

20. Nikephoros patriarch of Constantinople short history, Text, tr. and com. by C. Mango, Washington, 1990.
21. Kulakovskij Ju. A. *Istorija Vizantii*. S-Petersburg, 1996, T. III.
22. Ivanov S. A. Drevnearmjanskoe Zhitie Stefana Surozhskogo i hazary. *Hazary. Evrei i slavjane*, Ierusalim, Moscow, 2005, T. 16.
23. Vozouan A. La Vie Armenienne de Saint Etienne de Sougdai. Zuckerman C. (Ed.), *La Crimée entre Byzance et le Khaganat Khazar*, Paris, 2006.
24. Sargsjan T. Je. Zhitie Stefana Surozhskogo v armjanskih manuskriptah. *Bahchisarajskij istoriko-arheologičeskij sbornik*, Simferopol, 2008, Vol. 3.
25. Golb N., Pritsak O. *Khazarian Hebrew Documents of the Tenth Century*. Ithaca, London, 1982.

**Айбабин А. И.
Хазарская Сугдея
Резюме**

Расположенный на юго-восточном побережье Крыма портовый город греки называли Σουγδαία или Σουγδαία — Сугдайя или Сугдея. Первое достоверное упоминание города содержится в написанной в конце VII в. «Космографии» Равеннского анонима конца VII в., где назван Сугдабон — Sugdabon.

Вероятно, город основали сугды, переселившиеся под давлением хазар в Юго-Восточный Крым. В первой половине VIII в., благодаря динамичному росту экономики Восточного Крыма, Сугдея стала важным хазарским торговым портом региона. Вероятно, в начале столетия хазары создали в городе таможню. В акватории порта найдено свыше 400 византийских печатей VIII-XII вв., которые свидетельствуют о ведении Сугдеей прямой торговли с Константинополем и другими византийскими портами Малой Азии. В VIII в. Константинопольский патриарх учредил в городе епархию. Ее епископ Стефан участвовал в Седьмом Вселенском Никейском Соборе в 787 г., на котором временно победили иконопочитатели. В славянской и армянской версиях Жития Св. Стефана Сурожского правителем Сугдеи назван Юрий или Георгий по прозвищу Тархан. Вероятно, он подчинился «ха-пакиду» Боспора-Керчи — наместнику хазарского кагана. Очевидно, хазары оставили Сугдею до 873 г. В последней четверти IX в. город уже принадлежал Византии.

Ключевые слова: Сугдея, епархия, Стефан Сурожский, «Космография», хазары, тархан.

**Aibabin A. I.
Khazarian Sougdaia
Summary**

The Greeks called the port town located in the south-eastern shore of the Crimea Sougdaia (Σουγδαία or Σουγδαία). The first reliable account of the city occurred in the *Cosmography* by an anonymous author of Ravenna from the late seventh century and called it "Sugdabon."

The city was probably founded by the Sougdoi, who migrated to the South-Eastern Crimea due to Khazars' pressure. In the first half of the eight century, dynamically growing economy of the Eastern Crimea made Sougdaia an important commercial port of the Khazars in the area. In the early eight century, the Khazars probably created their customs in the city. There are more than 400 Byzantine seals from the eighth to twelfth century discovered in the water area of the port, supplying evidence of Sougdaia's direct trading with Constantinople and other Byzantine ports in the Asia Minor. In the eight century, the Patriarch of Constantinople established the bishopric of the city. Its Bishop Stephen participated in the Seventh Ecumenical Council of Nicaea in 787, where the iconophiles gained the upper hand. Slavonic and Armenian versions of the Life of St. Stephen of Sougdaia (Surozh) inform of the city leader Yurii or George nicknamed Tarkhan. Perhaps he was subordinated to the "HMQR" ("ha-paqid") of Bosphoros (Kerch), the governor from the Khazarian Khagan. The Khazars obviously left Sougdaia prior to 873 AD. In the last quarter of the ninth century, the city was the possession of Byzantium.

Keywords: Sougdaia, bishopric, Stephen of Sougdaia, *Cosmography*, Khazars, *tarkhan*.

C. ZUCKERMAN

Ecole pratique des hautes études / Université Paris Sciences et Lettres (EPHE / PSL)

THE END OF BYZANTINE RULE IN NORTH-EASTERN PONTUS¹

Вообще хочу отметить, что "захват половцами Тмутаракани" в сознании целого сонма «тмутаракановедов» (или «-едов») приобретает черты какой-то мифологемы, особенно контрастно это заметно на фоне работ Г. Г. Литаврина и А. П. Каждана, уже более полувека назад показавших, что в конце XI в. Матарха вернулась под власть Византии [Чхаидзе 2017: 10].

In the studies dedicated to the medieval history of the Crimea and the Taman peninsula, whose name is legion (in particular, in the Russian language), there are two perceptions that are engraved in stone. The continuity of Byzantine rule in the city of Cherson and, to some extent, in other regions of the Crimea in the twelfth century and beyond is one. The other is the instauration of direct Byzantine rule in the Taman's main city of Tamatarkha, Tmutorokan of the Rus'ian chronicles, in the last years of the eleventh century. For a prominent student of this city and its region, Victor Chkhaidze, quoted above, adherence to the latter perception is the mark of true scholars as opposed to charlatans.

It is my intention in this study to subject both *idées reçues* to a radical revision. Two new seals published in the past five years have produced crucial new data, yet scholars continue pouring new wine into old wineskins, as they struggle to adapt new evidence to the old concepts. I will argue, on the contrary, that the recent finds throw an entirely new light on the old familiar evidence and call for its thorough reconsideration. My aim is to propose a comprehensive view of the last surge of Byzantine power in North-Eastern Pontus, followed in the last third of the eleventh century by rapid decline and final disintegration both in Cherson and on the Taman peninsula. This large view is composed of small details, which need to be clarified one by one and which I invite the reader to follow.

I. The waning of the Byzantine presence in Cherson

The catalogue of the Byzantine seals issued in Cherson (not to be confused with the seals discovered in Cherson, several times more numerous) was published by Nikolaj (Nicolas) Alekseyenko five years ago, covering over four hundred specimens [Alekseyenko 2012]. They belong to Byzantine officials posted at Cherson as well as, in a small number of cases, to local dignitaries. The most voluminous group among the seals published, 137 examples, are those issued by the *stratego*i of the *thema* of Cherson. Some of the *stratego*i are known by ten to twenty seals and more, others are represented by fewer examples. As the editor points out, "les données des sceaux confirment l'existence du thème à partir du milieu du IX^e

¹ I am most grateful to Prof. Valerij Stepanenko (Yekaterinburg) for his critical reading of this paper (on behalf of the МАИЭТ editors). Despite our persistent disagreements, his remarks have helped me in the final editing. Dr. Oleksandr Romensky (Kharkiv) was of a great help in supplying me with some hard to access publications (which are not all quoted below: a fairly complete bibliography is available in [Чхаидзе 2017]).

siècle jusqu'à la première moitié du XI^e siècle, et fournissent aussi une précieuse information sur le rôle et la place de Cherson dans l'Empire" [Alekseyenko 2012: 49].

Neither the editor, however, nor other scholars ask the question why do the seals go as far as the middle of the eleventh century but no further. The question does not only concern the top commanders, *strategoi*, but all Byzantine officials, whether previously attested in Cherson — such as *kommerkiarioi*, *ek prosopou*, etc. — or not (the only exception is discussed below). The mid- to late-eleventh and the twelfth century represent as intensive a period for Byzantine seals as any. The total lack of sigillographical trace of Byzantine administration in Cherson, and in the Crimea as a whole, can have only one meaning — no such administration existed. The gradual vanishing of Byzantine presence can be traced step by step.

Werner Seibt, in his valuable review of Alekseyenko's catalogue, singles out a group of *strategoi* seals that he considers to be the most recent, dating them to the 1020-40's [Seibt 2013: 191]. They carry the traditional title of στρατηγός Χερσῶνος. Soon the title changes. A monumental inscription, now lost, dated April 10, 6567 (AD 1059), celebrated repairs to two gates at Cherson by Leo Aliates, *patrikios* and *strategos* of Cherson and Sugdea (modern Sudak in eastern Crimea) (πατρίκιος καὶ στρατηγός Χερσῶνος καὶ Σουγδαίας, IOSPE V, 11). We dispose of three seals of this officer, and at least two of them originate from Crimea, the most recent find coming from official excavations on the site of Cherson [Алексеенко 2016]. On the seals, however, Leo Aliates presents himself as *patrikios* and *strategos* only, with no geographical description of his command.

Leo Aliates' singular title on the inscription has been related to the seals of two *strategoi* of Sugdea recently discovered at Sudak: *protospatharios* George (4 ex., from a single *boulleterion*) and *patrikios* John (2 ex., probably from a single *boulleterion*). Elena Stepanova and Victoria Bulgakova, who have on different occasions edited the new finds from Sudak, both tend to believe that the *thema* of Sugdea was created first alongside Cherson, and then the two *themata* were brought together, in the middle of the eleventh century, under a single command [e.g., Степанова 2001: 105; Булгакова 2008: 314-6]. To this scheme, which would be rather uncommon, I will suggest an alternative below.

The next reform of Byzantine Crimea's command structure consisted in creating the position of a *katepano* (κατεπάνω, the "top" or "overall" commander). The katepanos, as attested from the last third of the tenth century, were assigned larger territorial districts than thematic *strategoi*, disposed of units of professional (tagmatic) troops, and exercised some authority, difficult to define, over the *strategoi* whose *themata* were situated within the territorial realm of the "katepanate" [Kühn 1991: 163-70].

The Crimean *katepano* has long been known from a unique entry common to two Rus'ian chronicles and dated to AM 6574. It describes the poisoning of Prince Rostislav of Tmutorokan by the cunning "Greek" *kotopan* (котопанъ) from Cherson [НПЛМл 1950: 185-6; PVL 2003: 1318-25]. The *katepano*, on a visit at Tmutorokan, allegedly hid the poison under his fingernail, and while drinking with Prince Rostislav from the same cup, dipped the finger in the wine before passing the cup to the prince. This story will interest us on several counts, but first we must clarify its date. According to the chronicles, Rostislav died on February 3rd, which is variously transcribed into the modern reckoning as February 3rd 1066 [e.g. Dimnik 2003: 82; Shepard 2006: 56; Алексеенко, Цепков 2012: 7²] or 1067 (most recent studies). The former calculation is based on the Byzantine year

² N. A. Alekseyenko and Ju. A. Tsepkov date the event to February 3, 1065 and only mention February 3, 1066 as an alternative dating in a "different redaction" of the chronicle. In fact, they rely on the Radziwiłł version of the *Tale of Bygone Years* (PVL) dating the entry to 6573, but this figure is an obvious scribal error due to the fact that the entry for 6573 is actually missing in the *Tale*

starting in September (AM 6574 = September 1065–August 1066), while the latter applies the "March-year" starting six months later (March 1066–February 1067). The "March-year" reckoning is generally used in the chronicle's early layer [Бережков 1963: 16], and most conspicuously so in the next two entries, AM 6575 & 6576. Thus, placing Rostislav's death in February 1067 appears secure. If so, the installation of a *katepano* at Cherson can be dated between late 1059 and late 1066.

The entry that carries the elaborate description of poisoning is one of several so-called "Tmutorokan notices" in the chronicle (a term going back to A.A. Shakhmatov), often linked to the person of Nikon, a prominent figure at the Caves Monastery in Kiev and its abbot in 1078-1088. According to the *Life of Saint Feodosij* of the Caves Monastery, Nikon had fallen out with Prince Izjaslav of Kiev in the early 1060's and left for Tmutorokan, where he founded a Monastery of the Holy Virgin. He returned to the Caves in 1068, reconciled with Izjaslav, yet left again in 1073, after refusing to endorse Izjaslav's dethronement by his brother Svjatoslav [Житие Феодосия 2004: 374, 388, 424]. In the same years, as revealed by textual study of the chronicles, a new chronographic compilation was composed at the Caves, which has only reached us as part of both the *Tale of Bygone Years* (PVL) and of the "younger redaction" of the Novgorod First Chronicle (НПЛМл). Nikon's role in this compilation — as author, informer, or neither — is debated. Since the monastery he had founded at Tmutorokan kept for many years the link to that of the Caves [Кабанец 2005], it could be the source of information on the region for any chronicler working at the mother-monastery. In fact, earlier and later entries in the *Tale* regarding Tmutorokan, which are only found in the *Tale* and not in the Novgorod First Chronicle, are independent of the 1070's compilation. As to the latter's precise date, the proposals range between 1072 (Cherepnin, Gippius) or 1073 (Shakhmatov) and 1077 (Ziborov). I have argued for dating the compilation to 1076 [Цукерман 2009: 273-82, with references], and I maintain my dating.

The near-simultaneity of the events described in the "Tmutorokan records" and their notation in the chronicle enhances the records' value for the historian. This, of course, is not to say that the story of the *katepano*'s involvement in Prince Rostislav's demise becomes any more plausible. The Byzantine officer was not caught red-handed, and the chronicler's only evidence for his guilt is the allegation that, upon his return to Cherson, the *katepano* could tell the exact day of the prince's death. But even if only a rumor, the story is revealing for the sour relations between the Byzantine commander in Crimea and the Rus'ian prince of Tamatarkha/Tmutorokan, as perceived by a well-informed observer.

The chronicler terminates the entry on Rostislav by pointing out in a purely factual manner that the *katepano* ended up being stoned to death by the people of Cherson. Scholars have linked his bad end to his alleged crime and formulated many excellent reasons why the inhabitants of Cherson could have taken so much to heart the fate of the Tmutorokan prince; a recent study describes the link between the *katepano*'s misdeed and the "rebellion of the Chersonites" as "established in historiography" [Роменский 2015: 215]. However, the long list of authorities cited in support of this view does not compensate for the fact that the chronicler himself makes no such connection [Якобсон 1950: 21-22, as corrected by Скрижинская 1953: 263]. The chronicler manifestly considers the *katepano*'s violent death as a punishment for his crime, but he does not try to claim that this was the motivation of the rebellious Chersonites. I will make a suggestion regarding their possible motives below, but here, again, I limit myself to the question of date. If we do not

(as shown by its other versions). The isolated testimony of Radziwiłł carries no weight against the combined evidence of the other versions.

insist on Nikon's role as the chronicler's informer, the Chersonites could have stoned their *katepano* any time in the late 1060's or early 1070's.

