

УДК 330  
ББК 65  
С56



Сборник научных статей по итогам работы Международного научного форума НАУКА И ИННОВАЦИИ - СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ КОНЦЕПЦИИ (г. Москва, 26 февраля 2021 г.). / отв. ред. Д.Р. Хисматуллин. – Москва: Издательство Инфинити, 2021. – 230 с.

У67

ISBN 978-5-905695-74-2

Сборник материалов включает в себя доклады российских и зарубежных участников, предметом обсуждения которых стали научные тенденции развития, новые научные и прикладные решения в различных областях науки.

Предназначено для научных работников, преподавателей, студентов и аспирантов вузов, государственных и муниципальных служащих.

УДК 330  
ББК 65

ISBN 978-5-905695-74-2

© Издательство Инфинити, 2021  
© Коллектив авторов, 2021

## THE ANALYSIS OF THE SOURCES ON SLAVIC DEITY DAZHBOG: HYPATIAN CODEX; SERBIAN LEGENDS OF DABOG

**Kutarev Oleg V.**

*St. Petersburg, Russia*

***Abstract.** This paper is concerned with the pagan Slavic deity Dazhbog (Dazhbog, Dažbog). The most important data on him are briefly considered in the paper: from ancient medieval sources to the latest texts of Modern Age distorting his image. Further, special attention is paid to appearance of Dazhbog in a fragment (on year 1114) of Old Russian “Primary Chronicle” in Hypatian Codex. The detailed analysis of complicated origination of this fragment, taking into account inaccuracies of accepted historiography as well, is carried out. Further, two short works of the Serbian folklore of 1860s about the character named Dabog who may be related to Dazhbog are considered. Appendices contain the original and English translation of: 1) the fragment from Hypatian Codex on Dazhbog and his father Svarog, 2) the fragments from John Malala’s “Chronographia”, to which Hypatian Codex goes back herein, 3) the both legends of Dabog (the both of them are provided in English translation for the first time).*

***Keywords:** Slavic paganism, Dazhbog, Svarog, Dabog, Hypatian Codex, John Malala*

*In memory of Oleg Viktorovich Tvorogov (1928–2015),  
a great researcher of the ancient Slavic literature*

### **§1. Dazhbog and his ancient references in the East Slavs**

Preparing my large paper on the Slavic pagan deity Dazhbog<sup>1</sup> for publication in English<sup>2</sup> in the well-known journal “Studia Mythologica Slavica” (hereinafter referred to as SMS), at first I wanted to put several various sources (in the original and in English translation) in the appendices thereto. However, in view of the volume of the material and because of the fact that in the course of work I have

1 The article will be called: “Dazhbog: the ancient Slavic pagan deity of the Shining Sky”. It is scheduled to be issued in the 24th volume of “Studia Mythologica Slavica” being issued in 2021. It is based on my early article in Russian (Kutarev 2016) that was significantly revised.

2 I would like to express my gratitude for assistance in translation of this article into English to Ksenia Alieva.

decided to place the emphasis on a research component in SMS journal, a decision was made to publish the sources in a separate article. It is that article that this paper represents, although it may be also considered as a fully independent one. In many respects, this paper is a development of my early work in Russian (Кутарев 2015) changed and added.

Dazhbog is one of the most frequently mentioned and significant deities of the pagan period in the East Slavs who became later the Ancient Rus. However, as will be shown, he was also well-known among the South Slavs (at least ca. X century) under the same name, which makes us think, firstly, about his very early proto-Slavic origin, and, secondly, about high probability that the West Slavs might be also aware of him (e.g. the Poles or the Czechs, about whose pagan deities, unfortunately, no specific information earlier than XV century has been preserved<sup>3</sup>), i.e. all three parts of the large Slavic world. In any event, “the [people’s] names Dadibog, Dadzibog(-ius), Daczbogius occur in the Polish documents of XIII–XIV centuries, Dadzibog Maskiewicz was among the students of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy in Kiev in XVII century” (Васильев 1999: 70); given that it is a form *\*Dadzьbogъ* that could be expected when reconstructing Dazhbog’s name in the Lechitic languages (to which Polish belongs). It is possible that these names (also well-known among the Russians in XIV century) were the echo of the pagan list of names concerned with the deities.

Dazhbog appears among the main deities of the Ancient Rus in “The Primary Chronicle”, the most important and the oldest Russian chronicle completed ca. 1118<sup>4</sup>. When in 980<sup>5</sup> king Vladimir came into power, he erected the main sanctuary in the then capital, Kiev, for the whole country to worship the most important deities: “*he put the idols on the hill behind the palace yard: wooden Perun with a silver head and golden moustache, and Chors, and Dazhbog, and Stribog, and Semargl, and Mokosh. And sacrifices were made to them, with calling them the dei-*

3 However, relatively vast pantheon of XI–XII centuries is known among the other branch of the West Slavs: Polabian and Baltic Slavs. It has no Dazhbog; although it seems that he could “hide” there under some other name. By virtue of extensiveness of this topic, let leave it for future works.

4 The Primary Chronicle is usually quoted according to two main editions (the earliest ones): Laurentian Codex and Hypatian Codex. Although they do not fully coincide with each other, and the Laurentian Codex is considered to be somewhat earlier, I will use only Hypatian Codex (early XV century) herein and hereinafter when quoting the Primary Chronicle, which is quite enough for the purposes of research; see the announced forthcoming article for SMS journal or (Кутарев 2016: 129–131) for the influence of minimal differences between Codexes that may concern Dazhbog. The Hypatian Codex in the Old Russian original is quoted herein according to the academic classic edition of the series “Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles” (Ипат. 1908). Its reprint is also given in the last edition of the chronicle of 1998. English translation is based on O.V. Tvorogov’s modern Russian translation of the Hypatian Codex of the Primary Chronicle according to the edition (БЛДР 2000).

5 In Ancient Rus Byzantine era “from the creation of the world” was used, where the first year was attached to 5508 B.C. (calculated according to the mythological dating from the Bible). Therefore, 980 is marked as 6488 (5508+980) in the Primary Chronicle. Only era A.D. will be used hereinafter.

*ties*” (БЛДР 2000: 126–127; Ипат. 1908: стб. 67)<sup>6</sup>. In 983, the chronicle described the human sacrifice<sup>7</sup> to the deities remained nameless (БЛДР 2000: 131; Ипат. 1908: стб. 69–70), and in 988 the same Vladimir christened Rus. At that time the king smashed idols, conducting special rituals of expulsion of the main deity, thunderer Perun (БЛДР 2000: 160–163; Ипат. 1908: стб. 101–102). As far back as the Primary Chronicle of 1071, some unnamed “*five deities*” were mentioned that appeared before volkhvs<sup>8</sup>, following which one of volkhvs came to Kiev and made predictions, for example, that the “*Russian land would replace the Greek one*”, etc.; there are other interesting data on volkhvs and paganism here (БЛДР 2000: 214–221; Ипат. 1908: стб. 164–171), but here there are no names of deities or “*бѣси*” (“*demons*”) as the chronicler also called them. The names of Slavic deities (Svarog and his son Dazhbog) appeared again only in Hypatian Codex in information on year 1114 for the last time in the chronicle. See the most detailed analysis of this extract herein in §2.

“The Tale of Igor’s Campaign”, a short epic poem created ca. 1185<sup>9</sup>, also plays the most significant part in understanding the essence of Dazhbog. It narrates the campaign of the ruler of small Old Russian Principality of Novgorod-Severskyi (near Chernigov in the far north of Ukraine nowadays) on steppe people of the Cumans. The campaign was not supported by other rulers of Russian lands. As a result, Prince Igor and his forces were defeated and captured, however, he was able to escape to Kiev. The unknown author brilliantly represents this simple plot: he appeals the Russian princes that had become very separate for unity, depicting startling atmospheric scenes of his epoch. Dazhbog’s name (as that of some more Slavic deities) appears here in poetic images in two text passages. In the first instance, the matter concerns the time of intestine wars between the Russian princes: “*Then, under Oleg Gorislavich, the heritage of Dazhbog’s grandchildren was sown and sprouted with the intestine wars, and it perished, human ages dwindled among princely feuds. Then, across the Russian Land, seldom did ploughmen shout, but often did ravens croak as they divided among themselves the cadav-*

---

6 Original: “*постави кумиры на холъму. вѣѣ двора теремнаго. Перуна деревана. а голова его серебряна. а оусѣ золотѣ. и Хорьса. и Дажьбога. и Стрибога. и Сѣмарьгла. и Мокошь. и жрахут имѣ. наричущѣ боги*”.

