

JUKKA KORPELA

Professor, Head of the Institute of History at the faculty of Social Sciences and Regional Research of the University of Joensuu (Finland)

jukka.korpela@joensuu.fi

NORTH-WESTERN «OTHERS» IN MEDIEVAL RUSSIAN CHRONICLES

The Novgorod chronicles revealing the facts concerning the population of Eastern Fennoscandia until XV century are analyzed in the article.

Key words: Chronicles, Cjud', Jem, Sum', Korela, Sami, aliens, Rus'

A. INTRODUCTION

In his essay from the year 1816 «Ueber die Wohnsitze der Jemen, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Neu-Finnlands», Aron Christian Lehrberg put the living areas of Finnic peoples on a map [1]. Jooseppi Julius Mikkola, another St. Petersburg scholar, identified the tribes of the area of modern Finland which are recorded in Novgorodian medieval sources [2]. Heikki Kirkinen has continued on the same path in his article «Finland in Russian Sources up to the Year 1323» [3].

The analyses, as well as many others of their likes, have taken for granted the ancient tribal system of Finnic peoples, which consists of Karelians, Tavastians, Finns, Ižorans, Vepsians, Estonians and Sámi/Lapps. These names are mentioned in medieval sources and archaeological evidence supports the existence of tribal areas to some extent also. The nation building is, however, a very complicated issue. Although we call foreigners according to their national names, the concepts have mostly been created by 19th century national romantics according to languages. The existence of the medieval Finnic tribes is problematic also, because a Finnish word for the

tribe, «heimo», had the original meaning of family. The 19th century historians only introduced it in the meaning of the population of a larger geographical area corresponding to the German concept «Stamm» [4].

In the medieval times other aspects were more important in identity building than languages and groups of people formed their togetherness according to activities, loyalties etc.; they were traders, men of Prince, pirates, crusaders etc. According to modern literature, the early populations of the Eastern Fennoscandia were heterogeneous, concentrated in resource niches and they hardly had supra-local, language based identities. Most probably the people identified themselves as members of families or clans and understood as others those whose economical system was different [5].

My intention is to re-evaluate the Novgorodian written sources concerning the populations in Eastern Fennoscandia until the 15th century state formation. I will try to see how the Novgorodians understood the situation in the territory, regarding what peoples or groups they understood to be living there, how exact their concepts of identities were and finally who Novgorodians considered to be «us» and who they considered to be «aliens».

The ancient authors were not always well informed, they were not intending to say something very specific, many times they were only following cultural patterns and myths and in any case there was no fixed terminology or standards for various phenomena. Generally, the terminology varies much from one source text to another [6].

My main source is the first Novgorodian chronicle which I have studied in detail. Moreover, the material of the first Sofian chronicle, Trinity chronicle, Laurentius chronicle, the fourth Novgorodian chronicle, Simeonov chronicle, Rogoskij chronicle, Voskresenskaja chronicle, Nikon-chronicle and Stepenaja Kniga has been used through indices and NIL-cases [7]. Thereafter I have re-checked the material with help of the collection *Materialy po istorii Karelii XII–XVI vv.*

Finns and Karelians are not a big issue in the texts. Including the unclear concept of čjud', there is in NIL all together some 68 entries which have something to do with our problem from the beginning of the 11th to the middle of the 15th century. Most of the cases are very scanty. The Internal wars, Tartarians and Lithuanians were the issues from the Novgorodian point of view.

The Novgorodian texts have, however, more detailed, correct and better information concerning the proceedings in the north than the other texts. The raid of 1042 to Jem' is recorded in the Laurentinian text, but except for the introduction, there are only three more entries with a Finnic case [8]. Rogoskij chronicle mentions Eastern Fennoscandia for the first time in 1278 in connection with the raid of Prince Dimitrij to Karelia and records a short statement concerning Prince Juris's raid to Viborg in 1322 [9]. The battle at Neva river in 1240, the raid of Aleksandr Nevskij to Jem' in 1256, the raids to Karelia in 1277 and 1322 and the attack of Andrej Aleksandrovič against Venec (= Landskrona on the River Okhta) in 1302 is recorded in Simeonov-chronicle [10]. Trinity chronicle mentions the raid of 1042, but thereafter, the text records only the raid of the year 1256 to Jem', the raid to Karelia in 1277 and the attack against Viborg in 1322 [11].

In relation to other proceedings in Novgorod, the peripheral value of the Finnic cases is clear in the southern sources because the city is as such recorded rather often. The late Muscovite texts (VL, NL, StKn) deal with Finnish and Karelian issues but less so than early Novgorodian texts and totally looking from the 16th century political perspective. VL is a little less loquacious than the others. Among the Novgorodian texts the Sofian chronicle and N4L pay less attention to the Finns than NIL.

B. PHILOLOGICAL POINT

Sources deal with people sometimes as collective groups and sometimes as individuals. There are clear singular collective concepts of jem', sum' and ves'. Svei, varjaži, gosti, nemci, greki and rusi are

mentioned in the plural form. The concepts čjud', vod' and korela seem to have both forms, i.e., also čjud' – čjudi [12], vod' – vožani [13] and korela – koreli (goročane korel'skyi). The plural forms are used very seldom [14].

Medieval Russian texts use plural forms for the peoples with whom they had regular contacts and who they personally knew, such as Slavic tribes or Hungarians or Poles or Varangians or Pečenegs or inhabitants of various towns [15]. More alien beings seem to have been addressed with collective forms like the Primary Chronicle does in the list of «all pagan peoples» who belonged to the subjects of Japheth after the Deluge [16].

The collective words čjud', vod', sum', ves' and jem' look like the noun Rus'. At first glance, they seem to refer to realms or administrative or cultural units and not just to people living somewhere. On the other hand, using these expressions the Novgorodians implied first of all a group of people because the texts use verbs in plural forms [17]. The same is the case with the noun Korela [18], although it is usually referring to the town Käkisalmi/Kexholm/Priozersk.

C. ČJUD'

Čjud' is the most common name for Finno-Ugrian peoples. For the first time, čjud' are recorded among taxpayers of Rus' in the prology of the Primary Chronicle [19]. According to Heikki Kirkinen, the word referred first to Baltic-Finnish tribes including Estonians and Finns but, later on when the Russians got the idea of the tribal system of the Finns, the word was used only for Estonians, while the others were called according to their proper names [20]. Later on Kirkinen advanced his theory claiming that čjud' were the pre-Karelian population at Lake Ladoga, which was later divided into Karelians and Ižorans [21]. According to some Russian scholars, the expression of čjud' meant Baltic Finns in the North-Western Rus' or the Novgorodians used it for all the people that had an unknown origin. Later the expression covered all Finno-Ugrians [22]. Other Russian scholars think, however, that čjud' have nothing to do with Finns or Karelians, but refers only to Estonians [23]. Earlier studies speak much about the concept of «zavoloč'skaja čjud'» which would refer to the Finnic population living between Lake Onega and River Dvina [24], or to the people in the area of River Vaga [25], or even to the mystic Bjarmians [26].

The basic weakness of the earlier studies is the idea about «the proper original names of the Finnish tribes». There is no evidence whatsoever about what the Finnic forest dwellers of backwoods called themselves and how they saw who they were. One has to see that Novgorodians only used some names to call peoples without proper ethnic analysis. The Sámi concept of čudde or čuðde means mystic foreign robbers, pursuers, enemies and their troops. This word is the root for the Rus'ian «čjud'». Per-

haps the ancient Slavonic speakers had taken the term into use when they saw how Sámi called foreigners demanding furs and wealth [27].

Čjud' is much more common in our material than Jem', Vod', Sum' or Korela. It is a name for human beings living in modern Estonia or in its neighbouring areas in those cases which can be defined. Except once, the čjud' were never living «beyond the sea» from the perspective of Novgorod. According to S1L, prince Aleksandr went «na svejskuju zemlju i na čjud'» when he attacked somewhere to the territory of modern Finland, 1256. The formulation is repeated in Muscovite chronicles after the end of the 15th century. Most probably, however, the chroniclers have mixed together various raids in Ingermanland, to River Narva and to Southern Finland as the story is described by N1L [28].

Čjud' were allied with Nemci but never with Varjaži or Korela. With Svei, Jem' and Sum' they were mentioned together only once, in the text of S1L at River Narva 1256. The same story is recorded in other texts without čjud' [29]. Although Novgorodians considered čjud' as «aliens», they were seldom taken as prisoners, i.e., slaves [30].

«Zavoloč'skaja čjud'» were living among «all heathens» («vsi jazyci») in the area of Noah's son Japheth, according to PVL [31]. The concept is not mentioned elsewhere in old texts. The word «zavoloč'e» is, however, widely used for the northern, peripheral territories. There were living there at least Finno-Ugrian Permians but otherwise modern scholars are not unanimous about the exact meaning of the concept [32].

Karamzin spoke about čjud' that killed Gleb Svjatoslavič in «zavoloč'e» in 1078. He refers to the chronicle of Novgorodian priest Ioann, i.e., the Academic MS of N1L(m) where is said that Gleb was killed by čjud' «za volokom» [33]. Čjud' living in the remote area encouraged scholars to call them in further studies «zavoloč'skaja čjud'» independently of the fact that such a concept is never mentioned in trustworthy old sources [34].

The expression of PVL is a more poetic than analytic concept in the meaning of real odd unknown people in remote backwoods. The noun «čjud'» describes here the alienness of the people and the adjective «zavoloč'skaja» (= remote) stresses the extreme remoteness of these aliens. Moreover, because PVL lists also Permians in the same entry, it is not identifying the Permians with «zavoloč'skaja čjud'». The short life story of St. Stephen of Perm' neither mentions any «zavoloč'skaja čjud'» [35].

