

Yulia Mikhailova  
New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology

Angels for Pagans: The Discourse on Angels in the *Hypatian Codex* as a Conceptualization of Cooperation between Christian Slavs and Pagan Turks in Southern Rus

I will discuss the composition and the meaning of a “learned” digression on angels found in the *Hypatian* redaction of the *Primary Chronicle* under 6618-19 (1110-11), which so far has not received much scholarly attention. I will try to show that this is a highly original and sophisticated text that has been unjustifiably neglected by the scholars of Russian<sup>1</sup> religious and intellectual history.

First, let me give you some background. The *Hypatian Codex*<sup>2</sup> contains the *Hypatian Chronicle* believed to have been compiled in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century; the manuscript has been dated to the early fifteenth century on the basis of paleographical evidence. The *Hypatian* begins with the *Primary Chronicle*, which seamlessly transitions into a continuation known as the *Kievan Chronicle*; it is then followed by the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*.

The entries containing the passage on angels are found at the very end of the *Hypatian* version of the *Primary Chronicle*. These entries describe the well-known 1111 campaign against the Polovtsy organized by Vladimir Monomakh. According to the chronicler, Monomakh was inspired to fight the Polovtsy by an angel who appeared in the Kievan Caves monastery in the form of a fiery pillar; during the battle, angels helped the Russian troops. This information is present in all the redactions of the *Primary Chronicle*. However, only the *Hypatian* version contains the long theoretical discussion of angels, which is the subject of my presentation.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Recently, “Russian” (*ruskii* in Russian and Ukrainian scholarship) has been increasingly common as an adjective referring to Rus’.

<sup>2</sup>A. A. Shakhmatov, ed., *Ipatevskaia letopis*, Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei, vol. 2. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaia archeograficheskaia komissia, 1908); reprinted: Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 1998, with a new introduction by B. M. Kloss and a new index); hereafter PSRL 2; Omeljan Pritsak, ed. *The Old Rus’ Kievan and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles: The Ostroz’ky and Cetvertyns’kyj Codices*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature: Text Series 8 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990).

<sup>3</sup>PSRL 2, 260-264, 268-273; Donald Ostrowski, ed. and coll., with David Birnbaum and Horace G. Lunt, *The Povest’ vremennykh let: An Interlinear Collation and Paradosis*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Text Series 10 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003; hereafter PVL), vol. 3, 2162-5.

There are several reasons why this discussion deserves scholarly attention. For one thing, this is the most heavily referenced passage in all the *Primary Chronicle*: it contains more erudite quotations than any other part of the *Primary Chronicle*, and possibly more than any part of any other Russian chronicle. The sources of quotations include the Scripture, the *Commentary on Daniel* by Hippolytus of Rome, the treatise *On Weights and Measures* by Epiphanius of Salamis, the Alexandrian legend, and the excerpt from *Chronicle* by George Hamartolos, which, in its turn, contains references to the same work by Epiphanius and to *Oratio in Synaxin archangelorum* by the early Christian author known as pseudo-Chrysostom. This alone makes the discourse on angels an important text for studying Russian intellectual history.

Furthermore, Simon Franklin, who analyzed the uses of the translated Greek works in some other parts of the *Primary Chronicle*, demonstrated that the borrowings were “functional,” that is, the chronicler used these works not to show off his erudition or to produce a literary effect, but to make statements about contemporary issues, which were important for him and his readers.<sup>4</sup> However, the purpose and the function of the stream of quotations in the entries for 1110-1111 remain unclear, and this impedes our understanding of the *Primary Chronicle* in general. Does the passage about angels demonstrate a change of attitude towards the use of the “learned” sources? Are they included simply to show that the chronicler was familiar with them? If yes, what are the reasons for the difference between the use of the translated works in the earlier parts of the *Chronicle* and in the entries for 1110-1111? On the other hand, if there is no change of attitude, and the borrowings in the entries for 1110-1111 are functional, just as the borrowings in the earlier parts of the *Chronicle* are, what is their function? Thus, an understanding of the discourse on angels is important for our understanding of the *Primary Chronicle* in general. Finally, I hope to show a value of this discourse for an interpretation of ethnic

