



**New researches
on the religion and mythology
of the Pagan Slavs**

Edited by Patrice Lajoie

Jiří Dynda

Alexander V. Ivanenko

Kamil Kajkowski

Aleksandr Koptev

Oleg V. Kutarev

Marina M. Valentsova

Roman Zaroff

Stamatis Zochios

Lingva



New researches
on the religion and mythology
of the Pagan Slavs

Collection
« **Histoire -mythes - folklore** »

2014

Mikhaïl Dragomanov et Lydia Dragomanova
Travaux sur le folklore slave, suivi de Légendes chrétiennes de l'Ukraine
Viktoriya et Patrice Lajoye
Sadko et autres chants mythologiques des Slaves de l'Est

2017

Patrice Lajoye
Fils de l'orage
Patrice Lajoye
Charmes et incantations. Biélorussie, Russie, Ukraine
Georges Dumézil
Contes et légendes des peuples du Caucase, 1

À paraître

Mitrofan Dikarev
Contes grivois et chansons paillardes de l'Ukraine

New Researches
on the religion
and mythology
of the Pagan Slavs

edited by
Patrice Lajoye

LINGVA

© 2019, Lingva, Patrice Lajoie and the authors
Éditions Lingva
22 A rue de la Gare
14100 Lisieux (France)
lingva.france@gmail.com
www.lingva.fr

Description of Rod and Rožanicy in Slavic mythology

B. A. Rybakov and his predecessor's interpretations

Oleg V. Kutarev

Russian Christian Humanitarian Academy
(191011, St Petersburg, Fontanka embankment, 15)

etnogenez@mail.ru

Abstract. Such characters of Slavic mythology as Rod and Rozhanicy have been scientifically studied for more than 150 years. It seems that quite a true notion of them should have been formed and spread for such a long period. However, is the most commonly encountered approach introduced in 1980s by academician B. A. Rybakov, which was popular among the considerable circles of neopagans, true? Analyzing Old Russian sources, folklore and studies of scholars preceding Rybakov, the author tries to answer this question, considering findings of this famous academician with regard to Rod and Rozhanicy.

Keywords. Rod and Rožanicy, Slavic mythology, Russian neopaganism, B.A. Rybakov, “The paganism of early Slavs”, Rodnoverie

THE LARGEST SLAVIC NEOPAGAN TREND in Russia is Rodnoverie¹ (Rus. “native faith”; connection with god Rod is also possible). Despite the highly considerable differences in communities of rodnoverie now and then, which may be expressed both regarding the text sources and pantheon, rites and religious practices, there are principles common almost to all representatives of rodnoverie. First of all, it is their basis in attracting the scientific sources of Boris Aleksandrovich Rybakov’s (1908–2001) works, academician and great researcher of paganism of early Slavs and Old Russia.

1. Kutarev 2014.

Meanwhile, in scientific Slavonic studies, as early as publication of B. A. Rybakov's main works², they were perceived quite carefully. In the course of time, there were a lot of pointed remarks; only familiarization and systematization of considerable archaeological, ethnographical and other material³ and his critical studies of such late forgeries as *Velesova knjiga (Book of Veles)*⁴ were acknowledged as his undoubted service for study. However, it is findings of Rybakov's main works that had crucial importance for the representatives of rodnoverie; to some extent B. A. Rybakov became "an apostle of Rodnoverie". Coincidence of propagation time and achieving fame of his works and collapse of the Soviet Union created a situation, in which academician Rybakov's main works became the main source of many first neopagan trends appeared just at that period⁵. To the present day, influence of Rybakov's ideas on neopagan, popular and even (to a lesser extent) academic literature should be acknowledged as an excessive one. At the same time, it is necessary to note that even the first Soviet editions of two main Boris Aleksandrovich's books numbered 25,000 copies for *The Paganism of early Slavs* (1981) and 95,000 copies for *The Paganism of Old Russia* (1988): after the breakup of the USSR and decline in Russian science and economics, perhaps, ALL scientific publications on the Slavic paganism of 1990s taken together had comparable scale. Thus, from the date of issue, B. A. Rybakov's "voice" has overridden the whole fair criticism against him for two decades, crucial for forming rodnoverie.

