

SPEROS VRYONIS, Jr.

Michael W. Weithmann, *Die Slavische Bevölkerung auf der Griechischen Halbinsel. Ein Beitrag zur Historischen Ethnographie Südosteuropas*, Dr. Rudolf Trofenik, München 1978

*(Review Essay)*

Any new study on the much vexed history of the Slavs in Greece is naturally of interest in the disciplines of Byzantinology, Balkan Studies and Slavistics. Such a study is of particular interest to the readers of the present journal and so with this in mind I have prepared this very detailed, analytical review article of the book of Weithmann. The reader will see that Dr. Weithmann has touched upon all the major problems that the topic entails, further that he has taken a position in each of these problems, and that whether the reader agrees or not with these positions Weithmann's explanation has to be heard and contemplated.

In the foreword (pp. vii-ix) Weithmann sets forth his task/goal, which is to achieve an understanding of a very important phase in the "historical ethnography" and "historical demography" of Southeastern Europe: (a) The occupation of parts of the Greek peninsula by Slavic tribes, and (b) the "continuity" of these Slavs in Greek lands and their fate there. Under the term "historical ethnography" the author means the description of the historical change of a specific people in a specific district at a given time, in the present case of the Slavs in the Greek peninsula at the time of the occupation of the land up until their de facto incorporation within the Byzantine Empire. By the phrase "historical demography" Weithmann means the description of the totality of the population inside a region, in this case a description of the Greeks and Slavs and of their ethnic, political, cultural, and social interaction on one another. When he speaks of *Völker* or *Stämmen*, in relation to Greeks and Slavs, he does so within the concept of *Abstammungsgemeinschaft* (*natio*, *gens*), i.e. in the sense of a group with a common culture and speech. He further delimits his topic geographically as being constrained to the Greek peninsula (for him the region south of the Roman *Via Egnatia*). Chronologically he is concerned with two phases: (a) The Slavic occupation of parts of the Greek land (*Landnahme*), not to be equated with the politico-military concept of conquest (*Eroberung*); (b) The period stretching from the *Eroberung* into the later middle ages. He proposes to analyse the consequences

of this Slavic Landnahme from the political point of view (relations with Byzantine centers), from the cultural point of view (linguistic influence), and from the point of view of the geography of settlement. In recognition of the insufficiency of the written sources, for the purposes of the analysis of his scholarly problem, Weithmann proposes to examine, in addition to these frequently studied written sources, the topographic, philological, and archaeological evidence. Weithmann closes the short foreword by acknowledging a debt to Professor Georg Stadtmüller, a debt which is apparent not only from the interest in the subject but also from the methodology, for which see Stadtmüller, *Forschungen zur albanischen Frühgeschichte*, *Albanische Forschungen* 2 (Wiesbaden, 1966).

In the Introduction (1-53) he treats four topics: (I) The Slavic question and its historico-intellectual background; (II) The state of historical research; (III) Problems of historiographical transmission; (IV) The written sources. The first three of these topics are handled skimpily, the fourth is treated in satisfactory detail. It is obvious that an inseparable component of the analysis of ethnogenesis is an analysis of the perception of this ethnogenesis by the people or peoples involved and by the concerned scholars. Weithmann attempts to compress into five pages the history of the Slavic question in Greece and its historico-intellectual background. He justifiably underlines Fallmerayer's political outlook as a key to understanding the Bavarian historian's pronouncements on the descent of the modern Greeks. Driven by his political liberalism and by the fear of Russian territorial expansion, he saw the liberation of Greece from the Ottoman Empire as a weakening of the latter (an anti-Russian force) and as a strengthening of Russia. This latter, for Fallmerayer, was the consequence of the fact that the Greeks shared with the Russians a common Orthodox Christian faith. It is at this point that Fallmerayer levelled his "learned hammerblows" at the "cloudy-cuckoo nest" (*Wolkenkuckucksheim*) of the European Philhellenes in attempting to prove that the Greeks were not only attached to the Russians by common religious bonds, but that they were even related to them by a common ethnic origin, i.e. they were in effect Slavs. What enraged Fallmerayer was his perception of the European Philhellenes as politically naive and as unaware of the fact that the removal of the Ottomans would inaugurate a Graeco-Slavic empire arrayed with the Byzantine institutions of Caesaropapism-autocracy and which could attain the hegemony over the Latin West. As Weithmann indicates, this background is all too often ignored by the scholars who have dealt with the ethnic problems that Fallmerayer's work raised. He then presents us with a survey of the dispute which ensued between supporters and contradic-

tors of Fallmeyer's pronouncements on Slavs and Greeks. This presentation is, in the opinion of the reviewer, quite inadequate given the length, violence and influence of this dispute, and given its importance for the history of Byzantium and of the intellectual milieu within which much of today's scholarly discussion transpires. He relies heavily on the excellent study of G. Veloudis, "Jacob Fallmeyer und die Entstehung des neugriechischen Historismus", *Südostforschungen*, XXIX (1970), 43-90. It is of interest to note that Fallmeyer was finally demonized, early, in modern Greece to the point that though he was actually a Slavophobe he came to be considered a Panslavist and an agent of the Tsar. The author reacts to D. Zakythinis' work *Oi Elláδοι ἐν Ἑλλάδι* (Athens, 1945), iv, and the charges made therein against his mentor G. Stadtmüller, "der Vorwurf des Neofallmeyerismus ist sogar noch gegen Stadtmüller erhoben worden!". If Weithmann had wished to be consistent he should have given the "geistesgeschichtlicher Hintergrund" here as well, and not only in the case of Fallmeyer. To wit, Stadtmüller came to Greece as an officer in the Nazi armies which occupied that country as victors, at a time when Bulgaria had occupied a segment of northern Greece, had expelled its Greek population, and initiated a sizable, Bulgarian colonization. Stadtmüller proceeded to author a book, *Der Peloponnes. Landschaft, Geschichte, Kunstaten* (Athens, 1944) intended for the consumption of the occupying Nazi armies and for the propagation of certain ideas about the Slavs and modern Greeks.

Part II, *Stand der historischen Forschung* (pp. 6-13) is a continuation of part I, in which Weithmann refers, very briefly, to the scholarship on the subject in the post-war era. He divides the scholars of this era into those who view the matter as an aspect of early Slavic history and into those who examine it within the domain of Byzantine historical ethnography. He emphasizes the importance of studying early Slavic history in those lands which, despite the appearance of Slavs in the past, managed, nevertheless, to maintain their own linguistic and ethnic character. The first such study "in einem heute nicht mehr slavischen Gebiet" is that undertaken by Stadtmüller for early Albanian history (p. 7). Weithmann's above statement is unclear, for on the one hand he assumes that present-day Albania was once a Slavic province (Slavischen Gebiet) and yet Stadtmüller's title refers to Albanischen Frühgeschichte. To say that Slavs settled in the area is one thing, to speak of Albania as once having been a Slavic province is another. I do not at this point dispute or confirm either statement, but the point is that Weithmann should be precise in such matters. The confusion continues when Weithmann indicates that he will apply Stadtmüller's "philologisch-siedlungsgeographische

Methode”, to the “slavische frühmittelalterliche Geschichte Griechenlands”. To speak of the “Slavic medieval history of Greece”, might imply one of two things: (a) A medieval history of Greece as seen by Slavs or from the point of view of the Slavs settled there, or (b) The medieval history of Greece was Slavic. Obviously this is quite different from the book’s title which, correctly, is “The Slavic population on the Greek peninsula”. Because of the considerable area for error and misunderstanding, the author should have been consistent and more careful. As to the method of Stadtmüller, it is a merit of Weithmann that he has attempted to apply it. The difficulty lies in the unsatisfactory present-day state of toponymical research in Greece and specifically in the domain of micro-toponymy. He indicates, briefly, certain trends in post-war historiography on the Slavs in Greece, trends often vitiated by ethnocentrism and other non-scientific assumptions, which either minimize or exaggerate the presence and role of the newcomer invaders-settlers and of the Greeks in Greece (I shall refer to the “Greek peninsula” (sic Weithmann) as Greece for the sake of convenience and without any implication as to its political status). As an example of the latter, he refers to the late Greek scholar A. Stratos who says that the Slavic invasions remained without any consequence, and to R. J. Jenkins who posits the complete extirpation of the Greeks. Weithmann, basing himself on the substantive, indeed fundamental, studies of Charanis takes a position between the two extremes: neither can the Slavic presence be ignored nor can one speak of the extermination of the Greeks. In his basic scheme and conclusions I would agree with the author, and above all I should at this point remark that Weithmann has dealt with the subject in a calm and evenhanded manner. His spirit should be recommended to all who wish to deal with such emotional historical problems. Nevertheless, since he has gotten into the problem (in parts I and II) of the history of the scholarly dispute over the Slavs in Greece, the continuity or extirpation of the Greeks, the intellectual dispute, and the status of the questions he should have presented the reader with a more incisive and more detailed treatment. For an introduction to this important historical question in the era of post-war scholarship and debate I might be permitted to refer to my own study *Recent Scholarship on Continuity and Discontinuity of Culture: Classical Greeks, Byzantines, Modern Greeks*, in *The ‘Past’ in Medieval and Modern Greek Culture*, ed. S. Vryonis (Malibu, 1978), 237-256, which appeared too late for Weithmann to consult.

In passing one should note, and since Weithmann does attempt to assay an intellectual history of the question he ought to have done so himself, R. Jenkin’s own “geistesgeschichtliche Hintergrund” which matches to a certain

degree that of Fallmerayer. Jenkins was a strong English nationalist and a proponent of the British Empire, he had served in its intelligence service, and was violently opposed to any political movement which he considered to be inimical to the empire's welfare and continuity. For him this was primary, whether he contemplated the Cypriot movement for independence or the political aspirations of the Soviet Union. His Russophobia, so virulently evident in his Cincinnati Lectures, parallels that of Fallmerayer, but his politics within the post-World War II political environment were stridently reactionary, in contrast to those of Fallmerayer which in the context of mid-nineteenth century Europe were enlightened and liberal. A second area of agreement between the two savants, and one which Weithmann ignores, is racism. Ethnicity for them depends exclusively upon a purity of blood (or else the right admixture of "Nordic and Mediterranean bloods") upon "biological factors". Both were in debt to Gobineau in this respect. Byzantinists, whether Greek or non-Greek, have by and large failed to disentangle themselves and their historical thinking from the pseudoscience of racist ethnology first put forward in Byzantine studies by Fallmerayer and then so strongly and passionately restated in our own times by Jenkins. The untroubled acceptance of Jenkins' utterances in this respect by the towering and venerable authority in Byzantine history in our age, G. Ostrogorsky (*History of the Byzantine State*, revised edition, New Brunswick, 1969, p. 94, note no. 1: "On the ethnic changes that took place on Byzantine territory and especially on the question of the Slavs in Greece, cf. the thorough discussion by R.J.H. Jenkins, *Byzantium and Byzantinism*, 21 ff.") is testimony to this fact.

