

SLAV: THE ORIGIN AND MEANING OF THE ETHNONYM

Jakov Bačić

Introduction

The origin and meaning of the ethnonym *Slav* and the earliest history of the Slavic peoples have occupied numerous writers since the middle of the sixth century A.D. The literature on these topics is impressionistically voluminous, but yet to be evaluated in a comprehensive bibliographic survey.¹ With the exception of the few scholars who believe they see clearly the emergence of the Slavs, the boundaries of their original habitat, and the etymology and earliest semasiologies of their national name,² most would agree that the field of Slavic protohistory and early history is at an initial stage where scholarly consensus on some of the fundamental questions is still lacking. For example, we still do not have a satisfactory explanation for a "sudden" appearance of the Slavic ethnos on the well-choreographed stage of early medieval history, are unable to identify a geographical area to serve as the original habitat for speakers of the reconstructed Common Slavic language, and, last but not least, we are still hoping that a reasonable and believable etymology of the ethnonym *Slav* might some day be proposed and universally accepted.

Until the nineteenth century Slavic origins were studied within the discipline of history, the science which medieval men believed had been established by Moses for the Christians, Herodotus for the pagans.³ Everything worth knowing and knowable about the past of any people was thought to be obtainable from written sources left by ancient Hebrews, Greeks, Romans and other literate Mediterranean Basin peoples. During the last two centuries our horizons on the Slavic past have expanded, thanks to the involvement of linguistics and archeology, two disciplines that are traditionally viewed as *ancillae historiae*. Judging by the nature of the most recent literature on Slavic origins, it appears that linguists and archeologists now play the dominant role in this field, with historians barely present. On the surface this is as it should be, for this much-plowed ground can now be profitably turned if there are new data, and these can be provided only by linguistics and archeology. As is well known, all our written sources on early Slavic history had been widely published since the beginning of the nineteenth century.⁴ Nevertheless, I was urged and guided by my mentor, Professor Rado L. Lencek, to reexamine the primary written sources with the purpose of establishing not only the facts as they can be deduced from the evidence, but also to relegate to the sphere of the unknown or unknowable some of the many hypotheses with which the literature on that period abounds. There is no doubt that it is very profitable and even necessary to restudy our sources, because past scholars have not done this fully and conscientiously. What appear to be interpretations of primary sources avowedly arrived at through a given scholar's own study of Greek and Latin texts, upon closer scrutiny turn out to be statements which owe as much, if not more, to earlier interpreters of the same sources as to their original writers.

Many routes have been taken by generations of scholars in their search for the origin and meaning of the ethnonym *Slav*. The method suggested here is to proceed from known facts toward the obscure but knowable ones and to stop when reaching the unknowable. Based on my own analysis of the primary sources, I have attempted to show how, when and where the Sclaveni branch of the Slavic race appeared.⁵ Therefore, I would like to submit that a search for the origin and earliest meaning of the ethnonym *Slav* be made within the established spatial and temporal boundaries of the first known Slavia. Since my

own interpretation of early Slavic history is different from those that are currently disseminated, a brief recapitulation of it is in order.

Early History

1. The earliest known Slavs and their homeland: *Sklabenoī/Scclaveni and Slavia* proprie dicta. At the turn of the fifth to the sixth century there appeared a people whose name was recorded in the mid-sixth century Greek and Latin sources as *Sklabēnoī* and *Scclaveni*. They were a warlike race, hostile to Roman and Christian way of life, fiercely independent, eager and capable to carry out wide-ranging military and political plans of conquest and state-building. Their historically attested homeland in the sixth century stretched from Noviodunum (near modern Ljubljana) and Mursa lake (at modern Osijek) in the south to the source of the Vistula River in the north and up to the Dniester River in the east. In the north, along the Vistula toward the Baltic Sea dwelt their ethnolinguistic relatives, the Venedi, while from the east both peoples were flanked by their Antae cousins.⁶ Thus, at first, in the mid-sixth century, the term *Slavia* (*Sklabēntā* in the sources) was used to cover a concrete area, or state, inhabited by Slavs (*Sklabēnoī/Scclaveni*). It comprised roughly modern northern Croatia, including Slavonia, parts of Slovenia, Cis-Danubian Hungary, Slovakia, southern Poland, parts of western Ukraine and western Rumania. The southern and western boundaries of *Slavia* were at that time clearly and sharply defined by ethnicity and religion. On the west pagan Slavs faced Christian and pagan Germans, on the south were Roman citizens with their crumbling empire and assertive Christian religion. The northern and eastern boundaries of the Scclavenic ethnoses, although unclear to us for lack of sources, may have been sharply defined in those areas where they divided this people from its relatives, the Venedi and Antae. They surely were abruptly and dangerously drawn in the regions where Slavic farmers infringed upon the steppe country, where the various nomadic tribes roamed.

