

*Byzantina et Slavica Cracoviensia, V*  
*Byzantium, New Peoples, New Powers:*  
*The Byzantino-Slav Contact Zone,*  
*from the Ninth to the Fifteenth Century*  
Cracow 2007

Krzysztof Fokt

(Wrocław)

### \*ŁĘDZANIE - HOW FAR FROM THE EMPIRE?

When a distant tribe is mentioned in a Byzantine chronicle or treatise, the question must be raised about the reasons behind its occurrence. It ought to be pointed out whether the mentioning of some "barbarian tribe" by an Imperial author happened merely accidentally, or if there were any special purposes for their interest in it. One could also ask, why mentioning these people seemed to be interesting for a Byzantine writer. Of course, if a given northern tribe was not a member of the regional powers, it was not interesting for the Empire *per se* and thus the distance of that people from Constantinople is not measurable directly. It could be, however, estimated through the studying of its position in the region and their relations towards regional centers of power. The case of \**Łędzanie* is certainly one of this kind. The people of the \**Łędzanie* were not only mentioned at least twice in Constantine Porphyrogenitus' *De administrando imperio* (further referred to as DAI)<sup>1</sup>, but they also used to live in a contact zone of three regional military powers: the Magyars, Rus' and Pechenegs. There is, however, an essential difference between the case of the \**Łędzanie* and other examples of Slavic peoples being mentioned in Byzantine sources; namely, the complexity of the former. Apart from the \**Łędzanie*, there is evidence of at least three other ethnic names that existed in the 9<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> century for the same area, which today is the Polish-Ukrainian borderland. Moreover, the sources suggest that some of those names could be younger than others and there are those which could have functioned on an over-regional level. Moreover, some scholars look for even more tribal entities in the area under study<sup>2</sup>. That is why at first the actual scope, chronology and functions of the name \**Łędzanie* and other ethnic names that have existed in the same territory should

<sup>1</sup> Or three times- if we accept G. LABUDA's, *Studia nad początkami państwa polskiego*, vol. II, Poznań 1988, pp. 74-76, conjecture of AИЛІІСІТ] to AИВІ(К)Т] (\**Łędzice*), cf. DAI XXXIII 16-19, pp. 160-162.

<sup>2</sup> Especially noteworthy are new approaches of K.T. WITCZAK, *O dwóch prapolskich plemionach zamieszkujących ziemię przemyską i chełmską - Łędzanach i Wierzbianach*, *Acta Archaeologica Carpathica* 38 (2003), pp. 157-172; and L. VOYTOVYCH, *Knjazivstva karpatskich Khorvativ*, (in:) *Etnohenez ta rannya istoria Slovyan: Materialy konferencii*, Kyiv 2001, pp. 195-210.

be examined. Only after having answered these questions will the places of the \**L*%dzanie in the contemporary network of powers and interests be analyzed.

The homeland of the \**L*%dzanie must have lain in some part of the basins of the Upper Dniestr, San, Bug and Styr. As already mentioned above, many scholars have tried to distribute at least a dozen ethnic names known from early medieval sources in that region. Most of these attempts, especially the ones that involved ethnic names in the 9<sup>th</sup>-century *Descriptio civitatum et regionum ad septentrionalem plagam Danubii*, are not verifiable at all and, as such, are almost worthless. Nonetheless, two of these ideas deserve attention and serious consideration - one as potentially plausible, the other as being frequently repeated. The latter hypothesis of the subcarpathian Croats is a beautiful example of a long lasting scientific myth. Although it was justly criticized more than 30 years ago, some scholars still look for Croats on the Dniestr and San rivers<sup>3</sup>. In fact, following the text of the oldest chronicle of Rus' (*Povest' Vremennykh Let* - from now referred to as PVL<sup>4</sup>), there is no evidence of Croats living under the Carpathians. According to PVL these Croats must have lived to the east, close to the *Vjatici*. They may be identifiable with anonymous Slavic settlements in the area close to the Don and Donets<sup>5</sup>. More sophisticated is the case of the \**Wierzbianie*, a people situated by K. T. Witczak upon the Bug river. Some *Bepfhavoi* were, indeed, mentioned in the ninth chapter of DAI as one of those peoples who were obliged to the *poljudje* for the kaghans of Rus'; i.e. served their sustenance in winter. As such, the *Bepfliavoi* constitute the last cell of the chain: *Sjever'-Krivici-Dregovici*. There is only one name missing in that enumeration: *Derevljane*, the direct neighbors of Kiev to the west<sup>6</sup>. This choice is the most plausible one, even though the *Derevljane* appeared in another passage of DAI under their own, properly spelled name (*AepPXevivoi*), because both notices had been derived from different sources of information. As such, both passages can give different spellings of the same name, as the list of peoples obliged to the *poljudje* shows the perspective of the khaganate of Rus', while *AspfiXevivoi* appear in the list of peoples neighboring the Pecheneg tribe of *Irtim*. Therefore, there is no need to place the \**Wierzbianie* instead of the well known *Derevljane* on the end of the list of peoples serving the *poljudje*. There is also no reason to situate \**Wierzbianie* upon the Bug, in the homeland of \**Buzane*, which is well known from other sources. In addition, the territory of eastern Volhynia only barely fits the seat of the \**Wierzbianie*, as, according to DAI, some part of the \**L*%dzanie must have lived there<sup>7</sup>. Finally, one must take for granted, that the *Bspfiavoi* were: 1) either a corrupted form of \**Derevljane* (most probable solution), or 2) the name of some part of the \**L*%dzanie upon the Styr or

<sup>3</sup> L. VOYTOVYCH, *Knyazivstva*, passim; V.D. BARAN, *Davni Slovyany*, Ukraina kriz viky, vol. 3, Kyiv 1998, pp. 125-126; further references to find there.

<sup>4</sup> Ed. V.P. ADRIANOVA-PERETS, D.S. LIKHACHEV, Moskva 1951.

