

# THREE PARTS OF EUROPE: COMMON FEATURES OF STATE-GENESIS IN ENGLAND, RUS' AND BULGARIA (A RECORD OF SYNTHESIS OF WRITTEN SOURCES AND HISTORIOGRAPHY DATA)

*Evgeny Shinakov, Andrey Fedosov*

**Abstract:** *The genesis of statehood on the European periphery was not influenced by Late Roman institutions and had both common and special features. The authors have spent many years studying the nature of Rus' in this particular aspect, in comparison with specifically Bulgaria and England. The results are exposed in a series of monographs and articles, including the ones in English. It helped to move to a new level, three-fold, of analysis and exploration. England, Rus' and Bulgaria were the fringe points of medieval Christian Europe, where the Romano – Barbarian synthesis either never happened or it was feeble and mediated by Byzantium. As a result, all “angles” of Europe fit under our analysis, except for the Muslim southwest (the Emirate of Cordoba) and nomadic east. The synthesis of the previously received evidence shows common features in State-genesis of these remote regions, with Rus' and Bulgaria being in the close contact, while England did not engage with either side. One of the most important features was the military factor: wars of conquest in the beginning of the process of state building, uniting wars in its middle, and defensive wars at the end, during the emergence of early statehood. The second feature is the foreign origin of the ruling elite: the Anglo-Saxons and Jutes upon the Celtic majority in England; the Ruses of different races upon the Slavic and Finno-Ugric population in Rus'; the Turkic Bulgarians upon the Slavic – and Greek speaking population of the Thracian origin in Bulgaria. The third feature is the preservation of the local, “lower” level of power and its special, but different in all three countries, relations with the “upper” level. Such binarity was eliminated only in the process of transition from the supra – complex chiefdom to early state. The process of State-genesis in all three countries was accompanied by conversion into a new consolidating religion – Christianity, though each country adopted it on different levels of development.*

**Keywords:** *State-genesis, statehood, England, Rus', Bulgaria, common features, comparative studies.*

Currently, an increasing interest in the processes of state formation is observed. This phenomenon is associated with the development of an integrative discipline of political (or socio – cultural) anthropology. Prioritizing the study of political institutions in different societies, it inte-

grates the achievements of history, ethnography, political studies and other social sciences. This resulted in the accumulation of practical and theoretical knowledge that enables a re-evaluation of the well-known facts about the origin of states in Europe.

The stage of complex chiefdoms (Service 1971 [1962], 1975, 1978; Claessen 2000, 2006; Claessen, Kloos 1981; Claessen, Skalník 1978a, 1978b; Carneiro 1970, 2000, 2004; Haas 1982; Крадин 2000, 2004) or the potestary – political stage (Куббель 1988), including the transitional period to the early state, is studied and compared within the framework of political – anthropological theory of state genesis. The term ‘a barbarian state’ is more developed and up to use in the East European historical science, and it actually reflects the same stage of political genesis as the above – mentioned political anthropology terms, and it is also partly accepted by its modern adherents (Коротчаев 1997, 2000, 2004; Бондаренко 2001; Попов 1990). It is also apt because it contaminates state genesis and sociogenesis as a transitional period between ‘wildness’ and ‘civilization’.

The methodological basis of comparative analysis is the observance of principle of synchrostadiality (not the chronological simultaneity) and typological homogeneity of the compared phenomena, structures and processes. As a working hypothesis we take our previously worked out classification of forms and models of statehood, approved by the data on different Slavic states and peoples (Шинаков 2000a, 2000b, 2001, 2003, 2005).

The aim of the article is to attribute Rus’, Anglo-Saxon England and First Bulgarian Empire to a particular stage of state genesis and to a definite form of statehood. Actually, we have already done this elsewhere with respect to Rus’ (Шинаков 2000a, 2002). That work has been similar in methodology to the one we have carried out to clarify the state form of the Ukrainian Hetmanate. For the sake of comparison, the same set of attributes of the form is used, but at the given stage of research the comparative analysis is applied not to all statehood forms (more precisely to their ‘ideal models’), but with different principle and different aim – to compare them with each other.

The sources on the subject are rather diverse (in respect of their category and type) and versatile (from the point of their ethnic origin and political engagement). We have previously presented on a number of occasions the analysis of sources on Rus’ in the respective aspect (Шинаков 1987, 1993, 2002; Шинаков, Гурьянов 2002), which saves the trouble of returning to it. As for Bulgaria, there have been analyzed *The Bulgarian Khans Names List*, works by John Exarchos, Theophanes, Nikiphor, Ennody, as well as the epigraphy data. All these sources have been often used by Bulgarian and Russian specialists in First Bulgarian Empire (e.g., Андреев 1994; Ангелов 1987; Иванова 1987; Литаврин, Наумов 1991 *etc.*), and we could not pass by their works and analytical publications on the sources. As for England, its early history is described in a number of sources, such as *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, *The Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, *The History of the Britons*, *The Annales Cambriae*, *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae* etc. Within contemporary Russian medieval studies, still the most actively debated are the issues of the time of formation and the character of the early Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, their German or late Roman origins, the role of royalty and nobility in the process of the state formation and formation of its various structural elements, as well as the influence of the church on this process. These points are often treated from completely opposite points of view. Even the chronological framework of the emergence of the Anglo-Saxon state is still debated. Thus, according to Alexander Gurevich and Klara Savelo, the transition to statehood occurred in the late 6th – early 7th century (Савело 1977), and according to Alexander Korsunsky it happened only at the end of the 7th century (Корсунский 1963: 73). Still things are changing in contemporary Russian historiography (Глебов 1998, 2003; Ларионов 1993). Some special studies on the history of Anglo-Saxon England and general surveys of the British historiography of the 20th century (Метлицкая 2003; Сидорова

2004; Шарифжанов 2004) demonstrate a more balanced assessment of both achievements and failures of their Western colleagues. Thus, Zoya Metlitskaya in her review *Anglo-Saxon England and Norman Conquest* for the first time in Russian historiography considers the traditional approaches to the study of the Norman conquest as well as new trends in the study of the issue. She is interested in political, socio – economic and ethnocultural aspects and implications of the events of 1066 (Метлицкая 2003). Among the recent Russian researches of the English historiography of the 20th century the most important is the monograph by Izmail Sharifzhanov *British Historiography in the 20th Century: The Key Theoretical and Methodological Approaches, Schools and Trends* (Шарифжанов 2004), in which the author explores from a new perspective many traditional and recognized works of the Western historians.

