



The President and Fellows of Harvard College

At the Dawn of Christianity in Rus': East Meets West

Author(s): OMELJAN PRITSAK

Source: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 12/13, Proceedings of the International Congress Commemorating the Millennium of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine (1988/1989), pp. 87-113

Published by: [Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41036307>

Accessed: 19/10/2014 07:16

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and The President and Fellows of Harvard College are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to Harvard Ukrainian Studies.

<http://www.jstor.org>

CHRISTIANITY IN RUS' BEFORE 988

At the Dawn of Christianity in Rus': East Meets West

OMELJAN PRITSAK

I. INGER AND THE "MAGIANS"

1.

As Cyril Mango showed in 1973, at least one or two Old Norse (Scandinavian) families reached Constantinople by the end of the eighth century, converted to Christianity, and succeeded in marrying into the Byzantine gentry. Around 825 someone named Ἰγγερ was appointed the (iconoclast) metropolitan of Nicaea; another Inger was the father of Eudocia Ingerina (b. ca. 837, d. 883), the mistress of Michael III (842–867) and thereafter the wife of his murderer and successor Basil I (867–881).¹

As stated by Mango, the name Inger cannot be explained from the Byzantine Greek, or, for that matter, from the Slavic; it is, rather, a variant of the Old Norse name **Ingvarr*.²

The last decade of the eighth century was precisely the time when the first Viking (*Denisc/Norðmen*) ships appeared in the West (according to the Anglo-Saxon chronicles, s.a. 787 [789]).³

One may well ask whether or not these events in the East and the West were synchronized, and if so, how. I will discuss the background of these East-West contacts, and in doing so make use of some Arabic sources, of a hitherto unappreciated reworked Slavonic translation of a Byzantine text, and of some data from the Old Norse sources.

¹ Cyril Mango, "Eudocia Ingerina, the Normans, and the Macedonian Dynasty," *Zbornik Radova Vizantološkoga Instituta*, vol. 14/15 (Belgrade, 1973), pp. 17–27 (=idem, *Byzantium and its Image* [London: Variorum reprints, 1984], no. XV).

² Mango, "Eudocia," pp. 18, 26–27.

³ *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, ed. Charles Plummer and John Earle, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1892; rptd. 1952), p. 54 (the Parker MS: = *Denisc*); p. 55 (the Laud MS: = *Norðmen*). See Peter H. Sawyer, *The Age of the Vikings*, 2nd ed. (London, 1971), pp. 14–18.

2.

Scholars have still not properly evaluated the information of two reliable and well-informed Arabic geographers and polymaths of the ninth and tenth centuries: Abu'l-Qāsim 'Ubayd Allāh Ibn Khurdādhbeh (ca. 840–890), the caliph's chief of intelligence (*murīd al-barīd* "postmaster general"); and Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Alī al-Mas'ūdī (d. 956), the most successful and prolific Arab polymath and traveler.

In his classical geographic work, *Kitāb al-masālik wa'l-mamālik*, Ibn Khurdādhbeh includes a chapter dealing with the international itinerant *negociatores*, or trading companies. The first ones were the Jewish merchants (*at-tuġġār al-yahūd*), called *ar-Rādhanīyya*, and the others were the Rūs merchants (*tuġġār ar-Rūs*), who were a kind of *Ṣaqāliba* (= *Veneti*).⁴ They traded a great assortment of merchandise, but their most lucrative commodities were eunuchs (*al-khadam*), female slaves (*al-ġawārī*), and young boys (*al-ghilmān*).⁵ In his basic extant work, *Murūġ adh-dhahab*, al-Mas'ūdī names only one company of international *negociatores*, namely that of the Rūs. He writes: "The Rūs [is a nomen of] numerous *colluvies gentium* (*umam*) of diverse kinds (*dhāt 'anwā' šattā*). Among them there is a kind called **al-Lo[r]domāna* [cf. Spanish Latin *Lordoman-* < *Nordoman-*]. They are the most numerous. They frequent with their wares the country al-Andalus [Muslim Spain], Rome, Constantinople, and [the country of] the Khazars."⁶

Muslim Spain is mentioned first because al-Mas'ūdī's information was of Spanish origin (note the Spanish form of the name for the Norsemen: *Lordomān-*). Apparently the Rūs/*Lordomāna* were thought to be centered somewhere not far from Muslim Spain.⁷

Extremely important is that Mas'ūdī uses the term Rūs not as an *ethnicon*

⁴ This is the meaning I apply in my "The Slavs and the Avars," *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, vol. 30 (Spoleto, 1983), pp 380–83, 389–94.

⁵ *Kitāb al-masālik wa'l-mamālik*, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leiden, 1889), pp. 153–55.

⁶ *Wa'r-Rūs umam kathīrah dhāt 'anwā' šattā; fa-min-hum jins yuqālu la-hum al-Lwdh'ānh, wa-hum al-aktharūna yukhtalifūna bi-t-tijārah 'ilā bilād al-Andalus wa-Rūmiyyah wa-'l-Qusṭantīniyyah wa-'l-Khazar: Les prairies d'or*, ed. Charles Pellat, vol. 1 (Beirut, 1966), p. 218. The word *al-Lwdh'ānh* is a misspelling of **al-Lwdhm'nh*, as is *al-Kwdhk'nh* (cf. variant reading *al-Lwdhgh'nh* in Mas'ūdī's *Kitāb at-tanbīh*, ed. M. J. de Goeje [Leiden, 1894], p. 141).

⁷ According to al-Ya'qūbī (d. 897) "the [maritime] *al-Maġūs* [on this term see below], who are called *ar-Rūs*," attacked in 844 the then Arab city of Seville via the fluvial route (Guadalquivir); al-Ya'qūbī, *Kitāb al-buldān*, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leiden, 1892), p. 354.

but as a *nomen*⁸ of a professional *colluvies*⁹ of *negociatores* (Arabic *umam* is a plural of *umma* 'people; nation; generation'), consisting of different kinds (*jins*, pl. *ajnās*).

3.

In a paper entitled "Did the Arabs call the Vikings 'Magians'?",¹⁰ I have demonstrated that there were two homonymous foreign words in Arabic—*al-maġūs*— of completely different origin. One was the Greek μάγος "Zoroastrian" (< Old Persian *maguš*), first introduced in the Muslim East (Baghdad); and the other was the Celtic *magos* ~ *magus*, corresponding to the Germanic *vīk*, Latin *forum*, Arabic *quran*, i.e., non-fortified *emporia* where the *negociatores* kept, displayed, and sold their wares. The Spanish Arabs, having entered in 793 the *pagus Rotinicus/Rutenorum* (the modern department of Aveyron in France's Midi) with its *magoses* (e.g., *Carantomagus* = Cranton; *Cobiomagus* = Bram; *Condatomagus* = Millau; *Vindomagus* = Le Vigan), simply called this territory "the country of the *magoses* (*bilād al-maġūs*)."¹¹ In this way they acted no differently than the Old Norsemen, who, arriving among the East-European Rus of the ninth–eleventh centuries, came upon many *garðs*, and thus called that polity simply *Garða-ríki*, "the land of *garðs*." Here the term *garð-* (Slavic *grad*) plays the same role as the name *magos* (spelled *maġūs*) in the Arabic *bilād al-maġūs*. To go even further: *maġūs* can be regarded as a synecdoche for *bilād al-maġūs*, just as *Garðar* / *Garðr* can stand for *Garðaríki*.¹¹

The term *magos* / *magus* (Arabic *al-maġūs*), from the *nomen loci* "emporium of the itinerant *negociatores*," shifted in Spanish Arabic to designate the inhabitants of such emporia with whom they had to deal: the guards and shipmen. There is a coeval analogy: the shifting of the name "inhabitant of a *vīk*" (*vīking*) into "piratae quos illi Wichingos appellant, nostri *Ascomannos* . . ."¹²

⁸ On the role of the *nomen* ἔπωνυμία in ethnogenesis, see Harald von Petrikovits, "Fragen der Ethnogenese aus der Sicht der römischen Archäologie," *Studien zur Ethnogenese* [vol. 1] (Opladen, 1985), pp. 101–122.

⁹ On the term *colluvies*, esp. *colluvies gentium*, see Wilhelm E. Mühlmann in *Studien zur Ethnogenese* 1 (1985): 23 and H. von Petrikovits in *ibid.*, pp. 116–18.

¹⁰ To appear in *The Seventh International Saga Conference/Centro Italiano di studi sull' alto Medioevo. XII Congresso Internazionale di studi sull' alto medioevo*, ed. Teresa Paroli (Spoleto).

¹¹ Full documentation is given in my paper quoted in fn. 10.

¹² *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, ed. Charles Plummer and John Earle, vol. 2, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1965), p. 129.

Elsewhere I have argued that the form *russ-/rus-* was the Rhine German substitution for the High German *ruzz-/ruz-* etymon.¹³ This, in turn, was the result of the German consonant shift *rut-i > ruzzi*. The *ruti* form, the basis of the Celtic tribal name *Rut-i/Rut-en-i*, developed in Old French into **rud-i* (cf. the modern *Rodez < Rutenis*). The latter nameform was adapted by the Riparian Franks and subjected to “gutturalization.” The result was the form *Rug-i*, which Adalbert of Trier, active as a missionary bishop in Kiev in 961–962, used with regard to the realm of the Rus’ Queen Ol’ga/Helga (baptized Helena) of Kiev.¹⁴

The leading French medievalist Georges Duby writes: “All that can be said is that eighth- and ninth-century sources, when referring to *negociatores*, frequently allude to two ethnic groups whose colonies were dispersed along the main routes and reached far beyond the frontiers of the Empire: Jews and (in the North Sea area) ‘Frisians.’”¹⁵ As we have seen above, the ninth-century author Ibn Khurdādhbeh made a very similar statement; however, he used the name “Rūs” instead of “Frisian.”