One of the most important issues, in which Boris Aleksandrovich's findings have not been met with support in scientific world, is reconstruction of Slavic pantheon. At the same time his highly disputable and sometimes quite contradictory findings to those of preceding and subsequent studies underlie the beliefs of rodnoverie. This article considers this fact by the example of Rybakov's approach to Rod and Rožanicý⁶, the characters of Slavic mythology that have been studied since the

2. Rybakov 1981, 1987. These works had a great circulation and have new editions.

3. See, for example, Egorov 2012, Klejn 2011, Novosel'cev 1993 and others; on request it is possible to list a lot of articles and books, criticizing one or another Boris Aleksandrovich's findings.

4. Buganov, Žukovskaja, Rybakov, 2004. *Vleskniga* or *Book of Veles* (Veles is one of ancient main Slavic gods, who is a shaman and patron of poetry and cattle) was made by Yuri P. Mirolubov (Юрий Петрович Миролюбов) in 1950s, but was presented as text of pagan Russian author of IX century.

5. Gajdukov 2004.

6. Russian and Old Russian word "Рожаница" [Rožanica] (literally translation "[feminine who giving] birth") is singular form; "Рожаницы" [Rožanicý] is plural form.

middle of XIX century. We will try to consider Rybakov's views against a background of studies preceding his ones (without touching upon the subsequent ones), seeking for revealing their grounds. Note that if considering the subsequent works, a series of critical opinions on academician's findings will be revealed; but we are interested in differences between Rybakov's ideas and findings of his predecessors (and many scholars after him) and what are the grounds for such his views rather than review of critique. Having distinguished various views of an issue and revealed differences between them, we will try to determine which view is more valid as far as possible.

* * *

For the first time Rod and Rožanicity are mentioned in Old Russian texts (although many scholars note possible borrowing of these text fragments from South Slavs)⁷. *The Tale of Some Who Loves Christ* and *The Tale of Idols*⁸, representing sermons against paganism and attributed by different researchers⁹ to XI–XIII centuries, are generally (including Rybakov) acknowledged to be the oldest. They similarly mention Rod and Rožanicity, for example, in *The Tale of Idols*: "... the Slavs create and make treba (a sacrifice) to Samodivas, Mokoš, Diva, Perun, Xors, Rod and Rožanica"¹⁰ (these names basically are the names of Slavic gods, known from other sources). In the following centuries in Old Russia several other texts appear mentioning these characters of Slavic mythology. However, such sermons add almost no new data on the essence of Rod and Rožanicity; in essence, they just repeat what is already known¹¹ according to these two *Tales*:

So, if we write "Rožanicity" it means plural. In Old Russian sources it's possible to find this word in singular, plural and even dual form (doesn't exist in modern Russian).

7. Sreznevskij 1855, Mansikka 2005: 142 and others.

8. *The Tale of Idols* is a conventional shortening (for example, in E. V. Aničkov); its full Old Russian name is *Слово святого Григорья, избрѣтено въ толицѣхъ о томъ, како первое погани суще языци кланялися ідоломъ і требы им клали; то і нынѣ творятъ* (Гальковский 2013: 281–299). The same relates to *The Tale of Some Who Loves Christ – Слово некогъо Христолюбца, и ревнителя по правой вѣрѣ* (Ibid.: 300–312).

9. See, for example, Aničkov 2009: 190, 199; Mansikka 2005: 142; *Pis'mennye pamjatniki istorii Drevnej Rusi* 2003: 153–157.

10. Translation from Old Russian is ours. In the original: «требою кладоуть и творятъ, и словеньскыи языкъ, Виламъ, и Мокошѣ, Дивѣ, Пероуноу, Хърсоу, Родоу, и Рожаницѣ» (Gal'kovskij 2013: 287).

11. See, for example, *Слово Ісаіа пророка истолковано святымъ Иоаномъ Златаоустом о поставляющихъ второую трапезу Роду и Рожаницамъ* (Gal'kovskij 2013: 348–355); *Слово нѣкоего Христолюбца и наказаніи отца духовного* (Sreznevskij 1863:

food was sacrificed to Rod and Rožanicý and they were worshipped along with other pagan characters: deities, Samodivas (fairies), etc., only occasionally allowing themselves highly unskillfully comparing them to the deities of other mythologies (Semitic, Egyptian, Greek). Only one source, communicating original information, is distinguished among the ancient ones mentioning Rod. It is a comment to the Gospel of XV century under the name *О вдуновении духа в челоуѣка* (*On blowing in the spirit to a human* in Old Russian), reporting: “*The Almighty, the only one who is immortal and the Creator of nondyings, blows in immortality and agelessly <...>; it is not Rod, sitting in the air, throws heaps to the earth, and children are born in him <...>. It is God who is Creator rather than Rod*”¹² (Slavic word “*зруды*” (heaps?) has a lot of possible meanings). Thus, this text points out fallacy (from Christian point of view) of the idea that Rod gives birth to souls, which he sends down from the “air” with the “heaps”, i.e., according to Rybakov, who was supported by many researchers, with the raindrops¹³.

Another domain of data of our interest in medieval texts concerns the relations between these characters and astrology¹⁴ (which were translated as “*rozhestvoslovie*”¹⁵) and fate. In *The Tale of Idols* “*халдѣйскаѣа астрономиѣа и родопочитание*” (“*Chaldea astronomy and ancestor worship*” in Old Russian) rank with one another¹⁶; and in general, as V. J. Mansikka convincingly shows, “a number of cases is known, when Greek words τύχη and εἰμαρμένη (literally “fate” and “destiny, doom” – O.K.) were translated as “Rod” and “Rožanicý”; moreover, the word “Rožanicý” often conveyed the words γένεσις and γενεαλογία (literally from Greek “origin, origination” and “genealogy” – O.K.) equal to it”; “perhaps, sometimes it is more correct to consider it as merely philological phenomenon, an attempt to convey τύχη, fortune, idea of fate in

699–700); Aničkov 2009: 125–152 and others.

12. Translation from Old Russian is ours. In the original: «Вдуновение бесмртное нестарѣюще единъ вдымаетъ вседръжителъ, иже единъ безсмртенъ и непогибающихъ творецъ <...>; то ти не Родъ, сѣдя на въздухѣ мечеть на землю груди и в том ражаются дѣти <...>. Всѣмъ бо есть Творецъ Богъ, а не Родъ» (Gal'kovskij 2013: 360-362).

13. Rybakov 1981: 450. It is worth noting that other authors (e.g. V.Y. Petrukhin and others) have another point of view as for definition of “heaps” in this text (heaps of earth etc.).

14. Sreznevskij 1855: 9.

15. Mansikka 2005: 145.

16. Gal'kovskij 2013: 288.

Slavic rather than really existing Slavic “idols” in Rod and Rožanicity”¹⁷; at any rate, sometimes we can claim it for sure. Rod and Rožanicity were worshipped the next day after Christmas¹⁸ and the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary¹⁹, and the sermons had been issued for several centuries, which condemned offering gruel and any pastries that day, devoted to Rožanicity; later child’s first hair trimmed sacrificed to Rožanicity²⁰. In essence, it is all direct data, which may be obtained from Old Russian texts. It is worth noting that Rod and Rožanicity are known only through the texts, condemning *dvoeverie* (“dual faith”, period in first centuries after Russia’s baptism in 988 AD with strong paganism’s influence), and there are no references to their idols, oaths, etc. (in contrast to other main gods), what is noted by Rybakov as well²¹. At any rate, Rod and Rožanicity are not mentioned under these names in the texts, describing pre-Christian epoch in Russia, and unknown to other early Slavs’ sources on pre-Christian epoch, e.g. Polabian and Baltic Slavs, about whose paganism is known quite a lot.

Extra data are reported by folklore, not only of the East and South Slavs, but even that of the West Slavs, although to a lesser extent. Jan Máchal writes on Rožanicity in the Slavic world: “they were also called Sudice (‘Givers of Fate’), Sudjenice, Sujenice (Croatian), Sojenice, Sujenice (Slovenian), Sudženici (Bulgarian), or Sudičky (Bohemian). The Bulgarians have their own name for them, viz. Naručnici (narok, ‘destiny’) or they call them Orisnici, Urisnici, Uresici”²², Russian Dolya and Udelnica and Serbian Srecha²³ are similar to them as well as Živica, Deklica, etc.; thus, worship of them appears to be “one of Common Slavic ancient remains”²⁴. According to folklore sources, it is known that women, often wearing something white, sometimes holding candles and wearing wreaths on the head, and “the Bohemians believe that after sending deep sleep upon a woman lying in childbed, the Destinies put the infant upon the table and decide his or her fate. Usually three Destinies appear, the third and oldest being the most powerful; but mention is also made of one, four, five, seven or nine, with a queen at their head”²⁵.