However, as a matter of fact the systematic and complex analysis of these resources in the comparative – structural aspect has not been carried out yet. Below a comparative table of elements of Bulgarian, English and Russian ‘barbarian’ statehood is given. The attributes are taken from one of the authors’ work on the Ukrainian Hetman state (Шинаков 2006b: 98 – 99):

1. Territorial – demographic structure.
2. Socio – economic basis.
3. Ways and mechanisms of state formation.
4. System (organization) of government.
5. Type of interrelations between state and society (including its particular fractions as classes, estates *etc.*).
6. Composition, sources and ways of forming and recruitment of the ruling stratum.
7. Composition of the social elite (exploiting classes).
8. The exploited classes.
9. Form of government.

10. Functions of the state apparatus.
11. Sources of the existence of the ruling stratum (‘state elite’).
12. Directions of public funds expenses. In addition to the basic, essential attributes the comparison was held on the basis of the ‘secondary’ (derivative) ones, which are more completely and precisely (and the main thing, unambiguously) reflected in sources. They are the following:
13. Character of the armed forces and the prevailing type of foreign conflicts immanent to the given form.
14. Types of internal conflicts.
15. National policy.
16. Character of law and legal proceedings.
17. Types and methods of ideological support of power.

So, the basic components of the complex analysis have turned out to be the following:

- a) the mechanisms of genesis of ‘barbarian’ statehood structures both reflected in the sources and in the categories of political anthropology;
- b) the structure of statehood in statistics, its correlation with the social basis: a ‘ranged’ or ‘stratified’ society (Fried 1967);
- c) the reasons of formation and functions of power structures (in reality and in pagan and Christian ideological grounding);
- d) the composition, sources of recruitment and incomes of the ruling elite or elites;
- e) the role of war and the form of military organization in creating, functioning and transformation of a certain form of statehood;
- f) time, reasons and mechanisms of ‘barbarian’ statehood transformation into ‘the early state’ one;
- g) the reasons of ‘choosing the way’.

	<b>Bulgaria</b>	<b>Rus'</b>	<b>England</b>
1	'Center' and 'Slaviniyas', hierarchic federation; territorial patrimonial, vertical relations	'Center' and 'Slaviniyas' + 'External Rus'; territorial patrimonial, vertical relations	The federation of separate kingdoms, headed by the Wessex family
2	Ranked society with arising strata; economical basis is semi – nomadic (camp) cattle breeding, agriculture, predatory wars	Ranked society with arising strata; economical basis is international trade, predatory wars, agriculture, stable cattle breeding	Ranked society with incipient strata; the basis of the economy is agriculture, stabled cattle breeding
3	The model is military, partly aristocratic; mechanisms are military – aggressive and defensive, meritocratic, 'kinship', contractual, legal	The model is military – plutocratic, partly aristocratic; mechanisms are military – defensive and aggressive, 'kinship', contractual	Military liberation way of state formation. The military – defensive, aggressive, 'family', bargain mechanisms
4	Division of power at 'federal' and local levels. System of 'federal' military deputies. Within the higher level of power there is a patrimonial (aristocratic) principle, arising of the official – serving principle	Division of power at 'federal' and local levels. 'Polyudie' as a direct government. Within the higher level of power there is a corporate – patrimonial principle	Division of power at 'federal' and local levels with a tendency to strengthen the role of royal power and royal officials
5	Reciprocity. Dominance – subordination against pre – Slavic autochthonous population, elements of enforcement between the levels of power	Reciprocity with elements of enforcement between the levels of power, dominance – subordination, exploitation of the Slavs by the Ruses	Military coercion of the population, feudalization (hierarchization) of the society
6	Military aristocracy, all proto – Bulgarian against the Slavs, Slavic bodyguard? Principles are abilities, origin, force, wealth	'All Rhos' and ruling patrimonies. Slavic patrimonial aristocracy and bodyguard. Methods are origin, abilities, wealth, 'luck'	The ruling clan is the Wessex kings; strengthening of the hereditary tendencies
7	Military men, cattle – and landowners	Military men, merchants	Royal governors, nobility and service aristocracy getting feudal characteristics
8	Community men, slaves a little, local pre – Slavic population	Community men, slaves a little	Community members (churls)
9	Patrimonial hierarchic monarchy	Patrimonial hierarchic monarchy	Patrimonial monarchy
10	Military – organizing, judicial, redistribution. Function of self – sufficiency	Military and trade – organizing, judicial at the low level of power, redistribution. Military frightening and repressive if necessary at the high level of power. Function of self – sufficiency	Military, repressive, trade organizing, judicial and redistributive functions of the state apparatus
11	Robbery of 'the aliens' (Byzantine), tribute, private sources (cattle breeding)	Private sources (trade incomes), robbery of 'the aliens' (Byzantine, the Orient), tribute, 'polyudie'	System taxes, revenues from the domains, a tribute (especially from the Celts)