I cannot dwell here on the activity of the ubiquitous Frisians, discoverers of the fluvial routes, in Celtic Rutenia.¹⁶ I can mention, however, that their activity began in the first or second century A.D. in connection with the shift in the production of the Gaulish *terra sigillata* (which originated in Condatomagos, modern La Graufesenque) from Ruthenia to the Rhine region.

One can assume that, once established, fluvial trade routes, contacts, and cooperation between the Ruteni and Frisians persisted, and that only the type of merchandise changed, according to varying market demands. In the seventh to ninth century, slaves were the “energy” (= labor) in demand. Hence the involvement of the *colluvies* of *negociatores* who adopted as their *nomen* the designation *Rut-/Rūs-* in the slave trade witnessed by ninth- and tenth-century Arabic authors.

4.

Harald von Petrikovits uses the term *colluvies gentium* to characterize the Germanic Allemans among the pre-Clovis Franks.¹⁷ I propose as *primum distinguens* for the *Magos/Rūs/Norðmen* the term *colluvies negociatorum*, since they cannot be regarded as the forerunners of a single future ethnos.

¹³ “The Origin of the Name *Rūs/Rus’*,” *Passé Turco-Tatar Présent soviétique (Études offertes à Alexandre Bennigsen)*, (Paris, 1986).

¹⁴ Pritsak, “The Origin of the Name *Rūs/Rus’*,” pp. 45–65.

¹⁵ Georges Duby, *The Early Growth of the European Economy* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1974), p. 101.

¹⁶ See fn. 10.

¹⁷ See fn. 9.

Their professions are the dominant factor.

The professionals in question, generally known as *Norðmen-*, wore many hats: they were traders, sailors, pirates, guards, and mercenaries. They are not easily identified, since they used, simultaneously, many different names, as did their adversaries. Without pretending to exhaust this matter, I suggest grouping the names into five categories: (1) names of "ethnic" origin: *Ruteni/Russi, Dani, Frisians*; (2) names based on geographical designations: *of Here ða lande (Hardenysssel in Jutland), Westfal-dingi* (in Norwegian, *Viken*); (3) names from the word meaning "(non-fortified) emporium, market, forum": *vīking* (< *vīk*), *magos* (< *magos*); (4) names from the fortified emporia *varing* (< *vár*), *garðar* (< *garðr*);¹⁸ (5) names from the types of ships: *ascomanni* (< *æsk*), *cokingi* (< *kogga*), *Δρομίται* (< *δρόμων*).

It is significant that Pseudo-Symeon Logothete called the Rus of Igor' (ca. 941) *Δρομίται*, on the one hand, and *οἱ Φράγγοι* 'the Franks' on the other.¹⁹

II. "THEODORA" AND THE VERACITY OF THE MIRACULA OF ST. STEPHEN OF SUGDAEA AND THE RUS (CA. 790)

1.

The eighth century witnessed a fierce struggle for the domination of the Black Sea and Caucasus between three rivals: Byzantium, the successor of Rome in these regions; the caliphate (first the Omayyads and later—from 750—the Abbasids), the successors of Sassanian Iran; and the Khazars, who, ca. 650, had established the center of their semi-nomadic empire in the confines of the old Bosphorus Kingdom.²⁰

The peninsula of Crimea now comes into the forefront. At that time it had three parallel structures. The first were Greek towns, formerly independent colonies with antique roots, located mainly in the southeastern parts of

¹⁸ The fortified emporia were called *burgh* (Germanic), *grad-* (Slavic) and *vár* (Iranian > Hungarian; see Lajos Ligeti, *A Magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai a honfoglalás elõtt és az Árpád-korban* [Budapest, 1986], pp. 170–71).

The difference between the "Vikings" and the "Varings (> *Varjag-i*)" was that the first were named after unfortified marketplaces, while the others were the stronghold's mercenaries. The Northern mercenaries in Byzantium were called *Βαράγγοι* 'the Varangians'; see, e.g., Benedikt S. Benediktz, *The Varangians of Byzantium* (Cambridge, 1978).

¹⁹ *PVL*, 1:33. But see A. Karpozilos, "Ros-Dromity i problema poxoda Olega protiv Konstantinopolja," *Vizantijskij vremennik* 49 (1988): 112–18.

²⁰ See Mixail I. Artamonov, *Istorija xazar* (Leningrad, 1962), pp. 233–61; J. M. Hussey, ed., *The Byzantine Empire* (=The Cambridge Medieval History, vol. 4), pt. 1 (Cambridge, 1966), pp. 61–104.

the peninsula. Among them were Sugdaea (Hunnic > Slavic: *Surož*),²¹ Cherson (=Chersones) (Hunnic > Slavic: *Korsun'*), and Bosporus (Hunnic > Slavic: *Kerc'*), the former capital of the kingdom of the same name.²² During this period, all three cities were sees of autocephalic archbishoprics; they were directly subordinated to the patriarch in Constantinople.²³ From the point of view of the capital, they were, like Byzantine Dalmatia, frontier towns, and as such they were allowed to keep their autonomy, especially after Justinian I (526–565) had reorganized the structure of the municipalities.²⁴ While Cherson was the military (naval) and political center of Byzantine Crimea, Sugdaea remained its commercial hub.

During the rule of Theophilus (829–842), the Crimean towns received the rank of a special theme called “The Climes” (τῶν κλιμάτων) and were governed by a *strategus* in Cherson.²⁵

Relations between the Crimean cities and the Byzantine emperors were in the hands of the *catapan* of Paphlagonia.²⁶ Its political and religious center was originally the city of Gangrae, in the interior of the province, but as a result of the growing importance of Crimean affairs, the coastal town Amastris, located on the southern shores of the Black Sea, grew in importance. In the last decades of the eighth century, the see of Amastris advanced to the rank of autocephalic archbishopric.²⁷ The naval expedition against Cherson was sent from Amastris in 833. John, bishop of the Crimean Gotthia, fleeing from the Khazars, found refuge there.²⁸

The second structure in the Crimea was represented by the Crimean Goths, remaining from the period of Great Migrations.²⁹ (One should keep in mind that until the days of the Flemish diplomat Augier Ghislain de Busbecq [1522–1592], who around 1560–1562 rediscovered the Christian community of Goths in the Crimea, they retained their Gothic customs

²¹ One of the typical features of Hunno-Bulgarian (> Chuvash) was the development *-gd->-r-.

²² On the Bosporus kingdom, see Viktor F. Gajdukevič, *Bosporskoe Carstvo* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1949).

²³ Hans-Georg Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959), p. 176.

²⁴ Jadran Ferluga, *Byzantium on the Balkans* (Amsterdam, 1976), pp. 65–66.

²⁵ See Alexander A. Vasiliev, *The Goths in the Crimea* (Cambridge, Mass., 1936), pp. 108–109.

²⁶ Ferluga, *Byzantium*, pp. 40–44.

²⁷ Hans-Georg Beck, *Kirche*, pp. 168–69.

²⁸ Artamonov, *Istorija xazar*, pp. 255–57.

²⁹ “Die Krimgothen” in Ernst Schwarz, *Germanische Stammeskunde* (Heidelberg, 1956), pp. 98–99.

and language. Busbecq noted eighty-six Gothic words.)³⁰ The community of Goths lived in the mountainous region of the peninsula. Their religious center, Theodoro/Doros, the location of which is still disputed among archaeologists,³¹ was the see of the Gothic bishopric. The seventh ecumenical council in Nicaea (Nicaenum II) planned to elevate Doros to the rank of a metropolitanate with seven bishoprics, encompassing the core territory of the Khazar empire.³² The acceptance of Judaism by the Khazar ruling elite, which took place soon thereafter,³³ did not, apparently, help the realization of that project.

From its creation in about 650, the Khazar kaganate had an interest in taking control of the Crimean towns. On their side, the leaders of those communities, when they felt Byzantine pressure, preferred submission to the sovereignty of the mercantile-minded Khazars. Although relations between the Khazar rulers and the Byzantine emperors were generally friendly, a quiet competition nevertheless developed regarding the patronization of the Crimean towns. By the end of the eighth century, most of the towns were under the Khazar protectorate. Cherson and Phanagoria were governed by their elected priors, called in Khazarian *babajuq* ("the [city] fathers"), while in Kerč and Tamatarcha (Tmutorokan') there resided *baličis* ("city priors"), appointed by the Khazars. The cities of Sugdaea/Surož and the Gothic Doros were at that time governed directly by Khazar administrators: Sugdaea by a *tarxan* and Doros by a tax collector with the title of *tudun*.³⁴

In 721, the Byzantine emperor Leo III the Isaurian took a public stand against the veneration of religious images (icons), and in 730 he officially prohibited their use. This iconoclast doctrine was officially defined in 754 at the Council of Hieria. Thus began the famous iconoclastic controversy, which soon embraced all aspects of Byzantine religious, cultural, and political life. The first iconoclastic period extended from 730 to 787, when the seventh ecumenical council in Nicaea, convoked by the empress Irene (780–802), the former Athenian beauty, condemned the iconoclastic teachings. But in 814, Leo V the Armenian (813–820) renewed the destruction

³⁰ J. van der Gheyn, *Auger Busbecq et les Gots orientaux* (Bruges, 1888).

³¹ È. J. Solomonik and O. J. Dombrovskij, "O lokalizacii strany Dori," *Arxeologičeskie issledovanija srednevekovogo Kryma* (Kiev, 1968), pp. 11–44; E. V. Vejrnar, J. T. Loboda, J. S. Pioro, and M. Ja. Čoref, "Arxeologičeskie issledovanija stolicy knjažestva Feodoro," *Feodal' naja Tavrida* (Kiev, 1974), pp. 123–39.

³² See Carl de Boor, "Nachträge zu den Notitiae Episcopatum," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 12 (1890): 531–33.