The Rus'ian chronicles' evidence for a *katepano* at Cherson has found little echo among the students of Byzantine history. And the attempt by Irina Sokolova to read the title *katepano* on two seals from Cherson [Соколова 1983: 162, n°50; 166, n°57] did not make it more credible. The seals' poor state of preservation rendered her readings highly hypothetical, and both seals have been recently re-edited with attributions to *strategoi* of Cherson [Aleksyenko 2012: 178, n° 93 and 177, n° 91, respectively].

The issue took a new turn with the discovery and publication of a well preserved seal of Nikephoros Alanos, the *katepano* of Cherson and Khazaria: † Κύριε βοήθει Νικηφόρω βεστάρχη καὶ κατεπάνω Χερσῶνος καὶ Χαζαρίας τῷ Αλανῶ [Алексеенко, Цепков 2012]. The seal was dated by the editors to the 1060-90's (p. 9). A slightly narrower dating, in the 1060-80's, has been proposed by Werner Seibt [2013: 192]. Curiously, it has not been pointed out that this is the very latest known seal of a Byzantine official struck at Cherson.

The seal defines for the first time the "katepanate"'s geographical realm. Its editors describe Khazaria as eastern Crimea including Sugdea but not necessarily Bosphoros [Алексеенко, Цепков 2012: 10], a localization that I share. Other proposals for localizing Khazaria will be discussed below, but first I should point out that the editors' localization suggests an explanation for the appearance of a *strategos* at Sugdea. Rather than admitting a merger of two distinct *themata* under Leo Aliates' command, an uncommon procedure, I would argue that the *thema* of Cherson was first expanded eastward and transformed into the *thema* of Cherson and Sugdea. This military and administrative unit existed for a short period of time between the late 1040's and the early 1060's, probably only in the 1050's. Then a *katepano* was dispatched to Cherson, making superfluous the presence of a *strategos* in the city. In fact, *strategoi* were appointed alongside the *katepanos* within the geographical realm of most "katepanates", and if this was the case with Sugdea, the *thema* of this name was created as a part of and at the same time as the "katepanate". As for the latter, we should be able to date its existence after reviewing the evidence on Tamatarkha/Tmutorokan.

II. The city of Tamatarcha outside and within the orbit of the Byzantine Empire

The city of Tamatarcha (from Turkic *tumen-tarkhan*, commander of 10,000 men; various Greek spellings attested) was built on the ruins of ancient Hermonassa as the Khazar seat of power on the Taman peninsula [the survey by Чхайдзе 2008: 258-95, contestable in some points, provides a good general view]. The city is mentioned for the first time with the new name in a list of bishoprics (*notitia episcopatum*), known as de Boor's *notitia* from the name of its first editor, and published by Jean Darrouzès as n° 3 of his corpus [Darrouzès 1981: 229-45]. All students of this document have recognized its non-official character. However, as I have argued elsewhere, this was not a figment of the private phantasy of some erudite compiler, but a project for a reform prepared in Patriarch Tarasios' chancellery ca. 802-805 and manifestly abandoned after the patriarch's death in February 806 [Zuckerman 2006: 202-18]. This project was mainly focused on integrating the western eparchies, detached by the Iconoclast emperors from papal jurisdiction, into the hierarchical structure of the Byzantine Church, but also included the creation of a metropolitanate in the territory of the Khazar kaghanate, Byzantium's close ally before the Khazars' conversion to Judaism. The fortress of Doros (modern site of Mangup) was destined to become the metropolitan see of "Gothia", with suffragan bishops at the Khazar capital Atil, at Tamatarkha and, among others, at the tribal see of Khotziroi, described as being close to Phoulai [Darrouzès 1981: 241-2, ll. 611-8; 245, l. 778]. There is no sign that any part of this project was actually put in practice.

Some recent studies speak of a transfer to Tamatarcha, about the middle of the ninth century, of the archbishop's see of Zikhia, traditionally based at Nikopsis [Виноградов 2009, followed by Чхайдзе 2013: 48]. This ghost-suggestion is not supported with any evidence for the date proposed, but the fate of the archbishopric of Zikhia is actually relevant to our topic. This ancient see, the only see situated in the Khazar territory, is conspicuously absent from the most systematic and thoroughly updated of all Byzantine *notitiae*, Darrouzès n° 7 [Darrouzès 1981: 269-88], promulgated by Emperor Romanos I Lekapenos and Patriarch Nicholas I Mystikos shortly after the celebration of the *Tome of Union's* first anniversary in July 921 [for the date, see Zuckerman 2006: 226].

The disappearance of Zikhia from the updated organigram of the Byzantine Church is surely related to the Khazar kings' endemic reprisals against Christians for the persecution and occasional forced baptism of Jews by the Byzantines in the aftermath of the Khazars' conversion to Judaism. A new round in this struggle started with the conversion of Alania, traditionally the Khazars' closest ally, to Christianity with Patriarch Nicholas' support, and ended with the Khazar king Aaron's victory over the Alans accompanied by the expulsion of Byzantine clergy from Alania ca. 932 [see for details Zuckerman 1995: 254-5].

The archbishop of Zikhia re-emerges in a new location, at Tamatarkha, in the list once known as the *notitia* of John Tzimiskes, presently Darrouzès n° 8. This *notitia* only lists the metropolitan and archbishop sees. In one of its forms, it names the archbishop as ὁ Ματάρχων ἦτοι Ζηκχίας; in another version, the see is presented, under number 53, as τὰ Ταμάταρχα ἢ Ζηκχία, the latter place-name being devoid of a number. Jean Darrouzès described the list, or rather the lists that he combined in *notitia* 8, as more or less systematic unofficial extensions of *notitia* 7. The metropolitans' list ends in most manuscripts with Pompeiupolis, that of archbishops with Tamatarkha/Zikhia; the two sees seem to have been promoted to their respective hierarchical positions fairly simultaneously [Darrouzès 1981: 79-87, 290-4 (text)]. Pompeiupolis' promotion to metropolitan rank is posterior to the creation of a metropolitan at Otranto (who appears several positions before Pompeiupolis) in 968 and shortly before a metropolitan was named in the newly converted Rôsia (who follows that of Pompeiupolis in later *notitiae*) ca. 990. This would suggest a Byzantine archbishop's installation at Tamatarkha either under John Tzimiskes or early in the reign of Basil II. Aleksandr Gadlo had every reason to link this re-emergence of the Zikhian see in the (former) stronghold of the Khazar kaghanate on the Taman to the kaghanate's collapse ca. 970 under the successive strikes of the Rus and the Oghuz Turks [Гадло 1991: 104-5].

A new hierarchical list of imperial lay dignitaries (*taktikon*), discovered by Nicolas Oikonomidès in a manuscript of the Escorial, has revealed another major move by Byzantium in the same region. This document, dated by Oikonomidès in the reign of John Tzimiskes after the end of his Bulgarian campaign (971-6), lists, among other officers non attested before, a *strategos* of Bosphoros, situated by the editor at Bosphoros-Kerch [Oikonomidès 1972: 269, l. 17, cf. 363]³. I consider this command to be about as recent as the *strategoi* created on Bulgarian soil by John Tzimiskes during or in the immediate aftermath of his campaign, and also listed in the *Taktikon*. The Empire's reaction to the kaghanate's decline in the 960's and its collapse ca. 970 was very rapid. The installation of a Byzantine *strategos* at Bosphoros and

³ I. A. Baranov suggested that the *strategos* of Euxeinos Pontos, also mentioned for the first time in the Escorial *Taktikon*, had his seat at Sugdea [Баранов 1990: 154, cf. Могаричев 2013: 52]. However, N. Oikonomidès had argued that this officer's role lay in protecting the northern access to Constantinople from the Black Sea along the Thracian Bosphoros [Oikonomidès 1972: 267, l. 10 (text), 358], and has later supported this analysis with more good arguments [see *DOSeals* 3, n° 721]. The statement by V. Chkhaidze that the Escorial *Taktikon* attests the *themata* at Sugdea and Bosphoros [Чхайдзе 2016: 20] seems to echo Baranov's suggestion.

an archbishop at Tamatarkha, just across the strait, occur in close sequence. The question is not whether the two events are linked, but what is the nature of this link.

Scholars who explored the site of ancient Tamatarkha have observed time and again the traces of a general fire, datable to the second half of the tenth century, that had terminated the Khazar period at the site [e.g. Плетнева 2000; Чхайдзе 2008: 143]. I consider this fire to be the outcome of the Byzantine conquest of Tamatarkha, more or less simultaneous with the installation of a Byzantine *strategos* at Bosphoros, on the opposite shore of the strait, and preceding shortly the arrival of a Byzantine archbishop in the city. By way of contrast, the unanimous Russian-language (and dependent) historiographical tradition ascribes the destruction of Khazar Tamatarkha either to Prince Svjatoslav or to Prince Vladimir.

The romantic vision of the “Varangian” Rus settling on the north-eastern coast of the Black Sea in the ninth century [e.g., Soloviev 1959: 573-5] belongs definitely in the past. Modern predominantly Russian-language historiography brings back the origins of the Rus presence at Tamatarkha to the times of Prince Oleg (941-945), Svjatoslav (ca. 961-972), or Vladimir (ca. 978-1015). Only the latest view can claim some support in the sources. A short appendix to the chronicle entry for AM 6496 / AD 988 describes Prince Vladimir’s division of “seats” between his sons and mentions the attribution of Tmutorokan to Mstislav [HJLM 1950: 159; PVL 2003: 946-8]. This text is considered to be an indication that Vladimir took possession of the city fairly early in his reign. Thus, in his survey of the Rus presence at Tamatarkha, V. N. Chkhaidze points out that Vladimir, precisely at that period, waged war in Crimea “from Cherson to Kerch” (от Корсуня и до Корча), and suggests that he used the occasion for establishing “a Russian protectorate” over Tamatarkha [Чхайдзе 2008: 286].

This is not the occasion to discuss the place within the chronicle of the short appendix on Vladimir’s sons, pertinently described in a recent study as “retrospective” and fairly late [Степаненко 2013: 158, n. 2]. Chkhaidze’s reference to a war waged “from Cherson to Kerch”, cited with no indication of source, does not describe Vladimir’s action, but rather that of his legendary avatar, Prince Bravlin, in the fifteenth-century Slavonic *Life of Saint Stephen of Surozh-Sugdea* [Ivanov 2006: 161]. There is no evidence of Vladimir’s engagement in eastern Crimea or the Taman peninsula. In fact, the earliest indication of the Rus involvement in the region, probably conducive to a permanent presence, belongs in the year after Vladimir’s death.

The presence of a Byzantine *strategos* at Bosphoros–Kerch seems to have only lasted for about half a century. An officer expressly endowed with this title, *protospatharios* Arkadios, is known from a seal [PmbZ Arkadios 20572], dated by Natascha and Werner Seibt to the late tenth-early eleventh century [Зайбт, Зайбт 1995: 95, who also mention two seals of uncertain reading possibly attesting Byzantine officials at Bosphoros]. Another early eleventh century seal belonged to George Tzoulas, *protospatharios* τοῦ Ποσφόρου [Alekseyenko 2012: 237, n° 159]. Despite some initial contestation, notably by Alexander Kazhdan, it seems to be admitted today that Ποσφόρος stands for Βοσφόρος, and the “*protospatharios* of Bosphoros” is none but the *strategos* of this military district carrying the court rank of *protospatharios*. Everything else regarding George Tzoulas is a matter of much debate.

A seal preserved in six exemplars, dating from the early eleventh century, presents George Tzoulas, an imperial *protospatharios* and *strategos* of Cherson; a similar seal, also known from six exemplars and dated the same, presents George Tzoulas, an imperial *protospatharios* and *strategos*, with no geographical definition of his command. The editor attributes both seals to one and the same *strategos* of Cherson [Alekseyenko 2012: 173-6, n° 89; 234-6, n° 156; cf. 44-5], and also suggests that George Tzoulas, notary and *khartolarios* on a late-tenth-century seal could be the same person at an earlier stage of his career [Алексеенко 2014: 143, n° 18]. The Tzoulas are the best-known aristocratic family of Cherson. A seal from the second half

of the tenth century features Leo Tzoulas, an imperial *protospatharios* and *strategos* of Cherson [Alekseyenko 2012: 162, n° 77]; Michael Tzoulas is styled on a late tenth-early eleventh century seal as imperial *protospatharios* of Cherson [*ibid.*: 232-3, n° 153], which points to his position of *strategos*. Two seals from the second half of the tenth century each present a Tzoulas (without the first name), an imperial *spatharios* of Cherson [*ibid.*: 231-2, n° 151-2], which also indicates the position of *strategos*. Tenth-eleventh-century seals attest five more family members, with or without titles [*ibid.*: 233-8, n° 154, 155, 157, 158, 160].

The most debated testimony on George Tzoulas belongs to John Skylitzes, a chronicler and a high functionary at Aleksios I Komnenos’ court. Skylitzes describes Emperor Basil II’s return to Constantinople in January 6524/1016, on which occasion the emperor sent a fleet to Khazaria (στόλον εἰς Χαζαρίαν ἐκπέμπει) under (Bardas) Mongos’ command. With the cooperation of Sphengos, a brother of Vladimir, the emperor’s brother-in-law, Mongos subdued the region (or the district) and captured its archon, George Tzoulas, in the first assault (καὶ τῆ συνεργίᾳ Σφέγγου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Βλαδιμηροῦ, τοῦ γαμβροῦ τοῦ βασιλέως, ὑπέταξε τὴν χώραν, τοῦ ἄρχοντος αὐτῆς Γεωργίου τοῦ Τζούλη ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ προσβολῇ συλληφθέντος)⁴ [Ioannes Scylitzes, ed. Thurn 1973: 354]. Three issues are at the heart of the debate concerning this passage.

The first two issues regard the identity of George Tzoulas and of Khazaria. Skylitzes’ archon was traditionally considered to be the ruler of a Khazar enclave, situated in Crimea or in “Caucasus”, which survived the fall of the Khazar kaghanate. After the publication of seals of the homonymous *strategos* of Cherson, he was identified as this *strategos* who had rebelled against the imperial authority [Скржинская 1953: 252-69]. This line of reasoning involved identifying Cherson or Crimea as a whole as Skylitzes’ Khazaria, which, as pointed out by Valerij Stepanenko, was its obvious weakness. This scholar considered Skylitzes’ Tzoulas to be an ethnic ruler in Crimea who actually started his career in the imperial service after his capture, attaining the rank of *protospatharios* [Степаненко 2008; 2011; cf. Роменский 2016, with detailed bibliographical surveys].

