




Oleksandr Fylypchuk (Chernivtsi)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5185-1743>

THE ATTACK OF THE RUS' ON CONSTANTINOPLE IN THE LIGHT OF THE *CHRONICON BRUXELLENSE**

Abstract. The *Chronicon Bruxellense* does not simply provide useful information on the date of the date (year, month, and day) of the Rus' attack on the Constantinople (18 June 860), but is crucial for a deeper understanding of nature of this chronicle and his sources. The article reveals important details about the date and structure of the *Chronicon Bruxellense*. It also offers his sources of description of Rus' raid and identifies George Monachus Continuatus's chronicle as the principal model. By seeking to construction the victory over the Rus', his anonymous author presents as a skilled compiler. This paper engages with recent discussion on the first attack of Rus' on the Constantinople, while also contributing to the renewed interest in the reception of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* in the late Byzantine literature.

Keywords: the *Chronicon Bruxellense*, George Monachus Continuatus's chronicle, Constantinople, Rus', Byzantine Empire

In 1894, the prominent Belgian scholar Franz Cumont published the so-called *Chronicon Bruxellense*, which survived in manuscript 11376 of the Royal Library of Brussels¹. This brief anonymous chronicle is a list of Roman emperors, beginning with Julius Caesar and ending with the death of Roman III Argyros in 1034, with very short entries or notes dedicated to each emperor. The *Chronicon Bruxellense* has unique information that is not found anywhere in the Byzantine literature². One such piece of information is the exact date (year, month, and day) of the first Rus' attack on Constantinople. According to the *Chronicon Bruxellense* this major date was June 18, 860³. The text contains this full date in three forms which are in complete accordance with each other (by indiction, by the year of Emperor Michael's reign, and by the Byzantine era from the creation of the world).

* I wish to thank the Fondation Maison des sciences de l'homme in Paris for supporting my research during much of the time. I thank the anonymous reviewers for their careful reading of my article and their many insightful comments and suggestions.

¹ *Anecdota Bruxellensia*, vol. I, *Chroniques byzantines du manuscrit 11376*, ed. F. CUMONT, Gand 1894 (cetera: *Anecdota Bruxellensia*).

² L. NEVILLE, *Guide to Byzantine Historical Writing*, Cambridge 2018, p. 135–136.

³ *Anecdota Bruxellensia*, I, p. 33, 15–21.

The emergence of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* caused a real furore among Russian scholars⁴. Much later Alexander Vasiliev wrote the following: *I remember very well our excitement and surprise when we became familiar with the publication of the noted Belgian scholar, Franz Cumont*⁵. Although many scholars (such as V.G. Vasilievski, E.E. Golubinskii and other) believed that 860 was the year of the Rus' attack on Constantinople, the shock caused by the *Chronicon Bruxellense* was justified⁶. A longtime discussion about the date of the first Rus' attack on Constantinople was in full swing when Franz Cumont edited his work. These debates ended in the light of the impact the *Chronicon Bruxellense* had⁷. Now no one doubted that this text was reliable. After Carl de Boor's paper *Der Angriff der Rhos auf Byzanz*, the date June 18, 860 was accepted by all scholars⁸. Skeptics remained of course, but mostly in Ukrainian and Russian academia⁹. In fact, this date of the Rus' attack has no alternative¹⁰. It agrees very well with all other sources and today we have not reflection on the *Chronicon Bruxellense*.

This text, preserved in a single manuscript dating back to the thirteenth century (codex 11376 of the Royal Library of Brussels, fols. 155–165), is interesting in many respects¹¹. First and foremost as a source for Byzantine historiography, since it provides substantial information about the *Chronicon Bruxellense* which is otherwise unknown. However, this brief Byzantine chronicle is not without its problems. Traditionally, its text is conditionally divided into three parts. The first part contains the reign of emperors from Julius Caesar to Constantinius. The second one adds the lists of emperors from Constantine to Michael III. The third one describes the lists of emperors from Basil I to Romanos III Argyros¹². Therefore, the structure of these parts is also heterogeneous: the first and the third parts in-

⁴ В. ВАСИЛЬЕВСКИЙ, *Год первого нашествия русских на Константинополь*, ВВ 1, 1894, p. 258–259.

⁵ А. VASILIEV, *The Russian Attack on Constantinople in 860*, Cambridge 1946, p. 102.

⁶ Е. ГОЛУБИНСКИЙ, *История русской церкви*, vol. I, Москва 1997, p. 40.

⁷ П. КУЗЕНКОВ, *Поход 860 г. на Константинополь и первое крещение Руси в средневековых письменных источниках*, [in:] *Древнейшие государства Восточной Европы. Материалы и исследования. Проблемы источниковедения*, ed. Е. МЕЛЬНИКОВА, Москва 2003, p. 10–11.

⁸ С. DE BOOR, *Der Angriff der Rhos auf Byzanz*, BZ 4, 1895, p. 445–446.

⁹ М. HRUSHEVSKY, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. I, *From Prehistory to the Eleventh Century*, Edmonton–Toronto 1997, p. 437–439. These arguments are elaborated in А. KAZHDAN, *Joseph the Hymnographer and the First Russian Attack on Constantinople*, [in:] *From Byzantium to Iran. In Honour of Nina Garsoïan*, ed. J.-P. МАНÉ, R. THOMSON, Atlanta 1996, p. 187–196.

¹⁰ For more information on this topic, see S. FRANKLIN, J. SHEPARD, *The Emergence of Rus 750–1200*, London–New York 1996, p. 50–52; А. ТОЛОЧКО, *Очерки начальной Руси*, Київ 2015, p. 139–140; J. SHEPARD, *Photios' Sermons on the Rus Attack of 860: the Questions of his Origins, and of the Route of the Rus*, [in:] *Prosopon Rhomaikon. Ergänzende Studien zur Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, ed. А. ВЕИНАММЕР, В. КРÖНУНГ, С. ЛУДВИГ, Berlin–Boston 2017 [= Mil.S, 68], p. 111–128.

¹¹ For a description of this manuscript, see А. КÜLZER, *Studien zum Chronicon Bruxellense*, В 61, 1991, p. 415–422.

¹² *Anecdota Bruxellensia*, I, p. 16–18, 10; 18, 12 – 33, 21; 34, 1–23.

clude limited details, but part two is the most extensive. It contains both detailed entries and some events from each emperor's reign.

The passage about the Rus' attack is crucial for understanding the origins, dating and structure of this chronicle. Thus, in his seminary work, Andreas Külzer suggests that the date and the passage about the Rus' invasion during the reign of Michael III was taken from a "local chronicle"¹³. On the one hand, Külzer admits that this hypothetical "local chronicle" was lost. In other words, he claims that it was only available for the author of the *Chronicon Bruxellense*. On the other hand, Külzer believes that the second part of the chronicle, including the passage about the Rus' invasion, could be written in the 860s. According to his short observation, it was a work of a contemporary of the Rus' attack, who noted the exact date of the event¹⁴. In his two works, Peter Schreiner developed similar ideas. In his opinion, the author of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* used this "local chronicle" only until the reign of Basil I. Schreiner also believes that parts two and three of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* were compiled at different times, however, he provides little evidence for this scenario¹⁵. Thus, Schreiner states that the entry dedicated to the emperors Michael III and Basil I has a so-called structural "failure". He remarks: *The fact that their reigns were named twice – in the final words of part two and the first words of part three – and also that the stylistic design of the third part was completely different clearly speaks about the "failure" at this place. This observation is important for the note about the Rus' at the end of the second part. It does not belong to the editor of the third part, who worked in the 11th century, but refers directly to the period of the reign of Michael III*¹⁶.

