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Abstract

The object of this study is a translation from Polish to Russian of the Polish historian Maciej Stryjkowski’s Kronika Polska, Litewska, Żmódzka i wszystkiej Rusi, made at the Diplomatic Chancellery in Moscow in 1673–79. The original of the chronicle, which relates the origin and early history of the Slavs, was published in 1582. This Russian translation, as well as the other East Slavic translations that are also discussed here, is preserved only in manuscripts, and only small excerpts have previously been published.

In the thesis, the twelve extant manuscripts of the 1673–79 translation are described and divided into three groups based on variant readings. It also includes an edition of three chapters of the translation, based on a manuscript kept in Uppsala University Library.

There was no standardized written language in 17th-century Russia. Instead, there were several co-existing norms, and the choice depended on the text genre. This study shows that the language of the edited chapters contains both originally Church Slavonic and East Slavic linguistic features, distributed in a way that is typical of the so-called hybrid register. Furthermore, some features vary greatly between manuscripts and between scribes within the manuscripts, which shows that the hybrid register allowed a certain degree of variation.

The translation was probably the joint work of several translators. Some minor changes were made in the text during the translation work, syntactic structures not found in the Polish original were occasionally used to emphasize the bookish character of the text, and measurements, names etc. were adapted to Russian norms. Nevertheless, influence from the Polish original can sometimes be noticed on the lexical and syntactic levels. All in all, this thesis is a comprehensive study of the language of the translated chronicle, which is a representative 17th-century text.
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1 Introduction

The language situation in late 17th-century Russia has received quite some attention from scholars. There was not yet a standardized literary language in Russia (cf. Chapter 4), and the various text genres could be grouped into four registers, which had their own traditions with different proportions of bookish and non-bookish linguistic features.

This was a time of intense contact with the Polish language, and many translations from Polish were made, of scientific works as well as literary texts. One of these translations is the object of the present study: the Polish historical text Kronika Polska Litewska/ Zmodzka/ y wszystkiey Rusi by Maciej Stryjkowski, printed in 1582 and translated into Russian several times in the late 17th century. One of the translations, made in 1673–79, will be in focus for reasons explained further on (cf. Section 3.4).

Through its combination of rich information on Russian history and methodical comparison of sources, this text has influenced Russian history writing for centuries, which has been well documented by scholars. Its language, however, has not been studied. During a time such as the late 17th century, with high translation activity and a growth of new genres, this translation was, one might say, at the intersection between an old tradition and new influence from foreign literature through translation.

Tradition played an important role since the register system was maintained through text orientation, i.e. scribes modeled their texts on earlier texts of a similar kind. This could show in the choice of words and phrases as well as of bookish or non-bookish linguistic features, and in the extent of the variation between them. Therefore, studying the language of this text as compared to other texts of the period will show not only where in the register system it was placed, but also how it related to different genres.

Since it is preserved in quite a few copies and since we know that its subject matter was influential, one may suppose that the language had an impact on later writings as well, again through text orientation. Therefore it deserves to be studied not only for its own sake, but as a contribution to our knowledge of the history of the Russian language.

---

1 Although a more accurate translation of the Russian term литературный язык may be ‘standard language,’ I will follow the practice of Slavists writing in English and use the term ‘literary language.’
This is one of many Russian texts from that period that have not been published, and therefore an important part of the thesis is an edition of a portion of the text.

1.1 Aim and outline of the study

The aim of the thesis is to give as full a picture as possible of the 1673–79 translation of Stryjkowski’s chronicle, especially its language. The first two chapters give background information. Chapter 1, the introduction, presents the material and method, defines some important terms and introduces some literature that will be used for reference throughout the thesis. Chapter 2 is about the author of the chronicle, Maciej Stryjkowski, and the original Polish text. This chapter also sketches the background of the historical context in which the chronicle was written and mentions some of the major tendencies in the historiography of the period.

The aim of Chapter 3 is to establish the manuscript situation and history of the 1673–79 translation. This chapter also gives the historical and cultural background for the East Slavic translations, provides information on those translators who are known by name and lists the manuscripts belonging to the other translations.

Chapter 4 contains a commentary on some morphological and syntactic features of the edited text against the background of the language situation in Russia in the 17th century. Focus is on those aspects that show variation between bookish and non-bookish forms and constructions. The aim is on the one hand to describe this particular text, and on the other hand to contribute to the knowledge of the language by setting the results in relation to previous studies on texts from that period.

To properly judge the language of the text, the relationship between the source text and the target text must be taken into account, and the translation technique is also an important field of study considering the great amount of translations made from Polish at this time. Therefore, Chapter 5 discusses translation theory in Russia during this period and comments on some aspects of the translation with the aim of identifying the norms by which the translators were guided. Through these translations, and through translators of Ruthenian or Polish origin (cf. Section 5.1), the Polish language exerted

---

2 The name ‘Ruthenia’ will be used in this thesis for the lands historically connected with Kievan Rus': parts of present-day Ukraine and Belarus. This term was in use until the 19th century (Niendorf 2006: 97). The name ‘Ukraine’ was first applied to the area around the Dnepr in the 16th century, and in the 17th century it was quite widely used about that area, although it was at this time not yet a sovereign state or a well-defined province. It was also applied to the Cossack Hetmanate (cf. Myl'nikov 1999: 77–81; Plokhy 2006: 316–320). I will use ‘Ukraine’ and ‘Ukrainian’ to refer to the area from the 17th century onwards, when my
influence on Russian. The study of lexical and syntactic polonisms in the text aims to determine their role and degree of integration in this text as well as their status in the Russian language of the time.

Naturally, different individuals would make different choices when translating. This particular text offers a chance to compare parts that were probably translated by different people. Chapter 6 attempts to determine the division of the text between them and at the same time to test criteria that in the future may help identify translators of 17th-century texts. For this purpose, the edited part of the text is compared with samples from other parts of the chronicle.

Chapter 7 contains a comparison of the text with original Russian chronicles from the same period and tries to determine what characterizes this translation as opposed to original chronicles. This is an attempt to contribute to the more general picture of the relationship between translated texts and existing genres.

Chapter 8 gives the editorial principles and describes the manuscripts used in the critical apparatus in more detail. Chapter 9 consists of a summary and conclusions, and the edition concludes the thesis as an appendix.

1.2 Editions of the Kronika: Polish and Russian

The original of the studied text, Maciej Stryjkowski’s Kronika Polska Litewska/ Zmodźka/ y wszystkiey Rusi, was printed in 1582 in Königsberg (hereafter called “the Kronika” or “the chronicle” – the latter only in unambiguous contexts, when it cannot be confused with Russian chronicles).

It was written in Polish with some dedications and quotes in Latin. The main part of it is written in prose, but some chapters or parts of chapters are written in verse, especially descriptions of battles.3 The text of the printed chronicle is paginated from 1 to 790, but as so often in early printed books, there are errors in the pagination. Only one of these will be mentioned here, since it falls within the chapters that are in focus in this study: there are two pages numbered 92, and they will be referred to as 921 and 922, respectively.

The chronicle proper is preceded by 42 unnumbered pages containing a list of sources, several dedications, a portrait of the author, his rhymed autobiography and a preface. References to these pages will be made using their signatures, e.g. A1r, where A refers to signature A, 1 to its first leaf and r to sources do so. For earlier periods, and when a less specific area is referred to, I will speak of ‘Ruthenia.’ For the corresponding language terminology, cf. Section 1.6.

3 Typical examples of the topics for verse sections can be found in headings such as O Bitwie pod Haliczem z Xiążęty Ruskimi/ y porażeniu ich od Polakow (chapter VI: 2, Stryjkowski 1582: 229) and O sławnej wojnie/ y szczęśliwey bitwie lągiedlowey y Witoldowey z Krzżaki Pruskimi/ y Xiążęty Niemieckiey Rzesze/ Roku 1410 (chapter XV: 1, Stryjkowski 1582: 521).
the recto side of the leaf. After the main text, there is an index of people, places and events (Reyestr/ álbo krotkie náznaczenie mieysc osobliwszych/ dla rychleyszegy y snádnieszego ználazenia). The chronicle is divided into 25 books with a varying number of chapters. The contents of the chronicle and the dedications are discussed in more detail in Section 2.3. Roman numerals will be used to designate the books of the chronicle, and Arabic numerals for the chapters. For instance, IV: 1 means book four, chapter one.

