

Tibor ŽIVKOVIĆ  
Institut of History  
Belgrade

### CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS' KASTRA OIKOUMENA IN THE SOUTHERN SLAVS PRINCIPALITIES\*

**Abstract:** The term *kastra oikoumena*, by which Constantine Porphyrogenitus designated the cities in Southern Slavs principalities, was usually understood as the *inhabited cities*. Since this term is going alongside the term *baptized Serbia/Croatia*, it appears that this term is related to the ecclesiastical terminology, and therefore, most probably has another meaning.

**Key words:** *kastra oikoumena*, Croats, Serbs, Constantine Porphyrogenitus, Anastasius the Librarian.

The names of the cities in the Early Medieval Croatia, Serbia, Zachlumi, Terbounia, Pagania, and Diocleia were first mentioned by the Byzantine emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, in Chapters 31 – 36, of his work *De administrando imperio* (further in text *DAI*).<sup>1</sup> Only a few of these cities are known to us from other Latin sources, however, the majority of them never appeared in history, again.<sup>2</sup> The list of these cities, recently investigated by S. Ćirković, is an *undoubted* trace of the administrative division and

---

\* Рад настао као резултат истраживања на пројекту Министарства за науку и технолошки развој *Српске земље у раном средњем веку* (Ев. бр. 147025).

<sup>1</sup> *Constantine Porphyrogenitus De administrando imperio*, ed. R. J. H. Jenkins – Gy. Moravcsik, Washington DC 1967, cc. 31 – 36 (= *DAI*).

<sup>2</sup> *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, ed. M. Kostrenčić, Zagreb 1967, N<sup>os</sup> 12 (Nin, 879); 17 (Nin, 886/887); 20 (Nin, 892); 25 (Nin, 925); 26 (Stagnon, Skordona, 928); 27 (Skordona, 928/929); 28 (Belegradon, ca. 950); 125 (Klaboka?, 1078); 169 (Stolpon, Stibliz?, ca. 1097). Mokron/Mucules (887): *Giovanni Diacono Istoria Veneticorum*, ed. L. A. Berto, Bologna 1999, 146.

*territorial organization* of these Slav principalities.<sup>3</sup> However, Ćirković has accepted as an *empirical truth* the usual translation of the term *κάστρα οικούμενα* (*kastra oikoumena*) as *inhabited cities*.<sup>4</sup> We have also recently tried to provide an answer on the primary question: *What kind of cities did Constantine mention?* – proposing that the cities were economic, administrative, military or ecclesiastical centres – however, without a definite conclusion.<sup>5</sup> Both attempts - Ćirković's and ours, neglected the essential fact that we did not consider the possibility that the term *kastra oikoumena* was not translated, and has not been understood well in historiography. It would certainly be better, before any hypothesis advancement, especially the one based on *empirical truth*, if we try to clarify the exact meaning of Constantine's phrase *kastra oikoumena*. The sections of the *DAI*, which contain *kastra oikoumena* are:

1.1 Ὅτι ἡ βαπτισμένη Χρῳβατία<sup>6</sup> εἰσὶν κάστρα οἰκούμενα, ἡ Νῶνα, τὸ Βελέγραδον, τὸ Βελίτζιν, τὸ Σκόρδονα, τὸ Χλεβένα, τὸ Στόλπον, τὸ Τενήν, τὸ Κόρι, τὸ Κλαβόκα.<sup>7</sup>

*In the baptized Croatia there are kastra oikoumena of Nona,<sup>8</sup> Beogradon,<sup>9</sup> Belitzin,<sup>10</sup> Skordona,<sup>11</sup> Hlebena,<sup>12</sup> Stolpon,<sup>13</sup> Tenin,<sup>14</sup> Kori,<sup>15</sup> Klaboka.<sup>16</sup>*

---

<sup>3</sup> S. Ćirković, "Naseljeni gradovi" *Konstantina Porfirogenita i najstarija teritorijalna organizacija*, ZRVI 37 (1998) 9 – 32 (= Ćirković, "Naseljeni gradovi"). See, also, I. Goldstein, "Zemljica Bosna" – "το χωρίον Βόσωνα", in: "De administrando imperio" Konstantina VII. Porfirogeneta, Zbornik o Pavlu Anđeliću, Sarajevo 2008, 104.

<sup>4</sup> For this kind of methodology, based on *empirical truth*, see, S. K. Bajaj, *Research Methodology in History*, New Delhi 2002, 121. We should note that the *empirical truth* is very often nothing more than a hidden hypothesis.

<sup>5</sup> T. Živković, *Crkvena organizacija u srpskim zemljama*, Beograd 2004, 166 – 171. (=Živković, *Crkvena organizacija*).

<sup>6</sup> According to *Codex Parisinus gr. 2009*, f. 92r; cf. *DAI I*, c. 29.67: Ὅτι [ἐν] τῇ βαπτισμένῃ

<sup>7</sup> *DAI I*, c. 31.68 – 70.

<sup>8</sup> The seat of the Croat *archontes* during the Early Middle Ages, the modern town of Nin, Croatia. Here it is recorded in romanized form *Nona*; cf. A. Loma, *Serbisches und Kroatisches Sprachgut bei Konstantin Porphyrogennetos*, ZRVI 38 (2000) 114 (=Loma, *Sprachgut*).

<sup>9</sup> Beogradon is the modern town of Biograd, Croatia. It was originally built by the Croats. See, *Fontes Byzantini Historiam populorum Jugoslaviae spectantes II*, ed. B. Ferjančić, Belgrade 1959, 44, n. 129 (= *FB II*); see also, Loma, *Sprachgut*, 106.

<sup>10</sup> The city is of unknown location; cf. Loma, *Sprachgut*, 107; *FB II*, 44, n. 130; *DAI II*, 129.

1.2 Ὅτι ἐν τῇ βαπτισμένη Σερβλίᾳ εἰσὶν κάστρα οἰκούμενα, τὸ Δεστινίκον, τὸ Τζερναβουσκέν, τὸ Μεγυρέτους, τὸ Δρεσνεήκ, τὸ Λεσνήκ, τὸ Σαληνές, καὶ εἰς τὸ χωρίον Βόσονα, τὸ Κάτερα καὶ τὸ Δεσνήκ.<sup>17</sup>

*In baptized Serbia there are kastra oikoumena of Destinikon, Tzernabouskei, Megyretous, Dresneik, Lesnik, Salines, and in the horion of Bosona, Katera and Desnik.*<sup>18</sup>

1.3 Ὅτι ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ τῶν Ζαχλούμων, εἰσὶν κάστρα οἰκούμενα, τὸ Σταγνόν, τὸ Μοκρισκίκ, τὸ Ἰοσλή, τὸ Γαλουμαήνικ, τὸ Δοβρισκίκ.<sup>19</sup>

*In the horion of the Zachlumi there are kastra oikoumena of Stagnon,<sup>20</sup> Mokriskik,<sup>21</sup> Iosli,<sup>22</sup> Galoumainik,<sup>23</sup> Dobriskik.<sup>24</sup>*

1.4 Ὅτι ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ Τερβουνίας καὶ τοῦ Καναλή εἰσὶ κάστρα οἰκούμενα, ἡ Τερβουνία, τὸ Ὀρμος, τὰ Ῥίσενα, τὸ Λουκάβεται, τὸ Ζετλήβη.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>11</sup> The modern town of Skradin, Croatia; cf. *FB II*, 44, n. 131; Loma, *Sprachgut*, 115.

