

## REVIEW ARTICLE

### THE CONTROVERSY ABOUT THE KOSEZI IN SLOVENE HISTORIOGRAPHY\*

Bogdan C. Novak

#### *Introduction*

An abundant literature written by German-Austrian and Slovene historians exists on the kosezi on Edlinge today. However, the present work will limit itself to the writings of Ljudmil Hauptmann, who advanced the Croat theory of the kosezi, and to his antagonist, Josip Mal. Because of limited space other German writers will be mentioned only as necessary in regard to Hauptmann's theory.<sup>1</sup> For the same reason, the Slovene historians Milko Kos and Bogo Grafenauer will also be referred to only in passing. The works of Hauptmann and Mal therefore represent the main part of this paper.

Ljudmil Hauptmann (1884-1968) obtained his doctoral degree from the University of Graz. After World War I he taught medieval history at the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, until 1926 when he left for the University of Zagreb in Croatia where he lectured until his retirement in 1948. While the major Austrian university—the University of Vienna—followed the Rankean tradition with its stress on sources, their analysis, and their objective interpretation, Graz University was much more flexible; it was open to new ideas and encouraged the development of new historical theories. So Hauptmann's alma mater greatly influenced him in his work and in his construction of the Croat theory.<sup>2</sup> Josip Mal (1884-1978) on the other hand studied history and geography at the University of Vienna and after he obtained his doctorate he became a regular member of the Institute for the Study of Austrian History at the same university. After World War I, Mal was appointed as director of the Museum in Ljubljana and the organizer of the Slovene archives. Chiefly he is known for his popularly written *History of*

\*A preliminary version of this paper was presented at the meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies in Asilomar, CA, on 20-23 September, 1981.

*the Slovene Nation* from Napoleonic times until World War II and for his editing of the *Herald of the Museum Society for Slovenia*.<sup>3</sup>

Hauptmann became interested in the kosezi, as he remarked himself, in 1907 when he was putting in order the *urbaria* (doomsday books) of Duke Auersperg.<sup>4</sup> In the *urbarium* for the sixteenth century of the Žužemberk estate he discovered some persons listed sometimes as "Kases" and other times as "Edlinger." It became evident to him that both terms referred to the same group of serfs, the first name being used by Slovenes, the other by Germans. Moreover the kosezi were a special group of serfs which stood out from the rest by paying small feudal dues and performing no *robot* (forced labor). Their farms were listed as *edelthumb* or *edeltum*, while the farms of other serfs were marked as *hoba*. For these privileges the Žužemberk kosezi had to guard and transport criminals.<sup>5</sup>

Thereafter Hauptmann discovered kosezi also in other parts of Slovenia. The kosezi in Zagorje and Teharje by Celje in Lower Styria and in Možberk (Moosburg) in Carinthia elected from among themselves their own judges called *Schöpfs* and only "blood crimes" were reserved for the ducal judges. The kosezi in Carinthia had the right to bear arms, while the kosezi from Teharje had to defend the castle of Upper Celje. It was evident that in the sixteenth century the kosezi in Slovenia were serfs with certain privileges and some special duties to perform.<sup>6</sup>

In addition Hauptmann learned that kosezi and Edlinge were also preserved in geographical place names. In Slovene *kosezi* appeared in three basic forms: in Carinthia as *kazaz*, in Lower Styria, near Croatia, and in eastern Carniola as *kasaz*, and in the rest of Carniola as *kosez*.<sup>7</sup>

Hauptmann became intrigued by the kosezi-Edlinge and wanted to find out more about them: how far back could we trace them? What was their origin and what role did they play in Slovene history? In his search to answer these questions, Hauptmann made a profound study of medieval sources, and published the results in different scientific journals. We will review and analyze in chronological order his most important scientific articles on the kosezi from the first one published in 1915 until his last work, a book, published in 1954. This will give us a clear picture of his Croat theory, particularly as it evolved under the criticism of his greatest opponent, Josip Mal.

### *Politische Umwälzungen*

In his article "Politische Umwälzungen unter den Slowenen vom Ende des sechsten Jahrhunderts bis zur Mitte des neunten,"

published in 1915 in the prestigious German journal, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* in Vienna, Hauptmann elaborated his Croat theory for the first time.<sup>8</sup> For a clear understanding of his new theory, Hauptmann began with the description of the life of the ancient Slavs as it was in their original homeland somewhere northeast of the Carpathian Mountains between the upper flows of the Vistula, Bug, Pripet and Dniester, an area known (today) as the Pripet Marshes. This account was based on the writings and theories of Jan Peisker, a Czech and Hauptmann's great mentor, who was instructor (Docent) at the University of Graz and later professor at the University of Prague.

According to Peisker there exists a "great natural law that a people is and remains what its land of origin has made it."<sup>9</sup> Applied to the old Slavs, we get the following picture:

For centuries the Slavs were living at the crossroads of Eastern Europe. From north to south the warlike Germanic tribes moved, while from east to west the mounted Turko-Altaiian nomads were dashing. In such a situation the Slavs were never able to form a strong state of their own because they had been constantly dispersed or enslaved either by the Germanic tribes or by the Turko-Altaiian nomads. The only protection from slavery was offered by the marshlands of the Pripet, but during the winter season the mounted nomads could follow them even there, too. As this kind of environment made the Slavs a meek and unwarlike people, it should not be surprising that all the first "so-called Slav states of which we have sufficient information turn out to be either Germanic or Altaian foundations."<sup>10</sup> In short, the natural environment made the Slavs to be slaves of the Germanic and Turko-Altaiian peoples. The same applied to the Avar-Slav relationship. The former were the masters, the latter the slaves.

This Peisker's theory was accepted by Hauptmann and he applied it when describing the settlement of the Eastern Alps by the Slavs or depicting the Avar-Slovene relationship. Accordingly, the Slavs, the forefathers of the Slovenes, came to the Eastern Alps as slaves of the Avars and were settled there by them. During the migration, the Avars had split and mixed up the Slavic tribes to prevent any formation of a strong Slav organization which would have enabled them to revolt against the Avars. One such splinter group which Avars had settled along the central Mura (Mur) River among the Slovenes was, according to Hauptmann, the Dudlebi or Duljebi. (It is interesting that he never suggested the Croats in Carinthia might be another such splinter group.) A further Avar precaution was the establishment of settlements among the Slovene people. Then in the beginning of the seventh century the Avar Empire was shaken by

great crises. While the Avars unsuccessfully besieged Constantinople, their allies the Slavs revolted in the east. About the same time the Western Slavs rebelled and under the leadership of a Frank named Samo established their own state.

This difficult situation was utilized also by the Croats in Dalmatia, who defeated the Avars and established a state of their own. Referring to the account of the Byzantine Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos Hauptmann pointed out that one part of the Croats at that time separated from the main Croat body and occupied Pannonia and Illyricum.<sup>11</sup> Hauptmann interpreted this statement his own way. Illyricum, according to him, could encompass also Noricum, that is the territory of old Karantania (including present day Carinthia, Upper and Lower Styria, and parts of Austria).<sup>12</sup> According to this interpretation Karantanian Slovenes invited the Croats into their homeland to protect them and to bring peace and order to them just as the Russian Slavs invited the Varangians. The result was that the Croats liberated the Slovenes from the Avar yoke and established their own Croat state in Karantania.