The next edition was printed in Warsaw in 1766 by Franciszek Bohomolec, who published it in the series Zbiór dziejopisów polskich (Stryjkowski 1766; cf. also Nowy Korbut 3: 297). Here, the punctuation has been modernized, and the orthography is slightly changed; for instance, the diaritical mark has been removed from á (a jasne) in most cases. Capitalization follows the 1582 edition closely in that not only proper names but also some other nouns were capitalized. The Kronika is followed by a history of Russia, Historia odmian w panstwe Rossyiskim, which deals with 18th-century events.

The latest edition of the Polish chronicle is a two-volume set published in 1846 and reprinted in 1985 (Stryjkowski [1846] 1985). It also has modernized punctuation and some changes in orthography, including the loss of the diaritical mark from á and the introduction of ó according to modern usage. Furthermore, y ‘and’ has been changed to modern i. Spellings with j have been introduced according to modern usage, e.g. ieden has been changed to jeden and Litewskiey to Litewskiéj (with ë for e pochylone). In the 1846 edition and the 1985 reprint, the text is preceded by two articles, one by Mikołaj Malinowski (Malinowski [1846] 1985) and one by Ignac Daniłowicz (Daniłowicz [1846] 1985). After the text of the chronicle, a few of Stryjkowski’s minor works are also published (cf. Section 2.2.2).

Quotes and references in this thesis will be made to the original edition from 1582, since some scholars have pointed out the shortcomings of the 1846 edition (e.g. Rothe 1983: 73; Wojtkowiak 1990: 21, 75). Since early prints can show individual peculiarities, four copies have been consulted: a microfilm version of a copy kept in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, a copy kept in the Cathedral Library in Strängnäs, Sweden, a copy kept in Wojewódzka Biblioteka Publiczna in Opole and one kept in Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich (the Ossolinski National Institute) in Wrocław. The latter two are accessible online on the digital library web sites www.obc.opole.pl and www.dbc.wroc.pl, respectively. No differences have been found between the copies that influence the reasoning in the thesis.

In some cases it has been desirable to be able to conduct a computer search for specific words, and for this purpose the 1846 edition has been

---

4 The chronicle does not follow the common practice of beginning with signature A. Instead, it begins with )( and )()(, which will here be cited as X and XX, and A is the third signature.
used. The first volume is searchable on the site Polska biblioteka internetowa (www.pbi.edu.pl). The second volume is to some extent searchable on Google Books, and certain parts of it have been converted to text files with the help of an OCR tool (www.newocr.com). The converted texts are not perfect, but have been considered sufficient for this purpose.

In the 17th century, the Polish text (in whole or in part) was translated into Ruthenian once and into Russian several times (for the terms ‘Ruthenian’ and ‘Russian,’ cf. Section 1.6). All these translations will be discussed in greater detail in Section 3.2. They are all preserved only in manuscripts, but parts of some of them have been published.

András Zoltán has published one small excerpt each from two of the Russian translations according to the manuscripts GIM Muzejskoe sobranie, no. 1391 (the 1673–79 translation, two folios) and GIM Uvarovskoe sobranie, no. 4 (the 1688 translation, three folios), once as diplomatic editions (Zoltán 2003) and later with variants from other manuscripts: RGB Egorovskoe sobranie, f. 98, no. 243 and BAN 31.4.32 for the 1673–79 translation and BAN 32.11.4, RGB Piskarëvskoe sobranie, f. 228, no. 171 and RGADA f. 181, no. 59 for the 1688 translation (Zoltán 2006).5

R. I. Avanesaũ (1961: 387–397) has published excerpts (approximately seven folios) from what he considered to be a Belorussian translation of the chronicle. Although the manuscript on which he based his edition is actually a copy of the Ukrainian Chronograph (cf. Section 3.2.6), Avanesaũ’s claim makes it justified to mention it here, as well as the fact that large parts are verbatim quotes from the Ruthenian translation of the Kronika.

According to the Polish biographical dictionary PSB (44: 540), the Obščestvo ljubitelej drevnej pis’mennosti in St. Petersburg and Komissija po izdaniju gosudarstvennych gramot i dogovorov in Moscow planned in the 1870s and 1880s to publish a bilingual edition of the Polish chronicle and its Russian translation, which never came to pass. The source of this information is not specified.

Aside from the editions, one of the most important titles among the secondary literature will be introduced here: the historian A. I. Rogov’s monograph Russko-pol’skie kul’turnye svjazi v épochu vozroždenija. Stryjkovskij i ego chronika (Rogov 1966). It is one of the major works on Stryjkowski’s sources, the reception of his chronicle in Russia and the manuscripts of the Russian translations and incorporates the results from earlier articles by the same scholar (Rogov 1963, 1965).

5 Cf. Sections 3.5 and 3.7 for more information on the different translations and manuscripts.
1.3 Material and method

As has already been mentioned, this thesis contains an edition of a portion of Stryjkowski’s chronicle in Russian translation, which is meant to contribute to the knowledge about the Russian language of the late 17th century. The edition aims at philologists and linguists, and great detail has therefore been observed on all linguistic levels (cf. Chapter 8).

Different aspects of the language in the translated chronicle have been studied. The Russian text in ms. U (UUB Slav 26–28), which is also the main manuscript of the edition (cf. Section 3.6.2), has served as the basis for the study. Depending on the nature of the various research questions, different portions of the text have been chosen as material.

The chapters that are the object of the edition, chapters IV: 1–3 (cf. Section 3.4), have been studied in detail. They will be described against the background of the language situation of the late 17th century, based on the assumption that there were several genre-dependent text traditions that were formed through the use of model texts (cf. Chapter 4). The description covers some morphological and syntactic features that display, or could be expected to display, variation, and the findings are set in relation to other 17th-century texts.

In other parts of the study, it is not sufficient to study only chapters IV: 1–3. Certain signs lead us to assume that the translation was the joint work of several people, and therefore some aspects of the language at the time are best described by comparing different parts of the text. These parts have been selected in the following way.

An estimate of the whole chronicle based on the distribution of verbal tenses referring to past events shows that some parts are dominated by the aorist and imperfect, some by the perfect tense. They alternate as illustrated by Table 1. The segments will be labeled A, B, C and D. This criterion alone does not reveal if there were two translators who worked on two parts each (A+C and B+D), three translators, one of whom worked on two parts (A+C, B and D or A, B+D and C), four who translated one part each, or even more (cf. Section 6.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Dominant tenses</th>
<th>Segment label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I–VI</td>
<td>Aorist/imperfect</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII–X</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI–XIV</td>
<td>Aorist/imperfect</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV–XXV</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the Kronika is a large text and it is difficult and time-consuming to work with such large amounts of manuscript text, sample chapters from each of the four segments have been chosen and compared. One set of sample
chapters is IV: 1–3, the chapters that are the object of the edition. For comparison, three consecutive chapters from each of the other segments have been chosen. The only criterion was that they had to be written in prose in the Polish original, since the translation of verse seems to differ from the translation of prose, at least as far as verbal tenses for past events are concerned (cf. Section 5.3.1). Table 2 shows the selected sample chapters and the approximate number of words they contain in the Russian translation according to ms. U.

Table 2. The sample chapters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Sample chapters</th>
<th>No. of words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>IV: 1–3</td>
<td>18,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>VIII: 3–5</td>
<td>5,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>XII: 3–5</td>
<td>5,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>XXIV: 3–5</td>
<td>7,380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These sample chapters have been used as material primarily in Chapter 6, where the validity of this preliminary division has been tested. Lexical and syntactic features – in comparison with the Polish original – have been chosen as criteria to distinguish between translators. It should be added that although the hypothesis of the different translators is not tested until Chapter 6, I will assume that it holds true and speak of “the translators” throughout the thesis, to avoid bulky constructions such as “the translator or translators”.