---

<sup>4</sup>Simon Franklin, “The Reception of Byzantine Culture by the Slavs,” *The 17<sup>th</sup> International Byzantine Congress: Major Papers* (New York: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1986), 385-97.

relations in southern Rus.<sup>5</sup>

To my knowledge, so far the content of the discourse on angels has been discussed in scholarly literature only twice; both times rather briefly.<sup>6</sup> The first scholar who paid attention to the *Hypatian* entries for 1110-11 was André Vaillant. Back in 1957, he identified the sources of some of the erudite quotations in these entries.<sup>7</sup> This was, of course, an important contribution; however, when it came to the meaning of these quotations, Vaillant stated that, essentially, there was none. He sees the entries for 1110-1111 as awkward reworkings of random passages from the texts which the chronicler did not understand and which he, therefore, used out of place. Vaillant suggests that the discourse about angels was produced by the unskillful continuator of the *Primary Chronicle*. He argues that this hypothetical continuator ineptly used the notes of his predecessor, Sylvester, who had prepared the materials, but did not have a chance to finish his work. The continuator's ineptitude and his misunderstanding of the texts that he quotes are evident from his outlandish statement that there is a special angel appointed to the Polovtsy.<sup>8</sup> This interpretation remained unchallenged for half a century, until Alan Timberlake discussed the discourse on angels in connection with the textual history of the *Primary Chronicle*. Timberlake hypothesizes that the latter part of the *Primary Chronicle* was written by “two chroniclers who expressed two different views of history.” One of them “had a naive and linear ... view of the world: if we suffer, it is because God punishes us.” The digression on angels belongs to the other chronicler, who had “a more flexible, more dialectic point of view, one that appreciates ambiguities and alternative points of view.” This flexibility is exemplified by the chronicler's idea that “God's

---

<sup>5</sup>In this paper, the term “Rus” is used for the territory which included all the principalities ruled by the Rurikids. As is well known, in the sources, the word “Rus” often signifies the area on the middle Dnieper encompassing the Kievan, Pereiaslav' and Chernigov principalities. I refer to this territory on the middle Dnieper as “southern Rus.”

<sup>6</sup>In addition to these two instances, the entries for 1110-11 have been discussed in connection with the textual history of the *Primary Chronicle*, but the scholars who examined them in order to reconstruct the hypothetical history of the process of the compilation of the *Chronicle* have not analyzed the content and the message of the discourse on angels for its own sake. For a review of the treatments of the entries for 1110-11 by the scholars of the textual history of the *Primary Chronicle* and for a recent interpretations of these entries from the textological perspective, see A. A. Gippius, “K probleme redaktsii Povesti vremennykh let II,” *Slavianovedenie* 2 (2008): 3-24, at 13-18.

<sup>7</sup>André Vaillant, “Les citations des années 1110-1111 dans la chronique de Kiev,” *Byzantinoslavica* 18 (1957): 18-38.

<sup>8</sup>Vaillant, “Les citations,” 19-21.

interference in history is not linear ... angels are sometimes beneficent, sometimes malevolent.”<sup>9</sup>

Such explanation, however, creates more problems than it solves. Even if we accept the idea that the chronicler held the otherwise unattested belief in malevolent angels, it is still unclear why the scribes kept copying and transmitting this heretical statement. In fact, the chronicler's argument that the Polovtsy, whom God sent to Rus “on account of our sins,” were being “led by an angel according to God's command,”<sup>10</sup> does not present the angel of the Polovtsy as malevolent: he simply fulfills the will of God, as angels always do.<sup>11</sup> The author of this passage does not challenge the “naive and linear” idea that “we suffer ... because God punishes us.” Rather, in accordance with the providential concept of history in the *Primary Chronicle*, he explains the mechanism of this punishment.<sup>12</sup>

Some scholars point out that the digression on angels may have been inserted by the compiler of the *Hypatian Codex* in the fifteenth century.<sup>13</sup> In this case, the question about its meaning and the motives of the compiler remains. Why did he insert this long digression into the account about the Polovtsian raids and the retaliating campaign of the Rus princes? Other chronicle entries in the *Hypatian Codex* are free from such interpolations. The meaning and the purpose of the discourse on angels require an explanation, regardless of whether it was written in the twelfth or in the fifteenth century, or at some time in between.