7 The year of Great Slav Rising among the Baltic Slavs; these geographically remote events were not infrequently related to each other in literature.

8 Volkhvs in the East Slavs represented the phenomenon similar to Celtic druids or Siberian shamans. Communicating with the deities, they were the keepers of myths; they made predictions in response to requests from people (e.g. in the Primary Chronicle they predicted the realized death of Oleg the Seer in 912 from his horse), treated, manipulated the elements, etc., see more (Кутарев 2017: 18–19).

9 In the original, the epic poem is quoted herein according to the first edition (СПИ 1800); English translation is based on O.V. Tvorogov’s translation from Old Russian into modern Russian according to the edition (СПИ 1985).

---

ers”<sup>10</sup> (СПИ 1985: 39). The second passage is less clear: “*For now, brothers, a cheerless tide was set in, now the wild has covered the strong. The Wrong (Obida, обида) has risen among the forces of Dazhbog’s grandchildren, she has stepped into Troyan’s land in the guise of a maiden, clapped her swan wings on the blue sea by Don, and scared away the rich times by clapping. The strife of the princes against the pagans has come to an end, for brother said to brother: ‘This is mine, and that is mine too’. And the princes have begun to say ‘This is big’ of what is small, while forging troubles against themselves, and the pagans entered the Russian land with victories from all sides*”<sup>11</sup> (СПИ 1985: 39). Without touching upon not quite resolved issues on the fact who Troyan was (whether one of the primal forefathers, or a mythological character, perhaps, even a deity) and how to understand “the Wrong”, I would point to one more problem of the epic poem: it is unclear who exactly is meant by Dazhbog’s grandchildren. It is usually supposed that it refers to either the Russian princes, or the Russian people in general (who feud despite of the relationship through their ancestor Dazhbog). It seems that this issue has not been still resolved, and the researchers disagree. See very broad historiography of the issue (Соколова 1995: 80–81).

Moreover, Dazhbog appears in two Old Russian sermons against pagans (Гальковский 2013: 299, 324) of ca. XIII and XVI centuries, although in the latter case we have only the quotation from the former, perhaps, having been already of formal nature by this time. See the forthcoming article in SMS journal for more information about this genre of literature and references to Dazhbog therein. I will not adduce them here, for it will not be possible to find out the essence of Dazhbog according to them: his name is just among the lists of deities, who had been still worshipped by the people, which drew the condemnation of the Christian authors of the sermons. No function or any other context of the essence of this deity may be found there.

Other Old Russian sources on Dazhbog provide no new reliable information and they may be called secondary; the majority of them arises from the quotation from the Primary Chronicle about the Old Russian deities in Kiev pagan sanctuary in 980. I will give only one example of this, at the same time point-

10 Original: “Тогда при Олзѣ Гориславличи сѣяшеться и растяшеть усобицами; погибашеть жизнь Дажь-Божа внука, въ Княжихъ крамолахъ вѣщи чловѣкомъ скратишась” (СПИ 1800: 16–17). Oleg Gorislavich (Svyatoslavich) is Prince Igor’s grandfather, having started wars for many years at the turn of XI–XII centuries, including those against other Russian princes, thereby attempting to extend his possessions. The author calls him “Gorislavich” on the basis of the word *gora* (rope – “trouble”).

11 Original: “Уже бо, братіе, не веселая година вѣстала, уже пустыни силу прикрыла. Вѣстала обида въ силахъ Дажь-Божа внука. Вступилъ дѣвою на землю Троянно, вѣсплескала лебедиными крылы на синѣмъ море у Дону плещучи, убуди жирня времена. Усобица Княземъ на поганья погыбе, рекоста бо братъ брату: се мое, а то моеже; и начыша Князи про малое, се великое мльвити, а сами на себѣ крамолу ковати: а поганіи съ вѣхъ странъ прихождаху съ побѣдами на землю Рускую” (СПИ 1800: 19).

ing out distortions appearing as time goes by and even the harm to understanding of the paganism when using such texts. In 1674 the Kievan “Synopsis” was published in Kiev, where, having passed a highly complicated route (from the Primary Chronicle through Western Europe and Poland), the spelling “*Dashuba or Dazhb*” appeared. The story of this name is as follows. In the middle of XVI century, to make his work “Notes on Muscovite Affairs” (Latin “*Rerum Moscoviticarum Commentarii*”), the German diplomat Sigismund von Herberstein used the Russian (Novgorod) chronicles depending on the Primary Chronicle: “..*what their chronicles report. Let us retell them*” (Герберштейн 1988: 59)<sup>12</sup>. He gave the following kind of Kiev pantheon: “*Perum (Perun)*” is “*wooden, but with a silver head; the others were called*<sup>13</sup>: *Uslad, Corsa, Daswa [Dasvua], Striba, Simaergla, Macosch*” (Герберштейн 1988: 63). “As it has long been noted, the name Uslad resulted from ‘усъ златъ’ (golden moustache) through misunderstanding in annalistic description of Perun” (Мансикка 2005: 123), and this curious thing belongs to the very Herberstein. Later, the Polish historian Maciej Strykowski described (directly referring to Herberstein) the Russian pantheon in his “Chronicle” (1582) as follows: the deity named “*Piorun*” had “*the body skilfully carved of wood, head cast of silver, ears of gold, legs of iron, and he held a stone in his hands decorated with rubies and carbuncles like a striking lightning. Other idols were called*<sup>14</sup>: *Uslad, Korssa, Dassuba, Striba, Symaergla, Makosz*” (Мансикка 2005: 130, по переводу с польского А.Б. Базилевского). The golden ears (sometimes nostrils) instead of moustache are as far back as Jan Długosz’s mistake of the end of XV century: “*Vladimir had made a statue to his main deity, deity of Lightning, the body of which was made of wood, head of silver, and ears/nostrils of gold*<sup>15</sup>” (Мансикка 2005: 127, по переводу с латыни М.Р. Ненароковой), who was also the source for Strykowski; as for the rest of Perun’s appearance, it is obvious that the very Strykowski has made it up, “in this way Perun was being filled with gold more and more” (Клейн 2004: 22; Мансикка 2005: 114–132). Referring to Strykowski, the author of the Kievan “Synopsis” wrote about Perun having the same carbuncles; other deities, and: “*Slyad or Osljad, Korsha or Chors, Dashuba or Dazhb, Striba or Stribov, Samaerglya or Semargl, and Makozh or Mokosh*” (Синописис 1774: 44, 48)<sup>16</sup>. A great influence of the “Synopsis” would be also

12 Original (Latin): “*de origine autem gentis, nihil habent præter annales infra scriptos*” (Rerum 1557: 2fv.).

13 Original: “*primum idolum, Perum dictum, capite argenteo, cætera lignea erant. alia*” (Rerum 1557: 7).

14 Original (Polish) (IV, 3): “*sam tulow iego byl z drzewa misternie rzezany glowe mial szrebrną odlewana uszy zlote nogi zelazne a w ręku trzymal kamień na xztalt pioruna palaiącego Rubinami y Carbunculussem ozdobyony. Drugie Balwany byly mianowane*” (Strykowski 1582: 132).

15 Original (Latin) (Lib. II, 978): “*Fabricavit autem Wlodimirus deo suo principali Fulmini corpus et simulacrum ex ligno, caput ex argento, et aures ex auro*” (Długossi 1964: 192).

16 Original (Russian): “*Слядь или Ослядь, Корша или Хорсь, Даиуба или Дажьбъ, Стриба или Стрибовъ, Самаергя или Семаргль и Макожь или Мокощъ*”.

evident throughout XVIII century and even in XIX century: “this book became the first and very popular history textbook for Russia, it has gone through more than 30 editions” (Клейн 2004: 21). This story is highly exponential in terms of reliability of the sources on paganism after XII–XIII centuries.

However, in XIX–XX centuries new sources on Dazhbog appeared<sup>17</sup>: firstly, proverbs of North and Central Russia that contain scant information (Соколова 1995: 79); secondly, the Ukrainian songs of XX century, in which, probably, so-called *secondary folkloraziation* was embodied: when any characters that have not been there from the beginning penetrate from literature into folklore (see more in the forthcoming article in SMS journal or (Кутапев 2016); the issue of deity functionality, etymology of his name and his place in the pantheon are also considered therein<sup>18</sup>). Thirdly, there are two Serbian legends written down in 1860s. See their detailed analysis herein in §3.