It is surely one of the methodological strengths of Weithmann's book that he attempts to weave the archaeological data into this treatment. He is not, however, thorough, as will appear (both at this point in the review and later) in his handling of this material. On page 13 he states that the newest state of research on the settlement of the Balkan peninsula by the Slavs, from the archaeological point of view, is the article by the Yugoslav archaeologist V. Popović, "Les témoins archéologiques des invasions avaroslaves dans l'Illyricum Byzantin", *Mélanges de l'école française de Rome (Antiquité)*, vol. 87, 1 (1975), 445-504. But Popović states explicitly that he intends to cover comprehensively the archaeological data only from the ancient diocese of Dacia, p. 448, thus for only one portion of the Balkan peninsula. (Since the appearance of Weithmann's book Popović has published other studies including *La descente des Koutrigours, des Slaves et des Avars vers la mer Égée: Témoignage de l'archéologie*, Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres. Comptes rendus des seances de l'année 1978, juillet-octobre, 596-648.

Parts III-IV (pp. 14-53) are dedicated to the written sources on the subject. In this the author presents no new or original finds but performs a service in assembling a catalogue of the sources with an exposition of the views of various scholars on the dating, contents and reliability of these written accounts. He observes, correctly, the absence of sufficient source material, the concentration on Constantinopolitan and dynastic events. This changes with the writings of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus and of course the local sources (particularly the *Miracula* of St. Demetrius and the *Chronicle of Monemvasia*) are a notable exception. He discusses these sources and the studies pertaining to them in seven categories.

1. Greek and Latin sources of the sixth and seventh centuries.
2. Syriac sources of the sixth and seventh centuries.
3. Sources contemporary to and close to the period from the seventh to the tenth century.
4. Later sources that deal with the period from the sixth to the tenth century.
5. The *Chronicle of Monemvasia*.
6. Sources of the tenth to the twelfth century.
7. Sources of the period from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century. Weithmann pays particular attention to the two local sources, i.e. the *Miracula Sancti Demetrii* and the *Chronicle of Monemvasia*. Since the publication of Weithmann's work Lemerle has published a new edition of the text of the *Miracula* and a second volume consisting of commentary on the text: *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint Démétrius. I Le texte. II Commentaire* (Paris, 1980-1981). As to the new edition of the text I have now compared it with the older text of Tougard and have found that the new edition adds nothing new in the way of historical data. The Lemerle edition adds a number of sentences and phrases (in the section concerning us here) of rhetorical and/or hagiographical interest. The volume of commentary, though detailed, is certainly not final. By way of example Lemerle has changed his earlier view on the date of the first major Slavic attack on Thessaloniki. Whereas in an earlier study he had opted for a date later in the reign of Maurice, 597, he here changes to 586, as per Barišič, without convincing evidence or reasoning for so doing (vol. II *Commentaire*, p. 54, note 65, and 96 ff.).

Our author gives considerable space (rightfully) to a discussion of the

famous Chronicle of Monemvasia (pp. 33-41). He takes a position on the historical importance of the data in this chronicle which its first editor named or misnamed (Pasini, 1749) the Chronicle of Monemvasia but which Lemerle more appropriately termed Chronicle of the Metropolitanate of Patras. Basing his judgment on the researches of Charanis, Lemerle, Barišič and Dujčev. Weithmann concludes that the historical value of the Iviron text of the Chronicle can no longer be doubted as regards the events of the period from the sixth to the ninth century. The contrary views of Zakythinos (that it is a historically worthless oral tradition) and Kyriakides (its data ultimately repose on a pious forgery associated with Nicephorus I and intended to sanctify the claims of the metropolitanate of Patras), and the views of other Greek scholars relying on either or both Zakythinos and Kyriakides, are no longer tenable in the face of the findings of Charanis et al. Weithmann adds that beyond the general principle of the historical importance of the Chronicle's data there are areas of legitimate disagreement (a) Authorship, (b) Time of composition, (c) Relation of Arethas to the Chronicle. The author tells us that the date of composition, which must fall between 784-806 (patriarchate of Tarasius) and the re-erection of the suffragant bishopric of Lacedemon under Patras (therefore prior to 1082-3) is set differently by various scholars. Charanis, seizing upon the reference to Nicephorus the Elder in the Chronicle, assumed the existence of Nicephorus II. Therefore for him the dating of the composition must be between 963-969 and 1082-1083. Dujčev brought a further narrowing of the dates by his observation that the mention of Stroimos (Sirmium) as being in Bulgaria, means that the text had to be written before 1018 and the destruction of the Bulgarian kingdom. Lemerle, rejecting the reference to Nicephorus *the Elder* as a later interpolation, states that the Chronicle must have been written between 806 and 932. It is my own opinion that Lemerle has not justified his rejection of Nicephorus *the Elder* as a scribal interpolation but has arbitrarily stated it to be the case. Second, Dujčev's observation on Stroimon as being in Bulgaria is significant.

I must agree with Weithmann as to his general position on the importance of the historical data in the Chronicle of Monemvasia, and yet I do so with certain additional reservations. The Chronicle reflects, *grosso modo*, an important historical fact, to wit the Slavs entered the Peloponnese in the late sixth century. Beyond this it would be dangerous to accept each detail without exhaustive research, i.e., as in the case of the 'regnal' years of the Avars (Avaro-Slavs) in the Peloponnese.

Recent archaeological findings have indicated the validity of both these propositions. Weithmann seems to have missed (perhaps it was already too

late since his book came out in 1978) the preliminary announcement of the French School of the results of its excavations at Argos in the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 1976. Herein we read that in excavating Bath "A" they found black cinders and several fragments of Slavic pottery in the deserted bath, "mettant la destruction en rapport avec les invasions de la fin du VIe ou du tout debut du VIIe s. après JC" (*Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, C (1976), II, 748, "Rapports sur les travaux de l'École française en 1975"). In the report of the following year (published in 1977) further Slavic sherds were found in the destruction and debris north of the stoa of the baths and the destructive Slavic raids were tentatively dated to 585-586 (*Rapport sur les travaux de l'école française en Grèce en 1976*", *BCH*, CI (1977), II, 699. Considerably earlier, from 1959 through 1967, the clearing of the ground for the new museum at Olympia revealed a considerable number of Slavic graves, so identified by N. Yalouris from the finding of the so-called Prague pottery and the incineration of the dead. (Yalouris, *Ἀρχαιολογικὸν Δελτίον*, XVI (1960), 125-126; XVII (1961/62), 106; XIX (1964), 174-176; XX (1965), 209; XXI, B1 (1966), 170. Weithmann has noted only the report in volume XVII (1961/62). Inasmuch as these Slavic graves were found immediately after the late Roman (early Byzantine) stratum, Yalouris tentatively dated the graves to the sixth century.

Since these important finds were made at Argos and Olympia, P. Yannopoulos and P. Aupert have published three important studies that date the Slavic attack on Argos to 585 (these finds will be discussed in greater detail at a later point in the review), P. Yannopoulos, "La pénétration slave à Argos", 323-372; P. Aupert, "Ceramique slave à Argos (585 ap. JC)", 373-394, Aupert, "Objets de la vie quotidienne à Argos en 585 ap. JC", pp. 395 ff. All three studies are in *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, *Etudes Argiennes* (1980), VI. At the same time the archaeologists conclude that the Slavic occupation of Argos lasted for one year and that in 586 the Byzantines drove them out. Archaeology has given the decisive answer as to the reliability-unreliability of the basic fact in the Chronicle of Monemvasia. The Avaro-Slavs were sufficiently powerful to enter the Peloponnese and to take Argos in 585. The Byzantines were sufficiently powerful to remove them one year later. The Slavs did enter the Peloponnese in significant numbers (as per the Chronicle of Monemvasia) but the Byzantines were not expelled completely from the peninsula in the period from 587/8 to 805/6 or for the period of 218 years mentioned by the Chronicle. This coincides with the results of a closer examination of the writings of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus. «Νίκηφόρος τὰ τῶν Ῥωμαίων σκῆπτρα ἐκράτει, καὶ οὗτοι ἐν τῷ θέματι ὄντες Πε-



λοποννήσου ἀπόστασιν ἐννοήσαντες, πρῶτον μὲν τὰς τῶν γειτόνων οἰκίας τῶν Γραικῶν ἐξεπόρθουν καὶ εἰς ἄρπαγὴν ἐτίθετο, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ κατὰ τῶν οἰκητόρων τῆς τῶν Πατρῶν ὀρμήσαντες πόλεως, τὰ πρὸ τοῦ τείχους πεδία κατέστρεφόν τε καὶ ταύτην ἐπολιόρκουν, μεθ' ἑαυτῶν ἔχοντες καὶ Ἀφρικοὺς Σαρακηνοὺς» (*DAI*, ch. 49).

While it is true that the Chronicle of Monemvasia relates a basic historical truth, i.e. the significant entry of Slavs into the peninsula during the reign of Maurice, the reviewer would conclude that one cannot rely on any specific detail contained in this chronicle without exhaustive historical and archaeological analysis.

It is B. Hauptteil (pp. 54-252) which constitutes the bulk of the book and is divided into three parts:

- I. Die slavische Bevölkerung auf der griechischen Halbinsel nach historischen Quellen.
- II. Erträge der Ortsnamenkunde und Philologie.
- III. Aussagen der Archäologie.