³³ Omeljan Pritsak, "The Khazar Kingdom's Conversion to Judaism," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 2, no. 3 (September 1978): 261–81.

³⁴ Pritsak, "Khazar Conversion," pp. 264–65.

of icons, which ended only in 843, when the veneration of icons was restored by the empress Theodora.

During the entire iconoclastic controversy (730–843), all the Crimean bishops remained iconodules; therefore, the Crimea became a refuge for the persecuted venerators of icons. Because it was necessary to prevent the interruption in the apostolic succession of the established Orthodox hierarchy, new bishops had to be consecrated by such iconodule authorities as John of Gotthia.³⁵

2.

Three *Lives* (*Bios* = *Vita*) from the period under investigation have survived. Naturally, all three of the saints so venerated were iconodules. Two came from the Crimea and one from Amastris. The three were contemporaries: Stephen, bishop of Sugdaea/Surož (d. after 787); John, bishop of Gotthia (d. ca. 792); and George, bishop of Amastris (d. ca. 807). One of these *Lives* was written in Constantinople by a prominent poet and hagiographer; the other two were written in the provinces by anonymous local literati.

The lucky prelate was George of Amastris, since his *Life* was written about 820 by Ignatius (b. ca. 770, d. after 845), who at that time was the deacon and *skeuophylax* of the Great Church in Constantinople. Later, Ignatius, a fellow-traveler of the iconoclasts, became an archbishop of Nicaea.³⁶

The only known manuscript of the *Life* of George of Amastris (Parisianus 1452) dates from the tenth century and is a direct copy, apparently, of the ninth-century original. George became archbishop of Amastris ca. 790 (he was probably the first tenant of that newly elevated see), and died ca. 802–807, during the reign of the emperor Nicephorus I (802–811).

Sometime after his death, but before the *Life* (including its *miracula*) was written, i.e., between 807 and 820, Amastris was attacked by “the barbarians of the *Rhos* (τῶν Ῥῶς), a people which is, as everyone knows, utterly wild and rough, devoid of any traces of humaneness.” When they were about to plunder the grave of Saint George, expecting to find hidden

³⁵ Ihor Ševčenko, “Hagiography of the Iconoclast Period,” *Iconoclasm: Papers given at the 9th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies* (Birmingham, 1975), pp. 113–31 (=idem, *Ideology, Letters and Culture in the Byzantine World* [London: Variorum reprints, 1982], no. V. [pp. 1–42], see esp. p. 30, fn. 14).

³⁶ I am using the edition of Vasilij G. Vasil’evskij in his *Trudy*, vol. 3 (Petrograd, 1915; rptd. Vaduz, 1968), pp. iii–cxli, 1–71. See W. Treadgold, “Three Byzantine Provinces and the First Byzantine Contacts with the Rus’,” in this volume of *HUS*, pp. 132–44.

treasures, a miracle took place: the robbers became paralyzed until their leader promised that he would not disturb the Christians any more.³⁷

The attack was a naval one. Ignatius presents this fact to his audience in the following way: "They—this people terrible in both their deeds and their name (= biblical Πῶς)—began their devastations from the Propontis (ἀπὸ τῆς Προποντίδος) and after having visited other parts of the littoral [of Paphlagonia] finally reached the birthplace of the Saint [i.e., Amastris]."³⁸ I shall dwell for a moment on the geographic term "Propontis," since there is some confusion about it in the scholarly literature. It is true that "Propontis" is referred to several times with the specific meaning of "the Sea of Marmara" as well as of the "Bosporus" and/or the "Dardanelles."³⁹ But it seems to me that Ignatius, true to his highly rhetorical style, was using "Propontis" not as a concrete geographic term, but in its appellative meaning, that is, as προ-ποντίς 'of the fore-head of the sea'. The "fore-head" in question was apparently the internal sea of the Crimea, the Maeotis (the Azov Sea), used here as a metaphor. The "head" was, naturally, the Black Sea, on the shores of which Amastris was located. The text clearly alludes to the Crimea as the place from which the pirates came. It says: "Among them (the *Rhōs*) still flourishes that old Taurian [Crimean] slaughter of aliens."⁴⁰

Since both the manuscript transmission and the veracity of this *Life* are beyond reproach,⁴¹ we may note that in about 820 the *Rhōs* were already well known in Constantinople. Their first appearance within Byzantine confines must have occurred some decades earlier.

The *Life* of the iconodule John of Gotthia was written in the provinces, possibly in Amastris, sometime between 815 and 842.⁴² It is short, with no rhetoric pretenses, but—in the words of Ihor Ševčenko—"it inspires confidence."⁴³ This *Life* contains some important data for the history of Khazar rule, but nothing of importance for the topic under discussion.

On the other hand, the second provincial *Life*, also short and unpretentious, is extremely valuable for our study. This is the "Life of St. Stephen of Sugdaea/Surož," the original of which, unfortunately, has not come down to us. We know of its existence from two sources. One is a late

³⁷ Ed. Vasil'evskij, *Trudy*, 3: 64; see also the rest of the miraculum, pp. 65–71.

³⁸ Ed. Vasil'evskij, *Trudy*, 3: 64.

³⁹ See Vasil'evskij, *Trudy*, 3: cxxviii–cxli.

⁴⁰ Ed. Vasil'evskij, *Trudy*, 3: 64–65. Cf. Vasiliev, *The Goths*, p. 111, fn. 5.

⁴¹ Ševčenko, "Hagiography," pp. 12–17.

⁴² Vasil'evskij, "Žitie Joanna Gotskogo," in *Trudy*, vol. 2 (St. Petersburg, 1909), pp. 351–427. Cf. Vasiliev, *The Goths*, pp. 89–96; Ševčenko, "Hagiography," p. 4.

⁴³ Ševčenko, "Hagiography," p. 4.

Greek excerpt made by an illiterate Greek from Sugdaea sometime in the fourteenth–fifteenth century, preserved in a single copy in the library of the Patriarchate of Constantinople (Chalcensis, no. 75). The other is a Slavic translation, embedded in a later hagiographic Slavic work, which, as will be shown, could not date earlier than from the middle of the fifteenth century. It exists in numerous (at least fifteen) copies dating from the end of the fifteenth century on.⁴⁴ Vasilij Grigor'evič Vasil'evskij, in his classic study of this *Life*, has proven beyond any doubt that the Slavic version, in the form it has come down to us, was not just a plain translation from the Greek, but an independent compilation by a Rus' writer (whom I shall call "Slavic" instead of "Rus'"; see below) of the mid-fifteenth century who knew Greek. Vasil'evskij identified the compilation's five sources, two of which belonged to the tradition of St. Stephen and three of which stood outside it.

In the first category was the short Greek *Life* (= *Bios*) of the saint. Vasil'evskij's findings were corroborated by Friedrich Westberg, who demonstrated that biographical details in the Greek and the Slavic reworkings agree and bear the stamp of truth.⁴⁵ Apparently both were based on the lost Greek original. The second source was the "Miracula of St. Stephen (of Sugdaea)," which, according to Vasil'evskij, was appended to the original *Life* and had the same author.⁴⁶ His arguments are convincing. The name of St. Stephen's church in Sugdaea is correctly named St. Sophia.⁴⁷ Philaretus was in fact St. Stephen's successor (d. 826).⁴⁸ In the second miracle, the local Khazar governor is called *Jurij tarxan*, by the expected Khazar title; he is referred to in another Slavic translational text as *Jurij naměstnik*.⁴⁹ According to Vasil'evskij (and Westberg), the third miracle in which the Rus' appear is also credible.⁵⁰ On the latter subject I will say more later.

The fifteenth-century compiler embellished the meager text of the original *Life* with rhetorical passages taken from classical hagiographic literature in both Greek and Slavic. Very large portions belong to the *Life* of St. John Chrysostom by George of Alexandria (d. 630), whereby the fifteenth-century compiler used both the Greek original and an earlier Slavic trans-

⁴⁴ All available material was collected by Vasil'evskij in his *Trudy*, vol. 3, pp. cxlii–cclxxxviii, 72–98.

⁴⁵ Friedrich Westberg, "O žitii Sv. Stefana Surožskogo," *Vizantijskij vremennik* 14 (1908): 226–36.

⁴⁶ Ed. Vasil'evskij, *Trudy*, 3: cclxvi–cclxix.

⁴⁷ Ed. Vasil'evskij, *Trudy*, 3: cxcv–cxvii, ccxii.

⁴⁸ Ed. Vasil'evskij, *Trudy*, 3: cclxvi–cclxvii, cclxx, cclxxii, ccxc, ccxciv; text, pp. 94, 96.

⁴⁹ Ed. Vasil'evskij, *Trudy*, 3: 95; see also pp. ccxxix, cclxvii.

⁵⁰ Ed. Vasil'evskij, *Trudy*, 3: cclxix–cclxxxvi; Westberg, "O žitii," pp. 226–36.

lation.⁵¹ Another plundered victim was John Moschus (seventh century), the author of *Pratum spirituale*.⁵² A third work from which the compiler of the fifteenth-century manuscript borrowed freely was the *Life* of St. Peter, Metropolitan of Kiev (residing in Moscow) (d. 1326), written by the Bulgarian cleric Cyprian (d. 1406), who was for decades metropolitan of Rus' and who was among the initiators of the so-called second South Slavic intellectual and literary revival in Rus'.⁵³

If one deletes these borrowed elements from the extant text of the Slavic *Life* of St. Stephen (of Sugdaea), there still remains a solid kernel. Friedrich Westberg has shown that the data it contains (as well as those in the extant Greek abridgement) are sufficient to establish basic biographical information on the saint.⁵⁴ On the basis of Westberg's study and on the reanalysis of the source data, it is possible to reconstruct the following events in St. Stephen's life:

- ca. 698 Stephen (= S.) was born in the locality of Morivas in Cappadocia; he attended the local school;
- ca. 714 he visited Athens, soon to be the center of the iconodules;
- ca. 720 S. arrived in Constantinople, his domicile for the next five years;
- ca. 724 S. became a monk in Constantinople and spent four (Δ) years in a monastery;
- ca. 728/729 the patriarch Germanus I (715–730) made S. (at that time at least thirty years of age) archbishop of Sugdaea;
- ca. 730–741 S. was persecuted by the emperor Leo III (717–741);
- ca. 741 the empress Irene of Khazaria (see below) helped S. to regain his freedom;
- 787 S. participated in the eighth ecumenical council of Nicaea;
- between 787 and 790 S. died a nonagenarian.