12	'Feeding' best warriors, bodyguard; prestige of power. Building of towns, fortresses	'Feeding' bodyguard, shipbuilding, usage in trade to gain the subjects of 'prestige consumption'. Building of 'grads'(towns)	Military actions, fleet construction, maintenance of the army, the construction of fortifications
13	Cavalry and infantry as a home guard, Slavic bodyguards, pre – Bulgarian 'best warriors' and aristocrats. Offensive and predatory, defensive	'Marines' – professionals ('Ruses'), Slavic home guard and tribal bodyguards. Offensively aggressive (unifying), predatory, 'commercial'	Professional land forces and the navy (at the times of Alfred)
14	Interpatrimonial inside proto – Bulgarian aristocracy	Interpersonal in the struggle for power (Rhos); interpatrimonial and tribal (Slavic including Finno – Ugric)	Confrontation between the Anglo-Saxons and the Normans
15	Preservation, but not accentuation of national differences, then the integration at the legal level. Mixture of languages and cultures, adding of the Slavs to 'federal' top. Confessional differences are kept till the baptism	National differences are 'shadowed' by corporate – pragmatic ones. Different law, different confessions. Process of mixture of languages and cultures, Slavic adding to the 'federal' top	Activities to consolidate the population of ethnically isolated kingdoms into a single British nation, united by a common Christian religion
16	Before reforms of Omurtag and Krum different 'customary law' for the proto-Bulgarians and Slavs. Later – a single written law, whose source is power	Separate 'customary law' (mononorms) for the Rhos ('Russian law') and Slavs	Royal laws, concerning secular and religious issues, the system of crime and punishment, the Danelaw
17	Spiritualization of ruling patrimony to deity – Tengri Khan, genealogical sanction	Demonstration of force and 'luck' at different levels of power. In 'Slaviniyas', probably, religious – genealogical sanction	Christianization, concepts of the common history of kingdoms

A. The First Bulgarian kingdom was formed in a military – contractual way. The same can be said about the initial Russian state – 'the Northern confederation' (Мельникова 1993) with its center in Novgorod, and England. The difference is that in Bulgaria and England it was made by means of a military – aggressive mechanism, and in Rus' – by the military-defensive one. By the way, the seizure of the Lower Danube region by the proto – Bulgarians under Asparukh was accompanied by the contract with the Severs and Slavic 'unity of seven tribes' (Тъпкова-Займова 1991: 45 – 47) as a defense from Byzantine attempts to restore its power in the region. As a result of the defensive liberation struggle of five Slavic and Fin-

no – Ugric tribal alliances and principalities (of the chiefdom level) with the Varangians, a new formed proto – state association appeared which was named in literature 'the Northern confederation' (Мельникова 1993). The conventional dates for the initial events are 679 – 681 for Bulgaria, and 859 – 862 for Rus' (in reality, with the account of the discrepancy of chronicle dating it is 852 – 854).

By contrast, the formation of statehood in Britain started simultaneously with the Anglo-Saxon conquest, although it is more logical to call it colonization. During the period between the 5th and the 7th centuries, the Anglo-Saxons who settled the territory, created settlements and

began to amalgamate into political – territorial structures.

The Anglo-Saxon conquest of Britain was a long and complicated process. The war between the Britons and the Anglo-Saxons in the 5th century was a continuation of a struggle between the Roman Empire and the barbarians who conquered it. In the 6th century, these conflicts transformed into the battles between the Britons' independent kingdoms and the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, which was the result of Britain's post – Roman split into numerous independent units, in which the Anglo-Saxon invaders established their own kingdoms. In the 5th – 7th centuries, the Anglo-Saxon invasion passed through at least three phases. The first phase, which followed the withdrawal of the Roman legions from Britain, was characterized by the use of barbarian military troops that were auxiliary mercenaries troops in the British kings' armies. Lands for settlement were given to the veterans in Britain, they called their fellow kinsmen, who arrived from their ancestral lands and joined them. The second phase started when the barbarians destroyed the Roman Empire, and there occurred a massive invasion by the tribes, that came to Britain with the armed forces and subordinated the country's significant territories.

B. All three pre-state societies best fit the definition of a 'two – level pre – state'. In respect of Rus' it becomes evident after the comparison of the data by Gardizi, Al – Masudi with Russian Primary Chronicle (*Povest vremennykh let*) and with Constantine Porphyrogenitus. The idea has been expressed with regards to Rus' by one of the authors of the present paper and in respect of Bulgaria – by E. Koicheva and N. Kochev (Койчева, Кочев 1991: 52). The same is true for England, where all regional polities in England were formed as complex chiefdoms.

C. In Bulgaria the necessity of submission of the Slavs to the proto-Bulgarians might have been determined by the necessity of joint warfare actions against Byzantine.

Within the proto-Bulgarian society the khans' power was based on their origin from the Turkic supreme god Tengri Khan. The types of power legitimation of particular pagan Slavic rulers in Bulgaria are unclear contrary to the Eastern Slavs. Among the latter there dominated either the 'first settlement' model of legitimation (the Polyans, Vyatichs, Radimichs), a patriarchal one (the Drevlyans) or the model probably connected with monopolization of power by a certain social – professional stratum (corporation) (the Krivichs) (Шинаков 2000a). The term *paktiots* was used in the interrelations of the 'Rhos' with the *slaviniyas*' rulers and it can be interpreted both as allies and as tributaries (Constantine Porphyrogenitus 1991). There was a common interest of the Slavic top to participate in trade and robbery in Byzantine, that was impossible without such large – scale actions organized by the 'Rhos'. This interest replaced the initial 'force authority', described in the Arabic sources concerning the 'Ruses' and 'Slavs' (Шинаков, Гурьянов 2002).

In the resources the right for power among the 'Rhos' (or 'Ruses') is not postulated anyhow and the degree of power itself belonging to the *chacanus Rhos* reminds not a sovereign power but that of a tribal chief (a head of corporation) which implies the abilities and 'luck' as power sanctions.

The first English kings, like Hengist and Horsa, were rather warlords, whose legitimacy was based on conquest, than real rulers. The necessity to control the subjugated Britons and, later, to repulse the attack of the Vikings, as well as the Roman influence, led to the strengthening of the royal power. On the one hand, there were retinues composed of professional soldiers in the king's service and they received compensation fee, as well as allotments. Younger warriors lived mostly in the royal burghs and in addition to military functions performed other functions, often acting as royal officials. The thegns, that is people close to the king, stayed at court during a certain period of time, and they usually owned land and spent most of their time in their households. They

were members of the royal council and officials and also participated in governing the state. Thus, it becomes clear that the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms reached the level of complex chiefdoms, and they were in the process of state formation.

