Sprachgeschichte u. Volkskunde, i (Berlin, 1885), 117–142, esp. 134 ff. The old bibliography is very extensive (and was largely utilized by Vasiliev, Byzantikii Vremennik, v [1898], 404 ff., 626 ff.); it is easily collected, and is summarized in some of the valuable critique of Labor Niederle, Slovanské Starožitnosti, ii (1906), 205–216, et altib, and also in Max Vasmer, Die Slaven in Griechenland, pp. 1–10, although Vasmer is, of course, chiefly interested in the literature concerning place names (his historical account owes much to Vasiliev). The reader in a hurry will find a succinct modern account of the Slavic invasions of Greece in Diehl and Marçais, Le Monde oriental de 395 à 1081 (2 ed., Paris, 1944), pp. 212–221.


104 K. Hopf, loc. cit., LXXXV, 107, and N. A. Bees, Byzantinis, i (1909), 82–83, believed that the letter of Nicholas III was the source whence the author of the Chronicle of Monemvasia drew the statement that the Avars had controlled the (western) Peloponnese for 218 years, but this was, of course, shown to be erroneous when J. B. Kouegas published the Scholium of Arethas, written in 932, which contains the same statement (Neos Hellen., IX [1912], 475, 478), i.e., more than a century and a half, at the very least, before Nicholas III: Kouegas believed that the Chronicle, in its earlier form, dated from the reign of Nicephorus II Phocas, i.e., 963–969 (op. cit., pp. 477–478).

105 We may note, among others, Max Vasmer (op. cit. in note 5 above), a study of the Slavic place-names in Greece; Const. Amantos, ‘The Slavs in Greece’ (in Greek), in the Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher, XVII (1944), 210–221 (a critique of Vasmer’s work); on Vasmer, see also Dem. J. Georgakas, ‘Beiträge zur Deutung als Slavisch erklärter Ortsnamen,’ Byz. Zeitschr., XXI (1941), 351–381; P. Charanis, ‘The Hellenization of Sicily and Southern Italy during the Middle Ages,’ American Historical Review, LII (1946), 74–86, esp. 83 ff., and ‘Nicephorus I, the Savior of Greece from the Slavs,’ Byzantina-Metabyzantina, i (1946), 75–92; and, especially, D. A. Zakythinos, Slav in Greece. The subject of the Slavs in Greece has been pursued with unflagging interest in recent years, and the following books deal with some of its multiple problems (in Greek): A. Keramopoulos, The Greeks and Their Northern Neighbors, Athens, 1945; A. Diomidis, Byzantine Studies, ii: The Slavic Attacks upon Greece and the Policy of Byzantium, Athens, 1946; Stilpon P. Kyriakidis, Bulgars and Slavs in Greek History (Thessalonica, 1946), and by the same author, Byzantine Studies, vi: The Slav in [the] Peloponnese (Thessalonica, 1947); and S. Pagoulatos, The Slav in [the] Peloponnese up to Nicephorus I (805 A.D.) (Athens, 1948).


107 Lampros, Historika Meletemata, pp. 97–125, with a commentary, texts of the three versions arranged in a harmony on pp. 98–109.


109 See Bees, Byzantinis, i, 90–91, 93 ff.

110 Lampros, Νος καθ’ τούς Χρονικόν του Μονεμβασεις, in Neos Hellen., IX (1912), 245–251.

111 Lampros, Historika Meletemata, pp. 118–119.

112 Bees, Byzantinis, i, 101 ff.
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Kougeas, Ἐπὶ τοῦ καλουμένου χρονικοῦ 'Περὶ τῆς κτίσεως τῆς Μονοβασιας, in Neos Hellen., ix (1912), 473–480, esp. 477–478, and cf. idem, 'Ὁ Κασσαρέιας Ἀρμᾶς καὶ τὸ ἄργων αὐτῶ, Athens, 1913, p. 60. Kougeas also asserts, with some reason, that we are dealing here not, despite the title in the manuscript, with a Chronicle of Monemvasia, but with a Chronicle of the Bishopric of Lacedaemonia (see Neos. Hellen., ix, 478–480).


117 Cf. Kougeas, Neos Hellen., ix (1912), 476; Bees, Byzantin., ix, 76 ff.; Zakythinos, Slav in Greece, pp. 40–41. The pertinent section in the Monemvasiote petition is printed in Neos Hellen., xiii (1915), 286–287, on which see Mercat, Scritti d'Isidoro il cardinale Rutenio, pp. 8–9 ff. On the relations of Arethas, the different versions of the Chronicle, and the letter of the Patriarch Nicholas III to one another, see Kyriakidis, Byzantine Studies, vi, pp. 73 ff.