<sup>12</sup> The modern town of Livno, Bosnia and Herzegovina; cf. *FB II*, 44, n. 132; Loma, *Sprachgut*, 117.

<sup>13</sup> This could be town Stupin near Rogoznica, Croatia; cf. Loma, *Sprachgut*, 116; *FB I*, 44, n. 133; *DAI II*, 129.

<sup>14</sup> The modern town of Knin, Croatia; cf. *FB II*, 44, n. 134.

<sup>15</sup> The modern town of Karin, Croatia; cf. *FB II*, 44, n. 135; Loma, *Sprachgut*, 112.

<sup>16</sup> Klaboka is a town of unknown location; see, *FB II*, 44, n. 136; Loma, *Sprachgut*, 111; *DAI II*, 129.

<sup>17</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.149 – 151.

<sup>18</sup> Not one of the cities mentioned in Serbia and Bosnia were located with certainty, only for Salines was said that it is probably modern town of Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina; cf. *FB II*, 58 – 59, notes 196 – 204; *DAI II*, 137; Loma, *Sprachgut*, 109 – 113, 115 – 116.

<sup>19</sup> *DAI I*, c. 33.20 – 21.

<sup>20</sup> The modern town of Ston, Croatia; cf. *FB II*, 61, n. 212; *DAI II*, 140.

<sup>21</sup> This city is of unknown location; cf. *FB II*, 61, n. 213; Loma, *Sprachgut*, 114; *DAI II*, 140. The most probable location of this city is near Mokro, west of Mostar, on the right bank of the Neretva River, Bosnia and Herzegovina.

<sup>22</sup> The modern village of Ošlje to the north-east of Ston, Croatia; cf. *FB II*, 61, n. 214; *DAI II*, 140; Loma, *Sprachgut*, 110 – 111.

<sup>23</sup> The most probable location of this town is the modern village of Glumine, to the north of Ošlje; cf. *FB II*, 61, n. 215; *DAI II*, 140. Loma, *Sprachgut*, 105 – 106, argued that it is the modern village of Golubinac, to the south of Popovo Polje.

<sup>24</sup> Most probably the Medieval Dabar, south-east from Ljubinje, Herzegovina; cf. *FB II*, 61, n. 216; *DAI II*, 140. Loma, *Sprachgut*, 110; Ćirković, “*Naseljeni gradovi*”, 19.

<sup>25</sup> *DAI I*, c. 34.19 – 20.

*In the horion of Terbounia and Kanali there are kastra oikoumena of Terbounia,<sup>26</sup> Ormos,<sup>27</sup> Rhisena,<sup>28</sup> Loukabetai,<sup>29</sup> Zetlibi.<sup>30</sup>*

1.5 Ὅτι ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ Διοκλήας εἰσι μέγала κάστρα οἰκούμενα τὸ Γράδετῃ τὸ Νουγράδε τὸ Λοντοδόκλα.<sup>31</sup>

*In the country of Diocleia there are megala kastra oikoumena of Gradetai,<sup>32</sup> Nougrade,<sup>33</sup> Lontodokla.<sup>34</sup>*

1.6 Ὅτι ἐν Παγανίᾳ εἰσιν κάστρα οἰκούμενα, τὸ Μόκρον, τὸ Βερούλλια, τὸ Ὅστρωκ, καὶ εἰς ... Λαβινετζᾶ.<sup>35</sup> Κρατούσιν δὲ καὶ ταύτας

---

<sup>26</sup> It is the modern town of Trebinje, Herzegovina; cf. *FB II*, 63, n. 223; *DAI II*, 140.

<sup>27</sup> The Medieval city of Vrm, between Trebinje and Bileća; cf. *FB II*, 63, n. 224; *DAI II*, 140; Loma, *Sprachgut*, 114; Ćirković, “*Naseljeni gradovi*”, 15.

<sup>28</sup> It must be the modern town of Risan in the Bay of Kotor, Montenegro; cf. *FB II*, 63, n. 225; *DAI II*, 140; Ćirković, “*Naseljeni gradovi*”, 15; Loma, *Sprachgut*, 115.

<sup>29</sup> Some authors believed that it is Luka a place nearby Trebinje; cf. *FB II*, 63, n. 226; *DAI II*, 140; Loma, *Sprachgut*, 113, the place should be read as Lukavac, with location between Bileća and Nevesinje. There is also a hill Lukovac 5 km south-west from Trebinje.

<sup>30</sup> Unknown location – the village of Necvijeće, Herzegovina, or Stolivo, on the west bank of the Bay of Kotor; cf. *FB II*, 63, n. 227; *DAI II*, 140. However, Loma, *Sprachgut*, 110, thinks that it is the modern village of Ćetoljubi in the East-Herzegovina.

<sup>31</sup> *DAI I*, c. 35.12 – 13.

<sup>32</sup> The place is of unknown location, but most likely existed in the region of Grbalj, Montenegro; cf. Loma, *Sprachgut*, 108; Ćirković, “*Naseljeni gradovi*”, 22. For other location see, *FB II*, 64, n. 231; *DAI II*, 141.

<sup>33</sup> In the olden historiography it was located near by Gradac, or identified with the modern village of Prevlaka; cf. *FB II*, 64, n. 232; *DAI II*, 141. More recently, Ćirković, “*Naseljeni gradovi*”, 22, proposed the solution that it could have been in the vicinity of Butua, the modern town of Budva, Montenegro, where are the toponyms as Veli Grad (lit. *Great city*) and Zagrađe (lit. *Behind the city*) found; see, also, Loma, *Sprachgut*, 114.

<sup>34</sup> The place is of unknown location; cf. *FB II*, 64, n. 233; *DAI II*, 141. Ćirković, “*Naseljeni gradovi*”, 23, thinks that this town should have been located somewhere in the central part of Diocleia, in the vicinity of ancient Diocleia. There is a possibility that this name actually contains the names of two cities, τὸ Λόγγ καὶ τὸ Δόκλα; cf. Loma, *Sprachgut*, 113.

<sup>35</sup> According to *Codex Parisinus gr. 2009*, f. 104v, lin. 12. *DAI I*, c. 36.15: καὶ ἡ Σλαβινετζᾶ. It appears that the scribe omitted the name of the region in which Lavinetza was situated. We know, according to the *DAI*, that Paganian consisted of three *zoupanias*: Rhastotza and Mokros on the sea, and Dalen in the interior of Paganian; cf.