D. The composition, sources of recruitment and providing of the ruling elite totally correspond to the époque of 'barbarity' or a transitional period from chiefdom to the early state, *i.e.* complex chiefdom.

E. Permanently influencing military aspect defined to a great degree the specificity of a statehood form and was the reason of the typical similarity between pre – state formations in Bulgaria, England in Rus'<sup>1</sup>.

F. The sequence of events that determined the process of transformation of a complex chiefdom into an early state looks as follows.

For Bulgaria: 1) the change of social basis of the top power level (settling of the proto – Bulgarians); 2) the reforms began only in the incorporated regions (Krum); 3) the major part of the territorial – administrative, law, governmental (Omurtag) reforms had led to an intensive mutual integration of social – ethnic bases of both power levels and their representatives; 4) the final stage of these reforms was the acceptance of an integrating world religion (Boris I); 5) the conflict with the proto – Bulgarian patrimonial aristocracy that lost the privileges and its 'demonstrative' suppression; 6) the defense from the Hungarians and Byzantines; 7) the ambitious building and demographic actions; 8) foreign expansion, an attempt to create an empire. The apotheosis was an acceptance of a title *basileus* by Simeon (913); 9) the end of the expansion, change of character and sources of the military – bureaucratic top's incomes by acquiring land possessions (Peter I). Beginning of the early state transformation into a

<sup>1</sup> The role of the war factor in the development of such a statehood form was figuratively reflected by Nikolay M. Karamzin: '...Oleg bored by the silence which is so dangerous for a military state ... decided to begin a war against Empire' (Карамзин 1989: 103).

mature one in the form of primarily official – bureaucratic and feudal-hierarchic (Шинаков 2001).

For Rus': 1) the actual consolidation of the 'Ruses' and 'Slavs' within the framework of a single, although syncretic, heterogeneous bodyguard subculture (by the middle of the 10th century); 2) external and internal crisis of the 'two – level' authority (941 – 944); 3) a 'provoked conflict' and its ritually – precedent suppression by princess Olga; 4) the beginning of territorial – administrative, governmental, tax – financial and law reforms only at the incorporated territories (after the Drevlyans' revolt) and domain (private) lands; 5) an attempt to introduce world religion and departure facing the threat of conflict during Olga's reign; 6) foreign expansion, Sviatoslav's attempt to create an 'empire'<sup>2</sup>; the emphasis on exoexploitation; 7) internal conflict within the ruling clan and the end of territorial consolidation after Sviatoslav's death (975 – 984); 8 – 9) parallel functioning of the defensive war factor and largescale border strengthening meant to eliminate the tribal borders and the influence of regional, military – patrimonial aristocracy, as well as to integrate the former tribes into a new, early state structure in combination with overall reforms in all spheres (986 – 1000); 10) the massive monumental temple and fortification construction, including building of *grady* (towns); 11) the acceptance of integrating and prestigious world religion; 12) the law reform and transition of the law under the state's control (1016 – 1113); 13) the

<sup>2</sup> Original point of view on the situation in case of realization of Sviatoslav's empire ambitions was stated by the 19th century historian M. P. Pogodin: 'He decided not to move the capital (it is a false expression), but simply speaking to move into another apartment, to another Slavic tribe in the suppressed country of Bulgaria and transfer a seed [of the Russian statehood – *E. Sh.*] into another soil! It was a toss of Bulgaria to become Rus', Normandy' (Погодин 1847: 475). In terms of political anthropology one may speak about the moving of a preserved as an atavism old Russian-team 'power level' to another low level – *Slaviniyas*. But by that time in Bulgaria they had already finished to exist for 150 years like 'a two-level protostate' as a whole.

change of the ruling class (*druzhina* top) status, its transformation into the *boyars* – landowners (starting from the middle and second half of the 11th century), that marked the beginning of the early state transformation into a mature one.

For England: 1) the disruption of the old tribal ties during migrations and conquest of new territories, formation of new dominions (5th – the beginning of the 6th centuries); 2) formation of kingdoms – complex chiefdoms in the 6th century. The social differentiation begins as new social groups appear: the churls and earls, gesithes (retainers), the laeti (semi – free), and the serfs (slaves); 3) the adoption of the single Christian religion, but this process ran independently in each kingdom, as a result a common center in Canterbury lacked gravitas, and so religion united not the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, but an alien Anglo-Saxons with a native long Christianized Romano – Britons (the first half of the 7th century); 4) socio – legal differentiation within the ruling class: the thanes and gesithes (7th – 8th centuries); 5) Vikings' invasion laid foundation for coalition of the kingdoms under the aegis of Wessex; at the same time, the Danelaw was emerging in the middle – second half of the 9th century; 6) The reforms of Alfred the Great, the unification of landed class and expansion of the thanes' right led to creation of the knight's cavalry. The period of internal conflicts followed the amalgamation of the Anglo-Saxon 'kingdoms' into England. At the same time a threat from Scandinavia temporarily declined; 7) the struggle between the new military and service class nobility with the landed magnates; new Danish – Norwegian invasions (the end of the 10th century); 8) emergence of the Danish Empire of Sweyn Forkbeard and Cnut the Great. England temporarily loses its sovereignty, but regained it later (1013 – 1042); 9) interruption of the natural process of development of the English statehood due to the Norman conquest (1066 and beyond).

As a result, it becomes possible to estimate the duration of the stages and phases of state gen-

esis for Bulgaria, England and Rus'. In Bulgaria the stage of the emergence of complex chiefdom in the form of 'a two – level power' lasted from 679 till the mid – 8th century; in Rus' – from the mid – 9th till the middle of the 880s. The heyday of the two – level pre – statehood in Bulgaria falls on the mid – 8th – beginning of the 9th century (before Krum's and especially Omurtag's reforms), in Rus' – from the middle of the 880s till 941. In England the initial period of state genesis (the Heptarchy) lasted from the formation of the first Anglo-Saxon polities in the 5th century to the 8th century. Later, in the 9th – 10th centuries, the Viking invasions destroyed the Heptarchy and led to unification and amalgamation of Anglo-Saxon kingdoms into a single political entity – the Kingdom of England.

