

Constantine Porphyrogenitus' Source on the Earliest History of the Croats and Serbs

The paper analyses the sources Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus may have used in describing the earliest history of Croats and Serbs in 30 through 32 chapters of his work *De administrando imperio*. It aims to show that the basic source for the earliest history of the Croats and Serbs belonged to the literary genre *De conversione*. The author proposes an interpretation according to which Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus's source was somehow related to the late ninth-century account of the conversion of the Bavarians and Caranthians (*De conversione Bagioariorum et Carantanorum*). As such a genre never existed in the Byzantine empire it seems very likely that it was composed in the Latin West. Therefore the present paper focuses on the textual relations between the *De conversione Bagioariorum et Carantanorum* and the *De administrando imperio*.

The Byzantine Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus wrote an extensive account about the early medieval history of the Croats and Serbs in his work dedicated to his son Roman, the *De administrando imperio*, as Meursius titled it four centuries ago.¹ In addition to the chapters on the Croats and Serbs (31 and 32), Constantine wrote two chapters on the province of Dalmatia (29 and 30), as well as four far smaller chapters on the principalities of Pagania, Zachlumi, Terbounia, and Diocleia (chs. 33–36). These eight chapters on the Southern Slavs and Dalmatia have become the main source for the history of this region during the so-called Dark Ages.

The unique information about the Southern Slavs preserved in the *DAI*, has attracted the attention of historians for almost four hundred years.² Those basic questions, which have tortured the minds of generations of scholars, have been:

¹ The standard edition is MORAVCSIK 1967. The commentary of this edition (the first edition was published in 1949) is JENKINS 1962.

² There are numerous studies dedicated to these chapters; see: MANOJLOVIĆ 1902; BURY 1906, 556–561; HAUPTMANN 1925; HAUPTMANN 1937; DABINOVIĆ 1941; OSTROGOR-SKI 1948; GRAFENAUER 1952; FERLUGA 1968; FERLUGA 1971; MARGETIĆ 1977; FERJANČIĆ 1978; FERJANČIĆ 1996; FERJANČIĆ 1997; KOŠČAK 1981; MAKSIMOVIĆ 1982; MAKSIMOVIĆ 1996; KLAJČIĆ 1984; KLAJČIĆ 1985; ŠEVČENKO 1995; ČIRKOVIĆ 1998; EGGERS 2007. For the older historiography see FERJANČIĆ 1959, *passim*.

who were these Croats and Serbs; did they come as *foederati* of the Emperor Heraclius or not; did they receive holy baptism from Rome and through the cooperation of the pope and Heraclius; and, did they truly originate from distant northern lands – i.e. southern Poland and Bohemia? Naturally, there are some other questions, which arise from Constantine's writings – i.e. the overall political situation in Dalmatia and the Byzantine presence there, the ethnogenesis of the Croats and Serbs, the mutual relationships between the principalities of the South Slavs, Dalmatia being divided between the Franks and Byzantium, as well as various ecclesiastical issues. Therefore, it is understandable why the *DAI* has become the most studied medieval source for the history of the Southern Slavs.

It is important to note that the methodology by which the *DAI* has been scrutinized has actively followed the same rules during its four centuries of investigation. Namely, the researchers' starting point has been the author himself and from his eyes the text has been solely observed.³ In turn, this approach has forced scholars to judge Constantine's information about the Croats and Serbs as having been *true – untrue, invention – genuine, possible – impossible, reliable – unreliable*. Yet, the most important question has been set aside, that of Constantine's sources. It is usually taken as granted that Constantine wrote the history of the Croats and Serbs according to their actual oral tradition, which had reached Constantinople through an informant from Dalmatia.⁴ This mysterious man from Dalmatia has hence become a *Deus ex machina*. If any particular information - such as data from the Archives of Imperial Palace - is unable to be classified, it is then invariably said that: "This must have come from Constantine's informant!"⁵ However, this mysterious man from the time of Constantine Porphyrogenitus would have not been able to know 300 years of Croat and Serb history based only upon their oral tradition. For instance, the oral tradition about the Croats' history is very richly detailed in the seventh century (the date of their arrival in Dalmatia, their baptism in the time of Heraclius, their fight against the Avars, their settlement in Pannonia, and their pact concluded with the holy See),⁶ but then is silent until ca. 850, not to

³ See, for instance, FERJANČIĆ 1959, *passim*; MARGETIĆ 1977, *passim*; KLAJIĆ 1984, *passim*; ANČIĆ 1999, 6–9; DZINO 2008, 197 – 198.

⁴ GRAFENAUER 1952, 21 – 22; MACARTNEY 1968, 137; JENKINS 1962, 100 – 101, 113 – 114, 118; Klaić, *Povijest*, 38 – 39, 133, 137; MARGETIĆ 1977, 31, 48, 61; LITAVRIN 1989, 368 – 370. FERJANČIĆ 1996, 150, thought that the author of chapter 30 of the *DAI* lived in Constantinople and that his informant was a Byzantine official from Dalmatia; cf. FERJANČIĆ 1978, 78 – 79.

⁵ For instance, see JENKINS 1962, 120 ("the native Croat tradition" – for the identification of Porin and Porga), 122 ("a native of Zara" – for the *župas* of Croatia), 124 ("his informant" – for the etymology of the Croat name), 128 ("an unknown Croat source" – for the conflict between the Croats and Bulgarians ca. 854), etc.

