

## THE CAMPAIGNS OF THE RUS' IN THE BALKANS IN THE MIDDLE OF THE 9<sup>TH</sup> AND THE END OF THE 10<sup>TH</sup> CENTURIES IN UKRAINIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE TURN OF THE XX – XXI CENTURIES

*Evgeniy Shinakov, Andrey Fedosov*

**Abstract:** *The report includes preliminary results of the research on this topic within the framework of the grant of the Russian Science Foundation “Ukrainian Historiography of Medieval Rus’ at the End of XX – Beginning of XXI Centuries: Concepts, Origins, Trends”. It draws attention mainly to the internal aspect and consequences of the campaigns of the Rus’ against the “Greeks” and Bulgarians: changes in the composition of participants in connection with the dynamics of the structures of Rus’ from the middle of the ninth to the end of the tenth century, creating favorable conditions for Christianization. From the external aspects the emphasis is made only on the desire of Svyatoslav to move the capital of Rus’ to the territory of Bulgaria and the beginning of the Pecheneg aggression as a reaction of Byzantium to the campaigns of Svyatoslav. Original, though contradictory to the sources, is the point of view that in 987 the “Tauro-Scythian” help to the basileus was rendered not against the rebellion of Bardas Phokas, but against the Bulgarians. A lot of attention is paid to Vladimir’s “forced” campaign to Korsun in 988, its religious and political consequences. In addition, an interesting idea of Pritsak is presented, who calls the Rus’ “the nomads of the sea”, comparing their model of interaction with sedentary societies with that of the steppe nomads.*

**Keywords:** *campaigns against Byzantium, the Rus’ people, politics, economy, religion, Ukrainian historiography of Ancient Rus’.*

Modern Russian historiography is interested in the Rus’ campaigns of the middle 9<sup>th</sup> – the end of 10<sup>th</sup> centuries on Byzantium, its enclaves and Bulgaria in terms of reliability of data, and also in aspect of their contamination with socio-political processes in Russia. This is due to the prevailing political-anthropological approach or, in other terms, the methodology and methods of sociocultural anthropology. These campaigns are regarded as one of the main ways of exoexploita-

tion, i.e. obtaining an “added” (surplus) product for the ruling upper class of the union of “Rosia” with “Slavinias” at the stage of transition from chiefdoms to the early state. Other issues (military aspect, Christianization, ethnic composition of the participants of the campaigns), if mentioned, play a minor role.

It is all the more interesting to compare other, modern Ukrainian, concepts of medieval Russian studies on this aspect, which also go back to a

<sup>1</sup> The research was supported by the Russian Scientific Foundation grant № 23-28-00281 “Ukrainian historiography of medieval Rus’ in the late XX – early XXI century: concepts, origins, trends”.

common source – historiography mainly Soviet, to a lesser extent emigrant. It should be noted that the findings of this report are preliminary, as the research under the grant under which it was carried out has only just begun. However, selectively it was possible to study a kind of “reference” Ukrainian works of different types and purposes: purely scientific, scientific with ideological overtones, popular science, aimed at different audiences, educational for higher and elementary school, and up to recent years, and not only in Ukrainian, but also in Russian and English.

Undoubtedly, the most outstanding representative of the scientific thought of Ukraine in the study of ancient Rus’ was and still remains Petr Tolochko. His conceptual works are dated 1987, 1996, 2016, 2020, which allows us to trace the dynamics of his views.

In a 1987 work, the early Kievan princes – Kiy, Askold and Dir, and even the embassy of “chacanus Rhos” to Byzantium in 838 are used to counter the “Norman theory”. It is proved that all these princes were Slavs, and even ambassadors of 838 – “ex gentis Sueonum” – although Swedes, but on service of the East Slavic state. Oleg’s campaign of 907 was caused by “Bulgaria’s request to help her in her struggle with Byzantium” (Толочко 1987: 26), and the main result was the trade treaties of 907 and 911. Igor’s campaigns were a response to the perfidy of Byzantine diplomacy, which, taking advantage of Russian help in the fight against the Muslims, set the Pechenegs against Russia, fearing its strengthening (Толочко 1987: 39). The treaty of 944 was not a defeat for Igor, but was mutually beneficial. The campaigns of Svyatoslav to the Balkans were caused by desire of the Byzantium diplomacy to push Russia with Bulgaria, thus weakening both powers. As a positive result of the campaigns of “Rus to Tsargrad” P. Tolochko repeatedly notes the process of its gradual Christianization, beginning with Askold and Dir (860/867).