The phase of transformation and crisis of the pre – statehood of the given stage and form in Bulgaria lasted from Krum – Omurtag's reforms (conventionally from the first – second decades of the 9th century) till 865 (the year of the mutiny of proto – Bulgarian pagan nobility and its suppression by Boris I).

In Rus' the stage of transformation began, on the contrary, with the crisis of 941 – 944 and completed in general with Vladimir I's reforms (the second half of the 80s – the early 90s of the 10th century). The case of Rus' is also peculiar as the 'complex chiefdom' final stage chronologically (from Olga's reforms) but not territorially coincides with the stage of early statehood formation which completed by the 20s of the 9th century (except some law details and ancestral vestiges). It is remarkable that both in Bulgaria and Rus' the dates of the approval of Orthodoxy as a state religion (864/865 and 988/989) are rather conventional but they symbolically represent the beginning of the prevalence of the new (early state) development trends over the old ('chiefdom', patrimonial) traditions during the transitional period. These very 120 years separate the formal dates of the end of the 'two – level proto – statehood' in both countries. In Rus' the stage of 'a two –



level proto – statehood’ formation began 30 – 40 years after the beginning of the transformation process into the early state in Bulgaria that allows speaking about the typological resemblance of the initial development conditions and not about the borrowings.

The transition from complex chiefdoms to early statehood in England can be dated back to the 10th century and connected with the struggle against the Vikings, inner strife and socio – political conflicts (against ‘separatists’ and within the noble class). In contrast to Rus’ and Bulgaria, conversion to Christianity in England took place long before the transition to the early statehood and didn’t have any connection with it.

From the typological viewpoint both Ancient Rus’ and First Bulgarian kingdom were referred by the famous Slavist Vladimir D. Korolyuk to the so – called ‘contact zone’ between the countries of the Roman – barbarian synthesis and the non – synthesis zone (Корольюк 1972, 1975). Its peculiarity is determined by the fact that the power of the Roman governmental and cultural institutions was indirectly influenced (though to a different degree) by Byzantine as well as by the strong influence of the nomadic factor (though varying in different countries of this zone). In Bulgaria this influence is obvious. In Rus’ in the 9th century the role of proto – Bulgarians was played by the ‘sea nomads’ (for the Eastern Europe – river) – the Varyags (Varangians) (or the ‘Ruses’ in the eastern sources and ‘Rhos’ in the Byzantine ones). The nomads and more precisely the semi – nomadic early state Khazar khaghanate, played the same role for the ‘two – level’ Rus’ of the second half of the 9th century as the Byzantine empire did for the synchronostadial Bulgaria of the 8th – beginning of the 9th century, that influenced the further transformation of both states. The role and place of the Slavs in the statehood formation both in Bulgaria and in Rus’ were absolutely identical and it is not without reason that in both countries the Slavic ethnopolitical component turned out to be the dominant one.

In conclusion, a relative synchronostadiality of state genesis process in Bulgaria, Rus’ and England can be stated. At the same time, similarities can be seen rather in the pairs of states under comparison: Rus’ and Bulgaria, Rus’ and England, England and Bulgaria. Common features for all three regions are: the persistence of state genesis and its pronounced phasing, a huge role of external and military factors as well as Christianization. The process of state genesis was the longest in England: from the 6th to the middle of 11th centuries. In Bulgaria it lasted from the end of the 7th century to the beginning of the 10th (Simeon’s ‘empire’). In Rus’ this process was the shortest: the ninth and tenth centuries only, considering the emergence of the patrimonial land property and creation of the first unified code – the Russian Law.

As for the external factors, it was partly common for Rus’ and England, as both countries were influenced by the Vikings, and for Rus’ and Bulgaria, which experienced the nomadic and Byzantine influence. But there is no common factors for England and Bulgaria, unless we compare Vikings’ conquest of England with the invasion of Russian Prince Svyatoslav in Bulgaria. As for direct contacts between three states, the only one was a marriage of Vladimir Monomakh to Gytha, a daughter of the last Anglo-Saxon King Harold.

Military factors were diverse for all three states: wars of conquest, predatory, unifying, defensive, internecine and even ‘religious’ wars. But their role and value were different on different stages of state genesis. In England and Rus’ defensive wars against the Vikings and nomads played crucial role in transition from the complex chiefdom to early state. In Bulgaria the lost defensive war with Byzantium in 960-s became a catalyst in conversion to Orthodoxy, which had an important role for completing of the Bulgarian state genesis. In Rus’ Christianization ‘crowns’ this process, and in England it happened on its initial stage.