2. The southern and western expansion of Slavs and the spread of the term *Slavia*: *Slavia antiqua* and *Slavia nova*. Our early written sources make it possible for us to chart the expansion of both the Slavs and the term *Slavia* toward the south and west. By the beginning of the reign of the Emperor Heraclius (610-641) Slavic armies had captured from the East Romans most of the Prefecture of Illyricum and parts of the Diocese of Thrace, having earlier consolidated their control over Pannonia, Noricum and Dalmatia (or, all of the Diocese of Illyricum, except Rhaetia).⁷ The passing of control of *Magna Germania* from the Vistula River to the Elbe and Saale rivers from Germans to Slavs cannot be described for lack of sources, nor is it possible to separate with certainty Scclavenic from Venedic conquests.⁸

After the Slavs and their allies had captured the Christian Roman areas in modern Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Albania, Greece and Turkey, the term *Slavia* also expanded in the minds of contemporary observers, which fact was copiously recorded in our extant sources.⁹ As late as the mid-tenth century, Constantine Porphyrogenitus knew of this southward expansion of *Slavia* when he correctly designated as Great Croatia, Great Moravia and White Serbia the territory of old *Slavia*, *Slavia proprie dicta*, from which the Balkan Slavs had immigrated.¹⁰ I have studied the Emperor's work and other sources with the aim of establishing plausible locations of the regions he calls "great" or "white" and have concluded that the three countries named comprised the mid-sixth century *Slavia*. The function of the adjectives "great" and "white" in Porphyrogenitus' work has been misunderstood by scholars. It is clear that he used the adjective "great" to designate a region that was more distant than the region marked with the adjective "little" or not marked, but presumed to be "little" or "lesser." On the basis of Porphyrogenitus and other sources we are permitted to call the original homeland of the Balkan Slavs *Slavia antiqua* and their newly conquered country south of this region *Slavia nova*.¹¹

3. The diffusion of the ethnonym *Slav* and *Slavia*: *Slavia sensu lato*. From the seventh century numerous writers mention and describe *Slavia*, *terra Scclavorum*, *Sklabēntā*. This land stretched from the environs of Constantinople, Thessalonica, Athens, Corinth, Patras, Dyrrhachion (Durrësi) and Aquileia along the Soča/Isonzo River to the Enns/Aniža River, northward to the Saale and Elbe rivers, and ultimately to the German and Baltic seas.¹² The northern and eastern boundaries of the Slavs remained unclear until they became described in the *Russian Primary Chronicle* and defined by Kievan Rus'.¹³ Renaissance and Baroque Slavic poets and philosophers sang and dissertated about *Slavia* stretching from the Adriatic to the White Sea, from the Elbe River to the Volga River, and eventually to the shores of the Pacific Ocean.¹⁴

4. History's contribution in the search for the Slavic *Urheimat* and toward establishing the direction and nature of earliest Slavic migrations.

4.1. *The original Slavic homeland.* Here we can only discuss that habitat of the Slavs whose spatial and temporal boundaries can be established on the basis of written sources. Since it appears certain that the earliest known Slavia, *Slavia antiqua*, was in the sixth century situated in the Danube Basin, the question to be asked is whether the Sclaveni had arrived thereto from another area. Since Ivan Lučić published his monumental study,¹⁵ the overwhelming majority of scholars have not only answered this question affirmatively, but have persisted in the belief that the Sclaveni had migrated from beyond the Carpathian Mountain ranges into the Danube Basin carrying along their own "Slavic" ethnonym from their elusive *prarodina*.¹⁶ This is one of the most firmly entrenched errors in the literature on Slavic origins. Its father, Ivan Lučić, was misled by two South Slavic medieval sources where the emergence of the Croats is arbitrarily entangled with the Goths and their migration from the region of Gdańsk to Roman Dalmatia.¹⁷ It seems that the erroneous belief that the Croats, whom our native medieval writers identified with the Goths, had migrated from Poland is the rock upon which rests the whole "scientific" structure of the theory of the Transcarpathian location of the Slavic *Urheimat*.¹⁸ Even the justly celebrated Slavist Lubor Niederle may have been influenced by the grey antiquity of this error to reject the Monk Nestor and other medieval Slavic writers who believed that all the Slavs had originated along the Danube.¹⁹