Special attention has been paid to the relationship between the Polish original, as found in the 1582 edition, and the translation. The existence of polonisms, lexical as well as syntactic, has been noted. These have been identified partly with the help of earlier studies, partly by observing glosses, alterations and varying translations in the text (cf. Chapter 5). All the sample chapters have been searched for polonisms, and the very fact that they were probably translated by different people has been helpful when characterizing lexical polonisms as more or less integrated into the Russian language (cf. Section 5.4.1).

Although ms. U is the main manuscript in the edition and provides the material for most of the thesis, some things could only be studied on the basis of another manuscript, ms. B (BAN 31.4.32). In this manuscript, corrections and alterations have been made throughout the text (cf. Section 3.6.1). Thus, in order to study the nature of these alterations, a different manuscript has been used as material than in other parts of the thesis, and examples have been taken from the whole text, not only the sample chapters.

The text has been compared with a variety of original chronicles in search of similarities and differences. Attempts have been made to identify syntactic constructions known to be typical for chronicles, and also fixed formulas and expressions (cf. Chapter 7).
Since this thesis views one text from several aspects, no single method has been applied, but in every part of the study, previous studies of a similar kind have been used and this text has been compared with their findings.

Cyrillic script is transliterated according to the recommendations of the journal Scando-Slavica, which are similar to the International Scholarly System. When discussing Ruthenians who were active in Muscovy, I use the Russian forms of their names. Longer passages from manuscripts are quoted according to the principles used in the edition, but accents and paerok have been omitted for greater legibility. Isolated words or short phrases quoted in the text have been slightly simplified with regard to graphical variation. Biblical quotes and names in English are given according to the King James Bible.

1.4 Historical interest

The Russian translations of the Kronika were held in high esteem in their time. One sign of this is that a manuscript containing the text was in the possession of tsar Fëdor Alekseevič, and passed on from him to Peter I (Zabelin 1915: 604; Luppov 1970: 115–116; Lukičev 2004: 340). Catherine II had a copy made for her when she studied Russian history (Rogov 1966: 276–277). Muscovite noble families turned to the chronicle to establish links between themselves and Polish nobility, and it served as an inspiration in the development of Russian heraldry (Sedov 2006: 401–402, 477).

This may say something about the status of the text, but its popularity is perhaps best determined by charting its influence on later historiography. The extent of that influence, primarily on Russian and Ukrainian historiography, has been well studied, for instance by Rogov (1967) and by G. N. Moiseeva (1970). The authors and works mentioned below do not give the full picture of its influence, but serve as representative examples.

In Russia, the Kronika was used in chronicle compilations as well as by historiographers. Among the first historiographers to use it was Andrej Lyzlov, who often referred to it in his Skifskaja istorija (finished 1692), and who also translated a part of it (cf. Section 3.3.1) (SKK 1993: 305–306). A. I. Mankiev, a man of Polish origin who worked as the secretary of the Russian resident in Sweden and spent many years in Swedish captivity, used it as a source for his Jadro rossijskoj istorii, which he finished in 1715, al-

---

6 Sedov (2006: 477) speaks of a copy of the translated Kronika with sketches of Polish and Lithuanian coats-of-arms in the margins, and refers to Rogov as his source, but I have not found this information in Rogov’s monograph.
though it was not printed until 1770 (Rogov 1967: 146–147; Moiseeva 1970: 85–86).\footnote{Some scholars believe that the text was written not by Mankiev, but by the Russian resident himself, A. Ja. Chilkov (cf. Kozlov 2011: 213–216).}

V. N. Tatiščev used the chronicle as a source for his *Istorija rossijskaja* (published posthumously between 1768 and 1784), partly because it offered information from sources to which Tatiščev did not have access. He also held Stryjkowski in high esteem as a historian, even though he pointed out some shortcomings. In some respects, Tatiščev’s way of presenting facts was similar to Stryjkowski’s, which may indicate that Stryjkowski served as a model for history writing (Rogov 1966: 8; 1967: 150–152). It is not known, however, if Tatiščev used the printed Polish edition or a manuscript of one of the Russian translations as his source. When he quotes Stryjkowski, the quotes do not coincide with the known Russian translations, and since he knew Polish, he himself may have translated these fragments (Rogov 1967: 154–156; Moiseeva 1970: 87–88).

M. V. Lomonosov also studied the *Kronika* in connection with the preparations for his *Drevnjaja rossijskaja istorija*, published posthumously in 1766. He may have come in contact with the Polish original, but according to Moiseeva (1970: 90–98), the penciled notes in the margins of ms. R are of his hand (cf. Section 3.5.2).

Late chronicles from Russian territory often used Stryjkowski as a source, either directly or through intermediate sources, e.g. other chronicles. One example of a chronicle that made use of the *Kronika* is the *Mazurinskij letopisec* from the 1680s (PSRL XXXI: 3).

Stryjkowski’s popularity in Russia can to some extent be explained by his own attention towards the country (Radziszewska 1978: 97). A remark by the *d'jak* Timofej Kudrjavcev, who in the 1650s was head of the *Zapisnoj prikaz*, the institution that at that time was in charge of official Muscovite historiography, implies that Stryjkowski was appreciated for his positive view on the Russian people and for the prominent position of the Russians in his explanation of the origin of the Slavic peoples, as seen in Section 2.4 (Rogov 1966: 266–267). G. Brogi Bercoff (2003: 215) claims that Stryjkowski was translated because he wrote in a manner reminiscent of East Slavic tradition. She also points out that of all the historiographical works available during that period, the only one that was translated into Russian apart from Stryjkowski was Bielski’s chronicle, which was close to the medieval, annalistic way of presenting history. This, she says, can be related to the fact that Russia was never really a part of Renaissance culture.

It is remarkable that in Russia, Polish historical works were used not only to learn about the history of the neighboring countries Poland and Lithuania,
but also about Russia’s own history. This may be explained by the fact that historiography developed later in Russia (Rogov 1966: 265).

Stryjkowski, together with other Polish authors, also had a great influence on historiography in Ruthenia, since even the parts that were under Muscovite rule (cf. Section 3.1.1) had close contact with Poland (Rogov 1965; 1966: 292–303). According to Rogov, Stryjkowski’s influence there may have been greater than in Russia, because historiography developed earlier in Ruthenia, and fewer early sources were available there. Old chronicles, for instance, were scarce and could only be used as a complement to the Polish historiographers. When Russian historiography began to take shape, Ruthenian texts became the main source of information, making Stryjkowski secondary. Moreover, Russian historiographers had easy access to old chronicles.

The best-known and most widely spread Ruthenian work for which Stryjkowski’s Kronika served as a source was the Kievan Synopsis (1st edition 1674), printed in the Cave monastery under the supervision of Innokentij Gizel’ (cf. Rothe 1983; Moser 2007). It was reprinted 11 times during the 17th century and the first half of the 18th, and manuscript copies were also made from the printed editions to meet the demand (Robinson 1963: 118; Rothe 1983: 46–49, 126–127). It was one of the few historical treaties of its time to be printed; most printed books were religious ones, whereas secular works were usually spread in manuscript (Myl'nikov 1996: 15–16). There are numerous references to and quotes from Stryjkowski in the Synopsis, and to some extent, his influence is seen in the dating of events, the method of comparing different sources, the order of the chapters, etc. (Rogov 1965: 328–329; 1966: 300–303; Rothe 1983: 76–78). The Synopsis also quotes a number of other sources straight from Stryjkowski (Rothe 1983: 72–73). Some scholars believe that the Polish printed edition of the Kronika was used (Rothe 1983: 76), others claim the source was rather the Ukrainian Chronograph, but that the Polish edition served as reference in some cases (Toločko 1996: 175–176).

The Ukrainian Chronograph is based on Stryjkowski’s Kronika, alongside the Synopsis and Guagnini’s Sarmatiae Europeae Descriptio (cf. Section 2.2.2), in some places following the text so closely that it has been mistaken for a translation (cf. Section 3.2.6) (Ulaščik 1968; PSRL XXXII: 4–5). The Letopis’ Račinskogo also used the Kronika as a source (Rogov 1966: 233).

Stryjkowski’s information was also used on the Orthodox side in the conflicts between the Orthodox and Uniate churches in Ruthenia. Although Stryjkowski himself was Catholic, he quoted Russian, i.e. Orthodox, sources and stressed Russia’s Orthodox history, which became an important argument (Rogov 1965: 312; 1966: 293; Rothe 1983: 36–37).