I suggest that this discourse is a statement on the controversial issue about the relationships between Christians and pagans in southern Rus. The problem of relations with different kinds of pagans

---

<sup>9</sup>Alan Timberlake, “Redactions of the *Primary Chronicle*,” *Russkii iazyk v nauchnom osveshchenii* 1 (2001), 217-18. 10PSRL 2, 262-3.

<sup>11</sup>Angels “cannot go against the will of God.” PSRL 2, 264. When God commands the angel of any land to lead the people of this land to war, “the angel of that land does not disobey God's command.” PSRL 2, 162. The statement has a general character: it applies to angels appointed to all lands, not just to the Cumans.

<sup>12</sup>On the providential concept of history in the *Primary Chronicle* see David Prestel, “Plody provideniia: iazycheskaia i sviashchennaia istoriia v Povesti vremennykh let,” *Rossica Antiqua* 4 (2011/12): 23-42.

<sup>13</sup>Horace G. Lunt and Moshe Taube, “Early East Slavic Translations from Hebrew?” *Russian Linguistics* 12 (1988), 156; Francis J. Thompson, “‘Made in Russia’. A Survey of the Translations Allegedly Made in Kievan Russia,” *Millennium Russiae Christianae. Tausen Jahre Christliches Russland 988-1988: Vortraege des Symposiums anlaesslich der Tausendjahrfeier der Christianisierung Russlands* (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 1993), 342.

plays a prominent role in the *Primary Chronicle*.<sup>14</sup> The later part of the *Chronicle*, in particular, has the Polovtsy as one of its main topic. In the *Kievan Chronicle*, which continues the *Primary* in the *Hypatian*, “pagans” also occupy a prominent place. In the *Kievan*, those pagans are not only the Polovtsy, but also the federation of the Turkic nomads known as the Chernye Klobutsi, the Black Caps. They lived in the Rus' southern borderland as an autonomous group that recognized the overlordship of Russian princes and performed military service for them in exchange for land and protection. Their most important task was to protect the Russian border from the Polovtsy, who often were a common enemy of both Rus and the non-Polovtsian Turks.<sup>15</sup> In addition, the Polovtsy themselves consisted of different groups, and each group had its own policy towards Rus and towards various nomadic peoples.

Thus, in practice, the relations between Rus and the steppe were, in the words of Peter Golden, “complex” and “multi-faceted” rather than invariably hostile.<sup>16</sup> However, it has been generally believed that the Russian literature did not reflect this complexity. Leonid Chekin expressed the commonly held view when he described the “image of the steppe” in the Russian chronicles as predominantly negative.<sup>17</sup> According to him, the steppe peoples were presented as “the essence of barbarity” and “were not conceptualized in terms of the image of the inhabitable world, ecumene.”<sup>18</sup>

Elsewhere, I tried to show that there was no single “image of the steppe” in the Russian chronicles.<sup>19</sup> The view of the pagan nomads described by Chekin is typical of the authors who worked

---

14See Donald Ostrowski, “Pagan Past and Christian Identity in the *Primary Chronicle*,” in Ildar H. Garipzanov, ed., *Historical Narratives and Christian Identity on a European Periphery: Early History Writing in Northern, East-Central, and Eastern Europe*, c.1070–1200 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 229-53.

15On the Black Caps, see A. Pletneva, *Drevnosti Chernykh Klobukov* (Moscow: Nauka, 1973); Peter B. Golden, “The Cernii Klobouci,” in idem, *Nomads and their Neighbours in the Russian Steppe*, Variorum Collected Studies Series, CS752 (London, UK: Ashgate, 2003), 97-107.

16Peter B. Golden, *Nomads and their Neighbours in the Russian Steppe*, Variorum Collected Studies Series, CS752 (London, UK: Ashgate, 2003), 97.

17Leonid S. Chekin, “The Godless Ishmaelites: The Image of the Steppe in Eleventh-Thirteenth-Century Rus’,” *Russian History* 19 (1992): 9-28.

18Chekin, “Godless Ishmaelites,” 11.