118 Lampros, Historika Meletemata, p. 118, cf. 109, 114; Neos Hellen., ix (1912), 250; Bees, Byzantin., i, 74; Zakythinos, Slav in Greece, p. 41. (In quoting the pertinent section from Lampros, Zakythinos' eye fell from one line to the next, and he missed entirely the first part of Lampros' division of the material in the Chronicle into three parts.)


120 Cf. Kyriakidis, Byzantine Studies, vi, passim.

121 I am inclined to agree with Charanis, Byzantina-Metabyzantina, i, 88, against Zakythinos, Slav in Greece, pp. 41–43, that the common source upon which the author (or authors) of the Chron. of Monemvasia and Arethas drew was a written one and not merely εἰς τῶν προφορικῶν πλούσιον τοῦ πελατονικικού λαοῦ (Zakythinos, op. cit., p. 41). Also Zakythinos' rejection of the Chronicle as a sound source is rather too cavalier (op. cit., p. 43).


123 Cf. V. Grumel, Les Actes des Patriarches, vol. i, fasc. 2 (1936), no. 371, pp. 21–22. (The imperial decree was probably genuine, since it was confirmed by later emperors.)

124 Chron. of Monemvasia (vers. i), in Byzantin., i, 65–66: Οἱ 'Ἄβαροι δὴ καὶ τὸν Πελοποννήσου ἐφορεσθαντες πολέμων ταῖς τῆς ἐλλοι καὶ ἐκβιβάζοντες τὰ ἐυγενῆ καὶ ἐλληνικά θησία καταθεθαντες κατάφθασιν αὐτῶν εἰς αὐτῇ. Both versions T and K of the Chronicle preserve a reminiscence of the tradition which recorded a Hunnic, or rather Bulgar, attack upon Greece and the Peloponnesus by assigning the Avars to the 'race of the Huns and Bulgars' (Byzantin., i, 61, and cf. Lampros, Historika Meletemata, p. 115 [passage from Genesis]). The text of the Chronicle has been republished by Kyriakidis, Byzantine Studies, vi, pp. 41 ff.

125 Ibid., Byzantin., i, 66: οἱ δὲ ταῖς μαχιανοῖς αὐτῶν χείρας δυνηθείσας ἐκφεγγέν, ἄλος ἀλλαχις διεσκάρησαν. This Sophoclean eloquence is not imitated in versions T and K (Byzantin., i, p. 63).

126 Maurice became Emperor on 13 August 582, and so his sixth year terminated on 12 August 588. The Empress Irene was deposed on 31 October 802, and so the fourth year of the reign of Nicephorus I terminated on 1 November 806: the 218 years in question could thus be 587–803 or 588–806, the former dates probably being the proper ones, since the Chronicle of Monemvasia notes that Patras was reestablished, παραμορφώσετε ἐν Ταρσιαῖοι, and the patriarchate of Tarasius terminated on 18 February 806 (cf. V. Grumel, Les Actes des Patriarches, vol. i, fasc. 2 [1936], p. 12).

127 For what her testimony is worth we may note again the contrary statement of the nun who wrote the life of St. Willibald, Bishop of Eichstäd: she says, of the pilgrims travelling to the Holy Land with Willibald (ca 725), '... et inde [from Syracuse in Sicily] navigantes, veneorunt ultra mare Adriad urbem Manafasiam in Slawinia terrae [sic] ...' (Vita Willibaldi Episcopi Eichstetensis, 4, in MGH, SS, xv, pt. 1 [1887], p. 93). Hopf, loc. cit., lxxxv, 57, and Zakythinos, Slav in Greece, p. 44, see no value in this source because of the geographical ignorance of the writer, who puts Tyre and Sidon on the Adriatic (cf. Hopf, op. cit., lxxxv, 106). Gregorovič-Lampros, Athens (in Greek), i, 178–179, sees the source as of some value. In any event the testimony is inconsistent with the state-
ment in the *Chronicle of Monemvasia* and the Scholium of Arethas, which are obviously accurate in this particular. Vasmér's studies have made the fact clearer even than it was before 'dass der Osten Griechenlands weniger slawische Einflüsse aufweist als der Westen. Im Peloponnes sind Korinth und namentlich Argolis am schwächsten von der Slaveninvasion betroffen, in Mittelgriechenland Attika und Böotien' (*Die Slaven in Griechenland*, p. 317).

