

THE CHRONICLE OF MONEMVASIA  
AND THE QUESTION  
OF THE SLAVONIC SETTLEMENTS  
IN GREECE

PETER CHARANIS

AMONG the short Byzantine chronicles, that concerning the *Foundation of Monemvasia* is perhaps the most curious and interesting. The most curious because, despite the importance of its contents, neither its author nor the date of its composition is known; the most interesting because of the notices which it contains concerning the establishment of Slavonic settlements in Greece, especially in the Peloponnesus, during the Middle Ages. Those who have dealt with the problem of these settlements have used it, either discounting its importance or emphasizing it unduly, their attitude depending upon their view concerning the magnitude, chronology, and significance of these settlements.<sup>1</sup> Notwithstanding its brevity, it has been the subject of two rather lengthy monographs wherein the attempt was made to determine its sources, the trustworthiness of its information, its author, and the date of its composition,<sup>2</sup> but the results have not been entirely conclusive. It is the object of this paper to reëxamine the question of the trustworthiness and the date of the composition of this chronicle.

The chronicle was first published in 1749 by Joseph Pasinus and his collaborators in their catalogue of the manuscripts of the royal library of Turin, from a manuscript written in the sixteenth century.<sup>3</sup> Pasinus' edition was the only edition available until 1884 when S. P. Lampros reissued it, together with two other versions which he found in two manuscripts, the one belonging to the monastery of Koutloumoussion, the other to that of the Iberikon, both monasteries of Mount Athos.<sup>4</sup> According to Lampros, the manuscript of the Iberikon was written in the sixteenth century, that of Koutloumoussion probably in the sixteenth, although there are some indications which point to the seventeenth.<sup>5</sup> In 1909 these three versions were re-

<sup>1</sup> Fallmerayer was the first to call attention to this chronicle and used it to bolster his fantastic theory that the ancient Greek race disappeared completely. Jacob Ph. Fallmerayer, *Fragmente aus den Orient*, 2nd edition by Georg M. Thomas (Stuttgart, 1877), p. 508, note 2. Opponents of the theory of Fallmerayer tried to discount the importance of this chronicle. See, for instance, K. Hopf, "Geschichte Griechenlands vom Beginn des Mittelalters bis auf unsere Zeit," in Ersch and Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, 85 (Leipzig, 1867), 106ff.; and K. Paparrhegopoulos, *Σλαβικά ἐν ταῖς Ἑλληνικαῖς χώραις ἐποικήσεις*, in *Ἱστορικὰ Πραγματεῖαι* (Athens, 1858), p. 247, note 25. Others have looked at it more impartially. See A. A. Vasiliev, "The Slavs in Greece" (in Russian), *Vizantiiskij Vremennik*, 5 (St. Petersburg, 1898), 411, 655ff. Vasiliev's work, although written fifty-two years ago, is still fundamental on the question of the Slavs in Greece. I read it with the aid of Mrs. Nathalie Scheffer.

<sup>2</sup> S. P. Lampros, *Τὸ περὶ κτίσεως Μονεμβασίας χρονικόν*, in his *Ἱστορικὰ Μελετήματα* (Athens, 1884), pp. 97-128. N. A. Bees, *Τὸ "περὶ τῆς κτίσεως τῆς Μονεμβασίας" χρονικόν*, in *Βυζαντίς*, 1 (Athens, 1909), 37-105.

<sup>3</sup> *Codices manuscripti bibliothecae regii Taurinensis Athenaei*, 1 (Turin, 1749), 417f.

<sup>4</sup> Lampros, *op. cit.*, pp. 98-109.

<sup>5</sup> Lambros (Lampros), *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos* (Cambridge, 1895-1900), 1:301; 2:86.

printed by N. A. Bees with some corrections,<sup>6</sup> and three years later a fourth version, found in a manuscript belonging to the Collegio Greco in Rome, was published by Lampros.<sup>7</sup>

Among these various versions there are substantial differences. The Iberikon deals primarily with the Avar and Slavic invasions of the Balkan peninsula, including Greece, in the sixth century; the settlement of the Slavs in the Peloponnesus, and their subjugation to the authority of the emperor during the reign of Nicephorus I. There is no mention of any event beyond the reign of Nicephorus I. The Koutloumouision and Turin versions on the other hand include, besides the main contents of the Iberikon, a number of other notices which deal primarily with events and persons connected with the metropolitan sees of Monemvasia and Lacedaemon, especially the latter. Chronologically these later notices cover the period from 1083 to about the middle of the fourteenth century, but most of them refer to the second half of the thirteenth century and the first half of the fourteenth. The Roman version consists of these later notices and includes none of the contents of the Iberikon. Between the Iberikon version on the one hand and the Koutloumouision and Turin versions on the other there are a number of other differences, but these are of minor significance.

The difference in contents between the Iberikon on the one hand and the Turin and Koutloumouision versions on the other was the principal argument used by Lampros in support of his opinion that these versions represent two different traditions of which the Iberikon was the original and the earliest, while the other, represented by the Turin and Koutloumouision manuscripts, was a reproduction of the Iberikon version with additional notices added by a later scribe. And, since the Iberikon version ends with the subjugation of the Slavs in the region of Patras during the reign of Nicephorus I when Tarasius, who died in 806, was still patriarch, while of the later notices found in the Turin and the Koutloumouision versions and missing in that of the Iberikon the earliest refers to the raising of the see of Lacedaemon to the status of a metropolis in 1083, Lampros came to the conclusion that the original version — the Iberikon — must have been written sometime between 806 and 1083.<sup>8</sup> As for the Turin and Koutloumouision versions, Lampros thought that they must have been written toward the end of the thirteenth century.<sup>9</sup>

The conclusions of Lampros were rejected by N. A. Bees, who re-

<sup>6</sup> Bees, *op. cit.*, pp. 61–73.

<sup>7</sup> Lampros, *Νέος κώδιξ τοῦ χρονικοῦ Μονεμβασίας*, in *Νέος Ἑλληνομνημον*, 9 (Athens, 1912), 245 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Lampros, *Τὸ περὶ κτίσεως Μονεμβασίας χρονικόν*, p. 118.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 119, 128.

examined the problem in detail. Bees rightly observed that it is impossible to accept the view of Lampros that the original version was written before 1083 simply because the additions found in the other versions begin with that year.<sup>10</sup> Nor is Lampros' view that these additions were appended to the original toward the end of the thirteenth century any more acceptable, for among them there are chronological notices that refer to the fourteenth century.<sup>11</sup> Indeed, Bees rejects the notion that the Iberikon is the original and earliest version, thinks that it is a simple variation of the other two, and considers the differences among them as accidental. He believes that the whole chronicle was composed sometime between 1340 and the sixteenth century, because one of the notices refers to the year 1340 while the manuscripts in which the chronicle has been found belong to the sixteenth century.<sup>12</sup>

When Bees published his study, the Roman version was not yet known. The peculiarity of this version is that it includes none of the contents of the Iberikon. In other words, it contains only the later notices which are found only in the Turin and Koutloumousion versions — notices which, according to Lampros, had been appended to the original chronicle later. In publishing the Roman version, Lampros remarked that its peculiarity confirmed his earlier view that the later notices of the Turin and Koutloumousion versions form a section independent of the part which constitutes the Iberikon version.<sup>13</sup> Indeed, the existence of two manuscripts — the one containing the part with the earlier notices, the other, that with the later notices — lends support to the argument of Lampros that these two parts were originally independent and that later someone put them together, producing thus the version represented by the Turin and the Koutloumousion manuscripts. And since the Iberikon is much more precise and complete in its notices, it is quite probable that it represents the original redaction of the chronicle, while the Turin and Koutloumousion versions are imperfect copies of it with the later notices added.

On determining the date of the composition of the original chronicle, that is, the Iberikon version, Lampros failed to notice one important detail. In his account of the subjugation of the Slavs near Patras during the reign of Nicephorus I, the author of the chronicle refers to that emperor as “the Old, who had Staurakios as son.”<sup>14</sup> This detail is of chronological importance

<sup>10</sup> Bees, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 98.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 98–99.

<sup>13</sup> Lampros, *Νέος κώδιξ τοῦ χρονικοῦ Μονεμβασίας*, p. 250. Lampros says that this is a manuscript of the thirteenth century, but surely there must be a mistake, for certain notices of the chronicle definitely refer to the fourteenth century.

<sup>14</sup> Bees' edition, p. 68: *Νικηφόρου τοῦ παλαιοῦ τοῦ ἔχοντος (υἱὸν) Σταυράκιον.*

because it places the composition of the chronicle after the reign of Nicephorus Phocas (963–969). This was pointed out by S. Kougeas,<sup>15</sup> who called attention to another expression of the chronicle which also helps to determine the date of its composition. This is the reference to the Tzacones, where it is said that this name had been lately given to them,<sup>16</sup> and as is well known the first mention of the Tzacones is made by Constantine Porphyrogenitus.<sup>17</sup> These observations led Kougeas to conclude that that part of the chronicle which constitutes the Iberikon version was composed during or not much after the reign of Nicephorus Phocas.<sup>18</sup>

There is another expression in the chronicle which lends support to the view of Kougeas. In describing the depredations of the Avars and Slavs in the Peloponnesus in 584, the author of the chronicle writes that many of the Greeks fled and found refuge in Calabria and Sicily. Those who went to Calabria came from Patras and settled in the region of Rhegium; those who went to Sicily came from Lacedaemon, where, says the chronicle “they still live in a place called Demena, are called Demenitae instead of Lacedaemonitae, and preserve their own Laconian dialect.”<sup>19</sup> Since the publication of Amari’s work, *Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia*, Demena as the name of a region in the northeastern part of Sicily and that of a town located in that region is well known,<sup>20</sup> but all of the references to the town belong to the ninth and tenth centuries. This fact has led Amari to declare that the town Demena existed until the tenth century, possibly until the eleventh, although that is doubtful.<sup>21</sup> But if the Lacedaemonians who had fled to Sicily still lived in Demena at the time of the composition of the chronicle, it means that Demena still existed, and this would place the composition of the chronicle not later than the end of the tenth century or the beginning of the eleventh.

The date of the composition of a document is, of course, of great importance, but more important still is the nature of its sources and the credibility

<sup>15</sup> S. Kougeas, ‘Ἐπὶ τοῦ καλουμένου χρονικοῦ “Περὶ τῆς κτίσεως τῆς Μομεμβασίας”, in *Νέος Ἑλληνομνημων*, 9 (Athens, 1912), 477.

<sup>16</sup> Bees’ edition, p. 67: οὐ καὶ ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων Τζακωνῖαι ἐπωνομάσθησαν.

<sup>17</sup> Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis*, 1 (Bonn, 1829), 696.

<sup>18</sup> Kougeas, *op. cit.*, p. 478.

<sup>19</sup> Bees’ edition, p. 66: οὐ καὶ εἰς ἔτι εἰσὶν ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν τόπῳ καλουμένῳ Δέμενα καὶ Δεμενίται ἀντὶ Λακεδαιμονιῶν κατανομαζόμενοι καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν τῶν Λακόνων διάλεκτον διασώζοντες.