<sup>5</sup> More about eastern Croats: J. KOTLARCYK, *Siedziby Chorwatów wschodnich*, Acta Archaeologica Carpathica 12 (1971), pp. 161-188; K. FOKT, *Zagadka plemion znad Bugu, Sanu, Dniestru i Styru*, Przegląd Historyczny 45 (2004), pp. 449-450.

<sup>6</sup> Reconstruction of the course of *poljudje*: O.P. MOCYA, *Kyivska Rus': etapy fonnovannya derzhavnoy terytorii*, Arheolohija 2001/1, p. 45, fig. 5.

<sup>7</sup> In order to send boats to Constantinople, the \**L*%dzanie must have had access to Dniepr.

Horyri, or 3) name of some ethnopolitical entity between the *\*Lqdzanie*, *\*Buzane* and *\*Derevljane*, or 4) some alternatively used name of *Derevljane*. Quintum non datur.

Apart from the eastern Croats and the *\*Wierzbianie*, which were excluded from further consideration, there are three more names left to be distributed in the region under study: the *\*Buzane*, *\*Duljeby* and *\*Volynjane*, all of them known from PVL. The most uncertain among these names is the last one, though the existence of some *\*Volynjane* in Volhynia from 1<sup>st</sup> century on has never been questioned. The actual subject of controversy is their existence in the 10<sup>th</sup> century, because the *\*Volynjane* had been described by PVL as the ones who occurred upon Bug after the *\*Buzane* and *\*Duljeby*<sup>8</sup>. This approach is, nevertheless, not the only admissible<sup>9</sup>. It is also not obvious, that no source mentioned the *\*Volynjane* in the 10<sup>th</sup> century - namely, one of ethnic names in al-Massoudi's passage about Slavs is being sometimes ascribed to *\*Volynjane*<sup>10</sup>. Keeping these in mind, one should, nonetheless, turn back to the firm ground, i.e., to the text of PVL. It seems significant, that all the quoted sentences of PVL refer to the territory upon the Bug, and in fact inform only that the name *\*Volynjane* replaced older names there. It does not, however, say whether the name *\*Volynjane* was created for the sake of renaming the Bug region, or only extended upon this land, having thus existed in some other territory previously to the fact of its extension. Therefore, *\*Volynjane* must be taken into the final account by any reconstruction of the pre-state ethno-political structure of the region discussed, though certainly not upon the Bug. Other ethnic names of PVL are less controversial, having found their confirmation in other sources.

In order to determine which areas hide under the name *\*Lqdzanie* in DAI, all ethnic names mentioned above should be linked to certain settlement areas and relations between them should be examined. The oldest ethnic denomination of the region seems to be the name *\*Duljeby*, having left its traces in names of the tribal entities and settlement areas in the Carpathian basin". What is more, in the 10<sup>th</sup> century St. Vaclav, prince of Bohemia, was called by al-Massoudi "king of Dulaba" - despite the fact that his subjects had their own ethnic name and the name *\*Duljeby* could be proper only for part of them. In light of that example from Bohemia, a kind of reverence probably linked to the name *\*Duljeby* seems significant. As such, it helps to explain why this name has not been forgotten until the times of PVL, while only the *\*Volynjane* used to live upon the Bug then. The same chronicle, however, mentioned two ethnic entities that preceded the *\*Volynjane* upon the Bug: the *\*Duljeby* and *\*Buzane*. Simultaneous occupation of the same territory by these two ethnic entities is hard to imagine. Firstly, it would be unreasonable from the point of view of settlement geography and archae-

<sup>8</sup> PVL, pp. 13-14.

Both approaches and their arguments: *Slavyane yugo-vostochnoj Evropy v predgosudarstvennyi period*, ed. V.D. BARAN et al., Kiev 1990, pp. 311-312.

<sup>10</sup> G. LABUDA, *Fragmety dziejów Słowiańszczyzny Zachodniej*, vol. I, Poznań 1960, pp. 46-62; cf. et infra.

<sup>11</sup> H. ŁOWMIĄŃSKI, *Początki Polski: z dziejów Słowian w I tysiącleciu n.e.*, vol. II, Wrocław 1963, pp. 106-110, 351-352; V.D. BARAN, *Skhidnokarpatskij region u V-VII st. n.e.*, (in:) *Etnogenez ta etnitschna istorija naselennja ukrains'kych Karpat*, vol. I: *Arkheolohija, antropolohija*, L'viv 1999, p. 305.

ology<sup>12</sup>. Secondly, information about the \**Duljeby* and \**Buzane* could have been derived from different sources of PVL. In fact, it is quite imaginable that there were not peoples, but only their names, that co-existed upon the Bug. This supposition is strengthened by the comparison of possible ranges of both ethnic names. The \**Buzane* were, as their name indicates, strictly connected with the basin of the Bug. On the contrary, distribution of names of localities derived from the ethnic name \**Duljeby* suggests that they had occupied at least the territory of what was from 13<sup>th</sup> century called Volhynia<sup>13</sup>. Therefore, the name \**Duljeby* has probably spread upon broader territories than of the \**Buzane*, probably further to the east. In fact, there is one source that confirms the hypothesis of existence of some ethno-political entity separate from the \**Buzane* eastern from the Bug area in the 10<sup>th</sup> century. It is the well known charter of Henry IV for Jaromir-Gebhard, bishop of Prague, from 29<sup>th</sup> April 1086 - a document well known to mediaevalists, though frequently underestimated<sup>14</sup>. The limits of the bishopric drawn in that charter probably reflect the status quo from the year 973<sup>15</sup>. In the area under study, the border of the bishopric had been marked with two river names: *Bug* and *Ztir*. It is, however, impossible to draw any reasonable linear limit with these two rivers<sup>16</sup>. Furthermore, there is no need to do so, as there are no linear borders drawn with other rivers in the charter. As far as any river being mentioned there, it was an axis of an administrative entity, not a linear border of any kind<sup>17</sup>. Therefore, it seems probable that there were two territories of more or less equal status, hiding there under the *Bug* and *Ztir*. The same territories could have hidden under *Cerven'* and *Peremyśl* from PVL - if we accept the conjecture of *Peremyśl* to *Peremył*<sup>18</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> R. TSCHAYKA, *Pidsumky dislidzhen pam'jatok litopysnykh Buzhan v Zakhidnomu Pobuzhzhii*, (in:) *Etnohenez ta rannja istoria*, pp. 261-267; A. NOWAKOWSKI, *Górne Pobuże w wiekach VIII-XI. Zagadnienia kultury*, Acta Archaeologica Lodziensia, No 21, Łódź 1972, s. 13-14.