I believe I have demonstrated that the two sources which Niederle adduced to prove that Nestor was wrong may more correctly and justly be summoned as evidence that he was correct in claiming that: "Over a long period the Slavs settled beside the Danube, where the Hungarian and Bulgarian lands now lie."²⁰ To sum up, anyone who studies primary sources with the aim of gaining knowledge out of them rather than twisting and torturing them to verify preconceived ideas will readily agree with the thesis that: *Pannonia est mater et origo omnium Slavonicarum nationum*, as it was first expressed by Boguchval and seconded by other medieval and early modern writers.²¹

4.2. *The earliest Slavic migrations.* All our knowledge on migrations of the Slavs as a people is derived from the Monk Nestor and other northern medieval Slavic writers. They speak of a veritable *Völkerwanderung* of Slavic tribes *from south to north*, from *Slavia antiqua* in the Danube Basin to modern Poland and the USSR, where they came to be known as Venedi and Antae by others. This must have occurred at the dawn of the Christian era when Augustus' armies invaded, conquered and enslaved the native peoples of the Danube Basin, causing a northward shifting of the population.²² There is no written evidence upon which to imagine a migration of Slavic tribes in the opposite direction, from Venedia and Antia into *Slavia antiqua*. Furthermore, the hypothesized migration of Slavic tribes from beyond the Carpathians to the Danube Basin and from there (or even directly) to the Balkan Peninsula has no basis in the sources and cannot be confirmed either by linguistics or archeology.²³ The manner in which the Slavs conquered the Balkan Peninsula from the Romans and attached it to their Danubian Basin Slavia is similar to that in which the Romans had a few centuries earlier conquered the same area from its native inhabitants and attached it to their empire. Therefore, just as scholars do not argue that a migration of Romans to the Balkan Peninsula and the Danube Basin was the cause of the emergence there of Romance speaking populations, but operate with such concepts as "Roman conquest" and subsequent "Romanization" of the area, they should admit that the transformation of the same region into Slavia was a result of conquest by the armies of Sklabēnoi/ Sclaveni and a subsequent Slavization of the conquered territory.²⁴ To conclude, the only historically attested Slavic migration took place at the beginning of the Christian era when masses of ancestors of later Transcarpathian Slavs moved northward under Roman pressure. The expansion of Slavs to the Balkan Peninsula was not a *migratio gentium* but a military conquest.

Everything I have tried to establish and recapitulate here may be verified in the available written sources. The two servants of history, linguistics and archeology, have not and cannot contribute their due share in the search of Slavic origins so long as scholars working in these fields persist in the errors promoted by historians. Since the latter have mistakenly concluded that the Slavic *Urheimat* had to be looked for between the Odra River in the west and the Dnieper River and the Pripyat marshes in the east, linguists and archeologists automatically followed them thither with their tools and methods. It is within this area that archeologists have tried to isolate a culture of their "original" Slavs and linguists have been laboring to assemble "Proto-Slavic" toponymic (mostly hydronymic) evidence. Small wonder that these efforts have yielded no fruit, directed as they are by the erroneous belief that the *prarodina* was there rather than in the Danube Basin. One of the rare linguists who shows mastery of his discipline as well as of written sources is O.N. Trubačëv. Using both

he arrived at the conclusion that the Danube Basin is the region where the Slavs originated as an ethno-linguistic group of Indo-Europeans.²⁵