Although some references clearly mean people living in remote areas and beyond the Gulf of Finland, the čjud' of our material can be mainly identified with non-Slavic populations living in Balticum. Because the Novgorodians used the collective conception čjud' as well as the plural form čjudi it looks like the Novgorodians had rather detailed information about čjudi and their society. They handled them as an organized unit but also

knew the individual members of this society and thus did not consider them as «total aliens». Čjudi were not used as sources of slaves more than Slavs. However, one had to understand that the Novgorodian chroniclers had not used the word as a general concept for people who were speaking a grammatically similar alien language. It would also be strange if the medieval Slavic chroniclers had been able to analyze their surrounding with the linguistic concepts of the 19th century philologists.

D. JEM'

According to the introduction of PVL, Jem' were among the taxpayers of Rus' [36]. Prince Vladimir Jaroslavič attacked them in 1042 [37]. Thereafter, the Novgorodians and the Korela launched raids against Jem' [38] and vice versa [39]. Jem' went also against vod' [40], Finno-Ugrians living at the south-eastern shore of the Gulf of Finland, around the town Kopor'je [41]. The living area of the jem' was situated far away from Novgorod, because the stories stressed the difficulty of the trip unlike in the connection of čjud' [42]. Obviously the Jem' came «from abroad» [43]. From Korela one went to Jem' by boats [44], but from Jem' to Vod' and from Novgorod to Jem' one could go «in the winter time», i.e., by land or on lake ice (not over the Gulf of Finland) [45], although to the «Vd'skoe ozero» one went by boat [46].

The area of Jem' was beyond the sea [47]. According to the Laurentinian chronicle, prince Jaroslav Vsevolodovič went against Jem' and proceeded so far that no Russian prince had ever been so far, in 1226 [48]. VL tells only that the raid went beyond the sea and was very successful [49]. The remoteness of the area of Jem' is also stressed in the story about the raid of Aleksandr Nevskij in 1256 [50]. While the story of the raid of 1226 described in N1L without any exceptional characterization, we might think that the jem' belonged to «the digital others» for Muscovites but were «less other» for Novgorodians. In comparison to čjudi they were, however, «more other» [51].

The «jem'skaja zemlja», is recorded in the sources for the first time in 1292 [52]. The concept of «zemlja» (land) has a special meaning in the Russian terminology of central power, regionalism, other – we. By using this term the sources stress the otherness of jem', because their living area is separated from «Novgorodskaja zemlja» or «Russkaja zemlja». There were neither towns nor castles in «jem'skaja zemlja» [53]. However, the raid of the year 1311 against Jem' was already launched to «nemeč'kaja zemlja» and nemči were the enemies there. Thus the idea of the land of Jem' was only short lived [54].

The contradictory sources do not allow to place Jem' on a map, although Finnish and Russian scholars have tried to find their place between western Finland and River Dvina. In the 1830s, Sjögren composed even a theory about two separate Jem'.

Traditionally Jem' are identified with the inhabitants of the inland of South-Western Finland, who are called Tavastians/Häme. According to the 19th century Romantic taxonomy, they would be the original Finnish tribe of the area [55].

The Jem' were taken as prisoners, i. e. slaves, by the Novgorodians and were thus regarded as alien heathens [56]. On the other hand, Jem' formed a group of people who threatened the land of Novgorod but who were also rich enough to be targets of robbery raids. According to the Novgorodian chronicles, 400 men of Jem' attacked against Novgorod in 1142 and this story is repeated in the 16th century Muscovite texts, too, but otherwise the sources do not deliver any information concerning the society of the Jem' [57].

According the Vladimir-Suzdal and Moscow chronicles, Prince Alexandr Nevskij attacked Jem' in winter 1256 with the Suzdalians and took prisoners [58]. Although the Suzdalians are recorded also elsewhere in the troops of Novgorod [59], they hardly went to western Finland. The wording implies, however, that Jem' were not simply heathen people beyond the sea but dangerous western enemies against whom Grand Prince must go with large troops and against whom the whole Rus' had a mission. This well suits the late medieval mission of the Muscovite rulers and might be the reason for this historiographic stress.

First, the raids of Jem' were separated from the raids of Swedes (svei, varjaži) [60] and of foreigners (nemci) [61], but later Jem' were already allied with western enemies of Rus' like at River Neva in 1240 and at River Narva in 1256. The change reflects the start of the Swedish state formation in eastern Fennoscandia although the stories may be better hagiographic than historical [62].

The First Sofian chronicle and Muscovite chronicles call the raid of Prince Aleksandr to Southern Finland, 1256, a raid «na svejskuju zemlju i na čjud'». Although the chroniclers have mixed together proceedings in Balticum, Finland and Ingermanland, this is the first time when the probable living area of Jem' (called here čjud') has been described as a part of the land of Swedes [63]. Organized western power has entered the area of western Finnish inland and founded a castle in the middle of the 13th century, but the people of Jem' remained outside of the centre as objects of the Swedish taxation [64]. A little later the «jemskaia zemlja» were mentioned and finally in the early 14th century, Novgorodian texts started to speak about the area as «nemeckaja» and about the representatives of the power as «nemci» [65].

The separation of Swedes from Jem' corresponding to townsmen and rural population reflects the division of power. The Jem' may have paid tribute to Swedes but were not considered as a part of their power structure. The concept of Jem' disappears from the Russian sources soon after the conclusion of the peace of Nöteborg in 1323, showing that Swedes were from now on able to implement

their permanent power in Western Finland (Häme, Savo, western part of the Carelian Isthmus). The only later evidence of using the concept of Jem' is the odd statement of N4L in 1496 that Prince Ivan Vasilevič attacked «gamskoju zemlju». This event is separated from Ivan's raid to Viborg earlier in the same year [66]. What was the reason for the reuse of this concept?

Although many later texts, like Rogoskij chronicle, do not use the concept of Jem' [67], the 16th-century imperial political manifestation Stepennaja Kniga describes how «Jem'» belonged to the subjects of Vladimir Svjatoslavič in the late-10th century, how Jaroslav Vsevolodovič launched a raid against Jem' in 1220s, how Vsevolod Mstislavič was victorious over Jem' in 1142, and how there were also Jem' participating in the battle of Neva in 1240, too. Scribes knew old texts and the concept of Jem' suited well the 16th century Muscovite diplomatic reclaims concerning the provinces which were surrendered in the treaty of Nöteborg to the Swedes [68].

E. SUM'

«Sum'» are mentioned as a tribe in three entries of N1L and S1L. Rogoskij chronicle and Laurentinian chronicle do not use the concept in the same stories. Simeonov-chronicle, Voskresenskaja-chronicle, Nikon-chronicle and Stepennaja Kniga mention the term in connection with the battle of Neva in 1240 [69]. N4L records the tribe «soum'» and Sokraščennyj Novgorodskij letopisec (spisok N. K. Nikol'skago) the tribe «sim» at River Narva in 1256 [70].

The Sum' were allies of Swedes in the stories of Neva and Narva [71]. More important is the story of the year 1318. Novgorodians attacked across the sea to River Polna, occupied the town Ljuderev and returned home. The town belonged to the prince and bishop of Sum' [72]. While S1L calls Ljuderev «gorod sum'skogo mesterja i biskupl'» [73], N4L tells how Novgorodians attacked «za more» to the River Polna and conquered two towns: Ljuderev and Piskupl'. The inhabitants were nemci (not sum') and they were killed during the raid [74].

The hard facts of the story are the names of the towns, Ljuderev and Piskupl', the River Polna and the notion that the people sum'/nemci were living «za more», i. e., beyond the Baltic Sea. The Sum' were living in towns and formed an organized Christian society mastered by a prince/"meister" and bishop. The variation of the ethnic names refers to the proceeding of the Christian state formation. The name of the town Piskupl' of N4L is derived from the Swedish word «biskop» or German «Bischof» (Bishop) and the concept «mester'» from German «Meister» [75].

The south-western part of Finland is called Finland Proper, in Finnish «suomi». The origin of the the concept «suomi» is unclear but looks like similar to «sum'». The traditional centre of the area

of Finland Proper is Turku, a permanent episcopal see since 1270s. Commander of the castle of Turku was Lyder van Kyr(e)n in 1318 and the scholarly tradition has connected the name of the town Ljuderev with his first name [76]. There was also an episcopal castle near Turku in Kuusisto which was built using stone in the beginning of the 14th century by Bishop Rangvald [77].

River Polna has been identified with River Aura which is running through Turku. Lehrberg explained the name as a translation from the Finnish name of the River Aura, which is according to him *avara = polnyj*. Although the philological explanation is unprofessional, the identification with River Aura is possible, because the name has been used also in one late Hanseatic document. On the other hand, «Polna» was in every-day use in old Russia for big rivers, and rivers with this name are known elsewhere, too [78].

The timing of the Novgorodian attack fits well with the sack of Turku by «rutheni» which is recorded in the late medieval «chronicle of Bishops» [79]. «The prince» of the text may have been «the Duke of Finland» Valdemar Magnusson, the younger brother of king Birger Magnusson of Sweden, although he was already murdered with his brother Eric in the early part of 1318 [80].

It is, however, difficult to believe that the Novgorodian sources had not known the right names of the most famous centres of Western Finland. It is also confusing that the sources suddenly speak about the people of Sum', their organized Christian society, the prince and bishop of Sum' which never happens in connection with Häme or Karelia and with the inhabitants of these areas in these years. Novgorodians were also active in Eastern Finland in the beginning of the 14th century and have more than enough problems elsewhere, too. Under these circumstances, it is highly improbable that Novgorod had launched a sudden raid to the totally new western area. The «chronicle of Bishops» is a problematic source, too, because it is actually a text of the 16th century and its so-called fragment of Palm-skiöld only from the late 15th century, and this was already the period of Swedish-Russian controversies. Possibly the author has «re-evaluated» some raids of pirates against Turku especially because the word of «rutheni» used in the chronicle was not an established concept for Novgorodians or Russians in the 14th century.