The presence of the name of Irene of Khazaria in both the Slavic *Life* of Stephen (of Sugdaea) and in an Arabic historical text (see below) is a warning for both Byzantinists and Slavicists not to dismiss this monument completely: in its easily discernible, non-borrowed parts, it is in fact reliable.

Let us proceed with uncovering the identity of the literatus, skilled both in Greek and Slavic hagiography, who transformed a simple, short Greek *Life* into a large rhetorical opus. Also, why did he do so?

The thirty-year-long pontificate of Archbishop Evfimij II (1429–1459) in Great Novgorod has a special significance for the intellectual history of that republic. Confronted with the threat from Moscow, Evfimij sought to

⁵¹ Ed. Vasil'evskij, *Trudy*, 3: ccxli–cclviii.

⁵² Ed. Vasil'evskij, *Trudy*, 3: ccxxxiv. See Catherine Ignatiev, *Žitie Petra des Metropoliten Kiprian. Eine Untersuchung zu Form und Stil russischer Heiligenleben* (Wiesbaden, 1976) (= *Abhandlungen zur Slavistik*, 22).

⁵³ Ed. Vasil'evskij, *Trudy*, 3: cclix, cclxxxvi.

⁵⁴ Westberg, "O žitii," pp. 227–32.

create a basis for Novgorodian identity.⁵⁵ What he needed was a set of *Lives* of Novgorodian saints, and of those who could be connected with Novgorod during the early history of Rus'. He was also eager to obtain a new common Rus' chronicle in which Great Novgorod played the leading role. In the fifteenth century, the main supplier of learned literary craftsmen for the Orthodox Slavic world was holy Mount Athos with its learned South Slavic (Serbian and Bulgarian) monks, who mastered both Greek and Slavic. The major figures in the intellectual life of Rus' were, with rare exceptions, of South Slavic origin. Hence Evfimij II invited the Serbian Paxomij Logofet to work for him in Novgorod.⁵⁶ Paxomij, then about thirty years old, arrived in Novgorod in ca. 1438, and there started his career as a very prolific writer of *Lives*. Occasionally, however, he also worked for Moscow, but shrewdly, without antagonizing any of his patrons.⁵⁷

Indeed, Paxomij was a *literatorus* who could satisfy everyone's tastes and expectations. He was well read in both Greek and Slavic, and had a very mobile pen. As mentioned above, he was an extremely prolific and popular writer, if not one very serious or concerned with historical veracity. It was typical for him to borrow freely from the existing hagiographical literature, old and new, Greek and Slavic.

Paxomij wrote, re-edited, and copied a great number of *Lives* and other edifying texts. But foremost of all he supplied Evfimij II with a true Novgorodian saint, whom he also presented as an anti-Moscow activist. This was the first archbishop of Novgorod, John (1163–1186), for whom Evfimij constructed some miracles, and then wrote his *Life* on that basis.⁵⁸

The Slavic version of the *Life* of Stephen (of Sugdaea) already existed in the middle of the fifteenth century, since its third miraculum is paraphrased, as Vasil'evskij recognized, in the *Life* of St. Dimitrij Priluckij (d. 1391), for which the year 1450 has been established as the date of composition.⁵⁹ Hence the extant Slavic *Life* of Stephen (of Sugdaea) must have been written in Novgorod by the 1440s. The only *vita*-writer active in Novgorod at that time was Paxomij the Serbian.

⁵⁵ V. L. Komarovič in *Istorija ruskoj literatury*, vol. 2. pt. 1, ed. A. S. Orlov et al. (Moscow and Leningrad, 1946), pp. 257–64.

⁵⁶ On Paxomij Logofet see Dmytro Čyževs'kyj, *Pachomij Logofet: Werke in Auswahl* (Slavische Propyläen, vol. 1) (Munich, 1963); this work consists of the editor's introductory bibliographical essay (pp. 5–12) and reprinted excerpts from V. Jablonskij's edition: *Paxomij Serb i ego agiograficheskie pisanija* (St. Petersburg, 1908), and G. M. Proxorov, "Paxomij Serb," in *Slovar' knižnikov i knižnosti Drevnej Rusi*, II: 2, ed. D. S. Lixačev (Leningrad, 1989), pp. 167–77.

⁵⁷ Čyževs'kyj, *Paxomij*, pp. 6–9.

⁵⁸ Komarovič, in *Istorija*, pp. 262–64.

⁵⁹ Ed. Vasil'evskij, *Trudy*, 3: cclx–cclxi.

I submit that a professional *vita*-writer such as Paxomij would not miss the opportunity to produce an extra favor for his Novgorodian patron. Familiar with the unpretentious and short Greek *Life* of Stephen of Sugdaea, which he may have taken with him together with other texts when he left Mount Athos for Novgorod, he realized its potential in this context. The Greek original apparently mentions, as did the *Life* of George (of Amastris), the Rhōs (Ῥῶς) in a general way as barbaric raiders. Having found in the Old Rus' Chronicle (*Pověst' vremennyx lět*) the (legendary) information that the Rus' dynasty began its career in Novgorod, Paxomij decided that the attackers of Sugdaea came from Novgorod. This was very important for his purposes, because now the primacy of Novgorod could be corroborated by a *Life* of a Greek saint, just by changing the simple mention of *Rhōs* into "rat' velika rousskaa iz' Novagrada (the great Rus' army from Novgorod)." ⁶⁰

Paxomij made a similarly intelligent editorial change when he borrowed a passage from Cyprian the Bulgarian's *Life* of St. Peter "of Moscow" to achieve the great final effect in his reworking of the *Life* of Stephen (of Sugdaea):

Cyprian	Paxomij
no ubo poneže tebe predstatelja Rusiiskaa zemlja stjaža, slavnyi že grad'' Moskva. čestnyja tvoja mošči jakože někoe s''krovišče čestno s''bljudaet'' . . .	no oubu poneže tebě pred'stelja Rous'kaja zemlja stjaža. slavnyj že grad'' Surož' čestnyja tvoja mošči jakože někoe sokrovišče čestno sobljudaet'' . . . ⁶¹

But now we leave Paxomij and return to the miracula of the *Life* of Stephen (of Sugdaea), which were, according to Vasil'evskij, adopted by the compiler of the Slavic reworking from the original Greek text. I can provide additional proof for this thesis.

Ihor Ševčenko, in his seminal 1977 study on the hagiography of the iconoclast period, expressed doubts about the authenticity of the *Life* of Stephen (of Sugdaea): "Its Greek [excerpt] version," he wrote, "confuses Leo III with Leo V and its author does not know—or does not want to know—that the pious woman Eirene who helped the Saint was in fact a Khazar princess, the very wife of the dreaded Constantine the Kopro-

⁶⁰ Ed. Vasil'evskij, *Trudy*, 3: 95.

⁶¹ Ed. Vasil'evskij, *Trudy*, 3: cclx: "But since the land of Rus' got you as a leader and the glorious city of Moscow/Surož preserves your venerable relics as a venerable treasure. . ."

nymos. . .⁶² Ševčenko also finds it strange, as Vasil'evskij did before him, that the empress Irene (the Khazar) appears in the Slavic version as "Theodora, daughter of the king (*car'*) of Kerč."⁶³

One should not blame the *Life* of Stephen for confusing Leo V with Leo III. As Westberg suggested, the original Greek text had here simply the name Leo, as the Slavic translation confirms: "*i prija v'se carstvo Lev*"."⁶⁴ The addition Ἀρμένιος (before Λέων) in the extant Greek text is just one of many errors on the part of the illiterate abbreviator of the fifteenth century.⁶⁵

The case of the mistaken identity of the empress Irene of Khazaria, the wife of Constantine Kopronymos, also has an explanation. The textual (in the late Greek reworking) διὰ τινος γυναικὸς Εἰρήνης 'through the agency of the Lady Irene' is not to be interpreted as "a certain woman Eirene," since it is qualified by the succeeding parenthetical sentence, καὶ τῷ ὄντι αὐτῆς εἰρήνης 'and in fact she was a peace(maker),' which was sufficiently marked to mean the empress Irene (of Khazaria). The Slavic text omits the name Irene altogether,⁶⁶ but it has extremely valuable information about that lady: "*a carici ego* [Constantine Kopronymos] *Feōdora ker'českogo carja dšči*."⁶⁷ This sentence, misunderstood by many scholars,⁶⁸ was correctly explained by Westberg:⁶⁹ Empress "Feodora" is not meant here, but, as the syntax demands, "Feodor, king of Kerč" (in the genitive), i.e., one must translate the passage as: "and his queen [was] the daughter of Theodore, King of Kerč." As mentioned above, Kerč (Bosporus) was the capital of the former Bosporus Kingdom, and, therefore, "King of Bosporus" was a natural metaphor for the emperor of Khazaria. This metaphor had already been recognized by Westberg⁷⁰ and Ševčenko,⁷¹ independently of each other. But there is irrefutable corroboration that the father of the empress Irene, the kagan of Khazaria, was named Theodore. In only a few cases do the extant sources note the name of the kagan of Khazaria. Fortunately, they do for the father of Irene. A very reliable old Arabic historian, Abū Muḥammad Aḥmad b. 'Alī Ibn A'tham al-Kūfī (d. 926), writes

⁶² Ševčenko, "Hagiography," p. 2.