#### *I. Die slavische Bevölkerung auf der griechischen Halbinsel*

In section 1 (Die griechischen Halbinsel am Vorabend der slavischen Südwanderung (pp. 54-84), Weithmann deals first with the condition of the 'Greek peninsula' on the eve of the Slavic raids. The picture which he draws is one of decline but with reservations. It is for him a decline already observable in the time of Pausanias (as per Hopf and Bon), given a certain impetus by foreign invasions (Visigoths 395-6, Vandals 467, 474, Ostrogoths 482-4), and manifested in the taxes remitted to Achaea in 414. This economic decline is accompanied by wholesale Christianization at the end of the fourth century (symbolized by the closing of the Olympic Games) and culminating in the closing of the Academy in Athens by Justinian 529. He indicates (p. 61) the limited nature of the written sources which dwell on natural catastrophes, barbarian invasions and other negative events, and that in any case the negative picture, emerging from the written sources, is contradicted, the author says, by the extraordinary building program of Christian basilicas from the fourth through the sixth century. "Die rege sekuläre Bautätigkeit des 4. bis 6. Jahrhunderts spricht für eine eigentlich unerwartete Blüte des frühchristlichen Griechenlands" (p. 59) (and on page 61: "...eine künstlerische Blüte von ausserordentlichen Glanz..."). Relying on two earlier studies of Zakythinos, he refers to the building of over 300 Christian basilicas in "Greece" during

this period. In a work which appeared too late for Weithmann to have seen the number and details of our knowledge about these basilicas have been substantially increased (D. Pallas, *Les monument paléochrétiens de Grèce découvertes de 1959 à 1973*, Rome, 1977). This seeming (to Weithmann) dissonance between municipal decline and flourishing building activity on the ecclesiastical level, is not in fact contradictory. I would suggest that this in itself does not indicate so much a decline in economic activity as in the redistribution of the local wealth of late ancient towns and their territories. The wealth of the towns was reduced, it is true, in the fourth and fifth century in the following manner. The central government claimed a significant share of municipal wealth for its growing armies and bureaucracy, and the church and large landowners began to alienate municipal land and wealth. Thus a portion of the older sources of municipal wealth once spent on civic building came into the hands of bishops who used it to build the basilicas. The process has been clearly conceptualized and described by the Bulgarian scholar V. Velkov in his important book (unnoted by Weithmann), *Cities in Thrace and Dacia in Late Antiquity* (Amsterdam, 1974).

Weithmann then discusses, in turn, the interrelated themes of Justinian's preoccupation with the reconquest of the West, the neglect of the Balkans which such a policy entailed, and Justinian's massive program of building and/or of rebuilding towns, fortresses and walls. This is followed by a discussion of the role of the Avars and of the principal landmarks of the Slavic settlement of the Balkans. For the author the slavische Landnahme is a phenomenon that transpired between 582 and 626, often in relation to the policies and wars of the Avar Khaqans. A nomadic warrior people with a tradition of strong centralized political authority, the Avars had a varied relation with the Slavs, who were an agricultural people still immersed in a polyarchic tribal society. By and large the relations of the two peoples varied according to the areas in which the Slavs were settled. In Pannonia, the center of Avar power, they were subject to immediate rule and to suppression, whereas in the Danubian region of Wallachia they were relatively free under their various tribal chieftains. But in either case they came together with the Avars in what Weithmann refers to as Kampfgemeinschaft, always under the tutelage of the Avar Khaqans. The author draws two very clear points, however. According to his view there were common Avaro-Slav invasions south of the Danube, but only a Slavic Landnahme. Second, despite the varying degrees of political tutelage which the Slavic tribes experienced at the hands of the Avars, there is no evidence of Avar influence on the Slavs.

“In der materiellen Hinterlassenschaft der Slaven an der mittleren Donau

gibt es keinen Anzeichen eines irgendwie tieferen Eingriffes des Avaren in das Leben der dortigen bäuerlichen Bevölkerung" (p. 73). According to the author the cultural and social evolution of the Slavs does not result from Avar influence but from contact with Byzantine culture. While the basic import of the proposition seems to be true, yet how is one to explain the importance of the title of župan among the Slavs, which according to the latest interpretation is of Avaric origin? (P. Malingoudis, "Die Institution des Zupans als Problem der frühslavischen Geschichte. Einige Bemerkungen", *Cyrrillomethodianum*, II (1972-73, 61-76).

As to the first proposition, that though there were Avaro-Slavic invasions south of the Danube there were only Slavic settlements, there is the annoying fact that the Greek sources occasionally speak of Avar settlement as well.

In the narration of key dates-events Weithmann follows the basic pattern established by Barišić, Popović, Grafenauer, and others. (He has not referred to the more recent and comprehensive studies of Barišić and Grafenauer in the symposium papers entitled: Simpozijum predslovenski etnički elementi na Balkanu u etnogenezi Juznih Slovena (Sarajevo, 1969); Barišić, "Proces slovenske kolonizacije Balkanu", 11-27; Grafenauer, "Proces doseljavanja Slovena na zapadni Balkan i u istočne Alpe", 29-55. He gives the following dates of the landmark events:

- 582 Fall of Sirmium to the Avars
- 586 First major attack on Thessaloniki by Avaro-Slavs
- 600 Maurice and Avars conclude peace on Danube
- 611 Slavs appear in Illyria, Dalmatia and Istria in great numbers
- 614/15 Fall of Salona and Narona to Slavs
- 615 Fall of Naissus to Slavs
- 616 Push into Thracia
- 626 Avaro-Slavic siege of Constantinople

Rebellion of the Karantinian and Bohemian Slavs under Samo, and migration of the Serbs and Croats into the Balkans are the consequences of the defeat of the Avars before Constantinople after 626.

These events culminated in the massive Slavonization of a major portion of the Balkan peninsula but not in 'Greece' where the Slavs were eventually to be Hellenized.

The one major date-event where the reviewer would disagree with the author is the dating of the first major attack on Thessaloniki. Here the author basically follows the reasoning of Barišić who in a series of articles decides on 586 (as in contrast to 597, the only other possible date). According to the

Miracula of St. Demetrius the advance of the Avaro-Slavs was announced to the Thessalonians on Sunday, September 22 in the reign of Maurice of blessed memory. Such a Sunday in the reign of Maurice occurred only in 586 and in 597. Barišič, and after him Weithmann, have preferred 586 as it would seem to coincide nicely with events in the Peloponnese. (Barišič, "Proces" 22-23, opted for 586 as it would put the Slavs on the way to the Peloponnese by the sixth year of the reign of Maurice 587/8 as per the Chronicle of Monemvasia. Lemerle originally had chosen the second possibility, 597 on the basis of the mention of the Thessalonian archbishop Eusebius, also mentioned in the *Miracula*, in papal correspondence between 597-603, "La composition et la chronologie des deux premiers livres des *Miracula S. Demetrii*", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XLVI (1953), 354. But in the recent publication of his commentary on the *Miracula*, *Commentaire* (1981), 54, 96ff, he chooses the date 586).

Barišič and after him Weithmann have preferred 586 as it would seem to coincide neatly with events in the Peloponnese. But the recent archaeological results of the French at Argos put the Slavic occupation of Argos one year earlier at 585. Further, in a paper delivered at the Centennial Celebration of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens, and soon to appear in *Hesperia*, I give further reasons for accepting 597 as the date of the first major attack on Thessaloniki. In short this has to do with the incident of the Byzantine military engineer Bousas (as reported by Theophylactus Simocatta) and the question of the Slavic acquisition of poliorcetic technology. The *Miracula* report that Slavs, when they first besieged Thessaloniki, were fully equipped with a variety of siege machinery (Lemerle, *Miracula*, I, 135, 137, 148-149, 151-154). Yet the earliest descriptions of Slavic military technology which we possess (Procopius, *Strategicon of Maurice*) make no mention of Slavic siege machinery and we know that they captured walled places either by ruse or by a combination of the use of ladders and archery attacks to clear the defenders from the walls. (Vryonis, "The Evolution of Slavic Society and the Slavic Invasions in Greece: The First Major Attack on Thessaloniki 597" to appear in *Hesperia*). Theophylactus, who is quite precise on Slavic activities, records that the Avars (and through them the Slavs) first learned to construct siege machinery from a captured Byzantine military engineer named Bousas (Theophylactus Simocatta, II, xvi, 9-10) outside the walls of Appiaria in 587. Before this event the Avars and Slavs had no siege machinery «ἔτι τῶν τοιούτων ὀργάνων ἀμαθεστάτους ὑπάρχοντας». In connection with later events (later than 587) the chronicler records that siege machinery had become a regular factor in Avaro-Slavic attacks on Byzantine walled centers (Theophylactus Simocatta, VII, x, 1; VII, xii, 1). Thus it is highly

probably that the first attack on Thessaloniki transpired in 597, not in 586, and that the Slavs before Thessaloniki on that occasion were not connected with those who in the first half of the decade of the 580's descended into the Peloponnese.

In section 2 (of part I), *Die slavischen Landnahme auf der griechischen Halbinsel nach historischen Quellen* (pp. 85-131), Weithmann shifts his focus from the north and central Balkans to the Slavic movement into and settlement in the Greek peninsula proper. According to the author the first phase of Slavic settlement took place between the years 580/1 and 586, it was only partial (restricted to the Peloponnese), and at the end of this period the remainder of the Slavs returned to the Danubian regions. The texts, much discussed by scholarship for over a century, are difficult and Weithmann does not succeed in reconciling all of them, though some of his conclusions as to this first phase of settlement seem to the reviewer valid, i.e., by 586 there were settlements of Slavs in the Peloponnese. It is this fact which is important, and the fact that he is not able to reconcile all the sources seems secondary. The basic sources are Menander Protector, John of Ephesus, Evagrius, and the *Miracula* of St. Demetrius (there are other sources as well). He rightly observes that the narratives are complicated because they give little detail, do not give all the chronology, and they seem to use the term *Hellas-Graecia* inconsistently.

The mention of the Slavic raids into *Hellas* by Menander Protector in 577/8 (ὅτι κεραιζομένης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὑπὸ Σκλαβηνῶν) is vague as to geographical extent (the meaning of *Hellas* is not clear) and in any case there is no statement that the Slavs settled there at that time. For the author more important is the text of John of Ephesus which states the following: In the year 580/1 the Slavs raided all *Hellas*, the region of Thessaloniki, all Thracia, took cities and many fortresses, devastated the land and burned it, took many captives and dominated the land. They had lived in this land for years (up to the time of the composition of the text). Again the geographical reference in the case of *Hellas* is not exact. But the text is partially confirmed by Theophylactus Simocatta and John of Biclaro who refer to the wasting of Thracia between 581-585. Weithmann then attempts to attribute the early raid of 5,000 Slavs on Thessaloniki (not to be confused with the first major attack on the city attributed by Weithmann to 586) mentioned by the *Miracula*, to this period. He does so on the basis of the fact that John of Ephesus expressly mentions the regions of Thessaloniki. For Weithmann the fate of the 5,000 Slavs is to be sought in the Peloponnese. His conjecture (for the *Miracula* do not say where the 5,000 went after their repluse from Thessaloniki) relies on

a particular interpretation of the term Hellas, which he says at this time referred to all of Greece (contrary to Bon who had restricted it to Central Greece). For in the account of John of Ephesus as to the Slavic destruction of the 'cities-fortresses' Corinth must also be included. In order to buttress this conjecture he goes to a twelfth century source, Michael the Syrian (who supposedly took this section from some lost fragment of John of Ephesus) and who says that at this time the Slavs on their withdrawal from Constantinople sacked the churches as also they sacked the church of Corinth. Since the archaeological evidence indicates the capture of the lower town of Corinth, the destruction of Cencreae, and an attack on Athens at this time, he feels that his interpretation of John of Ephesus and of the *Miracula* is confirmed. All this is further confirmed, in the eyes of the author, by John of Biclaro who relates that in 580/1 the "Avars a finibus Thraciae pelluntur et partes Graeciae atque Pannonia occupant". Since use of Graecia is unclear he suggests the emendation (proposed by Zeuss 40 years earlier) of Pannonia to 'Pelo-ponnesi'.