All recent participants in the debate dismiss the identity of Skylitzes’ George Tzoulas, whether united with or separated from the homonymous *strategos* of Cherson, with the strictly contemporary George Tzoulas of Bosphoros. But now that the reading of the seal linking George Tzoulas to Bosphoros is no longer contested, there can be little doubt that Skylitzes’ Tzoulas was a rebellious governor of Bosphoro⁵. In fact, two recently published seals not only allow a precise localization of Khazaria in eastern Crimea, but also show that in Skylitzes’ time, the imperial officer whose realm of command included Bosphoros region carried the official title, of which “archon of Khazaria” was part (see below). I have once suggested that after serving as the *strategos* of Cherson, a city ruled beforehand by members of his family, George Tzoulas was relegated to a much less desirable position of *strategos* of Bosphoros, and this was what prompted his rebellion [Zuckerman 2006: 224]. This scenario appears to me even more plausible now, but it would be appropriate to discuss Tzoulas episode in more detail after presenting the evidence of the seals.

The third much debated issue concerns the identity of Sphengos, presented as a brother of Prince Vladimir, Emperor Basil II’s brother-in-law. An old theory still popular with scholars identifies Sphengos as Vladimir’s son Mstislav [e.g. Shepard 2006: 31-4; Слядзь 2014: 39-

⁴ In a recent English translation Sphengos is described as “the brother of Vladimir and brother-in-law of the emperor” [Wortley 2010: 336], which is an oversight.

⁵ According to Chkhaidze, this George Tzoulas occupied two distinct positions, those of an archon of Khazaria and of a *strategos* of Bosphoros, “and what only remains unclear is in what sequence he occupied them” [Чхайдзе 2016: 21].

62], but neither the name nor the family relation to Vladimir fits. According to a much more plausible identification recently proposed by Oleksandr Fylypchuk, Sphengos was none other than the jarl Sweyn Haakonsson (Sveinn Hákonarson). Expelled from Norway ca. 1015, he went to Garðariki (Rus) to make a fortune and died a year later, in Sweden, upon his return from the East [Филипчук 2009]. There is no point in guessing why this personage claimed to be Vladimir's brother, but the names coincide and the chronological fit is most striking. This Scandinavian noble must have been Prince Jaroslav's "Varangian" ally, who provoked riots in Novgorod and then assisted Jaroslav in expelling his brother Svjatopolk from Kiev in winter 1015/6. He must have continued on his way to Byzantium in the spring, and his expedition to Khazaria must have then taken place in the summer, and not in the middle of the winter as claimed by scholars who take Skylitzes to mean that Basil II sent a sizable naval force across the Black Sea in January. The "Khazarian" raid was indeed very short, as stated by Skylitzes, since Sphengos-Sweyn was back in Scandinavia in the fall.

While I see no sign of the presence of a Rus'ian prince on the Taman either before or during George Tzoulas' rebellion, a few years later the *Tale of Bygone Years* pictures Mstislav as well established at Tmutorokan (AM 6530 / AD 1022). The power vacuum on the Bosporos in the rebellion's aftermath and the unsettled state of Rus during the years of Svjatopolk's and Jaroslav's struggle for the Kiev throne could have prompted Mstislav's move to Tamatarkha. But an arrangement with Emperor Basil II, still fully engaged in the Bulgarian war, about ceding the region to the Rus'ian prince would also appear plausible. The status of Bosporos is the main argument (see below), but Mstislav's coinage could also produce evidence supporting such a scheme. Recent studies attribute, in fact, the earliest Tmutorokan silver coins to the period of Mstislav's principedom [survey in Androshchuk 2016: 85]. In striking silver Mstislav followed the example of his father Vladimir and his rival brothers Svjatopolk and Jaroslav; unlike them, however, he did not decorate the coins with his own effigy but rather imitated the coinage of Emperors Basil II and Constantine VIII.

Thus I would link the emergence of a Rus'ian principality at Tmutorokan with the disappearance of the Byzantine Bosporos command. Starting in the late 1010's, for nearly eighty years, Tamatarkha-Tmutorokan gravitated in the orbit of Kievan Rus.

III. Prince Oleg-Michael and his seals

According to the *Tale*, Mstislav left Tmutorokan in AM 6532 / AD 1024 to challenge his brother Jaroslav over the throne of Kiev. As I have argued elsewhere, this was about the time when the struggle between Svjatopolk and Jaroslav actually terminated, rather than in 1019, as indicated in the *Tale* [Цукерман 2009: 219-22]. After Mstislav's departure, nothing is known about Tmutorokan until the 1060's. It is not my aim to present here in any detail the evidence on the Rus'ian presence at Tmutorokan, as delivered by chronicles and, in recent times, by archaeological excavations [survey in Чхайдзе 2008]. As pertinently observed by Mykola Kotliar, Tmutorokan, while ruled by rotating Rus'ian princes, never developed the administrative features of a regular Rus'ian "principedom", retaining strong elements of autochthonous self-government [Котляр 2003]. I would compare its position to eleventh-century Novgorod, with the main difference that the Rus'ian princes operated in Tmutorokan in a non-Slavic milieu and tended to be disinherited young adventurers aspiring for a better lot. Thus, for instance, in the 1060's the legitimate prince Gleb Svjatoslavich had been expelled twice by his ambitious cousin Rostislav (above) whom he also succeeded in 1067.

The prince who will interest us closely is Gleb's enterprising brother Oleg. According to the *Tale*, Oleg first came to Tmutorokan from Chernigov in spring 1078 fleeing his uncle Vsevolod. Tmutorokan was ruled at the time by Oleg's brother Roman and hosted another disinherited grandson of Jaroslav the Wise, Boris Vjacheslavich, who fled Chernigov shortly before Oleg. In the same summer, Oleg and Boris orchestrated a major invasion of Rus by

the Cumans, provoking much destruction and loss of men. Yet the Cumans were beaten off, Boris was killed, and Oleg fled back to Tmutorokan. The next year Roman attempted invading Rus with the Cumans in his turn, but he was outsmarted by Prince Vsevolod of Kiev and murdered by his own Cuman allies. As for Oleg, he was captured by the Khazars at Tmutorokan and expelled "beyond the sea" to Constantinople making place for a governor appointed by Vsevolod, who was evicted in 1081 by another disgruntled pair of princes, Davyd Igorevich and Volodar, son of Tmutorokan's former prince Rostislav [PVL 2003: 1606-45].

We recover Prince Oleg's trace in Byzantium in his fellow-countryman Abbot Daniel's account of pilgrimage to the Holy Land (ca. 1104-6). On his way, Daniel visited the island of Rhodes, where the "Rus'ian prince Oleg spent two summers and two winters" [Хождение игумена Даниила 2004: online]. Scholars have early observed that the duration of Oleg's relegation to an island coincided with the last two years of the reign of Emperor Nikephoros III Botaneiates, and concluded that Oleg's exile must have been negotiated with the latter. Oleg's liberation coincided with the coup-d'état that brought to power Aleksios I Komnenos.

The conditions of Oleg's return two years later have become better known thanks to a newly published seal, commented below. The *Tale* only notes that in 6591/1083, "Oleg came from (the land of) the Greeks to Tmutorokan, seized David and Volodar Rostislavich, and sat on Tmutorokan's throne. He slaughtered the Khazars who had advised killing his brother and himself, and let Davyd and Volodar go" [PVL 2003: 1646-7]. This chronicle entry is often cited as evidence for a general slaughter of Khazars at Tmutorokan perpetuated by Oleg [e.g. Мораричев 2013: 54], but this was clearly not the case. According to the chronicler's own indications, Oleg's brother Roman was assassinated by the Cumans, not the Khazars, who expelled, not killed, Oleg. Manifestly, some minority fraction of Tmutorokan Khazars had been particularly hostile towards Roman and Oleg and Oleg, upon his return, was strong enough to settle the score with his enemies. The Khazars appear as an organized ethnic group weighing decisively on Tmutorokan's destiny. The *Tale* assigns to Oleg a stay of eleven years at Tmutorokan, noting his departure for Chernigov, "his father's town", with his Cuman allies in 6602/1094 but no other events. Oleg's stint at Tmutorokan was marked by abundant coinage, mostly of low-grade silver, but we will only focus on his seals.

The first specimen of a seal in the name of Michael, carrying the legend Κύριε βοήθει Μιχαήλ ἄρχοντι Ματράχων, Ζιχίας καὶ πάσης Χαζαρίας, was published by Nicolas Banescu in 1941. The editor identified the seal's owner as a Byzantine official who took over the control of vast areas along the eastern shores of Pontus after Prince Oleg's departure in 1094 [Banescu 1941]. In a major correction to this view, Alexandre Soloviev attributed the seal to Prince Oleg himself [Soloviev 1958]. Soloviev reproached Banescu for not having consulted the Rus'ian sources, which would have revealed to him that Michael was Oleg's Christian name. This name is attested in the Ljubetch *synodikon*, a source on which I will not dwell, and, most importantly, in Abbot Daniel's account. At the very end, Daniel lists the Rus princes, whose names he wrote down for commemoration at the Laura of Saint-Sabas, naming the prince Michael Oleg [Хождение игумена Даниила 2004: online; Soloviev 1958: 578]. I know of no substantial objection or alternative to Soloviev's identification.

While the seal published by Banescu (with the help of Vitalien Laurent) was probably found in Istanbul, a recent survey by Victor Chkhaidze lists seven more seals with the same legend discovered since in eastern Pontus: two were found in or near the city of Kerch, ancient Bosporos, opposite Tamatarkha on the western coast of the Strait, two on the Taman peninsula⁶, one in the sea at the site of Tamatarkha, and two more at Sudak, as part of the

⁶ This is the indication of provenance in the survey by V. Yanin and P. Gajdukov, which Chkhaidze cites as source [Янин, Гайдуков 2004: 141], while indicating for his part a much wider area of provenance — Taman or Crimea. I note in passing that the first reference in [Чхайдзе 2016: 11,

so-called Sudak-Sugdea archive [Чхайдзе 2016: 11]. The provenance of the latter two can be considered as certain, while for the rest we depend on indications of private collectors, usually fairly reliable. Victoria Bulgakova has attributed the four seals known to her *de visu* or on a photograph (the one from Constantinople, the two from Sugdea, and one from Kerch) to one and the same *boulleterion* [Булгакова 2008: 321-2]. This is also clearly the case of the seal found at Tamatarkha and published for the first time by Chkhaidze [Чхайдзе 2016: 26, fig. 12]. The three remaining seals of this type are only known from descriptions.

The geographical extent of Oleg-Michael's realm, as described on the seal, has often been debated and will be discussed below. Scholars have also commented on his "neutral" self-description as *archon* and the lack of specifically Byzantine titles on his typically Byzantine seal. As Jonathan Shepard had every right to emphasize in 2006, "What Oleg did *not* declare himself to be was an officially subordinate 'client' of the emperor. He did not, on his extant seals, style himself by a Byzantine court title, and there are other hints that he preferred to accentuate the autonomous quality of his regime at Tmutarakan" [Shepard 2006: 45].

Thus all the more sensational was the recent publication by Oleksandr Alf'orov of a new seal of Oleg-Michael, reportedly found in the Dnipropetrovs'k province of Ukraine, which carries a different legend: Κύριε βοήθει τῷ σῶ δούλῳ Μιχαῖλ ἄρχοντι καὶ δοῦκα Ματράχων καὶ πάσης Χαζαρίας [Alf'orov 2015]⁷. This excellent specimen enables a secure reading of another seal, first pointed out in print in 1998 as originating from Kerch region, now in the same Sheremetiev collection in Kiev as the one previously cited [Alf'orov 2015: 98-9]. Visibly struck by the same *boulleterion* in a worn-down condition, this seal was, initially, only partially deciphered. On his newly discovered seal, Oleg-Michael does not name Zikhia among his domains yet he carries the Byzantine title of *doux*.

Most recently, Victor Chkhaidze published a third type of seal of the same series also found in the sea, in 2015, at Tamatarkha site. Only half of the seal is preserved, yet the editor could mostly read and complete the legend: † ΚC[R,Θ,] | ΜΙΧΑΗ[ΛΑΡ] | ΧΟΝΤΙ[...] | ΟΝ(OR K)Τ(?)[...] | ΑΤΡ[ΑΧΟΝ] | ΣΠ[ΑC,ΧΑ] | Ζ[ΑΡ,] = † Κ(ύριε) β(οή)θ(ει) Μιχαῖ(λ) ἄρχοντι ... [Μ]ατρ(άχων) (καὶ) π[ά]σ(ης) Χαζ[α]ρ(ίας) — †. Chkhaidze's definitive reconstruction, however, is startling: † Κύριε βοήθει Μιχαῖλ ἄρχοντι τῶν ἀρχόντων (sic! CZ) Ματράχων καὶ πάσης Χαζαρίας [Чхайдзе 2016: 13-4, with n. 83]. The old Armenian title of "prince of princes" (ἄρχων τῶν ἀρχόντων) is restrained in our period, as before, to the highest Armenian (eventually nearby Georgian) nobility [see Степаненко 2012], and is out of place in the present context. A simpler solution, in agreement with the published photograph (Fig. 1), would be to read and to complete: † Κ(ύριε) [β(οή)θ(ει)] | Μιχαῖ[λ] ἄρχ[οντι] [καὶ δ]οῦκ[α Μ]ατρ[άχ(ων)] (καὶ) π[ά]σ[α]ρ[χ(ίας)] †. The quality of the stamp, with its erratic distribution of letters in the lines, has nothing in common with that of the stamp used for the seal published by Alf'orov, yet the content is essentially the same.