17. Mansikka 2005: 134-135.

18. Gal’kovskij 2013: 114-115.

19. Zubov 1995: 46-48.

20. Mansikka 2005: 140–141, 225; Gal’kovskij 2013: 358.

21. Rybakov 1981: 442.

22. Máchal 1918: 250.

23. *Ibid.*: 251-252.

24. Sreznevskij 1863: 10-21.

25. It also happens that there are two of them or even one for each person. See: *Ibid.*

Their decisions often thwart one another, but what the last says is decisive and will be fulfilled. The chief matters which they determine are how long the child will live, whether it will be rich or poor, and what will be the manner of its death. According to a wide-spread belief, the first spins, the second measures, and the third cuts off the thread whose length signifies the duration of life of the newborn mortal”²⁶. Similar ideas, known to the Slavic folk art (cf. poet Alexander Pushkin: “Three fair maidens, late one night / Sat and spun by candlelight”²⁷), have obviously parallels to Indo-European mythologies. Germanic deities of fate are three “Norns, those, who come to every baby born and endow with the fate”²⁸. The same archetype is revealed by the Roman Parcae and their analogies – Greek Moirai, on whom Hesiod writes that there were three of them, that “they assign misfortune and fortune to people at birth”²⁹, and who are also conceived as spinners. At the same time the role of Rožanicy is related not only to the fate: they are also ancestors, embodying progenitresses and particularly protecting women. This idea also has analogies: “Similarly the Roman Junones (protectors of women) were originally souls of the dead, while the Dísirs of Scandinavian mythology are spirits of deceased mothers that have become dispensers of fate”³⁰. It is also possible to find other analogies: in legends of European folklore on three fairies, or in Hittite (tracing back to Hurrians) *The Song of Ulikummi* (XIV century B.C.), in which “goddesses of fate and protecting goddesses” are repeatedly mentioned. Thus, “in the course of time in expositors’ consciousness an idea of deceased ancestors, whose cult had extremely great propagation among the Slavs” joined to the “astrological meaning of Rod and Rožanicy <...>: Rod and Rožanicy seemed to the expositor to be identical with the deceased relatives”³¹. In this connection it is worth noting considerable similarity of worshipping such characters as Rod, Domovoj and, for example, Bulgarian Stopan: meals were sacrificed to all of them, all of them were considered to be masters of the fate of their descendants, and it is possible to easily find (and in Rod’s case fairly suppose) in worship of them the image of the deceased ancestor³².

26. Máchal 1918: 250-251.

27. In Russian original: “Три девицы под окном / Пряли поздно вечерком..”. Puškin 1982: 339. Every Russian knows this fairy-tale.

28. *Prose Edda, Gylfaginning*, 15.

29. Hesiod, *Theogony*, Lines 218-219.

30. Máchal 1918: 249.

31. Mansikka 2005: 135.

32. Máchal 1918: 238-240.

Let us make the first conclusions. First of all, Rod and Rožanicy appear to be the embodiment of the fate, at the same time in paganism Rod probably gave people souls, and Rožanicy – the fate. Moreover, meal is set for them and respect is properly shown; thus, Rod is a set of ancestors, deified kind of man and soul creator. Perhaps, they are gods, but not main in pagan time: their value increased just after baptism (when real main gods disappeared). Ancestors, not gods, were the basis of this cult: and that's why cult of Rod and Rožanicy exceeded meaning of other pagan gods in some late period, after all Christianity favored ancestor respect too.

Now, having briefly considered the data, which old texts and folklore provide us, we will examine Rybakov's idea of Rod and Rožanicy. He writes quite a lot about them and devote at least almost two chapters (out of ten) to them in *The paganism of early Slavs*³³. His quoting of Galkovsky is fair as Galkovsky stated that the issue of Rod and Rožanicy was one of the most complex and complicated, however, it is strange that distinguishing general trends of its examination, he only notes the approach to Rod as Domovoj (absolute identity of whom he fairly denies³⁴), without trying to analyze for some reason, say, V. L. Komarovich's view that "Rod is a set of ancestors of a particular family"³⁵, Rybakov criticizes his entirely different theses³⁶. Subjecting the remark that Rozhanicy were brought together with astrology to criticism and pointing to the fact that in this case we deal with homonym, Rybakov, however, does not even have a thought that similar property could be one of Rozhanicy's attributes, which is just confirmed by this homonymy³⁷.