⁶ *DAI* 30.61-67, 75-78; 31.6-10, 17-21, 31-42.

become extremely verbose again until ca. 878 (the arrival of the holy man Martin among the Croats, the revolt against the Franks and its outcome, the administrative division of Croatia, the conflict between the Croats and Bulgarians, the exact figures of the Croat army and fleet, and the names of the Croat *archontes* who ruled between ca. 855 and ca. 862).⁷ After this year, not a single piece of information about Croat history can be traced from oral tradition (the White Croats and their relations with Otto I, the borders between the principalities of the Southern Slavs, the tribute paid by Dalmatian cities to the Slavs, and the attempt to establish the latest figures of the Croat army and fleet).⁸ The same pattern is obvious for the Serbs. The alleged informant had known about the date of the Serb arrival and baptism, after which he was silent until ca. the late 840's, when he supplied a detailed account about the Serb-Bulgarian wars and their relations, but only up to ca. 856.⁹ Until 891, he was unable to say a single word about the Serbs.¹⁰ Similarity in the composition of the Croat and Serb chapters of the *DAI* is naturally sought after. In fact, its authorship did indeed belong to the same man – Constantine Porphyrogenitus.¹¹ However, it has never been assumed that this similarity is a consequence of using the same, unique, well composed source, which Constantine had at his disposal in Constantinople.

In addition to the chronicles, histories or geographical works which can be traced - such as: Theophanes the Confessor, Theophanes of Sygriane, and George the Monk - Constantine's sources for the *DAI* are chiefly from the Archives of the Imperial Palace.¹² There are a number of places in his work where he mentions

⁷ *DAI* 30.78-87, 90-94; 31.42-52, 60-67, 71-74, 75-78.

⁸ *DAI* 30.71-75, 94-119, 132-142; 31.79-82.

⁹ *DAI* 32.2-30; 33-64.

¹⁰ It has been proposed that chapter 32 on the Serbs was actually based on the so-called "Serbian Chronicle", which had been composed sometime before 944; cf. OSTROGORSKI 1948, *passim*; MAKSIMOVIĆ 1982, *passim*.

¹¹ The exception regarding its authorship is chapter 30, over which much has been discussed in historiography. An overview of the previous historiography on this question is given by FERJANČIĆ 1978, 67–70 (with notes 1 – 13); FERJANČIĆ 1996, 117–154; FINE 1991, 49–59. BURY 1906, 525, who did not notice any difference in style except for the absence of the *oti*. However, JENKINS 1962, 112–113 insists on the fact that there is an apparent difference in style; similarly, this was noticed by GRAFENAUER 1952, 17–18. For works bearing the emperor's name that are in different styles, see, ŠEVČENKO 1995, 184, n. 44; see LEMERLE 1971, 274–295 as well. I do not agree the supposition that chapter 30 was written by another author. Chapter 30 is Constantine's final version about Dalmatia and the Croats, based on material that had already been used in chapters 29 and 31; cf. ŽIVKOVIĆ 2010.

¹² Cf. *DAI* 14.1–35 (based on George the Monk); 17.1; 21.1, 35; 22.1; 22.78 (based on Theophanes the Confessor); 25.1 (Theophanes of Sygriane). The amount of the tribute paid by the Dalmatian cities to the Slavs (*DAI* 30.132–142), the imperial *keleusis* to the Southern Slavs regarding their role in the Italian expedition and siege of Bari (*DAI* 29.106–112), the description of the cities of Spalato, Tetrangourion, Ragusa, Diadora (*Iadera*) and Decaterum (*DAI* 29.217–284), as well as the description of the borders between the principalities of the Southern Slavs (*DAI* 30.94–119), are from the Archives of the Imperial Palace.

letters exchanged between the emperor and the *archontes* of various nations, i.e. Taron.¹³ There are obvious traces of the usage of the imperial *keleusis*, such as Basil's I order to the Southern Slavs to take part in the military expedition against the Arabs of Bari.¹⁴ There are traces of documents relating to military or finance, such as the demand for horses to be supplied to the *theme* of the Peloponnesus,¹⁵ the transfer of *bandons* between provinces,¹⁶ the taxation of the Slavs of Peloponnesus,¹⁷ and the amount of *nomismata* paid by Dalmatian towns to the Slavs.¹⁸ His list of sources had also included reports by imperial envoys sent to foreign nations, or reports of certain officials sent to settle issues in bordering provinces; for instance, the mission of the strategos of the *theme* of Dyrrachion to Paganian and his meeting with the Serb *Archon* Peter,¹⁹ the mission of the cleric Gabriel to the Turks,²⁰ or the mission of Petrona in Chazaria and Cherson.²¹

It is plainly clear that Constantine had an enormous amount and variety of written documents at his disposal. This material was not concentrated in one place, but was kept in different departments of Byzantine administration: the Imperial Court (i.e. the golden *boula* which had been issued to the metropolis of Patras by Leo VI and which Constantine had seen with his very own eyes),²² the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Ministry of Finance. It was up to Constantine to label these sources regarding their particular issues, as these sources had been of different timelines and therein could have possibly contained conflicting information on the same subject; for instance, the list of towns in the principalities of Southern Slavs falls into two different groups: the *kastra oikoumena* and the *kastra (simplex)*. These two groups of towns are always preserved in separate *oti-sections*, having been extracted from different sources.²³ The former group designates those cities which were ecclesiastically organized, while the other *kastra* were merely fortresses or strongholds: for instance Bona and Hum in Zachlumi, Ras in Serbia,

¹³ *DAI* 43.30-32; 100-101; 109-114; 135-137; 163-167; 177-179.

¹⁴ See note 12.

¹⁵ *DAI* 52.1 – 15.

¹⁶ *DAI* 50.92 – 110.

¹⁷ *DAI* 50.46 – 52.

¹⁸ See note 12.

¹⁹ *DAI* 32.81 – 84.

²⁰ *DAI* 8.23 – 33.

²¹ *DAI* 42.23 – 55.

²² *DAI* 49.50 – 59.

²³ For instance, the *kastra oikoumena* appear regularly in the separate *oti-section*; cf. *DAI* 31.68 – 70; 32.149–151; 33.20–21; 34.19–20; 35.12–13; 36.14–15. The cities of Rasa, Bona, Hum, and Diocleia are regularly written separately from the *kastra oikoumena*, and they are mentioned only as *kastra*; cf. *DAI* 32.53; 33.13–14; 35.9–11. On the other hand, the Byzantine cities of the theme of Dalmatia are also recorded in the separate *oti-sections*; cf. *DAI* 29.216 – 284.

and Dioclea in Dioclea.²⁴ These lists therefore did not only belong to different timelines, but also to different sources.