The River Polna describes the border between Sweden and Muscovy in the map of Anton Wied and Ivan Ljackij made in Vilnius between 1542 and 1555 [81]. The border river Polna is present in the all-European maps after the cosmographia of Sebastian Münster and the Theatrum Orbis Terrarum of Abraham Ortelius [82]. According to the early-15th century fictitious testament of King Magnus Ericsson, a monastery of Saviour was situated on the shores of River Polna. The monastery has later been identified as the Valaam-monastery of Lake Ladoga. Finally, Kyösti Julku has identified River Polna with

River Näätamö running to Arctic Ocean in Lapland and Heikki Kirkinen with Bömelfjordh near Bergen in Norway [83].

Although the border river Polna of the maps is a typical imagination of early modern cartographers, it has connections to reality, too. The western end of River Vuoksi «Suomenvedenpohja» formed a connection between Lake Saimaa and the Gulf of Viborg. It was navigable still in the 16th century; the Saimaa area forms a chain of lakes and rivers to the Arctic Ocean, and has been used as a communication route from times immemorial [84].

The story of the raid of 1318 can be connected to the area of Viborg in other ways, too. There is toponymic and other evidence concerning the early relations between (Varsinais-)Suomi and Gulf of Viborg, starting from the name of river Suomenvedenpohja which contains the prefix *sum'* [85]. The well recorded military activity in the region of Viborg in these years also fits well with the story of 1318, while there is no other evidence concerning expeditions from western Finland, and the names of the chronicle text are neither impossible in the connection with Viborg since it was also a Swedish royal castle and our real knowledge about the visits and travels of military leaders and bishops are most scarce.

«Suomi/sum'» names are present in Balticum, too. The Estonian island Saarenmaa (Osel/Ösel) is called in the Latvian language Sāmusala which is derived from «Suomensalo» (island of Suom/sum) [86]. It is not possible to exclude this region from the story of the raid in 1318 either, because it was «beyond the sea» from Novgorod and *nemci* were living there, archbishop of Riga Albert founded an episcopal see of Saarenmaa (Ösel-Wiek) in Lihula (Leal) in 1228 and German knights had been present with their «meiser» in Ösel since 1234. River Polna is possible to identify with straits, sounds and rivers of the area [87].

F. KORELA

According to PVL Korela belonged to the peoples of Japheth like *jem'* and *čjud'* [88]. The first real historical record of Korela is the story of the year 1143 [89]. Korela were like *Vod'* [90] and *Ižerjany* [91] not a part of the realm of Novgorod, while *ladožany* [92] had closer relations to Novgorod. Soon Korela were, however, allied with Novgorod against *Jem'*, *Nemci* and *Svei* [93]. The status of Korela was still long labile. The Prince of Novgorod planned a raid against Korela in 1269, but at the same time Korela also had internal troubles with Novgorodians, Pskovians, Ladogans, *Ižori* and *Vod'* concerning their mutual relation. Sometimes Korela was included in treaties between Novgorod and Hansa, like in 1262, but at the same Novgorod could not totally guarantee the security of the trade in Carelian Isthmus [94].

The relations of the areas around Lake Ladoga with Novgorod became closer after the 1270s. Prince Dimitrij Aleksandrovič occupied Korela in 1278 and

the area was taken under permanent Novgorodian rule during the early years of the 14th century [95].

Traditional studies have argued about the early independent status of Karelia, while being unable to understand that such an independent status did not exist in the medieval world [96]. It is more essential that Korela becomes a bigger issue in later texts than it was in earlier ones. According to the Nikon-chronicle, Aleksandr Nevskij fought «s korel'e/s koreloju» and even the monastery of Valaam existed in 1240 (in fact it was founded in the early 15th century), and the Laurentinian text, which is actually the most ancient physical manuscript of the chronicles, praises the Baptism of Korela by the prince Jaroslav Vsevolodovič in 1227 [97]. Correspondingly, the concepts Sum' and Jem' underwent a new popularity in the 16th century Muscovite texts.

The territorialization and nation building of Muscovy and Sweden started in the 15th century and were soon visible in the historiography on both sides. The early role of the old realm was emphasized in peripheral territories, and thus, the old texts were reviewed. Such an interpolation is most probably the story of the Karelian Baptism of 1227 and the idea of Stepennaja Kniga that Karelians paid taxes from now onwards to Rus' [98]. An obscure issue is also the expansion of the Novgorodian/Karelian trade and administration to the northern areas before the 15th century, despite the opinion of traditional literature [99].

After the conquest of Novgorod in 1471/1478, Muscovy came into direct contact with Sweden and a became a partner in regular peace negotiations from 1482; in the same time the Muscovite diplomacy took up the treaty of the year 1323 as a permanent argument for the defence of the border line against the expansion of Swedish taxation to the east [100]. The increasing interest of the 16th-century Muscovite historiography with the peace treaty of Nöteborg reflects the same fact [101]. The new situation is also clearly visible in the emphasis of the crusade of King Magnus Ericsson to Neva and in the interpolation of the fictitious testament of the King to the chronicles after the late-15th century [102].

The word Korela differs from the other concepts of our study because it was used also by the medieval western sources [103]. In connection with the noun Korela the verb is used in the plural which indicates that the authors spoke about inhabitants [104]. The use of the plural form «Koreli» differs from the concept of Jem' and Sum' and resembles the use of words čjudi and vožani. Probably Koreli were considered as individual people with whom Novgorodians were in regular contact and whom they knew fairly well. Perhaps Koreli were «not very much other».

There was a town (gorodok) and townsmen (gorodčanin) in «Korela» who were «Korela» and «Rusi» [105]. «Korela» were living also in the area of Viborg which was called «korela nemečkaja» like the town Viborg was a town of Nemci after the late

13th century, because it was founded by Svei [106]. This reflects the approach of the foreign power as a superstructure and a starting of foreign state building. The case resembles the description of Vanaja in 1311.

Thus Korela means people, town, as well as a geographic area, where superstructures were Swedish and Novgorodian, but the local population was Finnic [107]. The Korela could be taken as prisoners, i.e., slaves, too. According to some chronicles, prisoners were taken from the eastern part of Korela in 1277/1278 as well, but this is not sure [108].

The geographical location of Korela is rather precise, although exceptions can be found. According to the short life story of St. Stephen of Perm', Korela were living in Perm' [109]. Some western sources place Karelia on the southern coast of the Finnish Gulf, too [110].

Nemci could reach Korela by boat via River Neva and Lake Ladoga [111]. When Svei attacked, they divided the troops, and half of them went to Korela while the rest to Ižora [112]. The shores of the River Neva did not usually belong to korel'skaja zemlja [113], although Nikon chronicle once speaks about «grad Orehov korel'skij» [114]. There was a conceptual difference in the eyes of Novgorodians between the eastern end of the Gulf of Finland and Western Finland, too. Although Vanaja (Häme) belonged to «nemeč'kaja zemlja», the Swedes founded their castle of Viborg in «korel'skaja zemlja» in 1293, according to NIL [115].

«Kobyličkaja korila» as well as «korela semidesjackaja» belonged to the realm of Novgorod [116]. According to Heikki Kirkinen, the previous concept refers to the South-Eastern Carelian isthmus while Svetlana Kočkurkina speaks about the region of Toksova and also the area of Savo (South-Eastern Finland. According to John Lind «korela semidesjackaja» can be placed at the shores of the rivers Okhta and Saja and in the regions of Keltto, Rautu, Kuivas and Korpiselkä [117].

Kirkinen has placed «Korela semidesjackaja» in Northern Ostrobothnia, at the shores of the Botnic Gulf, but the theory has not, however, any direct support in sources. According to Kočkurkina, the concept could have meant also the eastern coast of Lake Saimaa [118].

Indeed, sources use concepts of Jemskaja, Korelskaja, Vodskaja and Cjudskaja zemlja. The lack of sumskaja zemlja might depend on the fact that this name is mentioned only three times. All the expressions belong to later periods. The use of the concepts excludes the people in concern outside of the Novgorodskaja zemlja as some kind of foreigners although Vod' and Koreli clearly belonged to the Novgorodian realm (vlast', volost') and not to the «digital other people». Zemlja is also referring to the fact that Novgorodians considered them as a unit in a certain geographic direction. The Novgorodians used the expressions more in the sense of population than as territorial names, because the predicate verbs are in plural form in the connections of the concepts [119].

G. MISSING SÁMI

The Finnic speaking population of the European arctic and subarctic area are called Lapps or Sámi. The Novgorodians had economical contacts with Kola, Finnmarken, Lapland and Norrland in the age of the Vikings [120]. For the first time, according to my knowledge, Russian sources refer to «Lopari» or «Lop'» in the *žitie* of Lazarij of Murom, who was opposed by «lopjane i čud'» in the 14th century Dvina. The text is much younger [121]. The «Lopari» and «Lop'» were recorded regularly in the tax books of the area from the 16th century onwards [122].

The lack of the concept in old chronicles does not mean that the Novgorodians had not faced Sámi speakers. As said, they had economic contacts with them and the Novgorodians used even Sámi based concepts like the word «čjud'». They did not, however, make any difference between Sámi speakers and other Finnic forest dwellers but used for them all the above mentioned concepts. In fact, the same phenomenon is visible in the western sources, too, which, on the contrary, use the concept of Lapp for all forest dwellers including the proper Finns [123]. This state of affairs underlines only two aspects. First, the language was not important for the identification of people. Secondly, the forest dwellers were simply odd, foreign people from the perspective of the Novgorodians.