As I will show below, these observations are thus not reliable evidence. If this "local chronicle" was surprisingly accessible to the author of the *Chronicon Bruxellense*, then it bypassed all the Byzantine authors who wrote about the first attack of the Rus' on Constantinople. Moreover, there is no certainly that parts two and three of the chronicle could be written at different times. It is difficult to assert that the "second part" of the chronicle or the "local chronicle" were available to the same author who prepared the third part of the chronicle up to the 1030s. In light of the above, certain issues of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* need to be raised. The core of my argument resides in a new analysis of the origins of the narrative about the Rus' in this source. Therefore, my first chapter focuses on the third part of the chronicle and the emergence of the *Chronicon Bruxellense*, the second chapter explores the evidence of the late origins of the story about the attack of the Rus' on Constantinople, while the third we shall see how the compiler of the *Chronicon*

¹³ A. KÜLZER, *Studien zum Chronicon Bruxellense...*, p. 447.

¹⁴ *Ibidem*.

¹⁵ P. SCHREINER, *Miscellanea Byzantino-Russica*, BB 52, 1991, p. 152; EADEM, *Orbis Byzantinus. Byzanz und seine Nachbarn. Gesammelte Aufsätze 1970–2011*, Bucuresti 2013 [= FMHA, 12], p. 196–199.

¹⁶ P. SCHREINER, *Miscellanea Byzantino-Russica...*, p. 152.

Bruxellense appropriated historical citations from other works, when constructing the entries about the Rus' attack.

The Lists of emperors from Basil I to Romanos III Argyros

The author gives no clue as to his identity. One might speculate, however, (as Franz Cumont noted) that the compiler of the texts lived during the reign of Romanos III Argyros and may have been a clergyman in the Stoudios monastery in Constantinople, but the text provides no information about the author's position¹⁷. It must be significant that the chronicle on fols. 155–165 is not comprised of independent texts written by many authors at different times (as imagined by many scholars). According to my observations, only one scribe was working on fols. 155–165. In this regard, the *Chronicon Bruxellense* is not a "collection" of early historical notes or texts, but it is a later short chronicle that appears to have been written after 1030s. This was evidently the time when many authors, both anonymous and Michael Psellos, wrote short chronicles on the period from Julius Caesar to Michael VII or Alexios Comnenos¹⁸.

In this context, little attention was paid to the third part of the *Chronicon Bruxellense*. Unlike other parts, it does not contain different entries regarding prominent events or passages dedicated to the churches, but it retains the identical structure and main rubrics describing certain chronology of the emperor's life and death:

μς'. Βασίλειος ἐκ Μακεδόνων μετὰ Μιχαήλ ἔτος ἐν μῆνας δ' καὶ μόνος ἔτη ιθ' παρὰ ἡμέρας κδ'.
 μζ'. Λέων ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἔτη κς' παρὰ ἡμέρας γ' .
 μη'. Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ αὐτάδελφος αὐτοῦ ἔτος ἐν ἡμέρας κδ' .
 μθ'. Κωνσταντῖνος υἱὸς Λέοντος ὁ Πορφυρογέννητος σὺν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ ἔτη ε'· οὗτος δέ
 ἐστὶν ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τῆς γυναικὸς Λέοντος τοῦ Σοφοῦ.
 ν'. Ῥωμανὸς σὺν Κωνσταντίνῳ τῷ ἑαυτοῦ γαμβρῷ ἔτη κς' .
 να'. Κωνσταντῖνος σὺν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ῥωμανῷ ἔτη ιε' παρὰ ἡμέρας κζ' .
 νβ'. Ῥωμανὸς ὁ υἱὸς Κωνσταντίνου ἔτη γ' μῆνας γ' .

The author of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* adds very little to his list of the emperors. In this case he cites Constantine's epithet πορφυρογέννητος ("born in the purple"), which served to emphasize the legitimacy of the seven-year-old boy on the throne. In addition, he writes correctly that Constantine VII began to reign under his mother's supervision.

νγ'. Νικηφόρος ὁ Φωκᾶς ἔτη ς' μῆνας γ' ἡμέρας κζ'· ὅς καὶ ἐσφάγη ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ ἔσωθεν τοῦ κοιτῶνος αὐτοῦ.

¹⁷ *Anecdota Bruxellensia*, I, p. 15–16.

¹⁸ *Michaelis Pselli Historia Syntomos*, ed. J. AERTS, Berlin 1990 [= *CFHB*, 30] (cetera: MICHAEL PSELLOS).

νδ'. Ἰωάννης ὁ Τζιμισκῆς ὁ τὸν Νικηφόρον ἀνελὼν ἔτη ζ' ἡμέρας λ' ¹⁹.

Next, the anonymous author has his primary focus on Nicephorus II Phocas. He remarks that Nicephorus II Phocas was brutally assassinated in his palace (ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ). The stories about the assassination of the emperor in his own bedroom are thought to have been composed after December 11, 969. These popular stories are very problematic for this time period. During the reign of John Tzimiskes, his name was removed from this narration²⁰. Some writers preferred not to mention it, but wrote about Theophano's involvement of in this killing²¹. In contrast to this period, which is pro-Tzimiskes in tone, later authors such as Leon Diaconus, John Geometres and others revealed the whole picture of the murder²². In this context, the *Chronicon Bruxellense* directly calls John Tzimiskes a murderer. It indicates that the anonymous author wrote from a great distance in time. Like Psellos' *Historia Syntomos*, he could find a detailed account of the assassination of Nicephorus II Phocas in *many detailed writings that were published both by contemporaries and by authors shortly after*²³. It is possible that the anonymous author could use oral tradition, but this assumption depends very much on the time when the chronicle was written²⁴.

In this context, two late short Byzantine chronicles on the period from Constantine the Great to Alexios I Comnenos (*Chronik 15* and *16*, edited by Peter Schreiner), surprisingly contain information very similar to the *Chronicon Bruxellense*²⁵. They are also shown to have somewhat more links between these texts. The content of these accounts is John Tzimiskes' coup against Nicephorus II Phocas. Both the *Chronicon Bruxellense* and *Chronik 16* (*Vind. gr.* 133, fols. 124–125, dating back to the 13th century) present us with a very similar example:

¹⁹ *Anecdota Bruxellensia*, I, p. 34, 12–15.

²⁰ L. PETIT, *Office inédit en l'honneur de Nicéphore Phocas*, BZ 13, 1904, p. 328–42; D. SULLIVAN, *The Rise and Fall of Nikephoros II Phokas. Five Contemporary Texts in Annotated Translations*, Leiden 2018 [= BAus, 23], p. 192–196.

²¹ M. LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres. Texts and Contexts*, vol. I, Vienna 2003 [= WBS, 24.1], p. 313.

²² *Leonis Diaconi Caloensis Historiae libri decem*, ed. C.B. HASE, Bonn 1829 [= CSHB, 30], p. 85–91; JEAN GÉOMÈTRE, *Poèmes en hexamètres et en distiques élégiaques*, ed., trans., com. E. VAN OPSTALL, Leiden–Boston 2008 [= MMe, 75], №61, 80, p. 209–216, 281–288; *Vita of Athanasios of Athos, Version B*, ed. J. NORET, [in:] *Vitae duae antiquae Sancti Athanasii Athonitae*, Turnhout 1982 [= CC.SG, 9], p. 178–179.