The same ideas are traced in the scientific part of the 1996 book, devoted to Svyatoslav, Vladimir and Yaroslav the Wise. About reasons of Vladimir’s campaign to Korsun it is not told anything, except that this city was a place of his christening. Indirectly – an argument for that to receive the permission to marry Princess Anna.

In a 2016 work “Where The Russian Land Comes from”, published in Russian, but in Kiev, the author again emphasizes the Christianization significance of the 860’s campaign of Askold and Dir. As for Oleg’s campaign of 907, its main goal was “to impose on Byzantium his partnership based on clear legal regulation” (Толочко 2018: 135). Summarizing a brief description of the campaigns of Oleg, Igor, Svyatoslav to the Balkans, and Vladimir to Crimea, P. Tolochko concludes their goal as “gaining an opportunity to trade freely in the Byzantine markets, which was impossible without a demonstration of military power” (Толочко 2018: 139).

In general, the works of the unconditional leader of the Ukrainian Soviet, and post-Soviet as well, historiography feel Marxist basic training, in early works there is a “feudal” terminology. He obviously follows the theory of Rybakov, implicitly – Grushevsky.

**Scientific and Ideological Literature.** In the book of 2020 “From Rus’ to Ukraine” P. Tolochko on the basis of scientific arguments and apparatus proves clearly a point of view, “not fashionable” for modern Ukraine: she left the “Russian<sup>2</sup> world” and only there she can take place as a nation and a state (Толочко 2020: 225). The ideological implication of this scientific monograph is evidenced, for example, by the name of one of the sections – “Sovereign Ukraine? A future without a past”. However, on the subject of this report there is almost nothing in it, only that the

<sup>2</sup> P. Tolochko suggested in his 2005 book “The Ancient Rus’ people” to use the adjective “Rusian” with one “s”. Such spelling is nowadays popular among Anglo-American historians as well (e.g., works by C. Raffensperger “Reimagining Europe”, “The Kingdom of Rus” etc.).

first mention of “the Russian land” is connected with the raid to Byzantium at the beginning of the reign of Michael III (842 – 867), and that with “Byzantine history is connected the most important impulse of realization by the Russian people of itself and its place among other enlightened peoples of the world” – the baptism of Rus’ in 988 (Толочко 2020: 17).

The work of a religious philosopher, professor of National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy Vladimir Gors’ky “The Saints of Kievan Rus’” is distinguished by scientific-theological, explicitly ideological orientation. The purpose of his work was to establish the origins of the “soul of the Ukrainian people”, its “moral ideal of the national spirit”. But, at the same time, the work has a scientific apparatus and relies on sources. It, however, mentions only military relations of Rus’ and Byzantium under Vladimir the Saint. They were of two types – Vladimir’s assistance to the basileuses in 987 and 988 in the suppression of the Bulgarian uprising and the rebellion of Bardas Skleros (according to Jacob the Monk) and the siege of Korsun to force the “Greeks” to fulfill the promise to give Princess Anna to Vladimir (Горьский 1994: 72, 73). All these events are described in great detail, with references to different sources.

The campaigns of “the Rus’ on Greeks” are indirectly, though originally and interestingly, concerned by the scientists of Chernigov school. Firstly, they consider, that Igor undertook campaigns of 941 and 944 on Byzantium not on his own initiative, but by force. He was forced by the Khazars after the defeat of his voivode Oleg (according to the Novgorod Chronicle and the Schechter Letter) in 940 under Samkerts (Kerch) from the Khazarian tarkhan Pesakh (Новик, Шевченко 1995: 96 – 97). Secondly, Helgu of the Schechter Letter, at first defeated by Pesakh, and then and Byzantines and died somewhere beyond the sea (in Barda?) – is no other than a representative of a separate Chernigov dynas-

ty not belonging to a kin of Kiev Rurikovich (Уманец, Шевченко 1995: 66).