<sup>20</sup> Michele Amari, *Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia*, 2nd edition (Catania, 1933), 1:609 ff. On Demena see also Sac. Luigi Vasi, “Notizie storiche e geografiche della città e valle di Demona,” in *Archivio storico Siciliano*, nuova serie, anno X (Palermo, 1885), pp. 1–15.

<sup>21</sup> Amari, *op. cit.*, 1:612, note XV: “Confrontando le quali testimonianze, e avvisandomi che nei diplomi notati dal n° VII al XIV si tratti anco della provincia, io credo provata la esistenza di Demana castello infino al decimo secolo, di Demana provincia dall’ undecimo in poi; ma parmi assai dubbio che il castello durasse fino all’ undecimo secolo, e certo che a metà del duodecimo fosse abbandonato o avesse mutato nome.”

of its contents. The contents of the chronicle of Monemvasia have been carefully analyzed by both Lampros and Bees. The latter, while making some additions to what Lampros had said concerning the sources of the Iberikon version, devoted his attention primarily to the second part of the chronicle, and of this part there will be no question here. Suffice it to say that Bees has come to the conclusion that it is worthy of trust and "valuable for the history of the Peloponnesus and indeed of Lacedaemon, especially of the fourteenth century, since it preserves some names and notices of things absolutely unknown from other sources."<sup>22</sup> But, however valuable this part of the chronicle may be for the history of the Peloponnesus in the fourteenth century, its contributions are of less general import than those of the first part, that is, the part which constitutes the Iberikon version. For the latter deals with no less a problem than the fate of the Greek people, particularly those inhabiting the Peloponnesus, during the early Middle Ages.

Lampros scrutinized the Iberikon version very carefully and was able to establish most of its sources. On the basis of the works of the Byzantine writers available to him which relate the same events related by the chronicle, he came to the conclusion, a conclusion which was then sound, that the author of the chronicle drew his information primarily from Menander, Evagrius, Theophylact Simocatta, and Theophanes.<sup>23</sup> But there are a number of notices for which Lampros was not able to find the source. He observed, for instance, that the name of the first metropolitan of Patras, Athanasius, who according to the chronicle was appointed and raised to the status of metropolitan during the reign of Nicephorus I, following the liberation of Patras from the Slavs, is found nowhere else. He made the same observation with respect to the statement of the chronicle that the Byzantine commander who liberated Patras from the Slavs was named Skleros and belonged to an Armenian family. These two problems, however, were solved by Bees, who offered evidence, independent of the chronicle, that both of these personages existed and had served in the capacities mentioned by the chronicle.<sup>24</sup>

Lampros also observed that nowhere else was he able to find the etymology of *Maniatae*.<sup>25</sup> This statement is puzzling, for nowhere in the chronicle

<sup>22</sup> Bees, *op. cit.*, p. 104 f.

<sup>23</sup> Lampros, *Tò peri ktíσεως Μονεμβασίας χρονικόν*, p. 109 ff.

<sup>24</sup> Bees, *op. cit.*, p. 78. Bees' reference about Skleros is to *Scriptor incertus de Leone Bardae F*, where it is said (Bonn, p. 336) that Leo Skleros was appointed strategus of the Peloponnesus by Michael I. It is not improbable, as Bees remarks, that Skleros had previous experience with the Peloponnesus and that was the reason for his appointment by Michael I. It must be pointed out, however, that this reference had already been cited by Vasiliev in the same connection. Vasiliev, *op. cit.*, p. 422.

<sup>25</sup> Lampros, *Tò peri ktíσεως Μονεμβασίας χρονικόν*, p. 117: οὐδαμοῦ γίνεται λόγος περὶ τοῦ ἐτύμου τῶν Μανιατῶν.

is there any question of the *Maniatae*. Apparently Lampros, as did also Hopf,<sup>26</sup> understood *Maniatae* by the *Demenitae* of the chronicle, probably because neither he nor Hopf knew anything about the Sicilian town of Demena. But Demena, as has been pointed out above, was a Sicilian town well known in the tenth century. How it got its name is not absolutely clear. Amari thinks that it was named after the inhabitants and supposes that the name was applied to the region and to the town at about the same time.<sup>27</sup> If this opinion is correct, then the name Demena may have been derived from *Demenitae*, the name by which, according to the chronicle, the Lacedaemonians who settled in Sicily came to be known. The chronicle says: "Some sailed to the island of Sicily and they are still there in a place called Demena and are called *Demenitae* instead of *Lacedaemonitae*."<sup>28</sup> A writer of the early fifteenth century understood *Demenitae* to be a barbarous form of Lacedaemonians. After speaking of those elements among the Laconians who settled in the mountains of Cynuria in the Peloponnesus and in the course of time barbarized their name into *Tzacones*, a corruption of *Lacones*, this writer then mentions the settlement of other Spartans in Sicily, and adds that they, too, as time went on, barbarized their name and came to be known as *Demenitae*.<sup>29</sup> It is quite probable that to this writer *Demenitae*

<sup>26</sup> Hopf, *op. cit.*, 85:108.

<sup>27</sup> Amari, *op. cit.*, 1:609 f.: Quanto al Val Demone, l'etimologia si é riferita ai boschi (Vallis Nemorum); si è riferita ai demonii dell' Etna, tenuto spiraglio d'inferno (Vallis Doemonum); altri più saviamente l'ha tratto da un forte castello, ricordato nelle memorie del nono secolo e abbandonato di certo nel duodecimo. Sembrami più probabile che i nomi della provincia e del castello fossero nati insieme dall' appellazione presa per avventura dagli abitatori di tutta quella regione: Perduranti, cioè, o Permanenti, nella fede, si aggiunga dell' impero bizantino. Perocchè un cronista greco del nono secolo, trattando delle città di Puglia rimase sotto il dominio di Constantinopoli, adopera il verbo analogo a così fatta voce (Teofane continuato, lib. V., cap. LVIII, p. 297: Καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ τούτου διέμειναν πιστοὶ βασιλεῖ τοιούτων ἐξηγούμενοι κάστρων); e una delle varianti con che questa ci è pervenuta è appunto *Tondemenon* che si riferisce, senza dubbio, non al territorio ma agli abitatori. On page 610, note 2, Amari explains: il participio presente del verbo *διαμένω* (permaneo, perduro) al genitivo plurale farebbe τῶν διαμενόντων, che l'uso volgare par abbia contratto in *Ton Demenon*. To us this etymology seems very improbable. Theophanes Continuatus used *διαμένω* because it was precisely the verb which he needed; no particular significance should be attached to it. Had he said that because the inhabitants of these cities remained faithful they came to be known as *διαμένοντες*, then the theory of Amari might be plausible, but he did not say that.

<sup>28</sup> See note 19 for the Greek text.

<sup>29</sup> Lampros, Δύο ἀναφοραὶ μητροπολίτου Μονεμβασίας πρὸς τὸν πατριάρχην, in *Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων*, 12 (Athens, 1915), 286: Προσοκείλαντες δὲ εἰς Μεσσήνην, ᾤκησαν ἐκεῖσε καὶ Δεμενίτας αὐτοὺς ὁ μακρὸς εἶπε χρόνος, βαρβαρίσαντας καὶ αὐτοὺς τοῦνομα. We shall speak more of this document later. As for the etymology of *Tzacones* it is now generally accepted that it is derived from the phrase ἔξω Λάκωνες. See C. Amantos, *Τσακωνία-Sclavonia*, in *Ἀφιέρωμα εἰς Γ.Ν.Χατζιδάκη* (Athens, 1921), pp. 130-134. On page 132 of his article, Amantos includes A. Vasiliev among those who derive the term *Tzacones* from the Slavic *zakon* and accordingly consider the *Tzacones* as Slavs. His reference is to Vasiliev's important article on the Slavs in Greece which we have already cited (above, note 1). I have carefully checked, with the aid of Vasiliev himself, this article (p. 422, n. 5) and I have found no statement such as

appeared to be a corruption of Lacedaemonitae, a term actually used by the chronicle instead of the classical Lacedaemonians. What he thought happened was the dropping of the first two syllables from Lacedaemonitae and the simplification of the spelling of what remained – Demenitae instead of Daemonitae. The form Demona instead of Demena occurs several times in the sources. But on this popular etymology of Demenitae from Lacedemonitae, and consequently Demena from Lacedaemon, we do not insist.

Among the several other notices of the chronicle for which neither Lampros nor Bees was able to find another source, there are two which are of capital importance for the history of Greece, Sicily, and southern Italy during the Middle Ages. Following is the passage where the first of these notices is found.<sup>30</sup> The whole passage is reproduced because it is necessary as a reference in the discussion of its source:

Ἐν ἐτέρᾳ δὲ εἰσβολῇ ἐχειρώσατο πᾶσαν τὴν Θεσσαλίαν καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα πᾶσαν τὴν τε παλαιὰν Ἡπειρον καὶ Ἀττικὴν καὶ Εὐβοίαν. Οἱ δὲ καὶ ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ ἐφορμήσαντες πολέμῳ ταύτην εἶλον καὶ ἐκβαλόντες τὰ εὐγενῆ καὶ ἑλληνικὰ ἔθνη καὶ καταφθείραντες κατῴκησαν αὐτοὶ ἐν αὐτῇ. Οἱ δὲ τὰς μαιφόνους αὐτῶν χεῖρας δυνηθέντες ἐκφυγεῖν, ἄλλος ἄλλαχῆ διεσπάρησαν. Καὶ ἡ μὲν τῶν Πατρῶν πόλις μετῴκησθη ἐν τῇ τῶν Καλαβρῶν χώρα τοῦ Ἑγγίου, οἱ δὲ Ἀργεῖοι ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τῇ καλουμένῃ Ὀρόβῃ, οἱ δὲ Κορίνθιοι ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τῇ καλουμένῃ Αἰγίνῃ μετῴκησαν. Τότε δὲ καὶ οἱ Λάκωνες τὸ πατρῶον ἔδαφος καταλιπόντες οἱ μὲν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ Σικελίας ἐξέπλευσαν, οἱ καὶ εἰς ἔτι εἰσὶν ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν τόπῳ καλουμένῳ Δέμενα καὶ Δεμενίται ἀντὶ Λακεδαιμονιῶν κατονομαζόμενοι καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν τῶν Λακῶνων διάλεκτον διασώζοντες. Οἱ δὲ δύσβατον τόπον παρὰ τὸν τῆς θαλάσσης αἰγιαλὸν εὐρόντες καὶ πόλιν ὄχυρὰν οἰκοδομήσαντες καὶ Μονεμβασίαν ταύτην ὀνομάσαντες διὰ τὸ μίαν ἔχειν τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ εἰσπορευομένων τὴν εἴσοδον ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ πόλει κατῴκησαν μετὰ καὶ τοῦ ἰδίου αὐτῶν ἐπισκόπου. Οἱ δὲ τῶν θρεμμάτων νομεῖς καὶ ἀγροικικοὶ κατῴκησθησαν ἐν τοῖς παρακειμένοις ἐκείσε τραχινοῖς τόποις, οἱ καὶ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων Τζακωνία ἐπονομάσθησαν. Οὕτως οἱ Ἄβαροι τὴν Πελοπόννησον κατασχόντες καὶ κατοικήσαντες ἐν αὐτῇ διήρκεσαν ἐπὶ χρόνοις διακοσίοις ὀκτωκαίδεκα μῆτε τῷ τῶν Ῥωμαίων βασιλεῖ μῆτε ἐτέρῳ ὑποκείμενοι, ἤγουν ἀπὸ τοῦ ,ς'ης' ἔτους τῆς τοῦ κόσμου κατασκευῆς ὅπερ ἦν ἕκτον ἔτος τῆς βασιλείας Μαυρικίου, καὶ μέχρι τοῦ ,ς'ου'ε' ἔτους, ὅπερ ἦν τέταρτον ἔτος τῆς βασιλείας Νικηφόρου τοῦ παλαιοῦ τοῦ ἔχοντος (υἱὸν) Σταυράκιον. Μόνου δὲ τοῦ ἀνατολικοῦ μέρους τῆς Πελοποννήσου ἀπὸ Κορίνθου καὶ μέχρι Μαλέου τοῦ Σθλαβηνοῦ ἔθνους διὰ τὸ τραχὺ καὶ δύσβατον καθαρεύοντος, στρατηγὸς Πελοποννήσου ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ μέρει ὑπὸ τοῦ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεῖος κατεπέμπετο. Εἰς δὲ τῶν τοιούτων στρατηγῶν ὀρμώμενος μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς μικρᾶς Ἀρμενίας, φατριᾶς δὲ τῶν ἐπονομαζομένων Σκληρῶν συμβαλὼν τῷ Σθλαβηνῷ ἔθνει πολεμικῶς εἶλέ τε καὶ ἠφάνισε εἰς τέλος καὶ τοῖς ἀρχῆθεν οἰκίητοσι ἀποκαταστήναι τὰ οἰκία παρέσχεν. Τοῦτο μαθὼν ὁ προειρημένος βασιλεὺς