The chronological sequence of the seals, at least of the two first-named types, has been debated. Oleksandr Alf'orov suggested that Oleg-Michael was granted the title of *doux*, together with a *boulleterion* with exquisite quality dies that carry this title, in Constantinople, in 1083, on the eve of his return to Tamatarkha from Byzantine exile. The title's significance remains obscure in Alf'orov, who briefly cites Werner Seibt's arguments against

considering it as a sign of Tamatarkha's submission to the Empire [Alf'orov 2015: 100-1]. For Alf'orov, however, the seal he published was clearly Oleg-Michael's first. About the same time, Valerij Stepanenko published a paper asserting the opposite sequence: Oleg-Michael earliest seal would be the one presenting him as *archon* only, followed by the one adding the title *doux*. In the new legend, Zikhia "slipped away" (for whatever reason) as part of Oleg's realm, while the double title marks Oleg-Michael's transition from the status of a sovereign ruler-*archon* to that of a Byzantine official-*doux* [Степаненко 2013]. Against this background, Chkhaidze describes the chronological sequence of the seals as "unclear" [Чхайдзе 2016: 21].

I propose the following sequence of the three seal types. The one with the double title comes first, as suggested by Alf'orov. On this seal Oleg-Michael carries his old title of *archon/knjaz'*, which he possessed before his exile, as well as his new Byzantine title of *doux*, more or less equivalent to *katepano* [cf. Kühn 1991: 158-70]. The seal carries on the obverse a finely crafted image of Archangel Michael with a rare depiction of the seal's owner kneeling at the archangel's feet. The original seal, once the matrices had been worn down as badly as shown by the "1998" specimen from Kerch region, was replaced by the one recently published by Chkhaidze. This seal drops the traditional phrase τῷ σῶ δούλῳ, but keeps the same title; on the obverse, the image of Archangel Michael is simplified and the owner's figure vanishes. The third type also carries a simplified image of Archangel Michael with no owner depicted and omits the phrase τῷ σῶ δούλῳ in the legend. But the main change occurs in Oleg-Michael's title: styled *archon* only, he adds Zikhia to his realm's description. I will argue that the two modifications in the title are related, but before that I will present the evidence pertaining to Oleg-Michael's installation at Tamatarkha, which has never been recognized as such: Manuel Straboromanos' testimony in his panegyric of Emperor Alexios I Komnenos.

Paul Gautier, who published the panegyric as part of a small dossier of texts relating to Manuel, did not dwell on its chronology; he only named the year of the last event that he could date, 1103, as the *terminus post quem* [Gautier 1965: 178, n. 1]. Radivoj Radić has argued that the text could not have been composed any later than 1103 either, since after that year some of Emperor Alexios's achievements, celebrated by Manuel, started unraveling [Радић 1989: 96-9]. Finally, Valerij Stepanenko has reviewed once more the historical context of the panegyric and proposed as the probable time-span for its composition the years 1098-1103 [Степаненко 1992: 129-33].

Among the emperor's many military feats, the panegyrist mentions (re)attaching (προσέθηκας) lost regions to the Empire, including those situated at the Cimmerian Bosphoros (καὶ ὅσα παρὰ τὸν Κιμμέριον Βόσπορον) [Gautier 1965: 190]. The first to have commented on the passage was Gennadij Litavrin, who related it to the principality of Tmutorokan [Litavrin 1965; update and retrospective in Литаврин 2000: 281-6]. The recovery of the Cimmerian Bosphoros by Alexios I consisted, in his view, in submitting the principality to direct imperial rule soon after Oleg-Michael, the last Rus'ian prince of Tmutorokan, had left it for Chernigov in 1094. Thus Litavrin's analysis integrated the long line of studies on Tmutorokan (listed by the author) presenting the city's vanishing



Fig. 1. Fragmentary seal of Oleg-Michael found at Tamatarkha site in 2015 [reproduced from Чхайдзе 2016: 27, fig. 15]

n. 66 is erroneous — he refers to Янин В. Л., Гайдюков П. Г. Актовые печати Древней Руси X–XV вв. Том III. Печати, зарегистрированные в 1970–1996 гг. М., 1998, while he actually has in mind *Они же*. Древнерусские вислые печати, зарегистрированные в 1997 г. // Новгород и Новгородская земля. История и археология. Вып. 12. Новгород, 1998].

⁷ The editor prints ἄρχοντι καὶ δοῦκα (p. 98) and comments on "the use of the dative case for the first term, and the accusative case for the second" (p. 100), but this is an obvious lapse: read dative in both cases.

from the Rus'ian chronicles (no mention after 1094) as a sign of its passage under Byzantine control. This approach is widely shared in modern scholarship, even though no scholar explains what form this control could have possibly taken and how it was exercised in practice.

The newly discovered seal of Oleg-Michael featuring him as a Byzantine *doux* throws an entirely new light upon Manuel Straboromanos' testimony. It leaves no doubt that Oleg-Michael was installed at Tamatarkha by Byzantium as an imperial officer. Thus it is now clear that in speaking of the recovery of the Cimmerian Bosphoros by Alexios I, Manuel had in mind the region's submission to a Byzantine military commander in the person of Oleg-Michael.

Yet, the evolution of the latter's titles shows that his attachment to the Empire did not last. Jonathan Shepard's observation that Oleg-Michael "did *not* declare himself to be ... an officially subordinate 'client' of the emperor" (above) fully pertains to the later part of his stint at Tamatarkha. The reason, no doubt, was that the title of *doux* implied subordination to the distant emperor, who, given the Empire's state at the time, could not be of any practical help. This is no coincidence that Oleg-Michael drops his empty title and simultaneously claims suzerainty over Zikhia. In the episode studied above, the chronicler explains the sour relations between the imperial *katepano* and Prince Rostislav of Tmutorokan in 1066 by the Byzantines' apprehension when Rostislav started claiming tribute "from the Kasogians and other countries, which scared the Greeks" [HJIM 1950: 185; PVL 2003: 1319]. Kasogia, the naphtha country, is part of Zikhia. By claiming Zikhia as his domain, Oleg-Michael openly lays hand on the sources of naphtha, to the detriment of his former imperial suzerain.

The last testimony to add to the dossier is a letter by Archbishop Theophylact of Bulgaria (or Ohrid) to Gregory Taronites (*Ep.* 81) written in summer 1003, that is in the same year as Manuel Straboromanos' laudatory speech or a couple of years later. The letter mentions the heavy tributes imposed by "Tanisman" (Emir of Sivas Danishmend Gazi) on "Hellenic cities" (ἑλληνίδας πόλεις) of the eastern and southern Black Sea coast, including those "between the river Tanais and the Maeotic Lake". Military action by Gregory removed Tanisman's vexations — from all cities or some is not said (Theophylact, ed. Gautier 1986: 126 [date], 426-9 [text and French translation]). A. Kazhdan was the first to cite this text as indicative of Byzantium's hold over Tamatarkha in the early twelfth century [Каздан 1963; better Kazhdan 1983: 345]. G.G. Litavrin linked this testimony to that of Manuel Straboromanos as an additional proof of Tamatarkha's passage under Byzantine sway after Oleg-Michael's departure for Chernigov [Litavrin 1965: 229-30]. Theophylact's letter is cited in the same capacity in later studies, but I see much confusion in the matter.

The first question that few scholars ask is how Danishmend Gazi, the emir of Sivas-Sebasteia, could impose any hardships on the cities of eastern Pontus, with which his small realm in north-eastern Asia Minor had no territorial contiguity (they were separated by the Georgian kingdom)? J. Shepard suggested that Danishmend employed his navy [Shepard 1974: 21-3]. A. Kazhdan surmised that the cities "were attacked ... if not by the Seljuks themselves, then by the Polovcians acting in alliance with them" [Kazhdan 1983: 345]. But we have no knowledge either of Danishmend's navy or of his Cuman/Polovtsian allies. We may ask, likewise, how Gregory Taronites with his small expeditionary force could reach as far east as Tamatarkha (which is not actually named by Theophylact). Paul Gautier, the editor of Theophylact's *Epistulae*, answered both these questions: "Il se pourrait bien que Théophylacte ait cédé à la *vis rhetorica*: il a exagéré l'étendue du territoire de Tanisman, pour le plaisir de citer des noms de peuples anciens, et gonflé le

success remporté par Grégoire Tarônites, success dont on ne niera pas l'existence, mais qui dut être local et modeste [Theophylact, ed. Gautier 1986: 124-5].

A quick verification in the TLG makes it clear that the root of error is Kazhdan's initial assumption that Theophylact used the idiom ἑλληνίδες πόλεις to describe imperial cities. But just as the Byzantine state is for Theophylact Ῥωμαϊκὸν πολιτεῖμα or Ῥωμαίων ἀρχή, cities of the Empire are πόλεις τῶν Ῥωμαίων. His unique usage of the idiom ἑλληνίδες πόλεις, applied to Greek cities close to the Tanais and the Maeotic Lake, conveys the exact meaning it carries in the classical sources, designating cities of Hellenic culture dispersed in barbarian surroundings. Theophylact's vocabulary choice implies no link between these cities and the Empire, quite the contrary. Three authors of a recent study quote Theophylact and Manuel Straboromanos (in addition to a highly speculative exegesis of a newly discovered seal), and propose a radiant vision of Byzantine dominance in Tamatarkha region in the first half of the twelfth century, including "provision of military forces, administration and church representation" [Чхаидзе, Каштанов, Виноградов 2015: 134-6]. Leaving the church hierarchy aside, I believe that this scheme hangs entirely in the air.

IV. "All Khazaria" = Khazaria. The location of Khazaria

All types of seals of Oleg-Michael feature Khazaria as part of his realm. In the years that have passed since Nicolas Banescu published the first exemplar of such a seal in 1941, two main diverging geographical definitions of Khazaria have been debated. Before discussing them in my turn, I should emphasize that two recently published seals have shifted the debate's parameters dramatically. While the seal of the Byzantine *doux* Oleg-Michael attaches Khazaria to Tamatarkha, the seal of the imperial *katepano* Nikephoros Alanos features it as part of the "katepanate" of Cherson, making clear that Khazaria belonged to the Empire as early as ca. 1060, when the "katepanate" was created. The same geographical notion on two nearly contemporary seals would presumably apply to the same territory.

It has been pointed out, however, that the seal of Nikephoros Alanos mentions Khazaria *tout court*, while those of Oleg-Michael speak of "all Khazaria" (πάσης Χαζαρίας). Various interpretations have been proposed for the idiom "all Khazaria" when it was the only formulation available, while recently Victor Chkhaidze proposed a thorough revision of the topic based on a semantic and geographic distinction between "Khazaria" and "all Khazaria". He observed with reason that rather than speculating abstractly on what "all Khazaria" could possibly mean, we should be guided by parallel usages in Byzantine administrative practice. Such usages are, essentially, two: "all the West" and "all Bulgaria". Their examination makes Chkhaidze conclude that adding the qualifier *πᾶσα* to a territorial unit's name "was linked to some extraordinary events in the territories in question, which required not only nominating energetic officials to administrate them, but also expanding the latter's authority, both in regard to its territorial scope and to the provision of wide administrative and military resources" [Чхаидзе 2016: 17-20]. Yet, a closer look at both cases named does not sustain Chkhaidze's conclusion.

This is not the place to retrace the history of the Byzantine military command of the West (τῆς Δύσεως), having that of the East (τῆς Ανατολῆς) as its counterpart [e.g. Kühn 1991: 262-72; Мохов 2008]. Suffice is to mention that in a representative cross-section of seals of thirty different officials "of the West" in the Dumbarton Oaks catalogue only three carry the expanded formula "of all the West" [DO Seals I: 1-15]. All three are contemporary with the seal of Oleg-Michael (last third of the eleventh century). I will examine one example. Alexios Komnenos, the future emperor, is presented on his seal as grand *domestikos* "of the West" [n° I, 15, dated to 1074-8],

while his brother and fairly close successor in the same position Adrianos is styled on his seal grand *domestikos* “of all the West” [n° I, 13, dated after 1086]. We could start speculating which brother was more “energetic” and endowed with authority in his commanding position, if we did not have their father, John Komnenos, described in an Athos document of 1062 as grand *doux* “of all the West” [Ivion II: 103, n° 35, l.36]. It is unlikely that the “territorial scope” of the Western command changed in the least within the period of activity of the three Komnenoi. Besides, in all other descriptions of his command, including his seal, John Komnenos carries the regular title of *domestikos* “of the West” [Μοxοv 2008, 172]. No scholar before Chkhaidze has ever suggested a semantic or functional distinction between “the West” and “all the West”. Manifestly, there was none.

The case of Nikephoros Ouranos mentioned by Chkhaidze deserves a special notice [Чхаидзе 2016: 19, after Μοxοv 2008: 169]. Nikephoros occupied in 996-9 the position of *domestikos* (of the Scholae) of the West [PmbZ 25617: Nikephoros Uranos], but is presented by John Skylitzes as πάσης δύσεως ἄρχων [Ioannes Scylitzes, ed. Thurn 1973: 341, l. 23]. Thus Skylitzes not only replaces the title of *domestikos* by the vague description archon, but also introduces the adjective πάσης, which will first appear in the *domestikos*’ title over sixty years after Nikephoros. I dwell on this example since it shows that scholars’ expectation to find in Skylitzes the exact reproduction of George Tzoulas’ official title is not reasonable. Skylitzes demonstrably did not shy away from paraphrasing and modernizing the titles.

The case of *Boulgaria* could appear less clear-cut. The duchy of this name was created in the core lands of the Bulgarian Kingdom soon after its conquest by Byzantium in 1018 [e.g. Kühn 1991: 227-33]. Scores of civilian and military officials who carry the name of the district *Boulgaria* in their title are attested by seals. Among the seals that mention *Boulgaria* with no qualifier, the seal of Constantine, προνοητής πάσης Βουλγαρίας, first published by Vitalien Laurent, later discovered in four more exemplars [see *DO Seals* I: 93-4, n° 29.1], created a small sensation. The first editor did not comment on the qualifier πᾶσα, yet in later scholarship the opinion prevailed that I quote from the authoritative *Dumbarton Oaks* catalogue published by John Nesbitt and Nicolas Oikonomides: “we find seals whose owners claim authority over ‘all of Bulgaria’ (πάσης Βουλγαρίας); in interpreting this phrase we tend to agree with Zlatarski, who thought that it designated the totality of the traditional Bulgarian territories (including the Paristrion)” [*DO Seals* I: 93]. This appraisal would have lent support to Chkhaidze’s analysis — if only it could be considered as founded.