Having made his way through this labyrinthine reasoning he finds further confirmation in the fact that Evagrius, in his account of events between 581-585, relates that the Avars went twice to the Long Walls, enslaved Singidunum, Anchialus, all Hellas, and other towns and fortresses. All of his reasoning assumes the dating of the first major Slavic attack (not the raid of the 5,000) on Thessaloniki at 586, the taking of Corinth between 581-584. He further assumes the reconquest of Corinth by Byzantine troops who had left Thessaloniki on the eve of the first major Slavic attack on Thessaloniki. He extrapolates this fact, very loosely, from the text of part one of the *Miracula* which says that the Thessalonian troops were absent from the city at the time of the attack, «κατὰ τὴν Ἑλληνῶν χώραν». Weithmann asserts that much as Ἑλλάς means all of Greece, it can include the Peloponnese, and this for his assertion that the Thessalonian troops in 586 were busy recapturing Corinth. Having removed the Slavs from Corinth, Weithmann tells us that the Thessalonian troops returned to Thessaloniki as they were unable to remove the Slavs from the remainder of the Peloponnese.

Weithmann thus concludes this difficult section as follows: In the six years between 581-586 the Slavic and Avaro-Slavic invasions south of the Danube did not lead to the possession of settlements in most of the Balkans south of the Danube. According to the evidence the only place where permanent Slavic settlement (*Landnahme*) took place during the reign of Maurice was the Peloponnese, as set out in the chronicle of Monemvasia. Contrary to Barišič and Tapkova-Zaimova there was no Slavic settlement in the rest of the Greek peninsula at that time.

The arguments of the author, it would seem to the reviewer, give evidence of four basic flaws, flaws which undermine his efforts to reconcile the sources but which do not affect the major part of his conclusions as to the first phase of the Slavic settlement in the Greek peninsula. The first and basic error is the assumption that the first major Slavic attack on Thessaloniki occurred in 586. It is highly probable (for reasons indicated above) that this major event transpired in 597. Therefore the Slavs who participated in this first major attack on Thessaloniki actually in 597 did not continue southward to enter the Peloponnese in 587 (and could not have done so), and probably are not at all connected with the events of 581-586 and the Slavic Landnahme in the Peloponnese. These two sets of events are thus disengaged and must be discussed separately from one another. Second, his treatment of the term *Hellas-Graecia* is not consistent. John of Ephesus speaks of Slavic activities in *Hellas*, the region of Thessaloniki, and Thracia. Weithmann (contrary to Bon who says it refers to central Greece) asserts that here the term refers to all the 'Greek peninsula'. But if this were so, then John of Ephesus would not have mentioned *Hellas* and the region of Thessaloniki, since *Hellas* according to Weithmann would have included the whole of the Greek peninsula, i.e. the region of Thessaloniki as well. Its use in the text next to the 'region of Thessaloniki' would tend to support the view of Bon that here it refers to central Greece, immediately adjacent to the region of Thessaloniki. John of Biclaro and Theophylactus Simocatta lend no support to Weithmann, for in speaking of these raids they only refer to Thracia, indicating that the major threat was not far to the south. It is on the basis of the text of John of Ephesus (*Hellas*) that Weithmann sends the 5,000 Slavs raiding from Thessaloniki to the Peloponnese, an assertion that is very heavily conjectural. He is also inconsistent in his principles of text emendation. When John of Biclaro relates that the Avars occupied parts of *Graecia* and *Pannonia* in 580/1, he accepts a possible emendation of the text, *Pannonia-Pelo-ponnesi* (proposed by Zeuss in 1940). This is a radical emendation which is doubly dubious: (a) In terms of geographical context the original *Pannonia* is preferable to *Pelo-ponnesi*, (b) orthographically it is difficult to justify the emendation as it would be difficult to confuse *Pannonia* with *Pelo-ponnesi*. Yet when a more probable emendation is proposed by Zakythinos in the text of the *Miracula* of St. Demetrius, *Korinthos-Perinthos*, he rejects it. The latter emendation is more reasonable in terms of both the geographical context and orthographic proximity. Thus Weithmann is not utilizing the same standards in his principle of emendation, but rather is twisting the text where it is convenient for the sake of his argument. This is a particularly dangerous approach when scholars are faced with such

difficult and sphinx-like sources as in the present set of problems. It is better to leave the ambiguity of the texts than to remodel them for the sake of an argument which is not well founded. Finally, the author explains the reconquest of Corinth on the basis of part one of the *Miracula* where it is said that at the time of the first major attack on Thessaloniki, the Thessalonian troops were out of the city «κατὰ τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν χώραν». This phrase does not tell us what part of the land of the Greeks, it could just as well refer to Athens, Thessaly etc. In any case if the first major attack on Thessaloniki took place in 597, such troops could hardly have retaken Corinth in 586. His effort, therefore, to reconcile these difficult texts is not successful. Nevertheless, his conclusion as to an early Slavic settlement in the Peloponnese is most certainly correct and has the virtue of being confirmed by the fundamental studies of Charanis.

Having dealt with this earliest Slavic settlement in the Greek peninsula in the early 580's (before 586), Weithmann then deals with the data contained in the *Chronicle of Monemvasia* and in related sources. He basically follows Charanis' studies as to the composition of the *Chronicle* and its historical merit (credibility). According to the *Chronicle* the Avars (read Slavs) raided all Thessaly, all Hellas (here it is interpreted as referring to central Greece), all of Old Epirus, Attica, Euboea and Peloponnese in 587/8. The brunt of the invasion fell on the Peloponnese where the Avars (Slavs) settled. A portion of the Greek population was destroyed, part fled (Patrenoi to Rhegium, Argives to Orobos, Corinthians to Aegina, Laconians to Demena in Sicily and to the mountains of the eastern Peloponnese (foundation of Monemvasia), and a portion of the Greeks remained in the Peloponnese (in the eastern Peloponnese from Corinth down to Malea and Maina). According to the *Chronicle* the Avars (Slavs) remained unsubjected for 218 years (587/8-805/6). From his study of the *Chronicle* and the interrelated sources Weithmann concludes: The Slavs raided the Peloponnese in the reign of Maurice; there was a flight of a portion of the Greek population from the Peloponnese; the eastern Peloponnese and the Maina remained relatively free of the Slavs. Also he assumes that the fortified citadels of Patras and Corinth did not fall to the Slavs. The author's conclusions seem reasonable, are consonant with the major sources, and in any case follow Charanis closely. There are details which have not been treated in the book, or elsewhere, and this has to do with the dissonance of this particular group of sources.

(a) The *Chronicle of Monemvasia* gives the Slavic 'regnal' years in the Peloponnese as 587/8-805/6, a period during which the Slavs were unsubjected. Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus notes that in the Slavic uprising



at Patras, dated 805 the Slavs *rebelled* ἀπόστασιν ἐννοήσαντες against their Greek neighbors, and that there was a Byzantine strategus at Corinth. Also, the date 587/8 does not coincide with the archaeological evidence from Argos, or with Weithmann's assumption of a Slavic Landnahme before 586.

(b) Constantine Porphyrogenitus relates that the area was "Slavonized" during the great plague of 746/7. Then he seems to contradict himself when he says that part of the Peloponnese (Maina) was not occupied by the Slavs, as Constantine Porphyrogenitus remarks: «Ἰστέον, ὅτι οἱ τοῦ κάστρου Μαΐνης οἰκήτορες οὐκ εἰσὶν ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς τῶν προρρηθέντων Σκλάβων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν παλαιότερων Ῥωμαίων, οἱ καὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν παρὰ τῶν ἐντοπίων Ἕλληνες προσαγορεύονται διὰ τὸ ἐν τοῖς προπαλαιοῖς χρόνοις εἰδωλοῦνται εἶναι καὶ προσκνητὰς τῶν εἰδώλων κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς Ἕλληνες, οἵτινες ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ ἀοιδίμου Βασιλείου βαπτισθέντες Χριστιανοὶ γεγόνασιν» (*DAI*, ch. 50).

(c) The presence of the emperor Constans II in Athens in 662-3 indicates the presence of Byzantine authority there and sufficient security for the emperor and his expedition to encamp there.

(d) Constantine V was able to take settlers for Constantinople from the Peloponnese in the eighth century (Theophanes, ed. De. Bon I, 429). If the Peloponnese was entirely removed from Byzantine administrative control how was it that the writ of the emperor was enforced and the transplanting of the population carried out?

For Weithmann the second wave of Slavic invasions-settlements in the Greek peninsula begins early in the reign of Heraclius (in this he conforms to the theories of Barišič and Popović). Thus the Slavic settlements in the Greek peninsula during the second phase are part of a larger ethnic migration that changed the ethnographic map of the northern and central Balkans. This time the principle source is part two of the *Miracula* of St. Demetrius, which recounts in detail two major attacks on Thessaloniki (the first was mounted by the Slavs under their leader Chatzon and the second was a combined Avaro-Slavic campaign under the leadership of the Khaqan). Taking 615/16 as the date of the fall of Naissus (based on the numismatic evidence of Popović), he tentatively dates the attack of Chatzon to 615/16 and that of the Khaqan to 617/18. These events involved not only military invasions but massive settlements of tribes among which the *Miracula* mention Dragovites, Sagoudates, Velegezites, Vaiounites, Verzites, and of whom it is said that they pillaged all Thessaly, the iles about Thessaly and Hellas, the Cyclades, all Achaea, Epirus, most of Illyria and a portion of Asia. According to the text they took to sea on ships.