²³ MICHAEL PSELLOS, 105, p. 99.

²⁴ R. MORRIS, *The Two Faces of Nikephoros Phokas*, BMGS 12, 1988, p. 83–115; S. MARJANOVIĆ-DUŠANIC, *L'écho du culte de Nicéphore Phocas chez les Slaves des Balkans*, [in:] *Le saint, le moine et le paysan. Mélanges d'histoire byzantine offerts à Michel Kaplan*, ed. O. DELOUIS, S. MÉTIVIER, P. PAGÈS, Paris 2016, p. 375–394.

²⁵ *Chronica Byzantina breviora = Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, vol. I, ed. P. SCHREINER, Wien 1975 [= CFHB, 12.1], p. 156–162 (the *Chronicle 15*), p. 163–168 (the *Chronicle 16*).

<i>Chronicon Bruxellense</i>	<i>Chronik 15</i> , p. 158	<i>Chronik 16</i> , p. 165
Νικηφόρος ὁ Φωκάς... καὶ ἐσφάγη ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ ἔσωθεν τοῦ <u>κοιτῶνος</u> αὐτοῦ	Νικηφόρος ὁ Φωκάς... ἐσφάγη δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Τζιμισχῆ	ἐσφάγη δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς Νικηφόρος ἐν τῷ <u>κοιτῶνι</u> αὐτοῦ

Consequently, *Chronik 16* was obviously a model for the anonymous author or vice versa. If *Chronik 16* was probably written in the 1120s, then the *Chronicon Bruxellense* could be composed after this time. However, the relationship between this passage of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* and *Chronik 16* was never clarified. Thus, it seems likely that the anonymous author of *Chronik 16* could read about the reign of Nicephorus II Phocas and John I Tzimiskes from the *Chronicon Bruxellense*.

After a brief statement about the death of Nicephorus II Phocas, the final passages of the text are as follows:

νε'. Βασίλειος ὁ νέος ὁ Βουλγαρκοτόνος πορφυρογέννητος καὶ τροπαιοῦχος, φιλοπόλεμος ὢν καὶ φιλόχρυσος, πολλὰ κατεργασάμενος κατὰ τοῦ Βουλγάρων ἔθους ἔτι δὲ καὶ κατὰ ἐτέρων πολλῶν τροπαία καὶ νίκας βασιλεύει σὺν Κωνσταντίνῳ αὐτοῦ ἔτη ν'.

νς'. Κωνσταντίνος μόνος ἔτη τρία.

νζ'. Ῥωμανὸς ὁ τούτου γαμβρὸς ὁ λεγόμενος παρωνύμως Ἀργυρόπουλος χρηστὸς τοῖς ἡθεσι καὶ σοφὸς τῷ λόγῳ ἔτη ε' μῆνας ε'²⁶.

What is most interesting, however, is the author's assumption about "Basil the younger, the Bulgar-slayer born in the purple chamber". It is certainly plausible to consider that the epithet Βουλγαρκοτόνος was not used by any contemporaries of Basil II. The anonymous author refers to Basil II as "the Bulgar-slayer", but unlike other epithets, such as νέος and πορφυρογέννητος, this appellation is not found in any historical texts before the Bulgarian confrontation in 1185–1186²⁷. In this regard Paul Stephenson suggests that "the Bulgar-slayer" of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* was almost certainly an interpolation by a late-thirteenth-century scribe²⁸. However, Angel Nikolov has recently made it clear that the epithet is found in some texts dating back to the late 11th century²⁹. This last statement seems convincing to me, but we have another possibility for its dating, suggesting that the mention of the "the Bulgar-slayer" was a reference about Basil II in the middle

²⁶ *Anecdota Bruxellensia*, I, p. 34, 16–23.

²⁷ P. STEPHENSON, *The Legend of Basil the Bulgar-Slayer*, Cambridge 2003, p. 66–80, see p. 71.

²⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 69.

²⁹ A. ΝΙΚΟΛΟΒ, *On Basil II's cognomen 'The Bulgar-Slayer'*, [in:] *Европейският югоизток през втората половина на X – началото на XI век. История и култура. Международна конференция. София, 6–8 октомври 2014 г.*, ed. В. ГЮЗЕЛЕВ, Г.Н. НИКОЛОВ, София 2015, p. 578–584.

of the 11th century. Paul Stephenson claims that the third part of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* may not have been transcribed in full, and *later entries may have been omitted*³⁰. There is no certainty, because the final praise in the *Chronicon Bruxellense* of the morals and wisdom of Romanus III indicates that the author wrote soon after the death of the emperor.

The Anomaly of the *Chronicon Bruxellense*

The author gives us a brief section on the reign of Michael III:

ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας μηνὶ Ἰουνίῳ ιη', η', ἔτους ςτξη', τῷ ε' ἔτει τῆς ἐπικρατείας αὐτοῦ ἦλθον ῥῶς σὺν ναυσὶ διακοσίαις, οἱ διὰ πρεσβειῶν τῆς παννυμῆτου Θεοτόκου κατεκυριεύθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν Χριστιανῶν καὶ κατὰ κράτος ἠττήθησάν τε καὶ ἠφανίσθησαν³¹.

During his reign, on the 18th of June of the 8th indiction in the year 6368, the fifth year of his reign, the Rus' came in 200 ships and were, through the intercession of the all-hymned Mother of God, overpowered by the Christians, utterly defeated and destroyed.

In the light of the *Chronicon Bruxellense*, the raid of the Rus' was very unfortunate. According to our source, the Rus' were "utterly defeated and destroyed". How are we to understand these words about the catastrophe in Constantinople? It is noticeable that this narrative of the Rus' total defeat contradicts other sources which describe the event in more detail than the *Chronicon Bruxellense*. Among them is the testimony of patriarch Photios, who wrote two homilies on the attack of the Rus' in the summer of 860³². Photios made some observations about these warriors from the North, but he did not write anywhere that they were defeated³³. Thus, in the second homily, Photios wrote that *truly is this most-holy garment the raiment of God's Mother! It embraced the walls, and the foes inexplicably showed their backs; the city put it around itself, and the camp of the enemy was broken up as at a signal; the city bedecked itself with it, and the enemy were deprived of the hopes which bore them on. For immediately as the Virgin's garment went round the walls, the barbarians gave up the siege and broke camp, while we were delivered from impending capture and were granted unexpected salvation*³⁴. Next, he

³⁰ P. STEPHENSON, *The Legend of Basil the Bulgar-Slayer...*, p. 69.

³¹ *Anecdota Bruxellensia*, I, p. 33, 15–21.

³² PHOTIOS, *Homiliai*, ed. B. LAOURDAS, Thessaloniki 1959 (cetera: PHOTIOS), p. 29–52; *The Homilies of Photius*, trans. C. MANGO Washington DC 1958 [= DOT, 3], p. 82–110.

³³ C. ZUCKERMAN, *Deux étapes de la formation de l'ancien État russe*, [in:] *Les centres proto-urbains russes entre Scandinavie Byzance et Orient*, ed. M. KAZANSKI, A. NERCESSIAN, C. ZUCKERMAN, Paris 2000 [= RByz, 7], p. 95–121, see p. 103.