In support of his theory, Hauptmann listed the following six place names in Carinthia and Styria with apparent Croat names: Chrawate, Kraubat, Krabaten, Krabersdorf (former Chrawaczdorf) and a Krowot. Besides there was in Carinthia also a Croat district (pagus Crouuati).<sup>13</sup> Moreover, Hauptmann believed that the Croats had brought with them the old ritual according to which the Karantanian princes and later the Carinthian dukes were installed. A similar ritual in Staro selo near Bihać, where peasants elected from among themselves a peasant king until the beginning of the nineteenth century, he adduced to support his allegation.<sup>14</sup>

Hauptmann also tried to prove that kosez (Edling) was originally identical to Croat; hence his equation: kosez (Edling) = Croat. The kosezi were settled most densely in the Croat district, encompassing Krnski grad (Karnburg), the seat of the Karantanian princes, and the nearby place of the prince's installation. Furthermore, villages with Croat names were located next to the villages with kosez (Edling) names, forming a continuum around the political center of Karantania. This confirms that the kosezi were closely connected with Croat rule and that therefore they had to be Croats, concluded Hauptmann.<sup>15</sup>

In his first article Hauptmann also accepted the view that the Croats were free peasants. The Croat warriors which had liberated the Karantanian Slavs settled down and became engaged in agriculture. In support of his assertion he indicated that Abbot John from Victoria (Janez Vetrinjski, Johann von Viktring) reports of

Carinthian dukes still being installed in the thirteenth and fourteenth century by a free peasant (*rusticus libertus*).<sup>16</sup> Based upon this conclusion, Hauptmann agreed that the German word *Edling* (noblelike) could not be a translation of the Slovene *kosez*—meaning a free peasant. Each word must have a different origin, and Hauptmann came out with the following explanation. Like the Croats in Dalmatia, so too their brothers in Karantania called themselves *plemeniti ljudi*, and the Bavarians and Franks translated this as *Edlinge*.<sup>17</sup> Regarding the *kosezi*, Hauptmann quoted the philologist Primus Lessiak, according to whom the Slovene forms *kosez*, *kasaz* or *kazaz* came from the Turko-Tatar word *quazaqu* meaning a free peasant or a hero.<sup>18</sup> Hauptmann concluded that *kosez* was the name by which Slovenes called their Avar masters, meaning free persons or free ones. When the Croats replaced the Avars, the Slovenes continued to call their new masters with the same name, namely *kosez*, the free one.<sup>19</sup>

Though different by their origin *kosez* and *Edling* denote the same people, the Croats. Therefore during the pre-Frankish period one could equate: *kosez* = *Edling* = Croat. Later when other ethnic groups (Bavarians, Franks and also some Slovenes) joined the *kosezi*, the Croat ethnic meaning of *kosezi* disappeared and *kosezi* and *Edlinge* began to denote a social class, that is, the free peasantry, which played such an important role in the installation ceremony.<sup>20</sup>

### *Staroslovenska družba*

Three years after his first article Hauptmann published “*Staroslovenska družba in njeni stanovi*” (Old Slovene Society and Its Social Groups) in Slovene, where he repeated what he had previously said.<sup>21</sup> However, using a richly metaphoric language he painted a much gloomier picture when describing the master-slave relationships between the Avars and the Slavs, in statements such as: the Slav was brave only if the Germanic or the Turko-Tatar people mixed their blood with his or if they subjugated him and forced him to fight for them.<sup>22</sup>

The same was true for the Slovenes. They were controlled from Avar encampments spread over Slovene territory. A statement for which Hauptmann provided only one proof, a place name in Carinthia (*Vovbre* [V Obre] in Slovene, or *Heunburg* [Hunenburg] in German) was to attest for this.<sup>23</sup> But whenever short of historical facts, Hauptmann used the wildest possible historical comparisons, such as the following, to depict Slovene enslavement: from ancient times we know one fact, whoever suffers like a dog, lives like a dog.

A slave is meek, peaceloving, he is afraid of arms and never uses them. For a long time the Slavs were victims of the savage hordes which were pouring from the Russian steppes into the Byzantine Empire; the Slavs used to jump in the water like frogs to hide from the approaching enemy. And if all the Slavs of the lower Danube were exposed to such treatment, why would the Slovenes have been the only ones to escape it?<sup>24</sup>

Turning to the Croats, Hauptmann omitted his previous statement that they might have been invited by Slovenes, but instead declared that the Croats had come to Karantania by themselves, defeated the Avars and, by replacing them, established their own rule. The Slovenes merely exchanged one master for another. By continuing to call the new masters *kosezi*, that is the free ones, the Slovenes confirmed that they themselves were not free. When the Franks took over Karantania in the beginning of the ninth century, they did not change its social structure. Karantania retained its two social groups, the masters and the slaves. The Slovene nobility, that is, the Slovenized descendants of Croat and Turko-Tatar ancestors, lived undisturbed under Frankish rule as counts, nobles and freemen, while the Slovene people remained what they had been all along, the servile population (*servi* and *mancipia*).<sup>25</sup>

This unfree or servile position of the Slovene people was confirmed, according to Hauptmann, also by the existence of two kinds of farms in Karantania, the Slovene and the Bavarian. The first was smaller, equal in size to servile farms in Bavaria, the second, given to Bavarian colonists in Karantania, was larger and equalled a free farm in Bavaria. Therefore Hauptmann concluded that Slovene farms denoted a servile farm and Bavarian farms a free one. This arrangement appeared to him quite logical because the Slovenes were people in servitude and could not have free farms.<sup>26</sup>

### *Mal's "Nova pota"*

In his article "Nova pota slovenske historiografije" (The New Ways of Slovene Historiography) published in 1923, Mal tried to dismiss the assertions advanced by Hauptmann in his two articles of 1915 and 1918.<sup>27</sup>

By citing ancient sources Mal disagreed with Hauptmann that the old Slavs were slaves, but instead indicated that the Slavs on the lower Danube lived in political freedom and often attacked the Byzantine Empire on their own. Like other barbarians they had enrolled as mercenaries in the Byzantine army where they had learned how to fight. Often the Avars and the Slavs fought together

against Byzantium and Byzantine and other contemporary writers clearly distinguished each group. Mal agreed that the Slavs of the Pannonian flatland might have been subordinated to the Avars. But this was not true for the Slovenes. They had come to the Eastern Alps by themselves and settled there as free people. And therefore they had no need to be liberated by anyone. Mal ridiculed those of Hauptmann's arguments in support of his Croat theory which leaned principally on the assertion that Noricum was part of Illyricum, and on six Croat villages. In regard to Croat place names, Mal explained that they could be found among all the Slavs and they do not prove any Croat political role.

Regarding the kosezi, Mal had not yet formed his final opinion and stated that a further study would be necessary. Of course he rejected Hauptmann's allegation that the kosezi were Croat descendants. On the contrary, he was of the opinion that the kosezi represented a Slovene social group. Mal also disagreed with his opponent that kosez was a Turko-Tatar word. Instead he went along with Luka Pintar according to whom the word kosez, like *knez*, derived from the Germanic word *kuning*. This also explains in Pintar's view why the Germans translated the Slovene village name of Koseze into the German Edling. In the old Germanic *kuni*, namely, meant *adal (edel)*, and *kuning* was therefore Edling.<sup>28</sup> Mal recognized that the kosezi existed in the later period but pointed out that no pre-Carolingian or Carolingian sources mentioned them. Furthermore, he denied that the kosezi installed the Carinthian dukes. Mal indicated that none of the older sources describing the installation rites mention the kosezi but explicitly state that the installation was performed by free peasants.<sup>29</sup> Only at the end of the fifteenth century did Jakob Unrest report that the peasant installing the dukes was an "Edlinger."<sup>30</sup> And Mal added: this is quite understandable since by the end of the fifteenth century the free peasant class in Austria, Styria, Carinthia and Carniola had shrunk to such a degree that very few free-peasants still remained in existence and as a result they stood out as a kind of peasant nobility. Kosezi might therefore denote free peasants toward the end of the Middle Ages but, on the other hand, the seventeenth century *urbaria* also listed another group, the privileged serfs, as kosezi. It was to clarify this problem that Mal encouraged further research.<sup>31</sup>

Regarding Frankish rule in Karantania, Mal was of the opinion that the Slovenes had accepted Bavarian and later Frankish overlordship not as slaves, but rather as free people. As a result, the Franks permitted them to have their own princes. Later, when in the ninth century the Franks became direct rulers over Karantania, the Slovenes still preserved many of their own legal institutions. The

foremost among them was the installation of the new foreign duke according to the old Slovene ritual and performed in Slovene as confirmed by many written sources.<sup>32</sup> Other such legal institutions which attest to Slovene freedom were the medieval witnesses testifying according to Slovene law (“sclavenicae institutionis testes,” “testes Sclavigenae”) mentioned in old medieval sources. Only a free person could testify and sign his name as a witness, explained Mal.<sup>33</sup>

Finally Mal disagreed with Hauptmann’s assertion that “Slovene farm” (“hoba sclavanisca”) was a “servile farm” (“hoba servilis”) and refused his equation *Slavus* = *Sclavus* or in German *Slave* = *Sklave*. He pointed out that the old documents indicate the “Slovene farms” were owned by freemen. In Mal’s opinion the “Slovene farm” denoted a special agricultural unit common among Slovenes before the arrival of the Bavarians and Franks.<sup>34</sup> Regarding *Slave* = *Sklave*, Mal explained that *Sklave* in German was used only for slaves who were bought and sold on the slave market. For the servile people, used as domestic servants or as agricultural workers on the estates, the Germans used the word *Knecht* (unfree servant) and not *Sklave*.<sup>35</sup> However, Mal recognized that later on during medieval times, Slovene peasants, once free, became unfree serfs of feudal lords. But he underlined that this enserfment of once free peasants was no particular event characteristic for Slovenes, but rather a general trend all over Europe which came into being as a consequence of the feudal system. Slovenes, no more and no less than other nations, were also serfs but this had nothing to do with the pre-Frankish period of Slovene history.