The reviewer would agree with Weithmann as to the undoubted historical importance of this text, as already indicated by most everyone who has dealt with it. There is however a problem which should be raised as to the reliability of the text in all of its details and specifically in regard to the maritime activity which it attributes to the Slavs. From earlier texts we know that the Slavs had a command of riverine navigation and technology and also that the Avar Khaqans utilized Slavic shipbuilders and sailors for their riverine operations (see above all the text of Theophylactus Simocatta; Vryonis, *Ἱστορία τῶν βαλκανικῶν λαῶν. Παραδόσεις*, Athens, 1971, pp. 168-169). The *Miracula* also mention a form of Slavic piracy that seemed to operate out of the coves of the northern Aegean but close to the shores. Their movement out into the open Aegean as far as the Cyclades, Crete and Asia Minor, however, raises serious historical problems. Ships of the primitive type described above, ἐξ ἐνὸς ξύλου γλυπτὰς νῆας, are suitable only for calm rivers, not for the rough Aegean. During my visit to ancient Sirmium in 1971 Prof. Popović kindly showed me a monoxyle raised from the depths of the Save River and now on display in the local museum. It was hewn out of the trunk of an immense oak, curving upward toward the smaller end, cut in half along its length and hollowed out. It had small holes for oar locks, was about 16 meters in length and could hold about ten to twelve rowers standing upright. It had no keel. Such a boat could never take to the rough open seas (the dating of the monoxyle of Sirmium presents difficulties according to Prof. Popović, for carbon 14 tests, if accurate, revealed a later date). The ability of the Slavs to take to the sea must have necessitated a middle step of technological symbiosis with the local Greeks, just as the case of the advance of their military technology reveals.

On pages 115-126 the author examines what he terms the *Formen des Zusammenlebens* of Greeks and Slavs. When the major Slavic settlements took place, he relates, many Greeks fled the plains to fortified areas. Smaller towns were destroyed and remained uninhabited and on occasion the local populations fled to nearby isles whence they might return to their fields after the storms had passed. The Slavs met with no thickly settled areas as the hinterland had been abandoned in earlier centuries. These are all generalizations for which the author gives us practically no primary sources. (On page 115 he refers the reader to page 172 for the sources. But once the reader turns to page 172 for the references he is disappointed to read "Die Fluchtbewegungen der griechischen Bevölkerung als Reaktion auf die Landnahme der Slaven sind bereits im historischen Zusammenhang dargestellt worden". And then he sends his reader back to page 115, the original point of departure.

He seems to rely on Koder, *Tabula Imperii Byzantini*, vol. I, Hellas und Thessalien, Vienna, 1976, p. 55). Since these are very important generalizations he should have presented a careful discussion of the evidence at this point, for the suppositions he makes are very broad, consequential, and are the partial basis for the development of his argument.

He rejects the theory (Bon, Lemerle, Zakythinos), of a slow peaceful wandering penetration of Slavs in the sixth-seventh century and asserts that this occurred only after the initial violent seizure of the land (Tapkova-Zaimova). As the only example of this latter process he gives the case of the eastward movement of Rynchinoi, Vlachorynchinoi, and Sagoudatai who in the eighth-ninth centuries moved eastward from Macedonia into Chalcidice (Dvornik). But how do we know that there were not Slavs settled in this area prior to the proposed movement and date? The most profound effect of this Slavic Landnahme, for the author, was the upsetting of the provincial infrastructure. According to him the settlement of Slavic groups in the countryside interrupted the old symbiosis and unity of Greek towns with the hinterland, the towns still remaining in the hands of the Greeks but now being cut off from the countryside as a result of Slavic possession. Then Weithmann seems to make an illogical statement in relating that the Greek towns now cut off from their hinterlands were forced to initiate trade relations with the Slavs in the countryside. This raises the question of whether the Slavic settlement did completely disrupt this relation of town and country.

Weithmann relates that this new situation is symbolized by the emergence of a new geopolitical concept, the Sklaviniai, groups of Slavs beyond effective control of the Byzantine administration. Thus the new conformation, according to the author, is rural Sklaviniai plus Greek towns. The reconquista which followed had as its ultimate goal the reintegration of the areas of the Sklaviniai into the Byzantine administrative structure from the seventh into the ninth century, moving gradually from north to the south. Consequent to it was the expansion of the thematic system (Hellas, Macedonia, Peloponnese, Nikopolis, Dyrrachium). Thus by the mid-ninth century the Greek peninsula was largely under the control of the Byzantine administration. For Weithmann Bulgarian-Byzantine political competition involved, for a time, the fate of the Slavs of the Greek peninsula for so long as there was a Christian Bulgaria these Slavs had an option between Bulgarization and Byzantinization. This issue was finally decided by the victory of Basil II and the destruction of independent Bulgaria. The author then examines the evolution of various Slavic tribal groups within the framework of the Byzantine reconquista and in terms of their legal obligations to the Byzantine state. In all of this Weithmann follows,

customarily, the results of the research of scholars who have gone before him.

In the second major portion of his book (pp. 132-197) the author discusses the toponymical and philological evidence for the presence of the Slavs in the Greek peninsula. The historically attested presence of numerous Slavs in the area for the late sixth and seventh century in further and partially corroborated by philological and a rich toponymical evidence. Weithmann (p. 132) quotes the tenth century epitomator of Strabo on the disappearance of certain Greek toponyms in the province of Elis. «Νῦν δὲ οὐδὲ ὄνομά ἐστι Πισατῶν καὶ Καυκῶνων...ἅπαντα γὰρ Σκυῖται νέμονται». Weithmann might well have given the full sentence of the text, as he omitted the phrase «ἡ νῦν βίσα καλεῖται» (Muller, *Geographi graeci minores*, II-5, 584). The text informs us that Pisa in the tenth century was known as βίσα which in itself seems to be a Slavic toponym and probably related to Bulgarian ВИС (elevation, hill, mound) and to Serbo-Croatian 'vis' (height, elevation, peak). Pisa was located on a hill near present-day Miraka, A. Mallwitz, *Olympia und seine Bauten* (Munich, 1972, p. 79). It has been indicated, by earlier scholars, that the use of toponymical-philological evidence has certain chronological limitations, as Weithmann rightly observes. First and foremost the earlier Slavic toponymic-philological stratum must be carefully isolated, but once this is done it cannot be chronologically refined beyond the statement that it dates to a long period between the sixth and the ninth century. There is a second problem, for alongside these early, archaic Slavic toponyms and loan words of the sixth-ninth century, there are Slavic toponyms brought in later by Greeks, Albanians, Vlachs, and toponyms brought in as late as the period of Ottoman rule. After having inserted this note of caution, the author next gives a brief survey of 150 years of scholarship on this particular subject. Fallmerayer realized the importance of toponymic and philological evidence, but a major portion of his assumed Slavic toponyms and loan words have subsequently been shown to be of non-Slavic origin. An element of error was introduced into his considerations by the fact that he relied on East Slavic rather than South Slavic forms. The Russian scholar Hilferding collected a significant body of Slavic toponyms in 1868. Fundamental, however, were the publications of Miklosich (1869) and of Meyer (1894) which proved, contrary to Fallmerayer, that modern Greek had undergone no basic linguistic influence from the side of Slavic and that the latter's influence was limited to some traces in the vocabulary. The next major step was the work of M. Vasmer, *Die Slaven in Griechenland* (Berlin, 1941) which remains today the basic scholarly tool in this complex field, and to which Weithmann in his study is largely indebted for the second section of his book. Based on some 2,000 toponyms and on

a broad source base, Vasmer proved, among other things, that the language spoken by the Slavic tribes that settled in Greece was descended from the same language or dialect spoken by the Slavic tribes settling in Bulgaria. Further, the language of the Slavs in Greece had not evolved far beyond early Slavic, in addition it was in this language that Cyril and Methodius wrote, and finally there was no overlay from Serbo-Croatian since the Serbs and Croats did not basically affect the Greek peninsula. According to Vasmer this form of Slavic was related to the Slavic of Moesia, Thrace, Albania and Wallachia. Weithmann also refers to the extensive toponymical studies of Georgacas and Zaimov. He goes on to note the efforts in modern Greece to Hellenize the toponyms, an effort parallel to the nationalization of toponymy in Bulgaria and Turkey. This is in itself an interesting phenomenon and he might well have referred to N. Polites, *Γνωμοδοτήσεις περί μετονομασίας συνοικισμῶν καὶ κοινοτήτων* (Athens, 1920). Polites was the head of an official committee whose task it was to study the toponymy and to propose changes, and the volume referred to above records the proceedings of this committee. Within the framework established by Vasmer additional culling of toponymical evidence is still to be gathered from the study of regional geographical and historical studies carried out by Greek scholars in the nineteenth and early twentieth century and which Vasmer missed. Such is the book of G. Papandreou, *Ἡ Ἠλεία διὰ μέσον τῶν αἰώνων* (c. 1923) which has a rich assortment of older place names and in which book the author had promised a study on the proposed alteration of the non-Greek toponyms. One should note here the appearance of a new toponymical study in the district of Laconia by the Greek Slavist Ph. Malingoudes, *Studien zu den slavischen Ortsnamen Griechenlands. 1. Slavische Flurnamen aus der messenischen Mani* (Mainz, Wiesbaden, 1981).

As mentioned, much of part II of Weithmann's book is based on the data and conclusions of Vasmer. Such are the linguistic bases for the identification of the earliest Slavic toponyms and loan words into Greek. As for the former, it includes the following items:

- a) Absence of a full 'Liquidametathesis'
- b) Absence of a second and third palatalization
- c) Presence of the old reduced b, b, rendered in Greek by ι, ου
- d) Absence of a separate J with an initial a.
- e) Possesivenamen in -jb is characteristic.

From his extensive 'data bank' Vasmer showed that most of the early Slavic place names in Greece have to do with natural features of the land or tribal

relations, but they also refer to tribal and ethnic names, social relations, economic life, forms of settlement, and rarely to religion. Weithmann cautions that at present it is not possible to establish the proportion between the Slavic and Greek place names during the period under consideration and one can only make approximations of relative density/sparsity as to Slavic place names in different Greek provinces, an effort already made by Vasmer. Weithmann proceeds to establish this relationship in different Greek provinces on the basis of Vasmer and other research.