### §2. Dazhbog and Svarog in the Hypatian Codex

Describing the events of 1114 in the Hypatian Codex<sup>19</sup>, the author informs us that on his visit to Ladoga<sup>20</sup>, the townspeople told him about the rains of glass beads that sometimes happened there, as well as the rains of squirrels and deer that happened close to east, in the Ural mountains and much farther. To confirm his words, the chronicler refers to some “Chronograph”, where at the beginning the rain of wheat and silver in foreign lands and the stones from the heavens in Africa are described. However, much more interesting is that the chronicler goes on quoting from the “Chronograph” further on. The whole corresponding text fragment from the Primary Chronicle in English translation and Old Russian original is provided below in **Appendix 1**.

It is said here that following the flood “*Mestrom*” reigned in Egypt, i.e. Mizraim, who is Ham’s son in the Bible, Noah’s grandson. Then “*Ermiya*” is called a ruler there, i.e. Hermes, the Greek god of guile, travellers, herding, and mediation. And after him “*Pheosta*”, i.e. Hephaestus, the Greek god of fire and blacksmith’s work, under whom blacksmith’s tongs fell from the heaven as well. However, the chronicler also calls Pheosta by Slavic name: “*he was called Svarog deity*”. This ruler also introduced a law on monogamy instead of promiscuity, having ordered to punish for betrayals by throwing into a fiery furnace, and, moreover,

17 Herein I would not even mention the hoaxes of the Slavic antiquities that also appeared on quite a massive scale in XIX–XX centuries, including those referring to Dazhbog; see (Кутапев 2016: 133).

18 In short, my idea is that Dazhbog was not the deity of sun (Chors indisputably played this part in the East Slavic pantheon; and Dazhbog was correlated with Helios in the Primary Chronicle as the son of fire god rather than by function of sun), he was the evolution of Indo-European Deity of the Shining Sky, Sky Father, as evident not only from the epithet “*Dazhbog’s grandchildren*” that shows him as an ancestor, but also from the due consideration of the etymology of his name.

19 I thank I.M. Zenkin for great assistance in work with the ancient sources and languages.

20 The most ancient capital of Rus, where in 862 Rurik (first king of Russia) was called to rule; nowadays it is a small village at a distance of 120 km to the east of St. Petersburg and 190 km to the north of Novgorod, which is situated on the same river as Volkhov does.

introduced the people to metal weapon, for which he deserved the Egyptians' reverence. "*Sun-king, Svarog's son, or Dazhbog*" ruled after him, maintaining his father's law, who, having heard of one woman's betrayals, caught her in act. When he beheaded the man, being with her, and started to take her "*over the Egyptian land to shame*" (note that no casting into a furnace takes place), good time came to the country, and "*everybody praised him*".

Reference to Egypt, Biblical and Greek mythological characters and motives clearly points out that there are no Slavic myths here. The scholars determined the complicated origin of this annalistic fragment long ago<sup>21</sup>. Shortly after the Christianization of the Roman Empire, it was necessary to create new history that would take into account not only the Classic mythology, but also the Biblical one. One of the greatest authors, having been concerned with this, was the Byzantine *John Malala*, who created the book "*Chronographia*" ca. 560s, where he traced the events "from the creation of the world" to his epoch. Inter alia, Malala has described the plot about the rule of Mizraim in Egypt after the Flood, and then that of Hermes, and then that of Hephaestus and his son Helios (the god of sun). He has declared the pagan deities here the outstanding people of the antiquity, whom the people began to worship due to ignorance<sup>22</sup>. The approach of Malala and other authors of similar chronographs spread in the Christian literature.

Therefore, when in IX–X centuries along with religious books Christianity came to the South Slavs: Bulgarians, Macedonians, and Serbians from Byzantine Empire, they have also adopted the historical literature in the form of chronographs from the Greeks. Thus, "probably, as far back as X century", "by I.I. Sreznevsky's hypothesis, [Malala's "*Chronographia*"] turned out to be translated [into Old Slavonic from Greek] in Bulgaria"<sup>23</sup> (Творогов 1987: 472). However, for many reasons (the Ottoman conquest of the Balkans is not the least), the South Slavic Malala's translations were not preserved. On the other hand, they (together with a number of other chronographs) have been preserved in Rus, where Christianity was also spreading from Byzantine Empire and by means of the Greek literature already translated by the South Slavs. And when the chronicler referred to Chronograph, he meant exactly that text: compilation of Greek history books composed of South Slavic translations (Творогов, 1983; Истрин 1994: 14–15).

It is highly significant that "contrary to diffused opinion" (БЛДР 2000: 523–

---

21 As far back as P.J. Šafārik's research (Мансикка 2005: 91 сн. 57).

22 This approach is called euhemerism. Cf. the very Primary Chronicle: "*Serug was the first to make idols, he made them in honour of the dead: some former kings or brave people and the magi, and adulteress wives*" (БЛДР 2000: 139; Ипат. стб. 78–79). Original: "*началникъ же блше кумиротворенію. Серухъ. твораше бо кумиры въ имена мерътвѣхъ чловѣкъ бывшимъ въѣмъ цесаремъ. другимъ храбримъ. и волъхвомъ. и женамъ прелюбодѣцалмъ*". Serug is a Biblical character, Abraham's great-grandfather.

23 The most prominent researchers of Malala's Slavic translation, V.M. Istrin and O.V. Tvorogov, and many others subsequently adhered to the same version of the translation's place of origin.

---



524), “identification of Hephaestus with Svarog, and Helios (Sun) with Dazhbog”, which we are interested in, “does not belong to the author of the compiled Russian chronograph <...>, never mind the chronicler, who had included the extract from Malala’s Chronographia in the annalistic article of 1114 <...>, but it goes back to some ancient (if not the original) version of the translation of Malala’s Chronographia” (Творогов, 1983: 191). Thus, we can see the source “relating to the higher mythology of the South Slavs (rather than the East Slavs as it is almost everywhere commonly believed)” (Ловмянский 2003: 75) because of the statements of such competent researchers as V. Jagić, A. Brückner, and V.J. Mansikka (Ловмянский 2003: 77–78)<sup>24</sup>. Indeed, they have done much for correct understanding of the Slavic paganism, but it is their approach to explanation of the extract from the Hypatian Codex about Svarog and Dazhbog where there is a considerable amount of mistakes (see also below).

One can see quite well the extent to which the chronicler knows well the translation of Malala: he used the plots from various parts of the book matching the case. The extract from the Primary Chronicle at issue is a “free retelling of chapter 23 of the first book of Malala’s Chronicle, chapter 1 of the second book and chapter 4 of the fourth book” (БЛДР 2000: 523). At the same time, I, 23 is the last lines of the 1st book, which makes the fragments I, 23–II. 1 the continuous text (Dazhbog as a loan translation of Greek Ἥλιος (Helios) also occurs in the Slavic translation of chapter II, 2 (Истрин 1994: 70))<sup>25</sup>.

**Appendix 2**, where the Greek original of Malala’s “Chronographia” and its translation into English are provided, shows that the South Slavic translation was highly faithful. It is evident here that the basis of the extract: kings in Egypt, introduction of metallurgy and monogamy, strict son, punishing the betrayers according to the father’s precept – goes back to John Malala’s Greek text. However, at first the **South Slavic** scribe of X century had put Svarog (as fire deity) and Dazhbog (as his son) from the Slavic mythology as the analogues of Greek Hephaestus and his son Helios to clarify their names<sup>26</sup>. And then, retelling various parts of

24 Let me give only one example of these misconceptions: speaking of correlation between Svarog and Hephaestus, and Dazhbog and Helios, A. Brückner noted: “these glosses were inserted by Russian hand in XI century”, since the Bulgarian scribes “avoided” the references to paganism “like fire” (Brückner 1918: 51). But and the Old Russian literature aimed at the same, did not it?

25 In this case, the division of text is used according to the edition (IMC 1831). See comments to **Appendix 2** for the differences between the divisions of text in the latest edition (IMC 2000).

26 Similarly, the Slavic thunderer Perun has replaced Greek Zeus in the Old Russian chronograph in the translation of Greek words: “*υἱὸς θεοῦ Διὸς τοῦ μεγάλου, βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξανδρος*” (i.e. “*the son of the great god Zeus, king Alexander*”). The replacement that “most likely could appear in the Russian land” has resulted in the form: “*сынъ божию, Пороуна велика, царь Александръ*” (“*the son of the great god Perun, king Alexander*”) (Истрин 1893: 222, 114–115 второй пагинации; Мансика 2005: 223). The translation of the so-called “Chronograph Alexandria” from Slavic into Greek that underlies the chronograph here was made not later than the middle of XIII century. And there is a number of deities in the extract from the “Sermons to the Spirit Children” according to the record of XVI century,

“Chronographia”, the **East Slavic (Old Russian)** chronicler of XII or XIII century added one more fragment: about the introduction of punishment for betrayal by casting into a fiery furnace by Svarog.