Slavic ethnogenesis and the birth of the Sklabēnoi/Sclaveni: Sclavonic ethnogony

Peoples are rarely named at birth, for until they are formed, usually through a long and complex process of ethnogenesis, there is nothing to name. Just as a human fetus has no name until, as a child, it utters its first cry after it comes out of its mother's womb, so a people remains unchristened until it makes an impression upon its neighbors, usually by some violent act. Of interest for Slavic ethnogenesis are the countless but nameless bearers of cultures and historically attested peoples who had inhabited Slavia *latissimo sensu* since the end of the ice age. The genetic make-up and cultural achievements of the people who preceded the Slavs as occupants of this Slavia had in the course of history become the heritage of the Slavic race. For example, the ancient Scythians, Sarmatians, Pannonians, Dacians, Thracian, Illyrians, Dalmatians and many other attested but now extinct peoples were assimilated in the course of history by Proto-Slavs or by any of that people's several descendants. Since we know close to nothing about their languages, we cannot describe the role each people had played in the formation of the Slavic ethnoses. Here, history is impotent, linguistics handicapped, and archeology ambiguous.

However, history can describe the bursting of an ethnoses into the consciousness of its neighbors and should try to deduce the reasons why and the manner in which the new-born people (rather, newly named or renamed) was named *Sklabēnoi/Sclaveni*. History can also approximate the time and place of this ethnic birth, or ethnogony.

Place and time of the appearance of the ethnonym 'Slav.'

Our search for the origin of the ethnonym *Slav* should not involve those peoples and areas that are known to have become "Slavic" as a result of conquest by Slavs. Furthermore, we have no reason to search for the "original" Slavs nor for the origin of the ethnonym in the lands inhabited by the Venedi and Antae, since these peoples, we have argued, migrated from *Slavia antiqua*. The Venedi and Antae became "Slavs" much later and only in the works of learned foreigners and their native imitators, never as self-designation.²⁶

Those scholars who look for the origin of the Slavic name outside the oldest known Slavic homeland, *Slavia antiqua*, should first prove that the Slavs had migrated to that region carrying along their ethnonym. In the absence of such proof all efforts to trace the Slavic name to some vaguely resembling name of some obscure tribe attested in a source or two in antiquity cannot be accepted. It appears, consequently, that we cannot know more than our classical and medieval observers knew on this matter, namely, that the *Sklabēnoi* had emerged in the Danube Basin and that the Venedi and Antae had migrated northward from the common Danubian Slavic habitat.

Therefore, instead of searching across the wastes of Eurasia for some unattested *Ur-Slavs*, it is more profitable to return to our authorities who dealt with concrete peoples and places. Of necessity we must start and end with Procopius' well-known passage:

In fact, the Sclaveni and Antae actually had a single name in the remote past; for they were both called *Spori* in olden times (*Spórous gâr tò palaiòn amfotérous ekáloun*), because, I suppose, living apart one man from another, they inhabit their country in a sporadic fashion. And in consequence of this very

fact they hold a great amount of land, for they alone inhabit the greatest part of the northern bank of the Ister (Danube).²⁷

Here is our answer why the mighty nation of the Slavs had been “unknown” in antiquity. In the mid-sixth century the name was relatively new, but the people or peoples quite old and well known. We have no ground upon which to reject the facts as they are presented by Procopius: that the name *Sklabēnoi* was in his time a new name, coined to designate the *Sporoi* of antiquity. As to who were the *Sporoi*, there is no better answer than that proposed by J. Dobrovský, J. Šafařík and other scholars, according to whom they were the Serbs, the same people who had been known as *Triballi* to their southern neighbors since the time of Herodotus.²⁸

Based on these facts, I would like to propose that the ethnonym *Sklabēnoi/Sclaveni* was coined in the same general area into which we can trace the oldest known and knowable Slavs and Slavia. We cannot know whether the new name began as a self-designation, or a name by which some autochthonous inhabitants of the Danube Basin became known to their neighbors. In the absence of an early “Slavic” form, it is safer to assume that the ethnonym *Sklabēnoi/Sclaveni* was as much in use among the observers as it was among the observed. From among the many etymologies of the ethnonym *Slav* the one which derives it from a hydronym seems quite plausible.²⁹ Several factors may be adduced in favor of a hydronymic solution. First, it is well known that Eurasian ethnonymy abounds in names of peoples that derive from names of various bodies of water, so there is nothing unusual in suggesting that the name *Sklabēnoi/Sclaveni* be added to an already long list of such names. Second, in one of our earliest sources the *Sklabēnoi* are contrasted with the *Physonites*. They are said to occupy the left bank of the Danube (the northern bank in Procopius), which our author took for the Biblical *Physon River* of the Garden of Eden, while the people he calls *Physonites* lived along the river’s right bank.³⁰ Third, there is a river in the original Slavia, *Slavia antiqua*, which, I suggest, gave its name to the people who settled along its banks, the *Zala River* of modern Hungary.