Peloponnese	400	Thessaly	130	Macedonia	has largest number
Epirus	400	Thessaloniki- Chalcidice	150	Acarnania- Aetolia	90

They are less numerous in Eurytania 48, Phocis 45, Boeotia 22, Attica 18. For the isles: Corfu 7, Crete 13, Euboea 13, also in Andros and Scyros. He then breaks down the c. 400 Slavic toponyms in the Peloponnese as follows:

Regions of Corinth	20	Elis	30	Messinia	40
Regions of Argos	18	Triphylia	40	Laconia	80
Achaea	90				

In discussing the linguistic influence of Slavic on Greek, Weithmann relies basically on the works of Miklosich, Meyer and Vasmer. He speaks of the powerful superiority of Greek culture and its assimilative powers over all invaders into medieval and modern Greece. The language of none of these groups affected the structure of Greek, and Slavic influence was limited to lexical borrowings. If one includes all regional uses of Slavic words in Greek, Weithmann indicates that the total number of borrowings is about 500 words. But only 60 of these are common to all Greek. The words are mostly from the agricultural and rural domain and must have entered Greek prior to the mid-ninth century (according to the linguistic rules listed above). Some of the borrowings are so common in modern Greek that on first sight they are startling:

woods, thicket	—	λόγγος
marsh	—	βάλτος
hay	—	σανός
hammer	—	σβάρνα

He might well have added:

trout	—	πέστροφα
-------	---	----------

chicken coop	—	κοτέτσι
share cropper	—	σέμπρος
clay	—	γλίνα

(See Vasmer, *op. cit.*, 28, 115, 275, 282).

The passage of many of these words into spoken Greek, according to Weithmann, presupposes a period of bilingualism among the Slavs, whereas a long period of such bilingualism is indicated by toponyms with Greek roots that have Slavic endings (Vasmer, 317-18, 262-66).

The author then reiterates his considerations as to the historical process of Slavic settlement (north to south with contemporary sea movements to isles, Epirus, Thessaly), corresponding Greek movements (a continuation of the earlier process of the abandoning of the countryside for the towns and coasts). Weithmann then analyzes the toponyms as to the economic life and areas of settlement by the Slavs. The loanwords indicate two areas of economic development: agricultural and pastoral. When the Slavs first entered the Greek peninsula they were agriculturalists as they were in areas outside of Greece. (But the Byzantine sources also mention that they had substantial herds of livestock. *Strategicon of Maurice*, ed. Mihaescu, 278: «Υπέστιν δὲ αὐτοῖς πλῆθος ἀλόγων...»). In these latter areas they remained agriculturalists but in Greece their life underwent a powerful change whereby they became Hirtennomaden-transhumant pastoralists. The author relates this transition to the consequences of the Byzantine reconquista. As a result of the Byzantine reconquests the plains came back under the control of the Byzantine bureaucracy and these Slavs who were willing to discharge their new obligations to the Byzantine state remained in the plains where they were subject to Christianization and Hellenization (according to Weithmann they had already been subject to the beginnings of Byzantine influence via the trade of Byzantine towns and Slavic hinterland). Some Slavs, he continues, found subjugation to the Byzantine administration not to their liking and so began to move up into the mountains of the Taygetus range in Laconia and into the Pindus of Thessaly and Epirus. Here in the mountains they cleared forests and adapted to a life of transhumant pastoralism. All that Weithmann says in this respect is clearly possible but it is very difficult to establish for as Weithmann admits, the mass of the Slavic toponymy, whether in the mountains or the plains, is similar as to form. That is to say it belongs to the earliest toponymical stratum from the sixth to the ninth century. One could assert with equal probability that many of the Slavic settlements in the mountains go back to the early period of settlement. In following the further fate, and disappearance, of the mountain Slavs

of Greece Weithmann utilizes the conclusions of Weigand, Kirsten, and Jochalas. In northern and central Greece the Vlach migrations from the eleventh-thirteenth century resulted in the occupation of the mountains and the absorption and disappearance of the Slavs. This is surmised by our author from the large number of Slavic toponyms of the Vlachs, ostensibly inherited from these mountain Slavs. In the Peloponnese Weithmann attributes the disappearance of the Slavs to the appearance of the Albanians. The author summarizes his conclusions regarding the toponymic and linguistic evidence as follows:

1. The Slavic invasions at the end of the sixth and in the seventh century drove the Greeks from the plains and the Slavs who replaced them engaged in agricultural and pastoral activity.

2. The Byzantines reconquered much of the Greek peninsula: seventh century they reconquered northern Greece, eighth century central Greece, ninth century the Peloponnese. The Slavs who remained in place were Christianized and Hellenized by the ninth century. The Slavs who fled to the mountains adapted themselves to transhumant pastoralism and so were less subject to Byzantinization.

3. The massive movement of Vlachs in the mountain areas of northern and central Greece, eleventh-thirteenth century, led to the total disappearance of the mountain Slavs and to the adoption of the Slavic toponymy by the Vlachs.

4. The Slavic tribes in the Peloponnese, especially the Ezerites and Melingoi, remained distinct ethnic and political entities into the fifteenth century. But already by the fourteenth century Albanian tribes began to appear in the Peloponnese who thus began to press the Slavs. When the Turks appeared, Weithmann asserts, the Slavs joined the Albanians in resisting the Ottomans. It would be interesting to know on what source Weithmann's statement could possibly be based, for the reviewer knows of none. Chalcocondyles, who gives detailed accounts of the Turkish Peloponnesian campaigns mentioned the resistance not only of Greeks but particularly of the scattered Albanian communities, but nowhere is there a mention of the Slavs. Generally Weithmann's argument at this point becomes vague and diffuse as he attempts to attribute the final disappearance of the Peloponnesian Slavs to the Ottoman policy of transplantation, and here again he seems to give no source.

The third and last section of the book (198-252) deals with the archaeological evidence. In a discussion of the limits and the possibilities of this type of evidence he rightly notes the lack of any systematic excavation of the



material remains of the Slavs in Greece, for the primary interest of archaeologists has remained the great classical period. Then he proceeds to a generalization which on the first instance seems reasonable: The sparsity of Byzantine material remains in the period from the seventh to the ninth century is an argument for the presence of the Slavs during that same period. But on closer examination one would have to conclude that Weithmann's argument is certainly debatable and indeed he seems to contradict himself in part on page 252 where he states that there are no archaeological remains to be affiliated with the Slavs in the eighth and ninth century (in the Greek peninsula) and in some regions no remains until the eleventh century or even later. The matter of the fact is that material remains of Byzantine culture in the seventh and eighth century are rare in Asia Minor as well. Thus the argument from silence is inconclusive and dangerous in terms of specifics. But the author states that he will adhere to an interpretation which features two types of archaeological evidence: (a) Direct, i.e. material remains of Slavs, (b) Indirect, i.e. lack of Byzantine remains, building of new forts, evidence of movement of Greeks, destructions.

He presents the reader with a narrative analysis of the process and present status of archaeological research.

(a) 1924-28 excavations by Soteriou at Phthiotic Thebes (Nea Anchialus), who concluded that there were Slavic burials there on the basis of belt buckles that he found.

(b) German excavations of Afiona in Corfu which uncovered non-Greek remains from the period of the *Völkerwanderung*.

(c) 1934 German excavations at Boibeis, at Magoula.

(d) 1938 Davidson-Weinberg discovered a soldier's grave in the colonnade of the South Stoa at ancient Corinth (the vase found there was later (1978) identified by Yalouris as Slavic, of the Prague type).

(e) In 1959 Yalouris uncovered a Slavic cemetery at Olympia which features incineration of the dead and Prague pottery.

(f) Werner in 1960 summarized his arguments as to the Slavic provenance of the metallic "Bügel fibeln mit Maskenfuss", and also the so-called Slavic figures purportedly found at Velestino.

(g) Hood described a series of Greek *Flüchtlingsiedlungen* of the late sixth century which were found on isles nearby the Greek coastline.

(h) Metcalf analyzed coin hoards of Greece and associated them with Slavic invasions of the late sixth and seventh century. Weithmann goes into

considerable detail as to the use of the numismatic evidence by Bon, Charanis, and Popović, but he is unaware of the literature which casts some doubt on the use of this evidence.

One should note that in his review of the state of research at the archaeological level he missed the announcement of the finds of Slavic pottery at Argos, datable to the decade of the 580's, in 1975. (It was briefly announced in the *Bulletin de Correspondence Hellénique*, C, 1976, 748, and has subsequently been the basis of three important studies). Second, he does not indicate the extent of the dispute as to whether the so-called Bügelfibeln mit Maskenfuss are really exclusively Slavic. Popović in a work utilized by Weithmann, denies the specifically Slavic attribute of this type of object, ("Les témoins archéologiques...", *Mélanges de l'école française de Rome*, LXXXVII, 1 (1975), 455-578). Werner, in his article published in the journal *Germania*, 1960, is not at all convincing in his attribution and really leaves the matter in doubt. The study of A. Pallas on this specific body of the archaeological matter is emphatic on this point, "Données nouvelles sur quelques boucles et fibules considérées comme avars et slaves et sur Corinthe entre le VIe et le IXe s.", *Byzantinobulgarica*, VII, (1981), 295-318. Thus Weithmann's further arguments, which depend on the Slavic attribution of this object, are all open to serious doubt and dispute. In his discussion of the archaeological evidence, as previously he sets it out, he concludes that the archaeological evidence does not contradict the historical texts. He does note that whereas there are hardly any Byzantine remains from the eighth and ninth century, the same holds true for the Slavs. Earlier he makes the qualification that an absence of Byzantine material remains is to be interpreted as indicating a flight, and therefore absence of Greeks, whereas the absence of substantial Slavic material remains does not indicate the absence of Slavs. The interpretation of negative evidence is always complex, but in this case it is something more. The negative archaeological evidence in this case could be interpreted in other ways, and so the interpretation of Weithmann is not compelling. Fortunately, the finds at Argos (unknown at the time of writing of the book) now prove the accounts of the historical texts with positive material evidence. Further, the questionable use of the Bügelfibeln as solitary evidence for Slavic presence, as well as the lax method of interpreting the finds at Afiona, Magoula and the citadel of Corinth, seriously undermine what the author has to say about the archaeological evidence for the Slavic presence.

The indisputable archaeological evidence lies in the realm of pottery and burials. Prague pottery, since its identification by Borkovsky in 1940, has been found wherever the early Slavs settled. It was first found and identified

in Greece by Yalouris at Olympia in 1959, and such pottery-burials continued to turn up at Olympia as late as 1967. This summer I was allowed to study this material and I counted some forty vases and fragments of vases of this early, handmade Prague pottery at Olympia. The dating of this material is still not firmly set. Weithmann has dated it to the seventh century (possibly on the basis of the fact that the last Byzantine coins found at Olympia are from the reign of Phocas). Popović had dated this pottery to the latter half of the seventh century on the basis of Nestor's opinion (oral) who so dated the Olympia material on the basis of style. Yalouris dated the material to the sixth century on the basis of the fact that it was immediately atop the early Byzantine stratum. The argument based on style and the argument based on numismatic evidence are not in themselves decisive or convincing, for the study and analysis of Slavic pottery has not sufficiently progressed to allow precise dating on the basis of style. Further, it is conceivable that there was co-habitation by Slavs and Greeks at Olympia (such instances are indicated by archaeological evidence for the areas Popović studied), or that such coins did find their way in the hands of Slavs.