The fact that these fragments have various origins is evident from the Slavic translation of Malala’s “Chronographia” that “was collected bit by bit by V.M. Istrin from chronographs and chroniclers”, mainly from Russian records of XV–XVI centuries; its full single text has not been preserved (Истрин 1994: 9). As evident from the translation of book II, there are substitute names here (Истрин 1994: 69–70), but there is nothing about the furnace (Истрин 1994: 31)<sup>27</sup>. It seems very important that the Old Russian chronicler used the South Slavic translator’s glosses: it means that both Dazhbog (and Svarog) were clear both to him and his prospective readers. It is not surprising, for Dazhbog was independently mentioned in the Primary Chronicle and other Old Russian sources. We can see the proof of circulation of common myths of Dazhbog both in the South Slavs and East Slavs even the centuries after the Christianization.

I would note one point that seems to have not been mentioned before in literature. In chapter II, 2 of the Slavic translation of Malala it is said that “*after Dazhbog, Svarog’s son, deceased*”, Sir reigned in Egypt, followed by Or (Osiris and Hor, Malala also had Sosis between Dazhbog and Osiris that was omitted by the translator), followed by Philis<sup>28</sup>, who asked the oracle, who had been or would be equal to him in his conquests, having started a speech with the following words: “*tell me, [not-]lying god, Pirisphon, that is sun..*” (Истрин 1994: 70)<sup>29</sup>. Thus, we can see again the deity of sun, but now it is the male image of Persephone<sup>30</sup>, the goddess of fertility and underworld, in no way concerned with the sun in Greek myths and having no male image, rather than Helios! It follows that the Slavic translator<sup>31</sup> (Malala has some fire and truthful sky deity without name rather than Persephone in the original), without particularly understanding, could assign the the prayers to whom a Christian should have avoided: “*роду и роженицам, порену и аполину, и мокоши, и перегини и всяким богомъ*” (“*to Rod and Rozhanicy, Perun and Apollo, and Mokosh, and Bereginia, and other deities*”); it should be pointed here to the “interpretation of word *Apolin* as the gloss on the theonym *Chors*” (Васильев 1999: 29–32).

27 The researchers have noted that another translator worked on book II of Malala’s “Chronographia” than on book I (Истрин 1994: 43; Мансикка 2005: 93).

28 It is Malala who has mentioned the character named Thoullis (Greek Θούλις) for the first time.

29 Original: “*по оумрътвиюже Дажьббожи сына Сварагова <...> цртова Филисъ, <повъжь ми, лживый боже, Пирисфоне, рекше слънце*” (the variant: “*неложный боже*”).

30 The Slavic translator was likely to make a series of mistakes or take liberties here, cf. (Истрин 1994: 66–67). In Malala, Thoullis addressed to the deity, saying “*having the Power of Fire, Truthful, Blessed*” (Аверинцев 1987: 242), original “*πυρισθενές, ἀγρενδές, μάκαρ*” (IMC 1831: 25; IMC 2000: 18). The Bulgarian scribe has mistaken the first word for the name of Persephone (to be more precise, masculine gender of this word), he has conveyed the second word as “*not-lying*” (the literal form from Greek), and he has defined the deity as the sun deity instead of the third word.

31 The same translator, who also added the glosses on Svarog and Dazhbog! It is still the same book II of the translation.

status of sun deity almost to anyone. I think that this even more depreciates the theory calling Dazhbog the deity of sun.

I would leave drawing quite evident parallels between Malala's fragments and the Primary Chronicle text, 1114, to a reader, and I would also omit the detailed comments on the Greek myths underlying the legend (Homer has already had them; for example, about the fact how Hephaestus went lame, cf. (Илиада 2008: I.586–594, с. 17, XVIII.393–397, с. 268; Одиссея 1953: VIII.310–311, с. 92), or how Helios, having found out Aphrodite's betrayal of her husband Hephaestus, has informed him thereof (Одиссея 1953: VIII.266–366. с. 91–93)). Cf. the extract from Mark Justin's "Epitome" on establishment of marriage by Cecrops (Gaia's son in Greek mythology, the first king of Athens) (II.6.7): "*Cecrops was the king of the Athenians, about whom it was told <...> that he had two natures inside, and he was the first to establish marriage between a man and a woman*" (Юстин 2005: 53). In its turn, the Byzantine "Easter Chronicle" (Пасх. хрон. 2004), going back to VII century, has already quite precisely retold (and here and there it has directly quoted the large fragments, including those about Hephaestus and Helios discussed) Malala, according to which individual passages may be compared.

### §3 Dabog in the Serbian folklore

In 1866-1867 in Western Serbia (Mačva District nowadays), two popular short legends<sup>32</sup> were written down, where **Dabog** is mentioned. These folklore works are provided below in the original and in English translation in **Appendix 3**. It seems that herein the both of them will be provided in English translation for the first time; their first translation into Russian was also made by me (Кутарев 2015: 107–108).

Since the introduction of the both legends into scientific discourse, the researchers have drawn more or less sure parallels between Dabog and Dazhbog, for example: (Гальковский 2013: 20–21; Ловмянский 2003: 362; Клейн 2004: 241–242), etc., see more for historiography (Кутарев 2015: 103). I suppose that among the great researchers only E.V. Anichkov and V.J. Mansikka had doubts about such a relation: "it is impossible to determine, whether the obscure name of the devil, Dabog, in one of the Serbian popular legends <...> is concerned with the East Slavic Dazhbog" (Мансикка 2005: 295). However, it has been already shown that Dazhbog is by no means an exclusively East Slavic character. Resemblance between the names really makes it possible to assume the connection specified, and if there is one, the length of public memory of this deity impresses. I think that the image of Dabog is related to Dazhbog, however, he has considerably changed his role for several centuries of existence in Christianity. Other characters are also well-known in Yugoslav folklore: Daba, Dabich, etc., on which basis V.

32 The both legends were written down by "the priest in Lojanice" (Serbian Лојанице) (Вила 1866: 642), a village at a distance of 70 km to the west of Belgrade.

Čajkanović and other South Slavic authors have even formulated too bold theories relating to the paganism, see more (Кутарев 2016: 132). In any event, I find it useful to consider both of these legends among the secondary sources for more in-depth research of the image of Dazhbog.

As to the first legend that is composed better, the researchers have often said that *dualism* here, i.e. confrontation of two powers comparable in might, is due to bogomilism (Christian heresy of X–XV centuries), for example, (Ловмянский 2003: 362 сн. 199), however, this opinion has been rejected at present (Кутарев 2015: 104). The translation of the second tale has quite a lot of complicated and controversial points. It has archaic features, for example, creation of heaven after the earth, four-part space division, cosmogonic non-Christian motives, etc. What is of particular interest is the reference to four winds (also known in Greek and German mythology) that are represented here in relation to the images of four Evangelists. According to the both legends, Dabog is a kind of leader (of demons); but if his image goes back to the pagan time, it is likely that at pre-Christian time, knowing so much, he could be the head of the pantheon consisting of the deities. Probably, the etymology of his name could be considered as going back to Proto-Indo-European \*Dyeus, “deity”, “sky”.

Drawing the parallels in comparative mythology (e.g. comparison between Dabog opened mouth wide from heaven to earth at first, and then Dabog defeated by the rival, and demon wolf Fenrir in “Gylfaginning” of “Younger Edda”) always has very relative success, therefore I will not do it here. I hope that publication of these sources will lead to appearance of new productive research. I think that the sources provided, first of all, confirm the significance of Dazhbog in Slavic mythology.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1.