Having all this in plain sight, the *DAI*'s chapters regarding the South Slavs can be approached. The story about the Croats preserved in chapter 31 consists of eight *oti sections* of more or less equal length. The story about the Serbs is of three *oti sections*, but of disproportional length, as the first *Isteon oti* covers 96% of this chapter (145 out of 151 lines overall). This should mean that the Serb chapter had almost been brought to its final version. The stories of the settlement and baptism of the Serbs and the Croats are told in a similar fashion. The Croats came from White Croatia as refugees to the Emperor Heraclius, defeated the Avars and then settled in Dalmatia. Then, Heraclius sent priests from Rome to them to have them baptized.²⁵ The same pattern can be traced for the Serbs. They also came as the refugees to Heraclius from the north (Bohemia) descending from the White Serbs. The Serbs had first settled around Servlia (modern Serbia), and asked permission to leave after some time. Heraclius granted this permission, but they changed their minds when they reached Belgrade and asked Heraclius, through the *strategos* of Belgrade, to give them yet another place to settle in. Heraclius therein granted them the lands of (*what is now*) Serbia, Pagania, Zachlumi, and Terbounia, and thereafter ordered and sent priests from Rome to baptize them.²⁶ Both stories contain an etymology of the names of the Croats and Serbs. While the Serb history becomes interrupted at this spot, the Croat history contains further information about the oaths given by the Croats to the pope of Rome where they state that they will not attack any foreign country and in exchange will receive the protection of Christ and Peter the Apostle.²⁷ There is also another ecclesiastical theme: after many years a certain pious man, named Martin, arrived among the Croats and confirmed their oaths given two centuries before. It was in the time of the Croat *Archon* Terpimer (ca. 840–855).²⁸ The list of the *kastra oikoumena* also belongs to the issue of ecclesiasticism and it comes near the end of the narrative in both chapters.²⁹

It appears that Constantine's source had paid lot of attention to ecclesiastical matters. It is interesting that Rome was marked as the center from which both the Croats and the Serbs received their baptism. Additionally, there are the oaths by which the Croats bound themselves to the pope – i.e. to Rome. The question is then why the Byzantine Emperor would have invented such a story? Of course,

²⁴ ŽIVKOVIĆ 2008, 19-21.

²⁵ *DAI* 31.6–25.

²⁶ *DAI* 32.2–29.

²⁷ *DAI* 31.31–42.

²⁸ *DAI* 31.42–52.

²⁹ *DAI* 31.68–70; 32.149–151.

there is no trace of Heraclius and Rome in chapter 30; rather, there is only a short remark that the Croats received baptism from Rome during the *Archon* Porin (who is the same Porga mentioned in chapter 31).³⁰ If chapter 30 is the final version about Dalmatia and the Croats, then it could have only been Constantine who removed Heraclius from the story. The reason why he would have done so is obvious: in 950 the *Vita Basilii*, an official history of the specific period of Byzantine history, was composed, and in this work all credit for the baptism of the South Slavs was given to Basil I, the founder of the Macedonian dynasty. What the situation 300 years ago had actually been was completely unimportant. Yet, traces of Constantine's source were preserved in the *Vita Basilii* as well. Constantine states that the Serbs and the Croats fell from Christian doctrine, which would mean that he had reason to emphasize that they had been Christians earlier.³¹ He knew about the earlier baptism from his source which was the basis for chapters 31 and 32.

The narrative in the Croat and Serb chapters clearly shows traces of ecclesiastical provenience. This is even more obvious in chapter 31 than in 32, but not due to its different sources, but rather that the source had not been equally informed about the Croats and the Serbs. What appears to have been used as the genuine oral tradition about the earliest past of the Croats, served as the basis for the history of the Serbs.³² The Croat *origo gentis* is rich. It mentions the names of five brothers and two sisters, while the Serb *origo* knows only two unnamed brothers. The Croat baptism includes an archbishop, a bishop, priests, and deacons, while the Serbs received only priests. The Croats defeated the Avars and settled in Dalmatia, while the Serbs wandered from Servia to Belgrade, and then back to Dalmatia (Dalmatia in the Roman sense). Both stories underline that the Croats and the Serbs had always been in submission to the emperor of the *Romaioi* since the very beginning.³³ Both stories settled them exclusively in Dalmatia. The Croats were not under the direct rule of Byzantium in Constantine's time, nor in any other previous century except during a short period from 878 to 879, when the *Archon* Zdeslav ruled as the Byzantine protégée.³⁴ If

³⁰ For the various identifications of Porga/Porin, see GRAFENAUER 1952, 26–27; HAUPTMANN, 1931, 19–20; BELKE-SOUSTAL 1995, 158; EGGERS 2007, 25 (Porga/Porin = Borna). On the other hand, ŠIŠIĆ 1925, 386, n. 20, proposed the identification of Porin = Branimer. See, also, FERJANČIĆ 1959, 42, n. 119. KLAIĆ 1975, 194–195; GOLDSTEIN 1995, 235 (Porin = Borna).

³¹ BEKKER 1838, 288.10–289.2; 291.1–292.13.

³² This has already been noted in historiography, see GRAFENAUER 1952, 24.

³³ *DAI* 31.58 – 60; 32.146–148.

³⁴ According to BERTO 1999, 140: *His diebus Sedesclavus, Tibimiri ex progenie, imperiali ful-tus presidio Constantinopolim veniens, Sclavorum ducatum arripuit filiosque Domagoi exilio trusit*. The same source speaks about the deposition of Zdeslav in 879 (April); cf. also BERTO 1999, 142: *His diebus quidam Sclavus, nomine Brenamir, interfecto Sedescavo, ipsius ducatum usurpavit*.