The *Zala* is one of the larger Pannonian rivers. Its source, all its course and its mouth are on the territory of Hungary, or on that part of Roman Pannonia Superior which was called Pannonia Prima at the end of Roman rule.³¹ The region drained by the *Zala* was considered by Jordanes as part of Scythia inhabited by *Sclaveni*.³² In 577 A.D. it was the central region of Slavia ruled by King *Daurentius*.³³ *Zalaegerszeg* is the chief city named after it, some of the others are *Zalaszentrót*, *Zalaapáti*, *Zalaszabar* and *Zalavár*. From antiquity only one city is attested, *Sala*, while the name of the river itself is not attested in the available classical sources.³⁴

To derive the ethnonym *Sklabēnoi* from this hydronym, we must postulate a form with the element *-ab/-av*, giving **Salaba/*Salava*. This word, meaning “water” (from *apa* “water”) can be identified in names of a large number of Central European rivers. It is quite unstable in that it is often attested only in place-names derived from hydronyms which had since lost it; it appears in some languages but is absent in others.³⁵ A few examples should suffice. The *Margus* in the land of the *Triballi*, recorded as the *Brongus* by Herodotus, is known today in Serbian as the *Morava*, the *Leitha* is called *Litava* in Slavic languages, and the *Nitra* in Slovakia has also been called *Nitrava*. Consequently, there should be no objection to postulating the form **Salaba/*Salava* for the river that the Hungarians call *Zala*. We must further postulate that in fast speech the first vowel was either not audible or it was dropped to yield **Slaba/*Slava*. Two other Danubian Basin hydronyms exhibit this process, the *Slaná* in modern Slovakia, which scholars derive from **Salana*,³⁶ and the *Mlava* in Serbia, which surely must have been known as **Malava* in antiquity, since the

ethnicon Malavenses and the name of the Roman province of Dacia Maluensis derive from this river's name.³⁷ On the other hand, it is possible that the *Urform* of the ethnonym *Sklabēnoi* was *Salavenoi, and that it came into Greek and Latin, reduced by native filters, as *Slabenoī.

To my knowledge, Ivan Lučić was the first scholar to point out that the consonants *k* and *th* were inserted into the cluster *sl* because both Greek and Latin do not tolerate this combination of consonants.³⁸ Thus the earliest attested forms of the ethnonym *Slav* are *Sklabēnoi*, *Sthlabēnoi* in Greek, *Sclaveni* in Latin.³⁹ Later, the suffix denoting origin, *-ēnoi/-eni* was dropped and the name became *Sklābos/Sclavus*. This form is the basis from which derived the word for the unfree, *sclavus*, *-a*, in Medieval Latin and in the other languages that were under its influence.⁴⁰ The Arabic *ṣaqlāb* derives from Medieval Greek, which also frequently substitutes the classical word *doûlos* "slave" with the word *sklābos*. Rumanian, Hungarian, and (Geg) Albanian derive their words for "slave" from the Slavic word *rabŭ*. It is understandable that living among Slavs the Hungarians used the classical word *servus* instead of the Medieval *sclavus*. Thus they greet each other with the expression *Servus!*, short for *Servus sum!* "I am your slave," while the Slavs' southern neighbors use the expression *Ciao!*, which derives from *Sciavo*, a Venetian word both for *servus* and Slav.

It seems that the Slavic form of the ethnonym *Slav* had a twofold origin. One appears to be native Pannonian, attested in the name of the *Slougenzin marcha* in 860,⁴¹ the other, *Slovēne*, recorded by the monk Chrabr at the beginning of the tenth century,⁴² may have been shaped under the influence of the learned Greek and Latin forms of the Slavic name. The forms with *-ov-*, as in "Slovak," "Slovene," *Sloveni*, and *Slovinje*, are native colloquial forms, while those with *-av-*, as in *Slavjanin* and *Slaven* are more bookish and may have been influenced by "elegant" foreign forms of the ethnonym. This is nothing unusual, for we know that the ethnonym *Korošec* (Carantanian) owes the initial *k* to the German and Latin forms, which, in turn derive from the native Slavic form *Xorutane*.⁴³ In our days we are witnessing a struggle between the native form *Hrvatska* and the foreign-derived form *Kroacija* among the Croats.