While Hauptmann was asserting the slave character of ancient Slovene society, especially in Karantania, Mal represented his anti-thesis by stressing the opposite, a free Slovene society.

In his answer to Mal in 1923, Hauptmann elaborated on his old views.<sup>36</sup> What was really new was his pronouncement that the kosezi were originally nobles and not just free peasants, which he himself had stated previously.<sup>37</sup> In his two next articles, Hauptmann tried to substantiate his new assertion.

### *Hauptmann’s “Karantanska Hrvatska”*

In the first, “Karantanska Hrvatska” (Karantanian Croatia), published in 1925, Hauptmann returned to his *urbarium* (Doomsday book) of Žužemberk and pointed out that according to this and other *urbaria*, it was clear that the kosezi were, during the sixteenth century, serfs with certain privileges.<sup>38</sup> Hauptmann asked himself if the kosezi were a special group of serfs who had risen on the social



ladder, as some contended, or were they former freemen who had declined socially and economically to serfdom. By examining the *urbaria* of villages where the kosezi had lived he came to the conclusion that they were freemen who had declined to serfdom. This process began somewhere around the end of the thirteenth century and was accomplished during the sixteenth century. It evolved along these lines: a freeman might first ask for the protection of a nearby landlord for which he paid his landlord-protector (*advocatus, vogt*) a small protection fee (*vogtzins, vogthafer, vogthuhn*) consisting of a measure of oats or a chicken.<sup>39</sup> His land, his *edeltum*, remained his free property, but his status was changed from free to half-free. His protection fee was in the beginning only a personal tax, but later was tied to his land, *edeltum*, thus transforming it from a personal tax to a land tax. Still later on, the tax was assigned according to the size of the land, and the kosez's status sank into serfdom. During the sixteenth century a kosez could enjoy his privileges only on his *edeltum* (*koseščina*). If he bought another unprivileged farm or servile *hoba*, he had to pay from it the same feudal dues as other serfs. If a serf bought an *edeltum*, it lost its privileged status and was transformed into a servile *hoba*, and remained a *hoba* though it might be recovered by a kosez. Based on this research, Hauptmann concluded that the kosezi were still freemen at the end of the thirteenth century, but later became half-free (paying personal taxes to their protectors) and finally in the sixteenth century sank to the rank of unfree serfs.<sup>40</sup>

Then Hauptmann asked himself what the kosezi had been before the end of the thirteenth century. Had they been free peasants or free nobles? But to go further back in time, when the sources were written in Latin, he had to find out what Latin word was used for Edling or kosez. He discovered that during the first half of the thirteenth century the free and half-free kosezi were called *libertini* and the nobles were listed interchangeably as *liberi, nobiles, or liberi nobiles*. While checking a few documents of bequest for places where he had found kosezi in the sixteenth century, Hauptmann tried to ascertain if some of these free nobles (*liberi nobiles*) might be kosezi.

Among a few other examples, Hauptmann presented also the case of Rahwin and Junik (Junic) from Otmanje (Ottmanach), a village in Carinthia close to Gospa Sveta (Maria Saal) and in the center of the old Karantanian state where many kosezi had lived. In the first part of the twelfth century Rahwin (Rahiwin, Rewinus) and his brother Engelsalk (Engelschalchus) delegated "*libertinus*" Junik to bequeath all their property to the diocese of Krka (Gurk). Both brothers were of the high nobility—they were listed as "*liberi*," that

is, "nobiles," while Junik and his two sons Rapot and Pero appeared among the witnesses as "libertini" after the "liberi"—the high nobility—but before the highest of the new service nobility (ministeriales), indicating that they must be regarded as noblemen. After the bequest Rahwin and his brother retained only the usufructural rights on their former property and because of it their social status declined. Thereafter he was still listed among the nobility but after the high nobles. Moreover, Junik divided his land among his two sons and they too declined on the social ladder. Before that time they were listed with the witnesses before the ministeriales and thereafter among them.<sup>41</sup>

With these and similar cases, Hauptmann tried to prove two things: first, that the kosezi once were nobles, and second, that the amount of property decided one's social status. By dividing their property, noble kosezi sank socially. While the *libertini*-kosezi were listed in the middle of the twelfth century after the high nobility (*liberi, nobiles*) but ahead of the service nobility (ministeriales), a century later, the *libertini*-kosezi were listed after the service nobility but before the knights (*fideles*). Then, by the end of the thirteenth century, we find the kosezi only as free and half-free peasants.<sup>42</sup> But originally the kosezi were nobles and Croats.

Hauptmann was aware that his new assertion that the kosezi once were nobles contradicted the sources according to which the dukes of Carinthia were installed by free peasants. The more so, as he himself in 1915 defended the verbal interpretation of these sources against the Austrian legal historian, Paul Puntschart, when the latter suggested that some of the kosezi might be *libertini*-nobles. But to solve this contradiction was no problem for Hauptmann. He pointed out that all the sources, except the *Schwabenspiegel*, were written in the fourteenth century when the kosezi were nothing more than free peasants. What about the *Schwabenspiegel*? The original of the *Schwabenspiegel*, explained Hauptmann, was written when the kosezi were still nobles, or at least some of them. But the original copy was lost and the scribe who made the copy preserved from the fourteenth century had erred. He interpreted "lantsaessen" according to his time, that they were free peasants instead of free countrymen.<sup>43</sup>

In his second article "Die Herkunft der Kärntner Edlinge" published in 1928, Hauptmann added additional data to support his previous assertions that the kosezi were originally nobles and Croats.<sup>44</sup> To enforce the Croat character of Karantania he maintained that the Croat district (pagus Crouuati) included not only a strip of land along the upper Glina (Glan) river, but rather encompassed the entire county of Breže (Friesach) including the central

part of old Karantania.<sup>45</sup> He supported his assertion by arguing that the Croat district should not be limited to Croat villages alone, but include also the territory of kosezi villages and other places where we know that the kosezi once lived. He justified this by the old equation Croat = kosez.

Hauptmann further strengthened his Croat theory by referring to the new discovery of the Slovene linguist Karl Oštir who indicated that kosez or kasaz could derive from Kosentzes which had been the name of one of the leaders of the Croat tribes mentioned by Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos. It could well be an eponym for the Croat tribe which occupied Karantania.<sup>46</sup> For Hauptmann, this was a further proof that his equation Croat = kosez was right.

In his polemics with the Austrian historian August Jaksch, Hauptmann conceded that Noricum might not be part of Illyricum, but added that by then (1928) this was unimportant for his Croat theory as other much stronger arguments supported it.<sup>47</sup> He was probably thinking of place names and Oštir's Kosentzes—were none of them a strong affirmative argument, however.

Because of Hauptmann's equation, Slav = slave, one wonders of what ethnic origin Hauptmann's warlike Croats were. He did not tackle this problem until 1935 when he wrote "Kroaten, Goten und Sarmaten" in German and when, two years later, he repeated the same ideas in his article "Seobe Hrvata i Srba" (The Migrations of Croats and Serbs) in Croatian.<sup>48</sup> In both articles Hauptmann stated that Croats, Serbs and Kasegs (singular Kaseg, plural Kasezi) were of Alan and Caucasian (Circassian) ancestry. During the upheaval caused by the Hunic invasion, the Croats, Serbs and Kasegs had fled—probably together with Turko-Tatar splinters—and settled among the Slavs behind the Carpathian mountains where they were quickly Slavized. In about 630 A.D., they came from there to Dalmatia and liberated the Slavs from the Avar yoke. The White Croat tribe of Kasegs came to Karantania and liberated the Slovenes from Avar overlordship.<sup>49</sup>

Many of Hauptmann's allegations were open to questioning. In the following some of the criticisms raised by Milko Kos, Josip Mal and Bogo Grafenauer are presented.