Constantine had insisted that the Serbs and the Croats ruled Dalmatia, to whom would he have thought to allow claims on the former praefecture of Illyricum? To the Bulgarians? Why would have Constantine described the Franks in chapter 30 as criminals³⁵ when he was pursuing an active policy of cooperation with Otto I at the same time?³⁶ The borders of Dalmatia are also incorrectly given; they match neither the boundaries of Roman, nor Byzantine Dalmatia.³⁷ Dalmatia extended far to the north – to the Danube, and the Avars had allegedly ruled and lived in such an extended Dalmatia. Archaeological evidence, even though it has been eagerly searched for over the last century, has not provided even a tiny trace of the Avars in Dalmatia.³⁸ However, they did live in Pannonia and, supposedly for Constantine's source, Pannonia was part of Dalmatia. In that same source the inhabitants of Dalmatia must have been called *Romani* as his source used the same term in chapters 29 and 31, but never in chapter 30, which was his final word on Dalmatia.

The ecclesiastical traces of Constantine's source for both stories are of crucial importance. The important role of Rome is underlined at least three times in the Croat chapters and is an important clue to be followed. The forcible attachment of Pannonia to Dalmatia speaks not about a political, but rather of an ecclesiastical issue. The list of *kastra oikoumena*, for when these cities can be identified, shows the distribution of the Roman Church's bishoprics and their parishes. For Zachlumi, Terbounia, Paganja and Croatia, the first *kastra* mentioned are the always well known ecclesiastical centers: Nin, Ston, Trebinje, and Mokro – all of which were bishoprics or at least had been the most prominent ecclesiastical centers in these principalities since the second half of the ninth century.³⁹ Not a single one of these cities belonged to the ecclesiastical organization of the Byzantine church. Finally, there is also an interesting terminology used: baptized Croatia versus unbaptized Croatia; baptized Serbia versus unbaptized Serbia/Serbs.⁴⁰

There is an interesting source which originated in 871 from the Archbishopric of Salzburg. It was written in the turbulent time when Rome and Salzburg competed with one another in Pannonia and Moravia. This source, at its very end, accused Methodius of being a trouble maker in Pannonia; a place which was considered

³⁵ Cf. *DAI* 30.80–82.

³⁶ For the politics of Byzantine to Otto I during the rule of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, see LOUNGHIS 1980, 201–203.

³⁷ This has been discussed by many authors; cf. NOVAKOVIĆ 1972, 11; FERJANČIĆ 1978, 77. KLAJČIĆ 1985, 47–48, argued that the author of chapter 30 had had the Byzantine province of Dalmatia in mind and not the Roman one.

³⁸ PETRINEC 2009, *passim*. For the settlements of the Avars in Pannonia, see VIDA 2008, 13–46; STADLER 2008, 47–82.

³⁹ Cf. ŽIVKOVIĆ 2008, 25–26.

⁴⁰ Cf. *DAI* 31.68, 71, 86; 32.2, 5, 149.

to be the missionary field of the Salzburg Church. The author of this work – The *De conversione Bagioariorum et Carantanorum (DCBC)* – was perhaps even the Archbishop Adalwin himself and he tried to prove that Salzburg had already had ecclesiastical rights over Pannonia since ancient times.⁴¹ To achieve this goal, the author included a number of genuine documents in his work,⁴² which had already been sent to Rome by 873.⁴³

The *DCBC* states that the Romans had ruled over Pannonia in ancient times, but then the Avars came, expelled the Romans and took possession of their land. Thereafter, the Bavarians and Carantanians expelled the Avars. For the author of the *DCBC* however, the Avars still lived there. It should be noted that the *DAI* contains the exact same sequence of events; only the place is different. Instead of Pannonia, the *Romani* had ruled Dalmatia (which also included Pannonia) until the Avars expelled them. Then the Croats appeared, fought the Avars for some time, and finally took possession of Dalmatia and ruled over the rest of the Avars, who were still living in Dalmatia:

(A) *DCBC: Antiquis enim temporibus ex meridiana parte Danubii in plagis Pannoniae inferioris et circa confines regiones Romani possederunt... (DCBC, 9.3–4)*

DAI: Ἡ δὲ καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν Ῥωμάνων διακράτησις ἦν μέχρι τοῦ Δανούβειος ποταμοῦ, οἱ καὶ ποτε θελήσαντες τὸν ποταμὸν... (DAI 29.14–15)

DCBC: Qui (sc. Romani, T. Ž.) etiam Gothos et Gepidos suae ditioni subdiderunt. Sed post annos nativitatis domini CCLXXVII et amplius Huni ex sedibus suis in aquilonari parte Danubii in desertis locis habitantes, transfretantes Danubium expulerunt Romanos et Gothos atque Gepidos... Tunc vero Sclavi post Hunos inde expulsos venientes coeperunt istis partibus Danubii diversas regiones habitare. Sed nunc qualiter Huni inde expulsi sunt, et Sclavi inhabitare coeperunt, et illa pars Pannoniae ad diocesim Iuvavensem conversa est, edicendum putamus (DCBC 9.6–10).

⁴¹ For a detailed analysis of the *DCBC*, see KOS 1936, 17–100; WOLFRAM 1995, 227–336).

⁴² *DCBC* 9.40–10.2; 10.12–19; 12.3–5; 12.10–17; 12.28–32; 13.12–17; 14.8–11.

⁴³ See, KOS 1936, 101 – 105, who has the general conclusion that the *DCBC* was written as a piece of information to the Archbishop Adalwin in 871 regarding his ecclesiastical rights over his own territory and was presented to Louis the German. WOLFRAM 1995, 193–197, argued that the *DCBC* was probably written by Archbishop Adalwin himself for Louis the German in 870 and was written against Methodius. However, as further analysis would eventually unveil, the *DCBC* served as the model for the document, which, most probably, was composed in Rome. This would therefore mean that the *DCBC* had been, in fact, sent to Rome.