124 *Ibid.*, *Byzantin.,* 1, 68–69; Scholium of Arethas, in *Neos Hellen.*, IX, 475. Towards the end of 812, or early in 813, the Emperor Michael I Rangabe appointed one Leo, a member of the family of the Skleroi, the first known Strategos of the Peloponnesus (... Δέωτα τῶν ἐπιλεξόμενων τοῦ Σελήνου... ἑτόσιν... στρατηγῶν ἐν Πελοπόννησοι), according to the Scriptor Incertus, *De Leone V* (ed. Bonn, with Leo Grammaticus and Eustathius [vol. 47, 1842], p. 386), a text apparently disregarded by Heinrich Gelzer, *Die Genesis der byzantinischen Themenerfassung* (Leipzig, 1899), p. 91. There is still extant a lead seal almost certainly that of the Leo Skleros in question, for which see N. A. Bees, 'Zur Sigillographie der byzantinischen Themen Peloponnes und Hellas,' in *Vyzantiskii Vremennik*, xxi, pt. 3 (1914–15), 91–92.


129 Even the late Professor S. H. Cross could write that 'in 588 they [the Slavs] had penetrated the Peloponnesus, where their occupation was so formidable that for the next two centuries a Byzantine Greek scarcely dared set foot in the southern part of the peninsula' (in the *Handbook of Slavic Studies* [ed. L. I. Strakhovsky, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1949], p. 7).

130 J. D. Mansi, xi, col. 689 A (cited by Dvoronik, *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome*, p. 241): 'Stephen, by the grace of God, Bishop of the Corinthian metropolis, in the province of Greece, for myself and the synod under me I have signed.'

131 Cf. Mansi, xii, esp. cols. 991 ff. Peter, Bishop of Monemvasia, was also present in 787 (*ibid.*, col. 1110 D).

132 Mansi, xvi, col. 144 A: ‘... Hilarione Deo amicissimo metropolita Corinthi ...’

133 Mansi, xvi, 191 C.

134 Geras. I. Konidares, *Al μητροπόλει καὶ ἄρχωνσισκοπαί τοῦ οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατηραρχείου καὶ ἡ τάξει αὐτῶν*, (Athens, 1934), p. 77, notes that Patras was made an autocephalous archbishopric at the Seventh Oecumenical Council (but his ref. to Mansi is inaccurate); cf. Ernst Gerland, *Neue Quellen zur Gesch. d. latein. Erzbistums Patras* (Leipzig, 1903), pp. 3, 6, and 247–248 (on the Bishops and Metropolitans of Patras).
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135 Mansi, xiv, cols. 417–422; Franz Dölger, Reposten, pt. i (1924), nos. 408 and 413, p. 50.

136 Hilduin (Abbot of St Denis), Prolegomena ad Vitam S. Dionysii, 10 (PL 106, col. 19 BC), on which see Fr. V. Laurent, ‘L’Erection de la métropole d’Athènes,’ in Études Byzantines, i (1943–44), 67–71. The first official notices, however, of Athens as a metropolis come in 870 and 879 (Mansi, xvi, 191 B, and ibid., xvii, 373 D). The Athenian problem is rather a complicated one, however, which I shall discuss, with some fullness, in my study of Athens in the Middle Ages.

137 Gregorovius, Stadt Athen im Mittelalter, i, 85 (Greek ed. by Lampros, i, 151).

138 G. R. Davidson, ‘The Avar Invasion of Corinth,’ Hesperia, vi (1937), 229–238. There is a valuable archaeological survey of the so-called Kessethyikultur by P. Reinecke, ‘Die archäologische Hinterlassenschaft der Awaren,’ in Germania: Korrespondenzblatt der römisch-germanischen Kommission des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, xi (July 1928), 87–98. Mention should also be made of a few other works instructive in the present connection: N. Fettich, Das Kunstgewerbe der Awarenzeit in Ungarn, (Budapest, 1926); G. Fehér, Les Monuments de la culture prodouglare et leurs relations hongroises (Budapest, 1931); A. Alföldi, Funde aus der Hunnenzeit u. ihre ethnische Sonderung (Budapest, 1932), esp. pp. 14, 61 ff. (but not much for our purpose); A. Marosi and N. Fettich, Trouvailles avares de Dunapentele (Budapest, 1936); and T. Horváth, Die avarischen Gräberfelder von Ullő und Kiskörös (Budapest, 1936). Professor Hans Zeiss has asserted that the Corinthian finds are actually Byzantine; he puts up a good case for his view of storage, but I have not been convinced by it (see infra).

On the buckles note also Andreas Alföldi, ‘Zur historischen Bestimmung der Awarenfunde,’ in Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua [Minna Volume], ix (Helsinki, 1934), 300, with plate xxxi, nos. 1–6.