τάς νήσους· νῆσος μεγάλη ἡ Κούρκρα ἦτοι τὸ Κίκερ ἐν ἧ ἔστιν καὶ κάστρον, νῆσος ἕτερα μεγάλη τὰ Μέλετα· ἦτοι τὸ Μαλοζεάται ἦν ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ ἅγιος Λουκᾶς μέμνηται Μελίτην ταύτην προσαγορεύων ἐν ἧ καὶ ἔχισ· τὸν ἅγιον Παῦλον· ἀπὸ τοῦ δακτύλου προσήψατο, ἦν καὶ τὸ πυρὶ ὁ ἅγιος Παῦλος κατέφλεξεν, νῆσος ἕτερα μεγάλη τὸ Φάρα, νῆσος ἕτερα μεγάλη ὁ Βράτζης. Εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι νῆσοι αἱ μὴ κρατούμεναι παρὰ τῶν αὐτῶν Παγανῶν· νῆσος τὰ Χώραρα, νῆσος Ἰης, νῆσος τὸ Λάστοβον.<sup>36</sup>

*In Paganía there are kástra oikouména of Mokron,<sup>37</sup> Beroullia,<sup>38</sup> Ostrok<sup>39</sup> and Lavinetza.<sup>40</sup> Also, they possess these islands: the large island of Kourkra, or Kiker, on which there is a city; another large island, Meleta, or Malozeatai, which St. Luke mentions in the Acts of the Apostles by the name of Melite, in which a viper fastened upon St. Paul by his finger, and St. Paul burnt it up in the fire; another large island, Phara; another large island, Bratzis. There are other islands not in the possession of these same Pagani: the island of Choara, the island of Ies, and the island of Lastobon.<sup>41</sup>*

The most difficult question to answer is on the origin of the source(s) Constantine Porphyrogenitus used when describing these provinces. Even the provenience of his source(s) could be a key to better understand the term *kástra oikouména*. These questions appear to be neglected in historiography.<sup>42</sup> The

---

*DAI I*, c. 29.104 – 109. Therefore, since Mokro, Beroullia, and Ostrok were at the sea, it is possible that the last listed city, Lavinetza, was in *zoupania* of Dalen.

<sup>36</sup> *DAI I*, c. 36.14 – 23.

<sup>37</sup> It is the modern town of Makarska, Croatia; cf. *FB II*, 65, n. 236; *DAI II*, 142; Ćirković, “*Naseljeni gradovi*”, 16; A. Škegro, *Mukurska biskupija (Ecclesia Muccurítana)*, *Povijesni prilozi* 34 (2008) 9 – 25.

<sup>38</sup> It is usually located in the modern place of Vrulja, Croatia; *FB II*, 65, n. 237; *DAI II*, 142. It is much more probable that it could be the modern place of Brela; cf. Ćirković, “*Naseljeni gradovi*”, 16; Loma, *Sprachgut*, 107.

<sup>39</sup> It is, most probably, the modern place of Zaoštrog, to the south of the town of Makarska, Croatia; cf. *FB II*, 65, n. 238; Ćirković, “*Naseljeni gradovi*”, 16; Loma, *Sprachgut*, 114. For the different identification, see, *DAI II*, 142.

<sup>40</sup> The identification of this city, either Slavinetza or Lavinetza, is of uncertain location; cf. *FB II*, 65, n. 239, Gradac, at the seashore near by the estuary of the Neretva river. The other possibility is Labčane, Lapčanj; cf. Loma, *Sprachgut*, 116; Ćirković, “*Naseljeni gradovi*”, 16, n. 23.

<sup>41</sup> For the identification of these islands, see, *FB II*, 65, notes 240 – 245; *DAI II*, 142.

<sup>42</sup> In regards to the chapters about the Slavs, and the Constantine’s source/sources (cc. 29 – 36), it is usually stated that he gathered the material from his informant/informants, most probably Byzantine official/officials, from Dalmatia, as well as from the Archives

thorough research on the *kastra oikoumena* could reveal at least, the origin, and possible provenience of Constantine's source(s) on the cities in the Slav principalities.

It is the fact that the list of the cities comes at the very end of all chapters that are dedicated to the Slavs, except in chapter 31, *Of the Croats and of the country they now dwell in*, where it is placed nearly at the end of the chapter. But each time it is opened with the particular word *oti*, which usually tells us that Constantine switched to another source, or has returned to the one he used previously.<sup>43</sup> Anyway, these conjunctors open sections of the text either literally used from Constantine's primary source on the specific matter, or most often, the sections based on a specific source retold by Constantine.<sup>44</sup> The conjecture *oti* could be a trace pointing out that the names of *kastra oikoumena* belonged to the same source, but were displaced by Constantine in the chapters related to a specific Slav principality. Furthermore, only in chapters 31, and 32, *Of the Croats and of the country they now dwell in* and *Of the Serbs and of the country they now dwell in*, there is a frequently used term 'in baptized Croatia/Serbia' followed by the term *kastra oikoumena*. In regards to the other Slav principalities, there is no clarification on the term *baptized* (country). This could mean that Constantine had two major sources, undoubtedly of the similar provenience, 'Of the Croats' and 'Of the Serbs' chapters, which contained the term *in baptized (Serbia/Croatia)*. Consequently, it means that the lists of the cities in other Slav principalities were contained in one of the two sources. Therefore, there was no need for the repetition *in the baptized country* Zachlumi, Terbounia, Diocleia, and Pagania. The identical terminology reveals, in fact, that both sources were of similar, if not completely of the same provenience, and with the same narrative structure. This interpretation is congruent with Constantine's statement that the Pagans, Terbounians, and Zachlumians were descendants of the unbaptized Serbs, and that is why the list of *kastra oikoumena* in those principalities, could be listed in the source related to the Serbs. This is the reason why there was no need for the author of the Constantine's source to repeat the term *in baptized country*. The lack of this

---

of Constantinople. See the examples in: B. Ferjančić, *Dolazak Hrvata i Srba na Balkansko poluostrvo*, ZRVI 35 (1996) 120, n. 9. The question on the Constantine's sources 'Of the Croats/Serbs', was in fact, never the matter of thorough research. The only exception is, B. Ferjančić, *Dalmacija u spisu De administrando imperio – vrela i putevi saznanja*, ZRVI 29/30 (1991) 9 – 21 (= Ferjančić, *Vrela*).

<sup>43</sup> J. B. Bury, *The treatise De administrando imperio*, BZ 15 (1906) 525, 538.

<sup>44</sup> See, for instance, *DAI I*, cc. 6.2 – 12; 7.3 – 17; 8.34 – 35; 13.3 – 8; 15.2 – 14; cf. R. Katičić, *Aedificaverunt Ragusium et habitaverunt in eo. Tragom najstarijih dubrovačkih zapisa*, Uz početke hrvatskih početaka, Split 1993, 132.

particular information in relation to the principalities of Zachlumi, Terbounia, Paganía, and Diocleia, just confirms that these principalities were not treated equally by the author who wrote *Of the Serbs* and *Of the Croats* chapters. If this anonymous author intended to write separate works on these principalities, then we should expect that he would have at least, once repeated the phrase *in baptized country* of Zachlumi, or Terbounia, or Paganía, or Diocleia. For the Diocletians in chapter 35, Constantine did not provide ethnic clarification. Based on our previous interpretation, we can assume that the list of the cities in Diocleia was not the part of the source related to the Serbs.<sup>45</sup> Furthermore, Constantine *ex silentio* said that Diocletians, in fact, were not the part of the Serbian tribe, since he said that the Serbs settled in the regions of Zachlumi, Terbounia, and Paganía, but he did not mention Diocleia.<sup>46</sup> It is important to note that Zachlumi and Terbounia are classified as *horion*, a small land, but Diocleia is called *hora*, a country.<sup>47</sup>

It is also important to notice that only the list of Diocleians' cities had the adjective *megala*. It primarily means *big*, but also, *old*, in this case, cities. It would be very odd that Constantine, who mentioned so many cities in the *DAI*, used this adjective *megalos* only in the case of the Diocletians' cities to underline how large they were. We cannot expect that this small principality was distinguished from the other Slav principalities because of its large cities. Constantine used this adjective *megalos* on several occasions in the *DAI*, and its true meaning is the matter of dispute. He said that White Croatia, the one from which Croats descended in to Dalmatia, is also called *Megala Chrovatia*,<sup>48</sup> and in chapters 13, 38, and 40, he spoke about the *Megala Moravia*. In both cases it

---

<sup>45</sup> It was argued that Constantine forgot to mention the Serb origin of the Diocletians; cf. *FB II*, 63, n. 229. In the Croat historiography, this is understood as an *ex silentio* evidence that Diocletians were, in fact, the part of the Croat tribe; cf. V. Koščák, *Dolazak Hrvata*, HZ 40 (1987) 380; I. Goldstein, *Hrvatski rani srednji vijek*, Zagreb 1995, 32, 91.