<sup>13</sup> ŁOWMIAŃSKI, *Początki Polski*, pp. 106-110; V.D. BARAN, *Davni Slovjany*, Ukraina kriz viky, t. 3, Kyiv 1998, pp. 120-121. Critical attitude against „Dulebian” toponyms: W. MAKARSKI, *Pogranicze polsko-ruskie do połowy wieku XIV. Studium językowo-etniczne*, Lublin 1996, pp. 46-47.

<sup>14</sup> MGH, *Die Urkunden der Deutschen Könige und Kaiser*, vol. VI: *Die Urkunden Heinrichs IV*, Bd II, ed. D.v. GLADISS, Berlin 1941, no. 390.

<sup>15</sup> R. TUREK, *Listina Jindřicha IV z 29 Dubna 1086 (DHIV 390) a její teritoria*, *Slavia Antiqua* 12 (1975), pp. 97 sqq; LABUDA, *Studia*, pp. 111-146, especially 139-146, 171.

<sup>16</sup> Nor with other rivers, proposed instead of these two (Boh, Seret, Stryj): J. SKRZYPEK, *Studia nad ^ pierwotnym pograniczem polsko-ruskim w rejonie Wołynia i Grodów Czerwińskich*, Warszawa 1962, pp. 88-89; S.M. KUCZYŃSKI, *Wschodnia granica państwa polskiego w X w. (przed 980 r.)*, (in:) *Początki państwa polskiego. Księga tysiąclecia*, Poznań 1962, pp. 236-238; J. KOTLARCYK, *Grody Czerwińskie a karpacki system obronny pod Przemyślem we wczesnym średniowieczu*, Acta Archaeologica Carpathica 11 (1969-1970), fasc. 2, p. 267; YA. D. YSAEVITCH, >Grady chervenskie< i peremishl'skaya zemlya v politicheskich vzaimootnosheniyach mezhdz vostochnimi i zapadnimi Slavyanami (koniec IX - nachalo X v.), (in:) *Issledovaniya po istorii slavyanskich i balkańskich narodov*, Moskva 1972, p. 119; VOYTOVYTCH, *Knyazivstva*, pp. 202-203.

<sup>17</sup> Namely river Váh (*Uuag provincia*). I would like to express my gratefulness to Mr Dariusz Niemiec M. A., who helped me develop the idea of two regions in DH IV 390 in course of discussions in winter 2002.

<sup>18</sup> S.M. KUCZYŃSKI, *O wyprawie Włodzimierza I ku Lachom na podstawie wzmianki z r. 981 w Opo- wieści lat doczesnych*, (in:) IDEM, *Studia z dziejów Europy Wschodniej X-XVII w.*, Warszawa 1965, s. 79-84; H. PASZKIEWICZ, *Początki Rusi*, Rozprawy Wydziału Historyczno-Filologicznego PAU, vol. 81, Kraków 1996, pp. 90-91.

The western of these two administrative entities, upon the Bug, corresponds naturally with the *\*Buzane*<sup>19</sup>. The second one (upon the Styr) could be no one else than the *\*Volynjane*- who, according to PVL, only later appeared upon the Bug as well. In any case, either we agree for the *\*Volynjane* upon the Styr, or not; two settlement areas upon the Bug and Styr probably enjoyed a common denomination of the *\*Duljeby*. Therefore, the only ethnic name left to be identified with particular territory would be the *\*Łędzanie*. Having settled other ethnic names in the limits of later Volhynia, one only has the area of the Upper San and the Upper Dniestr left for the *\*Łędzanie*, a territory quite well separated from Volhynia through landscape features. To identify that settlement area with the *\*Łędzanie*, the name of the Polish people in the Hungarian language ought to be involved, as it has preserved the tribal name of *\*Łędzanie* very precisely. The cause of that fact could have been from close contacts of the early Magyars and *\*Łędzanie*. These are, indeed, clearly visible in archaeological discoveries from the area of the Upper San and Dniestr, around later centers of Przemyśl and Halic<sup>20</sup>

This clear vision of three settlement areas upon the Bug, Styr, Dniestr and San and four ethnic names functioning there is being disturbed by one passage of the 9<sup>th</sup> chapter of DAI. According to that fragment, the *\*Łędzanie* must have lived not only south from the Roztocze range, but also upon some confluents of Prypeć, as they were able to send their boats to Kiev<sup>21</sup>. That passage of DAI, as well as the names of the Polish people derived from the name of *\*Łędzanie* in many languages, suggest that in the mid 10<sup>th</sup> century the name *\*Łędzanie* used to be a denomination of some broader region - at least of the territories under the Carpathians and upon the Styr. Moreover, the name *\*Łędzanie* must have advanced to such an outstanding position no longer than a few dozen years before being mentioned in DAI. In *Descriptio civitatum* from the mid 9<sup>th</sup> century *Łędzanie* (*Lendizi*) appeared in the same part of the source as the *\*Bużane* (*Busani*), though with a lower number of *civitates* ascribed to them<sup>22</sup>. In the part of the source where *Busani* and *Lendizi* were mentioned, greater number of *civitates* served probably to distinguish those peoples which were considered stronger and more numerous - which means that the *\*Łędzanie* were not very significant in comparison with the *\*Buzane* then. Despite that modest potential, the *\*Łędzanie* eventually occupied the dominant position in the region. The name *\*Łędzanie* must have substituted for the *\*Duljeby* upon the Bug and Styr in 10<sup>th</sup> century, at least to some extent<sup>23</sup>. Later, when

<sup>19</sup> Bug as settlement axis, not a limit: KUCZYŃSKI, *O wyprawie*, pp. 74, 91-92; PASZKIEWICZ, *Początki Rusi*, pp. 72-74.