³⁴ PHOTIOS, p. 45; *The Homilies of Photius*, trans. C. MANGO, p. 102.

declared with all clarity that *unexpected was the enemy's invasion, unhopd-for appeared their departure*³⁵. This is not the place to provide a full commentary on these important passages, but we can see that Photios knew nothing about the “destruction” of the Rus’ bands.

It is important for us that the other contemporaries are also silent regarding the issue of the terrible defeat of the Rus’. Thus, in his *Life of Patriarch Ignatius*, Nicetas David the Paphlagonian writes that *for at that time the bloodthirsty Scythian race called Rus’ advanced across the Black Sea to the Bosphorus plundering every region and all the monasteries*³⁶. Moreover, he remarks that *and recently when the Rus’ ravaged the island, they cast the altar of this chapel to the ground and it was Ignatius who reconsecrated it*³⁷. Furthermore, in his letter to Emperor Michael III, Pope Nicholas I said that *after having massacred many men, have burnt churches of the Saints and the suburbs of Constantinople (postremo non ecclesias sanctorum, interfectis numerosis hominibus, ac suburban Constantinopoleos, quae et muris ejus pene contigua sunt, incendimus) [...] there is no punishment whatsoever inflicted on those who are pagans (et vere de istis nulla fit ultio, qui pagani sunt)*³⁸. In other words, Pope Nicholas I claimed that the bands of the Rus’ escaped without interference. If the brief statement in the *Chronicon Bruxellense* comes from the same original source (as many scholars believe), then how can we explain that all texts about the defeat of the Rus’ written by contemporaries are silent?

It poses two major problems for the student of the *Chronicon Bruxellense*. There is probably no information on the defeat of the Rus’ in Byzantine literature before the middle of the tenth century. This story is preserved in different variants with minor changes in some chronicles which were clearly composed in Constantinople between 946 and 980s. We do not know the source and date of this invention of the victory over the Rus’ in 860. It is possible that this story was not completed under the supervision of Constantine VII, because one of his authors, known commonly as Theophanes Continuatus, wrote very vaguely about the first campaign of the Rus’: *the attack of the Rhos – these being a savage and wild Scythian nation – devastated the lands of the Romans, burning the Pontus and the very Euxine to ashes, and surrounding the city itself. But after Photios, who held direction of the Church, had entreated the Divinity, the Rhos had their fill of divine wrath and returned home*³⁹.

³⁵ PHOTIOS, p. 45; *The Homilies of Photius*, trans. C. MANGO, p. 103.

³⁶ NICETAS DAVID, *The Life of Patriarch Ignatius*, §28, ed., trans. A. SMITHIES, J. DUFFY, Washington 2013 [= DOT, 13] (cetera: NICETAS DAVID), p. 44–45.

³⁷ NICETAS DAVID, p. 69.

³⁸ *Nicolai I Papae epistolae*, ed. E. PERELS, Berlin 1925 [= MGH.E, 6], p. 479–480.

³⁹ *Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur Libri I–IV*, IV, 33, ed. J.M. FEATHERSTONE, J. SIGNES-CODOÑER, Boston–Berlin 2015 [= CFHB, 53] (cetera: *Theophanes Continuatus*), p. 279.

The story is found in different versions of the chronicle of Symeon the Logothete. These versions provide limited history on the defeat of the northern barbarians at Constantinople⁴⁰. Though they are different in approach, however, none of them dared to turn a successful campaign of the Rus' into a full catastrophe. If scholars imagine some "local chronicle" as a source of the *Chronicon Bruxellense*, then how are we to understand the omission of this mysterious text from different versions of the chronicle of Symeon the Logothete or rather all chronicles of the mid-10th century? Is it possible to do without making up this "lost city chronicle of Constantinople"?

Constructing the victory over the Rus'

Let us try to identify the sources of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* or rather of the section on the reign of Michael III. Warren Treadgold has recently summarized that *the chronicler's main source was the chronicle of Symeon the Logothete*⁴¹. However, Treadgold's correct observation requires some clarification here. Which version of the chronicle of Symeon the Logothete was available to our author? Why didn't he take the information about the first attack of the Rus' from this source? It is therefore reasonable to suppose that the phraseology and content of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* frequently coincide with different versions of the chronicle of Symeon the Logothete⁴². Unfortunately, the anonymous author does not provide many details. As a matter of fact, all instances of the use of the number of ships (200) of the Rus' described by the *Chronicon Bruxellense* are found only in Redaction A (Theodosius of Melitene, Leo Grammaticus) and Redaction B ("Continuation of George the Monk") of the chronicle of Symeon the Logothete⁴³.

⁴⁰ Leonis Grammatici *Chronographia*, ed. I. BEKKER, Bonn 1842 [= *CSHB*, 31], p. 240–241; *Theodosii Meliteni qui fertur Chronographia. Ex codice graeco Regiae bibliothecae monacensis*, ed. Th. TAFEL, Munich 1859, p. 168; *Georgius Monachus*, ed. I. BEKKER, Bonn 1838 [= *CSHB*, 31], p. 826–827.

⁴¹ W. TREADGOLD, *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, Basingstoke 2013, p. 268.

⁴² *Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae*, ed. S. WAHLGREN, Berlin 2006 (cetera: SYMEON), p. 246, 259 – 247, 273.

⁴³ *Книги временныя и образне Георгия мниха. Хроника Георгия Амартола в древнем древнерусском переводе*, vol. II, *Продолжение хроники Георгия Амартола по Ватиканскому списку*, ed. В.М. ИСТРИН, Петроград 1920, p. 10, 34 – 11, 13; PSEUDO-SYMEON, *Chronicle*, ed. (partial) I. BEKKER, Bonn 1838 [= *CSHB*, 35], p. 674, 18 – 675, 3.