Among Lithuanian historiographers, the Jesuit Albert Wijuk Kojałowicz (1609–77) made extensive use of Stryjkowski in his Historia Lithuaniae,
printed in two parts in 1650 and 1669, perhaps the first major work to focus exclusively on Lithuanian history (Niendorf 2006: 56).

1.5 Linguistic interest

Against this background, it is understandable that historians have been interested in the Kronika and its translations. This thesis, however, deals with the language of the 1673–79 translation, which is suitable for such a study for several reasons.

In the 17th century, genetically Church Slavonic and East Slavic language elements still co-existed in Russian writing tradition, in different proportions depending on the text genre. Some kinds of texts were regulated by norms, whereas others allowed great variation. As a result of normalizing efforts, the 18th century saw the emergence of a literary language (cf. Chapter 4) and the disappearance of the genre-dependent variations (Živov 2004: 21–28). Publishing and examining part of yet another 17th-century text, and such an influential one as this, will hopefully contribute to our knowledge of the language situation.

At the time when the chronicle was translated, Polish was one of the most common source languages for book translations made in Russia, second only to Latin (Sobolevskij 1903: 49–50). It is therefore of interest to examine the mechanisms that were at work when such translations were made. Translating between two similar languages, such as Polish and Russian, increases the probability of interference, which leads to two main areas of research: one is which of these elements of interference left their imprint on the Russian language, and the other is what the translators’ strategies were for avoiding interference that would have been unacceptable. It has been suggested in connection with this very chronicle that the differences and similarities between the original and the translation may reveal interesting facts about the rules by which 17th-century translators were guided (Davidsson 1975: 74–75).

Besides the generally interesting aspects of studying a translated text, this chronicle offers even more possibilities since it may be the joint work of several translators (cf. Chapter 6). By comparing segments translated by different people, we may come to conclusions regarding the mechanisms and strategies they applied; that is, we may be able to compare how different people chose to interpret and translate parts of the same text, and thus identify individual and collective norms. A later task could be a comparison with the other translations that were made during a period of a few decades, which would add a dimension of diachrony.

Because of its historical theme, the text stands in an interesting relationship to Russian chronicle tradition. Stryjkowski himself used Russian
chronicles as sources (cf. Section 2.3.1), and then again, as mentioned above (Section 1.4), later Russian chronicle compilations could use Stryjkowski as a source in turn. Thus, the language of the Kronika may contain traces of earlier chronicle tradition. A comparison of the text with original Russian chronicles may reveal to what degree these earlier texts were present in the translators’ minds.

1.6 Terminology: Russian and Ruthenian

As will be explained in Chapter 4, scholars differ in their views on the language situation in 17th-century Russia, and consequently use different words for the language varieties found in texts from that time. In the terminology I will use, the translation of Stryjkowski’s chronicle is in part written in Hybrid Church Slavonic and in part in a non-bookish register of Russian. However, to avoid having to use the term Hybrid Church Slavonic when speaking of some chapters and Russian when speaking of others, I will simply call it a Russian translation, since it was made in Moscow and in a manner found in many other texts written in Russia in the same period. This does not mean that every linguistic feature mentioned as occurring in the “Russian translation” was characteristic of vernacular Russian.

The language varieties spoken and written in the western parts of Muscovy and the eastern parts of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, i.e. in Ruthenia, are also of interest, since many translators in Moscow came from those areas and since influence from Polish often came by that route. The spoken language showed a variety of dialects that could roughly be divided into Ukrainian, Belorussian and Polissian (Shevelov 1974: 149).

As for the written language, there are two main ways of describing the situation: either modern Ukrainian and Belorussian each had a predecessor in the period under discussion, or they had one in common (cf. Pugh 1996: 2–5). G. Y. Shevelov (1974: 147–150) speaks of a standard secular language that he calls Ruthenian, mainly containing elements found in Belorussian dialects, but in which Ukrainian features could also appear more or less regularly. In the 16th century, there was no written language that was entirely based on Ukrainian dialects, but Ukrainian and Belorussian features can nevertheless be distinguished from each other in texts from a quite early date. S. Pugh (1996: 6–7), however, points out that using the modern standard languages as starting points for identifying such features may give an inaccurate picture of the situation in the 16th or 17th century, since the situation at that time was that of a dialect continuum rather than two emerging languages.

J. Besters-Dilger (2005: 239–242) uses the word Ruthenian to cover the non-Russian East Slavic written language in the 14th–17th centuries, and the
more specific term *prosta mova* for the language used in written texts, including religious ones, from the mid-16th and throughout the 17th century. According to Uspenskij (2002: 386–408), the *prosta mova* existed in a Ukrainian and a Belorussian variety, of which the Ukrainian variety was more influenced by Church Slavonic and the Belorussian one by Polish. Evidence from texts shows that it was clearly recognized as a written language with bookish syntax, distinct from the spoken dialects, and that it was to some extent codified.

Some previous scholars have used the term West-Russian (mainly in Russian: *zapadnorusskij*); others use the terms Ruthenian and Old Belorussian interchangeably (Niendorf 2006: 101).

In this thesis, unless my sources specify the Ukrainian or Belorussian provenance of a certain linguistic element, text or person, or characterize a text or feature as belonging to the *prosta mova*, I will use the term ‘Ruthenian,’ by virtue of its being the most general one, neutral with regard to later nationalities and applicable to both the spoken and written varieties. This general term is especially useful when discussing the influence of this language on the Russian spoken and written in Moscow, since the distinction between Ukrainian and Belorussian is even more difficult when seen through the prism of Russian.

When referring to the historical dictionaries SUM and HSBM, I will accept their definition of sources as Ukrainian and Belorussian, respectively, although I am quite aware that the distinction is problematic. However, no major conclusions in this thesis are based on that distinction.

### 1.7 Earlier studies on chronicle language

As explained above, this study consists of several parts, and I have chosen to present previous research on the different aspects in connection with each chapter, e.g. literature about Polish influence on Russian in Chapter 5 and about authorship attribution in Chapter 6. Previous studies on chronicle language, however, will be used for comparison throughout the thesis, and therefore some important contributions to this field will be presented here.

Several studies have focused on the verbal system, especially the use of the simplex preterites (aorist and imperfect).\(^8\) V. M. Živov (1995) has studied the *Mazurinskij letopisec* from the 17th century, which was written by a scribe who did not fully command the bookish language. The mistakes made by the scribe give hints as to what he considered to be characteristic of bookishness and chronicle language. He has also studied the *Stepennaja kniga*,

---

\(^8\) Cf. Matthews (1995); this corresponds to *prostye preterity* in e.g. Živov (1995) and Petruchin (2003).
which, like Stryjkowski’s chronicle, is not annalistic and only to some extent a part of chronicle tradition (Živov 2011).

P. V. Petruchin (1996; 2003) has examined the use of verbal tenses referring to past events in both early and late chronicles. His dissertation (Petruchin 2003) deals with the use of the imperfect in early chronicles, the use of the perfect and the pluperfect in the First Novgorod Chronicle and the use of verbal tenses in the 17th-century Piskarëvskij letopisec. One of his observations regarding the Piskarëvskij letopisec concerned the relation between the verbal aspect and the choice between the aorist and the imperfect. The hybrid norm (cf. Section 4.1.3) dictated that the imperfect be formed from imperfective verbs and the aorist from perfective verbs, but in a number of cases, this balance is disturbed for different reasons (Petruchin 2003: 147–167).

O. N. Kijanova has studied the language norms in late chronicle writing. Her results were first published in a monograph (Kijanova 2006), then defended as a dissertation (Kijanova 2007), which was later published as yet another monograph (Kijanova 2010).9 One of the aims of her study, based on a large number of chronicles of different types – monastic and provincial chronicles and family chronicles kept by the nobility – was to find out if the appearance of new types of chronicles led to a change in language usage as well (Kijanova 2010: 28). In some cases, chronicles written close to the administrative center in Moscow showed more archaic linguistic traits than those further from power (Kijanova 2010: 74). She also took into consideration the new type of texts that arose in the 17th century, which are something in between chronicles and historical texts of a more narrative type (Kijanova 2010: 120). In her study, Kijanova used a number of characteristics to determine to what extent a chronicle was written according to the old standards. One of these was the use of verb forms for the past, since the use of simplex preterites was a sign of bookish language. Another such sign of bookishness was the use of the dative absolute, and yet another was the use of dual forms of nouns and verbs (Kijanova 2010: 34, 47–48).