<sup>20</sup> M. PARCZEWSKI, *Problem Łędzian a kształtowanie się polsko-ruskiej rubieży etnicznej*, (in:) *Civitas Schinesghe cum pertinentiis*, Toruń 2003, pp. 161-163.

<sup>21</sup> DAI IX 10-17, pp. 56-58; cf. T. WASILEWSKI, *Dulebowie-Łędzanie-Chorwaci. Z zagadnień osadnictwa plemiennego i stosunków politycznych nad Bugiem, Sanem i Wisłą w X wieku*, Przegląd Historyczny 47 (1976), p. 184; PARCZEWSKI, *Problem Łędzian*, pp. 156-157, 160-161.

<sup>22</sup> After photocopies of the source, added to: S. ZAKRZEWSKI, *Opis grodów i terytoriów z północnej strony Dunaju czyli t. z. Geograf bawarski*, Lwów 1917; B. HORAK, D. TRAVNÍČEK, *Descriptio civitatum ad septentrionalem plagam Danubii* (t. zv. *Bavorský geograf*), *Rozprawy Československé Akademie Věd* 66 (1956), s. 2: "...*Busani habent civitates CCXXXI...Lendizi habent civitates XCVIII...*".

<sup>23</sup> Cf. WASILEWSKI, *Dulebowie-Łędzanie-Chorwaci*, pp. 184-185.

the Rus' finally mastered the region, the name *\*Lqdzanie* in its augmentative form *\*Ljachy* was already being assigned to the subjects of the Piasts<sup>24</sup>, and the name *\*Duljeby* was only recognized as a part of a tradition - as one can read in PVL. That is probably why the newly created administrative unit which arose from those territories upon the Bug and Styr was given a new name, derived possibly from one of its parts - *\*Volynjane*<sup>25</sup>.

Settling down what political and ethnic realities could hide under those particular names of the region under study solves the first task of this text. The second is to investigate these contexts, in which ethno-political entities known in the 10<sup>th</sup> century as the *\*Lędzanie* appeared. The most important information needed would be who and why someone passed the news about the *\*Lqdzanie* to the sources and in what spheres of military and political influence they existed. The first source that mentioned the *\*Lędzanie* and *Buzane* is *Descriptio civitatum et regionum ad septentrionalem plagam Danubii* - or more precisely its second part, describing peoples living beyond the neighbors of the Frankish kingdom. The second part of the *Descriptio* is being sometimes subject to elaborate interpretative operations, which tend to discover a consequent network of trade routes there<sup>26</sup>. Already simple processing of the data of the *Descriptio* through sorting and grouping its names by their position in the text, the number of *civitates* and the geographic situation is enough to prove the opposite. The second part of *Descriptio* is not a regular display of trade routes, nor does it show the spheres of influence, though regional groups are certainly discernible in it. In fact, this part of the *Descriptio* is a kind of recapitulation of several lists of peoples. These "primary" lists are discernible through those few names of the *Descriptio*, which can be identified with ethnonyms known from other sources. The first 29 names of the second part of the *Descriptio* can be divided into four regional groups of peoples deriving from different informers<sup>27</sup>. The names nos. 30-34 could have fallen out of previous lists, as they have neither the amount of *civitates*, nor any other description of their scale attached. Eventually, the list of peoples inhabiting Silesia and Lusatia (names nos. 35-44) has been added later - after the author, having acquired no additional information about peoples 30-34, decided to note their names down without numbers of *civitates*. The names *Lendizi* and *Busani* are a part of the longest "primary list" of peoples, containing the largest amount of names unknown from other sources and endowed with many *civitates*. Among these there are some probably nomadic names ending with -rozi, unparalleled in other "primary lists". Apart from nomads, turning our attention to the steppe regions north from the Black Sea, there are a few more peoples in that part of the source that let us identify the point of view of its author. These are the *Busani*, *Lendizi* and *Unlizi*, and all of these peoples used to inhabit what is today western Ukraine and

<sup>24</sup> Cf. LABUDA, *Studia*, pp. 179-184.

<sup>25</sup> More arguments supporting this sequence of ethnic names: FOKT, *Zagadka plemion*.

<sup>26</sup> Recently: B. TOMENCHUK, *Richkovi shlyachy v geopolitychnykh zv'yazkakh narodiv Centralnoy i Shhidnoy Evropy doby Serednyovichchya (za Bavarskym Geografom)*, (in:) *Etnohenez ta rannja istorija*, pp. 211-238.

<sup>27</sup> Namely: "danubian" (1-3 or 1-6, dependently on interpretation of no 6: *Zvireani*), "nomadic-slavic" (4-21 or 7-21), "baltic" (23-25) and "eastern" (27-29). Explication of this idea of the division of 2<sup>nd</sup> part of *Descriptio* will be brought forward in a separate study.

eastern Poland. In fact, these three names are the only ones certain in the discussed part of the source - except from possibly the *Chozirozi*, which probably are the Khazars. Moreover, it cannot be excluded, that also the *Ungare* (Magyars) and *Vuislane* (\**Wiślanie* in the Kraków area, nos. 33-34), written further down without the numbers of *civitates* attached, do belong here, too. In the 9<sup>th</sup> century Magyars used to live on the Black Sea steppe, not far from the *Unlizi*, and held adjacent Slavs under their rule, while the \**Wiślanie* were probably the western neighbors of the \**Bużane*. Maybe then, the list of peoples nos. 4(7)-21 originated from the region under study, or at least from the western part of the Magyar sphere of interest. It seems probable, provided that only one source passed this whole "primary list" of peoples to the author. Nonetheless, the five peoples mentioned above were exactly the ones who used to live directly *ultra fines* of the regions neighboring with the Franks, that is next to the *Marharii* and *Merehani* (probably Moravia and Slovakia), beyond the mountains. This reason was good enough for a Bavarian monk, who compiled *Descriptio civitatum*, to learn as much as possible about these peoples - and that is probably why they have found their place in the source.