**Popular Science Literature.** Very detailed, in the artistic style, with the introduction of fictional dialogues and characters, but quite plausible in the popular scientific book by P. Tolochko “Vladimir the Saint. Yaroslav the Wise” describes the march of Vladimir to Korsun in 988. The reason given for it is the desire to marry Princess Anne, as well as the root cause inherent in all previous campaigns “on the Greeks” – favorable trade agreements (Толочко 1996: 51).

To popular science genre with a very dubious scientific component (there is not even a list of literature and sources) can be attributed the “Short course of the history of Ukraine” by Alexander Paliy, 3rd edition of which was released in 2018. Starting the history of Ukrainians with the Tripolie culture and even the last ice age, the author briefly touches on our topic. He clearly adheres to the Polans-Russian concept, and attributes the campaigns to the Byzantium to the “Kievans”, without mentioning other tribes. An original passage is worth noting: that in 971 Svyatoslav left for Rus’ not as a result of defeat and agreement with John Tzimiskes, but “for reinforcement” (Палий 2018).

The ideological predecessor of A. Paliy can be considered M. Chubaty, whose report was heard and condemned even by some Ukrainian historians-emigrants and foreign scientists at the XI International Congress of Historians in Uppsala (Sweden). In it he builds the following genetic chain: the people of Tripolie culture – the Antes – the Ukrainians, creators of Kievan Rus. And only Ukrainians, partly Belarusians, are the heirs of the latter. The report was published in English only in 1964 in New York by the author himself as an appendix to the book (in Ukrainian) “Princely Russia-Ukraine and the emergence of three East Slavic nations”.

The conceptual, written in the popular scientific style, but oriented to the scientific audience and recommended as a manual for teachers and

students of humanities faculties, is the “Civilizational History of Ukraine” (Kiev, 2006). It was prepared with the funds of a joint grant from the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine and the Russian Humanitarian Science Foundation, but almost exclusively by Ukrainian scientists. In particular, the section we are interested in was written by the archaeologist and historian, corresponding member of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine Alexandr Motsya<sup>3</sup>. Without analyzing the causes and course of Russian campaigns to Byzantium, the author uses their description in sources to prove the original Slavic origin of the Rus’ as a people. In particular, A. Motsya denies that the “Sueoni” (Swedes) of the Annales Bertiniani were the ambassadors of the state of the Rus’-Slavs. The fact that they did not give their name (“Sueoni”), but introduced themselves as the messengers of “chacanus Rhos” seems to prove the Slavic background of the Rus’ as well as that they represented the latter and during negotiations with the Byzantines after the campaigns of Oleg and Igor (Гоелов и др. 2006: 163 – 164). That is, the name “Rus” was identical to the ethnonym “Slavs”. In 2010. A. Motsya confirmed the idea that the main prince – “konung” Oleg the Prophetic headed the Rus’, only after having come to Kiev and becoming to manage the Polans which were the main participants of his campaigns against Byzantium (Моця 2010: 290).

The influence of the Polans-Russian concept of academician B. Rybakov is clearly felt here, which is frankly recognized by A. Motsya himself in his later works. However, in them, since 2012, he considers descendants of these Rus’-Slavs only Ukrainians, believing that in the north, in Novgorod, there already existed a separate “external Rosia” of Constantine Porphyrogenitus – the predecessor of Russia, and

its inhabitants were not Eastern Slavs (Motsya 2012: 47, 50).

**Educational Literature.** Incomparably more place is given to the description of the Rus’ campaigns to Byzantium and Bulgaria in school textbooks, at least in 2007 ones. Thus, more than 5 per cent of the text, that expands to the 16<sup>th</sup> century, is devoted to this subject in the seventh grade textbook of Ukrainian-language primary schools, and slightly less in the textbook of other authors in Russian, due to the abundance of applications.