My suggestion that the name *Slav* originated from the hydronym Sala/Zala (from *Salava) is merely a hypothesis. However, if I be permitted to boast a little, it is one of the more plausible hypotheses, since it suggests that a people's name be explained from a name of a river along whose banks they did in fact live at the time when they were christened. On the basis of our sources, we are permitted to conclude that the *Sklabēnoi* may have been known in Pannonia by that name from the most remote antiquity, while they and their name became significant from the middle of the fifth century. By the middle of the following century, the people who had been known by the name *Sklabēnoi/Sclaveni* had accomplished so many acts (mostly acts of violence) that Jordanes thought God had sent them to punish Christians for their sins.⁴⁴

Of course today only Finno-Ugric Hungarians live along the Zala River, the few Serbs and Croats who dwell in their midst having migrated thither in the wake of the expanding Ottoman empire. Nevertheless, the ethnonym *Slav* lives as a self-designation among the neighboring Slovak and Slovene peoples, it has survived till this day in the name of Slavonia (earlier and popularly known as *Slovinje*). Although the names *Yugo-Slav* and *Yugo-Slavia*, as recent inventions of poets, philosophers and politicians, should not be used as evidence of the Pannonian origin of the ethnonym *Slav*, one could nevertheless venture to state that the descendants of the sixth century *Sklabēnoi* are still known by names that are derived from that *Urform*, namely Slovaks and Yugo-Slavs (including the Bulgarians).

As another example which may be used to strengthen the southern or Pannonian theory of Slavic origins is the fact that to their Italian neighbors the true Slavs are still and only the South Slavs, the descendants of the *Sklabēnoi*. To an average Italian Lenin was a Russian, the Pope John Paul II is a Pole, but the Madonna who has allegedly been appearing recently to Croatian children in a village of Hercegovina is known in Italy as the *Madonna Slava*.

New York

REFERENCES

1. Incomplete surveys are included in etymological dictionaries and historical grammars of the various Slavic languages. See also L. Niederle, *Slovanské starožitnosti, díl II, svazek I. Původ a počátky Slovanů jižních* (Prague, 1906) 476-484; E. Śluszkiewicz, "Rzut oka na dzieje etymologii nazwy 'Słowianie'." *Przegląd Klasyczny* (Lwów) 9-10 (1936) 731-798; J. Otrębski, *Słowianie: Rozwiązanie odwiecznej zagadki ich nazw* (Poznań, 1947), especially 35-53; F. Ślawnski, s.v. "Słowianie," in *Słownik starożytności słowiańskich V* (Wrocław-Warsaw-Kraków-Gdańsk) 274; L. Moszyński, "Czy Słowianie to rzeczywiście *nomen originis*?" in *Z polskich studiów slawistycznych, seria V* (Warsaw, 1978) [= Prace na VIII Międzynar. Kongress Slawistów w Zagrzebiu 1978] 499-507.
2. Z. Gołb's views are scientifically well founded. Unfortunately, the author stresses vague and controversial sources to prove his theses (Herodotus and Ptolemy), while not taking fully into account the more solid ones (Jordanes, Procopius, Pseudo-Caesarus, Theophylact Simocatta and others) who dealt with the Slavs *qua* Slavs. See his "About the connection between kinship terms and some ethnica in Slavic. (The Case of **Strbi* and **Slovēne*)," *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 25-26 (1982) 165-171, and "The ethnogenesis of the Slavs in the light of linguistics," in *American Contributions to the Ninth International Congress of Slavists, Kiev, September 1983, Vol. 1 (Linguistics)*, ed. by M.S. Flier (Columbus OH., 1983) 131-146. O. Pritsak's work "The Slavs and Avars," in *Gli Slavi Occidentali e Meridionali nell'alto medioevo*, Vol. 1 (Spoleto, 1983) [= Settimane di Studi del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo, 12-21 April, 1982] 353-435, is built on insight and almost prophetic inspiration, not on documentary evidence. For example, just as earlier scholars who followed J. Peisker frequently delivered the ancient Slavs into Hunnic, Avar and German slavery, Pritsak surrenders "the ethnographic material" of Eurasia into the "able" hands of the Proto-Bulgars and later Avars to use them as "cannon fodder," "Marines," and for other similar jobs of Turkic state-building.
3. Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum sive originum libri XX*, Lib. I. XLII.
4. Several national collections of sources on early Slavs, being often brief extracts, should be used only as guides to the originals published *in extenso* elsewhere. A bibliography of both is given in J. Bačić, *The Emergence of the Sklabenoi (Slavs), their Arrival on the Balkan Peninsula, and the Role of the Avars in these Events* (Ph.D. Diss., Columbia U., 1983; U. Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, MI., 1984).
5. Bačić, *The Emergence*; cf. O.N. Trubačev, "Jazykoznanie i ètnogenez slavjan," *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 1985/4: 9.
6. On the Antae, see Bačić, 186-200.
7. On Roman administrative divisions of the future Slavia, see Bačić, 131 ff.
8. Slavic and German scholars imagine the takeover as a peaceful activity, with Germanic tribes leaving for the Mediterranean Basin (as if going on a vacation). Slavic ones patiently waiting to take their land. Here the scholarly opinion wholly rests on the erroneous belief that the original Slavs were a peaceful people who avoided war; see Bačić, *The Emergence*.
9. On the use of the term *Slavia* by Byzantine writers, see Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio. II: Commentary*, ed. by R.J.H. Jenkins, et al., (London, 1962) 35, 185, where references to some sources are given; see further S. Antoljak, "Unsere 'Sklavinien'," *Actes du XII Congrès international d'études byzantines*, II, Ohrid (1964) 9-13; M. Đinić, in his "O nazivima srednjovekovne srpske države—Sklavonija, Srbija, Raška," *Prilozi za književnost*,