139 Men. Prot., Legat. ad Rom., 14 (PG 113, 817 D, 820 A; ed. C. de Boor, Excerpta de legationibus, 1, 2 [1903], p. 458). Baian sent ten thousand Kutrigurs to ravage Dalmatia, with the observation that if they perished in the undertaking, he would not be disturbed on their account (ει καλα γε αυτους θανατου δολαις, διλλων ειςευε νεαντοις συναλλαγας). Tibor Horváth, Hesperia, vi, 239, says that the graves are those of Kuturgur warriors who fell in the vanguard. (Horváth would seem to go somewhat astray in still believing, with Fehér and Hóman, that the Kutrigurs were the ‘Danube Bulgars’ [cf. Moravcsik, Ungarische Jahrbücher, x, 73]). The general bibliography is in Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica, i, 41–42.

140 In the two graves at Corinth under discussion remains of eight skeletons were found, from which three skulls were sufficiently whole to permit of scientific examination by Professor J. Koumaris (of Athens), who reported on them that ‘to be identified with the Avars the skulls should be brachycephalic, whereas these are dolichocephalic’ (Hesp., vi, 290). Actually, although crania found in Avaric graves do tend toward brachycephaly, meso- and sometimes (perhaps rarely) even strongly dolichocephalic finds are also made (cf. Arnold Marosi and Nándor Fettich, Trouvailles avares de Dunapentele (Budapest, 1936), pp. 100–105 [by Louis Bartuca]). An historic-anthropological discussion on the basis of the three Corinthian skulls would be very futile, but a few comments may be permitted. The Avars were, as indicated, brachycephalic, and these skulls are almost certainly not Avaric. Even leaving aside the objects found in the graves with the skeletons in question, there would be reason to believe that they were, most likely, not Greek, for most Greeks, especially those in the region around Corinth, apparently were and still are low brachycephals. As far as the cranial measurements go, these skulls could be those of Slavs, for although the Slavs in central Europe are today by and large brachycephalic, they were, surprisingly enough, dolichocephalic originally, and remained so until about the fourteenth century or so, from which time they have become progressively brachycephalic (cf. Krum Drontschilow, Beiträge zur Anthropologie der Bulgaren [dis. Berlin, Brunswick, 1914], p. 31, with ref. to works of Bogdanov, Niederer, and Matiega; L. Niederer, Manuel de l’anthropologie slave, i, 9–12; C. S. Coon, The Races of Europe, pp. 218–230). But as far as the cranial measurements go, the skulls could also be and (I think) are those of Bulgars: the strong tendency of the modern Bulgarian toward dolichocephaly is well known, and although the nation as a whole is today mesocephalic, the early Bulgarian peoples (i.e., Onogurs, Kutrigurs) were dolichocephalic (cf. Drontschilow, op. cit., pp. 18 ff.; J. B. Loritz, Anthropologische Untersuchungen an bulgarischen Schädeln aus alter u. neuer Zeit (diss. Munich, 1915); Wm. T. Ripley, The Races of Europe (1899, repr. 1937), pp. 425 ff.; Eugène Pittard, Les Races et l’histoire (Paris, 1924), pp. 282, 355–359; and Coon, op. cit., pp. 610–611). The assignment of the skeletal remains in the graves at Corinth to any given people must
obviously be based, not upon cranial measurements, but upon historical and archaeological evidence.

16 *Neos Hellen.,* xxi (1915), 286.


18 Cf. *Neos Hellen.,* xii, p. 285, ll. 15-16: ‘Latin strength having achieved this effect’ [συγκροτήσας τετράδιον τιμωρίων διάδοτας. There has been no reason to take seriously an interpolation in the text of George Phrantzes (cf. St Binon, *Echos d'Orient,* xxxvii, p. 279, n. 1, and cf. pp. 300 ff.), to the effect that Monemvasia, which was his native city, became a metropolitan see in the time of the Emperor Maurice, and was subsequently confirmed in this status by Alexius Comnenus and others (*Chron.,* iv, 16, in ed. Bonn, pp. 389-399), since its errors were observed by Michel Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus,* ii (Paris, 1740), cols. 216 ff. From the later tenth century there is extant a lead seal of one ‘George, Bishop of Monemvasia’ (N. A. Bees, *Viz. Vremennik,* xxiii, pt. 3 [1914-15], 106-110), but the lead seal in Gust. Schlumberger, *Stilographie de l'empire byzantin* (Paris, 1884), no. 1, p. 185, should probably be ascribed to the Bishop of Monod, not Monemvasia (Bees, *Viz. Vremennik,* xxii, 104-106).