## ИСПОЛЗВАНА ЛИТЕРАТУРА (REFERENCES)

- Ангелов 1987:** Д. Ангелов. Проблемы догосударственного периода на будущей территории Болгарского государства. – В: *Этносоциальная и политическая структура раннефеодальных славянских государств и народностей*. Ред. Д. Ангелов и др. Москва, 1987, 7 – 15. [D. Angelov. Problemy dogosudarstvennogo perioda na budushtey territorii Bolgarskogo gosudarstva. – V: *Этносоциальная и политическая структура раннефеодальных славянских государств и народностей*. Red. D. Angelov i dr. Moskva, 1987, 7 – 15.]
- Андреев 1994:** Й. Андреев. *Българските ханове и царе VII – XIV век. Историко – хронологичен справочник*. Пловдив: Петър Берон, 1994. [Y. Andreev. Balgarskite hanove i tsare VII – XIV vek. Istoriko – hronologichen spravochnik. Plovdiv: Petar Beron, 1994.]
- Бондаренко 2001:** Д. Бондаренко. *Доимперский Бенин: формирование и эволюция системы социально – политических институтов*. Москва: Институт Африки РАН, 2001. [D. Bondarenko. *Doimperskiy Benin: formirovanie i evolyutsia sistemy sotsialno – politicheskikh institutov*. Moskva: Institut Afriki RAN, 2001.]
- Глебов 1998:** А. Глебов. *Англия в раннее средневековье*. Воронеж: Изд-во Воронеж, 1998. [A. Glebov. *Anglia v rannee srednevekovye*. Voronezh: Izd-vo Voronezh, 1998.]
- Глебов 2003:** А. Глебов. *Альфред Великий и Англия его времени*. Воронеж: Изд-во Воронеж, 2003. [A. Glebov. *Alyfred Velikiy i Anglia ego vremeni*. Voronezh: Izd-vo Voronezh, 2003.]
- Иванова 1987:** О. Иванова. Формы политической организации славянского общества в центральной и восточной частях Балканского полуострова в VII – VIII вв. – В: *Этносоциальная и политическая структура раннефеодальных славянских государств и народностей*. Ред. Г. Г. Литаврин. Москва, 1987, 56 – 65. [O. Ivanova. Formy politicheskoy organizatsii slavyanskogo obshtestva v tsentralynoy i vostochnoy chastyah Balkanskogo poluostrova v VII – VIII vv. – V: *Этносоциальная и политическая структура раннефеодальных славянских государств и народностей*. Red. G. G. Litavrin. Moskva, 1987, 56 – 65.]
- Карамзин 1989:** Н. Карамзин. *История государства российского*. Т. 1. М.: Книга, 1989. [N. Karamzin. *Istoriya gosudarstva rossijskogo*. Т. 1. М.: Книга, 1989.]
- Койчева, Кочев 1991:** Е. Койчева, Н. Кочев. Болгарское государство с середины VIII до конца IX века. – В: *Раннефеодальные государства и народности (южные и западные славяне VI – XII вв.)*. Ред. Г. Г. Литаврин. М., 1991, 51 – 68. [E. Koycheva, N. Kochev. Bolgarskoe gosudarstvo s serediny VIII do kontsa IX veka. – V: *Раннефеодальные государства и народности (yuzhnyie i zapadnyie slavyane VI – XII vv.)*. Red. G. G. Litavrin. M., 1991, 51 – 68.]
- Константин Порфирогенет 1991:** Константин Порфирогенет. *Об управлении империей*. М.: Наука, 1991. [Konstantin Porfirogenet. *Ob upravlenii imperiyej*. М.: Nauka, 1991.]
- Королюк 1972:** В. Королюк. О так называемой «контактной» зоне в Юго – восточной и Центральной Европе периода раннего средневековья. – В: *Юго-Восточная Европа в средние века. Вып. 1*. Ред. Я. С. Гроссул. Кишнев, 1972, 31 – 46. [V. Korolyuk. O tak nazываемoy «kontaktnoy» zone v Yugo – vostochnoy i Tsentralynoy Evrope perioda rannego srednevekovyya. – V: *Yugo-Vostochnaya*

*Evropa v srednie veka. Вып. I. Red. Ya. S. Grossul. Kishenev, 1972, 31 – 46.]*

**Королюк 1975:** В. Королюк. Основные проблемы формирования контактной зоны в Юго – Восточной Европе и необъединенный регион в Восточной и Центральной Европе. – В: *Проблемы социально – экономических формаций / ред. Е. М. Жуков. М., 1975, 158 – 184.* [V. Korolyuk. Osnovnye problemy formirovaniya kontaktnoy zony v Yugo – Vostochnoy Evrope i neobaedinennyy region v Vostochnoy i Tsentralnoy Evrope. – V: *Problemy sotsialno – ekonomicheskikh formatsiy / red. E. M. Zhukov. M., 1975, 158 – 184.]*

**Коротаев 1997:** А. Коротаев. *Сабейские этюды. Некоторые общие тенденции и факторы эволюции Сабейской цивилизации.* М.: Восточная литература, 1997. [A. Korotayev. *Sabejskiye etyudy. Nekotoryye obshchiye tendentsii i faktory evolyutsii Sabejskoj tsivilizatsii.* М.: Vostochnaya literatura, 1997.]

**Коротаев 2000:** А. Коротаев. От государства к вожеству? От вожества к племени? (Некоторые общие тенденции развития социально – политических систем южных арабов за последние 3000 лет. – В: *Ранние формы социальной организации. Генезис, функционирование, историческая динамика / ред. В. А. Попов. СПб, 2000, 224 – 302.* [A. Korotayev. Ot gosudarstva k vozhdstvu? Ot vozhdstva k plemeni? (Nekotorye obshchie tendentsii razvitiya sotsialno – politicheskikh sistem yuzhnykh arabov za poslednie 3000 let. – V: *Rannie formy sotsialnoy organizatsii. Genezis, funktsionirovanie, istoricheskaya dinamika / red. V. A. Popov. SPb, 2000, 224 – 302.]*

**Корсунский 1963:** А. Корсунский. *Образование раннефеодального государства в Западной Европе.* М.: Изд-во МГУ,

1963. [A. Korsunskij. *Obrazovaniye rannefeodal'nogo gosudarstva v Zapadnoy YEvrope.* М.: Izd-vo MGU, 1963.]

**Крадин 2000:** Н. Крадин. Имперская конфедерация хунну: социальная организация суперсложного вожества. – В: *Ранние формы социальной организации. Генезис, функционирование, историческая динамика. Ред. В. А. Попов. СПб., 2000, 195 – 223.* [N. Kradin. Imperskaya konfederatsia hunnu: sotsialnaya organizatsia superslozhnogo vozhdstva. – V: *Rannie formy sotsialnoy organizatsii. Genezis, funktsionirovanie, istoricheskaya dinamika. Red. V. A. Popov. SPb., 2000, 195 – 223.]*

**Крадин 2004:** Н. Крадин. *Политическая антропология.* М.: Логос, 2004. [N. Kradin. *Politicheskaya antropologiya.* М.: Logos, 2004.]

**Куббель 1988:** Л. Куббель. *Очерки потестарно – политической этнографии.* М.: Наука, 1988. [L. Kubbel'. *Ocherki potestarno – politicheskoy etnografii.* М.: Nauka, 1988.]