<i>Chronicon Bruxellense</i>	Symeon the Logothete, p. 246, 259 – 247, 273	Pseudo-Symeon, p. 674, 18 – 675, 3	George Monachus Continuatus, p. 10, 34 – 11, 13
<p>ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας μηνὶ Ἰουνίῳ ιη', ἡ', ἔτους ζτη', τῷ ε' ἔτει τῆς ἐπικρατείας αὐτοῦ ἦλθον Ῥῶς <u>σὺν ναυσὶ διακοσίαις</u>,</p> <p>οἱ διὰ πρεσβειῶν τῆς πανυμνήτου Θεοτόκου κατεκυριεύθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν Χριστιανῶν καὶ κατὰ κράτος ἠττήθησάν τε καὶ ἠφανίσθησαν</p>	<p>οἱ δὲ Ῥῶς φθάσαντες ἔνδοθεν γενέσθαι τοῦ Ἱεροῦ πολὺν εἰργάσαντο φόρον Χριστιανῶν καὶ ἀθῶν αἶμα ἐξέχεον. ὑπῆρχον δὲ <u>πλοῖα διακόσια</u>, ἃ περιεκύκλωσαν τὴν πόλιν καὶ πολὺν φόρον τοῖς ἔνδοθεν ἐνεποίησαν.</p> <p>ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς καταλαβὼν μόλις ἴσχυσε διαπερᾶσαι καὶ δὴ σὺν τῷ πατριάρχῃ Φωτίῳ εἰς τὸν ἐν Βλαχέρναις ναὸν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ μητρὸς παρεγένετο κάκει τὸ θεῖον ἐξιλεοῦνται καὶ εὐμενίζονται.</p> <p>εἶτα μεθ' ὑμνωδίας τὸ ἅγιον ἐξαγαγόντες τῆς Θεοτόκου ὠμοφόριον τῇ θαλάσῃ ἄκρως προσέβαψαν, καὶ νηνεμίας οὐσης εὐθὺς ἀνέμων ἐπιφορὰ καὶ τῆς θαλάσσης ἠρεμούσης κυμάτων ἐπαναστάσεις ἀλλεπάλληλοι ἐγεγόνθησαν, καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀθέων Ῥῶς πλοῖα κατεάγησαν, ὀλίγων ἐκπεφευγῶτων τὸν κίνδυνον.</p>	<p>... καταλαβόντα δηλοῖ τὴν τῶν Ῥῶς ἄφιξιν, <u>πλοίων οὐσαν διακοσίων</u>.</p> <p>(Τῷ ι' αὐτοῦ ἔτει)</p> <p>Οἱ δὲ Ῥῶς ἔνδοθεν τοῦ Ἱεροῦ φθάσαντες πολὺν εἰργάσαντο φόρον. περιεκύκλωσιν οὖν τὴν πόλιν.</p> <p>καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως μόλις διαπερᾶσαι ἰσχύσαντος, εὐθὺς σὺν τῷ πατριάρχῃ Φωτίῳ τὸν ἐν Βλαχέρναις τῆς Θεοτόκου ναὸν καταλαμβάνουσι,</p> <p>καὶ μεθ' ὑμνωδιῶν τὸ ἅγιον τῆς Θεοτόκου ἐξαγαγόντες μαφόριον τῇ θαλάσῃ ἄκρως προσέβαψαν, καὶ νηνεμίας οὐσης εὐθὺς ἀνέμων ἐπιφοραὶ καὶ τῆς θαλάσσης ἠρεμούσης κυμάτων ἐπαναστάσεις ἀλλεπάλληλοι ἐγεγόνθησαν, καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀθέων Ῥῶς πλοῖα κατεάγησαν, ὀλίγων ἐκπεφευγῶτων τὸν κίνδυνον.</p>	<p>οἱ δὲ Ῥῶς ἔνδοθεν τοῦ Ἱεροῦ γεγονότες πολὺν φόνον κατὰ Χριστιανῶν κατεργάσαντο καὶ <u>διακοσίους πλοίοις</u> τὴν πόλιν ἐκύκλωσαν.</p> <p>ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς καταλαβὼν μόλις διαπερᾶσαι ἐξίσχυσε καὶ σὺν τῷ πατριάρχῃ Φωτίῳ εἰς τὸν ἐν Βλαχέρναις τῆς Θεοτόκου καταλαβόντες ναὸν πάννυχον ἰκετηρίαν ἐτέλεσαν.</p> <p>Εἶτα τὸ Θεῖον τῆς τοῦ Θεοτόκου ὠμοφόριον μεθ' ὑμνωδίας ἐξενεγκότες τῇ θαλάσῃ ἄκρως προσέβαψαν, καὶ νηνεμίας οὐσης εὐθὺς καὶ τῆς θαλάσσης κατεστορεσμένης ὑπαρχούσης</p> <p>εὐθὺς λαίλαψ ἀνέμου ἠγείρετο καὶ κυμάτων βιαίων ἐπιφορὰ ἀλλεπάλληλοι τὰ τῶν ἀθέων. Ῥῶς πλοῖα διαταράττουσα καὶ</p>

<i>Chronicon Bruxellense</i>	Symeon the Logothete, p. 246, 259 – 247, 273	Pseudo-Symeon, p. 674, 18 – 675, 3	George Monachus Continuatus, p. 10, 34 – 11, 13
			τῆ προσαρασσουσα καὶ κατεάσσουσα, ὡς ὀλίγα ἐξ αὐτῶν τὸν τοιούτον κίνδυνον διαφυγεῖν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἴδια μετὰ ἥττης ὑπο- στρέψαι.

It is noteworthy that Theophanes Continuatus does not provide any information on the number of ships⁴⁴. In this context, later Byzantine historians such as John Scylitzes, who apparently based their works on Theophanes Continuatus's narrative of the attack of 860, missed these details of the campaign⁴⁵. One can discern a common thread running through these episodes of the attack of the Rus'. In addition to the number of ships, these similarities include a final story with "the intercession of the all-hymned Mother of God". Thus, different versions of the chronicle of Symeon the Logothete provide a short narrative on how a violent storm arose and scattered the Rus' ships. There are, however, additional themes in Symeon the Logothete's account of the attack of the Rus' that are far less pronounced in episodes from the *Chronicon Bruxellense*. Attention is paid not only to the defeat of the Rus' but also to their departure. If the anonymous author said that the Rus' were "overpowered by the Christians" and "utterly defeated and destroyed", the chronicle of Symeon the Logothete contained a similar story where only a small part of the Rus' returned home. It is no exaggeration to say that the *Chronicon Bruxellense* offers not so much an account of the Rus' attack as a narrative of the chronicle of Symeon the Logothete. There seems to be no need to postulate any significant sources for the *Chronicon Bruxellense*'s account of the reign of Michael III other than one of the versions of the chronicle of Symeon the Logothete. How can we identify this chronicle? In order to support the identification of Symeon the Logothete's narrative as a source for the *Chronicon Bruxellense*, we can cite internal and external evidence.

Following the unprecedented interest of our author to chronology, some versions of the chronicle of Symeon the Logothete provide special chronological rubrics on the reign of Michael III:

⁴⁴ *Theophanes Continuatus*, IV, 33, p. 279.

⁴⁵ IOANNIS SCYLITZAE, *Synopsis Historiarum*, ed. I. THURN, Berlin–New York 1973 [= *CFHB*, 5] (cetera: IOANNIS SCYLITZAE), p. 107, 44–49.

<i>Chronicon Bruxellense</i>	Pseudo-Symeon	George Monachus Continuatus
με' Μιχαήλ υἱὸς Θεοφίλου σὺν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ Θεοδώρα ἔτη δ', καὶ μόνος ἔτη ι', καὶ σὺν Βασιλείῳ ἔτος ἕν μηνῶν δ'	Κόσμου ἔτος ςτλε' τῆς θείας σαρκώσεως ἔτος ωλε', Ῥω- μαίων βασιλεὺς Μιχαήλ καὶ Θεοδώρα ἔτη ιδ', μόνος ἔτη ιβ', καὶ σὺν Βασιλείῳ ἔτος α' μηνῶν δ', ὁμοῦ ἔτη κζ' μηνῶν δ'	Μετὰ δὲ Θεόφιλον ΜΙΧΑ- ΗΛ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ διευθυνεῖν καταλαμβάνεται σὺν μητρὶ Θεοδώρα τὰ τῆς βασιλείας σκῆπτρα. Καὶ ἐβασίλευσε σὺν μητρὶ αὐτοῦ ἔτη δ', καὶ μόνος ἔτι δέκα, καὶ σὺν Βασιλείῳ ἔτος ἕν καὶ μηνῶν τέσσαρες

It is extremely important that the anonymous author repeated George Monachus Continuatus's mistake in the chronological section of the reign of Michael III. Similarly to George Monachus Continuatus, he erroneously claims that Michael III reigned together with Theodora for 4 years (instead of the 14-year term). As we can see, coincidences between the *Chronicon Bruxellense* and George Monachus Continuatus's chronicle do not end there. Thus, the anonymous author replaced the entries about the reign of Michael III from George Monachus Continuatus's chronicle, where the emperor was named twice. Paradoxically, it was a major evidence of the so-called structural "failure". However, the anonymous author simply copied this specific chronological form from his source. In other words, in its description of the chronology of the reign of Michael III and the attack of the Rus', the *Chronicon Bruxellense* modified the text of George Monachus Continuatus's chronicle.