One of Rybakov's main arguments in favour of interpretation of "Rod as significant Slavic deity"³⁸ is notorious "periodization" of the author of "The Tale of Idols", which reports that "*the Slavs began setting the meal to Rod and Rožanicy before Perun* (one of main Slavic gods, warrior and thunder god), *their*

33. Rybakov 1981: 438-470, chapter 8. "Род и Рожаницы" ("Rod and Rožanicy").

34. *Ibid.*: 438-441.

35. *Ibid.*: 439.

36. It is worth noting that the form of article does not allow considering in detail all aspects of views on Rod and Rozhanicy in the studies. E.g., following Komarovich, Rybakov considers that this cult was public and national (see *ibid.*: 439-440), while N. M. Galkovsky notes: "worship of Rod and Rožanicy was a family thing, the private one" (Gal'kovskij 2013: 120); it is possible to distinguish a lot of similar views.

37. Rybakov 1981: 441.

38. *Ibid.*: 443.

deity. And before treba (a sacrifice) was made to Upirs (vampires) and Berehinyas (water spirits, sometimes emerged from drowned people, close to Samodivas)³⁹. Out of this actually unremarkable phrase, which does not develop in *The Tale of Idols*, Rybakov makes quite significant conclusions. Thus, he draws up a picture, according to which he clearly identifies historical periods, social formations and technological innovations. Relying upon only one phrase, Rybakov starts examining material only in those limits which he has just outlined, forgetting about the fact that there are other sources and that it is firstly necessary to approach to this very “periodization” critically. Meanwhile, in several decades prior to that, E. V. Anichkov has almost undoubtedly proved that acknowledged diversity and mosaicism of the text by Rybakov⁴⁰ is explained by the plenty of insertions and later additions⁴¹. L. R. Prozorov’s remarkable short article convincingly shows that information on the Slavs’ order of worship of Upirs and Berehinyas, later – of Rod and Rozhanicy, and finally of Perun in the stated quotation of ancient *The Tale of Idols* should be perceived as description of the ritual stages rather than the evolution stages of religion, which, undoubtedly, was unknown to the Old Russian scribe. L.R. Prozorov confirms his theory not only with extra Slavic medieval and ethnographical materials, but with surprisingly eloquent analogies from Indian culture⁴². However, Rybakov continues seeing intrinsic logic through “incompleteness, as it were the draft of *The Tale*”⁴³. Out of these lines he at once understands that it is Metholithic period and the late Stone Age when Upirs and Berehinyas were worshipped, that they were origins embodying evil and good, respectively, although he at once admits that we do not have even close data on these creatures in terms of time. As for Metholithic period, it is early to apply even Proto-Indo-European religion⁴⁴ to this period, and we know little about its very grounds. However, Rybakov continues developing his idea in I and VIII chapters of *The Paganism of early Slavs*, without particularly attracting at least any sources on this topic. The same relates to Rod that is, according to Rybakov, a dominating deity at the period of transfer “from appropriating economy to

39. Translation from Old Russian is ours. In the original: «словенѣ начали тряпезу ставити, родоу и рожаницямъ, переже перуона бога ихъ. А преже того клади требы оупиремъ и берегынямъ» (Gal’kovskij 2013: 288-289).

40. Rybakov 1981: 11-12.

41. Aniĉkov 2009: 101-120.

42. Prozorov 2017: 55-57.

43. Rybakov 1981: 12.

44. Eliade 2002: 174-178.

producing one”⁴⁵, i.e. from the beginning of the late Stone Age to nearly historical time, when, according to Rybakov, Perun strengthened himself as the main deity. Meanwhile, in the middle of VI century Procopius of Caesarea noted: the Slavs “consider that it is only the God, creator of lightning, that is the lord over people, bulls are sacrificed to him and people perform other solemn rites”⁴⁶. However, Rybakov considers Rod rather than Perun a creator of lightning; he puts forward many other original (whether defensible?) assumptions instead of arguments, just adding that it “could be”. As a result, Rybakov concludes that Rod is a deity of “the universe, the whole nature and fertility”, and Rožanicy take the same place which was taken by humble to Zeus Moirai in Greek mythology. At the same time, there are only two Rožanicy, for the author could be able to find only such an example in well-known to him archaeological materials⁴⁷. In order to verify the fact of Rod significance, Rybakov notes that monotheistic Christianity contrasted the only God with Rod. But what could the Christianity contrast with any pagan deity instead of the only God?