Milko Kos (1892-1972), professor of history at the University of Ljubljana in the interwar period and author of the first scholarly history of the medieval Slovenes, challenged one of the most important elements of Hauptmann's Croat theory, namely his equation Croat = kosez.<sup>50</sup> Kos established that "pagus Crouuati," according to the written sources, was limited to a narrow strip of land between Trg (Feldkirchen) and Št. Vid (St. Veit) on the Glina (Glan) and

therefore could not encompass the entire county (“comitatus,” “ministerium”) of Breže (Friesacher Grafschaft), especially as the sources clearly distinguish between the two. He agreed that one finds kosezi in this Croat district, but many kosezi, in reality the great majority of them, were living outside this district, with no Croat villages nearby. Likewise one finds a few Croat villages outside the Croat district with no kosezi close to them. Therefore one cannot assert that all the kosezi were Croats. It is equally true, that some Croats might be kosezi but we have no proof that all of them were. Hence, Kos concluded his argument, it is wrong to maintain that all Croats were kosezi or that all kosezi were Croats as the written sources and geographical data do not confirm any such assertion. Regarding the question of when the Croats did come to Carinthia, Kos gave no definite answer. On the one hand he pointed out that the Croat villages were situated on the territory of the oldest Slovene colonization of the seventh century, and, on the other, he indicated that the term “pagus Crouuati” did not appear in the written sources before the second part of the tenth century.<sup>51</sup>

When analyzing the oldest written source on Slovene history, the *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*, written in the ninth century, Kos came to the conclusion that by the middle of the eighth century, Slovene society was socially diversified, having a prince on the top with regional leaders (primates), nobles, freemen and an unfree population, including slaves. Hence, there was no sign of a two-class (master-slave) social structure. Kos also thought that the kosezi, composed of freemen and nobles, were closely connected with the installation ritual.<sup>52</sup>

But Josip Mal also criticized Hauptmann’s Croat theory anew. In his 1938 analysis of two interpolations into the *Schwabenspiegel*, Mal reaffirmed his previous opinion that the kosezi had played no role in the installation ritual. As the Slovene nobility fused with the Bavarian and Frankish nobility, explained Mal, the Slovene free peasantry remained the only representative of the old Slovene legal order and as far as the installation of the Carinthian dukes was a Slovene legal ritual, only Slovene free peasants could perform it.<sup>53</sup>

A year later, Mal systematically organized his views on early Slovene history, added some new source materials and published it in book form as *Probleme aus der Frühgeschichte der Slowenen*.<sup>54</sup> This work in general represented Mal’s old assertions with a few new critical observations. We will limit ourselves to these.

While still denying any Avar overlordship, Mal nevertheless recognized that the Avars had had an influence on Slovene political institutions and that the Slovenes had probably borrowed from them such words as župan and kosezi.<sup>55</sup> Regarding Croat place and family

names, he stressed that they are to be found also among other Slavic people, especially in Bohemia, Poland and Russia—which might indicate that in the past different Croat splinter groups had settled there. But none of these people ever claimed that any of these Croat groups had played a significant role in their political life. In addition he pointed out that the Croats of the Balkans established their own states only in the beginning of the ninth century. How did it come about that only the few Croat villages in Karantania should play such an important political role at a much earlier time, at the beginning of the seventh century, Mal wondered.<sup>57</sup> On “pagus Crouuati” he added that it was mentioned only a few times during the second half of the tenth century, that is, after the Magyar defeat. The written sources therefore knew nothing about the coming of the Croats to Karantania or about their rule there.<sup>57</sup> Regarding the Croat and kosezi villages in Carinthia, Mal stated that they could be described as insignificant places of third or fourth rank from the geographical, economic, political or strategic aspect. Mal wondered how it was possible that the Croat conquerors retreated to the remotest and poorest places while their Slovene slaves enjoyed the best parts of the land.<sup>58</sup>

About the kosezi, Mal introduced a new interpretation. He now distinguished between two kinds of kosezi, the original group of old Karantania and a new one which came into being in the latter part of the Middle Ages. The old kosezi were Slovene dignitaries whose names were mentioned in the Frankish Annals for the year 811 as Canzauci.<sup>59</sup> From this original word came the name kosezi (kanzaci—kazaci—kazazi), which was also preserved in the old village names of Kasaze and Koseze. These kosezi, like the *župani*, declined socially and finally disappeared. Toward the end of the Middle Ages when feudal lords needed people for guard and police duty or for transportation of mail, they appointed to the new jobs their own serfs and called them by the old name kosezi. Thus, while the old kosezi were Slovene dignitaries who had held their position by their own rights, the new kosezi were the creation of their feudal lords.<sup>60</sup>

Bogo Grafenauer, presently a professor of Slovene medieval history at the University of Ljubljana, published his first critical evaluation of Hauptmann in 1939 when he was still only a university student. Between 1939 and 1954, the year the last of Hauptmann's works came out, Grafenauer published several different articles dealing with Slav-Avar relationships and early Karantanian history. He has remained all of his life much closer to Hauptmann than Mal was at any time, and hence his criticism is much gentler.<sup>61</sup>

Grafenauer disagreed with Hauptmann on the master-slave relationship between Slavs and Avars, as Mal and Kos did before him,

and advanced a new interpretation. Avars and Slavs lived in a union which might be called a tribal military federation under Avar leadership. As a rule the latter did not meddle in the internal affairs of the Slavs but left the Slavic princes to rule over their Slavic tribes. However, this political lordship might also differ. Slavs living closer to the Avar political center in the Pannonian flatland might be under greater Avar control than the ones living far away, like the Karantanians.<sup>62</sup> According to Grafenauer, the Slavized Croats and Kasegs came to Karantania as friends and not as masters and helped the Slovenes to establish their independence from the Avars. Both were small in number and could have played no significant role in Karantania. One can prove this by the fact that neither the Croats nor Kasegs gave their name to the Slovenes as the Bulgars had given their name to the Balkan Slavs. The only exception were the Kasegs which gave their name to a social group—the kosezi, but still not to the entire people.<sup>63</sup>

Regarding the kosezi, Grafenauer first advanced the theory that they formed a special social group standing between the free peasants and the nobles and recognized that they played an important role in the installation ritual. Later he added that kosezi might have begun as the military retinue (*družiniki*) of Karantanian princes. The prince might accept not only Slovenes but also the Croat Kasegs to serve in his private army. True, he might prefer the latter when he had to put down revolts, as, for example, Hotimir had to suppress the revolt of pagan Slovenes in the second part of the eighth century.<sup>64</sup>

In 1954 Hauptmann published his last work, *Staroslovenska družba in obred na knežjem kamnu* (Old Slovene Society and the Ritual on the Prince's Stone) mainly to answer his critics and to reassert his Croat theory.<sup>65</sup> Some of the arguments advanced against his theory he corrected or refuted, others he twisted or left without an answer. The essence of his Croat theory continued to be that the Slavized Croat tribe of Kasegs had freed the Karantanian Slovenes and established their own rule there. Kasegs gave their name to the new ruling group, which in time was Slovenized and which accepted among themselves also Bavarians, Franks, and Slovenes. When the Franks established their overlordship over Karantania, they did not change the existing social system but accepted it as it was: the noble kosezi and the servile Slovenes. Because of feudalization and the division of their property among their sons, the kosezi declined from high nobles, to low nobility, then still further down to free peasants, to half-free peasants, and finally became serfs and peasant paupers. He supported the noble origin and the gradual decline of the kosezi by new sources of which the most substantial was the codex of Bishop Altwin (1049-1097), whose Brixen diocese had estates in the

upper Sava valley, namely Bled and Bohinj, and the estate Kamen (Stein) in Southern Carinthia.<sup>66</sup> Hauptmann persisted in his previous statement that Sclavus = servus, and hoba sclavonica = hoba servilis and stood by his assertion that pagus Crouuati included the entire Breže (Friesach) county. To the latter he added a new Croat district on the upper Mura (Mur) river.<sup>67</sup>