The second contemporary source that could have mentioned one of the \**Łędzan* peoples, such as the \**Volynjane*, is the above mentioned work of al-Massoudi<sup>28</sup>. Unfortunately, interpretation of the given ethnic name can be twofold: *Walinjana* (\**Volynjane* in Volhynia) or *Weletaba* (\**Veleti* upon Baltic Sea). Moreover, the names that should constitute the basis for every interpretative attempt in Massoudi's passage about Slavs: the Moravians, Serbs, and Croats, may have originated from various contexts. This ambiguity of apparently the most obvious names has generated a flagrant discussion which ended with absolutely discordant sentences<sup>29</sup>. Although this controversy may never reach a satisfactory solution, attempts have to be made at least to estimate the probability of some particular pieces of information contained in Massoudi's passage about Slavs. According to it, the *Weletaba/Walinjana* used to be the oldest, of purest blood and the most revered tribe among the Slavs. This description would be quite appropriate for Volhynia, from where the western Slavs had indeed descended<sup>30</sup>. On the other hand, no neighbors of Volhynia appeared in the same passage<sup>31</sup>. It is not the case, however, if we accept the equation *Weletaba*=*Velets*, as the names of the Germans and Saxons are certainly, and the names of Stodorans and Serbs probably are part of a northwestern context, suitable for *Velets*. Such a perspective would be similar to the one presented by Alfred the Great in his description of Central Europe<sup>32</sup>. The northwestern origin of Massoudi's information about the *Weletaba/Walinjana* should

<sup>28</sup> J. MARQUART, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*, Leipzig 1903, pp. 101-103.

<sup>29</sup> With T. LEWICKI and J. WIDAJEWICZ defending northwestern perspective of Massoudi's informers, and G. LABUDA stressing their southern, Danubian point of view, cf. ŁOWMIAŃSKI, *Początki Polski*, pp. 356-357.

<sup>30</sup> BARAN, *Dawni Slovyany*, pp. 122-123.

<sup>31</sup> Khaganate of Rus', mentioned as *ad-Dir* or *al-Aldair*, belong to the younger part of the passage discussed. Most astonishing is the lack of \**Łędzanie* and \**Buiane*, mentioned earlier in *Descriptio civitatum*.

<sup>32</sup> *Źródła skandynawskie i anglosaskie do dziejów Słowiańszczyzny*, ed. G. LABUDA, Warszawa 1961, pp. 66-69, 42-57 (photocopy of manuscript C).

be then treated as more probable<sup>33</sup>. This fact and the lack of context for \**Volynjane* in Massoudi's passage about Slavs are enough to exclude this source from discussion about possible role of the \**Volynjane* in trade or policy in the 920's and 930's<sup>34</sup>.

Apart from DAI and accounts presented above, the \**Lqdzan* peoples were mentioned in one more contemporary source: a table of peoples of the *Book of Yosippon*<sup>35</sup>. The *Book of Yosippon* was written by a Jewish author probably living in the area of Venice, about the mid 10<sup>th</sup> century (before 965) or about 980<sup>36</sup>. This table of peoples was composed after the pattern of *Genesis*; Slavs are supposed to be descendants of Dodanim, son of Yawan, son of Yafeth, son of Noah. List of Slavic peoples comprises of two rows of names: Mwr.wh (\**Morciva*) - Krw.tj (\**Char\>ati*) - Swrbjn (\**Sirbin*) - Lwcnjn (\**Lucanin*) and Lwwmn/con. Ljjkjn (\**Ljachin*) - Kr.kr (\**Krakar?*) - Bzjm/con. Bwjmjn (\**Bojmin*). These two rows of names are often interpreted as corresponding with those limits of the Slavs described in *Yosippon* - from the borders of Bulgaria to Venice and from Venice to the Baltic Sea<sup>37</sup>. In fact, there is no logical link between these two facts. To reconstruct the cognitive horizon of the author, it would be far better to analyze a composition of his list of peoples. Not surprisingly, the list presents quite a good knowledge of Italy, Gaul and the Germanic peoples - including such details as the Suebian descent of the Longobards. The author was also acquainted with the names of nomadic Turkish peoples; his knowledge, though not detailed, reached Byzantium, Rus', and Chorasán. In fact, his list in the *Yosippon* reflects quite exactly those possible external contacts of a northern Italian Jewish trader: towards Byzantium, the Khazars, and Saxony, and beyond these lands (Ismailits, Chorasán, Denmark, England). We can therefore assume that the Slavs were concerned only as far as they lived close to these routes. The first line of Slavic peoples can then be connected with the Adriatic coast, close to Venice<sup>38</sup>. The second line - Bohemia, Cracow and \**Ljachy* - can be extended by adding to it Rus', situated upon the river *Kiwa* (from the name of Kiev). That turns our attention to the route towards the Khazars<sup>31</sup>. Thus, these traders moving along transcontinental route to and from the Khazars must have passed through the land of the \**Ljachy* = \**Lędzanie*. According to the *Yosippon*, they passed through Cracow. It is then probable, that they used to meet the \**Lqdzanie* yet in Volhynia.

<sup>33</sup> I owe this conviction to Mr Marek Jankowiak M. A., whom I would like to thank for his time and attention devoted to ardent discussion about Massoudi's list of Slavonic peoples in May-September 2006.