Both textbooks emphasize the importance of the campaign of Askold and Dir, which they, according to the Byzantine tradition, date 860. “Rus’ was for the first time discussed in Europe, and the name of the state got into the Byzantine chronicles” (Свидерский и др. 2007: 35). And also failure of a campaign made Askold and the majority of his retinue to accept Christianity for the first time “under a name Mykola” (Власов 2007: 14 – 15). It is not very clear why Askold is separated from Dir in this episode, although in scientific historiography such a tendency has been observed for a long time<sup>4</sup>. Besides, 860 is not the first year, when the “Rhos” are mentioned. Before that, according to the Annales Bertiniani, their envoys visited Constantinople in 838, seeking “friendship” (Шинаков, Федосов 2022). And in the end of 842 or in the beginning of 843 (Шинаков 2014), having scouted the way before, they attacked Amastris. However, perhaps this eliminates the need to find an answer to the question: how the Bulgarian Empire, which at that time owned 600 kilometers of the Black Sea coast, missed a small embassy of the Rhos, obviously sailing along the coast along an as yet unknown route (Шинаков, Джамбов 2013). And the passage of their flotillas in 842/843 and 860 clearly suggests if not a military alliance of the Rus’ with the Bulgarians of anti-Byzantine orientation, then some kind of agreement, which

<sup>3</sup> In the 1980s, A. Motsya was one of the leaders of the Novgorod-Seversk expedition, the joint Academy of Sciences of the USSR and Ukraine, Chernigov and Bryansk pedagogical institutes.

<sup>4</sup> For Ukrainian editions see, e.g.: Лебедев 1994.



Ukrainian (and not only) historiography does not pay attention to.

The textbook in Russian describes in particular the campaigns of Svyatoslav, the reason for which was the intervention in the war between Byzantium and Bulgaria, but it is not specified on whose side. The impression of defeat of Svyatoslav is reduced, because his peace with John Tzimiskes is called “honorable”, and the peace of Igor conducted before (in 944) was “advantageous” for Rus’ (Свидерский и др 2007: 35, 43). Only the textbook in Russian language mentions, very briefly though, the reasons of the campaigns – the imposition on Byzantium advantageous trade for Rus’ with military methods (Свидерский и др. 2007: 35 – 36). Both textbooks emphasize that the 860 campaign was led only by Askold (without Dir). The textbook in Ukrainian says that one of the results of this campaign was the Christianization of the Rus’ (Власов 2007: 14 – 15). But the “Russian” textbook says that the Byzantines called Askold “Hagan” (Свидерский и др. 2007: 30). The term “Ukraine” is not used in any textbooks in relation to these events.

In this regard, Ukrainian school textbooks are radically different from, for example, the textbooks for the “Native Schools”, originally prepared in an emigrant environment in Canada. In particular, in the “historical stories” of Anton Lototsky, written before 1949, but in Ukraine published only in 1991, in the collection “Princely Glory” (in Toronto in 1984 the collection was entitled “Glory of Past Ages”), Svyatoslav protected the “eastern borders of Ukraine” from the Khazars and Pechenegs. In general, children were suggestive that the reason of the campaigns of the Kiev princes (“knights”) to the Byzantium was the yearn for glory and honor both for themselves and their retinues (Лотоцький 1984 – 1991: 25 – 26). In general, the description of these campaigns resembles a heroic epos, defeats are either omitted, or, as in the case of Askold and Dir, act as a reason for positive changes – the

first appearance in Kiev of the “Light of Christ”. No wonder, that in modern textbooks of 2015 and 2020 Rus’ is called Rus’-Ukraine (Дудар, Гук 2020: 5,14 etc.; Гисем 2015: 10, 12 etc.; Гисем, Мартинюк 2015: 18, 26 etc.; Сорочинська, Гисем 2020: 8, 9 etc.).