Among numerous Byzantine officials attested in *Boulgaria*, we do not find multiple “owners” of seals “who claim authority over all of Bulgaria”: this is the case of Constantine alone, and, most importantly, on only two out of four types of his seals [*Österreich* II: 130-1; cf. Jordanov 2003: 49]. The relative chronology of Constantine’s career, dated as a whole in the third quarter of the eleventh century, is indicated by the progress of his honorific court titles. He is first attested with the titles of *patrikios hypatos*, in the position of *anagrapheus*, chief cadastral officer of *Boulgaria*; then, promoted *anthypatos patrikios*, he is appointed *doux* of *Boulgaria*; then, endowed with the additional court title of *bestes*, he combines the positions of *logariastès* (chief accounting officer) and *anagrapheus* “of all *Boulgaria*” [latest edition *Österreich* II: 130-1, n° 112] — in other words, he controls the entire fiscal service of his district. Finally, he is further promoted *bestarkhes* and appointed *pronoètès* “of all *Boulgaria*” [*Österreich* II: 219-20, n° 220]. The *Österreich* seals’ editors Alexandra-Kyriaki Wassiliou and Werner Seibt make no comment on the qualifier πᾶσα and do not attribute to Constantine a more extended geographical realm of

authority in the period when his seals’ legend included the phrase πάσης Βουλγαρίας than when they referred just to *Boulgaria*. What is more, the editors suggest as his probable successor a certain John who described himself as προνοητής Βουλγαρίας *tout court* [*Österreich* II: 219-20]. It would have been most unlikely that for one single official and for a very short period of time the fiscal services of (at least) two districts were confounded into a single unit. It is even less likely that this unit would have been named “all *Boulgaria*” by reference to the long defunct Bulgarian kingdom, rather than in a more explicit and standard manner, such as “*Boulgaria* and Paristrion”, for instance, if those were the districts combined.

Thus a careful examination of use of the qualifier πᾶσα with a name of a military-administrative district in the two cases pointed out by Victor Chkhaidze undermines the conclusions formulated by the scholar himself. Neither “all the West” nor “all *Boulgaria*” refer to territorial entities any different from the “West” and “*Boulgaria*” *tout court*. The addition of the emphatic qualifier is no more than a speech mannerism typical of the last third of the eleventh century. This conclusion applies to “all Khazaria” on Oleg-Michael’s seals. I would also suggest applying it to the phrase “all *Rôsia*” (ἄρχοντι πάσης Ῥωσίας) in the legend of an idiosyncratic seal of Vsevolod-Andrew, prince of Kiev in 1076-7 and 1078-93 [*DO Seals* I: 192, n° 85.1; cf. Янин, Гайдуков 1998: 20-1]. The creative interpretations proposed for this title are not my topic; enough is to mention that chronologically, the legend of Oleg-Michael’s seals could have inspired the one employed by Vsevolod-Andrew.

The practical implications of Chkhaidze’s analysis are hard to grasp. He rightly places the seal of *katepano* Nikephoros Alanos in the 1060’s-1070’s, before Oleg-Michael’s seals, and he admits that “Khazaria” named on this seal as part of *katepano*’s command did not extend beyond eastern Crimea, since territories across the Strait of Kerch were ruled at the time by Rus’ian princes [Чхаидзе 2016: 22]. Nevertheless, Chkhaidze claims that Khazaria, “in the understanding of the inhabitants of the eleventh-century Byzantine Empire, (...) comprised both coasts of the Bosporos” and, therefore, attributes to Oleg-Michael an extended Khazaria, comprising the city of Tamatarkha and the adjacent territory [*ibid.*, and map, p. 35]. Yet, by making Tamatarkha coincide with Khazaria or part of it, we gain nothing but tautology because both Tamatarkha and Khazaria appear together on all Oleg-Michael’s seals. The weakness of this scheme resides in the author’s determination to reconcile two contradictory geographical definitions of Khazaria, one of which is simply wrong.

Twelfth-fourteenth-century sources apply the name Khazaria/Gazaria to Crimea, and more specifically, to eastern Crimea (William of Rubruck). Scholars who commented on Oleg-Michael’s seals have surveyed these sources situating “his” Khazaria in eastern Crimea [Soloviev 1958: 572-3; Litavrin 1965: 231]. Another well-known reference is even more pertinent, both geographically and chronologically. In his *Ep.* 68, addressed to a *strategos* of Cherson, Patriarch Nicholas I Mystikos announces the appointment of a new archbishop to Cherson, whom, however, he charged with a short detour. Before occupying “his proper throne”, the archbishop should visit Khazaria and ordain priests there, since a delegation sent by the locals complained of their absence [Nicholas, ed. Jenkins, Westerink 1973: 314-5]. Commentators link this letter to Nicholas’ *Ep.* 106, in which he praises the archbishop of Cherson for his “zeal on behalf of that deluded nation”, which the patriarch now deems worthy on an archbishop of its own [*ibid.*: 388-91]. I have dated *Ep.* 68 in late 914-early 915 and *Ep.* 106 in summer 920, identifying the archbishopric announced in *Ep.* 106 as Phoulai in eastern Crimea, localized at the site of Tepsen, next to modern Koktebel [Завадская 2014]; this archbishopric is first mentioned in Darrouzès *notitia* n° 7 in the early 920’s [Zuckerman 2006, 222-4]. After crossing the

sea from Sinope to Crimea's southern coast, the archbishop's ship could easily reach that area by sailing east, rather than west to Cherson. But long before I produced my arguments, scholars aware of the religious situation in the Khazar kaghanate, in the first place Mikhail Artamonov, had pointed out that a Christian mission there would have been out of place at Nicholas Mystikos' time, localizing "his" Khazaria in eastern Crimea [Артамонов 1962: 364].

These considerations have been dismissed in several recent studies. Thus, for instance, Sergej Sorochan, in arguing for the identification of Nicholas Mystikos' Khazaria as the Khazar state, cites the Khazars' proverbial religious tolerance, but gives no consideration to the specific evidence for the period concerned [Сорочан 2012: 193]. In commenting the same passage, Yuri Mogarichev asks rhetorically: "If the patriarch [Nicholas] conducted missionary activity in Alania, why would not he do the same in Khazaria?" [Могаричев 2012: 189]. The author forgets that as soon as the Khazars got the upper hand in Alania, all Byzantium-created ecclesiastical structure was dismantled and the clerics expelled (see above). Neither scholar explains how a newly appointed archbishop of Cherson could enlighten the Khazar kaghanate and provide it with priests as a *parergon* on his way from Constantinople to Cherson.

Yuri Mogarichev, a staunch opponent of Crimean Khazaria, points out rightly that Byzantine sources use to apply the name Khazaria to the Khazar state as a whole [Могаричев 2012; 2013; Могаричев, Сазанов 2012]. Therefore, this author strives to situate Tzoulas' Khazaria mentioned by Skylitzes as well as that of Oleg-Michael's seals in "Asian Bosphoros", in the former Khazar territory. He cannot, however, produce any example of such a restricted use of the name Khazaria in the Byzantine sources (while citing them to oppose a Khazaria in Crimea). Most importantly, Mogarichev can propose no specific localization for his Asian Khazaria. The newly published seal of *katepano* Nikephoros Alanos seals the fate of this line of reasoning. A Khazaria administratively attached to Cherson can only be situated in Crimea [cf. Степаненко 2014]. This Khazaria took its name from Turkic settlers who came to eastern Crimea in the wake of the Khazar invasion in the mid- to late seventh century; considered to be Bulgarians by archaeologists, they defined themselves as Khotzirs-Khazars [Zuckerman 2006: 225, with references]. The ecclesiastical center of this tribal area, Phoulai-Tepsen, lies about 30 km to the east of Sugdea. Thus the definition of the *katepano*'s resort, "Cherson and Khazaria" was devised to describe western and eastern Crimea, including Sugdea.

V. The epilogue and a glimpse into the twelfth century

In an earlier paper, I have described the Pontic basin in the first to the eleventh century AD as the stage of a drama in three acts played out by two main actors who, in the course of time, change only the costumes: the Empire, whether we call it Roman, Later Roman or Byzantine, and the nomads, who come with a multitude of names [Zuckerman 2006: 201]. Skipping the first act, the second act starts with a modest fourth-century military push [see now Seibt 2017] and culminates at the climax of the "Later Empire". Early in the reign of Emperor Justinian, the imperial forces regain the control of Bosphoros and Lazica, and then briefly close the gap between these two areas by occupying Zikhia / Taman. The Turk (late sixth century) and then the Khazar (mid-seventh century) invasions draw the curtain on this phase of expansion.

The third act begins with the fall of the Khazar kaghanate, and the re-conquest pace is remarkably fast. The kaghanate collapses in the late 960's, while the early 970's the Escorial *Taktikon* shows a Byzantine *strategos* established at Bosphoros, probably already in possession of the former Khazar stronghold of Tamatarkha. Yet, in the early eleventh century as in the mid-sixth, holding on to the easternmost coast of the Black Sea proves

to be a hard challenge. The Bosphoros *strategos* is no longer attested after George Tzoulas' rebellion, and the Rus'ian prince installed at Tamatarkha/Tmutorokan seems to take over both the eastern and the western coast of the Strait of Kerch.

The question whether the Rus'ian princes of Tmutorokan also controlled the region of modern-day Kerch on the opposite shore is debated. In the recent context, this debate acquires political undertones. By some weird twist of logic, the hold of a junior Kievan Rus prince over Crimea's eastern coast is taken to sustain the claims of modern Russia over this territory; in his detailed survey of the debate, Victor Chkhaidze has strongly opposed extending the Tmutorokan princes' suzerainty over Kerch [Чхайдзе 2017: 30 *et passim*; cf. Степаненко 2011: 155]. I take the opposite stand. The classical argument for considering the two shores of the Strait of Kerch as parts of a single political entity is a Slavonic inscription engraved on Prince Gleb's order during his third stint at Tmutorokan (after Prince Rostislav's death). It reads: "In the year 6576, indiction 6, Prince Gleb measured the sea on ice from Tmutorokan to Korchev, 14,000 *sazheni*" [Медынцева 1979]. The Byzantine year 6576 and indiction 6 correspond to September 1067 — August 1068; thus the Strait of Kerch froze in winter 1067/8, this rare phenomenon prompting the measurement. The result obtained by Gleb, ca. 24 km (*sazhen* is about a fathom), fits the distance between Tmutorokan and Korchev/Kerch. It is likely that Gleb did not undertake on ice a visit abroad but rather measured the distance between two main cities of his own domain [*ibid.*: 15]. Another argument is rooted in the recent recognition that the town named Rosia in twelfth-century sources, including imperial documents and al-Idrisi's *Geography*, is none other than Bosphoros/Kerch; first voiced by Julian Kulakovskij in 1902, this identification can no longer be contested [Бейліс 1996: 92, 101; Коновалова 2001]. This onomastic metamorphosis of ancient Bosphoros takes place in the eleventh century and can only be explained by a prolonged Rus'ian sway over the town. The lack of evidence for any kind of imperial institutional presence at Bosphoros after George Tzoulas' rebellion, an *argumentum ex silentio*, fits well with this evidence. If so, it would also appear plausible that the Rus'ian principality of Tmutorokan took over Bosphoros/Kerch from its very creation, which should be viewed as an act of negotiated concession of the eastern-most Pontic territories by Basil II to the Rus.

The imperial administration at Cherson survives the first half of the eleventh century without institutional changes. In the 1050's and the 1060's, however, the Empire's defenses in Crimea come under increasing pressure from the new masters of the steppe — the Cumans, Polovtsi of the Rus'ian chronicles. Scholars are fairly unanimous in linking the military reforms in Byzantine Crimea to the Cuman threat. In the scheme that I propose, the first step consisted in extending, in the 1050's, the Byzantine defenses eastward and transforming the *thema* of Cherson into the *thema* of Cherson and Sugdea. This first response to the Cuman penetration into eastern Crimean steppe must have consisted in strengthening the local military infrastructure; but we have no details and all we know is that this measure did not suffice. The next step consisted in replacing, in the early 1060's, the *strategos* at Cherson by a higher-ranking *katepano*, probably accompanied by a contingent of professional soldiers, and by installing a *strategos* at Sugdea. The *katepano*'s authority was geographically defined as Cherson and Khazaria, western and eastern Crimea.

Ca. 1070, the people of Cherson stoned their *katepano* to death. There is no reason to link his demise with his alleged but unlikely involvement in Prince Rostislav's death. It is more likely that the *katepano*, in his capacity of imperial officer, refused some concessions claimed by the Cumans and the Chersonites disapproved of his intransigent stand. However this may be, we know of no imperial official appointed to Cherson any time

later. And yet, ten years or so after the *katepano*'s disappearance, we discover Khazaria again, this time in the title of Prince Oleg-Michael. In 1083, Emperor Alexios I Komnenos installs Oleg-Michael on the Taman, in an act of Reconquista celebrated by Manuel Straboromanos, with the title of archon and *doux* of Matrakha and Khazaria. Both parts of the title, as formulated, apply to both regions. However, the title of archon clearly goes back to Oleg's title of *knjaz*' before his exile, while the title of *doux*, equivalent in the second half of the eleventh century to that of *katepano*, recalls the position of Byzantium's former commander-in-chief in Crimea. Most strikingly, the part of eastern Crimea previously subordinated to the latter officer seated at Cherson now belongs to the military resort of a Rus'ian prince improvised imperial *doux* at Tamatarkha/Tmutorokan. This is another indication that no imperial administrative infrastructure was left in Cherson in the 1080's. By contrast, enough of it must have survived in Sugdea for the empire to put a claim to this area, included in the notion of Khazaria.

Whatever ambitions Alexios I may have had of keeping a foothold in northern and eastern Pontus, they must have faded away within a few years. Oleg-Michael dropped the title of imperial *doux*, which imposed subordination with no tangible benefits, and reverted to using the unique title of archon/*knjaz*', while claiming Zikhia as part of his domain. I have no doubt that Emperor Alexios' courtesan John Skylitzes, in describing, probably in the late 1080's [cf. Flusin in Wortley 2010: XXXI], the seizure of George Tzoulas in 1016, had a thought for the unruly archon of Khazaria of his own time. Skylitzes modernizes, as his habit, Tzoulas' title, employing title elements of the freshly appointed governor of the area. After the recent seals' discovery, his usage is no longer a mystery. By including Bosphoros in Khazaria he commits an approximation, but his aim is clearly to describe George Tzoulas as the Byzantine governor of eastern Crimea. In 1103, Theophylact of Ohrid describes the cities of the Strait of Kerch area as ἑλληνίδες πόλεις detached from the "Roman" empire.