19Yulia Mikhailova, “Christians and Pagans' in the Chronicles of Pre-Mongolian Rus: Beyond the Dichotomy of 'Good Us' and 'Bad Them',” in Christian Lübke, Ilmira Miftakhova and Wolfram von Scheliha, eds., *Geschichte der Slavia Asiatica: Quellenkundliche Probleme* (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2013), 22-51.

in places located far away from the steppe, such as Suzdalia and Novgorod. They apparently shared the attitude that was predominant among the Christian European writers, for most of whom both pagans and nomads were distant, incomprehensible beings living on the margins of the world. According to scholars of the medieval West, “a dichotomy of good Christian and bad pagan, 'us' and 'them',” was typical of the medieval Christian descriptions of the world.<sup>20</sup> If any “pagan” was already the bad other, the “nomadic other” was perceived as “especially repellent.”<sup>21</sup>

However, southern Rus, which was, in essence, a borderland between the worlds of the Christian agriculturalists and pagan nomads, presented a special case. For a chronicler located in Kiev or Pereiaslavl, the Turkic nomads were not exotic monsters, but rather close and well-familiar, albeit at times troublesome, neighbors. The *Kievan Chronicle* often represents the “pagans” neutrally, or even positively.<sup>22</sup> I propose to look at the discourse on angels as a theoretical justification for such representations.

The author's polemical tone, his repeated objections to hypothetical opponents, appear to indicate that he was more concerned with pressing contemporary problems than with abstract theological questions. The author discusses angels not for their own sake, but to bolster his original theory about the role of pagan peoples in God's plan for humanity. The erudite quotations are part of a rather elaborate argumentation that supports this theory.

First, the quotation from Epiphanius establishes that God created angels of the elements and forces of nature:

As the wise Epiphanius writes, an angel is appointed to each creation, to clouds, and fogs, and snow, and hail, and frost. There are angels for sounds and for thunders, angels of winter, of heat, of autumn, spring, and summer. And [angels are appointed] to all the spirits of his creation on the earth and to secret abysses and to those hidden under the earth.<sup>23</sup>

---

20Suzanne Conklin Akbari, “From Due East to True North: Orientalism and Orientation,” in *The Postcolonial Middle Ages*, ed. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), 20.

21Uebel, “Unthinking the Monster,” 269.

22See Mikhailova, “Christians and Pagans,” 33-9.

23PSRL 2, 262. On this quotation, see Vaillant, “Les citations,” 22-24, where the original passage in Greek is quoted with reference to G. Dindorfius, *Epiphanii episcopi Constantinae opera*, vol. IV, part I (Leipzig: 1862), 27; Simon Franklin,

Next, the chronicler extrapolates that, therefore, angels are also appointed to lands and peoples, even though Epiphanius does not mention them explicitly:

... Angels are appointed to all creation. In the same way, an angel is appointed to every given land in order to take care of each land, even if the land is pagan. In case of God's anger at a certain land, God commands an angel of [another] land to wage a war against the [guilty] land. Hence, the angel of that land does not disobey God's command. It happened thus when God sent pagan aliens against us on account of our sins ... for they were being led by an angel by God's command.<sup>24</sup>

The author expects objections to this rather unusual statement, and he is ready to refute them: "If someone says that pagans do not have angels, let him listen how Alexander of Macedon," when he was planning a campaign against the Jews, had a vision of an angel who told him, "God sent me to restrain you [from taking Jerusalem]."<sup>25</sup> This angel also informed Alexander that he invisibly led Alexander and his troops. If Alexander, while being a pagan, was led by an angel, therefore, the author argues, it is possible for the Cumans to be led by an angel also:

Was not this an angel who led Alexander? Did not he win his victories while being a pagan? All Greeks were idol-worshippers. In the same way, these pagans [Cumans] were allowed to win on account of our sins.<sup>26</sup>

Now the author needs to solve the next problem, which is related to the controversial concept of an angel appointed to a collectivity, rather than to an individual. The author turns to the discussion of angels found in the *Chronicle* by George Hamartolos, who explains that only Christians and "the faithful" in the Old Testament have their personal angels,<sup>27</sup> but then he proceeds to show that a collectivity may also have an angel: "And Christ also appointed a guardian angel to each church, as St.