would justify Amantos' opinion. Indeed, while Vasiliev makes here no categorical statement on the problem, restricting himself to a summary of the conclusions of other scholars, I know, from several conversations that I have had with this distinguished Russian-American scholar, that he considers the term Tzacones to be certainly related to that of Lacones. On Tzacones see further G. N. Hatzidakis, Τζάκωνες, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 27 (Leipzig, 1927), 321–324; Dölger, *Byz. Zeitschrift*, 26:107. For a different etymology, see Ph. Koukoules, Τσακωνία καὶ Τζάκωνες, in *Byz. Zeitschrift*, 26:317–327. For the Tzaconian dialect see H. Pernot, *Introduction à l'étude du dialect Tsakonien* (Paris, 1934).

<sup>30</sup> Bees' edition, pp. 65–70. The Iberikon version.



Νικηφόρος καὶ χαρᾶς πλησθεὶς διὰ φροντίδος ἔθετο τὸ καὶ τὰς ἐκείσε πόλεις ἀνακαινίσαι καὶ ὡς οἱ βάβαροι κατηδάφισαν ἐκκλησίας ἀνοικοδομησαὶ καὶ αὐτοὺς τοὺς βαρβάρους Χριστιανοὺς ποιῆσαι. Διὸ καὶ ἀναμαθὼν τὴν μετοικεσίαν οὗ διατρίβουσιν οἱ Πατρεῖς κελεύσει αὐτοῦ τούτους τῷ ἕξ ἀρχῆς ἐδάφει ἀπεκατέστησε μετὰ καὶ τοῦ ἰδίου αὐτῶν ποιμένος, ὃς ἦν τὸ τηρικαῦτα Ἀθανάσιος τοῦνομα, καὶ μητροπόλεως δίκαια ταῖς Πάτραις παρέσχετο, ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς πρὸ τούτου χρηματιζούσης. Ἀνφοδόμησέ τε ἐκ βάρων καὶ τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγίας ἐκκλησίας, πατριαρχούντος ἔτι Ταρασίου . . .

### Here is a translation:

In another invasion they [the Avars] subjugated all of Thessaly and Greece, Old Epirus, Attica and Euboea. They made an incursion also in the Peloponnesus, conquered it by war, and, destroying and driving out the noble and Hellenic nations, they settled in it themselves. Those among the former [the Greeks] who succeeded in escaping from their blood-stained hands dispersed themselves here and there. The city of Patras emigrated to the territory of Rhegium in Calabria; the Argives to the island called Orobe; and the Corinthians to the island called Aegina. The Lacones too abandoned their native soil at that time. Some sailed to the island of Sicily and they are still there in a place called Demena, call themselves Dementitae instead of Lacedaemonitae, and preserve their own Laconian dialect. Others found an inaccessible place by the seashore, built there a strong city which they called Monemvasia because there was only one way for those entering, and settled in it with their own bishop. Those who belonged to the tenders of herds and to the rustics of the country settled in the rugged places located along there and have been lately called Tzaconiae. Having thus conquered and settled the Peloponnesus, the Avars have held it for two hundred and eighteen years, that is, from the year 6096 [A.D. 587] from the creation of the world, which was the sixth year of the reign of Maurice, to the year 6313 [A.D. 805], which was the fourth year of the reign of Nicephorus the Old who had Staurakios as son. They were subject neither to the emperor of the Romans nor to anyone else. And only the eastern part of the Peloponnesus, from Corinth to Malea, because of its ruggedness and inaccessibility remained free from the Slavs and to that part a *strategus* [governor] of the Peloponnesus continued to be sent by the emperor of the Romans. One of these governors, a native of Lesser Armenia, and a member of the family called Skleroi came into hostile blows with the Slavic tribes, conquered and obliterated them completely, and enabled the ancient inhabitants to recover their own. When the aforementioned emperor Nicephorus heard these things he was filled with joy and became anxious to renew the cities there, to rebuild the churches that the barbarians had destroyed, and to Christianize the barbarians themselves. And for this reason, having inquired about the colony where the people of Patras lived, he had them reestablished by his order together with their own shepherd [bishop], whose name at that time was Athanasius, on their ancient soil. He also granted to Patras, which was a bishopric before this, the prerogatives of a metropolis. And he rebuilt their city [Patras] and the holy churches of God from the foundations when Tarasius was still patriarch.

Now to examine the sources of this all-important passage. At first glance the notice concerning the invasion of Greece seems to have been taken

from Evagrius, who is mentioned in the chronicle as one of its sources.<sup>31</sup> This was the view adopted by Paparrhegopoulo,<sup>32</sup> but, as the chronicle names the various regions of Greece invaded by the Avars and Slavs, while Evagrius simply says “all Greece,”<sup>33</sup> both Lampros and Bees refrained from expressing an opinion on this point. Indeed nowhere else among the known sources is there any mention of the exact region of Greece invaded by the Avars and Slavs. Menander speaks of an invasion of Greece during the reign of Tiberius but, like Evagrius, he does not name the exact regions that were invaded.<sup>34</sup> Nor does the account of John of Ephesus add very much more.<sup>35</sup> It can either be that the author of the chronicle took Evagrius’ expression “all Greece” and broke it up on the basis of some local tradition, as Paparrhegopoulo supposes, or that he had before his eyes a source, now lost, which gave an account of the exact regions of Greece invaded by the Avars and the Slavs.<sup>36</sup> That the latter was the case will be presently demonstrated.

The statement of the chronicle that the Avars held the Peloponnesus for two hundred eighteen years — that is, from 587 to 805 — is known also from another source, the synodical letter of the patriarch Nicholas (1084–1111) to the emperor Alexius Comnenus.<sup>37</sup> As most commentators of the chronicle considered it to be a product of a late period they showed no hesitation in

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 61: Οἱ τοι (οἱ Ἄβαροι), καθὼς ὁ Εὐάγριος λέγει ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ αὐτοῦ λόγῳ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας . . .

<sup>32</sup> Paparrhegopoulo, *op. cit.*, p. 247, note 25.

<sup>33</sup> Evagrius, edited by Bidez and Parmentier, VI, 10: οἱ Ἄβαρεις δις μέχρι τοῦ καλουμένου μακροῦ τείχους ἐλάσαντες, Σιγγηδόνα Ἀγχιάλόν τε καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα πᾶσαν καὶ ἑτέρας πόλεις τε καὶ φρούρια ἐξεπολιόρκησαν καὶ ἠνδραποδίσαντο, ἀπολλύντες ἅπαντα καὶ πυρπολοῦντες, τῶν πολλῶν στρατευμάτων κατὰ τὴν Ἐφῶν ἐνδιατριβόντων.

<sup>34</sup> C. Müller, *Fragmenta historicorum graecorum*, 4 (Paris, 1851), 252 (frag. 48): ὄτι κεραϊζομένης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὑπὸ Σκλαβηνῶν καὶ ἀπανταχόσε ἀλλεπαλλήλων αὐτῇ ἐπηρητημένων τῶν κινδύνων, ὁ Τιβέριος . . . πρᾶσβύεται ὡς Βαϊανόν.

<sup>35</sup> John, Bishop of Ephesus, *The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John, Bishop of Ephesus*, tr. by R. Payne Smith (Oxford, 1860), p. 432: “That same year, being the third after the death of king Justin, was famous also for the invasion of an accursed people, called Slavonians, who overran the whole of Greece, and the country of the Thessalonians, and all Thrace, and captured the cities, and took numerous forts, and devastated and burnt, and reduced the people to slavery, and made themselves masters of the whole country, and settled in it by main force, and dwelt in it as though it had been their own without fear.”

<sup>36</sup> John of Biclar who was in Constantinople from 558 to 575 says in his chronicle that the Slavs devastated parts of Greece, but does not mention any of these parts. The chronicle of John was published by Mommsen in *Mon. Germ. Hist., Chronica Minora* (1893), vol. II. Here is his text as cited by Vasiliev, *op. cit.*, p. 410, note 5: “Sclavini in Thracia multas urbes Romanorum pervadunt, quas depopulates vacuas reliquere; Avares Thracias vastant et regiam urbem a muro longo obsident; Avares a finibus Thraciae pelluntur et partes Graeciae atque Pannoniae occupant.” These invasions are placed by John during the reigns of Justin and Tiberius.

<sup>37</sup> J. Leunclavius, *Juris Graeco-Romani, tam canonici quam civilis, tomi duo . . . ex variis Europae Asiaeque bibliothecis eruti* (Frankfurt, 1596), p. 278 f.: τῶν Ἀβάρων . . . ἐπὶ διακοσίοις δέκα ὀκτὼ χρόνοις ὅλοις κατασχόντων τὴν Πελοπόννησον, καὶ τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἁρχῆς ἀποτεμομένην, ὡς μηδὲ πόδα βαλεῖν ὄλως δύνασθαι ἐν αὐτῇ Ῥωμαίων ἄνδρα.

accepting the letter of the patriarch as the source of the chronicle. Lampros himself was somewhat puzzled, for if the patriarchal letter served as a source in the composition of the chronicle, then the chronicle was composed either during or after the patriarchate of Nicholas, but he had already expressed the view that the composition of the chronicle must be placed in the period between 806 and 1083. Accordingly he dismissed the question, saying that he thought it superfluous to deal with it, since Paparrhegopoulo had already dealt with it at length.<sup>38</sup> But Paparrhegopoulo entertained no doubts at all that what the chronicle says about the length of time that the Avars and the Slavs held the Peloponnesus was taken from the letter of the patriarch.<sup>39</sup> Actually, however, as it will be presently seen, the author of the chronicle drew his information from an entirely different source.