DAI: Παρὰ δὲ τῶν Ἀβάρων ἐκδιωχθέντες οἱ αὐτοὶ Ῥωμᾶνοι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ αὐτοῦ βασιλέως Ῥωμαίων, Ἡρακλείου, αἱ τούτων ἔρημοι καθεστήκασιν χῶραι. (DAI 31.15–17).

DCBC: *Nunc adiciendum est qualiter Sclavi qui dicuntur Quarantani et confines eorum fide sancta instructi christianique effecti sunt, seu quomodo Huni Romanos et Gothos atque Gepidos de inferiori Pannonia expulerunt et illam possederunt regionem, quosque Franci ac Bagoarii cum Quarantanis continuus affligendo bellis eos superaverunt. Eos autem qui obediebant fidei et baptismum sunt consecuti, tributarios fecerunt regnum, et terram quam possident residui, adhuc pro tributo retinent regis usque in hodiernum diem* (DCBC 6.20–7.4).

DAI: [Οἱ δὲ Χρωβάτοι]... ἤλθον εἰς Δελματίαν, καὶ εὗρον τοὺς Ἀβάρεις κατέχοντας τὴν τοιαύτην γῆν. Ἐπὶ τινὰς οὖν χρόνους πολεμοῦντες ἀλλήλους, ὑπερίσχυσαν οἱ Χρωβάτοι, καὶ τοὺς μὲν τῶν Ἀβάρων κατέσφαζαν, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς ὑποταγῆναι κατηνάγκασαν. Ἐκτοτε οὖν κατεκρατήθη ἡ τοιαύτη χώρα παρὰ τῶν Χρωβάτων, καὶ εἰσὶν ἀκμὴν ἐν Χρωβατία ἐκ τοῦ τῶν Ἀβάρων, καὶ γινώσκονται Ἀβάρεις ὄντες. (DAI 30.66–71).

These examples speak for themselves: not only is the pattern and description of the events used the same, but the choice of words as well. At this point it can be safely said that Constantine's source was used in chapters 29, 30 and 31 respectively, and it is the evidence that the same source had been used as the basis for both chapters. The same evidence is confirmation that the author of these three chapters is the same person – Constantine Porphyrogenitus.

However, Constantine's source had to find a way to include Pannonia under the political rule of the Croats, upon whom he had obviously relied in supporting his ecclesiastical claims. In the same chapter (30) he therefore states:

(B) DAI: Ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν Χρωβάτων, τῶν ἐλθόντων ἐν Δελματία, διεχωρίσθη μέρος τι, καὶ ἐκράτησεν τὸ Ἰλλυρικὸν καὶ τὴν Παννονίαν... (DAI 30.75–77).

Furthermore, the baptism of the Croats very much resembles the baptism of the Carantanians:

(C) DCBC: *Peractis aliquantis temporibus praenominatus dux Carantanorum petiit Virgilium episcopum visitare populum gentis illius, eosque in fide firmiter confortare. Quod ille tunc minime adimplere valuit, sed sua vice misso suo episcopo nomine Modesto ad docendam illam plebem, et cum eo Wattonem, Reginbertum, Cozharium, atque Latinum presbyteros suos, et Ekihardum diaconum cum aliis clericis, dans ei licentiam ecclesias consecrare et clericos ordinare iuxta canonum diffinitionem* (DCBC 7.29–35).

DAI: Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ἡράκλειος ἀποστείλας καὶ ἀπὸ Ῥώμης ἀγαγὼν ἱερεῖς καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ποιήσας ἀρχιεπίσκοπον καὶ ἐπίσκοπον καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους, τοὺς Χρωβάτους ἐβάπτισεν· εἶχον δὲ τῷ τότε καιρῷ οἱ τοιοῦτοι Χρωβάτοι ἄρχοντα τὸν Ποργᾶ. (DAI 31.21–25).

Note the hierarchy of the clerics listed in the *DCBC*: *bishop, presbyteros, deacon, clerics*, while in the *DAI* it is *archbishop, bishop, presbyteros, deacons*. These are used to give the same general idea – to show that the ecclesiastical organization of the area had already been completely built in the very early stages of Christianity. The anonymous author of Constantine's source went even further; he stated that the Croats received an archbishop, while in the *DCBC* the most prominent cleric is only a bishop. This is easy to explain. The archbishop of Salzburg would not have been able to send another archbishop to his new *diocese*, but the pope would have been; this is why this tiny trace places our anonymous author closer to the pope in Rome.

The *DCBC* then speaks about the spreading of Christianity among the other Slavs in Pannonia:

(D) DCBC: *Interim contigit anno videlicet nativitatis domini DCCXCVIII, Arnonem iam archiepiscopum a Leone papa accepto pallio remeando de Roma venisse ultra Padum eique obviasse missum Caroli cum epistola sua, mandans illi ipso itinere in partes Sclavorum ire et exquirere voluntatem populi illius et praedicare ibi verbum dei. Sed quia hoc facere nequivit antequam responsum referret suae legationis, festine perrexit ad imperatorem, et retulit ei quicquid per eum dominus Leo papa mandavit. Post expletam legationem ipse imperator praecepit Arnoni archiepiscopo pergere in partes Sclavorum et providere omnem illam regionem et ecclesiasticum officium more episcopali colere, **populusque in fide et christianitate praedicando confrotare**. Sicuti ille fecit illuc veniendo, consecravit ecclesias, **ordinavit presbyteros, populumque praedicando docuit** (DCBC 10.1–8)*

DAI: ... οὗς ὁ βασιλεὺς πρεσβύτας ἀπὸ Ῥώμης ἀγαγὼν ἐβάπτισεν, καὶ διδάζας αὐτοὺς τὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας τελεῖν καλῶς, αὐτοῖς τὴν τῶν Χριστιανῶν πίστιν ἐξέθετο. (DAI 32.27–29).