#### **“The Primary Chronicle”, Hypatian Codex, 6622 (1114), in the original and translation.**

Old Russian original (Ипат. 1908, стб. 278–279):

*“...аще ли кто сему вѣры не имать. да почнет фронографа <...>. и бысть по потопѣ и по раздѣленьи языкъ. поча царьствовати первое Местромъ. ит рода Хамова. по немь Еремия. по немь Феоста иже. и Соварога. нарекоша Егуптчане. царствующю. сему Феостѣ въ Егуптѣ въ время царства его. спадоша клѣщѣ съ небесѣ нача ковати оружье прѣже бо того палицами и камениемъ бяхуся. тѣ же Феоста законъ. оустави женамъ за единъ мужь. посагати и ходити говеющи. а иже прелюбы дѣющи. казнити повелѣваше. сего ради прозваше и богъ Сварогъ. прже бо сего жены блудяху. к немуже хоташе и блуху. акы стотъ блудяще аще родяшеть дѣтищѣ. которыи ъи любовь бываше. дашеть. се твое дѣта. он же створяше празнество приимаше*

Феоостъ же съ законъ. расыпа. и въстави единому мюжю едину жену имѣти. и женѣ. за одинъ моужь посагати. аще ли кто переступитъ да ввергуть и в печь огнену. сего ради прозваша и Сварогомъ. и блажиша и Егуптлане. и по семь царствова сынъ его именемъ Солнце егоже наричють. Дажьбогъ семь тысящъ и уи семьдесятъ днии яко быти лѣтома. двемадесатъма ти по лунѣ видаху бо Егуптлане. ниши чисти вви по лунѣ чтаху. а друзии. деньми лѣта чтаху. двою бо на десатъ мѣсяцю число потомъ оувѣдаша. втнележе. начаша челоувѣци дань давати царемъ Солнце царь сынъ Свароговъ. еже есть Дажьбогъ бѣ бо мужь силенъ. слышавше нѣ вт кого жену нѣкую. вт Егуптланинъ. богату и всажену соуцю. И нѣкоему въсхотѣвишу блудити с нею искаше ея яти ю хота. И не хота втца своего закона расыпати Сварожа. поемъ со собою моужь нѣколко. swoichъ. разумѣвъ годину. егда прелюбы дѣеть ноцью. припаде на ню не оудоси мужа с нею. а ону обрѣте лежащую съ инѣмъ с нимъ же хоташе емъ же ю и мучи и пусти ю водити по земли в коризнѣ. а того любодѣица всѣкну и бысть чисто житие по всей земли. Егупетъскои. и хвалити начаша. но мы не предолжимъ слова”.

Translation is made on the basis of O.V. Tvorogov’s translation from Old Russian into modern Russian (БЛДР 2000: 308–311):

**“If someone does not believe in it, let him/her read the Chronograph. <...>** Both following the flood, and following the language division, Mestrom, a descendant of Ham, began to reign first, followed by Ermiya, followed by Pheosta that was called Svarog by the Egyptians. When this Pheosta reigned in Egypt, during his reign the smith tongs fell down from the heavens, and people started to forge the weapon, while they had fought with clubs and stones before. The very Pheosta had issued a law that the women should have married to only one man and behaved abstinent, and he ordered to execute those, who would fall into adultery. **Therefore, he was named Svarog deity.** Formerly, the women came together with whomever they liked like livestock. When a woman bore a child, she gave it to that man, whom she loved: “This is your baby”. This man, having held a fete, took a baby to him. However, Pheosta had abolished this practice and ordered one man to have only one woman, and a woman to marry to only one man; if anyone violates this law, **let him/her be cast into a fiery furnace. Therefore, he was named Svarog,** and the Egyptians revered him. And after him, his son named Sun that is called Dazhbog had reigned for seven thousand and 400 and seventy days, which is twenty and a half years. For the Egyptians could not count otherwise: some of them counted according to the moon, the others considered the days to be the years; they found out the number of twelve months later on, when people began to pay tribute to the kings. The Sun-king, **Svarog’s son, or Dazhbog,** was a powerful man. Having heard from somebody of some rich and well-born Egyptian woman and some man, who wanted to come together with her, he looked for her, wishing to catch. He did not want to break his father’s law, **Svarog’s law.** Having

*taken several men with him and found out the time, when she committed adultery, he caught her at night and did not find her husband, but he found her lying with another man, whom she wanted. He caught her, subjected her to torture and sent to take her over the Egyptian land to shame, and beheaded that adulterer. And the pure way of life came to the whole of the Egyptian land, and everybody praised him. **However, we will not go on with the story***".

I have put in bold the independent Slavic insertions not corresponding to Malala's original.

## **Appendix 2.**

### **John Malala's "Chronographia"<sup>33</sup> in the Greek original<sup>34</sup> and translation.**

John Malala's "Chronographia". I, 23 (IMC 1831: 21–22) = I, 15 (IMC 2000: 15–16)<sup>35</sup>:

“Ὅτε οὖν αὐτὸς<sup>1</sup> Ἐρμῆς εἰς τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἦλθεν, ἐβασίλευσε τῶν Αἴγυπτίων τότε ἐκ τοῦ γένους τοῦ Χάμ ὁ Μεστράϊμ. οὗτινος τελευτήσαντος ἐποίησαν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τὸν Ἐρμῆν βασιλέα. καὶ ἐβασίλευσε<sup>2</sup> τῶν Αἴγυπτίων ἔτη λθ' ἐν ὑπερηφανία. Καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν ἐβασίλευσε τῶν Αἴγυπτίων ὁ Ἥφαιστος ἡμέρας ,αχπ', ὡς γενέσθαι ἔτη δ', μῆνας ζ', ἡμέρας γ'. οὐκ<sup>3</sup> ἤδεισαν γὰρ τότε ἐνιαυτοῦς<sup>4</sup> μετρεῖν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι, ἀλλὰ τὴν περίοδον τῆς ἡμέρας ἐνιαυτοῦς ἔλεγον<sup>5</sup>. τὸν δὲ αὐτὸν Ἥφαιστον θεὸν ἐκάλουν<sup>6</sup>. ἦν γὰρ πολεμιστῆς<sup>7</sup> καὶ μυστικός. ὅστις ἐλθὼν<sup>8</sup> εἰς πόλεμον συνέπεσεν σὺν τῷ ἵππῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ πληγεὶς ἔμεινε<sup>9</sup> χωλεῦον. Ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Ἥφαιστος νόμον ἔθηκε τὰς Αἴγυπτίας<sup>10</sup> γυναῖκας μονανδρεῖν καὶ σωφρόνως διάγειν, τὰς δὲ ἐπὶ μοιχείαν εὕρισκομένας τιμωρεῖσθαι<sup>11</sup>. καὶ ἠὲ χαρίστεσαν<sup>12</sup> αὐτῷ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι, διότι πρῶτον νόμον σωφροσύνης τοῦτον ἐδέξαντο. Ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Ἥφαιστος ἀπὸ μυστικῆς τινας εὐχῆς τὴν ὄξυλάβην ἐδέξατο ἐκ τοῦ ἀέρος εἰς τὸ κατασκευάζειν ἐκ σιδήρου ὄπλα. ὅθεν καὶ ἐπικρατῆς σιδήρου ἠρέθη<sup>13</sup> εἰς τοὺς πολέμους. ἀπεθέωσαν οὖν αὐτὸν, ὡς σωφροσύνην νομοθετήσαντα καὶ τροφήν ἀνθρώποις διὰ κατασκευῆς ὄπλων<sup>14</sup> εὕρηκότα καὶ ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις δύναμιν καὶ σωτηρίαν ποιήσαντα. πρὸ γὰρ αὐτοῦ ροπάλοις<sup>15</sup> καὶ λίθοις ἐπολέμουν”.

Variant readings (IMC 2000): 1 Ὅτε οὖν ὁ αὐτὸς 2 ἐβασίλευσεν 3 ὡς γίνεσθαι ἔτη δ' ἡμισυ καὶ ἡμέρας λη'. οὐκ 4 τότε μετρησαι ἐνιαυτοῦς 5 ἐνιαυτοῦς ἐκάλουν

33 I decided not to provide the Slavic translation of Malala recreated by V.M. Istrin in the Appendix, for it has reached us only in the latest records, which could not be the source for the Primary Chronicle. As noted, the Slavic translation, the protograph of which goes back to the Bulgarian text of X century, generally, conveys the original quite precisely. However, herein I refer to the corresponding passages in V.M. Istrin's work, and comment, where necessary. Moreover, I refer to the online version of V.M. Istrin's book in References.

34 The Greek text of "Chronographia" is provided in two editions, the text having minimal variant readings therein (all of them are taken into consideration further) and different division into the chapters. The translation is made according to the edition (IMC 1831), the original text is also provided according to this edition, but there are no significant differences in content of (IMC 2000).