---

"Some Apocryphal Sources of Kievan Rus Historiography," *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 15 (1982): 5-6, 11-12. Franklin refers to unpublished manuscripts of historical compendia. One of them, which plays a central role in Franklin's argumentation, has been since published: *Letopisets Ellinskii i Rimskii*, ed. O. V. Tvorogov, and S. A. Davydova (St. Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 1999); for the quotation from Epiphanius see vol. 1, p. 3.

24PSRL 2, 262-3.

25PSRL 2, 263.

26PSRL 2, 264. On the legend about Alexander the Great, see A. A. Alekseev, "Perevody s drevneevreiskikh originalov v Drevnei Rusi," *Russian Linguistics* 11 (1987), 1-20; Horace G. Lunt and Moshe Taube, "Early East Slavic Translations from Hebrew?" *Russian Linguistics* 12 (1988), 156-7, 160-1; Francis J. Thompson, "'Made in Russia': A Survey of the Translations Allegedly Made in Kievan Russia," *Millennium Russiae Christianae. Tausen Jahre Christliches Russland 988-1988: Vortraege des Symposiums anlaesslich der Tausendjahrfeier der Christianisierung Russlands* (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 1993), 343.

27PSRL 2, 264, 270.

John reveals, saying, 'To the angel of church in Smyrna say ...' (Rev 2.8)<sup>28</sup> According to Hamartolos, "Great Epiphanius says that an angel is appointed to each people."<sup>29</sup> However, the chronicler seems to be aware that Epiphanius only states that an angel is appointed to each creation, and he does not explicitly include the peoples among these creations. Thus, the concept of the "angels of peoples" is still somewhat shaky, and the chronicler goes on to bolster it with evidence from the Old Testament. Quotations from the book of Daniel and from the *Commentary on Daniel* by Hyppolitus are used to prove that the Archangel Michael was appointed as the angel of the Jewish people as a whole.<sup>30</sup> Finally, the existence of the angel of the Jews is established with reference to the words of God to Moses, "I will not go with you, because you are stiff-necked people, but my angel will go with you" (Ex 33, 1-3).<sup>31</sup>

Rather than being an inept writer, the author of the entries for 1110-1111 demonstrates a good logic and a skillful use of his diverse sources. If angels were appointed to the Jewish people and to churches, his argument goes, then it is possible for a collectivity to have an angel. If Alexander the Great was led by an angel, then it is possible for a pagan to have an angel. Therefore, it is possible for a pagan collectivity – such as the Cumans – to have its own angel.

Another question debated in the entries for 1110-1111 is the role of angels in wars. In the chronicler's rendering of the passage from Exodus 33 quoted above, God refuses to go with the Jews *na put'*, which means "road," "journey" and "military campaign," and in the chronicles it is more often used in the latter sense.<sup>32</sup> Thus, the passage implies that the angel will go with the Jews on a campaign. "In the same way," Rus troops defeated the Cumans in 1111 with the help of God through intercession

---

28 PSRL 270-1.

29PSRL 2, 271; V. M. Istrin, ed., *Khronika Georgiia Amartola v drevnem slaviano-russkom perevode: Tekst, izsledovanie i slovar'* (Petrograd: Rossiiskaia Akademiia nauk, 1920), vol. 1, 162.

30PSRL 2, 271-273. On the quotation from Hyppolitus, the third-century bishop of Rome, see D. S. Likhachev, *Kommentarii*, 543; Francis J. Thomson, *The Reception of Byzantine Culture in Medieval Russia* (Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1999), 110-11.

31PSRL 2, 273.

32Monomakh describes his campaigns as *puti* (PSRL 1, 247). See also PSRL 2, 344.



of the Mother of God and the angels.<sup>33</sup> The decisive role of angels in this campaign is confirmed by the testimony of the Cuman prisoners, who saw “glowing and terrible” figures riding in the air and helping the Rus troops.<sup>34</sup> Earlier, an angel appeared in the form of a fiery pillar to foretell the victory; the chronicler uses quotations from the Scripture to show that angels often take this form when they appear to humans.<sup>35</sup> The pillar moved from the Kievan Cave monastery in the direction of the place where Vladimir Monomakh was at that time, which indicated that the angel went on to inspire Monomakh to organize the campaign.<sup>36</sup> All these angels were sent to help Rus, because the Mother of God and the angels appointed to “our pious princes” had prayed God to have mercy on the Christians.<sup>37</sup> Correspondingly, the Cumans won a victory in 1110 because they were led by the angel appointed to them by God.<sup>38</sup> From the perspective developed in the entries for 1110-1111, the Cumans are not inherently evil existential enemies of the Christians. In the military conflicts between Rus and the Cumans both sides are led by angels.