**Ларионов 1993:** В. Ларионов. *Англосаксонские завоевание Британии и борьба за политическое господство (сер. IV в. – VII в.):* Дисс. канд. истор. наук. М., 1993. [Valerij Larionov. *Anglosaksonskiye zavoeyevaniye Britanii i bor'ba za politicheskoye gospodstvo (ser. IV v. – VII v.):* Diss. kand. istor. nauk. М., 1993.]

**Литаврин, Наумов 1991:** Г. Литаврин, Е. Наумов. Этнические процессы в Центральной и Юго – Восточной Европе и особенности формирования раннефеодальных славянских народностей. – В: *Раннефеодальные государства и народности (южные и западные славяне VI – XII вв.).* Ред. Г. Г. Литаврин. М., 1991, 232 – 250. [G. Litavrin, E. Naumov. *Etnicheskie protsessy v Tsentralnoy i Yugo – Vostochnoy Evrope i osobennosti*

formirovaniya rannefeodalnykh slavyanskikh narodnostey. – V: Rannefeodalnyye gosudarstva i narodnosti (yuzhnyye i zapadnyye slavyane VI – XII vv.). Red. G. G. Litavrin. M., 1991, 232 – 250.]

**Мельникова 1993:** Е. Мельникова. Предпосылки возникновения и характер «северной конфедерации племен». – В: *Восточная Европа в древности и Средневековье: Спорные проблемы истории. Чтения памяти В. Т. Паушто*. Ред. А. П. Новосельцев. М. 1993, 53 – 55. [Е. Melynikova. Predposylki vzniknovenia i harakter «severnoy konfederatsii plemen». – V: *Vostochnaya Evropa v drevnosti i Srednevekovye: Spornye problemy istorii*. Chtenia pamyati V. T. Pashuto. Red. A. P. Novoselytsev. M. 1993, 53 – 55.]

**Метлицкая 2003:** З. Метлицкая. *Англосаксонская Англия и Нормандское завоевание*. М.: РАН, 2003. [Z. Metlitskaya. *Anglosaksonskaya Angliya i Normandskoye zavoyevaniye*. M.: RAN, 2003.]

**Погодин 1847:** М. Погодин. *Исследования, замечания и лекции о русской истории*. Т. 3. М., 1847. [M. Pogodin. *Issledovaniya, zamechaniya i lektsii o russkoj istorii*. Т. 3. М., 1847.]

**Попов 1990:** В. Попов. *Этносоциальная история аканов в XVI – XIX веках*. М.: Наука, 1990. [V. Popov. *Etnosotsial'naya istoriya akonov v XVI – XIX vekakh*. M.: Nauka, 1990.]

**Савело 1977:** К. Савело. *Раннефеодальная Англия*. Л.: Издательство Ленинградского университета, 1977. [K. Savelo. *Rannefeodal'naya Angliya*. L.: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1977.]

**Сидорова 2004:** Т. Сидорова. *Формирование и развитие критического направления в английской историографии конца XIX – начала XX вв.* Автореферат дисс. докт. истор. наук. Казань, 2004. [T. Sidorova. *Formirovaniye i razvitiye kriticheskogo*

*napravleniya v anglijskoj istoriografii kontsa XIX – nachala XX vv.* Avtoreferat diss. dokt. istor. nauk. Kazan', 2004.]

**Тыпкова-Заимова 1987:** В. Тыпкова-Заимова. *Формы власти в Византии и в балканских государствах: До X в.* – В: *Этносоциальная и политическая структура раннефеодальных славянских государств и народностей*. Ред. Г. Г. Литаврин. М., 1987, 37 – 51. [V. Typkova-Zaimova. *Formy vlasti v Vizantii i v balkanskih gosudarstvah: Do X v.* – V: *Etnosotsial'naya i politicheskaya struktura rannefeodalnykh slavyanskikh gosudarstv i narodnostey*. Red. G. G. Litavrin. M., 1987, 37 – 51.]

**Шарифжанов 2004:** И. Шарифжанов. *Английская историография в XX веке. Основные теоретико – методологические тенденции, школы и направления*. Казань: Изд-во Казанск, 2004. [I. Sharifzhanov. *Angliyskaya istoriografya v XX veke. Osnovnyye teoretiko – metodologicheskie tendentsii, shkoly i napravlenia*. Kazany: Izd-vo Kazansk, 2004.]

**Шинаков 1987:** Е. Шинаков. *Русы IX – середины XI вв. (контент – анализ восточных источников). Культура и история Средневековой Руси.* – В: *Тезисы конференции, посвященной 85-летию А. В. Арциховского*. М., 1987, 96 – 99. [E. Shinakov. *Rusy IX – serediny XI vv. (kontent – analiz vostochnykh istochnikov). Kulytura i istoria Srednevekovoy Rusi.* – V: *Tezisy konferentsii, posvyashthennoy 85-letiyu A. V. Artsihovskogo*. M., 1987, 96 – 99.]

**Шинаков 1993:** Е. Шинаков. *Нетрадиционные источники по реконструкции процесса формирования древнерусской государственности (к постановке проблемы).* – В: *Отечественная и всеобщая история методология, источниковедение, историография*. Ред. Ю. В. Жуков и др. Брянск, 1993, 177 – 184. [E. Shinakov. *Netraditsionnyye istochniki po rekonstruktsii*

protsesta formirovaniya drevnerusskoy gosudarstvennosti (k postanovke problemy). – V: *Otechestvennaya i vseobshtaya istoria metodologiya, istochnikovedenie, istoriografiya*. Red. Yu. V. Zhurov i dr. Bryansk, 1993, 177 – 184.]

**Шинаков 2000а:** Е. Шинаков. Племена Восточной Европы накануне и во время генезиса Древнерусского государства. – В: *Ранние формы социальной организации. Генезис, функционирование, историческая динамика*. Red. В. А. Попов. СПб., 2000, 303 – 347. [Е. Shinakov. Plemena Vostochnoy Evropy nakanune i vo vremya genezisa Drevnerusskogo gosudarstva. – V: *Rannie formy sotsialnoy organizatsii. Genezis, funktsionirovanie, istoricheskaya dinamika*. Red. V. A. Popov. SPb., 2000, 303 – 347.]