The anonymous author had used the exact same pattern: it was the emperor (Heraclius) who ordered the *priests* to be sent to the Serbs, who had to *teach them to perform works of piety and to expound to them the faith of the Christians*. There is no hierarchy of the Church dignitaries – only the *presbyteros*. The model of

baptism of the Carantanians served as the pattern for the Croats and the model of the baptism of the Pannonian Slavs served as the pattern for the Serbs. The role of the emperor was crucial for the author of the *DCBC*, and this is why the anonymous author had had to use the same pattern. In the *DCBC*, Salzburg had been looking for political power to rely on in Pannonia – and this is why the anonymous author made the choice of the Bavarians and the Carantanians, as both were backed by the Frankish emperor. For this anonymous author, who was obviously in Rome, his political powers were the Croats and the Serbs, also backed by an emperor – the Byzantine one. This is why Constantine wrote that the Croats and the Serbs were in the servitude of and in submission to the emperor of the *Romaioi*. It had simply been stated in his source.

Speaking about the establishment of the ecclesiastical organization in Carantania, the author from Salzburg mentions the three most prominent churches. He thereafter mentions another 13 places in which churches had been consecrated in Pannonia.⁴⁴ This was, most probably, the main reason why the anonymous author supplied his list of *kastra oikoumena* for all the principalities of the Southern Slavs, as to show that the Roman Church had established its organization there quite some time prior.

Speaking about the Carantanian dukes, the *DCBC* knows only four of their names. The anonymous author also only knew the names of four Serbian rulers. This could have been accidental, but gains more ground when the whole context is seen: their names are given merely to strengthen the statement of both authors that these dukes/*archontes* had been subjugated and had been in servitude to the emperor – the Carantanians to the Frankish emperor and the Serbs to the Byzantine one:

E) *DCBC*: *Tunc primus ab imperatore constitutus est confini comfina comes Goterammus, secundus Werinharius, tertius Albricus, quartus Gotafridus, quintus Geroldus. Interim vero dum praedicti comites orientalem procurabant plagam, aliqui duces habitaverunt in illis partibus ad iam dictam sedem pertinentibus. Qui comitibus praefatis subditi fuerunt ad servitium imperatoris; quorum nomina sunt Priwizlauga, Cemicas, Ztoimir, Etgar* (*DCBC* 11.13–18).

***DAI*: Μετὰ δὲ χρόνους τινὰς ἐγεννήθη ἐξ αὐτῶν ὁ Βοϊσέσθλαβος, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὁ Ροδόσθλαβος, καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνου ὁ Προσηγός, καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνου ὁ Βλαστίμηρος, καὶ**

⁴⁴ *DCBC* 12.32–13.2. *Item in eadem civitate ecclesia sancti Iohannis baptistae constat dedicata, et foris civitatem in Dudleipin, in Ussitin, ad Businiza, ad Bettobiam, ad Stepiliperc, ad Lindolveschirchun, ad Keisi, ad Wiedhereschirichun, ad Isangrimeschirichum, ad Beatuseschirichun, ad Quinque basilicas temporibus Liuprammi ecclesiae dedicatae sunt; et ad Otachareschirchun et ad Paldmunteschirchun, ceterisque locis ubi Priwina et sui voluerunt populi. Quae omnes temporibus Priwinae constructae sunt et consecratae a praesulibus Iuvanensium.*

μέχρις αὐτοῦ τοῦ Βλαστιμήρου μετὰ τῶν Σέρβλων εἰρηνικῶς διετέλουν οἱ Βούλγαροι, ὡς γείτονες καὶ συνορίται ἀγαπῶντες ἀλλήλους, ἔχοντες δὲ δούλωσιν καὶ ὑποταγὴν εἰς τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῶν Ρωμαίων καὶ εὐεργετούμενοι παρ' αὐτῶν (DAI 32.33–38).

At this point, it can be safely concluded that Constantine's source about the earliest history of the Croats and Serbs had been titled the *De conversione Croatorum et Serborum* (DCCS). This is why even the chapters in the *DAI* follow an order of appearance where the Croats come first and the Serbs come second, as it is strange that the chapter on the Serbs (who were by far more important for Byzantium in the first half of the 10th century) come after the two Dalmatian chapters and the Croat one. The future research of chapters 30, 31, and 32 could perhaps provide a definite answer about the composition of the *DCCS*. Through the research of these chapters, it would be possible to see what had been originally placed in this source, and what Constantine's conclusions were. Furthermore, the entire perception of the earliest history of the Serbs and Croats must be changed, since it was not the invention of the Byzantine emperor, but rather of an author who was based in Rome ca. 877/878. The literary genre intended to describe the conversion of a pagan *natio* to Christianity simply did not exist in Byzantium; it only existed in the Latin West. This is the strongest evidence as to why the authorship of this kind of source must be sought in the West. On the other hand, the futile discussion about the "ideology" of Constantine Porphyrogenitus as being the main generator for his approach to the history of the Southern Slavs should finally be annulled. Furthermore, another barren discussion – that about a different authorship of chapter 30 – should also be placed *ad acta*.

Bibliography

Sources

BEKKER, Immanuel, ed. (1838), *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*, Bonnae.

BERTO, Luigi Andrea, ed. (1999), *Giovanni Diacono Istoria Veneticorum*, Bologna.
DAI = MORAVCSIK, Gyula – R. H. M. JENKINS (1967), *Constantine Porphyrogenitus De administrando imperio*, Greek text edited by Gy. Moravcsik, English translation by R. J. H. Jenkins, New Revised Edition, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae I, Washington.

DCBC = *De conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum libellus*, ed. D. W. Wattenbach, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, SS XI, ed. G. H. Pertz, Hannoverae, 1854.

