

**Mikhail Raev**

***University of Cambridge***

**The Russian-Byzantine Treaty of 971: Texts and Contexts**

In this paper, I continue my research into the Russian-Byzantine treaty of 971, the first part of which I presented in November 2004 and published in *Revue des études Byzantines* in 2007.

I have to amend my previous report, since new literature has appeared on the Primary Chronicle and on the Chronicle of Simeon the Logothete. D. Ostrowski reviewed his ideas on the composition of the Primary Chronicle, suggesting that it appeared as one text in the 1110s and that one cannot discern any previous historical texts, the remnants of which Shakhmatov had proposed to have been preserved in the Novgorod First Chronicle. Shakhmatov's opinion was affirmed by A. Gippius and L. Müller. S. Wahlgren published a collated edition of thirty manuscripts containing the work of Simeon the Logothete in 2006. There he corrected Kazhdan and pointed out that the Slavonic version of Simeon the Logothete was translated quite late. However, these works do not alter my conception that a work from the family of Simeon's Chronicle was used in the composition of the Primary Chronicle. Elsewhere, I have argued that an anonymous Russian writer borrowed a number of details concerning Sviatoslav's Balkan campaigns from such a work, which most likely included a continuation covering John Tzimiskes' reign. A different work stemming from the Logothete's family of chronicles was used in Skylitzes. I also furthered Shakhmatov's and Siuziumov's ideas on the common data between the Primary Chronicle and Skylitzes. Whereas both scholars proposed a Bulgarian Chronicle similar to Skylitzes', I suggest that it was in fact a Byzantine work. The common pieces of data include: two Rus campaigns; similar Sviatoslav's speeches; similar descriptions of Bulgaria and Pereiaslavets; the transition of the story from Preslav to Dristra; two exchanges of envoys; common places, Dristra and Preslav (=Pereiaslavets); common heroes, Sviatoslav, John Tzimiskes, and common metathesis in the name of Philotheos; and the death of Sviatoslav in the Pecheneg ambush during his journey back home. Most importantly, as I. Sorlin observed, this is the only Russian-Byzantine treaty that was recorded in the Byzantine sources and which has the same date as the one deduced from description of the Byzantine seizure of Dristra. None of the earlier treaties was attested to in the Byzantine sources, nor their dates could be verified.

In this paper, I propose that once we accept this idea of Shakhmatov, we have to disagree with his *stemma codicum* of the works preceding the Primary Chronicle, since not only was the entire Russian-Byzantine treaty of 971 omitted in the Novgorod First Chronicle, but so also was the paragraph before it. This paragraph mentions the transition of military activities from Pereiaslavets, i.e. Preslav, to Dristra. If using Shakhmatov's stemma, one has to prove that the composers of eleventh century Rus chronicles stopped before this paragraph while using data from

the Byzantine source. In the 1110s, this source was still available to the composer of the Primary Chronicle who translated some data of it and continued with the aforementioned paragraph and treaty's text. For this reason, I find more probable what S. Bugoslavskii and D. Ostrowski have proposed, i.e., that the Primary Chronicle was composed as a single text and the omission of data and mixing of texts in later Novgorod Chronicles could be the results of purposeful or unintended redactions. We may conclude that the author of the Primary Chronicle understood correctly the information in the Byzantine work which he had, but that he used only bits and pieces of data and reshaped the plot in order to create current story of Sviatoslav's campaign against Bulgaria and the Byzantine Empire.

I continue with comparison of the terms which both parties agreed according to the Byzantine and Russian written sources and conclude that they were conveyed in detail in Leo the Deacon's history. This Byzantine author wrote that the Russian army would leave Dristra to the Byzantines and would release the captives, and that the Rus would leave Bulgaria and would return to their country. The Byzantines agreed to leave the Rus to withdraw and not to attack them with Greek Fire; to supply them with provisions; and that all Russian merchants visiting Constantinople for trade would be treated as friends. Skylitzes transmits a summary of these terms. In the PVL, by contrast, none of the terms agrees with these recorded by the Byzantine sources. This allowed me to infer in my article and the resume of my previous report that it seems likely that the composer of the Primary Chronicle created or invented the treaty's terms. Even if the text of this treaty was preliminary or its text was shortened, one would not expect to find such discrepancies between the sources.

Indeed, the treaty's text presents certain difficulties with its inconsistency if compared with the earlier tenth-century Russian-Byzantine treaties. For instance, the omission of the name of John Tzimiskes before the Emperors Basil and Constantine is a feature, which I. Sreznevskii and S. Kashtanov tried to explain, although not convincingly. I propose that this omission is purposefully made by the compiler: in extending the treaty's term in the reign of Basil II and Constantine VIII, he transferred all these terms to Vladimir's reign too. In this way, I explain the insertion of the terms concerning the Byzantine Empire, Bulgaria and Chersoneses, which were not to be attacked by the Russian troops, and the Russian obligation to fight against any foe that invades Byzantium. Vladimir broke the last term sending the Varangians to Constantinople, instead of stopping them, although he warned the Emperor not to allow them enter the City. Similar trespasses upon the treaty's terms include Vladimir's attack on the Bulgarians in 985 and the capture of Chersoneses in 987 — although Sviatoslav attacked Bulgaria, we have no information concerning his attack on Chersoneses. I suggest that the Russian-Byzantine treaty of 971 and its text in the Primary Chronicle reflect the literary purposes of the medieval Russian composer and that they play a role in the conversion story of Vladimir, whereas the actual terms reached between Sviatoslav and John Tzimiskes were recorded in the Byzantine sources.

---

**Susan Reynolds**

***The British Library***

**“Lo, here comes Master Hippocras...”: The celebration of chaos in the Czech mediaeval farce *Mastičkář***

Scholars have frequently commented on the blend of the sacred, secular and scatological in *Mastičkář*, a Czech farce written for performance at Easter in the 1340s. While attempts have been made to define this in terms of the Bakhtinian terms of the carnivalesque, these have been opposed by critics who note that certain classes of society, especially the German-speaking nobility, are exempt from satire. The extreme ribaldry of the text has led to puzzlement at its use in a sacred context, culminating in the encounter between the quack doctor of the title and his assistant Rubin and the three Marys coming to buy ointments to anoint the body of Jesus at the Holy Sepulchre. The author compares this portrayal of the *Mastičkář* and his remedies with the Chaucerian figures of the Doctor and the Pardoner, relating the play to the ancient tradition of broad and even bawdy humour in the treatment of the sacred by Aristophanes, a comparison not previously explored.