⁶³ Ševčenko, "Hagiography," p. 29, fn. 8.

⁶⁴ Ed. Vasil'evskij, *Trudy*, 3: 91.

⁶⁵ Westberg, "O žitii," p. 230.

⁶⁶ Ed. Vasil'evskij, *Trudy*, 3: 76 (Greek text) = p. 93 (Slavic text).

⁶⁷ Ed. Vasil'evskij, *Trudy*, 3: 91.

⁶⁸ E.g., Ševčenko, "Hagiography," p. 29, fn. 8.

⁶⁹ Westberg, "O žitii," p. 231.

⁷⁰ Westberg, "O žitii," p. 231, however, implies the existence of a Khazar sub-kagan residing in Kerč, a vassal of the Itil-based grand-kagan, which is incorrect.

⁷¹ Ševčenko, "Hagiography," p. 29, fn. 8.

in his *Kitāb al-Futūḥ* that the name of the kagan who ruled in 732/733 was *Tʿṯr: khāqān malik al-Khazar wa'smu-hū tʿṯr*.⁷² Peter Golden, who in his *Khazar Studies* searched for Turkic elements in the Khazarian language, “corrected” (German: *Verschlimmbesserung*) the manuscript form to a nice “Turkic” *byṯr* (= **bayatur*) ‘hero,’⁷³ although that word is never manifest in Arabic script written with “ṯ” (*tā muallif*), but only with “t” (dotted *t*).⁷⁴ In my opinion *tʿṯr* = *tʿāṯr* (with the initial *t*- and not *b*-) is the Khazar-Bulgarian rendering of the Greek name “Theodore,”⁷⁵ whereby the local pronunciation of the Arabic letter “‘Ayn” as -γ- substituted for the hiatus missing in this language group.⁷⁶

In Khazaria the Bosphorus Bulgars were already Muslims during the reign of the caliph al-Maʿmūn (813–833).⁷⁷ The descendants of the old Bulgars, the non-Muslim Chuvashes, render the Arabic “‘Ayn” by χ[γ] even today,⁷⁸ e.g., *sāʿat* ‘time’ > *sexet*;⁷⁹ *ʿār* ‘shame’ > *xar*; *ʿaql* ‘mind’ > *xakāl*.

The Arabic “‘tā” is commonly used for the Turkic (and Bulgarian) -d-. The graphic representation *tʿāṯr* should be read as **teyador*, the Khazarian (and Bulgarian) version of the Greek name “Theodore.”⁸⁰

Hence, the empress Irene was not called “Theodora” in the Slavic *Life* of Stephen of Sugdaea.

⁷² Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi, III. Ahmet Kütüphanesi 2956 (copied in A.D. 1468); vol. 2, fol. 241r, l. 13 (reproduced by Peter B. Golden, *Khazar Studies*, vol. 2 [Budapest, 1980], p. 40).

⁷³ Golden, *Khazar Studies*, 1: 156–57.

⁷⁴ See Gerhard Doerfer, *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*, vol. 2 (Wiesbaden, 1965), no. 817 (pp. 366–77); Sir Gerard Clauson, *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish* (Oxford, 1972), p. 313.

⁷⁵ There was no one uniform rendering of Greek personal names in Arabic. In his *Kitāb al-Fihrist* (the oldest Arabic bibliography), an-Nadīm writes (A.D. 988) indiscriminately *tyʿdrws* (ed. Gustav Flügel, vol. 1 [Leipzig, 1871]), p. 242, l. 17; p. 303, l. 16; *thywdwrs* (ibid., p. 269, l. 5). In his *Taʿriḫ*, the Christian patriarch of Antioch Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd al-Anṭākī (d. ca. 1066) also uses different variants: *thʿwdhrs*; *thʿwdwrs*; and *thdwrs*; see ed. J. Kračkovsʿkij and A. Vasilʿiev (Paris, 1932), p. 375.

⁷⁶ Also in Kazan-Tatar, Bashkir, and Kazakh the Arabic “‘Ayn” is usually rendered as -γ-.

⁷⁷ See Omeljan Pritsak, *The Origin of Rusʿ*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 1981), pp. 60–61.

⁷⁸ See Vasilij G. Egorov, *Sovremennij čuvaškij literaturnyj jazyk v sravnitelʿno-istoričeskom osveščanii*, pt. 1 (Čeboksary, 1954), pp. 116–17.

⁷⁹ It is interesting that the *Codex Cumanicus* from the thirteenth–fourteenth century also has the variant *sahat* ‘hora.’ Kaare Grønbech, *Komanisches Wörterbuch* (Copenhagen, 1942), p. 210.

⁸⁰ Interestingly enough, the Moldavian documents of the fifteenth–seventeenth centuries render the Greek name as *Toader*, *Tador*, *Toder*, etc. See, e.g., *Documenta Romaniae Historica. A. Moldava*, vol. 1 (Bucharest, 1975).

III. BRAV[A]LIN AND THE BRÁVELLIR BATTLE:
THE *NORDMANNI* IN THE WEST AND EAST

1.

The third miraculum of St. Stephen of Sugdaea has in its Slavic (Paxomij's) version the title: “*O prixoždenii ratiju k Surožu knjazja Bravlina (Bravalina) iz' Velikogo Novgoroda,*” i.e., “On the coming to Sugdaea of Prince Bravlin [Bravalin] with his army from Novgorod the Great.”⁸¹ Naturally, the words “from Novgorod the Great” are Paxomij's additions.

The story begins as follows:

Po smerti že svjatago malo lēt'' minou priide rat' velika rousskaa iz'' Novagrada knjaz' Brav[a]lin'' silen'' zělo. plěni ot'' Korsounja i do Korča. s'' mnogoju siloju priide k Sourožu. za 10 d'nij bišasja zlě mežou sebe. i po 10 d'nij vnide Brav[a]lin''. siloju izlomiv'' železnaa vrata i vnide v'' grad'', i zem'' meč' svoj. i vnide v'' cerkov' v'' svjatuju Sofiju. i razbiv'' dveri i vnide iděže grob'' svjatago. a na grobě car'skoe oděalo i žemčjug'' i zlato i kamen' dragyj, i kandila zlata. i s'' sudov'' zlatyx'' mnogo, vse pograbiša. i v tom'' časě raz'bolěsja. . .

[A few years after the death of the Saint (who died ca. 787) came a large Rus' army from Novgorod (with) Prince Brav[a]lin (who was) very strong. He took captives from Cherson to Kerč, and with a large force he arrived in Sugdaea. For ten days they fought harshly with each other, and after ten days Brav[a]lin entered, having forcibly cut the Iron Gates. And he entered the city, and having taken his sword, he burst into the Church of St. Sophia. And having broken the door, he approached the grave of the saint. On the grave there was a royal robe and pearls, and gold and precious stones, and golden candelabras, and many golden vessels. Having robbed everything, he at once became ill. . .]

He was stricken by palsy. Enquiring about the cause of his calamity, he was told about the Christian faith by the saint himself, and consequently wished to become Christian. Archbishop Philaret and his priests now appeared, and Brav[a]lin and his entire *comitatus* (*i boljare vsi*) were baptized. As a result, Brav[a]lin was miraculously healed. He then ordered that the captives taken from the littorals between Cherson and Kerč be released. Having bestowed great offerings on the grave of the saint, Brav[a]lin departed with his retinue.

I may add that the phrasing “from Cherson to Kerč [Bosporus]” should not be taken literally: it is merely the contemporary (eighth- ninth-century) general designation for the Greek Crimea (the Klimata), which occurs, for example, in the *Life* of Theodore of Studium (written before 855).⁸²

⁸¹ Ed. Vasil'evskij, *Trudy*, 3:95.

⁸² Οἱ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τῆς κατὰ Χερσῶνα καὶ Βόσπορον παροικίας ἐπίσκοποι καὶ πρεσβύτεροι, “Vita S. Theodori Studitae,” ed. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeco-latina*, vol. 99, col. 253.

2.

As mentioned above, Evfimij II needed an all-Rus' chronicle that depicted Novgorod as *the* original political and religious center, and he commissioned the hagiographer Paxomij to write such a compilation. Unfortunately, this first Novgorod-centered historical work has not come down to us, apparently due to the demise of the Novgorodian republic thirty years later, when Novgorod was conquered and destroyed by Ivan III of Moscow (1478).

It was Aleksej Aleksandrovič Šaxmatov who proved that the so-called *Russkij xronograf* (redaction 1442), which left indelible marks on subsequent all-Rus' chronicle-writing of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, was produced by Paxomij.⁸³ But the latter's success at introducing "Brav[a]lin from Great Novgorod" as the first single ruler of Rus' was shortlived.

It was the first Kievan chronicler, working ca. 1072, who made an ingenious discovery about the year that marks the debut of the Rus' in history. Having found in certain Bulgaro-Slavonic translations of the Byzantine chronicles that the name of Rus' first appeared during the reign of the Byzantine emperor Michael III (842–867), he placed the emergence of Rus' in the first year of that emperor's reign. Unfortunately, due to a numerical error in his translational sources (explained by A. A. Šaxmatov), he computed that crucial date as A.M. 6362/A.D. 854 rather than A.D. 842, the year of the ascent to the throne of Michael III.⁸⁴ This error was "corrected" by the later chronicler, the hegumen Silvester (ca. 1116), compiler of the authoritative *Pověst' vremennyx lět*, to another incorrectly computed date, A.M. 6360/A.D. 852.⁸⁵ Since that time, the majority of chroniclers (and modern historians following in their footsteps) have erroneously regarded the year 852 as the "first known historical date" of Rus'. But the old chroniclers did not name the Rus' prince who ruled during that crucial year of 852. Paxomij, who knew from the *Life* of Stephen (of Sugdaea), which he reworked, that there was a Rus' prince Brav[a]lin, did not hesitate to make him (and, naturally, Great Novgorod) the originator of the historical period of Rus'. Initially this was accepted even in Moscow, but with the replacement of the odious name of Novgorod with that of Kiev. In the final

⁸³ Aleksej A. Šaxmatov, *Obozrenie russkix letopisnyx svodov XIV–XVI vv.* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1938), pp. 134–36.