19 Zakynthinos, *Slavs in Greece,* pp. 39 ff., whose slip was noticed by Charanis (*Byzantina-Metabyzantina,* i, 91).


21 The ‘old manuscript’ was produced by the ‘grand chartophylax’ of the patriarchal court at the Synod of 1397 (Miklosich and Müller, *Acta et diplomata,* ii, 288); we are informed that he read and expounded the text, and he may have caused some of the confusion.


23 Contrary to the traditional account, as found, e.g., in Diehl and Marçais, *op. cit.,* pp. 217-218; and cf. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica,* i, 352; see Grégoire, *Byzantion,* xvii [1944-45], 91, 104 ff.; Tatrali, *The살론인, pp. 131-134. Kovrat and Kouver had been identified by the learned Wilhelm Tomaschek (in his review of Jireček's *Gesch. d. Bulgaren*, *Zeitschrift f. die österreichischen Gymnasien,* xxvii (1877), 683. Zlatarski, *Istorija,* i, 1, pp. 121-122, 148-150, 155-159, following N. Milev, rejected Uspenski's identification of the two, and made Kouver the fourth son of Kovrat (on which note Grégoire, *Byzantion,* xvii [1944-45], 115). Gantscho Tzenoff has also, of course, identified Kovrat and Kouver in his *Geschichte d. Bulgaren u. der anderen Stüdländer* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1935), pp. ix, 171 ff. Tzenoff believes that the Bulgarians are ancient Thraco-Illrians, and denies their Turkish origin and their Volga residence: they were called *Vulgres* by the Romans because of their great numbers, *Vulges, ‘das grösste Volk im römischen Reiche’* (p. vi). ‘Skythen, Mysier, Hunnen, Goten und Bulgaren sind also ein und dasselbe Volk’ (p. 122), pretty much all Slavs under different names. Kovrat also bore a Slavic name, according to Tzenoff, whence came the name of the Croats. Justinian was a Bulgar himself, and so was Belisarius (pp. 186-187). The ‘Caucasus’ of the ancient
sources is not the mountain range so-called today, but was ‘eine thrakoilyrische Gebirgskette’ (pp. 38–42), and the river ‘Kuban’ of the sources is actually the Golden Horn (p. 45). ‘Der moderne bulgarische Staat begann also in Makedonien oder Ilyrien und breitete sich dann nach Thrakien aus’ (p. 175). Cf. Tzenoff’s previous study on Die Abstammung der Bulgaren und die Urheimat der Slaven (Berlin, 1930). Tzenoff’s books represent the complete triumph of Bulgarian nationalism over modern scholarship.


150 Cf. Grégoire, Byzantion, xvii (1944–45), 113, with refs., supra, to John of Nikieu.


152 Theophanes, Chronogr., A.M. 6149, in PG 108, cols. 705 D, 708 A; ed. C. de Boor, i, 347: ταύτω να τό έτος [657–658] οκτακύριονον δε γιασέλεσ κατά Σκλανείας, καὶ Χαμάλατον μανδήσανται εκ άπελθεν. Cf. Tafrali, Thesealomiene, p. 135. The numismatic evidence [on which see infra] suggests that the Bulgars had been driven from Corinth before the time of Justinian II, who also made, in 689–690, a famous expedition ‘into the lands of the Slavs and Bulgars’ (Theophanes, Chronogr., A.M. 6180, in PG 108, 740 B; ed. C. de Boor, i, 364; Patric Nicerius, Hist., ed. de Boor [1880], p. 36).

153 Bréhier, Vie et mort de Byzance, p. 62, n. 1. Among others Diehl and Marçais, op. cit., p. 217, suppose this too; it has been the traditional interpretation of Theophanes’ text (cf. Hof, loc. cit., lxxxv, 94).