Possibly related to this matter is the spectacular and datable find of Slavic sherds at the destroyed Bath A and its vicinity at Argos. This pottery, also handmade, and with the same striated decorations (parallel, perpendicular, and wavy) as in the case of the pottery at Olympia, is precisely dated to 585-586 by the excavators (for the bibliographical reference see above). Thus it is quite possible that the pottery of Olympia is contemporary with that of Argos, though this can only be ascertained by further excavations at Olympia. These two spectacular finds of Slavic pottery, in the one case securely dated to the 580's, constitute the single most important condition/factor as regards the general importance of the Chronicle of Monemvasia and thoroughly support what Charanis has been saying on the basis of this text for at least three decades.

As for the matter of Slavic military technology Weithmann is aware of the importance of tracing its evolution once the Slavs came into contact with Byzantium (pp. 213-214). He correctly observes that the description of Slavic military science and tactics in the Strategicon of Maurice presents the Slavs as a society without knowledge of siege machinery. This is of course confirmed by both Procopius and Theophylactus Simocatta. In all cases of sieges carried out by Slavs they took towns and fortresses either (a) where they were defenseless, (b) or by ruse, (c) or by a combined use of archery attacks and scaling ladders. The question then arises as to when and how the Avars and Slavs acquired the poliorcetic technology. Weithmann dates this important

event to the last third of the sixth century, prior to 586, the date on which according to him occurred the first major attack on Thessaloniki. The *Miracula* narrate that during this siege the Avaro-Slavs brought a large number and variety of siege machines with which to attack the city's wall.

“Im Verlaufe des letzten Drittels des 6. Jahrhundert scheint sich die Bewaffnung und Taktik der Slaven wahrscheinlich durch den andauerenden Kriegerischen Kontakt mit den in dieser Hinsicht hochentwickelten Byzantinern erheblich verbessert zu haben. Bei einem siebentägigen Sturm auf Thessaloniki vom 22. September bis 29. September 586—der Chronist der *Miracula* gibt nur 22. September während der Regierungszeit des Kaisers Maurikios (582-602) an (actually the critical factor, which Weithmann does not mention and which allows scholars to choose between 586 and 597, is that the date given was on a Sunday, September 22, in the reign of Maurice), das zweite mögliche Datum fugt sich nicht in den historischen Kontext ein—Kommen ἐλεπόλεις καὶ κριοὺς σιδήρου (arietes ferreos), πετροβόλους (iactores lapidum), χελώνας (testudines, Schutzdächer) zur Anwendung” (p. 214).

Thus Weithmann notes the important passages of the *Miracula* which inform us that during the first great siege of Thessaloniki (which he dates to 586) the Avaro-Slavs had a fully developed poliorcetic technology. But the dating of the siege is most probably incorrect, and as of 586 the Avaro-Slavs did not yet possess this advanced poliorcetic technology. The dating and circumstances of the Avaro-Slavic acquisition of poliorcetic technology are fixed with precision by the text of Theophylactus Simocatta who in many respects is a very detailed and knowledgeable source on Avars and Slavs. He relates that in 587 the armies of the khaqan appeared before the fortresses of Appiaria in Moesia Inferior but were unable to take it. A Byzantine military engineer resident in Appiaria fell into the hands of the khaqan and taught the enemy the crucial secret of how to build siege machinery. Theophylactus relates:

“Indeed Bousas taught the Avars to construct a certain siege machine for they (the Avars) happened to be most ignorant of such machines, and he built the siege machine which hurls missiles. Soon thereafter the fortress was levelled and Bousas... taught the barbarians something frightful, the technology of besieging. Thence the enemy captured effortlessly a great many of the Roman cities making use of this original device” (Theophylactus Simocatta, ed. De Boor, II, xvi, 1-10). Thereafter, relates Theophylactus, the Avaro-Slavs are designated as taking cities by the use of siege machinery. By the late sixth century they captured the city of Bongeis and forty fortifications in Dal-

matia by the use of siege machinery, and succeeded in levelling the walls of Singidunum.

Thus the acquisition of siege technology by the Avaro-Slavs is specifically fixed by Theophylactus, and the dating of the event at 587 has been fixed by the students of the chronicler's text. This also sets the date of the first major siege of Thessaloniki at 597, for in 586 the Avaro-Slavs had not yet acquired the elements of siege warfare. The episode before the walls of Appiaria recounted by Theophylactus speaks only of the Avars. But had the Slavs known this technology at that time, as vassals or subjects of the khaqan they would have either taught his troops the science, or would themselves have been called to bring siege machinery. When, by way of example, the khaqan wished to cross the Danube, he utilized Slavic ship builders to prepare the fleet. And in any case Procopius and the Strategicon of Maurice specifically exclude siege machinery from the armament of the early Slavs. 587 is the date on which Avars and Slavs were introduced to this 'frightful' science.

The remainder of the book consists of three parts: (a) "Ausblick" (pp. 253-261), wherein he clarifies "Slavisierung" and "Gräzisierung"; (b) "Anhang" (pp. 262-278) containing his own translation of the relevant section from the Iveron manuscript of the Chronicle of Monemvasia; Zusammenfassung (270-283). In the first section, "Ausblick", he relates that the theory of Slavonization of the Greeks has been in the scholarly literature since the time of Fallmerayer. According to this theory the Slavs, because of their numerical density, had ethnically assimilated the Greeks. Weithmann takes exception to this theory, as he does elsewhere in the book, and for him Slavonization might have taken place in isolated cases only. The reason for this is that Slavs and Greeks lived separately prior to their subjugation and Christianization. As two separate ethnic groups their contacts were evidenced only in war and "Commercium". Thus the historical continuity of the Greeks, who lived in the towns and "Rückzugsgebieten", remained unbroken. He further asserts that when "connubium" first developed after the Christianization of the Slavs it resulted not in Slavonization of the Greeks but rather in the Hellenization of the Slavs. In this respect he interprets the well-known passage from Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De Thematibus*, ed. Pertusi: «ἐσθλαβώθη πᾶσα ἡ χώρα καὶ γέγονε βάρβαρος», which is related to a devastating plague that struck the Peloponnese in 746/7, as referring to a territorial expansion of the Peloponnesian Slavs at the expense of the local Greeks. That it struck only, or primarily, the Greeks according to Weithmann is to be explained by the fact that the two groups lived apart and separately.

Thus Weithmann concludes (p. 254): "Der Begriff 'Slavisierung' ist also bezüglich der griechischen Halbinsel nur in siedlungsgeographischer, keineswegs in ethnischer Hinsicht zutreffend"! By contrast, in the more northerly Balkan regions (Thracia, Dacia, Illyria) the "Slavonization" was not only "siedlungsgeographisch" but also "ethnisch". According to Weithmann the reason for it was that the Greek and Roman populations (mostly soldiers, officials, merchants) had either abandoned the land or were killed. Further, the Slavs encountered only a very superficially Romanized or Hellenized Thracian and Dacian population which had not strongly identified itself with Imperial Rome. Therefore all those who did not flee to the mountains (as did the predecessors of Vlachs and Albanians) were culturally and ethnically assimilated by the Slavs. The reviewer, naturally, agrees with the author's statement that in the north and central Balkans Slavonization in the ethnic sense was thorough. But the reasons which Weithmann gives are not compelling, i.e. that the Thracians and Dacians were superficially Hellenized or Romanized and felt no close ties with the empire. In such cases one has to pay attention not only to the 'negative' or passive, forces in cultural change (the condition of the conquered) but also to the 'positive' or aggressive forces (the nature and magnitude of the force of the conquerors). Though the post World War II school of Bulgarian historiography has also attempted to lessen the historical impact of Romanization (north of the Haemus range) and of Hellenization (to the south of that mountain range) on the formerly Thracian population, the contrary condition would seem to have prevailed. That is to say the Thracian language was probably for the most part (not completely as Beševliev has shown) moribund and most of the population spoke either Latin or Greek, and the few remaining Thracian speakers were undoubtedly in the stage of bilingualism, that stage through which most peoples pass before basic cultural assimilation. (A. Moscy, *Pannonia and Upper Moesia. A History of the Middle Danube Provinces of the Roman Empire* (London, 1974); V. Velkov, *Cities in Thrace and Dacia in Late Antiquity* (Amsterdam, 1974); E. Condurachi, *Roumanian Archaeology in the Twentieth Century* (Bucharest, 1964). All these and others give strong evidence for effective Romanization-Hellenization of a provincial sort). The role of the Balkans and the Balkan peoples during the period of the fourth-sixth century indicates how closely the area was integrated into the empire, and the willingness of its inhabitants to resist barbarian invasions is clear in the accounts which Priscus gives of the Hunnic invasions and which Theophylactus Simocatta gives of the Avaro-Slavic attacks (see in particular the case history of the fortified town of Assema in this period of two centuries). Perhaps most dramatic is the graffiti

left by an inhabitant of Sirmium calling upon God to save the inhabitants and the city from capture by the Avars. During one of the attempts of the Avar Khaqan to take Singidunum he called on Slav shipbuilders to build him a fleet in the vicinity of the city in order to be able to take it. The citizens raided the shipyards of the Slavs and burned the ships before their very eyes. The evidence, what there is of it, indicates that the inhabitants identified by and large with the empire and with its civilization. Further, how is it that these people were “Superficially Romanized...” when the Latin speaking Dacians remained Latin speaking as the precursors of the modern Roumanians? The argument of superficial Romanization and Hellenization is in itself not provable, and whatever evidence exists indicates that this area had been profoundly transformed by aspects of Graeco-Roman culture. The area had been attacked from the fourth century and thereafter by Visigoths, Ostrogoths, Alani, Huns, Gepids, Avars, Slavs and Kotrigurs, and it had nevertheless resisted up to the mid sixth century. But Byzantine preoccupation with the West under Justinian, and with the East thereafter undermined the strength of the Byzantine government in the Balkans at a crucial time. Further, the bulk of the Slavs settled in the area between the Danube and northern Greece, so that to the ‘negative’ factors one must add the positive factor of *great numbers*. As Weithmann mentions, this was not a mere conquest but it was also a vast tribal migration, and with the paralysis of the central authority in Constantinople and its absorption elsewhere, the migration-conquest operated at will in the more northern and central provinces. (For these considerations, Vryonis, «Ἡ χερσόνησος τοῦ Αἴμου», in vol. VII, *Ἱστορία τοῦ ἑλληνικοῦ ἔθνους*, by Ekdotike Athenon, pp. 426-439).