H. ALIENS

Russian sources record also Svei, Varjaži, Nemci and Gosti in the north-western territories. Gosti were Novgorodian and foreign merchants, who had connections outside of Novgorod, but the concept is not used very often [124].

Nemci were at first foreign merchants [125], but soon the concept refers to foreign knights against whom Novgorodians were fighting, too. Nemci were allied with čjud' and they were the enemies of Rus' in the battle of Lake Peipus [126]. On the other hand, many Nemci come to Riga in 1237 and together with the locals attacked the heathen Lithuania [127], but Nemci were also the soldiers in Vanaja [128]. The concept «zemlja nemečkaja» is used as well [129]. Thus the term Nemci covers German knights, Swedes as well as the Baltic area.

Varjaži is an old term for varangians and Vikings as well as for the Latin Church [130]. In the Novgorodian material it is used for foreign merchants, too. Varjaži is like the word gosti but without any reference to Novgorodian merchants [131]. A clear exception is the use of the concept for Latin crusaders in the story about the sack of Constantinople 1204 [132].

Pirates are called in western sources sometimes curones. Although PVL records Kors', Ljub', Zimegola and Letgola which have been identified with these «Kurians», the Novgorodian and other Russian chronicles do not use the expressions in the

north. Perhaps the Curones were called Nemci or Svei as well, like we know that Vitalian pirates were called Nemci in 1392 [133].

Svei were pirates and other foreign enemies who came beyond the sea and attacked against Novgorod [134]. After the late-13th century a clear difference between Svei and Nemci disappears, as far as it concerns the areas of the Gulf of Finland and Carelia. While Trund and his men who went against Neva and Carelia in 1284 and the inhabitants of the town Vanaja were Nemci, the conquerors of Western Karelia in 1290s were Svei [135]. The castle of Viborg was in 1294 a «gorod sveiskij» but already in 1322 a «gorod nemečkij» for the same chronicle [136].

According to the Novgorodian texts, Svei attacked in the first years of the 14th century against Neva, brought their allies «from Rome, from Pope» and built a town at River Okhta [137]. In southern texts the concept of nemci is used in these proceedings, or like in Voskresenskaja chronicle «priidoša iz zamoria nemci svejskie» [138], and king Magnus Ericsson who made a crusade to Neva in 1348–1350 was also «korol' nemec'sky», according to the Trinity chronicle [139]. The manner of the Muscovite texts from the late-15th century on to call King Magnus in 1348 as «korol' sveiskii» reflects the new relations between Muscovy and Sweden [140]. The treaty of Nöteborg 1323 was concluded between the prince of Rus', Novgorod and the King of Sweden. Therefore, in the connection of the peace treaty the sources use the concept of Svei [141]. The idea to call the realm of the King of Sweden and his representatives as Svei and the unspecified foreigners as Nemci was established during the 14th century in Novgorodian first Chronicle [142].

Murmane is recorded in some entries as allies of western enemies. Svei attacked with Jem', Sum' and Murmane to River Neva, while at River Narva Murmane were connected to Sum' as well as to «land of didman», 1240 [143]. The word «murman» derives from «norman» [144]. «Murmanskoe more» had the meaning of the Arctic Ocean and «Murmanskij bereg» the shore of the Ocean from the mouth of White Sea to the Norwegian border. The Novgorodians had connections to Finnmarken which may explain the use of the expression, but the participation of real Norwegians in the proceedings is, of course, another issue [145].

The texts speak about «aliens» in plural. The explanations may vary, however, and all groups did not form similar unspecified unknown entities. Nemci and Varjaži were heterogeneous and indefinite foreigners while Gosti individual merchants and Svei, Ljahi and Greki well known neighbors.

One cannot make any ethnic differences between Swedes, Danes, Norwegians and Germans like today. All the expressions refer to living forms or activities, relation to sea, to position in power structures and only slightly and unspecified as to geographical direction [146]. National labels of merchants should also be avoided. Hansa was a German

national movement, and Vikings exclusively Scandinavians only in the imagination of the 19th century literature. The clear difference between Vikings and Hansa merchants is a later simplification, too [147].

I. RUS'

Traditionally, Novgorod is a part of Russia, but the concept of Rus' and the relation of Novgorod to Rus' is complicated in medieval sources. «Episkop' i kup'ce i sly novgorod'skyja ne puščahu iz rusi, - - -» [148]. A couple of years later, in 1145: «- - - hodiša vsja russka zemlja na Galic' - - - hodiša že i iz Novgoroda pomoč'e» [149] and in 1146: «Pres-tavisja v rusi Vsevolod'» [150]

These kinds of expressions are a standard in the Novgorodian sources. It looks like that Novgorodians did not count themselves to be a part of Rus'. Rus' was outside of Novgorod like the area of čjud': in 1149: «Ide arhiepiskop novgorod'skyj Nifont v rus' pozvan' Izjaslavom'» [151], in 1165: «V to že leto hodi igumen Dionisij s ljubov'ju v rus'» [152], in 1179: «Tgda že novgorod'ci poslašasja po brata ego po M'stislava v rus' - - -; a na zimu ide M'stislav s novgorod'ci na čjud' - - -» [153] and in 1180: «I poslaša novgorod'ci k Svjatoslavu v rus' po syn, - - - Tom že lete - - - ide knjaz' Svjatoslav Vsevolodic' - - - iz rusi na Suždal' - - -» [154]. In the last sentence the word Rus' refers only to Kiev because also Suzdal' was outside of it. The concept of Rus' is used in this way elsewhere, too, but exclusively in connection with the Grand Prince and Metropolitan [155].

The concept Rus' is not used in this way in chronicles which are from areas other than Novgorod, e.g., the Laurentinian text. Firstly, russkaja zemlja or Rus' is used very seldom. The geographical definitions are made basically with assistance of names of towns. When Rus' is used, it is a general concept in the meaning of we/us without any aspect of alienness. The aliens in Laurentinian text are, of course, different than in Novgorod, mainly «Ugry» (Hungarians) and «Ljahi» (Poles) [156].

The concept of Rus' is a singular collective word, too. As said above, this kind of expressions were used mainly for foreign, unknown groups of people. This fact is very striking, e.g., in the PVL-story about the foundation of the realm of Rurik in 862. All Slavic tribes and townsmen are in plural forms but non-Slavic tribes and the concept Rus' in singular collective forms [157]. One should remark, however, that sometimes a plural expression «rusi» was used or individual one «rusin», too [158].

J. RELIGIOUS OTHER

Modern scholars speak about the Novgorodian activity in the north also as a Christian Mission. The descriptions concerning the 14th century expansion of the Latin Church, the influence of the pope and Rome and the Western threat can be found in the later Muscovite chronicles [159]. Interestingly, the

raids until the early 14th century wars are mostly skipped in these texts with some short sentences. E.g., the famous story of the year 1227 when «Prince Jaroslav Vsevolodovič baptised very many Karelians almost all people» is recorded only in the Laurentinian chronicle [160]. Because Muscovy invested itself in the role of the defender of All-Rus' against the foreign religious threat and built its power on the religious legitimization since the 14th century, the Orthodox mission was increasingly emphasized in the Muscovite historiography after the early 15th century [161].

The Novgorodian texts, of course, noticed the religious matters, e.g., the participation of bishops in raids but religious missions were not an issue in early texts [162]. According to the traditional literature, the reason was the liberal attitude of the Novgorod administration towards local institutions and original religion [163]. This view is supported by the criticism of Henry of Livonia against the laziness of Novgorodians in religious matters [164].

The Novgorod texts do not consider western areas as a Pagan land. The concept for total alien beings «jazyč'nik» is never used for Swedes, Germans or other «Latins». Instead of this the concept «poganyj» («dirty», «pagan») and the word «bezbož'nyj» («godless») is used especially for Lithuanians. The Lithuanian Prince Algirdas was «bezbož'nyj», and the crusade and crusaders against Pskov are called «napadenie bezbož'nyh latin» and «poganaja latyna» [165].

The religious other is hidden in tribal terminology, too. A part of the inhabitants of the town of Korela was not regarded as Christians. The term «Rus'» might be equal to the expression of Christians in this connection and the Pagans referred most probably to the Finnic population called «Korela». This same use of the concept Rus' can be found in the story about St. Stephen of Perm' and his relation to the local Permians. A Novgorodian chronicle text tells about the uprising of 1337: «Townpeople killed Rus' from Novgorod and merchants from Ladoga and other Christians in Korela and escaped to the town of foreigners (Viborg) and killed there Christians, too» [166].

Similarly, the paganism is connected with Mordvians in the late antivity of Patriarch Nikon, St. Sergej was opposed in Valaam by (Pagan) Karelians, and angry (heathen) Lapps and Finns tried to, expel St. Lazarij of Murom from his island in Onega. Arsenij Konevskij faced also (heathen) Karelians who venerated a stone on his island of Konev [167].

In some earlier Novgorod stories the same tribal division is visible in a religious distinction, too. Jan Vyšatič went to Beloozero and collected tributes in 1071. According to the text, locals were terrorised during a famine by sorcerers whom Jan finally executed. In the chronicle entry of the same year, there is a story about a sorcerer and uprising in Novgorod, too. People aimed to kill Bishop Feodor who declared that those who believed in the sorcerer

must join with him and those who believed in Holy Cross must join with him. Bishop, Prince and his men were on one side, but the common people on the other side. Finally Prince Gleb Svjatoslavič slaughtered the sorcerer [168].

The third story about the sorcery in PVL describes the situation in the periphery. A Novgorodian visited the land of the *čud'* and met a soothsayer, while he was searching for Shamanistic services. The soothsayer did not succeed, however, because the ghosts were frightened by the Baptismal Cross of the Novgorodian. The division between «us» and «other» follows here the religious border but is described with a tribal concept, too [169].