Hauptmann completely ignored Mal's assertion that no written documents exist to prove the coming of the Croats to Karantania or to tell us about their role played there. And truly, after Hauptmann himself abandoned his previous interpretation that Illyricum in Constantine Porphyrogenetos' work included also Noricum or better Karantania, there was no other written source to support his Croat theory.<sup>68</sup> The entire theory now rested on few geographical names and on Hauptmann's witty discussion. To broaden the weak base of his theory, Hauptmann added kosezi villages to Croat ones on the ground that the kosezi (Kasegs) were Croats. But, if Croat and kosez meant the same thing, why were there two different names for their villages? This is how Hauptmann explained the mystery. The Bavarian, when he came to Karantania, saw in Hrovače a Croat tribal settlement and he also gave it its ethnic name Kroboten. In Kasaze the Bavarian saw a leading social group and he called it Edling. In time Croats were Slovenized, continued Hauptmann, and only here and there were there still villages where they were remembered as Croats, but socially they remained what they had always been, namely kosezi, the rulers.<sup>69</sup> In reality, one could call the Croat county also the kosezi county, concluded Hauptmann. But this additional explanation still left the Croat theory on rather shaky ground.

While Hauptmann completely ignored Mal's remark about why the Croat splinter groups among other Slavic peoples did not play any important role, he nevertheless took into consideration Grafenauer's question why the Croats did not give their name to the Alpine Slavs, that is Slovenes, as they did to the Slavs in Dalmatia. According to Hauptmann, this was not because of the small number, or because the Croats did not have a leading role, but because the Franks made Karantania one of their counties in 828. Today, Croats in Dalmatia would not call themselves Croats if the same thing were to happen to them, he explained.<sup>70</sup>

Hauptmann never answered directly why Croat and kosezi villages were third and fourth class in importance, a statement made by Mal. But with his examples, he tried to give an indirect answer by explaining what had happened to the freeholders in the surroundings of the Bled estate of the Brixen bishops. To round up and extend his Bled estate, Bishop Altwin, during the second part of the eleventh

century, pressed the small freeholders to donate their alodial possessions to the church. Many did, or exchanged their freeholds near Bled for ones farther away in Bohinj. After a while the bishops of Brixen went after them to Bohinj too. During the first part of the twelfth century, the bishops of Brixen were still acquiring some of the free alodial possessions, but then the freeholders disappeared from the sources. From 1253 on, a hundred years later, the sources of this region speak only of the kosezi-peasants. But they too declined on the social ladder. "A clear evolutionary line leads from the *nobiles* of the eleventh century to the pauperized serfs of the sixteenth century," wrote Hauptmann, indicating that what we see today are only the results of this decline caused by feudalization.<sup>71</sup>

Next is an example of how Hauptmann twisted certain factors. Mal in his works had tried time and again to disapprove Hauptmann's assertions of Croat-Slovene, master-slave relations in Karantania by quoting sources which spoke about free Slovenes and Slovene legal institutions. All these and similar arguments of Mal were, one might say, sarcastically dismissed by Hauptmann when he wrote:

No one had maintained that in Karantania there were no free people. In reality it was I who was the first to point out how much the Slovenes own to the Irish [referring to the first Christian missions], again I extended the history of the Karantanian extended nobility back to the seventh century and I proved the existence of an internally free Karantanian principality before the great reform of 828. . . . To make now appeals to the ghosts of the free Karantanians is therefore not an *instantia ad contrarium* against servus = Sclaus. The kasezi were free, were they not?<sup>72</sup>

Evidently Mal had talked about the Slovenes while Hauptmann referred to the Karantanians, composed of, according to his own theory, the Croat masters and the Slovene slaves, exactly what Mal had tried to prove wrong.

Finally, Hauptmann did somewhat change his views on the Slovene relationship to their Avar masters. According to him, the relationship as he had described it, had been misinterpreted. It did not apply to a master-slave relationship on an individualistic base, but rather it should be thought of as "collective slavery."

Nothing can justify the opinion that each Karantanian had his own Avar master. Month after month could pass by and in out-of-the-war places it might be even a whole year that he did not



see an Avar-nomad. However, if a band of them stopped in his village, then an absolutely lawless situation came about, as described in such a moving way by Fredegar and Nestor and as experienced even by the powerful Goths when under the Huns.<sup>73</sup>

Mal's final views on the kosezi were expressed in his last two articles published in the respected West German review *Südost-Forschungen* in 1961 and 1963. In the first one, "Die Eigenart des karantanischen Herzogstum," he refuted Hauptmann's and Grafenauer's latest assertions about the kosezi.<sup>74</sup> Mal stressed anew that there were no traces in the written sources which would prove that Hauptmann's Kasegs or Grafenauer's *družiniki* played any leading role in Karantanian history. Similarly there were no remnants about Croats, Kasegs and *družiniki* to be detected in all of Slovene folklore. Mal also disagreed with Grafenauer's assertion, that the Germans had accepted the *družiniki* in their own military and social system after having defeated the uprising of Ljudevit Posavski, who had been helped by a Karantanian prince and his Slovene nobility. Such an outcome would have been very unlikely and would have had no precedent in history.<sup>75</sup>

Mal's last article "Ist das Edlingerproblem wirklich unlösbar?" deals entirely with the kosezi problem.<sup>76</sup> By relying primarily on the written sources, Mal came to the following conclusions which were close to his original concept on the kosezi: the *urbaria* of the fifteenth and sixteenth century are the first written sources which talk about the kosezi. According to them the kosezi were a privileged social group among the serfs performing modest services for their feudal lords. As none of the written sources indicate that the kosezi were at any time a higher social group, Mal's theory on *cansauci-kosezi*, representing such dignitaries, was also abandoned. Mal now agreed that kosezi settlements appear in the written sources from the twelfth century on, and that their villages belonged to the oldest Slovene settlements usually near the old Roman roads. Hence, the kosezi were settled close to the administrative and economic centers but never formed part of them. Their duty was to secure and protect the approaches to these centers. Moreover, the kosezi were always closely connected with the feudal lords which represented provincial political and judicial authority and performed for them different minor services. In payment they received "Edeltum," free hereditary land, just as Serbian refugees (*uskoki*) had received free land for their military service in the Military Zones along the Ottoman border.

Mal also accepted the view, advanced particularly by Austrian historians, that individual kosezi had advanced on the social ladder

especially during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Some of them became craftsmen and traders and in this way entered the new social group of burghers. Others who excelled in martial arts entered the knighthood and some individuals rose even to *ministeriales*. However the great majority remained peasants. Then during the second part of the sixteenth century, the kosezi began to disappear from the *urbaria*. Because of social, economic and political changes the feudal lords no longer needed their services and revoked their privileges. The kosezi became simple serfs again. Because they had been a creation of feudal lords, the kosezi could never play an important role in Slovene history and could not be involved in the installation ceremony of Carinthian dukes.<sup>77</sup>

Less acceptable was Mal's new interpretation of the German and Slovene name for the kosezi. His arguments for the German name Edlinger evolve along the following line: according to the German legal statutes (*Sachsenspiegel* and *Schwabenspiegel*) of the thirteenth century, the term "edeln" meant "to acquire hereditary landed property," and "Edeltum" was such a property. As the kosezi owned these "Edeltums" they were called Edlingers. In the same law codes the term "edelnich" also appears, meaning the law-enforcing agent.<sup>78</sup>

As there was no satisfactory or generally accepted interpretation for the origin of the word kosez, Mal was eager to accept the advice of Janez Stanonik, professor of Germanic languages at the University of Ljubljana. The latter called to Mal's attention that in English medieval sources a social group is mentioned which was called originally "cotsetla." Out of this oldest form derived many others, such as "coteri," "coscez," "cozets" and finally we get "cozez," meaning the owner or the inhabitant of a small poor house or cottage. From the root cot + ja came also the Slovene word *koča* denoting as in English a small poor house or cottage. But also Du Cange's dictionary of medieval Latin has the word "coscez"—as well as some other forms—meaning poor peasants, poor people, workers, craftsmen who were owners or inhabitants of primitive houses. Du Cange includes under the same entry also some German names such as Kotsassen, Kotsaeten, Kossaeten—meaning inhabitants of small houses. From these English and German forms derived the Slovene name for kosez. The kosezi were therefore poor peasant owners of small cottages or *kajže*. A further proof is offered by Slovenes in Carinthia, who pronounce the village name Kazaze as Kajzaze, that is *kajžice* (small *kajže*). Both the German and Slovene names for the kosezi, therefore, confirm that this social group originated in feudal times and hence could not exist in a pre-feudal society, concluded Mal.<sup>79</sup>

*Conclusion*

To conclude, the Croat theory did not solve the question of the origin or role of the kosezi in Slovene history. Its only solid base lay in the Croat villages in Carinthia, mentioned so many times. But this is not enough. The villages with Croat names were few and do not warrant the great role which the Croats should have played according to this theory. Connected with this is the unresolved question of when the Croats came to Karantania? Did they come together with the Slovenes (as some speculate), or did they come later, after the Avar defeat by the Franks or after the Magyar invasion and their defeat by Otto I? If they came after the eighth century, they definitely could not have played a role in pre-Frankish Karantania.