FERJANČIĆ, Božidar, ur. (1959), *Vizantijski izvori za istoriju naroda Jugoslavije*, sv. II, Beograd.

Secondary literature

- ANČIĆ, Mladen (1999), Imperij na zalasku: Nestanak bizantske vlasti na istočnoj obali Jadrana u 9. stoljeću, *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru* 41, 1-20.
- BELKE Klaus – Peter SOUSTAL (1995), *Die Byzantiner und ihre Nachbarn: Die De Administrando Imperio genannte Lehrschrift des Kaisers Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos*, Wien.
- BURY, John Bagnell (1906), The treatise *De administrando imperio*, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 15/2, 517–577.
- ĆIRKOVIĆ, Sima (1989), „Naseljeni gradovi” Konstantina Porfirogenita i najstarija teritorijalna organizacija”, *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta* 37, 9–32.
- DABINOVIĆ, Antun (1941), Državnopravni odnos Hrvata prema istočnom carstvu, *Rad HAZU* 270, 49-148.
- DZINO, Danijel (2008), ‘Becoming Slav’, ‘Becoming Croat’: New approaches in research of identities in post-Roman Illyricum, *Hortus Artium Medievalium*, 14, 195-206.
- EGGERS, Martin (2007), Das *De administrando imperio* des Kaisers Konstantinos VII. Porphyrogenetos und die historisch-politische Situation Südosteuropas im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert, *Ostkirchliche Studien* 56, 15-100.
- FERJANČIĆ, Božidar (1978), *Struktura 30. glave spisa De administrando imperio*, *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta* 18, 61-80.
- FERJANČIĆ, Božidar (1996), Dolazak Hrvata i Srba na Balkansko poluostrvo, *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta* 35, 117-154.
- FERJANČIĆ, Božidar (1997), Vasilije I i obnova vizantijske vlasti u IX veku, *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta* 36, 9-30.
- FERLUGA, Jadran (1967), Vizantija i postanak najranijih južnoslovenskih država, *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta* 11, 55-66.
- FERLUGA, Jadran (1971), Vizantijsko carstvo i južnoslovenske države od sredine X veka, *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta* 13, 75 – 107.
- FINE, John V. A. Jr. (1991), *The Early Medieval Balkans*, Ann Arbor.
- GOLDSTEIN, Ivo (1995), *Hrvatski rani srednji vijek*, Zagreb: Zavod za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.
- GRAFENAUER, Bogo (1952), Prilog kritici izvještaja Konstantina Porfirogenita o doseljenu Hrvata, *Historijski sborni* 5, 1-56.
- HAUPTMANN, Ljudmil (1925), Dolazak Hrvata, u: *Zbornik kralja Tomislava*, Zagreb, 86 – 127.
- HAUPTMANN, Ljudmil (1931), Konstantin Porfirogenit o porijeklu stanovništva Dubrovačkog zaleđa, *Zbornik iz Dubrovačke prošlosti M. Rešetara*, Dubrovnik.
- HAUPTMANN, Ljudmil (1937), Seobe Hrvata i Srba, *Jugoslavenski istorijski časopis* 3, 30-61.
- JENKINS, Romilly J. H. (et al.), ed. (1962), Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio vol. II – Commentary*, London.
- KLAIĆ, Nada (1975), *Povijest Hrvata u ranom srednjem vijeku*, Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

- KLAIĆ, Nada (1984), O problemima stare domovine, dolaska i pokrštavanja dalmatinskih Hrvata, *Zgodovinski časopis* 29/4, 253-270.
- KLAIĆ, Nada (1985), Najnoviji radovi o 29, 30. i 31. poglavlju u djelu *De administrando imperio* cara Konstantina VII. Porfirogeneta, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 15, 31 – 60.
- KOS, Milko (1936), *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*, Ljubljana.
- KOŠČAK, Vladimir (1981), Pripadnost istočne obale Jadrana do splitskih sabora 925 – 928, *Historijski zbornik* 33–34, 291 – 355.
- LEMERLE, Paul (1971), *Le premiere humanisme byzantin. Notes et remarques su enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines aux Xe siècle*, Paris.
- LITAVRIN, G. G. – A. P. NOVOSELCEV (1989), *Konstantin Bagrjanorodnyj: Ob upravljenii imperiej, Tekst, prevod, komentarij*, Moskva.
- LOUNGHIS, T. C. (1980), *Les ambassades byzantines en Occident depuis la fondation des états barbares jusqu' aux Croisades (407 – 1096)*, Athenes.
- MACARTNEY, C. A. (1968), *The Magyars in the Ninth Century*, Cambridge.
- MAKSIMOVIĆ, Ljubomir, (1982), Struktura 32 glave spisa *De administrando imperio*, *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta* 21, 25–32.
- MAKSIMOVIĆ, Ljubomir (1996), Pokršćavanje Srba i Hrvata, *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta* 35, 155–174.
- MANOJLOVIĆ, Gavro (1902), Jadransko pomorje 9. stoljeća u svjetlu istočno-rimske (bizantinske) povijesti, *Rad JAZU* 150, 1 – 102.
- MARGETIĆ, Luj (1977), Konstantin Porfirogenet i vrijeme dolaska Hrvata, *Zbornik Historijskog zavoda JAZU* 8, 5-88.
- NOVAKOVIĆ, Relja (1972), Neka zapažanja o 29. i 30. glavi *De administrando imperio*, *Istorijski časopis* 19, 5-54.
- OSTROGORSKI, Georgij (1948), Porfirogenitova hronika srpskih vladara i njeni hronološki podaci, *Istorijski časopis* 1-2, 24-29.
- PETRINEC, Maja (2009), *Groblja od 8. do 11. stoljeća na području ranosrednjovjekovne hrvatske države*, Split.
- STADLER, Peter (2008), Avar Chronology Revisited, and the Question of Ethnicity in Avar Qaganate, *The Other Europe in the Middle Ages, Avars, Bulgars, Khazars and Cumans*, ed. F. Curta – R. Kovalev, Leiden, 47-82.
- ŠEVČENKO, Ihor (1995), Re-reading Constantine Porphyrogenitus, u: *Byzantine Diplomacy*, ed. J. Shepard – S. Franklin, Ipswitch, 167 – 195.
- ŠIŠIĆ, Ferdo (1925), *Povijest Hrvata u vrijeme narodnih vladara*, Zagreb 1925
- VIDA, Tivadar (2008), Conflict and Coexistence: The Local Population of the Carpathian Basin Under Avar Rule (Sixth to Seventh Century), *The Other Europe in the Middle Ages, Avars, Bulgars, Khazars and Cumans*, ed. F. Curta – R. Kovalev, Leiden, 13-46.
- ŽIVKOVIĆ, Tibor (2008), Constantine Porphyrogenitus' *kastra oikoumena* in the South Slavs Principalities, *Istorijski časopis* 58, 9-28.
- ŽIVKOVIĆ, Tibor (2010), *De conversione Croatorum et Serborum – A Lost Source*, (in print in the *Byzantinoslavica*).