The anonymous author did not modify many items to contribute to his narrative of the attack of the Rus'. The element of his narrative was to create a full chronology for the raids of the Rus' that consisted largely of existing information brought over from George Monachus Continuatus's chronicle. More important, however, and revealing of his working methods, is the fact that after George Monachus Continuatus's chronicle he added a complete sequence for the date of the defeat of the Rus'. It seems likely that the anonymous author borrowed chronology from his main source. As mentioned above, the anonymous author of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* took George Monachus Continuatus's chronicle as his foremost model.

There are many parallels between two part of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* and George Monachus Continuatus's chronicle⁴⁶. In fact, the anonymous author often repeated information (dates, events, names and lexical forms) from this source.

⁴⁶ *Anecdota Bruxellensia*, I, p. 18–25.

As Cumont already noted, the anonymous author of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* added very little to these versions of the chronicle of Symeon the Logothete⁴⁷. Unlike George Monachus Continuatus's chronicle or some versions of the chronicle of Symeon the Logothete, the *Chronicon Bruxellense* has unique data such as the full date (year, month, and day) of the first Rus' attack on Constantinople. According to the chronological network of George Monachus Continuatus's chronicle, the anonymous author mistakenly repeated the structure of the chronological section of the reign of Michael III. On this basis, he was able to calculate that the Rus' arrived during the 10th year of the reign of Michael III. Nonetheless, it does not apply to the month and day of the attack. If the anonymous author calculated the indiction, then how and where could he find other chronological details (the month and day)?

As we have seen earlier several times, the main purpose of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* was to create a short narrative. On the one hand, the anonymous author seemingly extensively uses George Monachus Continuatus's chronicle, constructing his narrative of the reign of Michael III. In fact, the *Chronicon Bruxellense*'s description of the first Rus' attack on Constantinople is very similar to the passages from George Monachus Continuatus's chronicle. On the other hand, the anonymous author adapted his main source, but neither the month nor the day of the attack was mentioned there. How did the anonymous author know that? In addition, a number of scholars, including de Boor, Schreiner, and Külzer, have suggested a possible connection between the date of the Rus' attack in the *Chronicon Bruxellense* and the lost "local chronicle"⁴⁸. The absence of traces of this mysterious text anywhere, while there are over 60 MS copies of various versions of the chronicle of Symeon the Logothete⁴⁹, diminishes asymptotically the veracity of this hypothesis. Scholars who believe in an early composition date of part two of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* tend to argue that the anonymous author did not calculate the date of the attack, but obtained it from outside. But where exactly would that be? According to the information concerning the collection of relics given in the *Chronicon Bruxellense*⁵⁰, we can postulate that another source of information was liturgical memory.

⁴⁷ *Anecdota Bruxellensia*, I, p. 26, n. 1, 27, n. 1.

⁴⁸ *Anecdota Bruxellensia*, I, p. 33, n. 2; P. SCHREINER, *Miscellanea Byzantino-Russica...*, p. 152; A. KÜLZER, *Studien zum Chronicon Bruxellense...*, p. 447. Or is it possible to assume that this lost "local chronicle" was a "common source" also used by George Monachus Continuatus? This idea, however, is undermined by a wider analysis of the reigns from Michael III to Constantine VII, which suggest to me a much simpler solution of the puzzle: the anonymous author of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* read George Monachus Continuatus's chronicle.

⁴⁹ SYMEON, p. 27–28.

⁵⁰ *Anecdota Bruxellensia*, I, p. 19, 21–22, 26–27.

After the Rus' siege and their sudden return to their home, the Robe of the Virgin Mary was regarded as the Palladium of Constantinople⁵¹. This is emphasized by the *Synaxarium* – that these relicts were awarded as divine gifts and a sure defence to this illustrious great city which is devoted to the Theotokos. Thus celebrates their arrival with magnificent and celebratory feast-days⁵². The commemoration of the deposition of the Robe took place in Constantinople on July 2⁵³. Specifically, the anonymous author could know that those final stage of the siege was associated with the feast day of the Virgin. In this context, he mentioned the date of the attack, which was not so far removed from these feast days. Finally, he could learn (from the same George Monachus Continuatus's chronicle on the attack of 941) that an attack of the Rus' on Constantinople was in June⁵⁴. It is very likely that the author of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* was a contemporary of the last Rus' attack of 1043, which lasted for two months, from June to August⁵⁵. The *Chronicon Bruxellense* was probably written around this time.

The next source of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* was the *Chronicle* of Theophanes⁵⁶. Both Franz Cumont in his edition of the Greek text and Andreas Külzer in his paper correctly note that the anonymous author widely used the *Chronicle* of Theophanes⁵⁷. In particular, Cumont cites many examples from the *Chronicle* of Theophanes (especially in his narrative on the period from Constantine to Michael III) but the attack of Rus' was unrecognized. This is manifested in the simple fact that the author of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* borrows some fragments from Theophanes' description of the siege of Constantinople of 629:

Theoph., p. 315–316	<i>Chronicon Bruxellense</i>
<p>τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τῶν πρεσβειῶν τῆς πανυμνήτου θεοτόκου συνεργήσαντος, καὶ πολέμου κροτηθέντος χάλαξα παραδόξως κατὰ τῶν βαρβάρων κατηνέχθη καὶ πολλοὺς αὐτῶν ἐπάταξεν...</p> <p>καὶ ταῖς πρεσβείας τῆς ἀχράντου καὶ θεομήτορος παρθένου ἠττήθησαν</p>	<p>ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας μηνὶ Ἰουνίῳ ιη', η', ἔτους ςτζη', τῷ ε' ἔτει τῆς ἐπικρατείας αὐτοῦ ἦλθον Ῥῶς σὺν ναυσι διακοσίαις, οἱ διὰ πρεσβειῶν τῆς πανυμνήτου Θεοτόκου κατεκυριεύθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν Χριστιανῶν καὶ κατὰ κράτος ἠττήθησάν τε καὶ ἠφανίσθησαν.</p>

⁵¹ A. VASILIEV, *The Russian Attack on Constantinople in 860...*, p. 222.

⁵² *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, ed. H. DELEHAYE, Brussels 1902, p. 935, trans. J. WORTLEY, *The Marian Relics at Constantinople*, GRBS 45, 2005, p. 171–187, see p. 174–175.

⁵³ J. WORTLEY, *The Marian Relics at Constantinople...*, p. 175.

⁵⁴ *Книги временныя и образне Георгия мниха...*, p. 60, 25 – 61, 30.

⁵⁵ IOANNIS SCYLITZAE, p. 430.

⁵⁶ *Theophanis Chronographia*, ed. C. DE BOOR, Leipzig 1883.

⁵⁷ A. KÜLZER, *Studien zum Chronicon Bruxellense...*, p. 433, 440.