<sup>46</sup> *DAI I*, c. 32.21 – 23.

<sup>47</sup> Paganía was also mentioned as *hora*, but only in the beginning of chapter 36; cf. *DAI I*, c. 36.3. The same pattern can be noticed in the case of Terbounia, mentioned together with the land of Kanale, since it is called *hora* at the beginning of chapter 34; cf. *DAI I*, c. 34.3. Also, in the case of the country of Zachlumi, which is called *hora* at the beginning of chapter 33; cf. *DAI I*, c. 33.3.

<sup>48</sup> *DAI I*, cc. 31.83; 32.5 – 6. However, in the chapter regarding the Pagans, Constantine used the adjective *megala* in the sense of *the large* for the islands of Korkyra and Meleta; cf. *DAI I*, c. 36.16 – 17.

was usually understood and translated using the adjective – *Great*.<sup>49</sup> Constantine also used this adjective to designate the *former* Francia, i. e. before it was divided in 843.<sup>50</sup> Therefore, other meanings of the adjective *megalos* (great) could be *old, ancient, or former*.<sup>51</sup>

If we apply this denomination to the *megala kastra* of Diocleia, then we propose the most probable meaning – *old cities*. If we also bear in mind that *megala kastra* classification is used only in chapter 35, then the whole phrase *megala kastra oikoumena* had different and a very specific meaning. This meaning could have come from a Latin text, i. e. Constantine's primary source 'Of the Serbs/Croats', since in the Latin language, there was another meaning for *major patria, major metropolis, major civitas* – *former, olden*.<sup>52</sup> For instance, the place Staro Město (lit. *Old city*) near Prague, was actually called during the Middle Ages (1282), *major civitas*, which *Continuator of Cosma Pragensis* called *antiqua civitas*.<sup>53</sup>

It would be fair to say that the translation of the phrase *kastra oikoumena* as *inhabited cities* sounds too literal. It seems unlikely that Constantine would endeavour to mention uninhabited cities, as well. If one was to mention a place – village, city, or a town – it is expected that one would mention inhabited places. Interestingly, Constantine repeated *kastra oikoumena* six times and in six different chapters of the *DAI*, those that were related only to the Southern Slav principalities. In chapter 28, for instance, he also supplied a list of the cities using the term *kastron* as a prefix for the city's names.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>49</sup> *DAI I*, cc. 13.5; 38.58; 40.33. Each time Constantine spoke about the *former* Moravia. For other opinions, see, *DAI II*, 62; S. Pirivatrić, *Vizantijska tema Morava i "Moravije" Konstantina VII Porfirogenita*, ZRVI 36 (1997) 173 – 201.

<sup>50</sup> *DAI I*, cc. 26.6; 29.134. In the translation in these passages, it is always understood as the *Great* Francia; cf. *DAI I*, 109, 131.

<sup>51</sup> See, T. Živković, *Južni Sloveni pod vizantijskom vlašću (600 – 1025)*, Beograd 2007, 194 – 195, and notes 880 – 888.

<sup>52</sup> See, M. Divković, *Latinsko-hrvatski rječnik za škole*, Zagreb 1900, 622, s. v. *magnus*. See, also, E. Kärcher, *Beiträge zur lateinischen Etymologie und Lexikographie*, Stuttgart 1844, 37; cf. *Q. Curtii Rufi De Gestis Alexandri Magni regis Macedonum libri qui supersunt octo*, ed. J. Mützell, Berlin 1841, 219: *Syraculis id simulacrum devexerant Poeni, et in maiore locaverant patria, multisque allis spoliis urbium a semet captarum non Carthaginem magis, quam Tyrum ornaverant*.

<sup>53</sup> See, W. W. Tomek, *Dějepis města Prahy I*, Prague 1855, 213, n. 25; cf. *Codex Juris Bohemici I*, ed. H. Jireček, Prague 1867, 185.

<sup>54</sup> *DAI I*, c. 27.75 – 88. For the term *kastron*, see, J. F. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century: The Transformation of a Culture*, Cambridge 1990, 460 – 461; *A History of Private Life I, From Pagan Rome to Byzantium*, ed. Ph. Ariès – G. Duby, Harvard University Press 1992, 565.

Throughout the *DAI*, he never used this term again, even though he continued to mention many cities (*kastra*) in other chapters. In chapter 42, Constantine mentioned Belgrade: κάστρον ἐστὶν τὸ Βελέγραδα, as well as Sarkel and Tamatarcha, each classified as *kastron*.<sup>55</sup> The same chapter contains the names of other cities, mostly without any classification, not even *kastron* – i.e. Thessalonica, Distra (Dristra).<sup>56</sup> In chapter 44, there are cities (*kastra*): Kars, Perkri, Chliat, Arzes, Tibi, Chert, Salamas, and Manzikert.<sup>57</sup> One could note that Constantine was summarizing his account in chapter 44, underlining that these cities have never been under the dominion of the Persians or Arabs.<sup>58</sup> As an accurate representation of the term *kastron* (city), it is worth mentioning Constantine's description of the city of Ardanoutzin, for which he said that it was *very strongly defended, and has moreover a considerable suburban area like a provincial city*.<sup>59</sup> In the chapter where he speaks of the Russians, Constantine provided a list of their cities, *kastra* (four cities), without any specific classification, which is the same as in the case of the Venetian cities by classifying them only as – *kastron*.<sup>60</sup>

Another important question we face, is whether the phrase *kastra oikoumena*, is truly in opposition to the term ἐρημόκαστρα (*erimokastra*) as it appears to be widely accepted in historiography.<sup>61</sup> It is important to note that only in the Slav chapters of the *DAI* that Constantine had used the phrase *kastra oikoumena*, as well as the term ἐρημόκαστρα, (chapters 29, 30, and 35, as well as in 27, and 37). The term *erimokastra*, with its primary meaning *deserted or uninhabited cities*, also appears to be literally translated and understood. The context in which these phrases appear is of essential significance for their true meaning. In chapter 27, of the *DAI*, Constantine told the story about Capua. He said that *it was a very large city (πόλις ὑπερμεγέθης) indeed, and was captured by the Vandals, i.e. Africans, who demolished it. When it was lying as deserted city (Ἐρημοκόστρου δὲ οὐσης), the Lombards settled in it (ῥέκουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ)*.<sup>62</sup> Then, *when the Africans came against them once more, bishop Landulf built a*

<sup>55</sup> *DAI I*, c. 42.16, 22, 92 – 93.

<sup>56</sup> *DAI I*, c. 42.15, 21.

<sup>57</sup> *DAI I*, c. 44.13 – 16, 40.

<sup>58</sup> *DAI I*, c. 44.116 – 118. It is to say that these cities were never under the rule of non-Christian ruler.