## REFERENCES:

- Власов 2007:** В. С. Власов. *Історія України*. Київ, 2007. [V. S. Vlasov. *Istoriia Ukraini*. Kiiiv, 2007.]
- Гисем 2015:** О. В. Гисем. *Історія України: підруч. для 7 класу*. Тернопіль: Навчальна книга – Богдан, 2015. [O. V. Gisem. *Istoriia Ukraini: pidruch. dlia 7 klasu*. Ternopil': Navchal'na kniga – Bogdan, 2015.]
- Гисем, Мартинюк 2015:** О. В. Гисем, О. О. Мартинюк. *Історія України: підруч. для 7 класу*. Харків: Вид-во «Ранок», 2015. [O. V. Gisem, O. O. Martinyuk. *Istoriia Ukraini: pidruch. dlia 7 klasu*. Khar'kiv: Vid-vo «Ranok», 2015.]
- Горелов и др. 2006:** М. Е. Горелов, О. П. Моця, О. О. Рафальский. *Цивілізаційна історія України. Нариси*. Київ: «УПВК ЕксОб», 2006. [M. YE. Gorelov, O. P. Motsya, O. O. Rafal'skiy. *Tsivilizatsiyna istoriya Ukraini. Narisi*. Kiiiv: «UPVK YEksOb», 2006.]
- Горьский 1994:** В. С. Горьский. *Святі Київської Русі*. Київ: Абрис, 1994. [V. S. Gor'skiy. *Svyati Kiivskoy Rusi*. Kiiiv: Abris, 1994.]
- Дудар, Гук 2020:** О. В. Дудар, О. І. Гук. *Історія України: підруч. для 7 класу*. Київ: Видавничий дім, Освіта, 2020. [O. V. Dudar, O. I. Guk. *Istoriia Ukraini: pidruch. dlia 7 klasu*. Kiiiv: Vidavnichii dim, Osvita, 2020.]
- Лебедев 1994:** Г. С. Лебедев. Русь Рюрика, Русь Аскольда, Русь Дира. – В: *Старожитности Руси – Украины*. Київ, 1994, 146–153. [G. S. Lebedev. Rus' Riurika, Rus' Askol'da, Rus' Dira. – V: *Starozhitnosti Rusi – Ukraini*. Kiiiv, 1994, 146 – 153.]
- Лотоцький 1984/1991:** А. Лотоцький. *Княжа слава. Історичні оповідання*. Торонто-Київ, 1984/1991. [A. Lotots'kiy. *Kniazha slava. Istorichni opovidannia*. Toronto-Kiyev, 1984/1991.]
- Моця 2010:** О. П. Моця. «Русь» на півдні східнослов'янського світу. – В: *Русское наследие в странах Центральной и Восточной Европы. Материалы Межгосударственной конференции 5 – 8 июля 2010 года (г. Брянск), приуроченной к 600-летию битвы при Грюнвальде*. Под ред. А. В. Антюхова и др. Брянск: БГУ – фонд «Русский мир», 2010, 290 – 300. [O. P. Motsya. «Rus» na pivdni skhidnoslov'yanskogo svitu. – V: *Russkoye nasledie v stranakh Tsentral'noy i Vostochnoy YEvropy. Materialy Mezghosudarstvennoy konferentsii 5 – 8 iyulya 2010 goda (g. Bryansk), priurochennoy k 600-letiyu bitvy pri Gryunval'de*. Pod red. A. V. Antyukhova i dr. Bryansk: BGU – fond «Russkiy mir», 2010, 290 – 300.]
- Моця 2012:** А. П. Моця. Начало древнерусской государственности – конец древнерусской народности. Образование Русского государства в IX – XI вв. и его возрождение после «Смуты». – В: *Международная конференция, приуроченная к 1150-летию образования Древнерусского государства (25 – 27 ноября 2012 г.)*. Под ред. Антюхова А. В. и др. Брянск: «Курсив», 2012, 43 – 51. [A. P. Motsya. Nachalo drevnerusskoy gosudarstvennosti – konets drevnerusskoy narodnosti. Obrazovaniye Russkogo gosudarstva v IX – XI vv. i yego vrozozhdeniye posle «Smuty». – V: *Mezhdunarodnaya konferentsiya, priurochennaya k 1150-letiyu obrazovaniya Drevnerusskogo gosudarstva (25 – 27 noyabrya 2012 g.)*. Pod red. Antyukhova A. V. i dr. Bryansk: «Kursiv», 2012, 43 – 51.]
- Новик, Шевченко 1995:** Т. Г. Новик, Ю. Ю. Шевченко. Княжеская династия Чернигова и киевские Рюриковичи. – В: *Деснинские древности. Материалы межгосударственной научной конференции «История и археология Подесенья», посвящённой Ф. М. Заверняеву*. Под ред. В. П. Алексеева и др. Брянск, 1995, 96 – 100. [T. G. Novik, Yu. Yu. Shevchenko. Kniazheskaia dinastiia Chernigova i kievskie Riurikovichi. – V: *Desninskiye drevnosti. Materialy mezghosudarstvennoy nauchnoy konferentsii «Istoriya i arkheologiya Podesen'ya», posvyashchyonnoy F. M. Zavernyayevu*. Pod red. V. P. Alekseyeva i dr. Bryansk, 1995, 96 – 100.]