<sup>34</sup> These are but not enough to exclude *Walinjana* from the history of Volhynia at all - at least as long as paleographic questions around that ethnicum occur. Chronology of discussed passage should correspond with reigns of Vaclav I in Bohemia (922-935) and kings of Germany - either Konrad I (+919), or Henry I (+936).

<sup>35</sup> V. YA. PETRUCHIN, *Nachalo etnokultur'noy istorii Rusi IX-XI vekov*, Moskva-Smolen'sk 1995, pp. 36-40.

<sup>36</sup> K.T. WITCZAK, *Ludy i państwa słowiańskie w tzw. Księdze Josippon*, *Slavia Antiqua* 36 (1993), p. 77.

<sup>37</sup> LOWMIANSKI, *Początki Polski*, p. 171; WITCZAK, *Ludy i państwa*, pp. 80-81, passim.

<sup>38</sup> WITCZAK, *Ludy i państwa*, pp. 79-81: Serbs, Croats, Zahumlje and southern Moravia; in contrary to G. FLUSSER, *Zprava o Slovanech v hebrejske kronice z X století*, *Česky Časopis Historický* 48-49 (1947-1948), pp. 238-241, who pointed at Serbs between Elbe and Saale, Croats and Lučane in Bohemia, and northern Moravia.

<sup>35</sup> LOWMIANSKI, *Początki Polski*, pp. 171-172.

As it was already mentioned, an extension of the name *\*Lędzanie* on the territory of Volhynia was reflected also in DAI by the mid 10<sup>th</sup> century and must have occurred not earlier than in the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 9<sup>th</sup> century. According to archaeological research, the relations of the subcarpathian *\*Lędzanie* with early Magyars were so strict in the later part of the 9<sup>th</sup> or early first half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century, that one can even speak of political dependence reflected in archaeological findings<sup>40</sup>. These facts move to ask, if the extension of the name *\*Lędzanie* upon Volhynia was not only approved, but also caused by the Magyars? Existence of a causal link between the "*\*Lędzan* commonwealth" from the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> quarters of the 10<sup>th</sup> century and earlier Magyar rule upon the subcarpathian region is being strengthened by two additional circumstances. Firstly, if we assume that at least the inhabitants of the basins of the Upper Dniestr, San and Styry used to share the name *\*Lędzanie* already before Magyar migration to the Carpathian Basin, such a union must have been directed against nearby nomads. These nomads were no one else, than Magyars; being, according to ibn Rosteh, quite oppressive against their Slavic neighbors<sup>41</sup>. In such a case it would be hard to explain why the same Magyars would not only tolerate some broader union of Slavs, but also preserved it under their own dominance. Secondly, only Magyar migration to the other side of Carpathians caused a rapid increase of strategic importance of the *\*Lędzanie*, especially from the viewpoint of the Magyars in face of Pecheneg threat<sup>42</sup>.

As the *\*Lędzanie* were noticed by DAI, they already belonged to the kaghanate of Rus'. According to DAI, in the mid 10<sup>th</sup> century the *\*Lędzanie* were part of the outer fringe of that political structure. At that time, the core of the khaganate consisted of cities which were in disposal of the dynasty, such as Kiev, Novgorod, and Vychehrad, or at least where some of the Rus' were in charge<sup>43</sup>. The inner circles of tributaries were the ones obliged to serve the *poljudje*. DAI knows the names of some of them: the *\*Derevljane*, *\*Dregovici*, *Krivici*, *\*Sever*<sup>44</sup>. Although the *\*Lędzanie* were not enlisted there, it could happen, that they were one of the mysterious A,outoircaicncoTcu. It seems, however, improbable for two reasons. Firstly, the *\*Lędzanie* were surely known to the author of the quoted chapter of DAI. Thus, if they were not mentioned among peoples serving the *poljudje*, it is probable that they simply did not belong there<sup>45</sup>. Secondly, the geographic situation of the *\*Lędzanie* makes it difficult to add them to that list. As

<sup>40</sup> M. PARCZEWSKI, *Początki kształtowania się polsko-ruskiej rubieży etnicznej w Karpatach: u źródeł rozpadu Słowiańszczyzny na odlam wschodni i zachodni*, Kraków 1991, pp. 40-42.

<sup>41</sup> IBN ROSTEH, *Quitab al-A'laq an-Nafisa*, chapter X, ed. T. LEWICKI, *Źródła arabskie do dziejów Słowiańszczyzny*, vol. II 2, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk 1977, pp. 32-35.

<sup>42</sup> There is no need to argue, that Pechenegs used to be a dangerous military power at that time, though scale of that danger can be discussed: KUCZYŃSKI, *O wyprawie*, pp. 34, 42-47; KOTLARCYK, *Grody Czerwieńskie*, pp. 248-249; O. PRITSAK, *The Pechenegs: A case of social and economic transformation*, *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevii* 1, 1975, pp. 211-235, pp. 18-19,21.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. DAI IX 1-9, p. 56. The list of cities contains not only domains of Olga and Svyatoslav, but also territories of allied rulers, e. g. of Chernigov and Smolen'sk, cf. W. DUCZKO, *Skandynawowie w Europie Wschodniej okresu Wikingów*, (in:) *Wędrowka i etnogeneza w starożytności i średniowieczu*, ed. M. SALAMON, J. STRZELCZYK, Kraków 2004, pp. 240-241.