<sup>59</sup> *DAI I*, c. 46.42 – 43.

<sup>60</sup> *DAI I*, c. 9.5 – 7.

<sup>61</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.290; cf. Ćirković, “*Naseljeni gradovi*”, 9.

<sup>62</sup> *DAI I*, c. 27.61 – 63.

*city at the bridge over the river and called it New Capua, and it still survives.*<sup>63</sup> It means that the city of Capua was deserted for a while before Longobards settled in, and then obviously it was not *erimokastron* anymore. The appearance of the bishop is significant, since it could mean that the city was recovered by the ecclesiastical organization, and therefore, was probably not considered *erimokastron* anymore, and not only because the Longobards repopulated it.

The similar context can be found in chapter 37, of the *DAI*. Constantine wrote that on the Dniestar River, the deserted cities (*erimokastron*) were: Aspron, Toungatai, Kraknakatai, Salmakatai, Sakakatai, Giaioukatai.<sup>64</sup> If these cities were deserted, it would be very strange that one would know their names, even the meaning of a particular name. For instance, Constantine said that Pechenegs called the city of Aspron *because its stones look very white.*<sup>65</sup> The following text probably explains the true meaning of *erimokastron*. Namely, Constantine added that *among the buildings of these old cities (not among the ruins at all) are found some distinctive traces of churches and crosses, whence some preserve a tradition that once on a time Romaioi had settlements there.*<sup>66</sup> The presence of the churches, or generally speaking Christianity, reveals that *erimokastron* could define the cities as those that once belonged to *oikoumene*, or the Christian world, i. e. the civilized world, and that the absence of the ecclesiastical organization made them deserted, i. e. out of the *oikoumene*, or out of the Christian world's jurisdiction. This peculiar interest into ecclesiastical matters could be a trace that Constantine's informant was a Churchman. Constantine certainly did not undertake archaeological excavations, nor such kind of works was performed by anyone at that time, rather the churches, and the crosses described in the *DAI*, certainly were the testimony of an eyewitness. This eyewitness did not wonder through the ghostly cities, but on the contrary, he visited *inhabited* cities of the Pechenegs, which he considered 'deserted' since the ecclesiastical organization did not exist in them. In line with this statement is Constantine's outlining of a truly uninhabited place (in this particular case an island) - *ἀοικήτος.*<sup>67</sup> In this case, the island was in fact

---

<sup>63</sup> *DAI I*, c. 27.63 – 66.

<sup>64</sup> *DAI I*, c. 37.58 – 64. About these cities, see, S. Brezeanu, *Toponymy and Ethnic Realities at the Lower Danube in the 10<sup>th</sup> century. The "Deserted Cities" in the Constantine Porphyrogenitus' De administrando imperio*, *Annuario 4* (2002) 19 – 46.

<sup>65</sup> *DAI I*, c. 37.60 – 61.

<sup>66</sup> *DAI I*, c. 37.64 – 67.

<sup>67</sup> *DAI I*, c. 47.4.

depopulated of its inhabitants.<sup>68</sup> The same term he used to describe a deserted ancient place where once Venice should have been built.<sup>69</sup>

Therefore, we have to conclude that Constantine Porphyrogenitus, throughout the *DAI*, was never repeated, except in the Slav chapters, an adjective that a city was *inhabited*. Perhaps the word *oikoumena* had another meaning, most probably due to the origin of Constantine's primary source for the Slav chapters. All these examples from the *DAI* that we presented, on the usage of the terms *kastra oikoumena* and *eirimokastrā*, lead us to form an opinion that in the Slav chapters, the meanings were specific, but still have not been clearly defined in the historiography.

As we already have mentioned, the repetition of the phrase *kastra oikoumena* in the lists of the cities in the Slav chapters, has revealed that this list was unique. In that list, it was said at the beginning of the section that *kastra oikoumena* were, in *baptized* Croatia, as well as in *baptized* Serbia, Terbounia, Zachlumi, Pagania, and Diocleia. Since Constantine had created separate chapters on the smaller principalities (Zachlumi, Terbounia, Pagania, Diocleia), probably induced in the same order in his primary source, he had to extract the names of the cities each time by placing it under the proper title, and contents of the specific chapter(s). Therefore, in accordance to this, he had to repeat *kastra oikoumena* each time. That is way Constantine's persistent repetition of this phrase reveals to us that he had two sources, *Of the Croats* and *Of the Serbs* that had contained the list of the cities as the part of two coherent sections.

In chapter 33, *Of the Zachlounians*, Constantine left an interesting hint by saying that there were two cities (δύο κάστρα) in the country of the Zachlumians, situated on the top of a mountain – Bona and Chlum.<sup>70</sup> However, below this section in the manuscript, where he placed the list of the *kastra oikoumena*, he did not list these two cities. Bona was the later medieval city of Blagaj, which is the Slav denomination from Lat. *bona*, too.<sup>71</sup> The persistence of this city's name throughout the Early and Later Medieval times suggests that the city was inhabited throughout all of that time.<sup>72</sup> Furthermore, Constantine had to translate the name of the city into the Greek language – καλόν.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> *DAI*, c. 47.15 – 25.

<sup>69</sup> *DAI*, c. 28.10 – ἀοικήτους νήσους.

<sup>70</sup> *DAI*, c. 33.12 – 14.

<sup>71</sup> see, *DAI II*, 137; *FB I*, 60, n. 207.

<sup>72</sup> For Blagaj, see, D. Kovačević – Kojić, *Gradska naselja srednjovjekovne bosanske države*, Sarajevo 1978, 115 – 116, and n. 27 – 29.

<sup>73</sup> *DAI*, c. 33.15.

In chapter 35 of the *DAI Of the Diocletians...*, Constantine said that there was a city Diocleia founded by Diocletian, *but now it is deserted city* (ἐρημόκαστρον), *though still called Diocleia*.<sup>74</sup> In the following text, in the section that contains the list of *kastra oikoumena*, Constantine did not list Diocleia, but only the *kastra megala*: Gradetai, Nougrade, and Lontodokla.<sup>75</sup> The classification of Diocleia, as an *uninhabited city*, did not mean that this city was abandoned. It seems that Constantine understood that, since he had to repeat that this city, even though deserted, was still called Diocleia. In chapter 29, of the *DAI*, Constantine mentioned the city of Diocleia with the remark that the city is *now occupied by the Diocletians*.<sup>76</sup> We can notice the same pattern as in the case of the deserted cities on the right bank of the Dniester River. Allegedly the cities were deserted, but still they had names and houses. In the case of Diocleia however, it is especially peculiar, since we know that the Bulgarian emperor Samuel (ca. 1009), burnt that same city, which already had been, according to Constantine, ‘deserted’.<sup>77</sup> In the *Notitia 10* of the Constantinople’s Patriarchate, dated from 971 to 976, there was also the Bishopric of Diocleia (Διοκλείας) under the Archbishopric of Dyrrachium.<sup>78</sup> The so-called *Charter of Andreaci*, on the foundation of the Church of St. Tryphon, in Cattaro (809), mentioned the Slav *iudex* whose seat was in Diocleia (*Duchia*).<sup>79</sup> These sources unanimously confirm that Diocleia was an *inhabited* city, at least until the beginning of the 11<sup>th</sup> century. It means at least another 50 years after Constantine Porphyrogenitus.