It is worthy of respect that in contrast to many other authors, Rybakov pays particular attention to Rod rather than Rožanicy, despite the fact that Rod, in essence, is unknown from folklore and ethnographic materials, what makes this material more complicated for any conclusions. However, Rybakov’s conclusions are quite controversial. The academician says that “manifold complex of Old Russian words contains ‘rod’ root”⁴⁸ may play a significant role in explanation of Rod’s properties and functions, at the same time associating him with water (e.g. Russian *родник* [*rodnik*] – ‘spring’), nature (e.g. Russian *природа* [*priroda*] – ‘nature’, etc. from root *родить* – ‘to spawn, birth’), red colour and even with ball lightning, without ever coming to the most evident conclusion that Rod could be a deity of... family (Russian *род* [*rod*]). Thus, it would be more logical for Rybakov to come to a justified conclusion that Rod is a Parent (Slavic *родитель* [*roditel’*]) as well. His conclusion regarding relations between the symbolism of the 6-wire wheel and Rod is highly questionable, in essence, he does not advance any argument in favour of that aside from the fact that this symbol related to the light and the main deity that suddenly became Rod in the course of another Rybakov’s speculation. There are also no grounds for the comparison between “main” East Slavic deity, Rod, and the main deity of West Slavic Rani tribe, Sventovit,

45. Rybakov 1981: 20.

46. Procopius of Caesarea, *Gothic War*, III.14.

47. Rybakov 1981: 24.

48. *Ibid.*: 451.



that is considered by the academician, focusing on his own interpretations of well-known Zbruč idol rather than the texts of Helmold and Saxo Grammaticus, having reliably described worship of him⁴⁹.

Idol from Fischerinsel
*XI-XII century, oaken statue of
West Slavic Veleti tribe, found
in 1969 at Fischerinsel island in
Tollensee lake, Germany.*
Neubrandenburg Regional
Museum.

As for Zbruč idol, even the correlation between him and Sventovit is in no way proven, what is also admitted by Rybakov⁵⁰, let alone bringing

together Rod and Sventovit. However, Rybakov devotes several pages to the examination of this idol as Rod (perhaps allegedly uniting several cults, because on Zbruč idol there are several characters). To this day, Rybakov's interpretation of the Zbruč idol's images, completely unreliable, is the most widely known.

Addressing to other idols, Rybakov talks about Rožanicy, insisting that there were two of them, although folklore shows different numbers of them, and the dominated one is three. As a result, the academician refers to Rožanicy as

49. Main sources (XII–XIIIth centuries) about West Slavic god Sventovit: Helmold of Bosau, *Chronica Slavorum*, I, 52, II, 12; Saxo Grammaticus, *Gesta Danorum*, XIV.39.

50. Rybakov 1981: 462. Zbruč idol (X–XI centuries, limestone statue of some East (or West?) Slavs, found in 1848 at Zbruč river, now Ukraine). Kept in Archaeological Museum of Kraków. Criticism of its non-Slavic or late origin is not sufficiently thorough.

famous dual idol from Fischerinsel (XI–XII century, oaken statue of West Slavic Veleti tribe, found in 1969 at island in Tollense lake, Germany), without paying attention to the fact that these “Rožanicy” have moustache⁵¹.

The academican refers only to Siberian and Greek myths, unlikely containing any data on Rod and Rožanicy, as an argument in favour of their duality. The only assumption, which, however, also requires further studies, is an idea that among other things the cult of Rod and Rožanicy could have an agrarian essence as well⁵². Boris Aleksandrovich’s view regarding the identification of Rožanicy as Lada, Lelya and other goddesses⁵³ is also highly questionable.

A valid question arises: if Rod was the main Slavic deity, why, even if it is possible to explain absence of idols to him by the exclusiveness of his properties, he was nowhere mentioned as the main one? Why was he mentioned only in Russian sources? Why do chronicles keep silent about him, why does not he exist in any folklore (opposed to Rožanicy), why is he mentioned in no external sources as Perun, for example, why are there no manifestations of him in the cult of Christian saints or, on the contrary, in the late demonology as other main gods?