When Archbishop Makarij sent priest Elijah with warriors to Carelia in 1534, to destroy the heathen «*čud'ian*» cult places, «the elder people did not dare to join the mission because they were frightened that the Devil might kill them. But when Priest Elijah had shown a miracle that after the holy water was spread, the Devil lost his case; the people joined with him with a joy and started to destroy the old sacred places». Again the cultural and political border went along the religious border and the aliens were called with tribal names [170].

K. CONCLUSIONS

The Novgorodian view concerning the political geography in early medieval eastern Fennoscandia differs from the traditional explanations. Swedes were those, who came from west by sea. International foreigners occupied towns and castles. Otherwise, the terminology is varying from one case

and time to another. The Novgorodians had neither dealt with the inhabitants of the area of eastern Fennoscandia like there had been an established tribal system with fixed areas and mutual relations, nor had they called the peoples with standard names. Generally, the level of information was not very high, which may reflect the less important position of the Eastern Fennoscandian area from the perspective of the Novgorod society. The sources use some pseudoethnic names, because they had to call by some way the heterogenic populations which were connected to fur trade, tributes and fights. The core idea was, however, to note the otherness, and there are differences between the levels of the otherness from «total other» to «rather well-known people». A division between the allies of Swedes and Novgorodians started to form during the 14th century, when the territorialization of the royal/princely power had proceeded far enough.

The tribes and their identities became important only during the early modern period when the Swedish Kingdom and Muscovy faced each other in every-day life. The formation of parishes and establishment of permanent taxation resulted in the late 15th century in the need to identify the real territorial border and the inhabitants, who belong to each realm. The task of historians was to create the ancient legitimization roots for this political argumentation and thus was composed also stories about medieval Karelians, Jem's and Finns among all others, and their roles as allies of medieval realms. It is, however, no longer our obligation to believe these legitimization stories created by the nation building processes of the 16th–19th centuries.

SOURCES AND REFERENCES

1. A. C. Lehrberg, Untersuchungen zu Erläuterungen der älteren Geschichte Russlands. Herausgegeben von der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften durch Ph. Krug, St. Petersburg, 1816, 103–236.
2. J. J. Mikkola, Venäläisistä kronikoista pohjoismaiden keskiajan historian lähteinä. Historiallinen Aikakauskirja (= HAik), 1928, 181–189.
3. H. Kirkinen, Finland in Russian Sources up to the Year 1323. SJH 1982, 255 - 275. About the same text is published also in: H. Kirkinen, Suomi ja sen asukkaat venäläisissä lähteissä vuoteen 1323. Suomen Väestön esihistorialliset juuret. Tvärminnen symposiumi 17.–19.1.1980. Bidrag till kännedom av Finlands natur och folk. Utgivna av Finska Vetenskaps-Societeten H.131, Helsinki, (= SVEJ) 1984, 265–282.
4. K. Vilkuna, Heimo, heimokansa, heimokunta. Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja (= KVS) 53, 1973, 35–42
5. J. Korpela, The World of Ladoga. Society, Trade, Transformation and State Building in the Eastern Fennoscandian Boreal Forest Zone ca. 1000–1555, Nordische Geschichte, Münster, 2008, passim, L. I. Hansen – B. Olsen, Samenes historie fram til 1750, Oslo, 2004, 31–42, L. I. Hansen, Interaction between Northern European sub-arctic Societies during the Middle Ages: Indigenous peoples, peasants and state builders. Two Studies on the Middle Ages. Edited by Magnus Rindal. The Research Council of Norway: KULTs skriftserie No. 66, Oslo, 1996, 33–34, 38, 41–42, J.-P. Taavitsainen, Ancient Hillforts of Finland. Problems of Analysis, Chronology and Interpretation with Special Reference to the Hillfort of Kuhmoinen. Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistyksen aikakauskirja 94, Helsinki 1990, 77, 114–117.
6. T. Pekkanen, Tutentattomien kansannimien identifiointimetoista. Suomen varhaishistoria. Tornion kongressi 14–16.06.1991. Esitelmät. Toimittaja Kyösti Julku. Studia Historica Septentrionalia 21, Pohjois-Suomen Historiallinen Yhdistys, Rovaniemi, 1992 (= SVH 1992), 388–391.
7. Новгородская первая летопись старшего и младшего извода // Полное собрание русских летописей (далее ПСРЛ). Т. 3. М., 2000 (далее НПЛ), Софийская первая летопись старшего извода // ПСРЛ. Т. 6. Ч. 1. М., 2000 (далее СПЛ), Приселков М. Д. Троицкая летопись. Реконструкция текста. М.; Л., 1950 (далее ТрЛ), Лаврентьевская летопись // ПСРЛ. Т. 1. М., 1962 (далее ЛЛ), Новгородская четвертая летопись // ПСРЛ. Т. 4. М., 2000 (далее НЧЛ), Симеоновская летопись // Русские летописи. Т. 1. Рязань, 1997 (далее СЛ), Рогожский летописец // ПСРЛ. Т. 15. Пг., 1922 (далее РЛ), Летопись по Воскресенскому списку // ПСРЛ. Т. 7. М., 2001 (далее ВЛ), Патриаршая или Никоновская летопись // ПСРЛ. Т. 9–14. М., 1965 (далее НЛ), Книга степенная царского родословия // ПСРЛ. Т. 21. СПб., 1908–1913 (далее СтКн).
8. ЛЛ. 6734 (1226), 6735 (1227), 6764 (1256). There is one more entry in: Продолжение Суздальской летописи по академическому списку // ПСРЛ. Т. 1. Л., 1928, 6736 (1228).
9. РЛ. 6785 (1277), 6830 (1322).