At the end of chapter 29, of the *DAI*, Constantine made an entry about the *inhabited* and *uninhabited* places in Dalmatia. That entry starts with *oti*, and is placed after the descriptions of the five major Byzantine cities in Dalmatia: Ragusa, Spalato, Tetrangurion, Diadora, and Decatera.<sup>80</sup> It is considered that Constantine gathered information on these cities either through an informant

---

<sup>74</sup> *DAI I*, c. 35.9 – 11.

<sup>75</sup> *DAI I*, c. 35.12 – 13.

<sup>76</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.11 – 12.

<sup>77</sup> *Estratto dalla Leggenda di S. T., Storia documentata della marinerezza bocchese*, ed. G. Gelcich, Ragusa 1889, 84. On the date of Samuel’s campaign, see, T. Živković, *Forging Unity – The South Slavs Between East and West: 550 – 1150*, Belgrade 2008, 229 – 247.

<sup>78</sup> *Notitiae episcopatum ecclesiae constantinopolitanae*, ed. J. Darouzès, Paris 1981, Notitia 10.612; Živković, *Crkvena organizacija*, 146 – 147.

<sup>79</sup> *Instrumentum corporis nostri gloriosi confalonis sancti Tryphonis*, Književnost Crne Gore od XII – XIX vijeka, Pisci srednjovjekovnog latiniteta, prir. D. Sindik – G. Tomović, Cetinje 1996, 18.

<sup>80</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.217 – 284.

from Dalmatia, or based it on the information from the Archives of Constantinople.<sup>81</sup> Since the following section is opened by *oti*, we cannot be so sure whether this section is also extracted from the same source which he used to get the information about the major Dalmatian cities. It could also be from another source. Constantine could have abbreviated his primary source by using *oti*.

In the last section of chapter 29, Constantine wrote that under Dalmatian control (i.e. under the rule of a Byzantine *strategos*), there were *numerous archipelago, extending as far as Beneventum. One of these islands is the city of Vekla, and on another island Arbe, and on another island Opsara, and on another island Lumbricatōn, and these are still inhabited (ἄτινα κατοικοῦνται μέχρι τοῦ νῦν)*.<sup>82</sup> We have to take note of the term κατοικοῦνται, meaning *inhabited*, as it leads us towards a conclusion that Constantine had intended to clarify which cities were still under Byzantine's rule (as it was the case with the five major Dalmatian cities he mentioned above), and to make a distinction between them and some other 'uninhabited' cities that were out of the Byzantine' jurisdiction. Namely, after the opening sentence, he said that the rest (of the islands) were uninhabited (ἀοίκητα), and had deserted cities (ἔχοντα ἐρημόκαστρα), of known names: Katautrebēno, Pizouch, Selbo, Skerda, Aloep, Skirdakissa, Pyrotima, Meleta, Estiounez,<sup>83</sup> *and many others of which the names are not known (ὧν τὰ ὀνόματάου νοοῦται)*.<sup>84</sup> The recorded names were of the islands, not the cities, and in this case, it was expected that somebody knew them, even though there were deserted places on the islands. Therefore, the term κατοικοῦνται stands in opposition to the term ἀοίκητα, *inhabited vs. uninhabited*, and the term ἐρημόκαστρα could have been translated as a *deserted city*. Finally, in the last sentence in this chapter, Constantine clarified that the rest of the cities on the mainland of the *theme* (Dalmatia), where ruled (κρατηθέντα) by the Slavs, stand uninhabited and deserted, and no one lives (κατοικοῦντος) in them.<sup>85</sup> We have to note that the term κρατηθέντα cannot be translated as *captured*, as it was done by the Moravcsik – Jenkins' edition of the *DAI*.<sup>86</sup> It means that even though these cities were allegedly uninhabited and deserted, the Slavs *ruled* over them. The usage of the terms ἀοίκητα καὶ ἔρημα (ἴστανται) is odd, since in this case

<sup>81</sup> Ferjančić, *Vrela*, 20.

<sup>82</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.285 – 289.

<sup>83</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.289-293. For the location of these islands, see, *FB II*, 24-26, n. 57-69.

<sup>84</sup> *DAI I*, 139, translated this as the names are *not intelligible*; *FB II*, 26, as the names of these islands are *not known*.

<sup>85</sup> *DAI I*, c. 29.293 – 295. The exact translation, *FB II*, 26.

<sup>86</sup> *DAI I*, 139.

they were synonyms, *uninhabited/deserted*. The following classification in the same sentence – ἵστανται, *to stand, to exist*, is of particular importance, since these cities were not in ruins and even after 300 years they appeared to be well-preserved. It appears that the deserted cities were in fact inhabited, not by the Romans/Romaioi, but by the Slavs. For instance, all toponyms on the islands of Premuda (Πυρότιμα) and Olib (Ἀλωήπ) described by Constantine as *uninhabited* were of Slavic origin.<sup>87</sup>

It was a common practice for authors of the Early Middle Ages to describe and list towns or cities that were well-known and inhabited. This practice would only change in the context of military destruction of a particular town by labeling it destroyed or deserted. Even though these authors had mentioned numerous towns or cities, some of them were not part of the Christian world, *oikoumena*. *Oikoumena* means *inhabited world, civilized world*, but in the language of the Christian theological doctrine, it means above all, the **Christian world**, and the only one which was recognized and praised during the Middle Ages. The opposite of *kastra oikoumena* must be *civitas deserta/civitas destituta*, or as Constantine's translator from Latin into Greek perhaps literally translated: ἐρημόκαστρα. There are some evidence in the Old Testament, which actually perfectly explained the true meaning of *deserted* or symmetrically opposite, *populated* place. *And the inhabited cities shall be laid waste, and the land shall become a desolation; and you shall know that I am the Lord* (Καὶ αἱ πόλεις αἱ κατοικοῦμεναι ἐξερημώθησονται καὶ ἡ γῆ εἰς ἀφανισμόν ἔστι καὶ ἐπιγνώσεσθε διότι ἐγὼ κύριος).<sup>88</sup> The inhabited places for the Bible are those in which the spirit of the God dwells, as it is clearly stated in another verse: *Until the Spirit is poured upon us from on high, and the wilderness becomes a fruitful field, and the fruitful field is deemed a forest* (ἕως ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πνεῦμα ἀφ' ὕψιλοῦ καὶ ἔσται ἔρημος ὁ Χερμελ καὶ ὁ Χερμελ εἰς δρυμὸν λογισθήσεται).<sup>89</sup> In the *Book of Ezekiah*, there are several examples, which also clarify the meaning of *inhabited* vs. *uninhabited* place (*civitates quae habitabantur and civitates desertae*): *And they will say: this land that was desolate has become like the garden of Eden, and the waste and desolate and ruined cities are now fortified and inhabited* (καὶ ἐροῦσιν ἡ γῆ ἐκεῖνη ἡ

---

<sup>87</sup> *FB II*, 26, n. 70.

<sup>88</sup> *Ezekiel*, XII, 20. The same verse in Latin: *Et civitates quae nunc habitantur desolatae erunt terraque deserta et scietis quia ego Dominus*.

<sup>89</sup> *Isaiah*, XXXII, 15. The same verse in Latin: *Donec effundatur super nos spiritus de excelso et erit desertum in Chermel et Chermel in saltum reputabitur*.