The notice concerning the subjugation of the Slavs in the territory of Patras and the recovery of that city by the Byzantines as well as its promotion to the status of a metropolis during the reign of Nicephorus I has been thought to be derived either from the letter of the patriarch or from the *De administrando imperio* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus.<sup>40</sup> But neither in the patriarchal letter nor in the account of Porphyrogenitus<sup>41</sup> is there question concerning the rebuilding of the city of Patras by Nicephorus and its resettlement with the descendants of those who had emigrated to the territory of Rhegium in Calabria at the time of the invasion of the Avars and Slavs. Besides, between the account of the chronicle and that of Porphyrogenitus there are some other important differences. Porphyrogenitus does not give the name of the Byzantine general who subdued the Slavs; he represents the city of Patras and the surrounding territory as being already in the hands of the Greeks; and he says that in this conflict the Slavs were aided by Africans and Saracens. In view of these important differences, it is absolutely clear that the account of the chronicle is independent of that of Constantine Porphyrogenitus.

It remains now to consider what is perhaps the most important notice of the entire passage — that concerning the invasion of the Peloponnesus by the Avars and the dispersion of the ancient inhabitants of the peninsula, “the noble and Hellenic nations,” as the chronicle puts it. That Slavs settled in the Peloponnesus is, of course, a well-known fact, but it is still disputed whether they settled there in the sixth century, during the reign of Maurice,

<sup>38</sup> Lampros, *Τὸ περὶ κτίσεως Μομεμβασίας χρονικόν*, p. 117.

<sup>39</sup> Paparrhegopoulo, *op. cit.*, p. 247, note 25. Bees, too (*op. cit.*, p. 82), accepts the letter of patriarch Nicholas as the source of the chronicle.

<sup>40</sup> Bees, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

<sup>41</sup> Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio* (Bonn, 1840), p. 217 ff. In this account Constantine seems to describe an attack of the Slavs against Patras after that city had been resettled with Greeks. See below, note 53.

or at a later epoch. The question remains open because the reference in the chronicle finds no definite confirmation in the known sources, except the synodical letter of the patriarch Nicholas, but, since that letter, so far as the settlement of the Slavs in the Peloponnesus is concerned, is considered by those who belittle the value of the chronicle to be the source of the chronicle, it carries little weight as a confirmation of the chronicle. The three important sources of the Avar and Slavonic invasions of the last quarter of the sixth century – the works of Evagrius, Menander, and John of Ephesus – say simply that the Avars devastated all Hellas. But “Hellas” has been interpreted by those who do not accept the authority of the chronicle to refer not to Greece proper, but to Illyricum as a whole, that is, the Byzantine possessions in the Balkan peninsula.<sup>42</sup> As late as 1939, the Greek scholar Amantos wrote, “By Hellas the archaist Menander means the Byzantine regions up to the Danube, including modern Bulgaria.” It is thus also that he explained the passage in Evagrius and referred to Theophanes, who, writing about the same incident, uses the term “Illyricum” where Menander and Evagrius have used “Greece,” in support of his view.<sup>43</sup> Accordingly, the works of Evagrius, Menander, and John of Ephesus cannot be cited as confirming the statement of the chronicle that Avars and Slavs settled in the Peloponnesus in the sixth century, and consequently that statement remains without any confirmation. That there is confirmation, however, will be seen in what follows.

The statement of the chronicle concerning the invasion of the Peloponnesus by the Avars and the Slavs could be said to have the support of Evagrius, Menander, and John of Ephesus if “Hellas,” as they use it, is taken, as it should, to refer to Greece proper. But neither Evagrius, nor Menander, nor John of Ephesus nor any other known source that treats of the Avar and Slavonic invasions of the Balkan peninsula during the sixth and seventh centuries makes the slightest allusion to the dispersion of the Peloponnesians and the emigration of some of them to Sicily, Italy, and elsewhere as a result of the Avar invasion. Accordingly this notice in the chronicle has been treated with caution or rejected outright. With the ex-

<sup>42</sup> Paparrhegopoulos, *Ἱστορία τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Ἔθνους*, edited by P. Karolides (Athens, 1925), III, 155, 158 f. Hopf (*op. cit.*, p. 91) interpreted the passage of Evagrius as follows: “Nur unkenntnis der Geographie konnte den Syrer Evagrius veranlassen nächst den bekannten Städten Singidon und Anchialos noch, ‘von ganz Hellas und andern Städten und Burgen zu reden;’ entweder dachte er sich unter Hellas eine Stadt oder Burg, was am wahrscheinlichsten, oder er übertrug den antiken Namen des eigentlichen Griechenlands auch auf die thrakisch-makedonischen Provinzen des Römerreichs.”

<sup>43</sup> Constantine I. Amantos, *Ἱστορία τοῦ Βυζαντινοῦ Κράτους*, I (Athens, 1939), 281 ff. See also Charanis’ review of this book in *Byzantion*, 15: 472. In a more recent study Amantos has sought to reinforce his interpretations of the term Hellas. Amantos, *Οἱ Σλάβοι εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα*, in *Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher*, 17 (Athens, 1944), 215, especially note 2.

ception of Fallmerayer, none of the scholars who have treated the question of the Slavonic settlements in Greece have put much reliance upon it.<sup>44</sup> Nor is it cited by any of the scholars, as far as the present writer has been able to ascertain, who have dealt with the problem of the Hellenization of Sicily and southern Italy during the early Middle Ages.<sup>45</sup>

Contrary to the general impression, however, not only this notice but a number of other elements of the passage that we have translated above is worthy of the greatest trust, for it is confirmed by no less an authority than Arethas of Caesarea. This fact was made known by S. Kougeas in a note published in 1912, in which was included a scholium written by Arethas himself in the margin of the Dresden manuscript which contains the brief chronicle of patriarch Nicephorus (806–815), a manuscript which was written in 932. Following is Arethas' text.<sup>46</sup>

Τῷ τετάρτῳ ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ ἡ Πατρῶν τῆς Πελοποννήσου τῆς πατρίδος ἡμῶν μετοικία ἀπὸ τῆς Καλαυρῶν πόλεως τοῦ Ῥηγίου ἀνεκομίσθη εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον πόλισμα τῶν Πατρῶν. Ἐφυγαδεύθη γὰρ ἦγον μετωκίσθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Σκλαυηῶν ἔθνους πολέμῳ ἐφορμησάντων Θεσσαλία τῇ πρώτῃ καὶ δευτέρᾳ καὶ προσέτι Αἰνιάσι τε καὶ Λοκροῖς ἀμφοτέροις Ἐπικνημιδίους τε καὶ Ὀζόλαις καὶ δὴ καὶ τῇ παλαιᾷ Ἡπείρῳ καὶ Ἀττικῇ καὶ τῇ Εὐβοίᾳ καὶ Πελοποννήσῳ καὶ ἐκβαλόντων μὲν τὰ ἐγγενῆ ἑλληνικὰ ἔθνη καὶ καταφθειράντων, κατοικισθέντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ βασιλείας Μαυρικίου ἔτους ̅ μέχρι τετάρτου ἔτους Νικηφόρου, ἐφ' οὗ τοῦ ἀνατολικοῦ μέρους Πελοποννήσου ἀπὸ Κορίνθου καὶ μέχρι Μαλεάς τοῦ Σκλαυηοῦ καθαρεύοντος, εἰς ὃ καὶ στρατηγὸς κατεπέμπετο τῇ Πελοποννήσῳ. Ἐκ τούτων τῶν στρατηγῶν ἀπὸ τῆς μικρᾶς ὀρμώμενος Ἀρμενίας, φατρίας δὲ τῶν ἐπονομαζομένων Σκληρῶν, συμβαλὼν τῷ Σκλαυηῶν ἔθνει, πολεμικῶς εἰλέν τε καὶ ἠφάνισεν εἰς τέλος καὶ τοῖς ἀρχῆθεν οἰκῆτορσιν ἀποκαταστήσαι τὰ οἰκία παρέσχεν. Βασιλεὺς γὰρ ὁ εἰρημένος ἀναμαθὼν τὴν μετοικίαν οὐ διατρίβειν κελεύσει αὐτοῦ τὸν τε λαὸν τῷ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐδάφει ἀποκατέστησεν καὶ μητροπόλεως δίκαια ταῖς Πάτραις παρέσχετο, ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς πρὸ τούτου χρηματιζούσης.

Here is a translation:

In the fourth year of his reign [reign of Nicephorus] took place the transfer of Patras of the Peloponnesus, our country, from the Calabrian city of Rhegium to the ancient city of Patras. For it had been driven away or rather forced to migrate by the

<sup>44</sup> Vasiliev (*op. cit.*, pp. 411, 412) uses it, but without much emphasis.

<sup>45</sup> See, for instance, Lynn White, "The Byzantinization of Sicily," in *American Historical Review*, 42 (1936), 1 ff. This article in a somewhat compressed form was reprinted in White's *Latin Monasticism in Norman Sicily* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1938), chapter 3. In an article which I devoted to the problem of the Hellenization of Sicily and southern Italy during the early Middle Ages I have made use of the material found in the chronicle of Monemvasia. See Charanis, "On the Question of the Hellenization of Sicily and Southern Italy during the Middle Ages," *The American Historical Review*, 52 (1946), pp. 74–86.

<sup>46</sup> Kougeas, *op. cit.*, p. 474 f. On the historical accuracy of the scholia of Arethas see further N. A. Bees, *Αἱ ἐπιδρομαὶ τῶν Βουλγάρων ὑπὸ τὸν τζάρον Συμεὼν καὶ τὰ σχετικὰ σχόλια τοῦ Ἀρέθα Καισαρείας*, in *Ἑλληνικά*, 1 (Athens, 1928), 337–370; Kougeas, *Ἐρευναι περὶ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς λαογραφίας κατὰ τοὺς μέσους χρόνους. Α' Αἱ ἐν τοῖς σχολίοις τοῦ Ἀρέθα λαογραφικαὶ εἰδήσεις*, in *Λαογραφία*, 4 (Athens, 1913/14), 236–269. The most complete work on Arethas is by Kougeas, *Ὁ Καισαρείας Ἀρέθας καὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ* (Athens, 1913).

nation of the Slavs when they invaded the First and Second Thessaly and in addition the country of the Aeniantes and that of the Locrians, both the Epiknemidian and Ozolians, and also ancient Epirus, Attica and Euboea and the Peloponnesus, driving away and destroying the noble Hellenic nations. They [the Slavs] dwelt there from the sixth year of the reign of Maurice to the fourth year of that of Nicephorus at whose time the governor for the Peloponnesus was sent to the eastern part of the Peloponnesus, from Corinth to Malea, because that part was free of Slavs. One of these governors, a native of Lesser Armenia, and a member of the family called Skleroi, clashing with the Slavic tribes, conquered them in war and obliterated them completely and enabled the ancient inhabitants to recover their own. For the mentioned emperor, having inquired where the colony was, reestablished the people on the ancient soil and granted to Patras, which was a bishopric before this, the prerogatives of a metropolis.