⁸⁴ See Omeljan Pritsak, "The *Pověst' vremennyx lět* and the Question of Truth," *History and Heroic Tale. Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium. Centre for the Study of Vernacular Literature in the Middle Ages* (Odense, 1983), pp. 136–37.

⁸⁵ *Pověst' vremennyx lět* (hereafter *PVL*), ed. D. S. Lixačev, vol. 1 (Moscow and Leningrad, 1950), p. 17.

analysis, the Brav[a]lin episode was ignored by the chroniclers and fell into oblivion.

To illustrate how presentation of this episode progressed, I quote three chronicles, each with a different treatment of the events of the year A.M. 6360/A.D. 852:

*Pověst vremennyx lět*⁸⁶

V'' lěto 6360, indikta 15 den', načensju Mixailu carstvovati, nača sja prozyvati Ruskaja zemlja.

O sem' bo uvědaxom'', jako pri sem' cari prixodiša Rus' na Car'gorod'', jakože pišetsja v lětopisan'i greč'stēm'. Těmže otsele počnem'' i čisla položim.''

[In the year 6360 (852), the 15th of the indiction, at the accession of Emperor Michael, the land of Rus' was first named.

We have determined this date (from the fact) that in the reign of this emperor the Rus' attacked Constantinople, as is written in the Greek chronicle. Hence we shall begin at this point and record the dates.]

Paxomij's *Russkij xronograf*⁸⁷

V'' lěto 6360 načen'su v'' Grěčěx'' Mixailu carstvovati, načatsja prozyvati Ruskaja zemlja.

I xodiša Slovaně iz'' Novagoroda knjaz' imenem'' Bravalin'' i vovevaša na Greki i povoevaša Grečeskuju zemlju ot'' Xersona i do Korčeva i do Suroža okolo Carja grada.

[In the year 6360 (852), at the accession of Michael in Byzantium, the land of Rus' was first named.

And the Slovene of Novgorod (under) Prince Bravalin went out, and they campaigned against the Greeks and raided the Greek land (Byzantium) from Cherson to Kerč (Bosporus) and to Sugdaea near Constantinople.]

Demidov's *xronograf*⁸⁸

Pri carě Mixailě, v'' lěto 6360, xodili Rus' vojnoju iz'' Kieva grada, Knjaz' imenem'' Bravalin'', vovavati na Greki, na Car'grad'', i povoevaša Grečeskuju zemlju, ot'' Xersona i do Skurueva [variants: korueva/korčeva] i do Suroža. . . . o tom'' pisano v'' Čjudesěx'' Sv. Stefana Surožskago.

[During the reign (of Emperor) Michael, in the year 6360 (852), the Rus' went out from Kiev City (under) the prince by the name of Bravalin to combat the Greeks, against Constantinople. And they campaigned in the Greek land (Byzantium) from Cherson to Kerč and to Sugdaea. . . . It is written about this in the *miracula* of St. Stephen of Sugdaea.]

⁸⁶ PVL, 1: 17.

⁸⁷ Aleksandr Vostokov, ed., *Opisanie russkix i slovenskix rukopisej Rumjancovskogo muzeuma* (St. Petersburg, 1842), p. 351.

⁸⁸ Andrej Popov, ed., *Obzor xronografov russoj redakcii*, pt. 1 (Moscow, 1866), p. 234. See also F. Giljarov, *Predanija russoj Načal'noj letopisi* (Moscow, 1878), p. 102.

3.

Now let us turn to the name *Bravalin/Bravlin*, since it appears in these two variants. In my opinion the form *Bravalin* is the primary one. The name could not have been invented by Paxomij, since it neither rings true nor has any meaning either in Greek or in Slavic, or even in Khazarian. Assuming that the name was present in the Greek original of the *Miracula* of Stephen (of Sugdaea), it must have been written there as *βραβαλινοϛ; apparently it represented a proper name with the adjectivizing suffix -ινοϛ (-in-o-s). Since in Greek the final vowel of a stem would be elided by the suffix -ινοϛ, it is reasonable to suppose that the starting point for the Greek form was *bravala.

This, again, seems to be none other than the Old Norse oblique form *brá-valla*,⁸⁹ the genitive of the name *Brá-vellir*. It so happens that this etymon is found uniquely in the name of the most famous battle in Old Norse pre-history—that of *Brávellir*—probably fought on the later Swedish-Gautish frontier.

The original meaning in Greek must have been “of *Brávalla*,” i.e., “a man who participated at the *Brávellir* battle.” Whether the form was a rendition of Old Norse **Brávalla-kappi* ‘a champion of *Brávellir*,’ or another Old Norse form, is a matter for further investigation and discussion. What is decisive and of primary importance for the present investigation is that we finally have a relatively well-dated event directly connected with the *Brávellir* battle.

We have seen above that the naval attack on Sugdaea/Surož, led by a warrior called *Bravalin*, i.e., “participant at the *Brávellir* battle,” took place sometime around 790. This again makes it very probable that the *Brávellir* battle occurred within the life span of *Bravalin*, who in 790 must not have been of an advanced age. Hence, we can establish, provisionally, that the *Brávellir* battle occurred between 770 and 790.

It is reasonable to assume that this—apparently the earliest—encounter between the Northmen and the Byzantine Greeks of the Crimea in ca. 790, which ended with the conversions of the Rus *Bravalin* and his *comitatus*,⁹⁰ resulted in the appearance of baptized Northmen in Byzantium no later than the end of the eighth century, as noted at the beginning of this paper.

⁸⁹ The Old Norse forms given above are in the plural (nom. *vellir*; gen. *valla*). The nominative singular is *vǫllr*, with the basic meaning of “field.”

⁹⁰ The Danube–Bulgarian Slavic form *boljar-* is used for *Bravalin*’s *comitatus*; ed. Vasil’evskij, *Trudy*, 3:95.

4.

Seven Old Norse sagas of the *Fornaldar* type, reduced to parchment in the second half of the thirteenth century, among them some from ca. 1260, mention a “decisive” battle fought both at the *vík* (“a small creek, inlet, bay”; “trading factory”) and on the *vøllr* (“a field, plain”; cf. Celtic *magos* “field; trading factory”) of Brá.⁹¹

During the last century, scholars have expressed many ingenious (if conflicting) opinions about the historicity or non-historicity of the Brávellir battle. The first school of thought was best formulated by Axel Olrik, who dated the event to ca. A.D. 550. According to Olrik, at that time, on the great plain of Brå härad (East Götland, north of modern Norrköping), the East Gauts (Sigurðr Hring) decisively defeated the invading Danes (Harald Hilditönn) and thus stopped the Danish expansion to the north. But the victorious Gauts suffered heavy losses at the battle and soon fell victim to the Svear, thus paving the way for Swedish hegemony.⁹² While accepting Olrik’s dating, Birger Nerman suggests that the competitors in the battle were the Swedes and the Gauts,⁹³ while Kemp Malone (basing his conclusions on the data from *Beowulf*) believes that the conflict was between the Franks and Frisians, on the one hand, and the Gauts, on the other.⁹⁴ The supporters of the mythic interpretation, especially Stig Wikander, regard the Brávellir battle as the reflection of an Old Indo-European myth, as recounted in the Old Indian *Mahābhārata*’s Kurukshetra battle.⁹⁵

⁹¹ The basic literature on the Brávellir battle is: Axel Olrik, “Bråvallakvadets kæmperække,” *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 10 (n.s. vol. 6) (1894): 223–87; idem, “Brávellir,” *Namn och Bygd* (Uppsala), 2 (1914): 297–312; Ture Hedeström, *Fornsagor och Eddakväden i geografisk belysning*, 2 vols. (Stockholm, 1917–19); Paul Herrmann, “Die Heldensagen des Saxo Grammaticus,” in idem, *Erläuterungen zu den ersten neun Büchern der Danischen Geschichte des Saxo Grammaticus*, pt. 2 (Leipzig, 1922), esp. pp. 539–48; Hermann Schneider, “Harald Kampfzahn und die ‘Bravalla-Schlacht,’” in idem, *Germanische Heldensage* (Berlin), vol. 2, pt. 1 (1933): 189–210; Didrik Arup Seip, “Det norske grunnlag for Bråvallakvadet hos Saxo,” *Norsk tidsskrift for sprogvidenskap* (Oslo), 3 (1929): 5–20; idem, “Bråvallakvadet,” *Kulturhistorisk leksikon for nordisk middelalder* (Copenhagen), 2 (1957): cols. 295–97; Bjarni Guðnason, “Um Brávallaþulu,” *Skírnir* (Reykjavík), 132 (1958): 82–128; Kurt Schier, “Brávallaschlacht-Lied,” *Kindlers Literatur Lexikon im dtv* (Munich), 3 (1986): 1618–19.

⁹² Axel Olrik, “Brávellir,” pp. 297–312.

⁹³ Birger Nerman, *Studier över Sväriges hedna Litteratur*, Akademisk avhandling (Uppsala, 1913), pp. 74–88.

⁹⁴ Kemp Malone, “Ubo Fresicus at Brávellir,” in idem, *Studies in Heroic Legend and in Current Speech* (Copenhagen, 1959), pp. 82–85.

⁹⁵ Stig Wikander, “Från Bråvalla till Kurukshetra,” *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 75 (1960): 183–93; Magnus Wistrand, “Slaget vid Bråvalla—en reflex av den indoeuropeiska mytskatten?,” *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 85 (1970): 208–22.