ἡφανισμένη ἐγενή ὡς κῆπος τρυφῆς καὶ αἱ πόλεις αἱ ἔρημοι καὶ ἡφανισμένοι καὶ κατεσκαμμένοι ὄχυραὶ ἐκάθισαν).<sup>90</sup>

The New Testament also contains similar examples of those we have already mentioned from the Old Testament. In the sentence: *Their voice has gone out to all the earth* (γῆν), *and their words to the ends of the world* (τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ ῥήματα αὐτῶν), is the comprehension of the word *oikoumena* as the world *inhabited by the word of God*.<sup>91</sup> We point out that the verb *oikeo*, *to dwell*, is not used in the New Testament only for humans, but also for the *word of God*. The following citation from the New Testament clearly shows it: Ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνοικεῖτω ἐν ὑμῖν πλουσίως.<sup>92</sup>

Our main goal is to prove beyond any doubt that *kastra oikoumena* were the cities with the ecclesiastical organization, in which the Spirit of God dwelled, and *erimokastra* were those in which ecclesiastical organization did not exist anymore, and therefore, the Spirit of God did not dwell in them.

Pope John VIII wrote a letter in November 876 to Charles, the Frankish emperor, urging for help against the Arabs from southern Italy having previously described the magnitude of the destruction: *En civitates, castra et villae destitute habitatoribus perierunt et episcopi hac illacque dispersi, sola illis apostolorum principum limina derelicta sunt in refugium, cum episcopia eorum in ferarum sint redacta cubilia et, ipsi vagi et sine tectis inventi, non iam eis liceat praedicare, sed mendicare*.<sup>93</sup> The statement that all inhabitants left their cities must be considered as an exaggeration, but the fleeing of bishops was probably true. For the Pope, the desolated city was above all the city abandoned by its ecclesiastical authorities. The following example seems to confirm this thesis.

In November 1000, Bishop Ekkehard from Schleswig (996 – 1026) wrote: *Termini episcopatus mei barbarica sunt feritate depopulati, civitas deserta, ecclesia desolata, sedem non habeo*.<sup>94</sup> His sorrow was definitely directed towards the destroyed ecclesiastical organization.

William of Tyre gave an excellent example worth considering: *civitas quae habitabatur* and *civitas deserta*. He said: *Jacuit autem multis temporibus*

<sup>90</sup> Ezekiah, XXXVI, 35. The same verse in Latin: *Dicent terra illa inculta facta est ut hortus voluptatis et civitates desertae et destitutae atque suffossae munitae sederunt*.

<sup>91</sup> Romans, 10:18. See, also, Luke, 2:1; 4:5; 21.26.

<sup>92</sup> Col. 3:16.

<sup>93</sup> *Registrvm Iohannis VIII. Papae*, ed. E. Caspar, MGH Epistolarvm VII, Epistolae Karolini Aevi V, ed. P. Kher, Berolini 1928, 20.5 – 8.

<sup>94</sup> *Vita Bernwardi episcopi Hildesheimensis auctore Thancmaro*, ed. G. H. Pertz, MGH SS IV, Hannoverae 1841, 768.3 – 5.

*deserta, ita ut nec uno incoletur habitatore, quousque dominus Balduinus, illustris memoriae Hierosolymorum rex quartus, ante captam Ascalonam, collectis regni viribus et publicis sumptibus, castrum in quadam parte civitatis munitum satis, aedificavit, constructumque statim fratribus militiae Templi donavit, jure perpetuo possidendum. Castrum ergo totum collem, supra quem civitas fundata fuerat, ut praediximus, non potuit occupare; sed convenientes quidam ad loci illius habitationem, ut totius ibi morarentur, reliquam partem collis, portis et muro, sed humili et infirmo, tentaverunt munire.*<sup>95</sup> It means that this desolated city was considered as being inhabited again [repopulated] only after the ruler rebuilt it and installed the monks of Temple in it.

In *Gesta regis Ricardi* there is an interesting description: *...et in opposita parte super littus maris in Romania est civitas deserta quae dicitur Sancta Karentet. Et ibi est bonus portus, latus et profundus.*<sup>96</sup> The city was allegedly deserted, but it still had a very nice port. The city was in fact, not deserted, but rather without an ecclesiastical organization.<sup>97</sup>

The author of Constantine's source was aware of the correct meaning of the term *kastra oikoumena*, as it was Constantine's informant on the Pechenegs. Indeed it was Constantine **who did not understand** the exact meaning of the term. That is why he had to clarify for Diocleia (a deserted city) that was occupied, at the time by Diocletians. Such misunderstandings could have only occurred if his source was from earlier times, not from Constantine's contemporary. Since he had some information on Dalmatia from his own time, Constantine probably tried to clarify some narrative parts that seemed strange to him. It is also important to stress that Constantine's approach to Dalmatia was a political one, however his primary source *Of the Croats* and *Of the Serbs*, as it appears, was ecclesiastical. That is why even the same terminology could have a different meaning. For a Churchman, *civitas deserta* could primarily mean the city out of the ecclesiastical organization and for an emperor dominated by political thinking, this same term could have meant literally – *deserted place*.

Anastasius the Librarian, who played a major role as an administrative officer<sup>98</sup> in Rome during the pontificates of three subsequent Popes: Nicholas I

---

<sup>95</sup> *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum liber vigesimus*, Lib. XX, Cap. XXI.

<sup>96</sup> *The Chronicle of the Reigns of Henry II and Richard I, A. D. 1169 – 1192*, II, ed. W. Stubbs, London 1867, 205.

<sup>97</sup> In fact, the basilica of the Forty Martyrs was deserted, and therefore the city itself was considered as the deserted; cf. *Recent Research on the Late Antique Countryside*, ed. W. Bowden – L. Lavan – C. Machado, Leyden 2004, 181.

<sup>98</sup> See, J. N. D. Kelly, *Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, Oxford 1996, 106 – 107; A. Louth, *Greek East and Latin West: The Church AD 681 – 1071*, St Vladimir's seminary Press

(858 – 867), Hadrian II (867 – 872), and John VIII (872 – 882), left an interesting clue about the meaning of *oikoumena* for the Romans and the Greeks. In his epistle to Pope Hadrian II in 871 he says: *Verum cum apud Constantinopolim positus frequenter Grecos super hoc vocabulo reprehenderem et fastus vel arrogantiae redarguerem, asserbant, quod non ideo oecumenicon, quem multi universalem interpretati sunt, dioceret patriarcham, quod universi orbis teneat praesulatum, sed quod cuidam parti praesit orbis, quae a christianis inhabitatur. Nam quod Grece oecumeni vocatur, Latine non solum orbis, a cuius universitate universalis appellatur, verum etiam habitatio vel locus habitabilis nuncupatur.*<sup>99</sup> The English translation is as follows: *When I was on my duty in Constantinople, I was often reprimanding the Greeks because of this term, having reproached them, their arrogance, and conceit, they claimed that they do not call their Patriarch ecumenical, being translated wrongly by many as universal, because he rules the whole world, but because he rules only the world which is inhabited by the Christians. Namely, what is called in Greek ekoumena in Latin should not be translated only as the world, by which universality the Patriarch should be called universal, but ekoumena also means inhabited, and inhabitable place.*

This example clearly shows that *oikoumena* meant not only the world inhabited by the Christians, but also every place the Christians lived in.<sup>100</sup>

The sections in the Slav chapters of the *DAI* that contain the term *kastra oikoumena*, would mean that the author of Constantine's source listed the cities that were in his time, a part of the ecclesiastical organization. In the chapters *Of the Croats, Zachlumians, Terbouniotes, and Pagani*, the list of the *kastra oikoumena* is opened with the name of the city for which we are positive that it was the seat of bishop in the Early Middle Ages. In Croatia, it is Nin, in Zachlumi, Ston, in Terbounia, Trebinje, and in Pagania, Mokro. All these places are known as the bishoprics and each of them is placed at the head of the specific list of the *kastra oikoumena*.<sup>101</sup> This cannot be by accident. For Diocleia and Serbia, we do not have other sources by which we could confirm that Gradetai and Destinik have been the seats of bishop or not. But the positive

---

2007, 168; H. Chadwick, *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church, from Apostolic Times Until the Council of Florence*, Oxford 2003, 99.