It takes only a superficial comparison of Arethas' scholium with the passage of the chronicle cited and translated above to see the close relationship between the two. In some instances the one repeats the other verbatim. Arethas focuses his attention on his native city of Patras and consequently his scholium is much compressed, leaving out a number of notices included in the chronicle. This fact is important for it shows that the author of the chronicle did not draw his information from Arethas' scholium. Nor could Arethas draw his information from the chronicle, for when he wrote his scholium the chronicle did not yet exist. These observations lead but to one conclusion: both Arethas and the chronicle drew their information from the same source, now lost — a source which was written sometime between 805, the year during which Patras was rebuilt and raised to the status of a metropolis, and 932, the year during which Arethas wrote his scholium.

If, as seems probable, this source was a chronicle whose author had drawn his information from Menander, Evagrius, Theophylact Simocatta, and some other source which is now lost, the reason why some of the notices of the chronicle of Monemvasia are easily traceable to Evagrius, Menander, and Theophylact Simocatta<sup>47</sup> would be explained. It seems improbable that the author of the chronicle of Monemvasia referred to these various works separately, drawing this notice from one, and that from another. Most probably he had before his eyes one work, and from that one work he compiled his own notices.

There is some evidence that a historical work covering the period from at least the middle of the sixth century to the second decade of the ninth century existed. In 1936 the Bulgarian scholar Dujčev published a fragment

<sup>47</sup> Certain notices of the chronicle can be traced to Theophanes (see Lampros *Τὸ περὶ κτίσεως Μονεμβασίας χρονικόν*, pp. 111–113; Bees, *op. cit.*, p. 81) but this may mean simply that Theophanes drew his information from the same source as the chronicle.

which deals with the last expedition of Nicephorus I in Bulgaria. This fragment was immediately studied by Henri Grégoire, who came to the conclusion that it is an extract of a contemporary work whose author was a historian of the first order, the same who wrote the fragment of the *Scriptor Incertus de Leone Armenio*, and that this work was a “continuation” of another “of the type and in the style of a Malalas,” which went as far as Leo the Armenian.<sup>48</sup> It is not impossible that this work was the source of the chronicle of Monemvasia and the scholium of Arethas. It is significant that the only other place, besides the chronicle of Monemvasia and the scholium of Arethas, where a Skleros is mentioned as governor of the Peloponnesus at the beginning of the ninth century is the *Scriptor Incertus de Leone Armenio*.<sup>49</sup>

This lost historical work, whatever its nature, was doubtless also the source from which the author of the chronicle of Monemvasia, the Iberikon version, drew the other important notice for which neither Lampros nor Bees was able to find another source. The notice concerns the reconstruction of the city of Lacedaemon by Nicephorus I and its settlement with a mixed population, brought from other parts of the empire. Here is the text: Τὴν δὲ Λακεδαίμονα πόλιν ἐκ βάθρων καὶ αὐτὴν ἀνεγείρας καὶ ἐνοικίσας ἐν αὐτῇ λαὸν σύμμικτον Καφήρους τε καὶ Θρακησίους καὶ Ἀρμενίους καὶ λοιποὺς ἀπὸ διαφόρων τόπων τε καὶ πόλεων ἐπισυναχθέντας ἐπισκοπῆν καὶ αὐθις ταύτην κατέστησε καὶ ὑποκέισθαι τῇ τῶν Πατρῶν μητροπόλει ἐθέσπισεν. To translate: “And he also built from the foundations the city of Lacedaemon, settled it with a mixed people, Caferoe,<sup>50</sup> Thracians,<sup>51</sup> Armenians and others whom

<sup>48</sup> Henri Grégoire, “Un Nouveau Fragment du ‘Scriptor Incertus de Leone Armenio,’” in *Byzantion*, 11 (Brussels, 1936), 417 ff. Grégoire shows also (*ibid.*, p. 417) that Theophanes used this source.

<sup>49</sup> *Scriptor Incertus de Leone Bardae F.*, published together with the chronicle of Leo Grammaticus (Bonn, 1842), p. 336: Λέοντα τὸν ἐπιλεγόμενον τοῦ Σκληροῦ, καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν στρατηγὸν εἰς Πελοπόννησον.

<sup>50</sup> Lampros (Τὸ περὶ κτίσεως Μονεμβασίας χρονικόν, p. 113, note 1) was not able to identify the Caferoe and raised the question whether they were not the same as the Cabeiroe. The same suggestion is made by Vasiliev (*op. cit.*, p. 657, note 2), but who were the Cabeiroe? Theophanes Continuatus (Bonn, p. 55) mentions the Cabeiroe among the troops of Thomas the Slavonian at the time of his revolt against Michael II, but Genesisius (Bonn, p. 33) has Saberoe (Saberoe is the reading of the manuscript, but for some unexplained reason the editor changed it to Cabeiroe) and as Genesisius generally represented the better tradition one should read Saberoe in Theophanes Continuatus. Nicephorus Bryennius (Bonn, p. 29) mentions the Cabeiroe as among the troops of Mahmud of Ghazna (eleventh century), but the Cabeiroe of Bryennius are people of the Oxus regions and by no means Christians. According to Theophanes, the people settled in Selavina by Nicephorus were Christians. William of Tyr (*Hist. Rerum Transmarin.*, Migne, P.L. 201: 221) calls the Oxus “Cobar,” a name which may give the clue to the identification of the Cabeiroe, i.e., people of the region of Cobar, the inhabitants of Khwārizin. It is also possible, as suggested by both Lampros and Vasiliev, that the Cabeiroe were remnants of the Cabaroe, mentioned by Constantine Porphyrogenitus (*De administrando imperio*, p. 171 ff). In any case these Cabeiroe have nothing

he brought together from various places and cities, made it again a bishopric and put it under the jurisdiction of the metropolis of Patras.”

No source known says anywhere anything about the reconstruction and the re-peopling of Lacedaemon by Nicephorus I, not even the Turin and the Koutlounousion versions of the chronicle of Monemvasia. And Arethas, of course, is silent on this point — a silence which is not hard to understand because Arethas restricted his remarks to his native city of Patras, its emigration during the reign of Maurice and its reconstruction during the reign of Nicephorus I. But the silence of the other sources by no means lessens the trustworthiness of this passage. It doubtless came from the work whence the author of the chronicle drew all his information, and that work is now lost. Besides, there is nothing in this passage which is inconsistent with Byzantine practices. The transplanting of peoples from one region to another for reasons of state was frequently resorted to in Byzantium before and after the reign of Nicephorus I.<sup>52</sup> Nicephorus himself re-peopled Patras with Greeks whom he had brought from Calabria. About this action there can be no doubt, in view of the testimony of both Arethas and the chronicle. If Nicephorus rebuilt Patras there is no reason to doubt the other statement of the chronicle that he also rebuilt Lacedaemon. The rebuilding of both Patras and Lacedaemon were measures doubtless taken by Nicephorus in order to keep the Slavonic tribes that still remained in the Peloponnesus in check. That Nicephorus sought to break the power of the Slavs by transplanting to their midst peoples from other regions of the empire is confirmed by Theophanes, who states that in 810 Nicephorus ordered the settlement of Christians from every province of the empire in the regions known as Sclavinias. Where these Sclavinians were located cannot be definitely determined, but in the light of what the chronicle of Monemvasia

---

to do with the Caferoe of the *Chronicle of Monemvasia*. Caferoe is doubtless the result of a confusion, and it is not unlikely that the Kibyraeotae are meant. The author of the chronicle may have had before him an abbreviated form of Kibyraeotae (Κιβυρρ. or Κοιβαιρ.) which he did not understand. For Κιβυρρ. as an abbreviation for Κιβυραιῶται see V. Benešević, “Die byzantinischen Ranglisten,” in *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher*, 5 (Athens, 1926/1927), 120. On the Cabeiroe see further G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica. II. Sprachreste der Türkvölker in den Byzantinischen Quellen* (Budapest, 1943), p. 132.

<sup>51</sup> The Thracians were so called because they dwelled in the Thracian theme. Consequently it is impossible to determine the racial origin of those who were transferred to Lacedaemon. But the Thracian theme was deeply Hellenized, indeed almost Greek, and the people involved in the transfer, if not Greeks, were certainly Hellenized. There may also be a confusion in the case of the Armenians in that Armeniacs, i.e., people of the Armeniac theme, may be meant. In that case they may have been Greeks, for the Armeniac theme contained an important Greek element. But even if they were Armenians, they doubtless belonged to the Hellenized element of that very important people.

<sup>52</sup> For examples of such transfers of population see Charanis' review of Amantos' *Ἱστορία τοῦ Βυζαντινοῦ Κράτους*, in *Byzantion*, 15: 471 f.



says it may very well be that one of them was in western and central Peloponnesus.<sup>53</sup>

It would be interesting to know how and when the original source used by the chronicle and Arethas disappeared. It was known in 932, the year during which Arethas wrote his scholium, and, if the opinion put forward in this study about the date of the composition of the Iberikon version of the chronicle of Monemvasia is correct, it was known also at the end of the tenth century or the beginning of the eleventh. It is not impossible that it served also as a source for the synodical letter of the patriarch Nicholas to Alexius I. The statement of the patriarch that the Avars held the Peloponnesus for two hundred and eighteen years until they were defeated at the time of Nicephorus I appears also in the chronicle, and this number of years could be computed also from Arethas' scholium. Therefore, this number must have been in the original source whence the patriarch also took it. But, as the synodical letter of the patriarch was written later than either Arethas' scholium or the chronicle, it is not impossible that the patriarch drew his information from either the one or the other. Still he must have used another source too, for his story, related also by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, of how St. Andrew routed the Slavs, appears neither in the chronicle nor in Arethas' scholium. It is quite possible, of course, that all this was in the introduction of the chrysobull which Nicephorus I granted to the metropolitan of Patras when he raised the see of Patras to the status of a metropolis,

<sup>53</sup> Theophanes, *Chronographia*, edited by C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1883), 1: 486: Τούτω τῷ ἔτει, (A.M., 6302, Alexandrian era), Νικηφόρος . . . Χριστιανὸς ἀποικίσας ἐκ παντὸς θέματος ἐπὶ τὰς Σκλαυινίας γενέσθαι προσέταξεν. Vasiliev (*op. cit.*, 422) interprets Scлавinia here to refer to Greece, but more especially to the Peloponnesus; and Hopf concedes (*op. cit.*, 98-99) that Peloponnesus may have been included among the regions in which the new settlements were established. According to Arethas' scholium, Patras was rebuilt and settled with Greeks in 805, a date also confirmed by the chronicle of Monemvasia, for it says that Patras was rebuilt when Tarasius was still patriarch. Tarasius died in 806. No date is given about the rebuilding of Lacedaemon, but if the Scлавinia of Theophanes is taken to refer to Greece, the rebuilding of Lacedaemon must have taken place in 810. Hopf suggests that the siege of Patras by the Slavs as described by Porphyrogenitus (*De administrando imperio*, 217 ff.) may have been caused by an attempt to establish Greek colonies in their midst and refers to the quoted passage from Theophanes in support of his suggestion. Hopf also places the siege of Patras by the Slavs in 807 or not long after. This would mean that the Slavs, following their first defeat and the resettlement of Patras by Greeks, made an effort to regain the city and called the Arabs to their aid, as is related by Constantine Porphyrogenitus. A siege of Patras by the Slavs after that city had been resettled by Greeks would explain the statement of Porphyrogenitus that at the time of this siege Patras was inhabited by Greeks. Moreover, the attack of the Slavs against the newly built city of Patras must have convinced Nicephorus that the Hellenic element in the Peloponnesus needed reinforcement, hence his order to settle there Christians brought from the other parts of the empire.