The battle—the events surrounding it and a long list of the participants—has come down to us in two sources, written independently of each other but apparently drawn from a common Old Norwegian-Icelandic source from ca. 1200. The older representative of that source is the eighth book of Saxo Grammaticus's Latin *Gesta Danorum*, written in Roskilde (Denmark) ca. 1200–1216.⁹⁶ Saxo implies that he was drawing upon an Old Norse poem, supposedly composed by the Danish hero Starkather (Starkaðr), an alleged active participant in the events described. The second witness of the Brávellir tradition is an anonymous Old Icelandic fragment called *Sögubrot af fornkonungum*, from ca. 1300.⁹⁷

Saxo's list of participants is extensive: it contains 162 names (68 supporters of Haraldr and 94 champions of Hringr). *Sögubrot*'s roll has only 98 names (36 on Haraldr's side, and 62 on Hringr's). The majority of the names that occur in the *Sögubrot* are also listed in the *Gesta* of Saxo, who typically latinized the Old Norse bynames. Occasionally Saxo gives a detail missing in the *Sögubrot*, and vice versa.

If one is to believe Saxo, and no other possibility is left to us, the common source of ca. 1200–1216 was still an oral one. Saxo states this explicitly: "Starkather, also a chief pillar of the Swedish war, was the first to relate its history in the Danish tongue [= *dønsk tunga*, i.e., the Old Norse *lingua franca*], though it was handed down by word of mouth rather than in writing."⁹⁸

Studies by Axel Olrik established that the story was based on a *þula*, a verse list (in this case of heroes) within a prose saga.⁹⁹ It has been stressed in scholarly literature that in the *þula*, geographical names from every Norwegian province are represented, with special attention given to Telemark. It was probably composed by an Icelander living in Norway.

There is no doubt that the *þula* was "dynamic" rather than "static." It tried to satisfy the taste of the patrons and to be *au courant*, as well as to replace the forgotten hero by the then popular one. Naturally, the mighty Danish king Haraldr, of the eighth century, had to have (anachronistically,

⁹⁶ *Saxonis Gesta Danorum*, ed. Jørgen Olrik and Hans Ræder, vol. 1 (Copenhagen, 1931), pp. 214–29; *Saxo Grammaticus: The History of the Danes*: vol. 1: English text, trans. Peter Fisher, ed. Hilda Ellis Davidson (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 238–52; vol. 2: Commentary, by Hilda Ellis Davidson and Peter Fisher (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 127–36.

⁹⁷ I am using the diplomatic edition by Carl af Petersons and Emil Olson in *Sögur Danakonunga* (= Samfund, vol. 46) (Copenhagen, 1925), pp. 15–25, esp. p. 20; see also the recent standardized edition by Bjarni Guðnason, *Danakonunga sögur* (Íslenzk Fornrit, vol. 35) (Reykjavík, 1982), pp. 59–71, esp. p. 65.

⁹⁸ *Saxo Grammaticus*, 1: 238.

⁹⁹ Axel Olrik, "Brávallakvadets kæmperække," pp. 223–87; idem, "Brávellir," pp. 297–312.

to be sure) Icelandic skalds at his court,¹⁰⁰ as was the practice in eleventh- and twelfth-century Scandinavia.

Saxo, too, was not immune to “correcting” the *pula*. In order to describe the splendor of the Danish army, he embellished his list with Kurlanders and Estlanders (newly conquered), as well as with “Slavs, Livonians, and seven thousand Saxons.”¹⁰¹

5.

Interestingly enough, Saxo and the *Sögubrot* disagree on who was the battle’s main hero. According to Saxo, it was the Dane Starkather, while in the *Sögubrot* the champion was Ubbo the Frisian. Surprisingly, Starkather is the leading champion of Hringr, the Swedish (Gautish) king, whereas Ubbo fights on the side of the Danish king Haraldr. One may agree, however, with Kemp Malone that “Starkaðr had no place in the original tradition about Brávellir,” and no embellishments can shake the central importance of Ubbo.¹⁰²

There is still another Frisian component in the Brávellir-*pula*—one that is apparently old, as it concerns a marginal champion who appears only at the beginning of the battle. His name is styled differently in the two lists: in Saxo,¹⁰³ “*Regnaldus Ruthenus Rathbarthi nepos* [Regnaldus, the Ruthenus (sic!), the grandson of Rathbarth]”; and in *Sögubrot*, in reconstructed form, “*Røgnvaldr hái Raðbarðs nefi [Røgnvaldr the Tall, or grandson of Raðbarðr].”¹⁰⁴

Raðbarðr of the Old Norse tradition corresponds with the historical Radbod, king of Frisia (and Flanders) and lord of the towns of the epoch (especially Dorestad). For four decades Radbod opposed the Carolingian Frankish expansion in his country (679–719).¹⁰⁵ In the Old Norse tradition his realm is called *Garðaríki* ‘the land of the towns’, a term which in ca.

¹⁰⁰ *Saxonis Gesta Danorum*, 1: 214; *Saxo Grammaticus*, 1: 238; 2: 127, fn. 8.

¹⁰¹ *Saxonis Gesta Danorum*, 1: 218. The first Danish “crusading” expeditions into Livonia, Estonia, and the Gulf of Finland took place during the reign of Valdemar II (1202–1241).

¹⁰² Malone, “Ubbo,” p. 83.

¹⁰³ *Saxonis Gesta Danorum*, 1: 257.

¹⁰⁴ The *Sögubrot* text (ed. Samfund, p. 20), *Rognualldr hai eða Radbarðr hnefi*, is certainly corrupt. Axel Olrik (“Brávallakvadets kæmperække,” pp. 254–55) reconstructs it as follows: “*Røgnvaldr ryzki, Ráðbarðs nefi. While I have no objections in accepting his emendations of the last two words (*Ráðbarðs nefi), I cannot understand how *hai eða* could be a corruption of *ryzki. The word *hai* has been explained by the editors (e.g., Bjarni Guðnason [see fn. 97]) and the commentators (e.g., Hilda Ellis Davidson, *Saxo Grammaticus: The History of the Danes*, vol. 2, Commentary [Cambridge, 1980], p. 130, fn. 37) as *háí ‘tall.’”

¹⁰⁵ Pritsak, *Origin of Rus'*, 1: 490, 494; see also Stéphane Lebecq, *Marchands et navigations Frisons du haut moyen âge*, 2 vols. (Lille, 1983), vol. 1, pp. 111–15, 150–52, 212–15.

the eleventh–twelfth century came to designate the Rus' of Novgorod and Kiev.¹⁰⁶ Saxo's term *Ruthenus* to mean "Frisian" is not surprising, since it is not an ethnic designation, but (as elaborated above) the *nomen* for a *coluvies negociatorum*.¹⁰⁷

6.

Charlemagne (771–814) decisively changed the map of Europe: in 773–774 he conquered Lombard Italy; in 787–788 he incorporated Bavaria; by 790 he finally subdued the Frisians; and in 795–796 he reduced

¹⁰⁶ Pritsak, *Origin of Rus'*, 1:217–26, 231.

¹⁰⁷ In his *Historia Regum Britanniae* (written in 1136; first edition, Paris, 1508; the latest, eighth edition by Jacob Hammer [Cambridge, Mass., 1951]), based on the so-called Chronicle of Nennius and the native Welsh "burgher" tradition (comparable to the Old Norse "Þiðreks saga af Bern"), Geoffrey of Monmouth (d. 1136) presents the glorious court of Arthur, the legendary king of the Britons. Among the fellows of Arthur's "Round Table," Geoffrey names Holdin, duke of the *Ruteni*, who ruled over Flanders and was buried in his native city of Tervana (Thérouanne in Artois in the Netherlands, IX, 13); Caesar came *ad litus Rutenorum* and saw *illic Britanniam insulam* (IV, 1). Doubtlessly, Holdin's models were the economically minded counts of Flanders, the enterprising successors of the former kings of Frisia. See also J. S. P. Tatlock, *The Legendary History of Britain: Geoffrey of Monmouth's "Historia regum Britanniae" and its Early Vernacular Versions* (University of California Press, 1950), esp. pp. 94–96.

The Lombard Papias (ca. 1050), commenting on a passage from Lucan's *Pharsalia* (I, 402) in his *Elementum Doctrinae Rudimentum*, a widely used and much copied Latin dictionary and encyclopaedia, explains the *Ruteni flavi* of the text (i.e., Lucan's Celtic *Ruteni*) as *Flandrenses populi*.

The *Codex Cumanicus* is a product of missionary (German) and mercantile (Italian) activities in the Crimean–Azov Sea region from the early period of the Golden Horde (thirteenth–fourteenth centuries). It was a multilingual guide for those who planned to visit the commercially minded Turkic Cumans (Qipčaqš). There is a special passage (phototyp. ed., Kaare Grønbech [Copenhagen, 1936], fol. 46) dealing with the linen fabrics (Middle Latin *tele* = Arabic *ketān*) of Franco-Flanders and Italy: *ḡonban k.* 'linen of Champagne'; *orlens k.* 'linen of Orléans'; *lombardi k.* 'linen of Lombardy'; *astexan k.* 'linen of [Italian] Asti'; *ostume k.* 'linen of Ostuni'; *bergonia k.* 'linen of Bourgogne'; *bergamaske k.* 'linen of Bergamo'; and finally, *rusi k.*, which is explained as *tele de Rens* 'linen of (i.e., sold at the grand fairs of) Rheims'. Significantly enough, the Arab traveler and adventurer from Spain, Abū Ḥāmid al-Gharnāṭī, who lived in Volga Bulgaria and in Hungary between 1131 and 1153, simply names the land producing the *ketān ar-Rūs* 'linen of Rūs' as *nāmiš* (= *nāmič*; cf. Slavic *němci*; ed. G. Ferrand, *Journal Asiatique*, 1925, no. 7–9, pp. 195–98), i.e., the German Roman Empire, a term including "Imperial Flanders" (*Rijksvlaanderen*), i.e., Flanders and Frisia. In 1282 a major flood breached the land between the Zuider Zee and the Northern Sea, and caused the deaths of over 60,000 people. This event in the Frisian Land is described in the Galician Chronicle s.a. 6793/1285; the Frisians are called there *Němci* (*PSRL*, vol. 2, ed. A. A. Šaxmatov [St. Petersburg, 1908], col. 896).