<sup>99</sup> *Anastasii Bibliothecarii Epistolae sive praefationes*, ed. E. Perels – G. Laehr, MGH Epistolarvm VII, Epistolae Karolini Aevi V, ed. P. Kher, Berolini 1928, 417.20 – 26.

<sup>100</sup> This example is also important for our understanding about the authorship of the Constantine's major source on the Serbs and Croats; cf. T. Živković, *De Conversione Chroatorum et Serborum – A Lost Source*, Belgrade 2009, in print.

<sup>101</sup> See, Živković, *Crkvena organizacija*, 111, 159, 169.

result in the cases of Croatia, Zachlumi, Terbounia, and Paganía allows us to assume that these two cities were actually the major centres of the ecclesiastical organization in those principalities too.

As previously mentioned, only few of these cities listed in the Slav chapters can be located without any doubt. It is interesting to note that in all of those that were located with certainty, there are archaeological evidence of the Early Medieval churches from the 9<sup>th</sup> century and on (see examples below).<sup>102</sup> This coincidence of the Constantine list of these towns with the archaeological data is the strong evidence that *kastra oikoumena* in fact meant the cities incorporated into ecclesiastical organization, to say: *the cities inhabited by the Christians*.

If the first city, which opens the list of the *kastra oikoumena* in particular principality, was the head of the ecclesiastical organization, then we must understand that other cities were in fact their parishes. In the case of Ošlje, there are the remnants of the large preromanic church.<sup>103</sup> Risan was the seat of bishop; Ostrog (Zaostrog), had large Franciscian monastery in the Middle Ages, and this could be because of the antiquity of the ecclesiastical organization dated back in the Early Middle Ages; Brela, i. e. Constantine's Beroulla was developed (Upper Brela) near the 13<sup>th</sup> century church of St. Nicholas,<sup>104</sup> and Lower Brela was situated near the Church of St Stephen.<sup>105</sup> The archeological site of Martinići, Montenegro, revealed the Early Medieval town with the remnants of the very large basilica dated to the 9<sup>th</sup> or 10<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>106</sup> It was proposed that this site was most probably the Constantine's city of Lontodokla.<sup>107</sup> Only for several of these supposed parishes we have confirmation of the existence of the churches from the Early Medieval times, and all of these places are called *kastra oikoumena* by Constantine Porphyrogenitus. That connection could be additional evidence that the exact

---

<sup>102</sup> For churches in the 9<sup>th</sup> century in Croatia, see, M. Jarak, *O karolinškim i bizantskim utjecajima u starohrvatskoj arhitekturi Trpimirova doba*, Opuscula archaeologica 22 (1998) 119 – 128.

<sup>103</sup> T. Marasović, *Ranosrednjovekovna crkva u Ošlju kod Stona*, Peristil 2 (1957) 85 – 89.

<sup>104</sup> Čirković, "Naseljeni gradovi", 16.

<sup>105</sup> There have never been archaeological excavations on those two sites.

<sup>106</sup> See, V. Korać, *Martinići, srednjovekovna transpozicija koncepcija antičkog grada*, ZRVI 36 (1997) 163 – 172.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.* 170. However, since there was a large basilica and a representative building (Court?) nearby, we would be more inclined towards the solution that this was rather Constantine's city of Gradetai – the centre of the ecclesiastical organization of Diocleia in the 9<sup>th</sup> or 10<sup>th</sup> centuries.

meaning of the term *kastra oikoumena* was not *inhabited cities*, but the cities which belonged to the ecclesiastical organization.

Therefore, the *kastra oikoumena* does not represent the trace of the earliest territorial organization of the Slav principalities, but rather, the scheme of the earliest ecclesiastical organization in them. Furthermore, because of the Latin provenience of Constantine's source, that organization reflected the Latin cult and development of the Roman Church in those regions. However, these cities can also be observed in the context of the territorial organization too, but primarily they were the cities incorporated into the ecclesiastical organization. According to this conclusion, we can propose that Constantine's major source on the Serbs and Croats was actually of ecclesiastical provenience, originally written in Latin, and that this trace should be followed in further research in regard to other information preserved in the Slav chapters of the *DAI*. Furthermore, since the author used sophisticated terms for *inhabited* and *uninhabited* cities, which was based on his profound knowledge of the Latin and Greek terminology, we would say that the author was not an ordinary priest or monk, but rather a higher dignitary of the Roman Church, with the knowledge of the doctrine and theology.

Тибор ЖИВКОВИЋ

**KAstra OIKOUMENA КОНСТАНТИНА ПОРФИРОГЕНИТА  
У ЈУЖНОСЛОВЕНСКИМ КНЕЖЕВИНАМА**

Резиме

У поглављима о словенским кнежевинама у залеђу Далмације у делу *De administrando imperio* византијског цара Константина Порфирогенита (945 – 959), поменути су *kastra oikoumena* – израз који је у историографији без изузетка превођен као *насељени градови*. Необично би било да византијски цар, који у своме спису наводи десетине градова од Италије до Кавказа, само у словенским поглављима користи израз *насељени градови*. Анализа Константинове терминологије за градове показала је да *kastra oikoumena* не значи *насељени градови*, већ означава оне градове који припадају хришћанском свету, тј. Екумени. Са овим закључком је у сагласности и чињеница да се у случају Хрватске, Захумља, Травуније и Паганије, на првом месту међу градовима поменутим у тим поглављима, налазе они за које се може поуздано утврдити било да су епископска средишта, или најважнија црквена средишта у тим кнежевинама – Хрватска – Нин, Захумље – Стон, Травунија – Требиње, Паганија – Макарска. У том случају Градете у Дукљи и Дестиник у Србији имала би једнако значење – били би средишта црквене организације у ове две кнежевине.

Такође, израз *megala kasta oikoumena* у случају Дукље, не значи *велики насељени градови*, већ *стари градови са црквеном организацијом*. Супротан појам *kastra oikoumena*, требало би да је Порфирогенитов израз *erimokasta*, *напуштени градови*, који у овом контексту може да означава само оне градове који су изван црквене организације. У латинској терминологији ово се може превести као *civitas deserta/civitas destituta*, док се *kastra oikoumena* може превести као *civitas oecumenica*.

Ново тумачење поменутих Порфирогенитових израза упућује на важан закључак да је његов главни извор за најстарију историју Срба и Хрвата, а најпре за приповест о покрштавању и досељавању, био спис писан латинским језиком и црквене провенијенције. Аутор овог списка, будући да показује добро познавање црквене доктрине и терминологије, није био обичан свештеник или монах, већ припадник највише хијерархије римске цркве.