and the patriarch Nicholas, who was acquainted with that chrysobull, may have drawn his information from it.<sup>54</sup>

Not until the first half of the fifteenth century is there another trace which seems to indicate that the source, or at least a corrupted form of it, used by Arethas for his scholium and by the author of the Iberikon version of the chronicle of Monemvasia, still existed. This was a petition addressed to patriarch Joseph II in 1429 by the metropolitan of Monemvasia, Cyril, and written by no other than Isidore of Kiev, who, after the council of Florence, remained faithful to the union and became a cardinal.<sup>55</sup> The petition was occasioned by a dispute between the metropolitan of Monemvasia and the metropolitan of Corinth concerning the jurisdiction over certain episcopal sees in the Peloponnesus, namely Mainé and Zemena.<sup>56</sup> The question was raised concerning the circumstance under which these bishoprics had come under the jurisdiction of Monemvasia and whether these circumstances still justified their retention by Monemvasia or whether they should not be returned to Corinth, to which they originally belonged. In writing this petition Isidore made full use of official and unofficial documents, in-

<sup>54</sup> According to Constantine Porphyrogenitus (*De administrando imperio*, p. 219) Nicephorus granted to the church of St. Andrew of Patras the defeated Slavs together with their families and property, apparently in the capacity of serfs, and confirmed the grant by a *sigillum*. It is not unlikely that in the introduction of the document there was a brief summary of the history of Patras and its relation to the Slavs down to the resettlement of the city by Greeks. In the later period, brief historical summaries were often included in imperial chrysobulls granted to cities. See for instance the chrysobull that Andronius II granted to the metropolis of Monemvasia in 1301. This chrysobull has been recently reëdited by St. Binon, "L'Histoire et la légende de deux chrysobulles d'Andronic II en faveur de Monembasie," *Échos d'Orient*, 37 (Paris, 1938), 310 ff. The one published by Miklosich and Müller (*Acta et diplomata graeca*, 5: 161) is not genuine.

<sup>55</sup> This document was published by Lampros in 1915 without indicating the author, (*Δύο ἀναφοραὶ μητροπολίτου Μονεμβασίας πρὸς τὸν πατριάρχην*, in *Νέος Ἑλληνομνημον*, 12: 272-318). Lampros recognized the value of the document and promised an exhaustive commentary, but never carried out his promise. G. Mercati identified the author of this document as Isidore of Kiev and showed that it was composed in 1429: G. Mercati, *Scritti d'Isidoro il Cardinale Ruteno et codici a lui appartenuti che si conservano nella biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana* (*Studi e Testi*, 46; Rome, 1926), p. 8. Since then the value of this document has been generally recognized. See V. Laurent, "La Liste épiscopale du synodicon de Monembasie," *Échos d'Orient*, vol. 33 (Paris, 1933), p. 152, note 1. Binot (*op. cit.*, 287) writes concerning the document: "La seconde, de 1429, mériterait un commentaire approfondi. S'il est vrai que la prudence doit présider à l'interprétation de cette lettre, qui est un plaidoyer plus qu'une page d'histoire, elle constitue un document historique de première qualité. Son auteur, disert et habile, a puisé aux meilleures sources: il cite pêle-mêle et sans ordre apparent, chrysobulles, prostagmata et sigillia patriarcaux; . . . il recourt à d'anciens manuscrits, à des histoires et même à des lettres de Guillaume de Villehardouin. La valeur démonstrative de la requête est indéniable." The editors of *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (24: 269) announced the publication of this text with the following remark: "Ediert aus Cod. Vatic. Palat. 226 die für die Geschichte des Peloponnes Zeitalter der Palaiologen wichtigen Texte." As for the metropolitan of Monemvasia for whom this document was written, see Laurent, *op. cit.*, p. 151 f.

<sup>56</sup> Concerning this dispute between Corinth and Monemvasia see Binot, *op. cit.*, p. 286 f.

cluding histories and letters. He was particularly anxious to prove that the capture of Corinth first by the Avars during the reign of Maurice and then by the Latins as a result of the fourth crusade had no relation to the elevation of Monemvasia to the status of a metropolis. Here is his text concerning the capture of Corinth by the Avars and the foundation of Monemvasia:

Δυοῖν τοίνυν θεωρουμένων ἀλώσεων τῆς Κορίνθου μετὰ τὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἐπικράτειαν τῆς Πελοποννήσου, μᾶς μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν Ἰουστινιανοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου, ὅς δι' αὐτὸ καὶ τὸν ἐκέισε ἰσθμὸν ὕστερον ἐτείχισε· κατ' αὐτὸν γὰρ τριῶν σκυθικῶν γενῶν τὸν Ἰστρον διαπερασάντων, Κοττιγάρους, Οὐττιγάρους καὶ Οὐνιγάρους τούτους ὠνόμαζον, τὸ μὲν ἐν τούτων γένος Μυσίαν τὴν ἄνω καὶ Παννονίαν καὶ Δαλματίαν καὶ τὰ μέχρι ἐς Ἴόνιον κόλπον ἐκ μᾶς ἐφόδου κατέδραμεν, Οὐττιγάρου δὲ Θράκην πάσαν καὶ τὴν ἐν Ἑλληςπόντῳ Χερρόνησον καὶ τὰ ἐντὸς Ἐβρου πάντα μέχρι τῶν τῆς Κωνσταντίνου προαστείων, οὓς δὴ καὶ ἀνεχαίτισε Βελισάριος, καταστρατηγησάμενος καὶ συντρίψας αὐτοὺς, Οὐνίγαροι δὲ Μακεδονίαν καὶ Θετταλίαν καὶ Ἑλλάδα καὶ τὰ ἐντὸς Θερμοπυλῶν ληισάμενοι πάντα καὶ μέχρι Κορίνθου φθάσαντες, εἶλον παραχρήμα τὴν πόλιν καὶ αὐτοβοεῖ. Σπαρτιατῶν δὲ τὸ μὲν ὅσον συρφετῶδες καὶ ἀγελαῖον τὴν ἐκείνους κοινὴν ἀκούσαντες ἄλωσιν, τοῖς ἐμπεριειλημμένοις τῇ Λακεδαίμονι καὶ ἐπανεστηκόσιν αὐτάρκως προσφυγόντες ὄρεσι, τοῦτο δ' ἂν εἴη μᾶλλον τὸ Παρθένιον ὄρος, ταῖς ἐκείνου χαράδραις καὶ τοῖς σπηλαίοις καὶ τοῖς βαράθροις ἐγκαταδεδυκότες, αὐτοὺς ὑπεξείρυσαν ἐκείνου δὴ τοῦ βαρβαρικοῦ ρεύματος, καὶ, σώζοντες ἔτι τὸ παλαιὸν ἐκείνο τῶν Λακῶνων ὄνομα, Τζάκωνας ἀντὶ Λακῶνων ἑαυτοὺς ὑποβαρβαρίζοντες λέγουσιν. Οἱ δ' αὖ ἐτύγχανον ἐμπορικὸν ἄγοντες ἐπιτήδευμα, φθάσαντες παρὰ τὸ Γύθειον ἐπίνειον δὲ τῶν Σπαρτιατῶν ἐκείνο· γυναιξὶν ἅμα καὶ τέκνοις, πληρώσαντες τὰς σφῶν αὐτῶν ναῦς, παρὰ Σικελίαν ἔθειον προσοκείλαντες δὲ εἰς Μεσσήνην, ἔκκησαν ἐκείσε, καὶ Δεμενίτας αὐτοὺς ὁ μακρὸς εἶπε χρόνος, βαρβαρίσαντας καὶ αὐτοὺς τοῦνομα· οἱ δὲ εὐγενέστεροι τούτων καὶ τῆς λαμπρᾶς τύχης καὶ τῶν εὐδαιμόνων, μαθόντες τὰ τῶν Κορινθίων ἐκεῖνα δὴ τὰ παγχάλεπα καὶ αὐτοὶ δέισαντες μὴ τὰ ὅμοια κατὰ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς γένηται, πρὸς Μονεμβασίαν ὡς εἶχον ἐχώρον εὐθὺς ὄλῳ ποδὶ, νησίον ἐπικείμενον τῇ Λακωνικῇ, νησίον ὑψηλὸν καὶ ἐπίμηκες καὶ ἀπότομον εἰδότες πάντη καὶ τῆς Θαλάττης ἰκανῶς ὑπερκείμενον καὶ φιλονεικοῦν ὡς πρὸς τὸν αἰθέρα προσαμιλλᾶσθαι καὶ παραψαίειν αὐτοῦ μᾶλλον δοκεῖν καὶ πανταχόθεν περιειλημμένον κρημνοῖς ὀρθίοις καὶ ἀβάτοις καὶ πᾶσι σχεδὸν τοῖς ὑπ' οὐρανὸν ἄβατόν τε καὶ ἀνεπιχείρητον, τῶν προκατειληφῶτων καὶ μόνων ἀνετυγχάνον, τὸ μέχρι τότε μηδεμίαν ἐσχηκὸς οἴκησιν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τοῦ τῆς Μονεμβασίας μεταλαχόν ὀνόματος. Ποῦ τοίνυν ἐνεχώρει, φηγάδας καὶ Λακεδαιμονίους ἅμα φηγάσι καὶ Κορινθίους προξένους γίγνεσθαι καὶ τούτων ὑποδοχεῖς ἢ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον σφῶν ἐκείνους ἐγκατοικίξειν αὐτῇ τὸν πλάνητας;

Following is a translation:

Of the two known captures of Corinth after the Roman domination of the Peloponnesus, one took place during the reign of Justinian the Great, who, on account of it, afterwards fortified the isthmus there. For in his time three Scythian tribes, called Cotrigurs, Utigurs, and Unigurs, crossed the Danube. One of these tribes overran by one attack upper Mysia, Pannonia, and Dalmatia as far as the Ionian sea, while the Utigurs invaded all of Thrace and the Chersonese on the Hellespont and all the territory within the Hebrus as far as the suburbs of Constantinople. However, Belisarius, deceiving them by a stratagem, checked and cut them to pieces. But the Unigurs, ravaging Macedonia and Thessaly and Greece and the territory beyond Thermopylae, arrived as far as Corinth and straightway and with one blow captured the city. When the lower and common element among the Spartans heard of this conquest, a conquest which

was common [i.e., important] to them, they fled in sufficient numbers into the high mountains which envelop Lacedaemon, especially mount Parthenion, and crept into its gullies, caves, and hollows and thus drew themselves away from the barbarous flood. And they still preserve that ancient name of Lacones, but speaking barbarously they call themselves Tzacones instead of Lacones. Those on the other hand who were engaged in commerce went to Gytheion — that was the seaport of the Spartans — with their wives and children and, boarding their ships, speeded towards Sicily, and disembarking in Messene, settled in the neighborhood and in the course of time they too barbarized their name and came to be called Demenitae. But the nobler, the brilliantly fortunate, and the more prosperous among the Spartans, having learned of the great difficulties of the Corinthians and fearing lest the same thing might happen to them, straightway, as they were, proceeded with all haste to Monemvasia, a small peninsula located in Laconia. For they saw that this peninsula was high and long and cut off from every side and situated well above the sea, rivaling the sky in height and seeming to touch it. It was surrounded by steep and impassable cliffs which made it inaccessible to, and unassailable by, any being under the sun with the exception of those only who happened to occupy it first. It was neither inhabited until then, nor did it have the name of Monemvasia. How was it possible then for the Lacedaemonians who were themselves refugees at the same time as the Corinthians to be the succorers and receivers of the latter or for their bishop to settle them in it [the Peloponnesus], a wanderer, as it were, settling wanderers?