WOLFRAM Herwig (1995), *Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich: Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum und die Quellen ihrer Zeit*, Wien – München.

Izvor Konstantina Porfirogeneta za najstariju povijest Hrvata i Srba

Osam poglavlja (29-36) u spisu *De administrando imperio* cara Konstantina VII. Porfirogeneta sadrži povijesne podatke o Slavenima na Balkanskom poluo-toku. U historiografiji prihvaćeno znanje potvrđuje da je Konstantin Porfirogenet koristio podatke o Hrvatima, Srbima i drugim Slavenima iz arhiva Carske palače kao i iz usmenih priopćenja bizantskih dužnosnika namještenih u Dalmaciji. Raščlamba najstarijeg povijesnog teksta o Srbima i Hrvatima sadržanog u 30, 31. i 32. poglavlju *DAI* pokazala je da usmena predaja nije mogla biti izvor podataka o Hrvatima i Srbima, već da je Konstantin koristio pisani izvor kojeg je moguće datirati oko 878. godine. Osobit stil tog izvora usredotočen je na pokrštanje (*Conversio Croatorum et Serborum*) i bliske veze Hrvata i Srba s Rimom. Taj stil, ili literarni žanr – *De conversione* – nije postojao u suvremenom Bizantu, no bio je dobro poznat u ranome srednjem vijeku na Zapadu. Raščlambom navedenih poglavlja *DAI* utvrđen je velik stupanj jezičnih podudarnosti s tekstom poznatim u historiografiji pod imenom *De conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*. Veze između *De conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum* i 30, 31, i 32. poglavlja *DAI* lako je prepoznatljiva u koncepciji djela kao i dijelovima koje je autor dodao. Zaključak ovog rada jest da je moguće potražiti novi put u razmatranju najranije povijesti Hrvata i Srba; očito je da je Konstantin Porfirogenet koristio podatke koje je preuzeo od anonimnog skupljača koji je, vrlo vjerojatno, djelovao kao visoki dužnosnik Rimske Crkve.

Ključne riječi: Konstantin VII. Porfirogenet, *kastra oikoumena*, *De Conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*, Hrvati, Srbi, Bizant, Franci

Key words: Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *kastra oikoumena*, *De Conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*, Croats, Serbs, Byzantium, Franks

FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET SVEUČILIŠTA U ZAGREBU

ZAVOD ZA HRVATSKU POVIJEST
INSTITUTE OF CROATIAN HISTORY
INSTITUT FÜR KROATISCHE GESCHICHTE

RADOVI 42

ZAVOD ZA HRVATSKU POVIJEST
FILOZOFSKOGA FAKULTETA SVEUČILIŠTA U ZAGREBU

The logo for FF press, featuring the letters 'FF' in a stylized font with a horizontal line through them, followed by the word 'press' in a lowercase, sans-serif font.

ZAGREB 2010.

RADOVI ZAVODA ZA HRVATSKU POVIJEST
FILOZOFSKOGA FAKULTETA SVEUČILIŠTA U ZAGREBU

Knjiga 42

Izdavač

Zavod za hrvatsku povijest
Filozofskoga fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu
FF-press

Za izdavača

Damir Boras

Glavni urednik

Hrvoje Gračanin

Uredništvo

Bruna Kuntić-Makvić (stara povijest)
Zrinka Nikolić Jakus (srednji vijek)
Hrvoje Petrić (rani novi vijek)
Željko Holjevac (moderna povijest)
Tvrтко Jakovina (suvremena povijest)
Silvija Pisk (mikrohistorija i zavičajna povijest)

Izvršna urednica za tuzemnu i inozemnu razmjenu

Kristina Milković

Tajnik uredništva

Dejan Zadro

Adresa uredništva

Zavod za hrvatsku povijest, Filozofski fakultet Zagreb,
Ivana Lučića 3, HR-10 000, Zagreb
Tel. ++385 (0)1 6120 150, 6120 158, faks ++385 (0)1 6156 879

Časopis izlazi jedanput godišnje

Ovi su Radovi tiskani uz financijsku potporu
Ministarstva znanosti, obrazovanja i športa Republike Hrvatske

Naslovna stranica

Iva Mandić

Grafičko oblikovanje i računalni slog

Boris Bui

Marko Maraković

Ivanka Cokol

Lektura

Julija Barunčić Pletikosić

Tisak

Hitra produkcija knjiga d.o.o.

Tiskanje dovršeno u prosincu 2010. godine

Naklada

200 primjeraka

*Časopis je dostupan na portalu znanstvenih časopisa Republike Hrvatske
Hrčku na adresi <http://hrcak.srce.hr/radovi-zhp>*