As we see, Rybakov overemphasizes Rod and raises Rožanicy to him; if his views of Rožanicy are not so far away from the generally accepted ones, rise of Rod is at the least groundless. Rybakov disagrees with the scientific majority and quite obvious sources data. The significant number of authors, starting with the earliest research, for example, that by I. I. Sreznevsky in 1855⁵⁴ (while study of them started in 1850s)⁵⁵, points to the interpretation of Rod and Rožanicy as the masters of fate and embodiment of ancestors and the whole family as well. Before Rybakov, as to this issue, the similar view was shared, for example, by A. N. Veselovskij⁵⁶, A. N. Sobolev⁵⁷, Jan Máchal⁵⁸, E. V. Anichkov⁵⁹, V. L. Komarovich⁶⁰, M. Gimbutas⁶¹ and others. Among the researchers, who

51. *Ibid.*: 465.

52. *Ibid.*: 469.

53. *Ibid.*: 465-470.

54. Sreznevskij 1855.

55. Klejn 2004: 182-183.

56. Veselovskij 1890: 192-261.

57. Sobolev 1999: 79-88.

58. Máchal 1918.

59. Aničkov 2009: 215-218.

60. Komarovič 1960: 84-104.

61. Gimbutas 2008: 207.

have written on that later, we may point out V. V. Ivanov and V. N. Toporov⁶², V. Y. Petrukhin⁶³, L. S. Klejn⁶⁴ etc. Finally, it is worth making a reservation that, although Procopius of Caesarea has written that the Slavs “do not know the fate and do not acknowledge it”, he then points out that they “make fortune-telling as well”⁶⁵. And as we see now, “surely, Procopius has noted not without the sense that the Slavs did not acknowledge the fate, but they acknowledged goodness and power of the divine intent”⁶⁶, that the fate is not blind and automatic for them, but it is embodied by some deities, namely Rod and Rožanicy, what Rybakov has never admitted, having drawn up original but generally groundless theory on Rod as an absolute and supreme deity of the Slavic paganism.

This article was first published in Russian: Kutarev O. V., « Charakteristika Roda i Rožanic v Slavjanskoj mifologii : interpretacii B. A. Rybakova i ego predšestvennikov », *Religiovedenie*, 2013, 4, 170-177. It is amended a little for this edition.

References

- Aničkov, E. V., 2009: *Jazyčestvo i Drevnjaja Rus'*. Moscow, Akademičeskij proekt.
- Buganov, V. I., Žukovskaja, L. P., Rybakov B. A., 2004: “Mnimaja «drevnejšaja letopis' »”, in O. V. Tvorogov, A. A. Alekseev (eds.), *Čto dumajum učenye o «Veselovoj knige»*. Saint-Petersburg, Nauka, 38-46.
- Egorov, V. B., 2012: “Kogda voznikla Kievskaja Rus'?”, *Istorija v podrobnostjax*, 2012, 3, 32-43.
- Eliade, M., 2002: *Istorija very i religioznyx idej*, T. 1. Moscow, Kriterion.
- Gajdukov, A. V., 2004: “Legitimnost' slavjanskogo neojazyčstva: osobennosti vzaimootnošenija s gosudarstvennoj vlast'ju”, *Gercenovskie čtenija: Aktual'nye problemy social'nyx nauk*. Saint-Petersburg, ElekSis, 274-278.
- Gal'kovskij, N. M., 2013: *Bor'ba xristianstva s ostatkami jazyčestva v Drevnej Rusi*. Moscow, Akademičeskij proekt.
- Gimbutas, M., 2008: *Slavjane. Syny Peruna*. Moscow, Centrpoligraf.
- Ivanov, V. V., Toporov, V. N., 1995: “Rod”, *Slavjanskaja mifologija. Enciklopedičeskij slovar'*. Moscow, Ellis Lak, 335.
- Klejn, L. S., 2004: *Voskrešenie Peruna. K rekonstrukcii vostočnoslavjanskogo jazyčestva*. Saint-Petersburg, Evrazija.
- Klejn, L. S., 2011: “Akademik Rybakov i partijnaja linija”, *Troickij variant*, 2011, 73, 14.