The evidence for the twelfth century is scarce. In the tidal moves of Byzantium's involvement in northern and eastern Pontus the reign of Manuel I Komnenos (1143-80) marks the last resurgence of a kind. In the Conciliar Edict of 1166, Manuel I adorns himself with the titles of ζηκχικὸς, χαζαρικὸς, and γοτθικὸς [Mango 1963: 324], thus laying claim to Crimea and eastern Pontus. Emperor Manuel I's privilege of 1169 for the Genoese traders, as quoted by Emperor Isaac II Angelos in 1192, allows their ships to sail in all Empire's regions with the exception of Rôsia-Kerch and Matrakha (ἄνευ τῆς Ῥωσίας καὶ τῶν Ματραχῶν), thus implying that the latter belong to the Empire. Curiously, the privilege's two Latin translations affirm the restriction with no indication of a link between the Empire and the two cities [see esp. Martin 1979 and Jacoby 2007, who quote the texts]. As long as Byzantium controlled the Thracian Bosphoros, it could impose any restrictions it chose on the western traders' access to the Black Sea. The question is what form of control the Empire actually exercised along its northern and eastern coast. Emperor Manuel I's Conciliar Edict of 1166 also endows him with the titles δαλματικὸς, οὐγγρικὸς, βοσθνικὸς, χροβατικὸς, etc. [Mango 1963: 324], and while each of these claims has a reason, no modern historian would draw a map of Manuel I Komnenos' empire including Hungary within its limits.

According to the traditional view, stated with force by Nataliya Bogdanova, Cherson's survival in barbarian surroundings was grounded in its being part of a mighty "suzerain" state, capable of defending it in the military and diplomatic arena — and up to 1204, this state was Byzantium [Богданова 1991: 88, and *passim*]. More realistically, Jonathan Shepard has recently observed that "by the 12th century, imperial administrative involvement in Cherson seems to have been slackened", while in the Strait of Kerch area

"imperial dominion was minimalist and largely indirect", exercised by "a small staff of imperial agents" [Shepard 2009: 429, 438-9]. Shepard refers in the latter case to a specific single testimony.

The only twelfth-century evidence for any kind of Byzantine administrative presence in the region is Michael Choniates' much-debated *Ep.* 3 to his friend Constantine Pegonites from ca. 1180 [*Michaelis Choniatae Epistulae*, ed. Kolovou 2001: 5-6, cf. 50*-51*]. Pegonites' appointment as a tax collector (πρὸς τῶν φορολογικῶν παρεσύρης πραγμάτων) made him a frequent visitor in the regions of the anciently inhospitable dwellers of Pontos (τῶν πάλαι κακοξείνων Ποντικῶν ἐπιχωριάεις τοῖς κλίμασιν). Michael Choniates also mentions the Hyperboreans as well as the scary Tauroscythia lying across the straits (θράπτει με καὶ τὸ τῆς Ταυροσκυθίας ἀντίπορθμον). Alexander Kazhdan localized Pegonites' activity in North-Eastern Pontus and, more specifically, at Tamatarkha-Tmutorokan, separated by the Strait of Kerch from Crimea identified as Tauroscythia [Kazhdan 1983: 348-53]. I would go a step farther and suggest considering Tauroscythia as a classicizing "translation" of Rhosia, the new name of Bosphoros-Kerch lying just across the strait from Tamatarkha. But this is not my main point. What none of Choniates' commentators seems to have noticed is that his friend did not actually have a fixed place of assignment, as the itinerant or seasonal nature of his function is clearly indicated (τῶν ... Ποντικῶν ἐπιχωριάεις τοῖς κλίμασιν). Alexandru Madgearu [2008: 28] has plausibly linked Pegonites' tasks with E.M. Martin's analysis of the reglementation imposed at the same period on the Italian traders' activity in the Black Sea. The most favorable duty-free trade status including access to Matrakha was granted to the Venetians, but not to the Genoese; the Pisans' status was in between [Martin 1979: esp. 114 with n. 3]. Such regulations implied measures of control and taxation, which Constantine Pegonites had for task to apply.

Sending a tax inspector to the Strait of Kerch did not signify, however, that Byzantium controlled the area. It meant that there was no power opposed to the inspector's presence. In every country named in Manuel I Komnenos' bombastic title Byzantium exercised some kind of suzerainty, but never the same. We lack evidence for defining with any precision the kind of ties it maintained with the cities of Crimea and the Taman peninsula, but there is no indication that after the empire's forced retreat from the region in the 1070-80's, these cities ever again became part of its military and administrative structures. The cities survived on their own — and they thrived. The current perception that belonging to a great empire is the key to prosperity should not be projected into the past.

BIBLIOGRAPHY СПИСОК ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

1. Алексеенко Н. А. Моливдовулы византийского Херсона из частной коллекции // АДСВ. 2014. Вып. 42. С. 132-151.
2. Алексеенко Н. А. Византийская администрация Таврики в XI в. и новая печать Льва Алиата из Херсона // VIII Международный Византийский семинар «ХΕΡΣΩΝΟΣ ΘΕΜΑΤΑ: империя и полис». Материалы научной конференции. Севастополь, 2016. С. 9-16.
3. Алексеенко Н. А., Цепков Ю. А. Катепанат в Таврике: легендарные свидетельства или исторические реалии // ХСб. Севастополь, 2012. Вып. XVII. С. 7-17.
4. Артамонов М. И. История хазар. Л., 1962.
5. Баранов И. А. Таврика в эпоху раннего средневековья (салтово-маяцкая культура). Киев, 1990.
6. Бейліс В. М. Країна ал-Куманія у "Географічному творі" ал-Ідрісі та половецька земля Іпатієвського літопису // *Mapra Mundi*. Збірник наукових праць на пошану Ярослава Дашкевича з нагоди його 70-річчя. Львів, Київ, Нью-Йорк, 1996. С. 84-103.
7. Бережков Н. Г. Хронология русского летописания. М., 1963.

8. Булгакова В. А. Сигиллографический комплекс порта Сугдеи (материалы подводных исследований 2004-2005 гг.) // Сугдейский сборник. Киев, Судак, 2008. Вып. III. С. 296-330.
9. Виноградов А. Ю. Зихия // Православная Энциклопедия. М., 2009. Т. 20. С. 257-259.
10. Гадло А. В. Византийские свидетельства о Зихской епархии как источник по истории Северо-Восточного Причерноморья // Из истории Византии и византиноведения. Л., 1991. С. 93-106.
11. Житие Феодосия Печерского / Подг. текста, пер. и ком. О. В. Творогова // Библиотека литературы Древней Руси. СПб., 2004. Т. I. С. 352-433 (and online).
12. Завадская И. А. Периодизация культового строительства на городище Тепсень (о кафедральном храме Фульской епархии) // МАИЭТ. 2014. Вып. XIX. С. 211-39.
13. Зайбт Н., Зайбт В. Печати стратигос византийской фемы Херсон // АДСВ. Симферополь, 1995. Вып. 27. Византия и средневековый Крым. С. 91-97.
14. Кабанец Е. П. К вопросу о роли Тмутараканской епархии в церковной истории Древней Руси конца XI вв. // Сугдейский сборник. Киев, Судак, 2005. Вып. II. С. 105-130.
15. Каждан А. П. Византийский податной сборщик на берегах Киммерийского Боспора в конце XII в. // Проблемы общественно-политической истории России и славянских стран. М., 1963. С. 93-101.
16. Котляр Н. Ф. Тмутороканское княжество: реальность или историографический миф? // Древнейшие государства Восточной Европы. 2003 г. М., 2005. С. 107-118.
17. Литаврин Г. Г. Византия, Болгария, Древняя Русь (IX — начало XII в.). СПб., 2000.
18. Медынцева А. А. Тмутараканский камень. М., 1979.
19. Могаричев Ю. М. К вопросу о «Крымской Хазарии» в X-XI вв. // Восточная Европа в древности и средневековье. Миграции, расселение, войны как факторы политогенеза. XXIV Чтения памяти В. Т. Пашуто. М., 2012. С. 188-192.
20. Могаричев Ю. М. О «Крымской Хазарии» в XI-XII вв. // Княжа доба. Історія і культура. Т. 7. Львів, 2013. С. 49-58.
21. Могаричев Ю. М., Сазанов А. В. Крымская Хазария X-XI вв. Хазарский анклав в Крыму или историографический миф? (исторический контекст) // Хазарский альманах. Киев, Харьков, 2012. Т. 10. С. 122-38.
22. Мохов А. С. Доместики схол Запада второй половины X — начала XII в. по данным сфрагистики // АДСВ. 2008. Вып. 38. С. 163-184.
23. НЛМл — Новгородская первая летопись старшего и младшего изводов / Под ред. А. Н. Сонова. М., Л., 1950.
24. Плетнева С. А. Оборонительная стена в Таматархе-Тмутаракани // Историко-археологический альманах. Армавир, 2000. Вып. 6. С. 21-8.
25. Радић Р. Манојло Стравороман: прилог историји византијско-јужнословенских односа крајем XI и у првим годинама XII века // Зборник радова Византолошког института. 1989. Т. 27/28. С. 93-101.
26. Роменский А. А. Последний пир князя Ростислава: политический контекст отношений Руси и Византии на Тамани и в Таврике в 60-е — 70-е гг. XI в. // Материалы по археологии и истории античного и средневекового Крыма. Тюмень, 2015. Вып. 7. С. 214-229.
27. Роменский А. А. В поисках Хазарии Иоанна Скилицы: к дискуссии о походе Варды Монга и Сфенга в 1016 г. // Хазарский альманах. 2016. Т. 14. С. 206-225.
28. Скрижинская Е. Ч. Рецензия на: Якобсон А. Л. Средневековый Херсонес (XII-XIV вв.). // Византийский временник. 1953. Т. 6. С. 252-268.
29. Слядзь А. Н. Византия и Русь: опыт военно-политического взаимодействия в Крыму и Приазовье (XI — начало XII века). СПб., 2014.
30. Соколова И. В. Монеты и печати византийского Херсонеса. Л., 1983.
31. Сорочан С. Б. Византийский Херсон в письмах Николая Мистика // Хазарский альманах. Киев, Харьков, 2012. Т. 10. С. 179-201.
32. Степаненко В. П. К истории средневековой Таврики (Византия и средневековый Крым) // АДСВ. 1992. Вып. 26. С. 125-133.
33. Степаненко В. П. Цула и Херсон в российской историографии XIX-XX вв. // Россия и мир: панорама исторического развития. Сборник научных статей, посвященный

- 70-летию исторического факультета Уральского государственного университета им. А. М. Горького. Екатеринбург, 2008. С. 27-35.
34. Степаненко В. П. Архонт Хазарии — стратиг Херсона? // ХСб. 2011. Вып. 16. С. 153-161.
35. Степаненко В. П. «Архонт архонтов» в византийской сфрагистике XI в. // ПОЛЕМОЛОГОС. Сборник статей памяти профессора В. В. Кучмы / Под ред. Н. Д. Барabanова. Волгоград, 2012. С. 147-159.
36. Степаненко В. П. Архонт и дука Тмутаракани в конце XI века // ΧΕΡΣΩΝΟΣ ΘΕΜΑΤΑ: «империя» и «полис». Севастополь, 2013. С. 157-168.
37. Степаненко В. П. Еще раз о локализации Хазарии в XI в. // МАИЭТ. 2014. Вып. XIX. С. 368-378.
38. Степанова Е. В. Судакский архив печатей: предварительные выводы // АДСВ. 2001. Вып. 32. С. 97-108.
39. Филипчук О. Перечитуючи Іоанна Скілицю: хто був Сфенг — брат Володимира Святого? // Історична панорама: Збірник наукових статей ЧНУ. Спеціальність «Історія». Чернівці: Рута, 2009. Вип. 8. С. 58-70.
40. Хождение игумена Даниила / Подг. текста, пер. и ком. Г. М. Прохорова // Библиотека литературы Древней Руси. СПб., 2004. Т. IV. (and online).
41. Цукерман К. Наблюдения над сложением древнейших источников летописи // Collectanea bogisoglebica = Борисо-Глебский сборник / éd. C. Zuckerman. Paris, 2009. P. 183-305. (Occasional Monographs published by the Ukrainian National Committee for Byzantine Studies 2).
42. Цукерман К. Политика Византии в Северном Причерноморье по данным Notitiae episcopatum // МАИЭТ. 2010. Вып. XVI. С. 399-435.
43. Чхаидзе В. Н. Таматарха. Раннесредневековый город на Таманском полуострове. М., 2008.
44. Чхаидзе В. Н. Зихская епархия: письменные и археологические свидетельства // ΧΕΡΣΩΝΟΣ ΘΕΜΑΤΑ: «империя» и «полис». Севастополь, 2013. С. 47-68.
45. Чхаидзе В. Н. «Хазария» XI века: к вопросу о локализации (по данным византийских моливдовулов). М., 2016. (available as a preprint on academia. edu)
46. Чхаидзе В. Н. Тмутаракань: печальный опыт историографии начала XXI века. М., 2017. (available as a preprint on academia. edu)
47. Чхаидзе В. Н., Каштанов Д. В., Виноградов А. Ю. Supplementum I: Алексей Комнин (1122-1142) // Чхаидзе В. Византийские печати из Тамани. М., 2015. С. 119-151.
48. Якобсон А. Л. Средневековый Херсонес (XII-XIV вв.) // МИА. 1950. № 17.
49. Янин В. Л., Гайдуков П. Г. Актовые печати Древней Руси X-XV вв. Т. III. Печати, зарегистрированные в 1970-1996 гг. М., 1998.
50. Янин В. Л., Гайдуков П. Г. Древнерусские вислые печати, зарегистрированные в 2003 г. // Новгород и Новгородская земля. История и археология. Новгород, 2004. Вып. 18. С. 137-161.
51. Alekseyenko N. L'administration byzantine de Cherson: catalogue des sceaux. Paris, 2012. (Occasional Monographs 4).
52. Androshchuk F. Images of power. Byzantium and Nordic Coinage century 995-1035. Kyiv, Paris, 2016. (Occasional Monographs 5).
53. Banescu N. La domination byzantine à Matracha (Tmutorokan), en Zichie, en Khazarie et en „Russie” à l' époque des Comnènes // Académie Roumaine. Bulletin de la Section Historique. 1941. Vol. 22. P. 57-77
54. Darrouzès J. Notitiae episcopatum Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae: texte critique, introduction et notes. Paris, 1981.
55. Dimnik M. The Dynasty of Chernigov, 1146–1246. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
56. DOSeals I — Nesbitt J., Oikonomides N. Catalogue of Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art, 1: Italy, North of the Balkans, North of the Black Sea. Washington DC, 1991.
57. DOSeals III — Nesbitt J., Oikonomides N. Catalogue of Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art, III: West, Northwest and Central Asia Minor and the Orient. Washington DC, 1997.
58. Ioannes Scylitzes. Synopsis Historiarum / Rec. I. Thurn. Berlin, 1973.
59. IOSPE V — Ancient Inscriptions of the Northern Black Sea, vol. V = Vinogradov A. Byzantine Inscriptions, 2015 (online).