154 See Hof, loc. cit., lxxxv, 98–99; cf. H. Gelzer, in Jahrbücher f. protestantische Theologie, xi (1886), 368; Zakythinos, Slav in Greece, p. 51; and P. Charanis, Byzantina-Metabyzantina, i (1946), 77–78, 82, concerning the passage in Theophanes’ Chronographia describing the repopulation of ‘Sclavinia’ by Christians under Nicephorus I in 809–810 (A.M. 6302, in PG 108, 976–977, and ed. C. de Boor, i, 486). However, a little earlier in his work Theophanes makes clear his use of the word Sclavinia in one connection at least (ed. de Boor, i, 450, 21–22): ai κατά [i.e., ‘in’] τήν Μακεδονίαν Σκλανείας. The word Sclavinia seldom occurs in Theophanes, but it seems to mean absolutely the same thing in each case (see de Boor, ii, 705). Cf. Max Vasmer, Die Slaven in Griechenland, p. 176, and Zakythinos, Slavs in Greece, p. 29. I am unable to place much confidence in the identification of Sclavinia as the Peloponnesus in the Theophanes passage noted above (cf. Runciman, First Bulgarian Empire, pp. 55, 59); the Chron. of Momennsvia states, of course, that Nicephorus repeopled Lacedaemonia by enforced immigration from certain Asiatic Themes (see supra, and cf. Zakythinos, Slavs in Greece, p. 51); but I doubt whether Theophanes is referring to this fact, and I am here concerned solely with ‘Theophanes’ use of the word Sclavinia. (It is possible that Nicephorus did plant Asiatic colonists in Lacedaemonia, on which cf. also Bury, Eastern Roman Empire [1912], p. 378.) If Sclavinia can mean the Peloponnesus in Theophanes, I might read the expedition of 657–658 ‘into Sclavinia’ as the expulsion of the Onogurs from Corinth. However, it seems to me best to regard Theophanes’ account of Nicephorus’ colonization of Sclavinia in 809–810 as referring only to Macedonia, since everywhere else in the Theophanes the word Sclavinia appears to mean Macedonia. There was, furthermore, considering the Bulgarian menace in the north, an especial reason for the colonization of Macedonia, for ‘it was the aim of the Bulgarians to bring the Macedonian Slavs under their dominion’ (Bury, Eastern Roman Empire, p. 342). The settlement of Sclavinia by ‘Roman’ colonists, to help hold down the Slavs in Macedonia, would be a natural preparation for the great campaign of the spring and summer of 811 which ended in the death of Nicephorus and in one of the great disasters of Byzantine history (Theophanes, A.M. 6303, ed. de Boor, i, 490–491; Geo. Monachus, Chron., ed. de Boor, ii [1904], 774–775; ‘Leo Grammaticus,’ Chronogr., in ed. Bonn, pp. 204–205; Geo. Cedrenus, Hist. compend. [Bonn, ii, 41–42]; and John Zonaras, Epit. hist., xv, 15 [Bonn, iii, 309–311]). The letter of the Emperor Michael II the Amorian to Louis the Pious, announcing the establishment of
Michael’s authority in the Byzantine Empire (824), notes that Thomas the Slavonian had drawn the forces for his great rebellion ‘de . . . partibus Thraciae, Macedonie, Thomassone [sic], et circumiacentibus Sclavinis’ (Mansi, xiv, col. 418 D), and this seems to be pretty much the meaning of the word Scilavini in the text of Theophanes. Cf. Kyriakidis, op. cit., pp. 11–13.

Davidson, Hesperia, vi, 238; Katharine M. Edwards, Corinth, vi: The Coins (1932), 165, and ‘Report on the Coins found at Corinth during the years 1930–1935,’ in Hesperia, vi, 255. The totals are thus given by Miss Davidson [up to 1937]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maurice (582–602):</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocas (602–610):</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius (610–641):</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans II (641–668):</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael I (811–813):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine IV (668–685):</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leo V (813–820):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius III (698–705):</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael II (820–829):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numismatic evidence now reveals as quite false the picture of Corinth in the seventh century drawn for us by Gregorovius: ‘Nicht durch Handel [!] lebhaft, verdunkelte diese [die Stadt Korinth] alle ubrigen Stadte Griechenlands’ (see Geschichte der Stadt Athen im Mittelalter, i, 101–102), which seems to be based only on Hierocles’ listing of Thebes as the (civil) metropolis of Boeotia, Athens as the metropolis of Attica, and Corinth as the metropolis of all Greece. Joshua Starr has published the epitaph of a Corinthian dyer, presumably from the end of the tenth or the early eleventh century (Byz.-Neugr. Jb., xii [1936], 49–49). There was some industry and prosperity in Corinth in the later ninth and tenth centuries (and thereafter, on which cf. J. H. Finley, in Speculum, vii [1932], 481–82) to which the story of Daniels and the Vitae of St Peter of Argos, St Luke of Stiria, St Nicon the ‘Metanoeite,’ and some other sources testify (which will be treated in my Athens in the Middle Ages, and cf. Zakythinos, Slaves in Greece, p. 46), but there was no real wealth or productive activity in Corinth in the seventh and eighth centuries. There was no building in Corinth, or in the rest of the Peloponnesus, in the seventh and eighth centuries (cf. on this point the remarks of Ant. Bon, in Zakythinos, L’Hellenisme contemporain, 2nd ser., iii [1949], 110–111). (Coins of Constans II are also vastly more numerous at Athens than those of his predecessors and successors [Hesperia, v (1936), p. 148], which is what we should expect.)