The chronicler apparently expected that his theory would be perceived as controversial, and he went out of his way to convince his opponents. Who were these opponents? They are not specified. All we know about them is that they did not believe that it was possible for pagans to have an angel. It would not be illogical to suggest that the author of the entries for 1110-1111 argued against the view of the steppe peoples as inherently evil and invariably hostile to Rus, the view reflected in some parts of the *Laurentian* and *Novgorodian First* chronicles.<sup>39</sup> The notion of angels appointed to pagan peoples entailed the possibility of positive interactions between them and the Christians, and the theory that the angel led the pagans to war according to God's command explained how such interactions could have

---

33PSRL 2, 273.

34PSRL 2, 268.

35PSRL 2, 260-261, 264.

36PSRL 2, 268.

37PSRL 2, 264.

38PSRL 2, 263.

39See Mikhailova, “Christians and Pagans,” 35-9.

existed in spite of intermittent hostilities.

The sentiment behind this theory is similar to the one expressed by the remark in the entry for 1068: “God sends aliens [as a chastisement]..., but internecine strife originates from the Devil.”<sup>40</sup> The pagans are not enemies of God, but rather his tools. They had their own place in Creation, just like the forces of nature to which they are implicitly compared. According to our author, pagan peoples have their own angels *because* “clouds, and fogs, and snow, and hail,” and other forces of nature have angels appointed to them. This implies a perception of the steppe peoples that corresponds to the type of inter-ethnic relations described by Fredrik Barth in his seminal work on what later came to be known as “borderland theory.” According to Barth, when interacting ethnic groups “occupy clearly distinct niches in the natural environment” and/or “monopolize separate territories,” they adapt to each other so that “other ethnic groups in the region become a part of the natural environment.”<sup>41</sup> This was exactly the case with Christian agriculturalists and pagan nomads in southern Rus, who occupied separate ecological niches.<sup>42</sup>

Thus, on the one hand, pagans belong to the morally neutral realm of nature, along with “clouds, and fogs, and cold, and hail.” On the other hand, the example of Alexander the Great shows that some pagans may even represent forces of good. It is all the more remarkable that elsewhere in the *Primary Chronicle*, Alexander is presented as the defender of civilization from the disgusting monstrous people whom he, with God's help, shut within the mountains so that they did not pollute the world. As we have seen, in the discourse on angels, the Polovtsy were directly and explicitly compared to Alexander and to the pagan ancient Greeks. In view of this, it is hardly fair to state that the Cumans

---

40PSRL 1, 167; PVL, vol. 2, 1335-6.

41Fredrik Barth, Introduction to idem, ed. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*, (first published Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1969; reprinted Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, 1998), 19.

42See Peter B. Golden, “Aspects of the Nomadic Factor in the Economic Development of Kievan Rus’,” in Ivan S. Koropeckyj, ed., *Ukrainian Economic History: Interpretive Essays* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991); S. A. Pletneva, “Polovetskaia zemlia,” in L. G. Beskrovnyi, V. A. Kuchkin, B. T. Pashuto, eds., *Drevnerusskie kniazhestva X-XIII vv.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1975).

were presented only as “the essence of barbarity” and “were not conceptualized in terms of the image of the inhabitable world, *ecumene*.”<sup>43</sup>

Thus, the discourse on angels, as I tried to show, asserts that positive interactions between Christians and pagans are possible and permissible, in spite of the ongoing military confrontation. Located at the very end of the *Primary Chronicle*, where it transitions into the *Kievan*, this discourse may be seen as both a conclusion to the *Hypatian* redaction of the *Primary Chronicle* and an introduction to the *Kievan* that prepares the reader for the numerous accounts of cooperation between the Russian princes and the “pagans” found in the latter. A remarkable feature of this discourse is the author's skill in arranging and interpreting quotations from diverse authorities to prove his point.

---

<sup>43</sup>Chekin, “Godless Ishmaelites,” 11.