9 These three works basically contain the same information, although they all have different titles. The dissertation and the 2010 monograph share a conclusion that is more substantial than the one in the 2006 monograph, and I will therefore refer to the 2010 monograph.
2 The author and the Polish original

The reason for the popularity of Stryjkowski’s chronicle in Russia can perhaps be found in the views it expressed on different peoples and states. It seems to have been more popular in the eastern parts of Poland than in the western ones, and the opinion of the author in Russia has been more decidedly positive than in Poland (Wojtkowiak 1990: 6–7). Polish writers who were influenced by him tended to emphasize the ties between Polish, Lithuanian and Ruthenian history, whereas Lithuanian and Ruthenian authors increasingly stressed the differences in origins and background between their lands and Poland (Plokhy 2006: 175).

The historical context, society and cultural ideas of the Poland-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the late 16th century are important to the understanding of the chronicle and can also partly explain why it became so popular in Muscovy and had such a great influence on Russian history writing. This chapter aims to give that historical background, as well as to introduce the author, the Polish printed original of the chronicle and a few of its most important topics.

2.1 Polish-Lithuanian society and culture in the late 16th century

The country in which Stryjkowski published his chronicle was a large and diverse one. Besides most of present-day Poland and Lithuania, it also included Ruthenia, the lands historically connected with Kievan Rus'.

This section is mainly based on three monographs with slightly different perspectives. D. Stone’s The Polish-Lithuanian state, 1386–1795 (Stone 2001) is a thorough historical study that also contains reflections on economics, society and culture during the indicated period. S. Plokhy’s The origins of the Slavic nations. Premodern identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus (Plokhy 2006) focuses on national identities in the East Slavic realm, from Kievan Rus' to late 18th-century Russia and Ukraine or Little Russia. M. Niendorf’s Das Großfürstentum Litauen. Studien zur Nationsbildung in der Frühen Neuzeit (1569–1795) (Niendorf 2006) studies Lithuania from various angles, containing chapters about ethnogenetic myths, the role of religion and language, and a chapter about Samogitia.
Through the formation of the Union of Lublin in 1569, the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania went from an originally personal and then dynastic to a full union, forming the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. This meant that the King of Poland was also to be the Grand Duke of Lithuania, elected jointly by the two parts of the Commonwealth. There was to be a common Sejm and other joint functions. There was firm Lithuanian opposition to the union, led by the Radziwill family and the magnates who did not want to be restricted by stricter Polish laws, but at the same time, Lithuania needed Polish support in its dealings with Muscovy (Stone 2001: 59–63; Plokhy 2006: 114–116). Wars between Lithuania and Muscovy concerning the Ruthenian lands had escalated in the beginning of the 16th century (Plokhy 2006: 108–109). Through the union, Poland also became involved in these conflicts. Stefan Batory, who reigned from 1575 to 1586, saw war against Russia as an important part of his foreign policy (Stone 2001: 122–127).

Because of the territorial overlap between Lithuania and Kievan Rus', the Lithuanian dukes could call themselves Grand Princes, as the Ruthenian princes had, or Rex Letvinorum et Ruthenorum, and see themselves as the successors of the Kievan princes. Although the relations between Lithuanians and Ruthenians had not always been good and local loyalties were often of higher priority than regional or national ones, the people of the Grand Duchy seem to have kept a sense of unity when faced with external threats (Myl'nikov 1999: 301–303; Stone 2001: 3–5; Plokhy 2006: 85–89, 114–121). In the 16th century, 40% of the nobility in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was ethnically Ruthenian rather than Lithuanian, but all the same, the term ‘Lithuania’ was used for them all, rather than ‘[terrae] Litwaniae et Russiae’ used in the beginning of the 15th century (Niendorf 2006: 33).

To this can be added Samogitia, set aside especially by Stryjkowski in the title of his work. This duchy, sometimes called Lower Lithuania, was a region with a distinct dialect of Lithuanian and a separate status within the Grand Duchy that set it on the same level as Lithuania and Rus', and it was identified both by its inhabitants and its neighbors as a separate entity (cf. Niendorf 2006: 179–199). Thus, its status in Stryjkowski’s writings is partly explained by the fact that this was where he lived (cf. Section 2.2.1), but he was not the only one to treat it separately from the rest of Lithuania.

There were social and cultural differences between the various parts of the Commonwealth, but as time went by, Lithuanian gentry tended to adopt Polish culture, while they still kept their feeling of Lithuanian identity. The use of the Polish language spread particularly quickly in Ruthenian areas, and even the peasants in Lithuania acquired at least passive knowledge of the language, since nobles and priests spoke Polish to them (Stone 2001: 63–64). Many people were probably multilingual, and the major languages spo-
ken in the Grand Duchy influenced each other as well as the minority languages, such as Yiddish (Niendorf 2006: 96–100).

Humanism had gained entry into Polish culture already in the 15th century and left its imprint on many aspects of society. The Jagellonian University in Cracow ensured that Poland developed in the same direction as the rest of Europe. Lithuania lagged behind somewhat. In political treatises, the division of power between monarch, aristocracy and people was defended. In religion, humanism inspired reforms and thoughts about a national church. Secular literature, especially poetry, developed, and with it a set of genres. During the 16th century, Polish took shape as a literary language, although many authors still wrote in Latin as well. Lithuanian was also used in printed books (Stone 2001: 94–107).\(^\text{10}\)

Religious tolerance was pledged by all Polish-Lithuanian kings starting with Henri Valois in 1573 (Stone 2001: 120). With the growth of Sarmatism (cf. Section 2.4) and in connection with the wars against the Lutheran Swedes, the Orthodox Russians and Cossacks and the Moslem Turks and Tatars, the position of Catholicism was strengthened (Stone 2001: 212). Freedom of religion seems to have been greater in the Lithuanian part than in Poland, at least until the second half of the 17th century, when the conditions for non-Catholics began to change for the worse (Niendorf 2006: 124–125).

This diversity means, among other things, that when Stryjkowski wrote the history of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, he needed to trace the origins of Polish, Lithuanian and Ruthenian territories, which in the latter case meant Kievan Rus'. This explains why he turned to Russian chronicles for information, and hence the interest his writings evoked in Russia.

2.2 Maciej Stryjkowski’s life and works

2.2.1 Stryjkowski’s life

Most of what is known about Stryjkowski has been drawn from his own texts. The chronicle is preceded by a rhymed autobiography, and his other major work, *O początkach* (cf. Section 2.2.2), is followed by an appeal to his readers (Stryjkowski 1978: 588–591) that also contains some information about his life. In addition to this, there are numerous references to his life and travels in the main text of the chronicle and *O początkach*.

Several scholars have extracted information from these sources and discussed their authenticity. Mikołaj Malinowski, in his introduction to the 1846 edition (Malinowski [1846] 1985), was among the first to attempt to

\(^{10}\) During the period 1553–1660, 20 books were printed in Lithuanian (Niendorf 2006: 104).
unite them into a biography and bibliography. He was especially concerned with Stryjkowski’s travels, describing them elaborately based on information from the chronicle. Julia Radziszewska has written about his life and works in a monograph (Radziszewska 1978) and in connection with the publication of O początkach (Stryjkowski 1978: 5–25). Zbysław Wojtkowiak’s monograph (Wojtkowiak 1990) is the latest major work to have been devoted to Stryjkowski’s biography and bibliography. The following information is mainly based on Wojtkowiak, since his monograph is more recent and more detailed than the others, and since he seems to have been more conscientious in critically examining the reliability of Stryjkowski’s information about himself (cf. Wojtkowiak 1990: 14, 52).