It is very important that the author of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* was a late reader of the *Chronicle* of Theophanes. Federico Montinaro has recently shown that the reception of Theophanes' *Chronicle* was active among the Byzantine historians from Constantine VII to John Zonaras⁵⁸. In this context, the anonymous author also used some of Theophanes' words to describe the attack of the Rus'. It is likely that only the story about the help of the most holy Theotokos was of interest to him.

The Influence of the *Chronicon Bruxellense*?

Although the *Chronicon Bruxellense* was not a popular chronicle for reading, its influence is felt in some late texts. It is evident in the writings of John the Oxite and Theodore Laskaris. In his shorter piece addressed to Emperor Alexios I Komnenos, dated by Paul Gautier back to after 1091, John the Oxite, the patriarch of Antioch, mentioned the defeat of the Rus' at Constantinople during the reign of Michael III⁵⁹. Providing a stinging critique of Komnenian rule, John the Oxite wrote the following: *Do you not hear that in the reign of Michael, Theophilus' son, the Tauroscythians, having attacked with a heavy fleet and taken (the country) all around, held the whole (city) as if in nets? After the Emperor, with the Archbishop and the whole population of the city, had come to the Church of Blachernae and all together made prayers to God, the very holy garment of the Mother of God was dipped in the sea*⁶⁰. Next, John the Oxite places much emphasis on the utter catastrophe of the first raid of the Rus'⁶¹. The same idea – from the defeat to victory over the Rus' – is expressed in the *Chronicon Bruxellense* in very similar terms. It is noticeable that John the Oxite read some texts which showed the attack of the Rus' as a total defeat for the invaders. Though the author of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* does not discuss this himself, it is reasonable to assume that he wrote his text for the monastery where he spent the years of his life. It is possible to suggest that John the Oxite could know something about the Rus' from the *Chronicon Bruxellense*. This is a very strong indication that the story about the total disaster

⁵⁸ F. MONTINARO, *The Chronicle of Theophanes in the Indirect Tradition*, TM 19, 2015, p. 177–205.

⁵⁹ P. GAUTIER, *Diatribes de Jean l'Oxite contre Alexis I^{er} Comnène*, REB 28, 1970, p. 5–55, see p. 39, 17 – 41, 1.

⁶⁰ A. VASILIEV, *The Russian Attack on Constantinople in 860...*, p. 222.

⁶¹ P. GAUTIER, *Diatribes de Jean l'Oxite contre Alexis I^{er} Comnène...*, p. 39, 17 – 41, 1: Οὐκ ἀκούεις διτι εν ταῖς του βασιλέως Μιχαήλ ἡμέραις, του Θεοφίλου παιδός, Ταυροσκύθαι βαρεῖ στόλω προσενηχθέντες και κύκλω διαλαβόντες ὡσπερ εντός δικτύων ἀπασαν εἶχον, του δε βασιλέως σὺν ἀρχιερεῖ και παντί τω της πόλεως πλήθει το εν Βλαχέρναις καταλαβόντων τέμενος και κοινή το θεῖον ἐξίλασαμένων, εἶτα βάπτεται μεν κατά της θαλάσσης ἀκρας το ἅγιον της Θεομήτορος ράκος (μαφόριον σὺνηθες τοῦτο καλεῖν), γίνεται δ'εὐθύς θαῦμα εκπληκτον και παράδοξον; Ἐκ γαρ σταθεράς μεσημβρίας και νηνεμίας ἀθρόον ἐκταραχθεῖσα ἡ θάλασσα πάντων των βαρβάρων σὺν αὐτοῖς βυθίζει τα σκάφη, ολίγων κομιδὴ περιλειφθέντων δσοι δηλονότι ἤρκουν τοις οἰκοι τήν καινήν ἀγγεῖλαι συμφοράν. Και τί μοι δεῖ πλειόνων και παλαιότερων υποδειγμάτων.

of the Rus' raid in 860 was composed and shared in public no earlier than the mid-eleventh century. The tension would reach a breaking point in the late eleventh – mid-thirteenth century, when Theodore Laskaris mentions the first attack of the Rus' in his *Oration on the Virgin to be Read in the Celebration of the Akathistos*⁶². He goes on to describe the gloomy event in the same negative terms, and then draws even more attention to the *great and strange spectacle of destruction*⁶³. One can in fact read the following on the defeat of the Rus' in Theodore Laskaris' *Oration*: *The striking was not from the air, but the wind was rising from the bottom; rudders were twisted; sails torn up; prows of boats sunk; and the enemies who were close to the shore, not knowing what had happened, hurriedly tried to escape only to be drowned*⁶⁴. There are parallels in imagery with the *Chronicon Bruxellense*, making it clear that perhaps Theodore Laskaris simply used more suitable expressions, drawn from this short chronicle.

Let us return to the question posed in the beginning of the essay: what are the broader implications of the *Chronicon Bruxellense* for our understanding of the nature of its section on the reign of Michael III? Many scholars have worked diligently to portray the account of the Rus' attack in the *Chronicon Bruxellense* as an available or anything that might be identified as a "lost" chronicle. However, it is argued that the *Chronicon Bruxellense* is not a relevant text for the reconstruction of the events of 860, but it presents compiler techniques of a later Byzantine author.

Bibliography

Primary Source

- Anecdota Bruxellensia*, vol. I, *Chroniques byzantines du manuscrit 11376*, ed. F. CUMONT, Gand 1894.
- Chronica Byzantina breviora = Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, vol. I, ed. P. SCHREINER, Wien 1975 [= *Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae*, 12.1].
- Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur Libri I–IV*, ed. J.M. FEATHERSTONE, J. SIGNES-CODOÑER, Boston–Berlin 2015 [= *Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae*, 53].
- Georgius Monachus*, ed. I. BEKKER, Bonn 1838 [= *Corpus scriptorum historiae byzantinae*, 31].
- The Homilies of Photius*, trans. C. MANGO, Washington DC 1958 [= *Dumbarton Oaks Texts*, 3].
- IOANNIS SCYLITZAE, *Synopsis Historiarum*, ed. I. THURN, Berlin–New York 1973 [= *Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae*, 5].
- JEAN GÉOMÈTRE, *Poèmes en hexamètres et en distiques élégiaques*, ed., trans., com. E. VAN OPSTALL, Leiden–Boston 2008 [= *The Medieval Mediterranean*, 75].

⁶² A. GIANNOULI, *Eine Rede auf das Akathistos-Fest (BHG 1140, CPG 8197) und Theodoros II. Dukas Laskaris*, JÖB 51, 2001, p. 259–283; D. ANGELOV, *The Byzantine Hellene. The Life of Emperor Theodore Laskaris and Byzantium in the Thirteenth Century*, Cambridge 2019, p. 322.

⁶³ A. GIANNOULI, *Eine Rede auf das Akathistos-Fest...*, p. 273.

⁶⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 274, trans. A. VASILIEV, *The Russian Attack on Constantinople in 860...*, p. 104.