A comparison of the text of Isidore with that of the Iberikon version of the chronicle of Monemvasia reveals certain important differences between the two. There are a number of elements which are in the chronicle, as for instance the emigration of the people of Patras to Calabria, the settlement of the Corinthians in the island of Aegina, the emigration of the Argives to Orobe, and others which do not appear in the text of Isidore. On the other hand, while the story of the emigration of the Laconians is substantially the same as that of the chronicle, the text of Isidore has a number of new elements. The Spartans who went to Sicily were principally merchants; they disembarked at Messene. Parthenion is named as one of the mountains into which the peasants among the Spartans fled.<sup>57</sup> But where the two texts differ most radically is in the date of, and the circumstance under which, the events which they both relate took place. And this raises the question whether Isidore did not use a different and a less accurate source than the one used by Arethas and the author of the chronicle.

Isidore puts the invasion of Greece and the consequent dispersion of

<sup>57</sup> One is tempted to wonder whether Gytheion, mentioned by Isidore as the port whence the Spartans left for Sicily, was actually in his source or whether he did not add it himself in order to display his learning. His wording, ἐπίγειον δὲ τῶν Σπαρτιατῶν ἐκεῖνο (Γύθειον), differs very little from the wording of Strabo, (8.3,12) in speaking of the same port: Γύθειον, τοῦ τῆς Σπάρτης ἐπιπέλου. Isidore is known to have possessed a codex of Strabo. See Remigio Sabbadini, "La traduzione guariniana di Strabone," in *Il libro e la Stampa*, n.s., 3 (1909), 14. I owe this information to my friend Milton Anastos.

the Peloponnesians in the reign of Justinian. The invasion which he describes has certain elements in common with that undertaken by the Cotrigr chief Zabergan in 558 as related by Agathias.<sup>58</sup> But between Agathias' account and that of Isidore there are a number of very important differences. According to Agathias, Zabergan divided his forces into two groups; one of these groups he sent against Greece; the other he directed against the Thracian Chersonese. The latter group, however, was in turn also divided, with one section charged with the capture of the Chersonese, while the other was led against Constantinople by Zabergan himself. The three groups were separately defeated, that under Zabergan by Belisarius, who used a clever stratagem, that at the Chersonese by Germanus, and that which had been sent against Greece by the garrison at Thermopylae. The statements of Isidore that one of the three groups into which the Cotrigurs were divided overran Mysia, Pannonia, and Dalmatia as far as the Ionian sea, and that as a consequence of this invasion Justinian fortified the Isthmus of Corinth finds no confirmation in Agathias. And as for Greece the two texts are contradictory. Agathias definitely states that the Cotrigurs were stopped at Thermopylae and were not able to penetrate into Greece,<sup>59</sup> but, according to Isidore's account, they swarmed over Greece and captured the city of Corinth. Obviously Agathias was not directly Isidore's source, for the invasion which the latter describes is made up of elements drawn not only from different sources, but belonging to different invasions.

Certainly there are elements in the account of Isidore which seem to refer to the great invasion of 539 as related by Procopius.<sup>60</sup> Procopius calls the barbarians who were responsible for that invasion Huns; other Byzantine writers refer to them as Bulgars.<sup>61</sup> Breaking into the Balkan peninsula, they plundered Illyricum from the Ionian sea to the suburbs of Constantinople; stormed the Thracian Chersonese; and, invading Greece, bypassed Thermopylae, overran the country, and "destroyed," says Procopius, "almost all the Greeks except the Peloponnesians." The three regions where, according to Procopius, the barbarians operated in this invasion were Illyricum to the Ionian sea; Thrace, including the Chersonese; and Greece. These are precisely the regions which, according to Isidore, were devastated by the

<sup>58</sup> Agathias, *History* (Bonn, 1828), p. 301 ff.; J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire* (London, 1923), 2: 304 ff.

<sup>59</sup> Agathias, *op. cit.*, p. 330. οἱ δὲ ἀνὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα πρότερον ἐσταλμένοι, οὐδέν τι ἀξιαφήγητον ἔδρασαν, μήτε τῷ Ἴσθμῷ προσβαλόντες, μηδέ γε τὴν ἀρχὴν τὰς Θερμοπύλας παραμειψάμενοι διὰ τὴν φρουρὰν τῶν ἐκείσε ἰδρύσθαι τεταγμένων Ῥωμαίων.

<sup>60</sup> Procopius, *De bello persico*, II.4; cf. *De bello gothico* III.14; III.40 where invasions of the Slavs are recorded.

<sup>61</sup> Theophanes, *op. cit.*, p. 217. Malalas (p. 437), like Procopius, calls them Huns. Vasiliev (*op. cit.*, p. 408) calls them Bulgars.

Cotrigurs, Utigurs, and Unigurs. However, Procopius does not say in this passage that the barbarians took Corinth or that Justinian fortified the isthmus as a result of this invasion. And neither Agathias nor Procopius mentions the Unigurs in connection with the invasions which both of them describe. There seems to be little doubt that Isidore confused three different invasions, that of the Bulgars of 539, that of the Cotrigurs of 558, and that of the Avars during the reign of Maurice.

How is Isidore's confusion to be explained? It is quite possible that Isidore, for some motive, wanted to place the foundation of Monemvasia in the reign of Justinian, hence the invasion as a result of which Monemvasia was founded had to be in the reign of Justinian. It must be remembered that the text in which this account of Isidore occurs was a petition addressed to the patriarch in defense of the rights of the see of Monemvasia, a petition in which every effort was made to glorify Monemvasia. The text is based on good sources and is on the whole accurate, but it is not entirely free from errors. Besides the confusion of the invasions there is another serious error: it is the attribution of the liberation of Monemvasia from the Franks and its promotion to the status of a metropolis to Andronicus II.<sup>62</sup> It is hard to believe that Isidore, who in the whole text displays exceptional knowledge of documents, histories, and letters that relate to Monemvasia, did not know that the liberator of Monemvasia was not Andronicus II, but Michael VIII. It seems rather that he willfully committed the error because he wanted to dissociate the promotion of Monemvasia to the rank of a metropolis from Michael VIII, who from the point of view of the church was not quite acceptable, and to associate it with Andronicus II, whose piety and subservience to the church were well known. Similarly, the motive for placing the invasion as a result of which Monemvasia was founded in the reign of Justinian was that Isidore wanted to associate the foundation of Monemvasia with the reign of Justinian the Great.

This explanation would account for the error in the date of the foundation of Monemvasia but not for the confusion of the different invasions of the sixth century. Did Isidore read Procopius, Agathias, and a history of the Avar invasion and then drew a composite account of the invasion as a result of which Monemvasia was founded? Not likely. More likely he drew his information from one source, a source where the confusion of the invasions and the wrong date of the foundation of Monemvasia already existed. That he used a source other than Agathias and Procopius is shown by his state-

<sup>62</sup> Lampros, *Δύο ἀναφοραὶ μητροπολίτου Μονεμβασίας πρὸς τὸν πατριάρχη* (p. 290): 'Ἀλλὰ λοιπὸν ἦν τῷ τῆς λατινικῆς ἀπαλλάξαντι τὴν Μονεμβασίαν δουλείας εἰς μητρόπολιν τετιμηῆσθαι. Καὶ τὶς οὗτος ἦν; 'Ὁ πάντ' εὐσεβῆς καὶ στερρὸς τῶν δογμάτων τῆς ἐκκλησίας [ὑπέρμαχος], ὁ δεύτερος τῶν Παλαιολόγων, ὁ κῦρ 'Ἀνδρόνικος.

ment that Justinian fortified the isthmus of Corinth as the result of the capture of Corinth, and by his attribution of the invasion of Greece to the Unigurs. That the isthmus of Corinth was fortified by Justinian is known from another work of Procopius,<sup>63</sup> but there is nothing in that account that would explain Isidore's statement that the isthmus was fortified after the capture of Corinth by the barbarians. Indeed nowhere does Procopius say that Corinth was taken by the barbarians. Nor does Agathias or Procopius attribute the invasion of Greece to the Unigurs.<sup>64</sup> Agathias has Cotrigurs, and Procopius has Huns. It seems quite probable, therefore, that Isidore used a source which had already deviated from the true tradition in so far as the chronology and the order of the events were concerned but which contained elements of whose historical accuracy there can be no doubt. To these elements belongs Isidore's account of the dispersion of the Peloponnesians, an account which must have been originally drawn from the same source that Arethas and the author of the chronicle used. Isidore's account, therefore, goes back indirectly to the source of Arethas and the author of the chronicle, but whether that source still existed at the time Isidore wrote cannot be determined. Isidore's account does prove, however, that the tradition of the dispersion of the Peloponnesians and the emigration of some to Italy as a result of the invasions of the barbarians in the sixth century was known in the fifteenth century and was accepted as a fact by the educated.

Before the publication of Arethas' scholium and Isidore's text, the chronicle of Monemvasia was the only source known which said definitely that Slavs settled in the Peloponnesus in the sixth century; that, in settling there, they exterminated many of the ancient inhabitants; and that many among the latter fled and settled elsewhere. This fact may have justified to some extent the skepticism with which this chronicle was regarded by most scholars. But with the publication of Arethas' scholium and Isidore's text this skepticism has no longer any foundation, for virtually every

<sup>63</sup> Procopius, *De aedificiis*, IV.2. It is likely that Justinian fortified the Isthmus not long after the invasion of 539, but Procopius does not say so. See J. B. Bury, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 308, note 4. On these fortifications see H. Megaw, "On the Date of the Fortifications of Corinth," *The Annual of the British School of Athens*, 32 (1931/32), 69-79. Megaw gives no exact date.