The inscriptions found at Corinth tell the same story, or rather they tell no story at all. Sixth-century inscriptions are fairly numerous, but the seventh century remains a blank. Of some 66 inscriptions published by Professor N. A. Bees, in Die griechisch-christlichen Inschriften des Peloponnes, Athens, 1941 (Corpus der griechisch-christlichen Inschriften von Hellas, i: Isthmos-Korinthos), only 6 are assigned as probably to the seventh century (see nos. 17, 21, 27, 34, 37, 45). I could see no basis for dating these inscriptions at all, and appealed to Professor B. D. Meritt for comment; Meritt writes ‘that I see no evidence intelligible to me for assigning any precise dates to these inscriptions’ (letter of 6 December 1949).


Theophanes, Chronogr., A.M. 6153 (PG 108, 709 B; ed. C. de Boor, i, 348); G. Ostrogorsky, Gesch. d. byzant. Staates, Munich, 1940, p. 77; Paulus Diaconus, De gestis Langobardorum, v, 6 (PL 95, 598 A); ‘. . . Constantinus Augustus, qui et Constans est appellatus . . . Constantinopoli egressus, per litoralia iter habens Athenas venit, indeque mare transgressum Tarentum applicuit.’ Note also Anastasius Bibliothecarius, De vitis Roman. Pontifecum, Ixxxvii (in Muratori, Rerum Italicorum Scriptores, iii, p. 141): ‘Huius temporibus venit Constantinus Augustus [Constans II] de regia urbe per litoraria in Athenas . . .’; and Johannes Diaconus, Chronicon Venetum et Gradensae (MGH, SS, vii [1846], p. 8): ‘. . . Constantinus Augustus, qui et Constans est appellatus, Ytaliam a Longobardorum manibus diecripere cuinius, Constantinopolym egressus, per littora iter habens Athenas venit, indeque mare transgressum, Tarentum applicuit . . .’ In Athens the appearance of Constans II was an historical event. No Emperor had been in Hellas or the Peloponnesus since the time of the Isaurian Zenon (in 486), and no Emperor was to come again to Athens until 1018 when Basil II returned victorious from his famous Bulgar campaign and dedicated some of the fruits of his victory in the Parthenon, Church of the Theotokos Aieniathissa (Gregorovius, op. cit., i, 88–89, 103, 161 ff.; Greek ed. by Lampros, i, 154–155, 168, 228 ff.).
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133 Salonika, Archaeological Museum, no. 588: American Agora Collection, inv. no. B282 (refs from Davidson, Hesperia, vi, 233–234). For the buckle recovered at Aphiona on Corfu, see Heinrich Bulle, ‘Ausgrabungen bei Aphiona auf Korfu,’ Mitteilungen d. deutschen archäol. Instituts, Athen. Abteilung, lxx [1934], 222, fig. 26, nos. 29–34: Bulle (esp. pp. 236 ff.) regards the finds at Aphiona as of Avaric origin. Aphiona, however, is not so far from the plain of Monastir where the Onogur prince Kovrat established his settlement: it also lies within easy reach of the Emperor Constans ii’s route to Italy; and the finds at Aphiona could quite reasonably be explained in either connection. Still another such buckle, found in Athens, and alluded to supra in the text, bears a Christian monogram (ibid., p. 226, fig. 27), interpreted as φως ξωή, and a very similar buckle with a similar monogram has also been found at Taormina in Sicily (see next note). Hans Zeiss, ‘Avarenfund in Korinth’ in Serta Hoffilleriana [Hoffelierov Zbornik] (Zagreb, 1940), pp. 95–99, believes that all these buckles are of Byzantine origin or, at least, of Byzantine manufacture; doubt is expressed on this score in the text; nor am I entirely certain, with regard to the buckles bearing the Christian monogram, found at Athens and Taormina, that ‘die griechische Inschrift erweist das Stück als byzantinische Arbeit’ (op. cit., p. 96).