- jezik, istoriju i folklor*, 32 (1966) 26-34, pursues the use of the term Scлавonia from a general multiethnic to an exclusively Serbian content.
10. *De Administrando Imperio*, Greek text and English trans. ed. by Gy. Moravcsik and R.J.H. Jenkins (Budapest, 1949), chaps. 29-32, and the *Commentary* 93 ff.
 11. I have prepared a special study on Porphyrogenitus and the Slavs. For a brief discussion of the location of Great Croatia, Great Moravia and Serbia, see J. Bačić, "Some notes on the early history of the Serbs," *Serbian Studies*, 2.2-3 (1983) 19-40.
 12. See, e.g., Helmoldi presbyteri Bozoviensis *Cronica Slavorum*, ed. B. Schmeidler (Hannover-Leipzig, 1901), I. 1.
 13. *Povest' vremennyx let*, ed. by D.S. Lixačev and V.P. Adrianova Peretc, I-II (Moscow, Leningrad, 1950).
 14. See especially Vinko Pribojević, *De origine successibusque Slavorum*, ed. G. Novak (Zagreb, 1951); and Mavro Orbini, *Il Regno degli Slavi hoggi corrottamente detti Schiavoni* (Pesaro, 1601).
 15. Ioannes Lucius, *De Regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae Libri sex* (Amsterdam, 1666; repr. J.G. Schwandtner in *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum, Dalmaticarum, Croaticarum et Sclavonicarum*. . . III (Vienna 1748).
 16. Z. Gołab, for example, accepts the Transcarpathian location of the Slavic *Urheimat* and selects *Stauanoí*, who dwelt along the middle Dnieper River, as the ancestors of the Slavs, rather than the *Souobēnoí* of the Volga River. See map attached to his "The Ethnogenesis," 146.
 17. These are *Regnum Slavorum* of the Anonymous Presbyter of Dioclea and *Chronica Salomitana* of the Archdeacon Thomas of Split. Lučić is the first publisher and interpreter of these sources, which, along with the *De Administrando Imperio* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, he appended to his work cited in note 15.
 18. On Theophylact Simocatta's "testimony," see Bačić, *The Emergence* 262-268. For an opposite view, see R. Novaković, *Odakle su Srbi došli na Balkansko poluostrvo* (Belgrade, 1978).
 19. Bačić, *The Emergence*, 166-182.
 20. *The Russian Primary Chronicle*, trans. and ed. by S.H. Cross and O.P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor (Cambridge MA, 1953) 52-53.
 21. Bačić, *The Emergence*, 182-183.
 22. See Bačić, *The Emergence*, 97-149, for a discussion of Roman conquest of the Balkans and Danube Basin and its effects on native populations.
 23. So far the two servants of history have failed to find the *Urheimat* because the mistress had misdirected them. If my interpretation of the historical evidence is convincing, some seekers of Proto-Slavic linguistic and archeological remains should search in the Danube Basin.
 24. Bačić, *The Emergence*, ch. 4.
 25. "Jazykoznanie i etnogeneza slavjan," *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 1982/4: 10-26; 1982/5: 3-17; 1984/2: 15-30; 1984/3: 18-29; 1985/4: 3-17; 1985/5: 3-14.
 26. The exception are the Slověne of the Novgorod area and the Slovinci of Kashubia (see, respectively, H. Łowmiański, "Słowiene," and H. Popowska-Taborska, "Słowinicy kaszubscy," in *Słownik starożytności słowiańskich*, V (Wrocław-Warsaw-Kraków-Gdańsk, 1975) 296-298 and 299-300).
 27. *Libri de bellis*, VII.XIV; the English is from the Loeb Classical Library edition.
 28. Bačić, "Some Notes."
 29. Sławski, "Słowianie."
 30. Bačić, *The Emergence*, 151-153.
 31. A. Móscy, *Pannonia and Upper Moesia*, trans. S. Frere (London-Boston, 1974).
 32. Bačić, *The Emergence*, 157-60.
 33. Bačić, *The Emergence*, 238-49.
 34. For location, see *Tabula Imperii Romani 1:1,000,000 L34* (Budapest, 1968); on Roman Salla, see N. Vuljić, "Salla," in *Pauly Wissowa Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, XXV/2 (Stuttgart, 1920), col. 1297; on the importance of medieval Zalavár in Slavic history, see Z. Hılczler-Kurnatowska, "Zalavár," in *Słownik starożytności słowiańskich*, VII (Kraków etc., 1982) 60-83.
 35. J. Bačić, "On the Etymology of Beljak," *Slovene Studies* 3 (1981) 23-29.
 36. Known as the Sajó in Hungarian, Šajava in Slovak.
 37. C.G. Brandis, "Dacia," *Pauly Wissowa Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* VIII (Stuttgart, 1901), cols. 1948-1976.
 38. Lučić, 449.