<sup>44</sup> DAI IX 104-109, p. 62.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. MOCYA, *Kyivska Rus'*, p. 46, fig. 4.

we recall what kind of trouble arose for Igor and Olga for collecting tributes from their direct neighbors (*\*Derevljane*), there is no need to ask how risky the *poljudje* among distant *\*Lędzan* peoples could have become at that time. Regardless whether the *\*Lędzanie* were to serve the *poljudje* or not, their dependence from Kiev was probably not so tight, as in the case of the peoples lying closer to Kiev. They were, however, two times *expressis verbis* called tributaries of Rus' in two separate chapters of DAI. To explain the dependency of the *\*Lędzanie* from Rus' in the mid 10<sup>th</sup> century, it is necessary to involve the second chapter of DAI that dealt with the *\*Lędzanie* chapter 37 about the Pechenegs. Data from that part of the treatise originated probably from the Pechenegs themselves, as it contains a broad range of detailed information about their origins, laws, and customs as well as organization of that ethnos. Particularly reliable is the information about three tribes called Kangar, praised in the final passage of the chapter as the most noble among Pechenegs<sup>46</sup>. Among these Kangar there was tribe of *Irtim/labdiertim*, who according to chapter 37 of DAI used to live next to the *\*Lędzanie*, *\*Ulici* and other Slavs<sup>47</sup>. This sentence of DAI is supported through ar-

<sup>48</sup> chaeological data: the *\*Lędzanie* and Pechenegs were, indeed, direct neighbors. In face of Pecheneg danger, the *\*Lędzanie* certainly needed protection from some mighty center of military power. One can only guess, what kind of advantage could the suzerainty of Rus' have from the viewpoint of the *\*Lędzanie* compared with the rule of the Magyars. Firstly, the latter being neighbors of the *\*Lędzanie* were able to control them directly, and as archaeological research has proved, did not hesitate to do so. In the case of the Rus', their willingness to directly control distant parts of their sphere of influence is not so obvious at that time<sup>49</sup>. Secondly, to be included into the structure of the khaganate of Rus' meant not only to have duties, but also to benefit from that fact through participation of tributaries in commercial and military activities of Rus'.

For the sake of this study, the motivation of the *\*Lędzanie* to shift their dependence is, however, far less interesting than the readiness of Rus' to include them into their political system. The dominance of Rus' upon the *\*Lędzanie* must have occurred after the year 944, as no *\*Lędzan* peoples supported Igor in his expedition against Constantinople. The *\*Lędzanie* must have been thus subdued by Duchess Olga. Their tributary subordination to Kiev could have been undertaken after the final subjugation of the *\*Derevljane*, in order to secure limits of the conquered territory. Was it but enough to challenge the Magyars and Pechenegs<sup>50</sup>? Looking for other reasons to subdue Volhynia, one can follow a pattern typical for early states of the region. Due to their in-

<sup>46</sup> DAI XXXVII 68-71, p. 170.

<sup>47</sup> DAI XXXVII 42-45, p. 168.

<sup>48</sup> PARCZEWSKI, *Problem Lędzian*, pp. 157-161.

<sup>49</sup> About stabilization of the political structure of the khaganate in the 10<sup>th</sup> century: N.F. KOTLYAR, *O sotsial'noj sushishnosti drevnerusskogo gosudarstva IX- pen'oj poloviny X v.*, (in:) *Drevneyshie gosudarstva vostochnoj Evropy: materialy i issledovaniya 1992-1993 gody*, Moskva 1995, pp. 38-40.

<sup>50</sup> A few traces indicate, that Magyars used to be quite active in the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> and in the 1<sup>st</sup> half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century in what was later southern Rus', including Kiev itself: E. DĄBROWSKA, *Węgrzy*, (in:) E. DĄBROWSKA, W. SZYMAŃSKI, *Awarzy, Węgrzy*, *Kultura Europy wczesnośredniowiecznej*, vol. 5, Wrocław 1989, p. 163.

tense involvement in long distance trade and military competition, the main concern of these states was to control important routes of trade and warfare<sup>51</sup>. In the 10<sup>th</sup> century - at least in its second half - there was one tract of transcontinental importance that crossed *\*Łędzan* lands: the route through Prague and Cracow towards Kiev and the Khazars. Control of it was probably the goal of Boleslav I, duke of Prague, in the early 970's. If he did finally succeed in his attempts or not, then taking over Volhynia was a quite logical consequence of the previous development of his state. The domains of Prague, as far as they are known from accounts of al-Massoudi, the *Book of Yossippon*, DAI and Ibrahim ibn Ya'qub, were thus stretching along the route towards the Khazars<sup>52</sup>. The charter of Henry IV from the year 1086 proves also that Boleslav pretended only to control Volhynia and its confluents of the Dniepr, while the subcarpathian areas were left out of his sight. The easiest way to explain that fact is, indeed, to suppose a commercial background of Premyslid aspirations in the manner presented above. If not only Duke Boleslav, but also the Duchess Olga subdued Volhynia in order to take hold of some part of the transcontinental west-east route, remains thus a mere guess-work, based only upon retrospective reasoning. Nonetheless, it seems significant that at least the Volhynian part of *\*Łędzanie* already in the years 940-980 underwent several changes of control. These changes were probably connected with the transcontinental west-east trade route, though only in the case of Premyslid aspirations there is enough evidence to take it for granted. Available sources do not let us reconstruct reliably the history of the subcarpathian region at that time, though some traces could speak for the continuity of Magyar rule upon that territory<sup>51</sup>.

Even these scarce pieces of information, accessible through unequivocal sources, are enough to state that during the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of the 10<sup>th</sup> century, the *\*Łędzan* regions used to belong to four spheres of interest: namely, of the Magyars, Pechenegs, Rus' and Premyslids, and that three of these centers of power tried to dominate some parts of the region under study. At least the Magyars and Rus' succeeded in their efforts; not to mention, that the Magyars were probably partly responsible for the advance of the name *\*Łędzanie* to super-regional status. Surprisingly, while even existing in separate political structures, Volhynian as well as subcarpathian groups were retaining their common name *\*Łędzanie*<sup>5</sup>. That fact indicates how shallow the interference of aforementioned regional centers in the territory under study actually was. According to present state of research, only the Magyars exceeded that scope of domination, and kept their own garrisons on the outer side of the Carpathians. To raise military outposts under the Carpathians was an adequate answer of the Magyars to the Pecheneg challenge. A subcarpathian tribe of *\*Łędzanie*, neighboring with both steppe powers, could not remain neutral. Becoming Magyar adherents must have obviously caused some

<sup>51</sup> Z. KURNATOWSKA, *Proces formowania się "państwa gnieźnieńskiego"*, (in:) Civitas Schinesghe, pp. 38-39.