But if the Bulgars wished to write, they possessed no other language to write in; they never had an alphabet of their own, and the Slavonic alphabet did not yet exist (the Bulgars used Greek in their later inscriptions); also we might expect some Christian decorative emblems to be employed by the Onogur Bulgars at this time. The Khan Kovrat and, presumably, some other Onogurs were converted to Christianity during the reign of Heraclius (for the evidence, especially from the Coptic chronicle of John of Nikius, see Grégoire, Byzantium, xvii [1944–45], 101–102), and Moravcsik believes it possible that the Onogurs possessed an organized church in their homeland, the Kuban region, at this time (‘Ungarische Jahrbücher’, x [1930], 64–65). There were many Bulgar Christians long before the official date of the ‘conversion of the Bulgars’, now set in 663–864 (on which, see A. Vaillant and M. Lascaris, in Revue des études slaves, xiii [1933], 5–13). However, if the buckles in question should ever prove to be of Byzantine manufacture, which I doubt, their relatively high incidence in Hungarian graves is remarkable, on which see Davidson, Hesperia, vi, pp. 232–236, figs. 2–5; pp. 236–238, figs. 6–8, with numerous refs. to the finds in Hungarian graves described in Joseph Hampel’s great Alterthümer des frühen Mittelalters in Ungarn. Dr Horváth, Miss Davidson’s collaborator, believed the finds at Corinth belonged to the Kutrigur Bulgars (Hesperia vi, 239). Miss Davidson seems not to have noticed that Zeiss had already claimed a Byzantine origin for some buckles similar to those found at Corinth (cf. Athen. Mitt., lxx [1934], 227). Zeiss also calls attention to a buckle of heart-shaped design, somewhat similar to those under discussion, as having been found in a Visigothic grave at San Pedro de Alcántara, Málaga, Spain (Zeiss, Die Grabfunde aus dem spanischen Westgotenreich, Berlin and Leipzig, 1934, pl. 21, no. 9, and cf. pp. 52 and 192). The province of Málaga, however, is on the coast, and many strange things come over the sea. In his discussion of the late-Roman (or Byzantine) origin of certain of the basic designs of these buckles, Zeiss cites O. M. Dalton, East Christian Art (Oxford, 1925), pp. 362 ff., the direct relevance of which to the question he is discussing is not apparent to me. Zeiss also cites Alois Riegl, Spätromische Kunstindustrie (Vienna, 1927), pp. 290–291, but I find that the examples taken by Riegl to illustrate the alleged Byzantine artistic forms and motifs involved come from a Lombard grave in Ascoli Piceno, from south Russia, and from the Egyptian Fayyum, and although the buckle found in south Russia is decorated with an inscribed palmette very similar to a marble decoration from S. Vitale in Ravenna, the Byzantineism of these buckles still, it seems to me, remains in question. Other buckles of like form have been found in the Crimea and in southern Russia (N. Repnikov, in Bulletin du Museum d’Etat de Chersonèse Taurique [Kersonesskii Sbornik], iv, Sevastopol, 1927, p. 153, fig. 8, and Lothar Fr. Zott, Die spätgotermmanische Kultur Schlesiens im Gräberfeld von Gross-Südring [1935], p. 14, fig. 9, refs. from Zeiss). For Byzantine influence upon the jewelry, ornaments, weapons, etc., of the Avars, Bulgars, and others, found in Hungarian graves, see, in general: Joseph Hampel, Alterthümer des frühen Mittelalters in Ungarn (3
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169 See P. Orsi, ‘Byzantina Siciliae,’ in *Byz. Zeitschr.*, xx (1912), p. 203, with fig. 24, and cf. fig. 23; Nils Åberg, *Die Goten und Langobarden in Italien* (Uppsala, 1923), pp. 112 ff., fig. 234 (p. 118), and cf. figs. 204 (p. 114) and 221 (p. 116).

170 Some of the buckles found in south Italian graves, together with those few found in northern Italy, came into the possession of the Lombards through, presumably, the Avars, themselves in close contact with the Bulgars and the Byzantines.

171 The papyrus has been published four times by Carl Wessely: see the *Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyrskunde*, xx (Leipzig, 1921), no. 133, p. 100. D. Detschew erroneously saw a proper name in the word *boulgarikos* (in the *Zeitschrift für Ortsnamenforschung*, n [Munich and Berlin, 1927], 198); at least so I believe; I have followed Moravcsik’s reading of this text, which is much more likely, in view of the reference to ‘Bulgarian belts’ in the *Tactica* of the Pseudo-Maurice (see infra).


174 *Neos Hellen.*, xii (1915), 256.

The writer’s indebtedness to his learned young friend Mr George Chr. Soulis, who supplied him with some very valuable bibliographical information; to the Editor of *Speculum*, who assumed more than his share of the burden of seeing this article through the press; and to the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, whose grant of a generous Fellowship made possible the leisure during which some of the research in this paper was done.

Miss Gladys R. Davidson, now Mrs Sol M. Weinberg, will soon publish an extensive work on the ‘small finds’ at Corinth, with a great abundance of photographs. I do not know whether or not there is more than one ‘Bulgarian buckle’ in the Archaeological Museum at Salonika (see, *supra*, note 159). Although I succeeded in getting into the Museum this summer, after arousing the janitor’s wife from an afternoon siesta, there was no informed person on hand of whom I could inquire concerning such belt buckles and their whereabouts.

The reader’s attention is called to the article that follows by Professor John Harvey Kent on an interesting inscription found at Corinth which seems to fit perfectly into the interpretation of texts and events given above.