The name Stryjkowski (which is the accepted form, although the spelling Striykowski is more frequent in the chronicle) is derived from the town of Stryków in Łódź voivodeship, Poland, where the author was born in 1547 (Wojtkowiak 1990: 15–21). He also used the name Osostevicius or Osostewiciusz. He himself traced this from his ancestors, “od […] Osostow z Herbu Leliwâ” (Stryjkowski 1582: XX1r), thereby implying that he was a nobleman. Who they were and where the name comes from has not been firmly established, and his relation to other known figures of the name Stryjkowski is also uncertain. No other noble families of the name Osostevicius are known from that time, and the secrecy and uncertainty surrounding Stryjkowski’s descent may indicate that he was, in fact, not a nobleman at all.11 His father’s name, as can be gathered from the patronymic Iacobi, which he added to his name (in its Latin form) in one instance, was Jacob or Jakub, but nothing else is known for sure about him (Wojtkowiak 1990: 22–24; cf. Stryjkowski 1582: 23).

Stryjkowski received his education at a parochial school in Brzeziny, close to his hometown. He probably never studied at the university. In his texts, he does not mention higher education, but, on the contrary, in the rhymed autobiography he calls Brzeziny his Padua and Bologna.12 Still, he prided himself on his knowledge of languages and on his ability to write poetry and draw portraits and maps (Radziszewska 1978: 19–20; Wojtkowiak 1990: 40–51).

At the age of 16 or 18 he left for Lithuania, where he served in the army.13 The chronicle does not tell very much about his time in the military. The author mentions battles but does not explicitly claim to have taken part in

---

12 Some scholars, such as Rogov (1966: 21–22), believe he studied in Cracow, but the registers of the University of Cracow speak of a Mathias Stanislai de Strykoff – the son of a Stanisław, and therefore not “our” Stryjkowski (Wojtkowiak 1990: 36–40).
13 There are two contradicting statements in the chronicle regarding his age at the time of his first journey to Lithuania (Stryjkowski 1582: 372 vs. Stryjkowski 1582: A3v). Cf. Wojtkowiak (1990: 20–22).
them. That, and the fact that he describes a lot of places that were on Russian territory, may, according to Wojtkowiak, imply that he worked as some kind of spy. He claims to have seen many places along the Russian border in 1573, which was the last year he spent in that area. One of his duties in the military may have been that of a cartographer (Wojtkowiak 1990: 58–69). In 1574, he joined Andrzej Taranowski’s embassy to Turkey, which later allowed him to add his own observations when he wrote about Constantinople in his chronicle (Radziszewska 1978: 21–27; Wojtkowiak 1990: 71–75).

As can be gathered from his dedications and from the text of the chronicle, Stryjkowski spent the following years as the client of different noblemen, as discussed further in Section 2.3.2. After the death of one of his patrons, Jerzy (Jurij) Olelkowicz, in 1578, he sought the protection of the bishop of Samogitia, Melchior Giedrojć, and during the time of their connection he became a priest. In a list from 1579, he is mentioned as one of the canons in Giedrojć’s diocese (Radziszewska 1978: 38; Wojtkowiak 1990: 81–86).

After 1582, when the chronicle – Stryjkowski’s last known text – appeared, we have to rely on archival material for information. In a letter from 1586, he is called “canonic zmodzki plieban jurborski,” (‘canon of Samogitia and curate of Jurbork,’ present-day Jurbarkas), which meant that he had risen in the ranks of the church since 1579 (Wojtkowiak 1990: 89–91). In May of 1592, another man is mentioned as canon of Samogitia, which may mean that Stryjkowski was dead and this was his successor. Wojtkowiak (1990: 94–97) puts forth the hypothesis that he may have fallen victim to the plague that raged in Lithuania in 1590. Other scholars date his death to before or around 1593 (Radziszewska 1978: 38).

2.2.2 Stryjkowski’s works

The Kronika was Stryjkowski’s largest piece of work and the one he is best known for, but he also wrote other texts in prose and verse. However, as is the case with his biography, the bibliography is also largely based on his own information, rather than on extant texts. Therefore, scholars have reached very different results.

Malinowski ([1846] 1985: 19–30) listed eight printed texts and eleven manuscripts by Stryjkowski and believed that he may have written another four texts. The two main Polish bibliographies, Estreicher’s Bibliografia polska and Nowy Korbut, disagree with each other: Estreicher (29: 350–357)

\[\text{Cf. also the map in Wojtkowiak (1990) between pp. 56 and 57.}\]
lists eight certain and eleven possible titles,\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Nowy Korbut} (3: 296–299) 17 titles all in all. Radziszewska (1978: 145) puts down 21 titles on her list, of which 9 survive at least in part, and in the cases where the text is not preserved, she indicates where Stryjkowski refers to them in his extant works. Wojtkowiak (1990: 180–191) lists ten extant texts (printed or in manuscript) and discusses some texts that may since have been destroyed, without making a definite list of them.

Besides the \textit{Kronika}, Stryjkowski’s other major text was \textit{O pocz\’atkach, dzielno\’sciach, sprawach rycerskich i domowych slawnego narodu litewskiego, \’zemjdzkiego i ruskiego, przedym nigdy od \’adnego ani kuszone, ani opisane, z natchnienia Bo\’zego a uprzejmie pilnego do\’świadczenia}, usually called \textit{O pocz\’atkach}, which was not printed during his lifetime but has been published in modern times by Julia Radziszewska (Stryjkowski 1978). It is preserved in one manuscript, kept in the Biblioteka Narodowa (the National Library) in Warsaw.\textsuperscript{16} For several years, Stryjkowski worked on them simultaneously (\textit{O pocz\’atkach} was written 1571–78, the \textit{Kronika} 1574–82). It deals with basically the same subjects as the chronicle, and some scholars do not see the two as distinct pieces of work, but rather as two versions of the same thing. They differ in form, however: the \textit{Kronika} is written mainly in prose, \textit{O pocz\’atkach} mainly in verse, although verse and prose alternate in both. The \textit{Kronika} consists of books and chapters, whereas \textit{O pocz\’atkach} is divided into unnumbered sections (Radziszewska 1978: 67). Wojtkowiak (1990: 191–211) has discussed the relationship between the two texts and tried to reconstruct how they came into being. He sees one main difference in content, namely that the \textit{Kronika} had the ambition to be the history of the Slavic peoples in general, or at least of most of Eastern Europe, whereas \textit{O pocz\’atkach} concentrated on the Lithuanian nobility. Radziszewska (1978: 67–68) also points out the lack of information on the origin of the Poles in \textit{O pocz\’atkach}.

New editions of two of Stryjkowski’s other texts, printed in his lifetime, were included in the 1846 edition together with the chronicle: \textit{PrzEs\’lawnego wjazdu do Krakowa […] Henryka Walezyusa} and \textit{Goniec eanoi}, both from 1574 (Stryjkowski [1846] 1985, II: 439–563). A manuscript text that was listed by bibliographers but considered perished has lately attracted the attention of scholars, but no complete edition has as yet been published (Wojtkowiak 2010).

Stryjkowski also claimed to have written another important historical text. He complained in the introduction to his chronicle, in his rhymed autobiog-

\textsuperscript{15} Wojtkowiak (1990: 175) counts nine titles in Estreicher; perhaps he counted the 1766 edition of the \textit{Kronika} as a separate title.

\textsuperscript{16} For a description of the manuscript cf. Radziszewska (1978: 54–56), Stryjkowski (1978: 22–23).
raphy and in hints elsewhere in the chronicle that “an Italian” had stolen or plagiarized his work, *Sarmatiae Europeae Descriptio*, and published it (Stryjkowski 1582: XX2r, A3v; Wojtkowiak 1990: 177–178). This Italian was Alexander Guagnini, who had been his superior in the army (cf. SKK 2004: 205–207). Guagnini was born in Verona but had been in Polish service since 1561, and he was a captain of the cavalry at the fortress of Vicebsk (Vitebsk) (Radziszewska 1978: 71). The text was printed in Latin in 1578 (there is also a Polish translation, printed in 1611). Stryjkowski complained to the king about the suspected plagiarism, and in 1580, king Stefan Batory decided the case in Stryjkowski’s favor, which did not change the fact that the popular text was still published under Guagnini’s name (Radziszewska 1978: 73). Given the fact that Guagnini does not seem to have written anything else, and given the similarities between *Sarmatiae Europeae Descriptio* and Stryjkowski’s other texts, the question of whether the latter’s claims were true is usually decided in his favor. However, it is not certain if Guagnini, in that case, reworked the manuscript and to what extent (Rogov 1966: 24–25; Wojtkowiak 1990: 179–180).