39. Sławski, "Słowianie."
40. Ch. Verlinden, "L'origine de sclavus = esclave," *Bulletin du Cange (Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi)* 17 (1943) 97-128.
41. W. Swoboda, "Slougenzinmarcha," *Słownik starożytności słowiańskich* V (Wrocław etc., 1975) 237.
42. *Old Church Slavonic Texts*, ed. R. Lencek (Department of Slavic Languages, Columbia Univ., New York, 1973) 4.
43. Bačić, "On the Etymology of Beljak."
44. Bačić, *The Emergence*, 220.

POVZETEK

SLAV-/SLOV-: IZVOR IN ZGODNJI POMEN TEGA ETNONIMA

*Avtor se opira na svojo teorijo, da je bila najstarejša zgodovinsko izpričana domovina Slovanov v Podonavju. Eden temeljnih zaključkov njegove doktorske disertacije je ta, da je bila Slavia 6. stoletja, ki jo imenuje Slavia antiqua, zibelka slovanske narodnostno-jezikovne skupine. Avtor skuša oživiti srednjeveško mišljenje, da so se Slovani pojavili v Panoniji, ne pa v Zakarpatju, kot pravijo druge teorije. Ljudje, ki so se pojavljali v grških in latinskih virih 6. stoletja pod imenom 'Sklabenoii/Sklaveni', so bili prej poznani pod različnimi imeni. Etonim Slav-/Slov- izvira iz vodnega imena Zala (staroveška Sala), katere neizpričana, čeprav dokaj verjetna oblika je bila *Salava. Zdi se, da je najstarejša domačinska oblika slovanskega narodnostnega imena oblika 'Slougenzin marcha' iz 9. stoletja.*