Still weaker is Hauptmann's assertion of the Slavized White Croat tribe of Kasegs. The only solid basis for it is the name of a Croat leader, Kosentzes, an eponym for the Kaseg tribe, mentioned in Constantine Porphyrogenetos' work. But neither Constantine nor any other source indicates that this Croat leader or his tribe had anything to do with Karantania. Hence, the equation Kaseg = kosez is without any basis.

Hauptmann's assertion that the kosezi were nobles who had declined in their social status because of feudalization is equally weak. First, we have no evidence in the sources that the kosezi were originally nobles, though some might well have been. Secondly, sources advanced by Hauptmann do not prove his arguments. For example, he listed a few cases—the Bled estate of the Brixen bishops or the village of Otmanje—and then extended his conclusions based on these few cases to be valid for all of Slovenia. Third, he did not show the decline of even one specific noble family, which he might have traced from its noble status down to serfdom. He could only indicate that in certain locations (like Bled, Otmanje) there were noble families which had bequeathed some of their property to a church or a monastery; then a few centuries later, Hauptmann discovered that the kosezi were living on such and such a property or close to it. But he never established a direct connection between a noble family and their kosezi descendants, for example, that the kosezi in Otmanje were the descendants of Rahwin or Junik. Moreover, while ascertaining one evolutionary trend of decline for the kosezi, he fails to take into account other social changes such as the rise of the service nobility (ministerials), which finally fused with the old nobility into a new noble group, or the beginnings of the cities. Junik, which was listed before the ministerials, and his sons listed among them, is not necessarily a case for decline, but rather indicates that Junik's sons joined the service nobility, which at that time was

obtaining also a higher social status, and might in turn be similar to the one their father Junik enjoyed before. Furthermore, the detailed study of Austrian historians after World War II proved that many former kosezi had joined the new city dwellers in the later part of the medieval period. In his last work of 1954, Hauptmann did offer some recognition of these new trends by making marginal remarks that individual free kosezi might have saved themselves from further decline by joining the ministerials or the burghers.<sup>80</sup>

Mal made substantial contributions to the kosezi controversy and to early Slovene history. In general his conclusions are reliable as long as they rest on written sources. However he is weak whenever he experiments with a new theory or uses linguistic interpretations. His *cansauci*, the old kosezi nobles, is the best example.<sup>81</sup>

Grafenauer's theory of the kosezi as an armed retinue (*družiniki*) of the Karantanian princes has historical parallels with other Slavic princes (the Kievan *družina*). But again we have no sources to support this assertion. The only indirect proof for it, advanced by Grafenauer, is the pagan revolt, which Prince Hotimir was able to defeat with his own army—his *druziniki*. Such an origin of the kosezi was asserted also by Austrian historians.

Finally we may ask ourselves—who were the kosezi? The Hauptmann-Mal debate has thrown some new light on the mysterious past of this social group and encouraged other historians (Slovene and Austrian) to do more research on this problem. But besides the many new theories and speculations we still do not know much about the origin of the kosezi and the role they played in the early period of Slovene history. Moreover we have very few sources or historically proven facts to depend on in our search for the truth. What we know for sure are the following facts. Kosezi villages usually belong to the oldest Slovene settlements and were grouped around the old administrative centers such as Krnski grad (Karnburg) in southern Carinthia, Judenburg on the Mura (Mur) in Austrian Styria, Celje, and the Kranj-Kamnik region (the seat of the medieval Carniolan administration). Just as the old and the new *župani* were connected with administrative functions, so also the kosezi (as far as mentioned in the sources) were always connected with military or guard functions—functions connected with arms. These three facts are generally recognized and accepted. But, did the kosezi play a role also in the installation ceremony? The installation sources inform us that the installation ritual was performed, at least from 1286 on, by a ducal peasant (Herzogbauer) whose right was hereditary in his family. Only in 1414 do we learn that Ernest Habsburg confirmed the privileges to the ducal peasant, who was an Edlinger (kosez). Was the installation peasant always a kosez or was he called a kosez because he had

a privileged position similar to other kosezi of late medieval times, who were elevated to their position by their feudal lords? The role of the kosezi at the installation ceremonies is still not supported enough by historical facts to be finally decided upon.<sup>82</sup>

So the origin and the role of kosezi in ancient Slovene society still remains a mystery and will continue to intrigue the historian determined to solve it.

#### NOTES

1. Below the German researchers are listed in three groups. The first includes the ones which were active mostly, though not exclusively, in the pre-World War I period, the second the ones active during the inter-war period, and the third, the youngest, active after World War II.

The outstanding scholars in the first group were: Paul Puntschart, professor of legal history at the University of Graz, wrote *Herzogseinsetzung und Huldigung in Kärnten: Ein Verfassungs- und kulturgeschichtlicher Beitrag* (Leipzig, 1899), which was the first thorough study of the installation ritual of the Carinthian dukes and the kosezi (Edlinge). The latter are discussed on pp. 144-203. Hauptmann used this work extensively. Alfons Dopsch, professor of history at the University of Vienna, published *Die ältere Social- und Wirtschafts-verfassung der Alpendslaven* (Weimar, 1909), a rebuttal of Jan Peisker's theories. Martin Wutte, "Zur Geschichte der Edlinger, der Kärntner Pfalzgrafen und des Herzogsstuhles," *Carinthia I*, vol. 139 (1949): 13-33.

The second group is represented by: August Jaksch, "Die Edlinge in Karantanien und der Herzogsbauer am Fürstenstein und die Zeremonien bei demselben," *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Phil.-historische Klasse*, 205, Abhandlungen 5 (Vienna, 1927): 1-19; H. Bräumüller, "Noriker und Karantaner," *Carinthia I*, vol. 123 (1933): 21-31; the same, *Geschichte Kärntens* (1949); F. Jantsch, "Die spätantiken und langobardischen Burgen in Kärnten," *Mitteilungen der anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, 68 (1939): 327-390; Anton Riedler, "Die rechtliche Stellung der Slowenen im deutschen Reich des Mittelalters," *Carinthia I*, vol. 124 (1934): 79-98; Karl Torggler, "Die Arbeiten Ludmil Hauptmanns und ihre Bedeutung für Kärnten, besonders in der Edlingerfrage," *ibid.*, vol. 128 (1938): 41-45; Gregor Graber, *Volksleben in Kärnten* (1934); the same, "Auf den Spuren der Langobarden in Kärnten," *Kärntner Jahrbuch 1942*, pp. 40-47; Ernest Klebel, "Langobarden, Bajuwaren, Slawen," *Mitteilungen der anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, 69 (1939): 41-116; the same, "Aus dem römischen und germanischen Kärnten," *Festschrift für Rudolf Egger* (1942), pp. 327-454; the same, *Von den Edlingern in Kärnten (Archiv für vaterländische Geschichte und Topographie*, vol. 28), (Klagenfurt: Geschichtsverein für Kärnten, 1942).