10. СЛ. 6748 (1240), 6764 (1256), 6785 (1277), 6810 (1302), 6832 (1324).
11. ТрЛ. 6550 (1042), 6764 (1256), 6785 (1277), 6832 (1324).
12. НПЛ. 6624 (1116): «Иде Мстислав на чудь», НПЛ. 6638 (1130): «Иде Всеволод с новгородци на чудь», НПЛ. 6750 (1242): «немци же и чудь поидоша по нех», НПЛ. 6684 (1176): «а чуди множества избиша», НПЛ. 6776 (1268): «в ней же ябше много чуди».
13. НПЛ. 6657 (1146): «придоша емь на водь», НПЛ. 6748 (1240): «придоша немци на водь», НПЛ. 6577 (1069): «О, велика быше сеча вожаном», НПЛ. 6723 (1215): «а вожане помроша», НПЛ. 6749 (1241) «а вожан и чудю переветники извеша», НПЛ. 6824 (1316): «и соидеся вся волость новгородская: плсковичи, ладожане, рушане, корела, ижора, вожане».
14. НПЛ. 6651 (1143): «ходиша корела не емь», НПЛ. 6822 (1314): «Избиша корела городчан», НПЛ. 6699 (1191): «Ходиша новгородци с корелою на емь», НПЛ. 6749 (1241): «поиде князь Олександр на немци на город Копорью, с новгородци и с ладожаны и с корелою и с ижеряны», НПЛ. 6892 (1384): «Прихаша городчане ореховци и корельскыи с жалобою», ЛЛ. 6735 (1227): «Того же лета князь Ярослав Всеволодич послав крести множество корел, мало не все люди». According to I.P. Shaskol'skii (Ша с к о л ь с к и й И. П. Борьба Руси против крестоносной агрессии на берегах Балтики в XII–XIII вв. Л., 1978. С. 24, прим. 29), there were concepts Rus'-rusin, Čud' - čudin and Jem' - jemin. The first is a collective concept for the people while the second an individual word for a member of that people. The expression rusin is recorded (e.g. Повесть временных лет. 6420 (912)), but the words čudin and jemin are only known as individual names. Semen Jemin was tysjackij (commander of emergency volunteer corps) of Novgorod in 1219 (НПЛ. 6727) and Čudin Mikula a Kievian Boyar in the late-11th century (J. Korpela, Beiträge zur Bevölkerungsgeschichte des Kiever Rus' bis zum Tode von Vladimir Monomah. Studia Historica Jyväskyläensis, 54, 1995, nr. 98 and 559).
15. Повесть временных лет / Подготовка текста, перевод, статьи и комментарии Д. С. Лихачева; Под редакцией В. Н. Адриановой-Перетц. Изд. 2-е, испр. и доп. СПб.: Наука, 1996 (далее ПВЛ). 6370 (862), 6390 (882)–6393 (885), 6406 (898), 6410, (902), 6415 (907), 6500 (992), 6505 (997), 6526 (1018).
16. ПВЛ. С. 8.
17. НПЛ. 6650 (1142): «Приходиша емь и воеваша область новгородскую», НПЛ. 6653 (1145): «Ходиша вся русская земля на Галич», НПЛ. 6657 (1149): «Придоша емь на водь», НПЛ. 6736 (1228): «Придоша емь воевать во Водьское озеро в лодках», НПЛ. 6722(1214): «Чудь поклонилася еми», НПЛ мл. извода. 6725 (1217): «Чудь же начаша слати с поклоном лестию».
18. НПЛ. 6651 (1143): «Ходиша корела на емь», НПЛ. 6822 (1314), НПЛ. 6822 (1314): «Избиша корела городчан, кто тут был руси в Корельском городке, и введоша к собе немец».
19. ПВЛ. Prooem. C. 13.
20. H. Kirkinen, Karjala Idän kulttuuripiirissä. Bysantin ja Venäjän yhteyksiä keskiajan Karjalaan. Historiallisia tutkimuksia 67, Helsinki, 1963, 22–29, E. Kuujo - H. Kirkinen, Baltiassa ja Suomessa asuneiden heimojen osallistuminen Itämeren alueen kysymysten ratkaisuun 1100- ja 1200-luvuilla. Historiallinen Arkisto 69, Forssa, 1975, 34–35.
21. H. Kirkinen, Karjala taistelulentä. Karjala idän ja lännen välissä I. Venäjän Karjala renessanssijalla (1478–1617), Helsinki, 1970, 15–16, E. Kuujo - H. Kirkinen, Historiallinen Arkisto 69, 1975, 39.
22. Кирпичников А. Н., Рябинин Е. А. Прибалтийско-финские племена в составе Древнерусского государства // Финны в Европе в VI–XV веках. Прибалтийско-финские народы. Историко-археологические исследования. Вып. 2. Русь, финны, саамы, верования. М., 1990 (далее ФвЕ 2, 1990). С. 102 и прим. 2, cf. also С. 112–113. R. Grünthal, Livvistä liiviin. Itämerensuomalaiset etnonyymit. Castrenianumin toimitteita 51, Helsinki, 1997. 150–164.
23. История Эстонской ССР (с древнейших времен до наших дней) / Под ред. Г. И. Наана. Таллин, 1952. С. 31–32 and the following map, H. Ligi, Tšuudid ajalookirjanduses. Keel ja kirjandus 23, Tallinn, 1980 (tai 1986?), 610H, Попов А. И. Названия народов СССР. Введение в этноимику. Л., 1973. С. 68–70, E. Kuujo - H. Kirkinen, Historiallinen Arkisto 69, 1975, 34–35, also about same meaning J. J. Mikkola, HAik 1928, 184–185.
24. H. Kirkinen, 1963, 23–24, 26, Назаренко В. А., Овсянников О. В., Рябинин Е. А. Чудь заволочская // ФвЕ. Вып. 2. Л., 1990. С. 93–101, Седов В. В. Древнерусская народность. Историко-археологическое исследование. М., 1999. С. 71, R. Grünthal, 155–156.
25. O. V. Ovsyannikov, First discovered burialfield of «Zavolochye tshud». Fenno-urgi et slavi 1978. Helsingin yliopiston arkeologian laitos. Moniste n:o 22, Helsinki, 1980. P. Uino, Karjalan tutkimus ja pohjoinen Fennoskandia. SVH 1992, 609.
26. E. Kuujo - H. Kirkinen, Historiallinen Arkisto 69, 1975, 39, Киркинен Х. О связях биармов и Скандинавии в средние века // Скандинавский сборник. Вып. 26, 1981. С. 87–97, H. Kirkinen, Merjasta Mikkeliin. Kadonneen sukulaiskansan jäljillä. Inkerin tiellä. Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja 69/70, Helsinki, 1990, 245, T. N. Jackson, Location of Bjarmaland. SVH 1992, 123.
27. M. Korhonen, Johdatus lapin kielen historiaan. SKS toimituksia 370, Jyväskylä, 1981, 45, T. Itkonen, Lappalaisperäisiä paikannimiä suomenkielen alueella. Virittäjä 1/1920, 2, Hansen, 1996, 82–88, E. Söderholm, Sadat sotaisat tšuudit. Uusi selitys saamen čuddi -sanalle. Vieraan ymmärtäminen. Kirjoituksia kielestä ja kulttuurista Olli Nuutisen (1939–1995) muistoksi. Toimittaneet Sirkka-Liisa Hahmo, Osmo Nikkilä. SKS toimituksia 656, Helsinki, 1996, 105–116, J. Korpela, 2008, 109.
28. СПЛ, Московский летописный свод конца XV века // ПСРЛ. Т. 25. М., 2004 (далее МЛС), НЛ, НПЛ. 6764 (1256).
29. СПЛ. 6764 (1256).
30. Mainly heathens were taken in slaves. СПЛ and БЛ 6764 (1256) record how prisoners were taken during a raid against čjud'. The chroniclers seem to have mixed, however, here an information concerning jem' with čjud'. Chroniclers have also added sometimes information concerning prisoners without any reliable facts. E.g., the prisoners of the raid of 1042 appear only in the 16th century БЛ. 6550 (1042).
31. ПВЛ. Prooem. C. 8, НЧЛ. Prooem. C.2. ТрЛ. Prooem. C. 52, НЛ. Prooem. C. 2.
32. НПЛ, СПЛ. 6832 (1324), J. Lind, Sjögrens Häme-teori og de russiske krøniker. En opgør med finsk tradition. Historisk Tidskrift för Finland (= HTF) 62, 1977, 287–288, Макаров Н. А. Колонизация северных окраин Древней Руси в XI–XIII вв. По материалам археологических памятников на волоках Белозерья и Поонежья. М., 1997. С. 48–50.
33. Карамзин Н. М. История государства Российского. Т. 2. СПб., 1892. С. 56. In the note 133 Karamzin correctly refers to the source text «za volokom» and tells that Tatiš'ev identified these čjud' with jem'. J. Lind. HTF 62, 1977, 287–288, 293.
34. Cf. also J. Lind, HTF 62, 1977, 294–297.

35. НЛ. 6904 (1396), Рыбаков Б. А. Русские карты Московии XV – начала XVI в. М., 1974. С. 12–13. Personally I am sceptic about the story of St. Stephen as a historical source, J. Korpela, Stefan von Perm', Heiliger Täufer im politischen Kontext. Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas, München (=JfGO), 2002, 481–499, J. Korpela, Stefan Permiläinen, Ortodoksia 49, 2002, 109–148.
36. ПВЛ. Prooem. С. 13.
37. ПВЛ., НПЛ., ЛЛ., ВЛ., НЧЛ. 6550 (1042).
38. НПЛ. 6550 (1042), 6631 (1123), 6651 (1143), 6694 (1186), 6735 (1227), 6800 (1292), 6819 (1311), SIL 6550 (1042), 6631 (1123), 6650 (1142), 6672 (1164), 6735 (1127), 6736 (1128), 6800 (1292), 6819 (1311). НЧЛ. 6550 (1042), 6631 (1123), 6650 (1142), 6735 (1227), 6736 (1228), 6764 (1256).
39. НПЛ. 6650 (1142).
40. НПЛ., СПЛ., НЧЛ. 6657 (1149).
41. Рябинин Е. А. Водь // ФВЕ. Вып. 2. Л., 1990. С. 15–31.
42. НПЛ. 6631 (1123).
43. НПЛ. 6650 (1142): «Приходиша емь» On the same НПЛ. 6550 (1042) «идеа на емь» and «идеа на греку».
44. НПЛ. 6651 (1143), 6699 (1191), 6748 (1240).
45. НПЛ., СПЛ. 6657 (1149), НЛ. 6764 (1256).
46. НПЛ. 6736 (1228). According to НЛ 6736 (1228) this raid went to Ladoga.
47. НПЛ. 6764 (1256), 6819 (1311), NL 6764 (1256). This is also the main view of Stepennaja Kniga (СтКн (7. ст.) С. 251).
48. ЛЛ. 6734 (1226).
49. ВЛ. 6734 (1226).
50. НПЛ., СПЛ. 6764 (1256).
51. НПЛ. 6735 (1227), S. Aalto, The Digital «Other» in *Heimskringla*. Dialogues with Tradition: Studying the Nordic Saga Heritage. Edited by Kristel Zilmer. Nordistica Tartuensia, no. 14, Tartu, 2005, 96–97, 109–110J.
52. НПЛ мл. извода. 6800 (1292).
53. Like in Karelia, cf. НПЛ мл. извода. 6801 (1293), 6803 (1295), only in 6819 (1311) is mentioned Vanaja but it was the town of nemci.
54. НПЛ. 6819 (1311).
55. A. J. Sjögren, Über die älteren Wohnsitze der Jemen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Tschudischen Völker in Russland. Mémoires de l'Académie Imperiale des Sciences de St. Péterbourg, 6. Ser.: Sciences politiques, Histoire, et Philologie, T. I, 1832, 263–345, S. Suvanto, Tavaster. Kulturhistoriskt lexikon för nordisk medeltid (= KHLNM), 18, Viborg, 1982, 144, H. Kirkinen, 1963, 26–27, cf. the critical discussion J. Lind, HTF 62, 1977, 286–293, J. Lind, HTF 62, 1977, 286–323. According to Stepennaja Kniga, Vladimir Svjatoslavič ruled over jem' who were living in Dvina StKn (1. st.) p. 63. Cf. J. Lind, HTF 62, 1977, 299–302, H. Kirkinen, SJH 1982, 258–262, P. Uino, Ancient Karelia. Archaeological Studies. Suomen muinaismuistoyhdistyksen aikakauskirja 104, Helsinki, 1997, 192–193.
56. НПЛ. 6694 (1186), 6696 (1188), 6735 (1227), ЛЛ., СПЛ., ТрЛ., НЛ, СЛ. 6764 (1256).
57. НПЛ., НЧЛ., СПЛ., НЛ. 6650 (1142), actually the 400 is the number of the killed jem' raiders. ТрЛ and МЛС 6650 (1142) do not record the case.
58. ЛЛ, ТрЛ, НЛ, СЛ 6764 (1256).
59. ТрЛ. 6785 (1277), НЛ. 6786 (1278).
60. НПЛ. 6650 (1142), 6672 (1164), (s) 6709 (1201).
61. НПЛ. 6696 (1188), 6739 (1231), 6745 (1237), 6748 (1240), 6750 (1242).
62. НПЛ. 6748 (1240), 6764 (1256), 6792 (1284), НПЛ. 6819 (1311), J. Lind, Bishop Thomas in Recent Historiography – Views and Sources. SVH 1992, 311–312.
63. СПЛ, МЛС, НЛ 6764 (1256).
64. S. Suvanto, 1985, 43–51, cf. also Шаскольский И. П. 1978, 22–27.
65. НПЛ мл. извода. 6800 (1292), НПЛ, СПЛ, НЧЛ. 6819 (1311).
66. НЧЛ. 7004 (1496).
67. РЛ. 6748 (1240).
68. СтКн (gran. st.). С. 47 (1-я ст.), с. 63 and (1-я ст.), с. 188–189 (7-я ст.), с. 251, (8-я ст.), с. 281. The jem' of Prince Vladimir seem to have been in Dvina, cf. also J. Lind, HTF 62, 1977, 299–300.
69. СЛ. 6748 (1240), СтКн. (8-я ст.), С. 281, ВЛ, НЛ 6749 (1241).
70. НЧЛ. 6748 (1240), НЧЛ. С. 597, year 6764 (1256).
71. НПЛ. 6748 (1240), 6764 (1256), SIL 6749 (1241), 6764 (1256), Cf. the sceptic view of J. Lind, SVH 1992, 311–312, J. Lind Early Russian – Swedish Rivalry. The Battle on the Neva in 1240 and Birger Magnussons' Second Crusade to Tavast. SJH 16, 1991, 276–277.
72. НПЛ. 6826 (1318).
73. СПЛ. 6826 (1318).
74. НЧЛ. 6826 (1318).
75. The concept «meister» is used in younger texts for western power and military leaders, e.g., ВЛ. 6749 (1241).
76. A. C. Lehrberg, 1816, 196–197, H. Kirkinen, SJH 1982, 256, K. Julku, Polna-joen ongelma. Faravid 12, Oulu, 1988, 29.
77. Paulus Juusten, Catalogus et ordinaria successio episcoporum Finlandensium. Edidit Simo Heininen. Societas Historiae Ecclesiasticae Fennica. Suomen kirkkohistoriallisen seuran toimituksia 143, Helsinki, 1988, nr. 10 (p. 55): «Ragvaldi temporibus castrum Cuusto erigitur anno Domini 1317.» Suomen keskiajan piispainkronikan n.s. Palmskiöldin katkelma. Uudelleen julkaissut Aarno Maliniemi. Xenia Ruuthiana professori emerito Martino Ruuth praesidi promotorique. Suomen kirkkohistoriallisen seuran toimituksia 47, Helsinki, 1945, 388 (r. 34–36): «Ranguald Alandensi hic Kwsto erigi fecit anno mcccviij.»
78. Liv-Esth- und Curländisches Urkundenbuch nebst Regesten (=LECUB), 9, Moskau 1889, 79, A. C. Lehrberg, 197, K. Julku, Faravid 12, 1988, 30.
79. Paulus Juusten, nr. 10 (p. 55): «Et sequenti anno (= 1318) combusta fuit civitas Aboensis et ecclesia cathedralis per Ruthenos direpta.» Suomen keskiajan piispainkronikan n.s. Palmskiöldin katkelma, 388 (r. 34–36): «huijus tempore Birgerus rex tres fratres suos duces interemit (= 1318) Ecclesia Aboensis a Ruthenis spoliatur feria 2:a Penthecostes Anno [].»
80. S. Carlsson - J. Rosén, Svensk historia I, Stockholm, 1969, 111–113, A. C. Lehrberg, 1816, 198.