60. Gautier P. Le dossier d'un haut fonctionnaire byzantin d'Alexis Ier Comnène, Manuel Strabormanos // *Revue des études byzantines*. 1965. Vol. 23. P. 168-204.
61. Ivanov S. A. The Slavonic Life of Saint Stefan of Surozh // *La Crimée entre Byzance et le Khaganat khazar* / éd. C. Zuckerman. Paris, 2006. P. 109-167. (Monographies du Centre de recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance 25)
62. Ivron II — Actes d'Ivrou. II. Du milieu du XIe siècle à 1204 / éds. J. Lefort, N. Olkonomidis, D. Papachryssanthou. Paris, 1990.
63. Jacoby D. Byzantium, the Italian maritime powers, and the Black Sea before 1204 // *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*. 2007. Bd. 100. P. 677-699.
64. John Skylitzes. A synopsis of Byzantine history, 811-1057 / tr. J. Wortley. Cambridge, 2010.
65. Jordanov I. Corpus of Byzantine seals from Bulgaria. Vol. I: Byzantine seals with geographical names. Sofia, 2003.
66. Kazhdan A. Some Little-Known or Misinterpreted Evidence about Kievan Rus' in Twelfth-Century Greek Sources // *Okeanos: Essays presented to Ihor Ševčenko on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students*. Harvard, 1983. P. 344-58. (Harvard Ukrainian Studies 7).
67. Kühn H.-J. Die byzantinische Armee im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert. Studien zur Organisation der Tagmata. Wien, 1991. (Byzantinische Geschichtsschreiber. Ergänzungsband 2).
68. Mango C. The Conciliar Edict of 1166 // *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*. 1963. Vol. 17. P. 317-330. = *Studies in Constantinople*. Aldershot, 1993. No. XVIII.
69. Madgearu A. The Byzantine Expansion in the Black Sea Area // *Review of Military History*. 2008. P. 22-31 (available online).
70. Martin M. E. The First Venetians in the Black Sea // *Archivon Πόντου*. 1979. T. 35. P. 111-122.
71. Nicholas I Patriarch of Constantinople. Letters / ed. tr. R. J. H. Jenkins, L. G. Westerink. Washington DC, 1973.
72. Oikonomides N. Les Listes de préséance byzantines des IX^e et X^e siècles. Introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire. Paris, 1972.
73. *Österreich II* — Wassiliou A.-K., Seibt W. Die byzantinischen Bleisiegel in Österreich. 2. Teil: Zentral- und Provinzialverwaltung. Wien, 2004.
74. *PmbZ* — Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit (online resource).
75. *PVL* — The Pověst' vremennykh lēt: an interlinear collation and paradosis / Ed. D. Ostrowski // *Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature*. Vol. X (3 parts). Cambridge Mass., 2003.
76. Seibt W. Was lehren die Siegel über die Verwaltung von Cherson im Mittelalter? // *Зборник радова Византолошког Института*. Београд, 2013. Vol. 50/1 (Mélanges Ljubomir Maksimović). С. 187-194.
77. Seibt W. Roman military presence on the Georgian coast from the third to the fifth century: with an appendix on the Ala Abasgorum // *Οὗ δῶρόν εἰμι τὰς γραφὰς βλέπων νόει: mélanges Jean-Claude Cheynet* / éd. B. Caseau, V. Prigent, A. Sopracasa. Paris, 2017. (Travaux et mémoires 21/1) (in print).
78. Shepard J. Closer encounters with the Byzantine world: the Rus at the Straits of Kerch // *Pre-Modern Russia and Its World: Essays in Honor of Thomas S. Noonan* / eds. K. L. Reyer-son, Th. G. Stavrou, J. D. Tracy. Wiesbaden, 2006. P. 15-77.
79. Shepard J. 'Mists and portals': the Black Sea's north coast // *Byzantine Trade, 4th–12th Centuries. The Archaeology of Local, Regional, and International Exchange* / ed. M. Mango. Farnham, 2009. P. 421-441.
80. Soloviev A. V. Domination byzantine ou russe au nord de la mer Noir à l'époque des Comnènes? // *Akten des XI. Internationalen Byzantinistenkongresses* / Hrsg. F. Dölger, H.-G. Beck. München, 1958. S. 569-80. (reprinted in *Id., Byzance et la formation de l'État russe*. London, 1979. n° VII).
81. Theophylactus Achridensis. Epistulae / éd. P. Gautier. Thessaloniki, 1986.
82. Zuckerman C. Byzantium's Pontic policy in the Notitiae episcopatum // *La Crimée entre Byzance et le Khaganat khazar* / éd. C. Zuckerman. Paris, 2006. P. 201-230. (Monographies du Centre de recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance 25) (Russian translation: Цукерман 2010).

REFERENCES

1. Alekseenko N. A. Molivdovuly vizantiiskogo Khersona iz chastnoi kollektzii. *Antichnaia drevnost' i srednie veka*, 2014. Vol. 42, pp. 132-151.
2. Alekseenko N. A. Vizantiiskaia administratsiia Tavriki v XI v. i novaia pechat' L'va Alia-ta iz Khersona. *Materialy nauchnoi konferentsii VIII Mezhdunarodnyi Vizantiiskii seminar «ΧΕΡΣΩΝΟΣ ΘΕΜΑΤΑ: imperia i polis»*, Sevastopol, 2016, pp. 9-16.
3. Alekseenko N. A., Tsepkov Iu. A. Katepanat v Tavrike: legendarnye svidetel'stva ili istoricheskie realii. *Khersonesskii sbornik*, Sevastopol, 2012, Vol. XVII, pp. 7-17.
4. Artamonov M. I. *Istoriia khazar*. Leningrad, 1962.
5. Baranov I. A. *Tavrika v epokhu rannego srednevekov'ia (saltovo-maiatskaia kul'tura)*. Kiev, 1990.
6. Beilis V. M. Kraïna al-Kumaniia u "Geografichnomu tvorii" al-Idrisi ta polovets'ka zemlia Ipatiivs'kogo litopisu. *Marra Mundi. Zbirnik naukovikh prats' na poshanu Iaroslava Dashkevicha z nagodi iogo 70-richchia*, L'viv, Kiiu, New-York, 1996, pp. 84-103.
7. Berezhevskii N. G. *Khronologiiia russkogo letopisaniia*. Moscow, 1963.
8. Bulgakova V. A. Sigillograficheskii kompleks porta Sugdei (materialy podvodnykh issledovaniï 2004-2005 gg.). *Sugdeiskii sbornik*, Kiev, Sudak, 2008, Vol. III, pp. 296-330.
9. Vinogradov A. Iu. Zikhiia. *Pravoslavnaia Entsiklopediia*, Moscow, 2009, T. 20, pp. 257-259.
10. Gadlo A. V. Vizantiiskie svidetel'stva o Zikhskoi eparkhii kak istochnik po istorii Severo-Vostochnogo Prichernomor'ia. *Iz istorii Vizantii i vizantinovedeniia*, Leningrad, 1991, pp. 93-106.
11. Zhitie Feodosiia Pecherskogo. *Biblioteka literatury Drevnei Rusi*, S-Petersburg, 2004, T. I, pp. 352-433 (and online).
12. Zavadskaiia I. A. Periodizatsiia kul'tovogo stroitel'stva na gorodishche Tepsen' (o kafedral'nom khrame Ful'skoi eparkhii). *Materialy po arkheologii, istorii i etnografii Tavrii*, Simferopol, 2014, Vol. XIX, pp. 211-39.
13. Zaibt N., Zaibt V. Pechati stratigov vizantiiskoi femy Kherson. *Antichnaia drevnost' i srednie veka*, Simferopol, 1995, Vol. 27. Vizantiia i srednevekovyi Krym, pp. 91-97.
14. Kabanets E. P. K voprosu o roli Tmutarakanskoï eparkhii v tserkovnoi istorii Drevnei Rusi kontsa XI vv. *Sugdeiskii sbornik*, Kiev, Sudak, 2005, Vol. II, pp. 105-130.
15. Kazhdan A. P. Vizantiiskii podatnoi sborshchik na beregakh Kimmeriiskogo Bospora v kontse XII v. *Problemy obshchestvenno-politicheskoi istorii Rossii i slavianskikh stran*, Moscow, 1963, pp. 93-101.
16. Kotliar N. F. Tmutarokanskoe kniazhestvo: real'nost' ili istoriograficheskii mif? *Drevneishie gosudarstva Vostochnoi Evropy*. 2003 g., Moscow, 2005, pp. 107-118.
17. Litavrin G. G. *Vizantiia, Bolgariia, Drevniaia Rus' (IX — nachalo XII v.)*. S-Petersburg, 2000.
18. Medyntseva A. A. *Tmutarakanskii kamen'*. Moscow, 1979.
19. Mogarichev Iu. M. K voprosu o «Krymskoi Khazarii» v X-XI vv. *Vostochnaia Evropa v drevnosti i srednevekov'e. Migratsii, rasselenie, voïny kak faktory politogeneza. XXIV Chteniia pamiati V. T. Pashuto*. Moscow, 2012, pp. 188-192.
20. Mogarichev Iu. M. O «Krymskoi Khazarii» v XI-XII vv. *Kniazha doba. Istoriia i kul'tura*. L'viv, 2013, T. 7, pp. 49-58.
21. Mogarichev Iu. M., Sazanov A. V. Krymskaia Khazariia X-XI vv. Khazarskii anklav v Krymu ili istoriograficheskii mif? (istoricheskiï kontekst). *Khazarskii al'manakh*, Kiev, Khar'kov, 2012, T. 10, pp. 122-38.
22. Mokhov A. S. Domestiki skhol Zapada vtoroi poloviny X — nachala XII v. po dannym sfragistiki. *Antichnaia drevnost' i srednie veka*, 2008, Vol. 38, pp. 163-184.
23. *NIIml* — *Novgorodskaiia pervaiia letopis' starshego i mladshhego izvodov*. Moscow, Leningrad, 1950.
24. Pletneva S. A. Oboronitel'naia stena v Tamatarkhe-Tmutarakani. *Istoriiko-arkheologicheskii al'manakh*, Armavir, 2000, Vol. 6, pp. 21-8.
25. Radih R. Manojlo Stravoroman: prilozhennii vizantijsko-juzhnoslovenskikh odnosa krajem XI i u prvim godinama XII veka. *Zbornik radova Vizantoloshkog instituta*, 1989, T. 27/28, pp. 93-101.
26. Romenskiï A. A. Posledniï pir kniazia Rostislava: politicheskiï kontekst otnosheniï Rusi i Vizantii na Tamani i v Tavrike v 60-e — 70-e gg. XI v. *Materialy po arkheologii i istorii antichnogo i srednevekovogo Kryma*, Tiumen', 2015, Vol. 7, pp. 214-229.