The third group includes: F. Popelka, "Die Judenburg Ritterstadt und der karolingische Wehrsystem in Karantanien," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, 62 (1954): 299-316; the review will be hereafter cited as *MIÖG*; Herwig Ebner, *Von den Edlingern in Innerösterreich (Archiv für vaterländische Geschichte und Topographie*, vol. 47) (Klagenfurt: Geschichtsverein für Kärnten, 1956); the same, *Das freie Eigen: Ein Beitrag zur Verfassungsgeschichte des Mittelalters* (Klagenfurt: Geschichtsverein für Kärnten, 1969); W. Fresacher, "Klagenfurt: eine Edlingersiedlung," *Carinthia I*, 150 (1960): 118-161.

2. For data on Hauptmann see: *Slovenski biografski leksikon* (Ljubljana, 1926), p. 298; *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, vol. 3 (Zagreb, 1958), pp. 665-66; Bogo Grafenauer, "In memoriam: Ljudmil Hauptmann," *Zgodovinski časopis* (Ljubljana), 22 (1968): 311-312.

3. For data on Mal see: *Slovenski biografski leksikon* (1933-1952): 30-31; Vasilij Melik, "In memoriam: Dr. Josip Mal," *Zgodovinski časopis*, 33 (1979): 467-468. The Slovene title of his history is *Zgodovina slovenskega naroda: najnovejša doba* (Celje, 1928-1939), and the Slovene title of the Herald is *Glasnik Muzejskega društva za Slovenijo* (Ljubljana); the latter will be cited as *Glasnik*.

4. Ljudmil Hauptmann, *Staroslovenska družba in obred na knežjem kamnu*, Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti, Razred za zgodovinske in družbene vede: Dela 10, Inštitut za zgodovino: Sekcija za občo in narodno zgodovino 2 (Ljubljana, 1954), p. 75. The Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti will be cited henceforth as SAZU.

5. Ljudmil Hauptmann, "Karantanska Hrvatska," *Zbornik kralja Tomislava u spomen tisućugodišnjice hrvatskoga kraljestva*, Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Posebna djela, 17 (Zagreb, 1925): 298-302.

6. *Ibid.*, pp. 302-303.

7. Ljudmil Hauptmann, "Staroslovenska družba in njeni stanovi," *Časopis za slovenski jezik, književnost in zgodovino* (Ljubljana), 1 (1918): 85. The journal will be cited as *Časopis*.

8. Ludmil Hauptmann, *MIÖG*, 36 (1915): 229-287.

9. Jan Peisker, "The Expansion of the Slavs," *The Cambridge Medieval History*, 2nd rev. ed., vol. 2 (1926): 426; the same, "Die älteren Beziehungen der Slawen zu Turkotataren und Germanen und ihre sozialgeschichtliche Bedeutung," *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 3 (1905): 329-360, 465-517. "The Expansion of the Slavs" was first published in *The Cambridge Medieval History* in 1913. It is of interest that it was reprinted in 1926 and 1936, though Peisker's theories on the ancient Slavs had been scientifically proven to be wrong by Dopsch as early as 1909. (On Dopsch see footnote 1.)

10. Peisker, "The Expansion of the Slavs," *Cambridge Modern History*, 2 (1926): 433.

11. See Constantinus VII Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio*, Greek text ed. by G. Moravcsik, English trans. by R. J. H. Jenkins, rev. ed. (Washington-New York, 1967).

12. Hauptmann, "Politische Umwälzungen," *MIÖG*, 36 (1915): 256-257.

13. *Ibid.*, pp. 257, 260.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 264.

15. *Ibid.*, pp. 259-260.

16. *Iohannis Abbatis Victoriensis Liber certarum historiarum*, ed. by Fedorus Schneider as a separate publication of *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum ex Monumentis Germaniae Historicis*, 6 books in 2 vols. (Hannover, Leipzig, 1909, 1910),

vol. 1, pp. 251-253, 290-294, vol. 2, pp. 160-161, 195-196. On "rusticus libertus" specifically see, vol. 1, pp. 251 and 291. See also Hauptmann, "Politische Umwälzungen," *MIÖG*, 36 (1915): 260-261, 262.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 264.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 261.

19. *Ibid.*, pp. 264-265.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 265.

21. *Časopis*, 1 (1918): 79-99.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 81.

23. *Ibid.*, p. 85. Historical sources many times refer to the Avars as Huns.

24. *Ibid.*, pp. 86-87.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 85.

26. *Ibid.*, pp. 88-99.

27. Mal, "Nova pota slovenske historiografije," *Čas* (Ljubljana), 17 (1923): 185-220.

28. *Ibid.*, 199. See also Luka Pintar, "O krajevnih imenih" (On Topographical Names), *Ljubljanski Zvon*, (1912): 600-605. Similarly Franc Jeza recently developed kosez from the Nordic kosning-kosing-kosez as meaning the elector, the one who elects the prince (*Skandinavski izvor Slovencev* [The Scandinavian Source of the Slovenes] [Trieste: 1967], pp. 286-287).

29. The older sources about the installation include: two interpolations into the *Schwabenspiegel*, the St. Gallen manuscript, and the Giessen manuscript. For the first see: *Der Schwabenspiegel oder schwabisches Land- und Lehen-Rechtbuch*, ed. by F. L. A. von Lassberg, introduction by A. L. Reyscher, a reprint of the 1840 edition (n.p.: 1961), pp. 133-134, note 217; for the second, Josip Mal, "Schwabenspiegel in koroško ustoličenje" (The Schwabenspiegel and the Carinthian Installation Ritual), *Glasnik*, 19 (1938): 109-139; photocopy of the latter manuscript and its transliteration, *ibid.*, pp. 114-115. The second is *Ottakars Östereichische Reimchronik*, according to the manuscript prepared by Franz Lichtenstein and ed. by Joseph Seemüller, in *Deutschen Chroniken und andere Geschichtsbücher des Mittelalters of Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Scriptores qui vernacula lingua usi sunt*, vol. 5, part 1 (Hannover, 1890), pp. 263-267. For the third, Abbot John from Victoria (*Iohannis Abbatis Victorienis Liber certarum historiarum*) see note 16. An abundant literature exists on the installation ritual, though here we mention only three works: the first and most detailed study was written by Paul Punischart in 1899 (see note 1). The second such detailed analysis was written after World War II by Bogo Grafenauer: *Ustoličevanje koroških vojvod in država karantanskih Slovencev* (The Installation of the Carinthian Dukes and the State of the Karantanian Slovenes), SAZU, Razred za zgodovinske in družbene vede: Dela 7, Inštitut za zgodovino, Sekcija za občno in narodno zgodovino 1 (Ljubljana, 1952). For a short description in English see: Joseph Felicijan, *The Genesis of the Contractural Theory and the Installation of the Dukes of Carinthia* (Cleveland, 1967).

30. Mal, "Nova pota slovenske historiografije," *Čas*, 17 (1923): 210-213. About Jakob Unrest see: *Jakobi Unresti Chronicon Carinthiacum*, in *Collectio monumentorum veterum et recentium*, vol. 1 (Braunschweig, 1724), pp. 482-485 cited in Grafenauer, *Ustoličevanje koroških vojvod*, pp. 135-139. Mal was wrong here. The first time the peasant installing the duke was referred to as Edling was in 1414, hence in the beginning of the fifteenth century, in a letter with which Ernest Habsburg confirmed the rights to Gregor Schatter, the Edlinger, who had installed him in that year. (*Ibid.*, p. 315.) See also Puntschart, p. 150.

31. Mal, "Nova pota slovenske historiografije," *Čas*, 17 (1923): 217.

32. *Ibid.*, pp. 210-213.

33. *Ibid.*, p. 213.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 216.

35. *Ibid.*, p. 217.

36. Hauptmann, "Staroslovanska in staroslovenska 'svoboda,'" (The Old-Slav and the Old-Slovene 'Freedom'), *Čas*, 17 (1923): 305-334.

37. *Ibid.*, p. 330.

38. *Zbornik kralja Tomislava*, pp. 297-317.

39. *Ibid.*, p. 305.

40. *Ibid.*, pp. 303-306.

41. *Ibid.*, p. 309.

42. *Ibid.*, p. 306-310.

43. *Ibid.*, p. 311-312.

44. Hauptmann, *Vierteljahrschrift für Social- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 21 (1928): 245-279.

45. *Ibid.*, pp. 271, 273.