81. Рыбаков Б. А., 1974, р. 12/13 (nr. 2–3), J. Lind, HTF 70, 1985, 324.
82. К. Julku, Faravid 12, 1988, 34–37.
83. НЧЛ, ВЛ 6860 (1352), Накадзава А. Рукописание Магнуша. Исследования и тексты. СПб., 2003, *passim*. J. Lind, Magnus Eriksson som birgittinsk konge in lyset af russiske kilder. Birgitta – hendes værk og hendes klostre i Norden. Redigeret af Tore Nyberg, Lund (= Birgitta), 114–117, K. Julku, Faravid 12, 1988, 42–47, H. Kirkinen, 1963, 144–148.
84. К. Julku, Faravid 12, 1988, 41–43.
85. Т. J. Paloposki, Viipurin-Karjalan asema kolmannen ristiretken aikoina. HAik 1966, 100–101, K. Vilku, Onko varsinaissuomalaisilla ollut kaukaisia nautinta-alueita. Varsinais-Suomen maakuntakirja 10, Turku, 1948, 150–152, M. Pöllä, Laatokan länsirannikon asujaimiston etnisen koostumuksen muutokset rautakaudella ja Karjalan synty. SVH 1992, 424, K. Julku, Suomen itärajan synty. Studia Historica Septentrionalia, 10, Rovaniemi, 1987, 73–74.
86. J. J. Mikkola, HAik, 1928, 185–186.
87. H. v. zur Mühlen, Leal. Lexikon des Mittelalters (=LexMA) V, München, 1991, 1775–1776, H. v. zur Mühlen, Ösel, Ösel-Wiek, LexMA VI, München, 1993, 1492–1493.
88. PVL. Prooem. C. 8.
89. E. g., NIL (s, m) 6651 (1143). According to A. M. Spiridonov (Кочкуркина С. И., Спиридонов А. М., Джаксон Т. Н. Письменные известия о карелах. Петрозаводск, 1990. С. 5) и М. Пелля (M. Pöllä, SVH 1992, 419) korela is recorded in a birch-bark letter found in the archaeological layers between the years 1065–1085. Янин В. А., Зализняк А. А. Новгородские грамоты на бересте из раскопок 1977–1983 гг. М., 1986. N 590 (С. 50–51) date the text between the late-12th and the early-13th centuries. The first records of taxes (the furs from korela and jem') is in the letter of Prince Svjatoslav Ol'govič of Novgorod from 1137 (Памятники истории Великого Новгорода и Пскова / Под ред. Г. Е. Кочина. Л., 1935. N 7. С. 47–48, Шаскольский И. П. 1978, 23, H. Kirkinen, SJH, 1982, 260, J. Korpela, Viipurin linnaläänin synty. Viipurin läänin historia II, Helsinki, 2004, 61, 210.
90. НПЛ. 6657 (1149), 6749 (1241).
91. НПЛ. 6749 (1241), 6800 (1292).
92. НПЛ. 6672 (1164), 6749 (1241).
93. НПЛ. 6699 (1191), cf. also H. Kirkinen, 1963, 24–26.
94. НПЛ, СПЛ. 6777 (1269), this status is reflected also in the archaeological material, cf. Кирпичников А. Н., Рябинин А. Е. Указ. соч. // ФВЕ. Вып. 2. Л., 1990. С. 105, 109, СПЛ, НЧЛ, НПЛ. 6778 (1270). Cf. also НПЛ. 6824 (1316), Грамоты Великого Новгорода и Пскова. М.; Л., 1949. N. 29, Кочкуркина С. И., Спиридонов А. М., Джаксон Т. Н. Указ. соч. Петрозаводск, 1990. С. 33, M. Pöllä, SVH 1992, 435, O. S. Rydberg, Sverges traktater med främmande magter jemte andra dit hörande handlingar. Första delen 822–1335, Stockholm, 1877, 111.
95. НПЛ мл. извода, СПЛ, НЧЛ. 6786 (1278), НПЛ мл. извода, НЧЛ. 6803 (1295), НПЛ. 6818 (1310).
96. Шаскольский И. П. Указ. соч. Л., 1978, С. 17–19, 29–30, H. Kirkinen, 1963, 82–91, H. Kirkinen, SJH 1982, 265–268.
97. ЛЛ. 6735 (1227). There is also a short note of Karelians in the Prodolženie suzdaľ'skoj letopisi po akademičeskomu spisku, 6736 (1228). About the founding of the monastery of Valaam, cf. J. Lind, The Russian Testament of King Magnus Eriksson – A Hagiographic Text? Medieval Spirituality in Scandinavia and Europe. A Collection of Essays in Honour of Tore Nyberg. Edited by Lars Bisgaard, Carsten Selch Jensen, Kurt Villads Jensen and John Lind, Odense University Press, Odense 2001, 203–205, J. Korpela, 2008, 154–156.
98. ВЛ. 6657 (1149), 6777 (1269), 6778 (1270), 6824 (1316), НПЛ, НЛ. 6734 (1226)–6736 (1228), СтКн., prooem. C. 4, СтКн. (7-я ст.), с. 254, J. Korpela, 2008, 24.
99. J. Korpela, 2008, 270–272.
100. O. S. Rydberg, 1877, 434–504. The treaty is in three languages of which the most original copies are: the Latin one from the late-15th century, the Swedish one from year 1537 and the Russian copy from early-17th century. All of them are in the Riksarkivet at Stockholm. Cf. also K. Julku, 1987, 224–259, J. Korpela, Keskiäikaikainen itäraja läpi itäisen Fennoskandian metsävyöhykkeen – mikä se on! HAik 2006, 454–469, J. Korpela, Finland's Eastern Border after the Treaty of Nöteborg: An Ecclesiastical, Political or Cultural Border. Journal of Baltic Studies, 33:4, 2002, 384–397, J. Korpela, Die Schwedische Ostgrenze von Nöteborg bis Kardis 1323–1660: Kirchengrenze, politische Grenze oder Kulturgrenze? Nordosteuropa als Geschichtsregion. Beiträge des III. Internationalen Symposiums zur deutschen Kultur und Geschichte im europäischen Nordosten vom 20–22. September 2001 in Tallinn (Estland). Veröffentlichungen der Aue-Stiftung 17, Lübeck, 2006, 267–286.
101. ВЛ. 6831 (1323), РЛ. 6832 (1324).
102. НЧЛ, ВЛ, НЛ, Летописный свод 1497 г. // ПСРЛ. Т. 28. М., Л., 1963, Летописный свод 1518 г. (Уваровская летопись) // ПРСЛ. Т. 28. М., Л., 1963, МЛС., 6860 (1352). The testament was not included in TrL.
103. R. Grünthal, 1997, 79, M. Pöllä, SVH 1992, 417–419, 435.
104. НПЛ. 6651 (1143), 6822 (1314).
105. НПЛ. 6822 (1314), NIL(m) 6845 (1337).
106. НПЛ мл. извода. 6801 (1293), 6846 (1338), 6858 (1350), НПЛ. 6830 (1322), 6845 (1337), НЛ. 6802 (1294).
107. Сакса А. И., Тюленев В. А. // ФВЕ. Вып. 2. Л., 1990. С. 76.
108. НЛ. 6786 (1278), НПЛ мл. извода. 6846 (1338), ВЛ, ТрЛ, Летописный свод 1497 г., Летописный свод 1518 г. (Уваровская летопись). 6785 (1277), SL, NL 6786 (1278).
109. НЛ. 6904 (1396).
110. LECUB I. Reihe, III. Band, Dorpat, 1857, 169a (13.4.1241).
111. НПЛ мл. извода. 6792 (1284).
112. НПЛ мл. извода. 6800 (1292).
113. НПЛ. 6808 (1300), 6831 (1323).
114. НЛ. 6892 (1384).
115. НПЛ мл. извода. 6801 (1293), 6819 (1311).
116. НПЛ мл. извода. 6846 (1338), N4L, NL 6883 (1375).
117. H. Kirkinen, 1963, 143, Кочкуркина С. И., Спиридонов А. М., Джаксон Т. Н. Указ. соч. Петрозаводск, 1990, С. 12–13, J. Lind, Omkring de svensk-russiske forhandlingar 1537, 1339-traktaten og Nøteborgsfreden, HTF 1985, 16–17.