27. Romenskii A. A. V poiskakh Khazarii Ioanna Skilitsy: k diskussii o pokhode Vardy Monga i Sfenga v 1016 g. *Khazarskii al'manakh*, 2016, T. 14, pp. 206-225.
28. Skrizhinskaia E. Ch. Retsenziia na: Iakobson A. L. Srednevekovi Khersones (XII-XIV vv.). *Vizantiiskii vremennik*, 1953, T. 6, pp. 252-268.
29. Sliadz' A. N. *Vizantiia i Rus': opyt voenno-politicheskogo vzaimodeistviia v Krymu i Priazov'e (XI — nachalo XII veka)*. S-Petersburg, 2014.
30. Sokolova I. V. *Monety i pečati vizantiiskogo Khersonesa*. Leningrad, 1983.
31. Sorochan S. B. Vizantiiskii Kherson v pis'makh Nikolaia Mistika. *Khazarskii al'manakh*, Kiev, Khar'kov, 2012, T. 10, pp. 179-201.
32. Stepanenko V. P. K istorii srednevekovoï Tavriki (Vizantiia i srednevekovi Krym). *Antichnaia drevnost' i srednie veka*, 1992, Vol. 26, pp. 125-133.
33. Stepanenko V. P. Tsula i Kherson v rossiiskoi istoriografii XIX–XX vv. *Rossia i mir: panorama istoricheskogo razvitiia. Sbornik nauchnykh statei, posviashchennyi 70-letiiu istoricheskogo fakul'teta Ural'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. A. M. Gor'kogo*, Ekaterinburg, 2008, pp. 27-35.
34. Stepanenko V. P. Arkhont Khazarii — stratig Khersona? *Khersonesskii sbornik*, Sevastopol, 2011, Vol. 16, pp. 153-161.
35. Stepanenko V. P. «Arkhont arkhontov» v vizantiiskoi sfragistike XI v. Barabanov N. D. (Ed.), *ΠΟΛΕΜΟΛΟΓΟΣ. Sbornik statei pamiati professora V. V. Kuchmy*, Volgograd, 2012, pp. 147-159.
36. Stepanenko V. P. Arkhont i duka Tmutarakani v kontse XI veka. *ΧΕΡΣΟΝΟΣ ΘΕΜΑΤΑ: «imperii» i «polis»*, Sevastopol, 2013, pp. 157-168.
37. Stepanenko V. P. Eshche raz o lokalizatsii Khazarii v XI v. *Materialy po arkheologii, istorii i etnografii Tavrii*, Simferopol, 2014, Vol. XIX, pp. 368-378.
38. Stepanova E. V. Sudakskii arkhiv pečatei: predvaritel'nye vyvody. *Antichnaia drevnost' i srednie veka*, 2001, Vol. 32, pp. 97-108.
39. Filipchuk O. Perechituiuchi Ioanna Skilitsiu: khto buv Sfeng — brat Volodimira Sviatogo? *Istorichna panorama: Zbirnik naukovikh statei ChNU. Spetsial'nist' "Istoriia"*, Chernivtsi, 2009, Vol. 8, pp. 58-70.
40. Khozhdenie igumena Daniila, *Biblioteka literatury Drevnei Rusi*, S-Petersburg, 2004, T. IV. (and online).
41. Zuckerman C. Nabludeniia nad slozheniem drevneishikh istochnikov letopisi. Zuckerman C. (éd.), *Collectanea borisoglebica = Boris-Glebiskii sbornik*, Paris, 2009, pp. 183-305. (Occasional Monographs published by the Ukrainian National Committee for Byzantine Studies 2).
42. Zuckerman C. Politika Vizantii v Severnom Prichernomor'e po dannym Notitiae episcopatum. *Materialy po arkheologii, istorii i etnografii Tavrii*, Simferopol, 2010, Vol. XVI, pp. 399-435.
43. Chkhaidze V. N. *Tamartarkha. Rannesrednevekovi gorod na Tamanskom poluostrove*. Moscow, 2008.
44. Chkhaidze V. N. Zikhaskaia eparkhiia: pis'mennye i arkheologicheskie svidetel'stva. *ΧΕΡΣΟΝΟΣ ΘΕΜΑΤΑ: «imperii» i «polis»*, Sevastopol, 2013, pp. 47-68.
45. Chkhaidze V. N. «Khazariia» XI veka: k voprosu o lokalizatsii (po dannym vizantiiskikh molivdovulov). Moscow, 2016. (available as a preprint on academia. edu)
46. Chkhaidze V. N. *Tmutarakan': pechal'nyi opyt istoriografii nachala XXI veka*. Moscow, 2017. (available as a preprint on academia. edu)
47. Chkhaidze V. N., Kashtanov D. V., Vinogradov A. Iu. Supplementum I: Aleksei Komnin (1122-1142). *Chkhaidze V. Vizantiiskie pečati iz Tamani*. Moscow, 2015, pp. 119-151.
48. Iakobson A. L. Srednevekovi Khersones (XII-XIV vv.). *Materialy i issledovaniia po arkheologii SSSR*, Moscow, 1950, No. 17.
49. Ianin V. L., Gaidukov P. G. *Aktovye pečati Drevnei Rusi X-XV vv. T. III. Pečati, zaregistriruvannye v 1970-1996 gg.* Moscow, 1998.
50. Ianin V. L., Gaidukov P. G. Drevnerusskie vislye pečati, zaregistriruvannye v 2003 g. *Novgorod i Novgorodskaiia zemlia. Istoriia i arkheologiia*, Novgorod, 2004, Vol. 18, pp. 137-161.
51. Alekseyenko N. *L'administration byzantine de Cherson: catalogue des sceaux*. Paris, 2012. (Occasional Monographs 4).
52. Androshchuk F. *Images of power. Byzantium and Nordic Coinage centure 995-1035*. Kyiv, Paris, 2016. (Occasional Monographs 5).
53. Banescu N. La domination byzantine à Matracha (Tmutorokan), en Zichie, en Khazarie et en „Russie” à l'époque des Comnènes. *Académie Roumaine. Bulletin de la Section Historique*, 1941, Vol. 22, pp. 57-77
54. Darrouzès J. *Notitiae episcopatum Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae: texte critique, introduction et notes*. Paris, 1981.
55. Dimnik M. *The Dynasty of Chernigov, 1146-1246*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
56. *DOSeals I — Nesbitt J., Oikonomides N. Catalogue of Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art, I: Italy, North of the Balkans, North of the Black Sea*. Washington DC, 1991.
57. *DOSeals III — Nesbitt J., Oikonomides N. Catalogue of Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art, III: West, Northwest and Central Asia Minor and the Orient*. Washington DC, 1997.
58. Ioannes Scylitzes. *Synopsis Historiarum*. Berlin, 1973.
59. *IOSPE V — Ancient Inscriptions of the Northern Black Sea*, vol. V = Vinogradov A. Byzantine Inscriptions, 2015 (online).
60. Gautier P. Le dossier d'un haut fonctionnaire byzantin d'Alexis I^{er} Comnène, Manuel Straboromanos. *Revue des études byzantines*, 1965, Vol. 23, pp. 168-204.
61. Ivanov S. A. The Slavonic Life of Saint Stefan of Surozh. Zuckerman C. (éd.), *La Crimée entre Byzance et le Khaganat khazar*, Paris, 2006, pp. 109-167. (Monographies du Centre de recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance 25)
62. *Iviron II = Lefort J., Oikonomides N., Papachryssanthou D. (éds.), Actes d'Iviron. II. Du milieu du XIe siècle à 1204*. Paris, 1990.
63. Jacoby D. Byzantium, the Italian maritime powers, and the Black Sea before 1204. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 2007, Bd. 100, pp. 677-699.
64. Wortley J. (tr.), John Skylitzes. *A synopsis of Byzantine history, 811-1057*. Cambridge, 2010.
65. Jordanov I. *Corpus of Byzantine seals from Bulgaria*. Vol. I: Byzantine seals with geographical names. Sofia, 2003.
66. Kazhdan A. Some Little-Known or Misinterpreted Evidence about Kievan Rus' in Twelfth-Century Greek Sources. *Okeanos: Essays presented to Ihor Ševčenko on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students*. Harvard, 1983, pp. 344-58. (Harvard Ukrainian Studies 7).
67. Kühn H.-J. *Die byzantinische Armee im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert. Studien zur Organisation der Tagmata*. Wien, 1991. (Byzantinische Geschichtsschreiber. Ergänzungsband 2).
68. Mango C. The Conciliar Edict of 1166. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 1963, Vol. 17, pp. 317-330 = *Studies in Constantinople*, Aldershot, 1993, No. XVIII.
69. Madgearu A. The Byzantine Expansion in the Black Sea Area. *Review of Military History*, 2008, pp. 22-31 (available online).
70. Martin M. E. The First Venetians in the Black Sea. *Αρχαίον Πόντον*, 1979, T. 35, pp. 111-122.
71. Jenkins R. J. H., Westerink L. G. (ed. tr.), *Nicholas I Patriarch of Constantinople. Letters*. Washington DC, 1973.
72. Oikonomides N. *Les Listes de préséance byzantines des IX^e et X^e siècles. Introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire*. Paris, 1972.
73. *Österreich II — Wassiliou A.-K., Seibt W. Die byzantinischen Bleisiegel in Österreich. 2. Teil: Zentral — und Provinzialverwaltung*. Wien, 2004.
74. *PmbZ — Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit* (online resource).
75. *PVL — The Povest' vremennykh let: an interlinear collation and paradosis. Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature*, Vol. X (3 parts), Cambridge Mass., 2003.
76. Seibt W. Was lehren die Siegel über die Verwaltung von Cherson im Mittelalter? *Zbornik radova Vizantoloshkogo Instituta*, Beograd, 2013, Vol. 50/1 (Mélanges Ljubomir Maksimović), pp. 187-194.
77. Seibt W. Roman military presence on the Georgian coast from the third to the fifth century: with an appendix on the Ala Abasgorum. Caseau B., Prigent V., Sopracasa A. (éd.), *Οὐ δῶρόν εἰμι τὰς γραφὰς βλέπων νόει: mélanges Jean-Claude Cheynet*, Paris, 2017. (Travaux et mémoires 21/1) (in print).

78. Shepard J. Closer encounters with the Byzantine world: the Rus at the Straits of Kerch. Reyerson K. L., Stavrou Th. G., Tracy J. D. (eds.), *Pre-Modern Russia and Its World: Essays in Honor of Thomas S. Noonan*, Wiesbaden, 2006, pp. 15-77.
79. Shepard J. 'Mists and portals': the Black Sea's north coast. Mango M. (ed.), *Byzantine Trade, 4th-12th Centuries. The Archaeology of Local, Regional, and International Exchange*, Farnham, 2009, pp. 421-441.
80. Soloviev A. V. Domination byzantine ou russe au nord de la mer Noir à l'époque des Comnènes? Dölger F., Beck H.-G. (Hrsg.), *Akten des XI. Internationalen Byzantinistenkongresses, München*, 1958, pp. 569-80. (reprinted in Id., *Byzance et la formation de l'État russe*, London, 1979, n° VII).
81. Gautier P. (éd.), *Theophylactus Achridensis. Epistulae*. Thessaloniki, 1986.
82. Zuckerman C. Byzantium's Pontic policy in the Notitiae episcopatuum. Zuckerman C. (éd.), *La Crimée entre Byzance et le Khaganat khazar*, Paris, 2006, pp. 201-230. (Monographies du Centre de recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance 25).

Цукерман К.

Конец византийского правления на северо-восточном побережье Понта Резюме

Представление о продолжении византийского правления в Крыму и на Тамани в XII в. является в работах недавнего времени практически общепризнанным. Однако недавняя публикация двух новых печатей заставляет полностью его пересмотреть. Четко прослеживается угасание византийской власти в Херсоне, завершившейся побиением камнями имперского катепана ок. 1070 г. Попытка восстановления византийского владычества на Тамани и в Восточном Крыму связана с назначением в качестве имперского дуки ссыльного тмутараканского князя Олега (Михаила) Святославича в 1083 г. Именно это достижение императора Алексея I Комнина отмечает в своем панегирике Мануил Стравороман. Однако, как показывают печати Олега-Михаила, он вскоре отбросил свой имперский титул, сохранив за собой переданный ему империей Восточный Крым (Хазарию) и, по всей вероятности, также подчинив себе Зихию. Никаких указаний на вхождение Крыма и Тамани в военно-административные структуры Византийской империи после 70-80-х гг. XI в. в источниках не усматривается.

Ключевые слова: Византия, Херсон, Хазария, Таматарха, Тмутаракань, Сугдея, Боспор, Керчь, Олег-Михаил, Георгий Цула, катепан, стратег.

Zuckerman C.

The End of Byzantine Rule in North-Eastern Pontus Summary

The current belief in the continuity of Byzantine rule at Cherson and in other regions of Crimea, as well as on the Taman peninsula, in the 12th century needs to be revised in the light of two recently published seals. This study traces the waning of the Byzantine power at Cherson in the late 1060 — early 1070's. A short-lived attempt to install a Byzantine *doux* at Tamatarkha in the person of the Rus'ian exiled prince Oleg-Michael takes place ca. 1083 and is celebrated in Emperor Alexios I Komnenos' panegyric by Manuel Straboromanos. In addition to Tamatarkha, his former principality, the Empire transfers under his authority territories in eastern Crimea, designated as Khazaria, essentially the resort of the *strategos* of Sugdea. Soon, however, probably by the late 1080's, Oleg-Michael abandons his imperial allegiance. After these dates, neither Cherson nor Tamatarkha will ever again be part of the imperial military and administrative structures.

Keywords: Byzantium, Cherson, Khazaria, Tamatarkha, Tmutorokan, Sugdea, Bosporos, Kerch, Oleg-Michael, George Tzoulas, katapano, strategos.

В. А. СИДОРЕНКО

ЯЛТА — ВИЗАНТИЙСКИЙ ГОРОД В ГОТСКОЙ ЕПАРХИИ¹

Впервые Ялта упоминается у арабоязычного автора ал-Идриси (Абу 'Абдаллах Мухаммад ибн Мухаммад ибн 'Абдаллах ибн Идрис ал-Хаммуди ал-Хасани) в сочинении «Нузхат ал-муштак фи-хтирак ал-афак» («Отрада страстно желающего пересечь мир»²), описательной карты, составленной по заказу норманнского короля Сицилии Рожера II (1130-1154 гг.) в 1154 г. [11, с. 281; 2, с. 208-210; 8, с. 2-11]. Полное издание этого труда вышло в 1592 г. в типографии Медичи в Риме под заглавием «Китаб нузхат ал-муштак фи зикр ал-амсар ва-л-актар ва-л-булдан ва-л-джузур ва-л-мада'ин ва-л-афак» («Книга развлечения истомленного в рассказе о столицах, округах, странах, островах, городах и областях»³). Карта обобщала сведения, почерпнутые автором из лоций и работ его предшественников — греческих и арабских географов. В начале своего сочинения ал-Идриси называет свои источники, связь картографической части его работы с неотмеченными им авторами выявлена исследователями [14, с. 5; 11, с. 291; 8, с. 27-36].

В «Нузхат ал-муштак», в 5-й секции VI климата Ал-Идриси помещает названия приморских городов и портов на пути от Константинополя до города Матрахи (Таматархи) в последовательности движения вдоль Крымского побережья с запада на восток. После перечисления пунктов, расположенных до устья Дуная, сообщается (перевод И. Г. Коноваловой): «Мулиса находится в устье реки Данабрис. От устья [этой реки] до [города] (У)лиски одна миля, затем до [города] Карсуна без малого один день плавания, что составляет восемьдесят миль. От Карсуна (Херсонес) до Джалита (Ялта) тридцать миль; это город, [принадлежащий] к стране ал-Куманийа (Половецкая степь). От Джалита до города Гурзуби (Гурзуф) двенадцать миль; это многолюдный город, [расположенный] на берегу моря. От него до города Бартанити (Партенит) десять миль; это небольшой цветущий город, где строят корабли. От него до города Лабада (Ламбат) восемь миль; это прекрасный город. От него до Шалуста (Алушта) десять миль; это красивый большой город, [расположенный] на море. От него до города Султатийа (Судак) по морю двадцать миль, а от города Султатийа до [города] Бут(а)р (Феодосия) двадцать миль. От Бут(а)р до устья реки Русийа (Керченский пр.) двадцать миль. От устья реки Русийа до (города) Матраха (Тмутаракань) двадцать миль» [8, с. 115]. В помещаемых И. Г. Коноваловой в скобки пояснениях названий античный «Херсонес» можно понимать как средневековый «Херсон», а «Бутар» трудно сопоставлять вслед за Б. А. Рыбаковым с Феодосией [14, с. 19], прекратившей свое существование задол-

¹ Статья выполнена в рамках базовой части государственного задания Минобрнауки РФ № 33.5156.2017/БЧ по теме «Византийское присутствие в Крыму: политический, экономический и культурный аспекты».

² Перевод И. Г. Коноваловой, у И. Ю. Крачковского — «Развлечение истомленного в странствии по областям».

³ Перевод И. Ю. Крачковского.