62. Ivanov, Toporov 1995.

63. Petrukhin 2000: 236-243.

64. Klejn 2004: 182-196.

65. Procopius of Caesarea, *Gothic War*, III.14.

66. Sreznevskij 1863: 14.

- Komarovič, V. L., 1960: "Kul't Roda i zemli v knjažeskoj srede XI–XIII vv.," *Trudy otdela drevnerusskoj literatury*, XVI, 84-104.
- Kutarev, O. V., 2014: "Neojazyčestvo Evropy", *Filosofija i kul'tura*, 2014, 12, 1801-1810.
- Máchal, J., 1918: "Slavic Mythology", *Mythology of all races*, Vol. III. *Celtic and Slavic Mythology*. Boston, Marshall Jones Company, 215-330, 351-361 (Notes), 389-398 (Bibliography).
- Mansikka, V. J., 2005: *Religija vostočnyx slavjan*. Moscow, IMLI RAN.
- Novoseļcev, A. P., 1993: "«Mir istorii» ili mif istorii?", *Voprosy istorii*, 1993, 1, 23-32.
- Petruxin, V. Ja., 2000: *Drevnjaja Rus'. Narod. Knjaz'ja. Religija*, in *Iz istorii russkoj kul'tury*. Moscow, Jazyki russkoj kul'tury, 11-410.
- Pis'mennye pamjatniki istorii Drevnej Rusi*, 2003: *Pis'mennye pamjatniki istorii Drevnej Rusi*. Saint-Petersburg, Blic.
- Prozorov, L. R., 2017: "Preže Peruna, boga ix': k voprosu o mnimoj 'periodizacii slavjanskogo jazyčestva'", *Vostočno-Evropskij naučnyj vestnik*, 2017, 3, 55-57.
- Puškin, A. S., 1982: "Skazka o care Saltane", in Puškin, A. S., *Sočinenija v 2 t.*, T. 1. Moscow, Xudožestvennaja literatura, 339-348.
- Rybakov, B. A., 1981: *Jazyčestvo drevnix slavjan*. Moscow, Nauka.
- Rybakov, B. A., 1987: *Jazyčestvo Drevnej Rusi*. Moscow, Nauka.
- Sobolev, A. N., 1999: *Zagrobnyj mir po drevnerusskim predstavlenijam*. Saint-Petersburg, Lan'.
- Sreznevskij, I. I., 1855: *Roženicy u slavjan i drygix jazyčeskix narodov*. Moscow, Tipografija A. Semena.
- Sreznevskij, I. I., 1863: *Drevnie pamjatniki. Izvestija Imperatorskoj Akademii nauk po Otdeleniju russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti*, T. 10, vyp. 7. Saint-Peterburg, Imperatorskaja Akademiya Nauk.
- Veselovskij, A. N., 1890: "Razyskanija v oblasti russkogo duxovnogogo stixa", Gl. XIII, "Sud'ba-Dolja v narodnyx predstavleniax slavjan", *Otdelenie russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti*, 1890, 46, 6, 172-261.
- Zubov, N. I., 1995: "Naučnye fantomy slavjanskogo Olimpa", *Živaja starina*, 1995, 3 (7), 46-48.

Table of contents

Foreword.....	p. 5
Jiří Dynda, Slavic Anthropogony Myths. Body and Corporeality in the Slavic Narratives about the Creation of Man	p. 7
Alexander V. Ivanenko, Towards the PSl. * <i>stribogъ</i> origin	p. 25
Oleg V. Kutarev, Description of Rod and Rožanicy in Slavic mythology. B. A. Rybakov and his predecessor's interpretations ...	p. 33
Kamil Kajkowski, Idols of the Western Slavs in the Early Medieval period. The example of Pomerania (northern Poland)	p. 47
Stamatis Zochios, Slavic deities of death. Looking for a needle in the haystack	p. 69
Marina M. Valentsova, Slovak mythological vocabulary on the Common Slavic background. Ethno-linguistic aspect.....	p. 99
Aleksandr Koptev, Mythological triadism as the paradigm of princely succession in early Rus' according to the <i>Primary Chronicle</i>	p. 127
Patrice Lajoie, Sovereigns and sovereignty among pagan Slavs	p. 165
Roman Zaroff, Some aspects of pre-Christian Baltic religion	p. 183