118. Н. Kirkinen, 1963, 151–153, cf. also J. Lind, HTF 1985, 17, K. Julku, 1987, 131–132, 185, Кочкуркина С. И., Спиридонов А. М., Джаксон Т. Н. Указ. соч. Петрозаводск, 1990. С. 12–13, 15, cf. also J. Lind, Om Nøteborgsfreden og dens grænser. HTF 1985, 334–336.
119. НПЛ ст. извода. 6653 (1145), НПЛ. 6684 (1176), НПЛ мл. извода. 6800 (1292), 6801 (1293), 6824 (1316), 6846 (1338), 6684 (1176). Сакса А. И., Тюленев В. А. // ФВЕ. Вып. 2. Л., 1990. С. 75.
120. J. Korpela, 2008, 22, 43.
121. Завещание преподобного Лазаря. С. 120, Литвинова Н. К., Прохоров Г. М. Житие Лазаря Муромского // Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси. Т. 2. Ч. 1. Л., 1988. С. 288–290 (далее СККДР), J. Korpela, 2008, 144.
122. J. Korpela, 2008, 146–149.
123. J. Korpela, 2008, 137–144.
124. E.g. НПЛ. 6650 (1142), 6738 (1230). The concept of *gost'* is very unclear. It is actually the Latin *hostis/hospes* which has forms in other languages too: *Gast*, *guest* etc.
125. НПЛ. 1188 (6696), 6739 (1231).
126. НПЛ. 6725 (1217), 6748 (1240), 6749 (1241), 6750 (1240), 6761 (1253), 6776 (1268).
127. НПЛ. 6745 (1237).
128. НПЛ. 6819 (1311).
129. НПЛ. 6776 (1268).
130. Киево-Печерский патерик / Вступительный текст и примечания проф. Д. И. Абрамовича. Киев, 1931. С. 190–192 (Слово о вере крестьянской и о латинской Феодосия Печерского).
131. НПЛ. 1188 (6696), 6709 (1201).
132. НПЛ. 6712 (1204).
133. S. Suvanto, 1985, 31, ПВЛ. С. 8, НПЛ, НЧЛ, НЛ. 6900 (1392).
134. НПЛ. 6659 (1142), 6672 (1164), 6748 (1240), 6764 (1256).
135. НПЛ. 6792 (1284), 6800 (1292), 6801 (1293), 6803 (1295), 6819 (1311), 6821 (1313), 6822 (1314), 6825 (1317), according to John Lind the Novgorodians called already 1188 for the first time Swedes as *nemci* (J. Lind, HTF 1981, 145–174, J. Lind, The Martyria of Odense and a Twelfth-Century Russian Prayer: The Question of Bohemian Influence on Russian Religious Literature. The Slavonic and East European Review 68, 1990, 21).
136. НПЛ. 6801 (1293), 6830 (1322), it is not sure wheather the chronicler is the same, cf. Клосс Б. М. Летопись Новгородская первая // СККДР. Т. 1. XI – первая половина XIV в. Л., 1987. С. 246.
137. НПЛ. 6808 (1300), 6809 (1301).
138. ВЛ. 6808 (1300), СЛ. 6810 (1302).
139. РЛ, ТрЛ. 6856 (1348).
140. Летописный свод 1497 г., Летописный свод 1518 г., МЛС., ВЛ, РЛ, 6855 (1347), K. Julku, 1987, 224–259.
141. НПЛ. 6831 (1323), 6808 (1300).
142. НПЛ. 6846 (1338), 6847 (1339), 6856 (1348), 6858 (1350).
143. НПЛ. 6748 (1240), 6764 (1256), Didman has understood as a personal name referring to some mighty German vassal in the Baltic area. J. Jaakkola, Suomen varhaiskeskiaika. Kristillisen Suomen synty. Suomen historia III, Porvoo, 1938, 310–311, J. Lind, SJH 16, 1991, 271, 277, Suomen varhaishistorian lähteitä. Historian Aitta XXI, Jyväskylä, 1989, n:o XVIIa–b and XXa.
144. Подвысоцкий А. Словарь областного архангельского наречия в его бытовом и этнографическом применении. СПб., 1885. С. 94, J. J. Mikkola, HAik, 1928, 182.
145. J. Lind, Om Nøteborgsfreden og dens grænser. HTF 70, 1985, 322, C. Pape, Rethinking the Medieval Russian – Norwegian Border. JfGO 52, 2004, 161–187, Подвысоцкий А. Указ. соч. С. 94.
146. I agree with J. Lind, Birgitta, note 12 otherwise but I would stress more the unstability of the use of the expressions. According to J. J. Mikkola, HAik, 1928, 182, «svei» was an ethnic- and state concept while «nemci» religious-political concept.
147. Подоляк Н. Г. Юго-восточное направление ганзейской торговли. «Горный путь» в XIV веке // Славяне и их соседи. Средние века – раннее новое время. Вып. 9. Славяне и немцы. 1000-летнее соседство: Мирные связи и конфликты. М., 1999. С. 105–106, J. Korpela, 2004, 137–142, cf. Th. S. Noonan, Why the Vikings First Came to Russia. In: Th. S. Noonan, The Islamic World, Russia and the Wikings, 750–900. The Numismatic Evidence. Variorum collected studies series, Aldershot–Brookfield: Ashgate, 1998, 345.
148. НПЛ. 6650 (1142).
149. НПЛ. 6653 (1145).
150. НПЛ. 6654 (1146).
151. НПЛ. 6657 (1149).
152. НПЛ. 6673 (1165).
153. НПЛ. 6687 (1179).
154. НПЛ. 6688 (1180); similar kind of formulation we encounter also in НПЛ. 6689 (1181), 6701 (1193), 6709 (1201), 6719 (1211).
155. НПЛ. 6675 (1167).
156. Cf. ЛЛ. 6653 (1145), 6654 (1146), 6657 (1149), 6687 (1179), 6689 (1181), 6709 (1201).
157. ПВЛ. 6370 (862).
158. НПЛ. 6822 (1314), ПВЛ. 6374 (866), 6420 (912).
159. E.g., ВЛ, НЛ. 6808 (1300).
160. ЛЛ. 6735 (1227).
161. J. Korpela, Prince, Saint and Apostle. Prince Vladimir Svjatoslavič of Kiev, his Posthumous Life, and the Religious Legitimization of the Russian Great Power. VOMG 67: Harrasowitz, Wiesbaden, 2001, 173–210.
162. НПЛ. 6650 (1142), 6748 (1240).
163. Шаскольский И. П. Указ. соч. С. 16–18, Н. Kirkinen, 1963, 104–105.
164. Heinrici Chronicon Livoniae. Heinrich von Lettland Livländische Chronik. Editionis quam paraverant L. Arbusow et A. Bauer textum denuo imprimendum curavit Albertus Bauer. Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters, 24., Würzburg, 1959, c. 28.4: «- - - que (= ecclesia Ruthenica) non spe regenerationis in fide Iesu Christi sed spe tributum et spoliolum terras sibi subiugare conatur.»

-
165. НПЛ. 6745 (1237), СПЛ. 6779 (1271), НЧЛ. 6885 (1377), СПЛ. 6779 (1271), S. C. Rowell, *Between Lithuania and Rus': Dovmont – Timofej of Pskov, his Life and Cult*. Oxford, 1992.
 166. НПЛ, СПЛ. 6822 (1314), 6845 (1337), Слово о житии Стефана. С. 122–160, J. Korpela, *Ortodoksia* 49, 2002, 128.
 167. История о искоренителе древнего благочестия патриархе Никоне отступинике старья веры. С. 349 (l. 2Ob–3) (according to the editor, the text is only from the 19th century but the basic stories from the 17th century), Сказание о Валаамском монастыре. С. 450–452, Завещание преподобного Лазаря. С. 120, Житие Арсения Коневского. С. 164–166.
 168. ПВЛ. 6579 (1071).
 169. ПВЛ. 6579 (1071). Here, the relation between the Novgorodian and the čud' resembles much the contemporary Norse relation with the Lapps (finnr), MCKINNELL, 2005, pp. 97, 99–100.
 170. НЧЛ (список Дубровского). 7042 (1534).