35 The Slavic translation of the fragment and comments thereon: see, respectively (Истрин 1994: 31: 13–17, 41).

6 θεὸν ἔλεγον 7 γὰρ καὶ πολεμιστῆς 8 ὅστις ἐξελθὼν 9 ἔμεινεν 10 ἔθηκεν τὰς Αἰγυπτίων 11 τιμωρεῖσθαι 12 ἠύχαριστησαν 13 κατασκευάζειν ἐκ ὅθεν καὶ ἐπικρατῆς ἠύρέθη 14 ὄπλων 15 ῥοπάλοις

Translation (based on A.S. Dosaev's translation from Greek<sup>36</sup>, to whom I express my gratitude):

*“When the very Hermes appeared in Egypt, Mestram, a descendant of Ham, reigned over the Egyptians. And when he deceased, the Egyptians made Hermes their king. And he had arrogantly reigned over the Egyptians for 39 years. And after him, Hephaestus had reigned over the Egyptians for 1680 days, which is 4 years, 7 months and 3 days<sup>37</sup>. The point is that in those days the Egyptians was not aware of era, but they measured time in days rather than in years. They called the very Hephaestus the god. And he was [rather] militant and mysterious. Having gone to war [once], he fell from the horse [there], and went lame after that. This Hephaestus had issued a law that all women in Egypt should have been content with only one man and behaved chaste. [According to this law], punishments were [also] provided for those, who would be caught in adultery. The Egyptians were very grateful to him for that, for this law became the first law [for them] regarding chastity. By means of some secret prayer, the very Hephaestus had obtained the smith tongs out of thin air, using which it was possible to make weapon of iron; thanks to that, he became the Tamer of Iron for those, who fought in the wars. Due to the fact that Hephaestus had raised chastity to a law form, [and] discovered the means, by which the people had learnt to make weapon adding power to them in the war and providing safety to them, he was deified<sup>38</sup>. They had fought [solely] with clubs and stones before Hephaestus”.*

John Malala's “Chronographia”. II, 1 (IMC 1831: 23–24) = II, 1 (IMC 2000: 17)<sup>39</sup>:

*“Μετὰ δὲ τελευτήν<sup>1</sup> Ἥφαιστου ἐβασίλευσεν Αἰγυπτίων ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Ἥλιος<sup>2</sup> ἡμέρας ,δουζ', ὡς εἶναι ἔτη ιβ' καὶ ἡμέρας ζζ'. οὐ γὰρ ἤδεισαν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τότε ἢ ἄλλοι τινὲς ἀριθμὸν ψηφίσαι<sup>3</sup>, ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν τὰς περιόδους τῆς σελήνης ἐψήφιζον*

36 The existing full Russian translation by N.N. Bolgov was used by me only for general proof-reading of translations (Болгов 2016: 55–57, 83–84) and comments: was it made from English?

37 According to the edition (IMC 2000): “within four years and 38 days” (Болгов 2016: 55), which obviously does not correspond to declared 1680 (αχπ') days (4x365+38=1498) as opposed to the version (IMC 1831), where 4x365+7x31+3=1680. In Slavic translation “...four and a half years and 38 days” (Болгов 2016: 55 сн. 74).

38 In Bolgov's edition: “they deified him, for he had established chastity by law, and he had bought food for men making weapon, and war gave them power and safety”. In the quotation from “Easter Chronicle” (D. 82): “he was deified, since he was the author of the law on abstinence, and due to invention of the weapon, he procured food for people and ensured power and safety for them in wartime” (Пасх. хрон. 2004: 164), cf. (Истрин 1994: 31).

39 Slavic translation of the fragment and comments thereon: see, respectively (Истрин 1994: 69; 42–47, 62–63).

εἰς ἔνιαυτούς, οἱ δὲ τὰς περιόδους τῶν ἡμερῶν εἰς ἔτη ἐψηφίζον. οἱ γὰρ τῶν ἱβ' μηνῶν ἀριθμοὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπενοήθησαν, ἐξότε ἐπωνομάσθη τὸ ὑποτελεῖς εἶναι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν. ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Ἥλιος, ὁ υἱὸς Ἡφαίστου, ἦν φιλότιμος δυνατός. ὅστις ἐδιδάχθη ὑπὸ τινος ὡς γυνή τις Αἰγυπτία τῶν ἐν εὐπορίᾳ καὶ ἀξία οὐσῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐρῶσά τινος ἐμοιχεύετο ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ Ἥλιος ἐξήτησεν αὐτὴν πιάσαι διὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἡφαίστου νομοθεσίαν, ἵνα μὴ λυθῇ. καὶ λαβὼν στρατιώτας ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου στρατοῦ, μαθὼν τὸν καιρὸν τῆς μοιχείας αὐτῆς γίνεσθαι νυκτῶν, ἐπιρρίψας<sup>4</sup> αὐτῇ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς μὴ ὄντος αὐτόθι, εὔρεν αὐτὴν μετὰ ἄλλου καθεύδουσαν τοῦ ἐρωμένου παρ' αὐτῆς. ἦντινα εὐθέως καταγαγὼν ἐπόμπευσεν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ χώρᾳ τῆς Αἰγύπτου τιμωρησάμενος. καὶ γέγονε σωφροσύνη μεγάλη<sup>5</sup> ἐν τῇ γῆ τῆς Αἰγύπτου. κάκεῖνον δὲ τὸν μοιχὸν ἀνεῖλε<sup>6</sup>, καὶ εὐχαριστήθη<sup>7</sup>.

Variant readings (IMC 2000): 1 Μετὰ καὶ τὴν τελευτήν 2 αὐτοῦ ὀνόματι Ἥλιος 3 ἀριθμὸν <ἐνιαυτῶν> ψηφίσαι 4 ἐπιρρίψας 5 γέγονεν σωφροσύνη μεγάλη 6 ἀνεῖλεν

Translation (based on S.S. Averintsev's translation from Greek according to the edition (Аверинцев 1987: 241)):

*“After Hephaestus's death, his son, Helios, had reigned over the Egyptians for four thousand four hundred and seventy<sup>40</sup> and seven days, in other words, twelve years and ninety-seven days; however, in those days neither the Egyptians, nor other peoples could count yet, but some of them considered the moon's circuits to be the years, the others considered the days to be the years. Calculation according to twelve months was contrived after the people were named subjects by the kings. That Helios, Hephaestus's son, was fame thirsty and powerful. He found out from somebody that some Egyptian woman being in easy circumstances and honour and conceiving a desire to some man had fallen into fornication with him; having heard that, Helios looked for her to catch according to Hephaestus's statute, in order that she could not avoid the punishment. Having found out the time of her lascivious dates and taken the warriors from his armed force, he rushed in her house at night<sup>41</sup> in the absence of her husband and found her lying with her adul-*

40 “Seventy” has been added by me, since S.S. Averintsev has a gap here (although he has translated according to the edition IMC 1831, where 4477): “four thousand four hundred and seven”, perhaps, according to another manuscript. S.S. Averintsev's version has been also got into my article (Кутарев 2015: 106). However, the medieval Slavic translator of Malala also had a variant reading here (or did he use another Greek record?): “седемъ тысящъ уѣзъ” (Истрин 1994: 69), i.e. 7477. The number was almost correctly conveyed to the Primary Chronicle from here. However, following Malala's Greek text, “the correct number should be 4477” (Истрин 1994: 45). The next fragment also confirms this: 12x365+97=4477. In Slavic translation of Malala, the explanation followed this: “яко быти лѣтомъ двѣмнадцатма ти полоу” (Истрин 1994: 69), i.e. “twelve and a half years” (Болгов 2016: 57 сн. 78), and it is obvious that the Russian chronicler, having revealed a discrepancy, corrected it to “twenty and a half years”, having decided that that is where the mistake is. In “Easter Chronicle” (D. 82): “4477 days, which is 12 years, 3 months and 4 days” (Пасх. хрон. 2004: 164).

41 “At night” has been put in by me, since the Greek text contains it (νυκτῶν), cf. “Easter Chronicle” (D. 83): “having taken the warriors from his forces and found out that the time of adultery was



terer. Having caught her, he ordered to immediately take her over the Egyptian land to shame; since then chastity has become great in Egypt. And he executed that adulterer, having gained gratitude thereby”.

John Malala’s “Chronographia”. IV, 4 (IMC 1831: 71) = IV, 5 (IMC 2000: 50)<sup>42</sup>:

“τοῦτο ἀπὸ<sup>1</sup> τῆς Ἀττικῆς εἶρχθη, τὸ μὴ ἀναγκάζεσθαι αὐτὰς συνεῖναι ἀνδρὶ πρὸς ὃν βούλονται. οὐδεὶς οὖν ἦδει τίς ἦν υἱὸς ἢ θυγάτηρ, καὶ ἐδίδου<sup>2</sup> τὸ τεχθὲν ᾧ ἠβούλετο ἀνδρὶ συμμιγέντι αὐτῇ, εἴτε ἄρρεν<sup>3</sup> εἴτε θῆλυ ἔτεκε, καὶ ἔχαιρον δεχόμενοι. ὁ δὲ Κέκροψ ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου καταγόμενος ἐξεφώνησε<sup>4</sup> τὸν νόμον τοῦτον, εἰρηκώς”.