- Knigy vremennyja i obrazne Georgija mniha. Hronika Georgiya Amartola v drevnem drevnerusskom perevode*, vol. II, *Prodolzenije hroniki Georgija Amartola po Vatikanskomu spisku*, ed. V. ISTRIN, Petrograd 1920.
- Leonis Diaconi Caloensis Historiae libri decem*, ed. C.B. HASE, Bonn 1829 [= *Corpus scriptorum historiae byzantinae*, 30].
- Leonis Grammatici Chronographia*, ed. I. BEKKER, Bonn 1842 [= *Corpus scriptorum historiae byzantinae*, 31].
- Michaelis Pselli Historia Syntomos*, ed. J. AERTS, Berlin 1990 [= *Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae*, 30].
- NICETAS DAVID, *The Life of Patriarch Ignatius*, ed., trans. A. SMITHIES, J. DUFFY, Washington 2013 [= *Dumbarton Oaks Texts*, 13].
- Nicolai I Papae epistolae*, ed. E. PERELS, Berlin 1925 [= *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Epistolae*, 6].
- PHOTIOS, *Homiliai*, ed. B. LAOURDAS, Thessaloniki 1959.
- PSEUDO-SYMEON, *Chronicle*, ed. (partial) I. BEKKER, Bonn 1838 [= *Corpus scriptorum historiae byzantinae*, 35].
- Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae*, ed. S. WAHLGREN, Berlin 2006.
- Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, ed. H. DELEHAYE, Brussels 1902.
- Theodosii Meliteni qui fertur Chronographia. Ex codice graeco Regiae bibliothecae monacensis*, ed. Th. TAFEL, Munich 1859.
- Theophanis Chronographia*, ed. C. DE BOOR, Leipzig 1883.
- Vita of Athanasios of Athos, Version B*, ed. J. NORET, [in:] *Vitae duae antiquae Sancti Athanasii Athonitae*, Turnhout 1982, p. 127–213 [= *Corpus christianorum, Series graeca*, 9].

Secondary Literature

- ANGELOV D., *The Byzantine Hellene. The Life of Emperor Theodore Laskaris and Byzantium in the Thirteenth Century*, Cambridge 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108690874>
- DE BOOR C., *Der Angriff der Rhos auf Byzanz*, "Byzantinische Zeitschrift" 4, 1895, p. 445–466, <https://doi.org/10.1515/byzs.1895.4.3.445>
- FRANKLIN S., SHEPARD J., *The Emergence of Rus 750–1200*, London–New York 1996.
- GAUTIER P., *Diatribes de Jean l'Oxite contre Alexis I^{er} Comnène*, "Revue des études byzantines" 28, 1970, p. 5–55, <https://doi.org/10.3406/rebyz.1970.1427>
- GIANNOULI A., *Eine Rede auf das Akathistos-Fest (BHG 1140, CPG 8197) und Theodoros II. Dukas Laskaris*, "Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik" 51, 2001, p. 259–283.
- GOLUBINSKIJ E., *Istorija russkoj tserkvi*, vol. I, Moscov 1997.
- HRUSHEVSKY M., *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. I, *From Prehistory to the Eleventh Century*, Edmonton–Toronto 1997.
- KAZHDAN A., *Joseph the Hymnographer and the First Russian Attack on Constantinople*, [in:] *From Byzantium to Iran. In Honour of Nina Garsoïan*, ed. J.-P. MAHÉ, R. THOMSON, Atlanta 1996, p. 187–196.
- KÜLZER A., *Studien zum Chronicon Bruxellense*, "Byzantion" 61, 1991, p. 413–447.
- KUZENKOV P., *Pohod 860 g. na Konstantinopol i pervoje kreschenije Rusi v srednevekovyh pismennyh istochnikah*, [in:] *Drevnejshije gosudarstva Vostochnoj Evropy. Materialy i issledovanija. Problemy istochnikovedenija*, ed. E. MELNIKOVA, Moscov 2003, p. 3–172.

- LAUXTERMANN M., *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres. Texts and Contexts*, vol. I, Vienna 2003 [= Wiener Byzantinistische Studien, 24.1], <https://doi.org/10.1553/0x00034c77>
- MARJANOVIC-DUŠANIC S., *L'écho du culte de Nicéphore Phocas chez les Slaves des Balkans*, [in:] *Le saint, le moine et le paysan. Mélanges d'histoire byzantine offerts à Michel Kaplan*, ed. O. DELOUIS, S. MÉTIVIER, P. PAGÈS, Paris 2016, p. 375–394, <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.psorbonne.37690>
- MONTINARO F., *The Chronicle of Theophanes in the Indirect Tradition*, “Travaux et mémoires” 19, 2015, p. 177–205.
- MORRIS R., *The Two Faces of Nikephoros Phokas*, “Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies” 12, 1988, p. 83–115, <https://doi.org/10.1179/byz.1988.12.1.83>
- NEVILLE L., *Guide to Byzantine Historical Writing*, Cambridge 2018, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139626880>
- NIKOLOV A., *On Basil II's Cognomen 'The Bulgar-Slayer'*, [in:] *Evropejskiiat Iugoistok prez vtorata polovina na X – nachaloto na XI vek. Istoriia i kultura. Mezhdunarodna konferentsiia Sofia, 6–8 Oktomvri, 2014*, ed. V. GIUZELEV, G.N. NIKOLOV, Sofija 2015, p. 578–584.
- PETIT L., *Office inédit en l'honneur de Nicéphore Phocas*, “Byzantinische Zeitschrift” 13, 1904, p. 328–342, <https://doi.org/10.1515/byzs.1904.13.2.398>
- SCHREINER P., *Miscellanea Byzantino-Russica*, “Византийский временник” / “Vizantijski Vremennik” 52, 1991, p. 151–160.
- SCHREINER P., *Orbis Byzantinus. Byzanz und seine Nachbarn. Gesammelte Aufsätze 1970–2011*, Bucuresti 2013 [= Florilegium magistrorum historiae archaeologiaeque Antiquitatis et Medii Aevi, 12].
- SHEPARD J., *Photios' Sermons on the Rus Attack of 860: the Questions of his Origins, and of the Route of the Rus*, [in:] *Prosopon Rhomaikon. Ergänzende Studien zur Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, ed. A. BEIHAMMER, B. KRÖNUNG, C. LUDWIG, Berlin–Boston 2017 [= Millennium-Studien, 68], p. 111–128, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110533804-009>
- STEPHENSON P., *The Legend of Basil the Bulgar-Slayer*, Cambridge 2003.
- SULLIVAN D., *The Rise and Fall of Nikephoros II Phokas. Five Contemporary Texts in Annotated Translations*, Leiden 2018 [= Byzantina Australiensia, 23], <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004382169>
- TOLOCHKO A., *Ocherki nachal'noj Rusi*, Kyiv 2015.
- TREADGOLD W., *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, Basingstoke 2013, <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137280862>
- VASIL'EVSKIJ V., *God pervogo nashestvija russkih na Konstantinopol*, “Византийский временник” / “Vizantijski Vremennik” 1, 1894, p. 258–259.
- VASILIEV A., *The Russian Attack on Constantinople in 860*, Cambridge 1946.
- WORTLEY J., *The Marian Relics at Constantinople*, “Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies” 45, 2005, p. 171–187.
- ZUCKERMAN C., *Deux étapes de la formation de l'ancien État russe*, [in:] *Les centres proto-urbains russes entre Scandinavie Byzance et Orient*, ed. M. KAZANSKI, A. NERCESSIAN, C. ZUCKERMAN, Paris 2000 [= Réalités Byzantines, 7], p. 95–121.

Oleksandr Fylypchuk

Yuri Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University
Department of History, Political Studies and International Relations
Kotsubynskogo St. 2
Chernivtsi, 58012
Ukraine
o.fylypchuk@chnu.edu.ua



© by the author, licensee University of Lodz – Lodz University Press, Lodz, Poland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)