46. *Ibid.*, pp. 272-273.

47. *Ibid.*, pp. 276-277.

48. Hauptmann, "Kroaten, Goten und Sarmaten," *Germanoslavica* (Prague), 3 (1935) cited in "Seobe Hrvata i Srba," *Jugoslovenski istoriski časopis* (Ljubljana, Zagreb, Belgrade), 3 (1937): 30-61.

49. *Ibid.*, pp. 60-61.

50. For data on Milko Kos see: *Slovenski biografski leksikon*, 1 (1925-1932): 528; Bogo Grafenauer, "Znanstveno delo Milka Kosa" (Scientific Work of Milko Kos),



*Zgodovinski časopis: Kosov zbornik*, 6-7 (1952-1953): 9-29; Ferdo Gestrin, "In memoriam akademiku in profesorju dr. Milku Kosu," *Zgodovinski časopis* 26 (1972): 5-10.

51. M. Kos, "Slovenska naselitev na Koroškem" (The Settling of Slovenes in Carinthia), *Geografski vestnik* (Ljubljana), 8 (1932): 112-115.

52. M. Kos, *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*, Razprave Znanstvenega društva v Ljubljana 11, Historični odsek 3 (Ljubljana, 1936); for text see *ibid.*, pp. 127-140; see also "De conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum libellus," *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, ed. by Georgius Heinricus Pertz, reprint of 1854 edition, vol. 11 (Hannover-Leipzig, 1925), pp. 4-15. M. Kos, *Zgodovina Slovencev od naselitve do reformacije* (The History of the Slovenes from the Settling Down [in Eastern Alps] to the Reformation) (Ljubljana, 1933), pp. 90-93.

53. Mal, "Schwabenspiegel," *Glasnik*, 19 (1938): 123, 125.

54. Mal, *Probleme* (Ljubljana, 1939); and the same *Kontinuiteta slovenske karantanske kneževine* (Celje, 1949).

55. Mal, *Probleme*, pp. 34, 35.

56. *Ibid.*, p. 54.

57. *Ibid.*, pp. 49, 52.

58. *Ibid.*, pp. 49-50.

59. Quoting from *Historia Francorum* (MG, SS, vol. 4, ad a. 811): "Venerunt etiam Aquas de Pannonia duo principes Auarum et Tudun et alii Canzauci et primores Sclavorum circa Danubium habitantium cum muneribus." (Mal, *Probleme*, p. 36). Hauptmann quite rightly pointed out that two older sources spelled "Canzauci" differently, namely, "Canizauci" and "canizauci." The word was prior to Mal interpreted variously. To F. Kurze the editor of *Annales regni Francorum* the word indicated the supreme khan; Dimmler, on the other hand, thought it was a personal name of the khan, hence Khan Izauci, which might have been a corrupt spelling. (For it see Franc Kos, *Gradivo za zgodovino Slovencev v srednjem veku* [Sources for the History of the Slovenes during the Middle Ages] [Ljubljana, 1906], vol. 2, pp. 39-40.)

60. Mal, *Probleme*, pp. 36-38.

61. For data on Grafenauer see: Fran Zwitter, "Bogo Grafenauer-šestdesetletnik" (Bogo Grafenauer—Sixty Years Old), *Zgodovinski časopis*, 30 (1976): 233-238; and Olga Janša-Zorn, "Bibliografija prof. dr. Boga Grafenauerja" (Bibliography of Professor Dr. Bogo Grafenauer), *ibidem*, pp. 239-253.

For older works on this topic see: B. Grafenauer, "Svoboda ali sužnost" (Freedom or Slavery), *Čas*, 33 (1938-1939): 306-327. This is a critical analysis of the dispute between Hauptmann and Mal. "Država Karantanskih Slovencev" (The State of the Karantanian Slovenes), *Koroški Zbornik* (Ljubljana, 1946), pp. 77-103, is a condensed account of early Slovene history. "Nekaj vprasanj iz dobe naseljevanja južnih Slovanov" (Some Questions About the Period of Southern Slav Settlement [in the Balkans]), *Zgodovinski časopis*, 4 (1950): 23-126, analyses the time table of the colonization of the Balkans by the Southern Slavs and their relationship to the Bulgars and the Avars. For our discussion the chapter describing the Avar-Slav relationship is the most important (*ibid.*, 4 (1950): 91-123).

62. Grafenauer, "Svoboda ali sužnost," *Čas*, 33 (1938-1939): 313.

63. Grafenauer, "Drzava Karantanskih Slovencev," *Koroški Zbornik*, p. 93.

64. Grafenauer's later views on kosezi were elaborated by him in the following major works: *Ustoličevanje koroških vojvod in država karantanskih Slovencev* is his most important work, over 600 pages long, which Hauptmann did not include in his last discussion though it was published two years before his book came out; "Vprašanja županov, 'Hrvatov' in ustoličevanja koroških vojvod" (The Questions Regarding Župani, 'Croats' and the Installation of the Carinthian Dukes), *Naša Sodobnost* (Ljubljana), 3 (1955): 1125-1146; "Deset let proučevanja ustoličevanja koroških vojvod, kosezov in država karantanskih Slovencev" (Ten Years of Research on the Installation of the Carinthian Dukes, the Kosezi, and on the State of the Karantanian Slovenes), *Zgodovinski časopis*, 16 (1962): 176-209; on kosezi, *ibid.*, pp. 188-206; "Ustoličevanje koroških vojvod in vojvodski prestol" (The Installation of Carinthian Dukes and the Ducal Throne), *ibid.*, 24 (1970): 112-122. For Grafenauer's most recent views see *Zgodovina Slovencev* (The History of Slovenes) (ed. by Zdenko Čepič and others [Ljubljana, 1979]) of which the medieval part was written by Grafenauer.

65. *Staroslovenska družba in obred na knežjem kamnu* (The Old-Slovene Society and the Ritual on the Prince's Stone). For the test of the data see note 4.

66. Hauptmann, *Staroslovenska družba*, pp. 109-116.

67. *Ibid.*, pp. 85, 11-118.

68. In 1935 Hauptmann himself advanced the new interpretation, much closer to the truth, that Constantine's Illyricum was Duklja (Doclea) south of Dalmatia and not Noricum (Karantania). On it see: "Kroaten, Goten und Sarmaten," *Germanoslavica*, 3 (1935): 339; and "Seobe Hrvata i Srba," *Jugoslovenski istoriski časopis*, 3 (1937): 47-48.

69. Hauptmann, *Staroslovenska družba*, p. 120.

70. *Ibid.*, pp. 88-89.

71. *Ibid.*, pp. 114-115.

72. *Ibid.*, pp. 85-86.

73. *Ibid.*, p. 90.

74. "Die Eigenart des karantanischen Herzogtums," *Südost-Forschungen* (Munich): 20 (1961): 33-73. Hereafter the review will be cited as *SOF*. The above article is a further elaboration of Mal's Slovene article "Slovenska Karantanija in srednjeveška nemška država" (Slovene Karantania and the Medieval German State), *Razprave-Dissertationes* (Ljubljana, SAZU: Razred za zgodovinske in družbene vede), 2 (1953): 103-137. As the manuscript of the Slovene article was finished in 1951—hence before the publication of Hauptmann's last book and Grafenauer's main work—Mal referred to the new theories only in his footnote 24, pp. 115-116. So Mal's criticism of Hauptmann's Kasegs and Grafenauer's *družiniki* appeared only in the German article.

75. "Die Eigenart des karantanischen Herzogtums," *SOF*, 20 (1961): 40-41, 42-45, 46-49.

76. "Ist das Edlingerproblem wirklich unlösbar?" *SOF*, 22 (1963): 140-178.
77. *Ibid.*, pp. 151-157, 159, 164, 166, 172, 175.
78. "Die Eigenart des karantanischen Herzogtums," *SOF*, 20 (1961): 57-58.
79. "Ist das Edlingerproblem wirklich unlösbar?" *SOF*, 22 (1963): 175-178.
80. Hauptmann, *Staroslovenska družba*, p. 120.
81. See above note 59.
82. The last to confirm the privileges of the installation peasant was Emperor Francis II in 1801. See: Puntchart, *Herzogseinsetzung*, pp. 167-169.