- Палий 2018:** О. Палий. *Короткий курс історії України*. Київ, 2018. [O. Paliy. *Korotkii kurs istorii Ukraini*. Kiiv, 2018.]
- Свидерский и др. 2007:** Ю. Ю. Свидерский, Т. В. Ладыченко, Н. Ю. Романишин. *История Украины. Учебник для 7 класса*. Киев, 2007. [Yu. Yu. Sviderskiy, T. V. Ladychenko, N. Yu. Romanishin. *Istoriia Ukrainy. Uchebnik dlia 7 klasse*. Kiev, 2007.]
- Сорочинська, Гисем 2020:** Н. М. Сорочинська, О. О. Гисем. *Історія України: підруч. для 7 класу*. Богдан, 2020. [N. M. Sorochin'ska, O. O. Gisem. *Istoriia Ukraini: pidruch. dlia 7 klasu*. Bogdan, 2020.]
- Толочко 1987:** П. П. Толочко. *Древняя Русь. Очерки социально-политической истории*. Киев: Наукова думка, 1987. [P. P. Tolochko. *Drevnyaya Rus. Ocherki sotsialno-politicheskoy istorii*. Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1987.]
- Толочко 1996:** П. П. Толочко. *Володимир Святий. Ярослав Мудрий*. Київ: «АртЕк», 1996. [P. P. Tolochko. *Volodimir Svyatyi. Yaroslav Mudriy*. Kiiv: «ArtEk», 1996.]
- Толочко 2005:** П. П. Толочко. *Древнерусская народность*. СПб: Алетея, 2005. [P. P. Tolochko. *Drevnerusskaia narodnost'*. SPb: Aleteya, 2005.]
- Толочко 2016:** П. П. Толочко. *Откуда пошла Русская земля*. Киев, 2016. [P. P. Tolochko. *Otkuda poshla Russkaia zemlia*. Kiiev, 2016.]
- Толочко 2020:** П. П. Толочко. *От Руси до Украины. Пути исторической памяти*. Москва, 2020. [P. P. Tolochko. *Ot Rusi do Ukrainy. Puti istoricheskoi pamiati*. Moskva, 2020.]
- Уманец, Шевченко 1995:** А. Н. Уманец, Ю. Ю. Шевченко. Эволюция Чернигова к X в. в контексте киевской государственности. – В: *Деснинские древности. Материалы межгосударственной научной конференции «История и археология Подесенья», посвящённой Ф. М. Заверняеву*. Под ред. В. П. Алексеева и др. Брянск, 1995, 63 – 66. [A. N. Umanets, Yu. Yu. Shevchenko. *Evoliutsiia Chernigova k X v. v kontekste kievskoi gosudarstvennosti*. – V: *Desninskiye drevnosti. Materialy mezhgosudarstvennoy nauchnoy konferentsii «Istoriya i arkheologiya Podesen'ya», posvyashchyonnoy F. M. Zavernyayevu*. Pod red. V. P. Alekseyeva i dr. Bryansk, 1995, 63 – 66.]
- Шинаков, Джамбов 2013:** Е. А. Шинаков, И. Джамбов. Болгарские аспекты и «посольства хакана рос» 838 – 839 гг. – В: *Сборник за съвмесната музеино-археологическа експедиция Международната издание*. Пловдив – Брянск, 2013, 10 – 12. [YE. A. Shinakov, I. Dzhambov. *Bolgarskie aspekty i «posol'stva khakana ros» 838 – 839 gg.* – V: *Sbornik za s»vmesnata muzeino-arkheologicheska yekspeditsiya Mezhdunarodnata izdaniye*. Plovdiv – Bryansk, 2013, 10 – 12.]
- Шинаков 2014:** Е. А. Шинаков. Три первых упоминания русов (росов) конца 30-х – начала 40-х гг. IX в. в международном аспекте. – В: *Вестник БГУ (Вестник Брянского государственного университета)* 2, 2014, 158 – 165. [YE. A. Shinakov. *Tri pervykh upominaniia rusov (rosov) kontsa 30-kh – nachala 40-kh gg. IX v. v mezhdunarodnom aspekte.* – V: *Vestnik BGU (Vestnik Bryanskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta)* 2, 2014, 158 – 165.]
- Shinakov, Fedosov 2022:** Е. А. Shinakov, A. V. Fedosov. The Geopolitical Context of the Rus' Raid on Seville. – *Вестник СПбГУ (Вестник Санкт-Петербургского государственного университета)*, История, 67, 2022, 1, 5 – 22. [Vestnik SPbGU (Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta), *Istoriya*, 67, 2022, 1, 5 – 22.]