### 2.3 Contents of the *Kronika*, sources and ideology

The chronicle deals with the history of Poland, Lithuania, Samogitia and Muscovy from the creation of the world until 1580, when the text appears to have been handed over to the printer (Wojtkowiak 1990: 88). It concerns the relations of these countries to each other and their struggle against Turks and Tatars.

Preceding the chronicle itself in the printed edition from 1582 (several copies of which have been consulted, cf. Section 1.2), we find the following:

1) a title page
2) a list of sources (one page)
3) a dedication in Latin to Stefan Batory (five pages)
4) a dedication in Latin to Jerzy Radziwiłł (two pages)
5) a dedication in Latin to Jerzy, Szymon and Aleksander Olelkowicz (three pages)
6) a portrait of the author, and below it, beginning on the same page
7) his rhymed autobiography in Polish (nine pages)
8) various shorter dedications in Polish and Latin to Stryjkowski from other people (six pages)
9) a letter of privilege in Latin from Stefan Batory (one page)
10) a preface (*przedomowa*) in Polish (fifteen pages).

The chronicle proper begins on page 1 and ends on page 791 (unnumbered), and is followed by a list of corrections (one page) and an index (17 pages). It
is divided into 25 books, which in turn are divided into a varying number of chapters, ranging from book III, which consists of only one chapter, to books VI and XV, with 16 chapters each. Many chapters are subdivided into smaller units with separate headings.

2.3.1 Stryjkowski’s sources

Stryjkowski used a number of sources, which he listed in the beginning of the Kronika. He referred to Greek and Roman historians, but most of his account was based on Polish historians, primarily Maciej Miechowita (1457–1523) and Marcin Kromer (1512–89), but also Jan Długosz (1415–80), Bernard Wapowski (ca. 1450–1535) and Marcin Bielski (ca. 1495–1575). He also made great use of Siegmund von Herberstein’s (1486–1566) Rerum Moscoviticarum Commentarii (Rogov 1966: 44–46).

However, he also used old chronicles and annals of different origin that are mentioned in his list, usually with no more detailed reference than e.g. “Kijowskie Kroniki stare 4,” “Litewskich Latopischów 12,” “Ruskie Kroniki stare” (Stryjkowski 1582: X1v). Sometimes he repeated information that his Polish predecessors had quoted from chronicles, but often when he found discrepancies he either quoted both the Polish historiographers and the chronicles on equal footing or gave priority to the version found in the chronicles. Rogov (1966: 41–44) gives several examples of how Stryjkowski compared the sources he had at hand. The following is an example of such a comparison:

A s tey przyczyny stoczył bitwę z Izasławem Synem Wołodimirzowym Xiążećia Pereasławskiego nie Kijowskiego/ iak Miechouius fol. 62 pisze/ bo ná ten czas był Swatopelek Kijowskim (Stryjkowski 1582: 195–196).

Rogov (1966: 123–258) has made an important contribution to the research on Stryjkowski’s sources about Lithuania, but also on the Russian chronicles that provided information on Kievan Rus' (Rogov 1966: 35–122). With the help of Stryjkowski’s own comments on the contents of his sources, Rogov came to the conclusion that Stryjkowski used the Primary Chronicle, probably in versions close to the Novgorodsko-Sofijskij svod from the 1430s (sometimes dated 1448), the Tverskaja letopis’ and the Letopisec Perejaslavlja Suzdal'skogo. Short versions of the Novgorodsko-Sofijskij svod were frequent in Ruthenia, as were the other two chronicles (Rogov 1966: 108–114).

Stryjkowski had access to a fragment of a chronicle that he chose to quote in its entirety in Polish translation (Stryjkowski 1582: 184–186). Rogov

(1966: 83–90, 115–122) tried to trace its origins and connected it with the Cave Monastery in Kiev, partly on account of the detailed information it gives on important church events. He dated it to the 16th century, but the events it tells about occurred between 1093 and 1146. D. Aleksandrov and D. Volodichin also turned their attention to this text and published it in a modern Russian translation (Aleksandrov & Volodichin 1993).

Another category of chronicles, one that has raised some discussion, consists of what Stryjkowski sometimes calls “latopisce ruskie,” i.e. Ruthenian chronicles, sometimes “latopisce litewskie.”18 These chronicles were written on Lithuanian territory and deal with early Lithuanian history, but their language is Ruthenian, sometimes called Old Belorussian (cf. Section 1.6). Therefore, they are usually called Belorussian-Lithuanian chronicles, although some scholars have used other names for them, such as Lithuanian or West-Russian chronicles (Ulaščik 1985: 3).

Danilowicz ([1846] 1985) was among the first to recognize the existence of chronicles written on Lithuanian territory and to try to establish the relationships between them. He wished to separate Lithuanian chronicles, which explained the origin of the Grand Duchy and were not annalistic, from Ruthenian ones, i.e. chronicles about Rus’, but stated that Stryjkowski did not do so and that they were all written in Ruthenian. N. N. Ulaščik, in his monograph about these very chronicles, included a summary of the discussions about their nature (Ulaščik 1985: 9–28). Later scholars have divided the existing Belorussian-Lithuanian chronicles into two main groups according to what they contain, especially regarding the origins of the Lithuanians (cf. Section 2.5).

Among them, the Chronika (or Letopis’) Bychovca (Polish: Kronika Bychowca), which was written in Ruthenian, but using the Latin alphabet with Polish orthography, is usually singled out as being the most complete (Ulaščik 1985: 18, 23, 25–26). It is now lost but was published by T. Narbutt (1846) and has been reprinted several times (PSRL XVII: IX, 473–572; PSRL XXXII: 8, 128–173). Stryjkowski seems to have had access to several chronicles that were similar to it, but more extensive in their presentation of events, and sometimes differing in facts (Rogov 1966: 250–251; Ulaščik 1985: 94). In general, however, Stryjkowski’s chronicle and the Chronika Bychovca coincide so closely that Stryjkowski’s text is used to fill in the missing parts in the edition of the Chronika Bychowca (PSRL XXXII: 128).

2.3.2 Connections and ideology

Many of the chapters in the chronicle are preceded by dedications. Attempts have been made to extract information about Stryjkowski’s sympathies and political views – especially on the subject of the Polish-Lithuanian union – from the text of the chronicle, its dedications and information about his patrons. A few conclusions made by other scholars on this topic will be summarized here.

2.3.2.1 Connections

Wojtkowiak (1990: 140–174) discusses the people mentioned in dedications and also lists them along with their titles and religious affiliation in Appendix III (Wojtkowiak 1990: 233–234). J. Bardach (1970: 70) also discusses some of those mentioned. He notes that there are many dedications to people connected with Samogitia and Ruthenia. The people to whom dedications were written are too numerous to discuss here, but those who can be believed to have been Stryjkowski’s patrons at some point will be mentioned.

As can be gathered from Stryjkowski’s writings, he was connected to the Chodkiewicz family. He mentions three members of the family in his texts and dedications (Wojtkowiak 1990: 126–128). Aleksander Chodkiewicz, starosta of Hrodna (Grodno), who died in 1578, was most certainly one of his patrons, since he dedicated a poem from 1574 to “Panu Alexandrowi Chodkiewicowi […] panu menu miłościwemu” (Wojtkowiak 1990: 128–129; cf. Stryjkowski [1846] 1985, II: 441). Both Aleksander and his cousin Jan Chodkiewicz, starosta of Samogitia and castellan of Vilnius (from 1574), supplied Stryjkowski with chronicles as sources.19 This family seems to have been important to Stryjkowski, since people connected to them by marriage can also be found in his dedications (Wojtkowiak 1990: 129–131).