<sup>52</sup> J. ZEMLIČKA, *Cechy v dobe knížeci*, Praha 1997, p. 37.

<sup>53</sup> As Premyslid aspirations in the 970's were limited to Volhynia, and keeping outposts on the outer foreground of Carpathians was probably of crucial importance for Magyars.

<sup>54</sup> As stated above, *\*Łędzanie* sensu stricto lived under Carpathians, but DAI as well as *Book of losippon* and possibly PVL, cf. LABUDA, *Studia*, pp. 182-184, extended that name also to the inhabitants of Volhynia.

inconvenience for them, as well as the obligation to maintain Magyar troops. The \**Lqdzanie* were, however, capable of taking advantage of this situation as well. These advantages must have generally exceeded disadvantages, as in the mid 10<sup>th</sup> century the inhabitants of Volhynia were also called \**Lqdzanie*. Generally speaking, the advance of \**Lqdzanie* came into being thanks to their seemingly inconvenient situation between two steppe powers. It is, however, dubious, if that factor could affect knowledge of the \**Lqdzanie* in the Empire. In the first quarter of the 10<sup>th</sup> century the Magyars were engaged in military actions in the west and probably not interested in conflict with the Empire. Moreover, they were loyal allies of the Emperors in their system of alliances against Bulgaria<sup>55</sup>. As such, they stayed beyond the horizon of detailed observation of Imperial diplomacy, which was concerned with closer and more direct tasks. That situation changed to a considerable extent in the second quarter of the 10<sup>th</sup> century, when the Bulgarian threat diminished, and new challenges from the north occurred. Magyars proved to be capable of attacking Constantinople, especially when in alliance with the Pechenegs<sup>56</sup>. Also the Rus' turned their attention to the Dniepr route, and emerged as a strong player in the Pontic zone<sup>57</sup>. These changes in the balance of power suggest that not only curiosity could incline the elite of the Empire to learn more about northern peoples. That increased acquaintance with the north was reflected in DAI. Not only was the Premyslid state described there (as White or Great Croatia<sup>58</sup>), but also tributaries of Rus', among them the \**Lqdzanie*. In the geo-political situation of the mid 10<sup>th</sup> century, particularly important for the Empire became the Pechenegs. As long as the other northern powers, such as the Khazars, Rus', Bulgaria and Magyars, would be in conflict with the Pechenegs, they were not free to attack the Empire. That is why, according to relevant chapters of DAI, the main goal of Byzantine diplomacy at that time was to maintain friendly relationship with the chiefs of the Pechenegs<sup>59</sup>. Thanks to that strategy, the reader of DAI was provided with a detailed description of Pecheneg tribes and their neighbors - among them, of course, the \**Lędzanie*. Such a relative boom of information in a Byzantine source concerning one of northern tribes should not, however, mislead us. As far as the sources inform the reader about the \**Lędzanie*, they never occurred as an independent political or military power, who would be interesting for the Empire *per se*. There is also no evidence that the \**Lędzanie* could be regular partakers of the Pontic trade and policy. There is no trace of \**Lędzan* peoples being involved in trade through the Dniepr-Prypec-Bug route in the late 9<sup>th</sup> and early 10<sup>th</sup> century<sup>60</sup>. It seems possible, however, that some Bug-Dniestr line could have func-

<sup>55</sup> G. MORAVCSIK, *Byzantium and the Magyars*, Budapest 1970, pp. 53-54.

<sup>56</sup> MORAVCSIK, *Byzantium*, pp. 54-56.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. D. CHRISTIAN, *The Kaghanate of the Rus': Non-Slavic Sources of Russian Statehood*, (in:) *Challenging Traditional Views of Russian History*, ed. S.G. WHEATCROFT, Palgrave/Macmillan, Houndmills-Basingstoke-Hampshire 2002, pp. 19-21.

<sup>58</sup> DAI XXX 71-75, p. 142; XXXI 3-5, 83-91, pp. 146, 152. Cf. LOWMIAŃSKI, *Początki Polski*, p. 169.

<sup>59</sup> DAI I-V, pp. 49-53.

<sup>60</sup> M. CZAPKIEWICZ, F. KMIETOWICZ, *Skarb monet arabskich z okolic Drohiczyzna nad Bugiem*, Kraków 1960, pp. 151-156.

tioned at that time; a route of obviously inferior value<sup>61</sup>. Even though the *\*Łędzanie* used to take part in trade enterprises of Rus' in the mid 10<sup>th</sup> century, their role in those activities was certainly not eminent. The only military or trade routes of over-regional importance that crossed *\*Łędzan* territories were the east-west connections from the Carpathian passes and Moravian Gate towards the east. That is why the *\*Łędzanie* could have become an object of interest of Magyar, Premyslid or western Jewish traders, as DH IV 390 and the *Book of Yosippon* assert for the third quarter of the 10<sup>th</sup> century. *\*Łędzan* peoples were, however, no object of interest from the viewpoint of the Empire, as they were not an independent player in trade and war. To know the names and geographic positions of such peoples was actually quite enough for a Byzantine writer, if even though it was not too much at all. As such, the occurrence of *\*Łędzanie* in the sources of the 10<sup>th</sup> century reflects the general ethno-political situation of that time in Middle and Eastern Europe. Many parts of these regions witnessed processes of growth and competition of new centers of power, which pulled the Slavic ethno-political entities into their systems of tribute exaction. These structures were naturally being watched by Constantinople and other centers of civilization, and that is how and why the *\*Łędzanie* occurred not only in DAI, but also in other contemporary sources.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. H. SAMSONOWICZ, „Długi wiek X” Z dziejów powstawania Europy, Poznań 2002, pp. 80-84. Also list of peoples mentioned in *Descriptio civitatum* could suggest existence of such a route.