# ПОХОДИТЕ НА РУСИТЕ НА БАЛКАНИТЕ В СРЕДАТА НА IX И КРАЯ НА X ВЕК В УКРАИНСКАТА ИСТОРИОГРАФИЯ ОТ КРАЯ НА XX – НАЧАЛОТО НА XXI ВЕК

**Евгений Шинаков, Андрей Федосов**

**Резюме:** *Работата включва предварителни резултати от изследването по тази тема в рамките на гранта на Руската научна фондация „Украинска историография на средновековната Рус в края на XX – началото на XXI век: концепции, произход, тенденции“. Обърнато е внимание главно на вътрешния аспект и последиците от походите на русите срещу „гърците“ и българите: промени в състава на участниците във връзка с динамиката на структурите на Рус от средата на IX до края на X в., създаващи благоприятни условия за Християнизацията. От външните аспекти се акцентира само върху желанието на Светослав да премести столицата на Рус на територията на България и началото на печенежската агресия като реакция на Византия на походите на Светослав. Оригинално, макар и противоречащо на изворите, е мнението, че през 987 г. „тавро-скитската“ помощ на василевса е оказана не срещу бунта на Вардас Фока, а срещу българите. Много внимание се отделя на „принудителния“ поход на Владимир към Корсун през 988 г., неговите религиозни и политически последици. Също така и върху една интересна идея на Прицак, който нарича русите „номадите на морето“, сравнявайки техния модел на взаимодействие с уседналите общества с този на степните номади.*

**Ключови думи:** *кампании срещу Византия, русите, политика, икономика, религия, украинска историография на Древна Рус.*

**Prof. d.h.s. Yevgeny Shinakov**

ORCID iD: 0000-0002-7151-9948

Bryansk State University named after Academician I. D. Petrovsky

shinakov@mail.ru

**Andrey Fedosov, PhD-candidate**

ORCID iD: 0009-0005-3848-2724

Bryansk State University named after Academician I. D. Petrovsky

fedosov-andrey@yandex.ru