Variant readings (IMC 2000): 1 τοῦτο δὲ ἀπὸ 2 θυγάτηρ, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἂν ἔδοξε τῇ μητρὶ, ἔλεγε καὶ ἐδίδου 3 ἄρρεν 4 ἐξεφώνησεν

Translation (based on A.S. Dosaev’s translation):

“*[Cecrops] had banned the residents of Attica from their former practice, according to which the local women could copulate with whomever they liked, for due to this, it turned out that none of local residents were aware of who was the son of whom and who was the daughter of whom. And when a baby was born, either male or female, at her own discretion, the mother gave him/her to any of her lovers, and that man, who received this present, should have gladly accepted it. Egyptian Cecrops had banned this practice mentioned above*”<sup>43</sup>.

### Appendix 3.

**Two Serbian popular legends about Dabog in the original and translation (translation from Serbian is mine, I express my gratitude to S. Stamenković for assistance in translation of both legends<sup>44</sup>):**

Дабог<sup>45</sup> (Послао: Живојин Радоњић, свешт. у Лојаницама, 1866):

“Био Дабог цар на земљи, а Господ Бог на небесима. Па се погоде: грешне душе људи да иду Дабогу, а праведне душе Господу Богу на небеса. То је тако

night, he attacked her, when her husband was not at home” (Пасх. хрон. 2004: 165). It came to the Slavic translation (“ноцию”), and then to the Primary Chronicle from here.

42 Slavic translation of the fragment and comments thereon: see, respectively (Истрин 1994: 104; 91–92).

43 V.J. Mansikka did not take into account this Malala’s fragment in his work, for which reason he considered that it had the Slavic origin in the Primary Chronicle: “the chronicler <...> writes a story about the former intemperance of the Egyptians”. V.J. Mansikka has also made other mistakes regarding this passage, having assumed, for example, the appearance of insertions of Svarog and Dazhbog’s names in Lithuania ca. 1262, which has been reliably disproved by O.V. Tvorogov (Мансикка 2005: 89–94, 306). Meanwhile, it seems that today, almost 100 years after publication of V.J. Mansikka’s work, it is his work that is often used to consider this passage.

44 I would also like to thank my colleague, N. Radulović, for updating the translation, who also has pointed out that both legends were republished in Serbian in 2009 (Narodna proza 2009: text 18, 20, p. 74–75, 77).

45 Accurately reproduced according to (Вила 1866: 642).

дуго трајало. Док се Господу Богу ражали што Дабог много преко мере душа прождире, па стане мислити как би силу Дабогову укратио. Да га убије, није могао јер је Дабог, Боже прости био силан као и Господ Бог на небесима, а није могао нити је било од требе погодбу покварити. Најпосле пошље св. Тому к Дабогу да га искуша: чим би му се могла сила укратити. Свети Тома сиђе на земљу к Дабогу, и једнако га је кушао док га није искушао: да се његова сила укратити никако не може, јер су тако два цара уговорили; него ако би се у Господа Бога син родио, он би могао потражити своју очевину. Како то чује свети Тома одма се дигне, те Господу Богу, и каже му све по реду шта је чуо од Дабога. А Господ Бог задија сина. Кад Дабог чује да се у Господа Бога задијао и родио син, и да већ иде по своју очевину, од тешке јарости зине да му се једна виличетина вукла по земљи, а другом у небо додирао, не би ли и сина Божијег прождрво. Али му син божији не даде ни данути, него га удари копљем у доњу вилицу и усправи копље те му се и горња вилица на копље набоде. И како је онда син божији копљем вилице развалио, тако стоји и данас, и стајаће веки амин. А све зрешине душе, што их је Дабог од памтивека прождрво покуљају из уста и оду са сином Господу Богу на небеса”.

The Serbian popular legend “Dabog” (the priest Ž. Radonjić wrote it down in 1866):

“There was king Dabog on earth, and God in heaven. And there was such an agreement: people’s sinful souls passed to Dabog, and holy souls to God to heaven. This lasted long. Finally, somebody complained to God that Dabog devoured too many souls, and he started to think how he could diminish Dabog’s power. And he could not murder him, since Dabog (God forgive me!) was strong like God in heaven; and he could not violate the agreement. Then he sent Thomas the Apostle to Dabog to try to discover how he could diminish his power. Thomas the Apostle descended to the earth to Dabog and started to ask him unless he discovered that Dabog’s power in no way could be diminished, since both kings had agreed with that; but if God had a son born, he could reach his possession. When Thomas the Apostle heard it, he immediately stood up and told God everything step by step what he had heard from Dabog. And God conceived a son. When Dabog heard that God had conceived a son, and a son was born and he was going to take his possession, Dabog opened his mouth with rage in a way that one jaw was dragging on the ground, and the other one reached the heavens; he could even devour the son of God. However, the son of God did not let him have a sigh, and struck his lower jaw with a spear, and set the spear in such a way that the upper jaw was also pierced with the spear. And when the son of God broke the jaws with the spear, they are still open wide to present day, and will be like this for all time, amen. And all the sinful souls that Dabog had devoured at all times broke loose from his jaws and went away with the son of God to heaven”.

**Из прича о створењу света<sup>46</sup> (Послао Живојин Радонић, свештеник, 1867):**

“Господ Бог створио је најпре земљу, па онда небо. Али се некако догоди те земљу створи већу а небо мање, те не могне небо да покрије земљу. Кад то види господ Бог, замисли се, шта ће и како ће. Стане питати све редом своје свеце: шта ће и како ће. Али ни један ништа му не умеде казати. У то време Дабог скупио скупштину па већна и смеје се што се господ Бог мучи. А господ Бог куд ће шта ће те пошље челу, да оде и да падне на капу Дабогу, да све саслуша шта се он разговара, па после да му – господу Богу каже. Чела оде и све саслуша шта се Дабог на скупштини са нечастивим – буди Бог с нама и анђели божији – разговара. Али кад полети, не даде јој се мировати, него зукне. Дабог скочи, удари се руком по колену и рече: “ово је гласоноша бојжи, кућа му од г..., све ће казати што смо се год разговарали.” – па пусти јак ветар да челу у лету смете, и грозну кишу да јој се крила оквасе те да не могне узлетети и господу Богу његове разговоре казати. Кад зло време јадну челицу сулети, оно куд ће шта ће него утече под струк босиљка. А где ће стручак босиљка заклонити кога од зла времена...?! Одатле полети те падне на тополов лист, а он се стане трести да јадна чела спадне на земљу. Одатле се опет давранише те падне на тамњаново дрво под кору, и ту се одржи док ветар и киша не стану, па се одатле вине горе и господу Богу падне на колена<sup>47</sup>, а господ Бог узме је на длан, и запита је: шта је чула, и где се ода зла времена склонила. А она му одговори: “Чула сам где Дабог вели: да зна господ Бог, да пусти четири ветра да са четири стране земљу стежу, нека се утолегну долине а искоче брда: и да пошље четири своја јеванђелиста да на четири стране небо растежу – онда би му небо поклопило земљу. И још ме нагрди, рече ми: да ми буде кућа од г... А да не би малог стручка босиљковог и тамњановог дрвета, по тополи страдала бих ти ода зла времена.” Господ Бог рече јој: “Нека ти и буде кућа од г..., а ти да си благословена; без тебе се не могло ни живети ни умрети. Да је благословен и стручак босиљка и тамњаново дрво, без њих се не могло ни живети ни умрети; а топола да је проклета, тресла се и на лепом времену.” То рекне па пусти четири ветра да са четири стране (дувањем) земљу стежу да искоче брда, а утолегну се долине, и пошље четири јеванђелиста да на четири стране небо растежу. Ветрови стегну земљу те искоче брда и утолегну се долине, а јеванђелисти растегну небо, те тако небо поклопи земљу. С чега, босиљак и тамњаниково дрво остану благословени, а топола

46 Accurately reproduced according to (Вила 1867: 655–656), except for the spelling of Dabog’s name. For some obscure reason, in the original of the publication of the second legend, Dabog’s name is always spelled with a circumflex in the first syllable: Dâbog, although such a spelling is not used in the Serbian alphabet. Having pointed out this fact, I convey a text with a common “a”. A common “a” is also used in the edition (Narodna proza 2009: text 20, p. 77).

47 Here was mistake in (Кутарев 2015: 108) “па колена”.

проклета и до данас”.