A trace of the activity in the emporium of the *Rus negociatores* on the Danube in Upper Austria is left in the Carolingian charter from 863, where *Ruzaramarcha*, or "the march of the Ruzzi (Rus)" appears; see Omeljan Pritsak, "The Origin of the Name *Rūs/Rus*," in *Passé Turko-Tatar—Présent Soviétique* (Paris, 1986), pp. 50–51.

the nomadic Avar *pax* in Central Europe. But most of his efforts were in fighting the Saxons (772–785; 793–797). The only Germanic people on the continent that Charlemagne was unable to conquer were the rulers of Denmark, who then made their appearance in history. Between 777 and 797 the Frankish sources mention a king called *Sigifrid Danorum rex* (“*Annales Einhardi*,” s.a. 777), *Sigifridi regis, id est Halptani* (“*Annales Laurissenses*,” s.a. 777), or *Sigifridi regis Danorum, Halbdani videlicet* (“*Annales Fuldenses*,” s.a. 782).¹⁰⁸ Sigifrid, like his successor, Godfred, was a formidable rival of Charlemagne: he not only dared to give refuge to the Saxon chief Widukind, an enemy of Charlemagne, but also gave Widukind his own daughter, Geva, in marriage (778).¹⁰⁹

7.

Of crucial importance is that both Sigifrid and his people are given two appellations: Sigifrid is also “Half-Dane” (*Halbdan, Halptan*) and his *Dani* are also *Nordmanni*. The coeval Anglo-Saxon epic *Beowulf* (ca. 800) uses the designation *Hælf-Dene* for the itinerant Vikings connected with the emporia of the *negociatores*.¹¹⁰ Singled out specifically is Hnæf Hōcing as *Hælf-Dena* in the “Finn Episode.”¹¹¹ The term *Nordmanni* (>*Lordoman-*) has been discussed above.

It was the great Russian medievalist Ernst (Arist) Kunick (1814–1899) who identified the valiant Sigifrid of the Frankish Annals with Sigurðr Hringr of the Brávellir battle, who, after his great northern victory, was epically identified (epic hypostatis) with the older Germanic hero of the same name: Sigurðr Fafnisbani of the Nibelungen cycle. As the date of the Brávellir battle, Kunick suggested “around 770.”¹¹²

8.

¹⁰⁸ I quote the Frankish annals from the editions of *Monumenta Germaniae Historica; Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separati: Annales regni Francorum inde ab a. 741 usque ad a. 829, qui dicuntur Annales Laurissenses maiores et Einhardi*, ed. Friedrich Kurze (Hanover, 1895); *Annales Fuldenses sive Annales regni Francorum orientalis*, ed. Friedrich Kurze (Hanover, 1891).

¹⁰⁹ Conrad Botho, *Chronicon Brunsvicensium*, ed. Gottfried Leibnitz, *Scriptorum Brunsvicensia illustrantium*, vol. 3 (Hanover, 1711), p. 292. See Ernst Kunick, “Die Brawallaschlacht ist der erste sichere Ausgangspunkt für die dänische, schwedische und ostslavische Chronologie,” *Mélanges Russes* (St. Petersburg), 1 (1851): 279.

¹¹⁰ Pritsak, *Origin of Rus'*, 1: 183–87. Concerning the etymology of the term, see Jan de Vries, *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Leiden, 1961), p. 204: “*Halfdan* m. PN. eig. ‘der Halbdäne’.”

¹¹¹ Pritsak, *Origin of Rus'*, 1: 186.

¹¹² Kunick, “Die Brawallaschlacht,” pp. 265–89, esp. pp. 270–71.

A characteristic feature of the early medieval history of Eurasia was the role of the imperial *limes* as the *officina gentium* or *vagina populorum*, to use the terms coined by Jordanes in A.D. 551.¹¹³ It was essentially unimportant whether the sedentary empire was China, Iran, or Rome, since the behavior of the “barbarians” in question was very similar, be they “nomads” of the steppe or those of the sea.

As was the case with the emergence of the Old Turks ca. 550 on the Chinese *limes*, the *Vindivarii* (ancestors of the Wenedi/Wends) were, according to Jordanes, *ex diversis nationibus adgregati*, ‘as though they had fled to one particular refuge and had subsequently formed a tribe (gens)’—the Vistula–Baltic sea region in the case of the *Vindivarii* and Mongolia in the case of the Old Turks. Essential to the future frontier “tribe” was the acquisition of a common name, a *nomen/vocabulum/ἔπωνυμία*, as mentioned above. It made no difference whether the *nomen* was chosen (or usurped, as in the case of the Pseudo-Avars) by the band itself, or given to it by others. The Halani (= Alans)—writes Ammianus Marcellinus (ca. 380)—had “in the course of time been united under one name (*ad unum. . . vocabulum*), and are all, for convenience, called Halani because of the similarity of their customs, their savage mode of life, and their weapons”;¹¹⁴ cf. the tribal names: “Franks” from *franca* ‘spear’; “Saxons” from *sahs* ‘single-edged sword’; Turks from *türk* ‘a young man in his prime’. The case of the Alemanni was similar ([οἱ δὲ Ἀλαμανοί] ξυνήλυδές εἰσιν ἄνθρωποι καὶ μιγάδες καὶ τοῦτο δύναται αὐτοῖς ἢ ἔπωνυμία).¹¹⁵ H. von Petrikovits has shown that a name (*nomen/vocabulum/ἔπωνυμία*) was essential to the development of tribes formed of *ad hoc colluvies*—congregations of linguistically and racially disparate elements—since the name comprised “the self-consciousness of the group and its recognition as a unit of action.” That a band developing into a tribe might collaborate with, prey on, or incorporate the pre-existing organization of international traders (*colluvies negociatorum*) in an inter-imperial *pax* can be seen from the (well-documented) example of the Old Turkic Empire (550–745), which was the result of the fusion of the frontier bands known as “Türk” with the East Iranian Sogdian international traders, called “*Sir*.” The *pax* consequently had a double name: *Türk Sir*

¹¹³ See my remarks in “The Slavs and the Avars,” *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull’alto medioevo*, vol. 30, pt. 1 (Spoleto, 1983), pp. 353–424.

¹¹⁴ *Ammianus Marcellinus*, with an English translation by John C. Rolfe, vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass., 1958), pp. 390–91.

¹¹⁵ “The Alemanni are a flocked together and mixed people, and this means [to them; i.e., their] surname,” Agathias (d. ca. 582), *Historiarum*, ed. Ludwig Dindorf (*Historici Graeci Minores*, 2) (Leipzig, 1871), pp. 149–50.

bodan (used in ceremonial acts),¹¹⁶ the abbreviated form of which was *Türk*.

9

As stated above, the second half of the eighth century was dominated by the empire-building and expansion of the Franks under Charlemagne. A new semi-barbarian *pax* soon came into existence along the *limes* of his empire. It consisted of the *colluvies* of international traders (*negociatores*) and of warriors/seamen. The *nomen* of the *negociatores* was *Rut-/Rus-*, and that of the warriors was *Nordmanni*. As in the case of the *Türks*, the *nomen* that this incipient *pax* chose, or was given, was *Norðmen* (Anglo-Saxon Chronicles, s.a. 787), a word which in the basin of the Mare Nostrum, the main focus of contemporary international trade, was transformed into *lordoman-* both in the West (Spain) and in the East (Caliphate: al-Mas'ūdī: *al-lō[r]domān-*). The sources name Sigifridus, *rex* of the *Nordmann-* (also called *Dani*), as the catalyst in this process, which evolved from 777 to 797.

It is impossible to investigate in one paper the way in which sedentarization of both the *Dani/Nordmanni* in French Normandy and of the *Rus-/Nordmanni* in Eastern Europe proceeded, or to attempt to determine the degree to which the two groups interacted within the two polities in question. Suffice it to note that the *Nordmanni (Dani)* of the second half of the eighth to the early ninth century used an Old Norse *lingua franca* called “Danish” (*dǫnsk tunga*);¹¹⁷ hence the appearance of the name Inger in Byzantium by the end of the eighth century. It may have been brought there by participants in the battle that was decisive in forging the maritime mercantile “tribe” (*gens*) *Rus-Nordmanni*; hence the name of the “Rus” leader Brav[a]llin (<*Brávalla-kappi, etc.) in the miraculum of the *Life* of Stephen of Sugdaea.

The thrust of this paper has been to show that by the end of the eighth century a corollary movement to that of the *Rus-Nordmanni* (also called Vikings) in the West had also begun in the East, where the focal point was first the Crimea (and Old Ladoga¹¹⁸), and later Kiev. Thereafter commenced the process of individual (or group) acculturation to Christianity.

¹¹⁶ See my “The Distinctive Features of the *Pax Nomadica*,” *Settimane di studio del Centro Italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, vol. 35 (Spoleto, 1988), pp. 749–88.

¹¹⁷ In his *De administrando imperio* (from ca. 948–952), Constantine Porphyrogenitus witnesses that along the Dnieper trade route in his times two *linguae francae* were in use: one of the Old Norse type, which he calls Ῥωσιτῆ (= *dǫnsk tunga*), and the other Σκλαβησιτῆ (“Slavonic”); ed. Gy. Moravcsik and R. J. H. Jenkins (Budapest, 1949), pp. 58, 60.

¹¹⁸ I cannot discuss here the Old Ladoga aspects of the problem under study.

At least one such neophyte family had a successful career in Constantinople in the first half of the ninth century. There must have been similar cases along the Dnieper trade route, which either went unrecorded or have yet to be discovered.

Harvard University