<sup>64</sup> The Unigurs (ὀνίγαροι, ὀνιγούροι, ὀννογούροι, ὀνογούροι) were known to the Byzantines in the fifth and sixth centuries, but no known source speaks of an invasion of the empire by them in the sixth century. It is not unlikely, however, that elements of this people joined the Cotrigurs in their great invasion of 558. Menander (*op. cit.*, p. 202) calls the followers of Zabergan "Huns." More probably they are the Huns of Procopius who invaded the empire in 539, called also Bulgarians by other sources. In a text of the early eighth century we read ἔθνους τῶν ὀννογούρων βουλγάρων. In other words, there were certain Bulgars who were also called ὀννογούροι. Julius Moravcsik, "Zur Geschichte der Onoguren," in *Ungarische Jahrbücher*, 10 (Berlin and Leipzig, 1930), 67. Moravcsik considers this people as the ancestors of the later Hungarians. See also Moravcsik, "Les Sources byzantines de l'histoire hongroise," *Byzantion*, 9 (Brussels, 1934), 666-673. Also Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, II: 189.

notice contained in the chronicle is confirmed by another source. Lampros, writing in 1884, said that "the basis of the chronicle . . . is historical and old," but at some later date, perhaps at the time the Turin and Koutloumoussion versions were written, there were introduced into the original version "mythical accounts about the emigration and return of the Peloponnesians."<sup>65</sup> Years later virtually the same view was expressed by Bees.<sup>66</sup> That was because neither Lampros nor Bees was able to find another source that confirmed the chronicle. The discovery of Arethas' scholium rendered the opinion of both Lampros and Bees obsolete. Kougeas, in publishing Arethas' scholium, remarked that the scholium of Arethas refutes the view of Lampros "according to which what is said in the chronicle about the emigration and dispersion of the Peloponnesians at the time of Maurice and their return at the time of Nicephorus was considered to be tales and made up additions" of later writers.<sup>67</sup> With the objections of Lampros disposed of 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 on the Avar and Slav penetration of Greece during the reign of Maurice.

From this observation there follow certain inescapable conclusions. It can no longer be doubted that Slavs settled in the Peloponnesus during the reign of Maurice; that, in settling, they exterminated part of the ancient population and forced others to disperse and emigrate. It is no longer possible either to interpret the term "Greece" as used by Evagrius and Menander to mean anything else than Greece proper, or to discuss the question of the hellenization of Sicily and southern Italy in the seventh century without some reference to the Greek settlements which the Peloponnesians who fled before the Avars and Slavs established there. But it by no means follows that the Greek element completely disappeared from the Peloponnesus and that the modern Greeks are Christians of Slavonic descent in whose veins flows "not a single drop of real pure Hellenic blood."<sup>68</sup> For the source, on whose authority it must be said that Slavs settled in the Peloponnesus in the

<sup>65</sup> Lampros, *Tò perì ktíσεως Μονεμβασίας χρονικόν*, p. 128. Hopf (*op. cit.*, 85: 107-108) had already called the account of the chronicle concerning the emigration of the Peloponnesians a myth, a confusion with the Greek colonizations of Sicily and Italy in ancient times or possibly with the Albanian migration of the fourteenth century. Hopf thought that the chronicle had been written in the sixteenth century.

<sup>66</sup> Bees, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

<sup>67</sup> Kougeas, *op. cit.*, p. 476.

<sup>68</sup> Fallmerayer, *Geschichte der Halbinsel Morea während des Mittelalters* (Stuttgart, 1830), I, iii-xiv, as quoted by A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, I (Madison, Wisconsin, 1928), 213-214.



sixth century, says also that they did not penetrate the eastern part of it, which was settled and remained settled by Greeks. But this is not all. When under Irene, but more especially under Nicephorus, the authority of the imperial government was reestablished in the Peloponnesus as a whole, the Hellenic element which had remained there was powerfully reinforced and the Slavonic influence began gradually to decline. The most important step in the realization of this end was the resettlement of certain parts of the Peloponnesus, such as Patras and Lacedaemon, with new elements brought from other parts of the empire — elements some of which were pure Greek, like those who were brought from Calabria, others less pure, but doubtless hellenized. Constantinople saved the Greek race in Greece itself, and among the emperors who contributed most in the accomplishment of this end Nicephorus I must henceforth be given first place.

#### POST SCRIPTUM

When this work was composed I did not have access to a number of publications which had appeared in Europe during the war or immediately after. Additional publications have appeared since.

Among these publications the work by Max Vasmer is no doubt the most significant.<sup>1</sup> A book of 350 pages, it is devoted primarily to the examination of the etymology of toponyms in Greece in an effort to determine the distribution and extent of the Slavonic settlements. There is one chapter dealing with the literary sources, but no mention is made of the chronicle of Monemvasia or of the scholium of Arethas; the latter, of course, gives the former its significance. Very interesting, however, is the distribution of the toponyms in the Peloponnesus which Vasmer considers as Slavic. This distribution is as follows: <sup>2</sup> Corinth 24, Argolis 18, Achaia 95, Elis 35, Triphylia 44, Arcadia 94, Missenia 43, Laconia 81. These figures confirm what the chronicle of Monemvasia says, that the eastern part of the Peloponnesus was least affected by the Slavonic penetration. Vasmer accepts the view that Slavs settled in the Peloponnesus as early as the sixth century.<sup>3</sup>

Shortly after the publication of Vasmer's work two studies dealing with the same general subject appeared in Greece. The one was by C. Amantos; <sup>4</sup> the other by Dion. Zakythinos.<sup>5</sup> The work of Amantos is actually a review of Vasmer's book, where the reviewer makes some contributions of his own.

<sup>1</sup> Max Vasmer, *Die Slaven in Griechenland* (*Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Jahrgang 1941. Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Nr. 12*) (Berlin, 1941).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 317.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 14 f.

<sup>4</sup> C. Amantos, *Οι Σλάβοι εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα*, in *Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher*, 17 (1944), 210-221.

<sup>5</sup> Dion. Zakythinos, *Οι Σλάβοι ἐν Ἑλλάδι* (Athens, 1945).

These contributions are almost wholly philological in character and do not affect our study here. It may be noted, however, that Amantos still holds to the theory that when Evagrius and Menander speak of the devastations of Greece by the Avars and Slavs toward the end of the sixth century, by Greece they mean not Greece proper, but the possessions of the empire in the Balkan peninsula. Accordingly, as against Vasmer, he denies that Slavs settled in Greece toward the end of the sixth century.

Of the work of Zakythinos I have written at length elsewhere.<sup>6</sup> It is a good book, based upon the sources and the most scholarly of modern works. To both the chronicle of Monemvasia and the scholium of Arethas Zakythinos devotes considerable discussion and comes to the conclusion that they were drawn from the same source, a source, however, whose "original core must be sought, far from the written tradition, in the oral richness of the Peloponnesian people," and consequently "the information according to which the Peloponnesus was subjected definitely by the Slavs in the year 588, lacks any significance." In the long review which I devoted to this book I tried to show why these conclusions are not acceptable. Zakythinos himself seems to have changed his views in another study which he has published more recently. He writes: "Nevertheless, if we have some difficulty in admitting that the chronicle of Monemvasia 'constitutes one of the most precious sources of the history of the Byzantine empire,' we are, on the other hand, disposed to acknowledge a historical value in certain of its parts. Despite its legendary presentation, the information concerning the emigration *en masse* and the internal movement of the population, constitute a solid historical core."<sup>7</sup>

The chronicle of Monemvasia was the subject of a dissertation submitted for the doctorate to the Faculty of Philology of the University of Athens and published in 1947.<sup>8</sup> This book consists of two parts. The one is a study of the chronicle of Monemvasia, its various versions, its sources, nature, date of its composition, and its meaning. The other, and by far the longer, deals with the problem of the etymology of the term Tsacones. For a detailed and critical account of this book I refer the reader to the long review which I devoted to it.<sup>9</sup>

The question of the Slavonic settlements in the Peloponnesus was also treated by the well-known Greek scholar, S. P. Kyriakides.<sup>10</sup> The study of

<sup>6</sup> See the post scriptum to my article, "Nicephorus I, the Savior of Greece from the Slavs (810 A.D.)," *Byzantina-Metabyzantina*, 1 (1946), 86-92. See also *Byzantinoslavica*, 10 (1949), 94-96.

<sup>7</sup> Dion. Zakythinos, "La population de la morée byzantin," *L'Hellénisme Contemporain*, 2<sup>ème</sup> série, 3<sup>ème</sup> Année (Athens, 1949), 23 f.

<sup>8</sup> Sp. A. Pagoulatos, *Οἱ Τσακωνες καὶ τὸ περὶ κτίσεως τῆς Μονεμβασίας χρονικόν* (Athens, 1947).

<sup>9</sup> *Byzantinoslavica*, 10 (1949), 92-94.

<sup>10</sup> S. P. Kyriakides, *Βυζαντινὰ Μελέται. Οἱ Σλάβοι ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ* (Salonica, 1947).

Kyriakides is, to a considerable extent, a study of the sources. On two of these sources the author lays particular stress: (1) the passage in the *De Administrando* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus concerning the revolt of the Slavs and their attack upon Patras during the reign of Nicephorus I; and (2) the famous synodical letter of the patriarch Nicholas (1084–1111) to the emperor Alexius Comnenus. On the basis of these two sources he builds an extremely ingenious hypothesis by means of which he seeks to invalidate as historical sources both the chronicle of Monemvasia and the scholium of Arethas. To this book of Kyriakides I have devoted a special study. I show there that the arguments he uses to bolster his conclusions have no validity.<sup>11</sup>

Four other works on the subject of the Slavonic settlements in Greece need to be mentioned: A book by Alexander N. Diomedes, the well-known Greek financier and politician who in recent years has shown considerable interest in the history of Byzantium and has made some important contributions; this book, which came out in 1946, is a useful summary of the question as that question is treated in Greece.<sup>12</sup> A study by D. Georgakas in which the author takes issue with Vasmer on the etymology of certain toponyms.<sup>13</sup> The essay on the history of the Peloponnesus which Georg Stadtmüller contributed to a general work dealing with that peninsula which was published in Athens during the war, for the German soldiers.<sup>14</sup> Stadtmüller accepts the view that Slavonic settlements were established in the Peloponnesus during the reign of Maurice and that the power of the Slavs there was not broken until the beginning of the ninth century. And finally the capital work on Philippi and eastern Macedonia published by Paul Lemerle. Lemerle's discussion of the question of Slavonic settlements in Greece is relegated to a long footnote and his treatment is not systematic. He contents himself with posing the problem, citing some of the sources and discussing the position of modern Greek scholars.<sup>15</sup> That Slavs established themselves in the Peloponnesus he does not doubt, but expresses no definite view as to the date of their coming. He mentions neither the chronicle of Monemvasia nor the scholium of Arethas.

<sup>11</sup> *Byzantinoslavica*, X (1949), 254–259.

<sup>12</sup> A. N. Diomedes, *Βυζαντινὰ Μελέται*. Β'. Αἱ Σλαβικαὶ ἐπιδρομαὶ εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ ἡ πολιτικὴ τοῦ Βυζαντίου (Athens, 1946).

<sup>13</sup> D. Georgakas, "Beiträge zur Deutung als Slavisch Erklärter Ortsnamen," *Byzant. Zeitschrift*, 41 (1942), 351–381.

<sup>14</sup> *Der Peloponnes. Landschaft. Geschichte. Kunststätten*. Von Soldaten für Soldaten. Herausgegeben von einem Generalkommando (Athens, 1944), 42–159.

<sup>15</sup> Paul Lemerle, *Philippe et la Macédoine orientale à l'époque chrétienne et byzantine* (Paris, 1945), p. 116, n. 3.