As for “Gräzisierung” Weithmann relates that it could only begin after the Byzantines subjugated the Slavs militarily and then incorporated them administratively. Nevertheless it is difficult to establish in detail the course of Hellenization as the written sources are meager. The Greeks continued to inhabit Greece, without interruption, though restricted geographically by the Slavic intrusion. According to the author there are three factors or causes which play a role in the cultural assimilation of one people by another: (a) Politico-military mastery, (b) “interethnisches Kulturgefälle”, (c) relative numbers. In the case of the Slavs of Greece, it is very clear that condition (a) was enforced by the Byzantine state. This reintegration of the Slavs and the areas they settled into the Byzantine administration took place in middle Greece and the northern Peloponnese by the ninth century, in Macedonia first after the destruction of Bulgaria in the early eleventh century. As for condition (c), relative numbers, the author asserts that it is impossible to

arrive at a scientific estimate of the numerical relation of Slavs to Greeks. Further, after the reconquest the narrative sources inform us that the Greek population in certain areas, especially the Peloponnese, was strengthened by Greeks either returning to the homes of their ancestors or else by Greeks being sent as colonists by the emperors. Condition (b) (*interethnisches Kulturgefälle*) had come into existence of course long before these events in the form of economic relations. With the reincorporation of these areas and their Slavic inhabitants into the Byzantine administration, they were Christianized and eventually Hellenized. Weithmann believes that the majority of the subjugated Slavs of middle and south Greece were culturally Hellenized in the course of the ninth and tenth century. Their complete adoption of the Greek language was preceded by a stage of bilingualism and it was at this stage that the Slavic words entered the Greek language. With the disappearance of their language (it did not disappear so early in the regions of Taygetus and in northern Greece), the adoption of Christianity and the Byzantine life style, their ethnic consciousness disappeared. That part of the Slavic population which survived in the mountains and in isolated areas were immune from direct Byzantine assimilation. The author once more indicates, as an important factor, what he considers to be the strong assimilative power of the church and the Greek language, and their entire cultural context. With their Christianization the Slavs also acquired the possibility of vertical social mobility.

Weithmann assembles the results of studies by physical anthropologists (Angel, Charles, Poulianos, Virchow, Schwidetzky, Alekseeva, Boev) in what must constitute the least 'scientific' part of the book, given the fact that it is almost impossible to characterize the physical types of the Greeks and Slavs at the time of the Slavic *Landnahme* and at the time of the Hellenization of the Slavs. It will nevertheless be of interest to give the reader an idea of what has been said on the subject. The author points to the methodological difficulty of identifying anthropological materials (in this case human remains, types) with ethnic groups and linguistic entities in the historical past. He asserts, further, that neither *Sklavenoi* nor *Antae* nor Greeks had any monolithically uniform anthropological types. On the Greek physical type or types he relies heavily on the anthropometric studies of Angel and Charles, and he refers to the synthesis of this material by Poulianos. The procedure is further complicated, as he rightly observes, by (a) the return of large numbers of Greeks from Bulgaria and Asia Minor in the 1920's, and (b) by the presence of Albanians and Vlachs. According to Angel the population of Mycenaean Greece forms the racial basis of the Greeks from the Bronze Age to the present day, and though it included a variety of racial types, i.e. alpine, dinaro-medi-



terranean, nordic, it was essentially of the Mediterranean racial type. Poulianos also agrees with Angel that the racial type of the Greek has not basically changed from antiquity to the present. Weithmann contends that Poulianos exaggerates for he does not take into account, sufficiently, the massive Slavic and Albanian settlement. Yet, he continues, it has been frequently observed, in anthropological studies that: "die historisch als bedeutsam eingestuft werden, zu keinen nennenswerte, anthropologisch fassbaren Veränderungen der Bevölkerungsstruktur gefuhrt haben". He then concludes, very much like Poulianos: "Im vorliegenden Fall, der slavischen Einwanderung, ist es niemals zu einem Massenbevölkerungswechsel gekommen. Die griechische autochthone Bevölkerung, wie sie sich seit der Bronzezeit aus heterogenen Elementen zusammengesetzt hatte, bildete für die Neuankömmlinge ein rein zahlenmässig überlegenes Substrat. Von diesem wurden die fremden Elemente nicht nur wie die Geschichts- und die Sprachwissenschaft zeigen kulturell innerhalb kurzer Zeit assimiliert, sondern auch, wie die anthropologische Forschung lehrt rassenmässig weitgehend assimiliert" (p. 272). Thus, according to Weithmann, the Greek racial type (itself mixed from the time of its genesis in antiquity) absorbed the Slavs and the Greek physical type predominated at the expense of the Slavic physical type.

As for the Albanians, they lived separately from the Greeks when they first entered and settled, and the process of assimilation was slow, not being completed until the early twentieth century. They were, according to the author, anthropologically dinaric, ethnically Illyrian with an early Slavic admixture. Therefore, Weithmann concludes, the dinaric type observable among the modern Greek population goes back to the Albanians. One should note here, briefly, that there are serious philological studies that call into question Weithmann's (as well as the Albanians') assertion of the Illyrian descent of the modern Albanians and which indicate that before their descent into Albania they lived in the northcentral Balkans close to the Dacians. (I. I. Russu, *Die Sprache der Thraco-Daker* (Bucharest, 1969); V. Georgiev, "The Earliest Ethnological Situation of the Balkan Peninsula as evidenced by linguistic and onomastic Data", in *Aspects of the Balkans*, edited by H. Birnbaum and S. Vryonis (The Hague-Paris, 1972), 50-65). Second, though the presence of an important Albanian component in Greece is beyond dispute, the question of their 'racial contribution' to the modern Greek stock is complicated by the fact that a dinaric type is already observable among the Greeks in ancient or Mycenaean times (see above, Angel). As for the Slavs, scholars have assumed (supported by the testimony of Procopius and the Strategicon of Maurice) that they were of the Nordic physical type. Once in

the Balkans they mixed with the Thracian and other Balkan physical types, as well as with Avars and Protobulgars. But, Weithmann relates, the Slavs who came to Greece in the sixth century were of the Nordic type. Thus physical anthropologists have turned to the question of the traces of 'blondism' among modern Greeks. Boev attributes it to the Slavic racial input whereas Poulianos attributes it to the Celts. But no one of them refers to the existence of blondism among the ancient Greeks at the very beginning of the racial evolution of the Greeks. I close the section on physical anthropological evidence by reciting what I said in the beginning: it is the least 'scientific' body of evidence discussed by Weithmann and tells us practically nothing about the question under discussion. (He might have also mentioned the attention given to the problem by the American anthropologist C. Coon, *The Races of Europe* (New York, 1939) pp. 604, 607).

Weithmann ends his book by recapitulating its main conclusions already set out in great detail during the course of the book, on the Slavic Landnahme, Byzantinization, Hellenization.

The review has been long and detailed but the subject matter is of perennial interest to Byzantinists, Balkanists, and Slavists, and it constitutes a central historical question for many scholars in these fields. Much effort, particularly in the post war years, has been dedicated by the historians, archaeologists, and philologists of the Balkan countries to their origins, purported or real, and to their ethnogenesis. The Bulgarians have developed the field of Thracology, have propounded a continuity of the Thracians so that by making of them a part of their own ethnogenesis the Bulgarians acquire an "ancient" status in the Balkans. The Roumanians have brought together all the evidence supporting their view of the continuity of the Daco-Getans, via Romanization, in the ethnogenesis of the Roumanians, thus assuring themselves of priority on the land. Albanians have sifted the archaeological evidence to demonstrate their descent from the Illyrians and thus to carve out for themselves an indigenous status. But of all the Balkan peoples it is the origin of the modern Greeks which has most exercised the imagination not only of Greek scholars but also of westerners. Thus Weithmann's book comes a century and one-half after the modern phase of this controversy commenced with Fallmeyer. The basic stages of this scholarship were first Fallmeyer who renewed the problem. The next stage is marked by the basic study of the written texts in the work of A. Vasiliev, "Slavjane v Grecii", *Vizantiiskii Vremenik*, V (1898), 404-434, 626-670. The third is marked by the appearance of Vasmer's *Die Slaven in Griechenland* (Berlin 1941) which set the scholarly tone of the linguistic and toponymic investigations, and finally

Charanis' many studies which infused the study of the texts with information from numismatics and archaeology. What then is the contribution of Weithmann? I have disagreed with the author on a number of points but it is nevertheless true that this work is of significance and every scholar interested in the question of the Slavs in Greece must read it. Though he brings forward no single new bit of evidence, that is all the data was previously known, his book is the first comprehensive synthesis of the knowledge accumulated by other scholars since the appearance of Vasmer's work. Second, unlike Vasmer and others who emphasized one body of sources or another, he has tried to evaluate and synthesize all the various types of sources and data: written, philological-linguistic-toponymic, archaeological, anthropological, and he has tried to give, though sketchily, a history of the controversy. Behind all of his detailed discussion there is an overall structure, a historical structure which interprets isolated details that by and of themselves would be either meaningless or less meaningful. Some of his historical explanations, even when they are conjectural and devoid of immediate textual or other bases are nevertheless stimulating and display an interesting mind at work. Though I have disagreed in detail with the author, yet I found his overall judgment and evaluations mature and historically correct. Above all I have been impressed by the balance of his treatment, succeeding as it does to approach all the evidence. The future of these studies lies primarily in the hands of the archaeologists, for it is they who will recover for us the archaeological evidence of the late sixth, seventh and eighth centuries which is now largely lacking. The way has been indicated. The way has been indicated by the Roumanian, Bulgarian and Serbian archaeologists and by the excavations at Argos and Olympia. Hopefully they will uncover Slavic cemeteries, as I. Nestor did at Sarata Monteoru, Slavic and Greek villages, and urban remains from the period. The recent book of Dr. Ph. Malingoudes indicates further that the disciplines of toponymistic and linguistics still have much to tell us about the details of the Slavic Landnahme in Greece.

*Von Grunebaum Center for Near Eastern  
Studies, UCLA  
University of Athens*