**Шинаков 2000б:** Е. Шинаков. Формы ранней государственности западных славян IX – XII вв. (вопрос о дружинном государстве). – В: *Право: история, теория, практика*. Red. И. А. Тарасова и др. Брянск, 2000, 138 – 150. [Е. Shinakov. Formy ranney gosudarstvennosti zapadnykh slavyan IX – XII vv. (vopros o družinnom gosudarstve). – V: *Pravo: istoria, teoria, praktika*. Red. I. A. Tarasova i dr. Bryansk, 2000, 138 – 150.]

**Шинаков 2001:** Е. Шинаков. О так называемой «Византийско – болгарской модели государственности в славянском мире». – В: *Славяне и их соседи. Становление славянского мира и Византия в эпоху раннего средневековья*. Red. Г. Г. Литаврин. М., 2001, 126 – 128. [Е. Shinakov. O tak nazываемой «Vizantiysko – bolgarskoy modeli gosudarstvennosti v slavyanskom mire». – V: *Slavyane i ih sosedi. Stanovlenie slavyanskogo mira i Vizantia v epohu rannego srednevekovyya*. Red. G. G. Litavrin. M., 2001, 126 – 128.]

**Шинаков 2002:** Е. Шинаков. *Образование Древнерусского Государства: Сравнительно – исторический аспект*. Брянск: Издательство БГУ, 2002. [Y. Shinakov. *Obrazovaniye Drevnerusskogo Gosudarstva: Sravnitel'no – istoricheskij aspekt*. Bryansk: Izdatel'stvo BGU, 2002.]

**Шинаков 2003:** Е. Шинаков. Опыт формализованной классификации государств Древности и Средневековья. – В: *Эволюция 1*, 2003, 39 – 41. [Е. Shinakov. Oпыr formalizovannoy klassifikatsii gosudarstv Drevnosti i Srednevekovyya. – V: *Evolyutsia 1*, 2003, 39 – 41.]

**Шинаков 2005:** Е. Шинаков. Опыт формализованной классификации государств Древности и Средневековья. – В: *Эволюция 2*, 2005, 47 – 49. [Е. Shinakov. Oпыr formalizovannoy klassifikatsii gosudarstv Drevnosti i Srednevekovyya. – V: *Evolyutsia 2*, 2005, 47 – 49.]

**Шинаков 2006:** Е. Шинаков. Форма государственности украинского Гетманства XVII в. – В: *Ucrainica Petropolitana. Вып. 1*. Red. Т. Г. Яковлева. СПб., 2006, 97 – 107. [Е. Shinakov. Forma gosudarstvennosti ukrainskogo Getmanstva XVII v. – V: *Ucrainica Petropolitana*. Выр. 1. Red. T. G. Yakovleva. SPb., 2006, 97 – 107.]

**Шинаков, Гурьянов 2002:** Е. Шинаков, Валерий Гурьянов. «Славяне» и «Русы» IX – начала X вв.: сравнительный контент – анализ «восточных» источников. – В: *Русский сборник. Сборник научных трудов, посвященный 25-летию исторического факультета БГУ*. Брянск, 2002, 186 – 207. [Е. Shinakov, Valeriy Guryanov. «Slavyane» i «Rusy» IX – nachala X vv.: sravnitel'nyy kontent – analiz «vostochnykh» istochnikov. – V: *Russkiy sbornik. Sbornik nauchnykh trudov, posvyashtenny 25-letiyu istoricheskogo fakulyteta BGU*. Bryansk, 2002, 186 – 207.]

- Carneiro 1970:** R. Carneiro. Theory of the Origin of the State. – *Science*, 169 (2008), 733 – 738.
- Carneiro 2000:** R. Carneiro. Process vs. Stages: A False Dichotomy in Tracing the Rise of the State. – *Alternatives of Social Evolution* (2000), 52 – 58.
- Carneiro 2004:** R. Carneiro. Was the Chieftdom a Congelation of Ideas? – *The Early State, its Alternatives and Analogues* (2004), 28 – 45.
- Claessen 2000:** H. Claessen. Problems, Paradoxes, and Prospects of Evolutionism. – *Alternatives of Social Evolution* (2000), 1 – 11.
- Claessen 2006:** H. Claessen. Developments in Evolutionism. – *Social Evolution & History* 5,1, 2006, 3 – 41.
- Claessen, Kloos 1981:** H. Claessen, P. Kloos. *Current Issues in Anthropology: The Netherlands*. Rotterdam: Anthropological Branch of the Netherlands Sociological and Anthropological Society, 1981.
- Claessen, Skalnik 1978a:** H. Claessen, P. Skalnik. *The Early State*. The Hague: Mouton, 1978.
- Claessen, Skalnik 1978b:** H. Claessen, P. Skalnik. Limits: Beginning and End of the Early State. – *The Early State*, 1978, 619 – 636.
- Fried 1967:** M. Fried. *Evolution of Political Society. An Essay in Political Anthropology*. New York: Random House, 1967.
- Haas 1982:** J. Haas. *The Evolution of the Prehistoric State*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
- Service 1971:** E. Service. *Primitive Social Organization. An Evolutionary Perspective*. New York: Random House, 1971.
- Service 1975:** E. Service. *Origins of the State and Civilization*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1975.
- Service 1978:** E. Service. Classical and Modern Theories of the Origins of Government. – *Origins of the State: The Anthropology of Political Evolution*, 1978, 21 – 34.

**Prof. Shinakov Evgeny,**

Bryansk State University after academician I. G. Petrovsky, Bryansk, Russia (Брянский государственный университет имени академика И. Г. Петровского, Брянск, Россия),  
shinakov@mail.ru

**Fedosov Andrey,**

Bryansk State University after academician I. G. Petrovsky, Bryansk, Russia (Брянский государственный университет имени академика И. Г. Петровского, Брянск, Россия)