The Serbian popular legend “From the legend on creation of the world” (the priest Ž. Radonjić wrote it down in 1867):

“God created the earth at first, and then the heaven. However, somehow it happened that he had created the earth larger, and the heaven smaller, and the heaven could not cover the earth. When God saw that, he thought what’s what. He started to ask his saints one after another: what’s what. However, none of them could say anything to him. At that time Dabog convened a meeting and laughed at the fact that God was worried. And God, you know, sent a bee to Dabog, so that it could settle on his head and listen to what he was talking, so that then it could tell him (God) about it. The bee flew there and listened to everything, what Dabog was saying on the meeting with the impious people, let God and angels of God be with us! However, when the bee was about to fly away, Dabog did not let it do it peacefully, and the bee began to buzz. Dabog jumped up, hit his knee with a hand and said: “it is God’s herald, and its house is made of s...<sup>48</sup>, it will tell him everything, what we were talking about”. Dabog let the strong wind out, so that it could sweep away the bee in the air, and heavy rain, so that its wings could get wet, so that it could not fly up and tell God about their conversations. When bad weather overtook the bee, it, you know, flew under the basil stem. And how could the basil stem protect anyone from bad weather...?! It flew from there and settle on the poplar leaf, and this leaf began to shake in such a way that poor bee fell to the ground. It flew again from there to frankincense under the bark, and was waiting here till the wind and rain stopped, and flew from there to the mountain; it settled on the God’s knee, and God took it in his palm and asked: what it had heard and where it had hidden out from such bad weather. And the bee answered to him: “I have heard what Dabog told; let God know, and let him let four winds out, so that they could squeeze the earth from four sides, and let the valleys sink and hills jump out; and let him send his four Evangelists to four sides to stretch heaven, and in that case, heaven would cover the earth. And he also rewarded me, he said to me: let my house be made of s... And let the basil and frankincense stems be long, and let the poplars be damaged in bad weather”. God said to the bee: “let your house be made of s... though, but let you be blessed; no one can either live, or die without you. Let the basil and frankincense stems be also blessed, no one can either live, or die without them; and let the poplar be damned, let it shake even in good weather”. Having said that, he let four winds out, so that they could squeeze the earth from four sides, and so that the hills could jump out and the valleys sink, and he sent his four Evangelists to four sides to stretch heaven. The winds had squeezed the earth, the hills had jumped out and the valleys had sunk, and the Evangelists had stretched heaven in such a way that it covered the earth. Since then basil and frankincense have become blessed, and poplar is still damned to present day”.

---

48 Made of shit (говно wrote as z...).

References

1. Brückner, A. 1918: *Mitologja słowiańska*. Krakow: NAU.
2. Długossii 1964: *Ioannis Długossii Annales seu Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae. Liber 1, 2. Varsaviae: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe*.
3. IMC 1831: *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia. Rec. L. Dindorf. Bonn*.
4. IMC 2000: *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia. Rec. I. Thurn. Berolini: Walter de Gruyter*.
5. *Narodna proza u "Vili"*, ed. by Snežana Samardžija, Beograd-Novi Sad: Institut za književnost i umetnost – Matica srpska, 2009.
6. *Rerum 1557: Sigmund von Herberstein. Rerum Moscoviticarum commentarii. Antverp*.
7. Strykowski, Maciej 1582: *Kronika Polska, Litewska, Żmudzka i wszyskiej Rusi. Königsberg*.
8. Аверинцев, С.С. 1987: *От берегов Босфора до берегов Евфрата*. Москва: Наука, 1987.
9. БЛДР 2000: *Повесть временных лет (по Ипатьевской редакции) / Перевод с древнерусского О.В. Творогова. // Библиотека литературы Древней Руси. Т. 1. Санкт-Петербург: Наука. С. 62–315*.
10. Болгов 2016: *Иоанн Малала. Хронография. Книги I–VI (Т. 1) / Переводчик Н.Н. Болгов. Белгород: НИУ БелГУ*.
11. Васильев, М.А. 1999: *Язычество восточных славян накануне крещения Руси: Религиозно-мифологическое взаимодействие с иранским миром. Языческая реформа князя Владимира*. Москва: Индрик.
12. Вила 1866: *Дабог // Вила: лист за забаву, књижевност и науку. / Изд. С. Новаковић. Београд: Државна штампарња. Година друга. С. 642*.
13. Вила 1867: *Из прича о створењу света // Вила: лист за забаву, књижевност и науку. / Изд. С. Новаковић. Београд: Државна штампарња. Година трећа. С. 655–656*.
14. Гальковский, Н.М. 2013: *Борьба христианства с остатками язычества в Древней Руси*. Москва: Академический проект [both volumes in one book; the second volume is a reprint of 1913 (p. 263–572), with page numbering x+264 (p. 300 in 2013=p. 36 in 1913)].
15. Герберштейн, Сигизмунд 1988: *Записки о Московии / Перевод с немецкого А.И. Малеина и А.В. Назаренко*. Москва: МГУ.
16. *Илиада 2008 / Перевод с древнегреческого Н.И. Гнедича*. Санкт-Петербург: Наука.
17. *Ипат. 1908: Ипатьевская летопись: Полное собрание русских летописей. Т. 2. Издание второе*. Санкт-Петербург.
18. Истрин, В.М. 1893: *Александрия русских хронографов. Исследование и текст*. Москва.

19. Истрин, В.М. 1994: *Хроника Иоанна Малалы в славянском переводе*. Москва. [PDF: [https://vk.com/doc-120497\\_589964358](https://vk.com/doc-120497_589964358)]
20. Клейн, Л.С. 2004: *Воскрешение Перуна. К реконструкции восточнославянского язычества*. Санкт-Петербург: Евразия.
21. Кутарев, О.В. 2015: *Древнерусский Дажьбог, сербский Дабог и греческий сын Гефеста Гелиос* // *Acta Eruditorum*. 2015. Вып. 19. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство РХГА. С. 101–109. [PDF: [https://vk.com/doc-120497\\_591204198](https://vk.com/doc-120497_591204198) LJ: <https://dajbojic.livejournal.com/5180.html>]
22. Кутарев, О.В. 2016: *Славянский Дажьбог как развитие индоевропейского Бога Сияющего Неба (Дьеус-Патер)* // *Философия и культура*. 2016. №1. С. 126–141. DOI: 10.7256/1999-2793.2016.1.17386 [PDF: [https://vk.com/doc-120497\\_437685885](https://vk.com/doc-120497_437685885)]
23. Кутарев О.В. 2017: *Психотехники в североевропейском старом язычестве* // *Северный Ветер*. №16. С. 14–21. [PDF: [https://vk.com/doc-120497\\_590571515](https://vk.com/doc-120497_590571515)]
24. Ловмянский, Г. 2003: *Религия славян и её упадок*. Санкт-Петербург: Академический проект.
25. Мансикка, В.Й. 2005: *Религия восточных славян*. Москва: ИМЛИ РАН.
26. *Одиссея 1953 / Перевод с древнегреческого В.В. Вересаева*. М.: ГИХЛ, 1953.
27. *Пасх. хрон.* 2004: *Пасхальная хроника / перевод с греческого, вступление и комментарии Л.А. Самуткиной*. Санкт-Петербург: Алетейя.
28. *Синописис 1774: [Кіевский] Синописисъ или краткое описаніе отъ различныхъ лѣтописцевъ, о началѣ Славенскаго народа*. Санкт-Петербург.
29. Соколова, Л.В. 1995: *Дажьбог (Даждьбог)* // *Энциклопедия «Слова о полку Игореве»: В 5 т.* Санкт-Петербург: Дмитрий Буланин, 1995. Т. 2. С. 79–82.
30. *СПИ 1800: Ироическая пѣснь о походѣ на половцовъ удѣльнаго князя Новагорода-Сѣверскаго Игоря Святославича*. – Москва: Въ Сенатской Типографіи, 1800. [Первое издание «Слова о полку Игореве» online: <https://dajbojic.livejournal.com/4207.html>]
31. *СПИ 1985: Слово о полку Игореве / перевод с древнерусского О.В. Творогова*. // *Воинские повести Древней Руси*. Ленинград: Лениздат. С. 36–44. [online: <https://dajbojic.livejournal.com/4549.html>]
32. Творогов, О.В. 1983: *Материалы к истории русских хронографов. 2. Софійский хронограф и «Хроника Иоанна Малалы»* // *Труды Отдела древнерусской литературы*. Ленинград: Наука. Т. 37. С. 188–192.

33. Творогов, О.В. 1987: Хроника Иоанна Малалы // Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси. Ленинград: Наука. Вып. 1. С. 471–474.
34. Юстин Марк Юниан, 2005: Эпитома сочинения Помпея Трога «*Historiae Philippicae*» / Перевод с латинского А.А. Деконского, М.И. Рижского. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство СПбГУ.