The Olelkowicz family, princes of Słuck, was related by marriage to the Chodkiewicz family. Stryjkowski spent some time at the court of Jerzy (Jurij) Olelkowicz before the latter’s death in 1578, perhaps after Stryjkowski’s return from the embassy to Turkey in 1575. O początkach is dedicated to Jerzy Olelkowicz, and in the Kronika, which, as we know, was printed a few years later, Stryjkowski wrote an extensive dedication to his three sons Jerzy, Szymon and Aleksander (cf. Section 2.3). Stryjkowski seems to have received some help in his historical research from the family. Jerzy Olelkowicz belonged to the Orthodox church, but two of his sons later converted

---

to Catholicism, and the household was characterized by religious tolerance (Malinowski [1846] 1985: 12–13; Wojtkowiak 1990: 81–82, 131–136).

Stryjkowski also had connections to the Samogitian bishop Melchior Giedrojć, to whom he wrote a large dedication as an introduction to chapter II: 1 (Stryjkowski 1582: 21–23). He was an ardent Catholic and Jesuit (Bar-

Even though there are many dedications to members of the Radziwiłł family in the chronicle, it is improbable that Stryjkowski was particularly close to them, since they were adversaries to his protectors, the Chodkiewicz family. Most of the members of the Radziwiłł family were Calvinists, but there were also Catholics among them (Radziszewska 1978: 31, 35; Wojtkowiak 1990: 142–144; cf. Niendorf 2006: 130). They belonged to the most active separatists before the union was concluded.

2.3.2.2 Ideology

Stryjkowski’s views on the Union of Lublin have been of interest to several scholars. Some have considered him to belong to a kind of separatist camp (Zachara-Wawrzyńczyk 1963: 29; Rogov 1966: 30–31). Others have claimed that he was in favor of the union, but promoted Lithuania’s rights within it and its equality with Poland (Bar-

Wojtkowiak (1990: 140–141) points out the need to be careful when announcing the affiliations of Stryjkowski’s patrons, since mostly it is known what their positions were around the time of the union, but it is uncertain how their views might have changed in the years that passed until Stryjkowski wrote his chronicle. The same can be said about the religious affiliation of the magnates. Bardach (1970: 70–71) also stresses that many of those who were originally opposed to the union adopted another point of view after its realization, one that concentrated more on the rights of Lithuania within the union. Separatism would, according to him, have been an anachronism at this time, and in the 1570s, the existence of the union was not debated in the Sejms, only the conditions of it. Stone (2001: 63, 148), on the other hand, states that separatism remained in Polish-Lithuanian life for as long as the Commonwealth existed. The attempt of Janusz Radziwiłł the Younger in 1655 to replace the Union of Lublin with a union with Sweden must be counted as an expression of separatism, even though it was mainly the initiative of a few people and not a widespread desire (Niendorf 2006: 51). The question of Stryjkowski’s attitude towards the union may deserve a new study.
In religious matters, not much can be gathered from the dedications. Although Stryjkowski himself was a Catholic priest and his patron Giedrojc was active in the counterreformation, some of the names belong to Orthodox persons, Lutherans or Calvinists (Wojtkowiak 1990: 141–142, 233–234).

However interesting Stryjkowski’s dedications may be, it is not certain that they reveal much about his political views. Wojtkowiak (1990: 174) believes that they are only signs of whom he was indebted to for the financial means to print the Kronika. It may therefore be more fruitful to conclude something about Stryjkowski’s views from what he says in his chronicle.

Although he was born in Poland, Stryjkowski apparently identified with Lithuania, as can be seen from many details in his chronicle, as well as from the very fact that he wrote it, and the manner in which he wrote it. Expressions such as u nas w Zmodzi (Stryjkowski 1582: 298) show that he felt at home in Samogitia, and he sometimes used similar expressions about Lithuania as well (Wojtkowiak 1990: 216–218), although phrases such as my Polacy or Polacy nászy (e.g. Stryjkowski 1582: 87, 149) are also found. According to F. Sielicki, who studied the reception of Russian chronicles in Poland, Stryjkowski was the first Polish author to describe Lithuania in a positive way, as his own country, instead of using neutral or negative expressions (Sielicki 1965: 151–152). In his interpretation of events, he often chose a Lithuanian version of the story over a Polish one, or judged them as equal (cf. Rogov 1966: 153–154, 192–194).

As previously mentioned, Stryjkowski devoted much attention to the early history of Kievan Rus’, as the predecessor of Ruthenia. Further on in the chronicle, he did not give as much attention to the Muscovite state, other than as a neighbor or enemy of the Commonwealth (Rogov 1966: 36–37, 243). When reporting on Muscovite struggles with Tatars and the Teutonic Order, however, Stryjkowski did show some sympathy for Russia (Bardach 1970: 73).

Stryjkowski’s writings betray his aversion to the Turks, especially O wolności Korony Polskiej i Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego, a versed text comprising 43 leaves, written shortly after the author’s return from Turkey and printed in Cracow in 1575 (Malinowski [1846] 1985: 20; Radziszewska 1978: 44–47).

As mentioned above, Stryjkowski had connections with people of different religious affiliations. In the text of the chronicle, he also adopted a tolerant view on the Orthodox Eastern Slavs, emphasizing the common provenance and related languages of all Slavs, as well as the fact that they all were Christians, without placing too much judgment in the fact that some were Orthodox and some Catholic (Myll'nikov 1996: 120; cf. Niendorf 2006: 79). This may be related to the fact that he saw the Ottoman Empire as a common enemy of all Christian peoples.
2.4 Sarmatism and the origins of the Slavs

Early historiographers often saw it as their task to search for the roots of their people or nation, and to give them as prominent a place in history as possible. These theories were very important in their time, and Stryjkowski’s Kronika is frequently mentioned as having a special place in that tradition. The most thorough study of the ethnogenic myths among the Slavic peoples is A. S. Myl'nikov’s Kartina slavjanskogo mira: vzgljad iz Vostočnoj Evropy (Myl'nikov 1996). It will be the main point of reference in this section.

One way of giving a people ancient and noble roots was to search for biblical ancestry. Many peoples attempted to trace their roots to Noah’s sons Shem, Ham and Japheth, primarily referring to Genesis, where the division of the earth between them is described. These claims were often supported by quotes from Herodotus and other antique or Byzantine writers.

In the case of the Slavic peoples, such attempts had been made ever since Eastern Slavic chronicle writing began. Chronicle writers incorporated the legends in their texts, and the Primary Chronicle, for instance, begins by describing this division of the earth (PVL 2007: 7–8). As we will see, these myths still circulated in the 16th and 17th centuries.

According to biblical tradition, Noah’s son Japheth was the ancestor of all peoples in the northern and western parts of the world, among which were the Slavs (Myl'nikov 1996: 21; Kohut 2004: 59–60). Most chroniclers and historiographers agreed on this and it was an accepted truth among Polish historiographers, but they differed in their views on which one of Japheth’s sons was to be considered the ancestor of the Slavs. Maciej Miechowita, for instance, followed a medieval tradition in claiming that the Slavs stemmed from Japheth’s fourth son Javan and Javan’s son Elishah (Myl'nikov 1996: 22–23). Ukrainian Cossack chronicles, on the other hand, preferred a version about Japheth’s eldest son, Gomer. Being a descendant of the eldest son was of course the most prestigious (Kohut 2004: 76–77).

The most widely spread version and the most important one in this context was introduced by Bernard Wapowski and further promoted by Marcin Bielski. It claimed Japheth’s sixth son Meshech as the ancestor of the Muscovites, based on the similarity of the words Mosoch (i.e. Meshech) and Moskva (Myl'nikov 1996: 25; Kohut 2004: 63). This connection between Meshech and Moscow gained popularity with time, and Stryjkowski is often mentioned in connection with it. An important trait of the Meshech-theory is that it emphasized the common ancestry of all the Slavs, despite confessional differences. As explained above, Stryjkowski also seems to have harbored such ideals (Robinson 1963: 103–105; Myl'nikov 1996: 36–37).

---

20 The Bible itself only says that the lands were divided between Noah’s sons, not how this was done, cf. Genesis 10: 1–5.
Stryjkowski also claimed that when Meshech settled the Slavic lands, he was accompanied by “Asarmot […] álbo Sarmata” (Stryjkowski 1582: 92), i.e. the biblical Hazarmaveth, descendant of Shem. He associated this name, Asarmot or Sarmata, with the ethnonym Sarmatians, which for Polish historians was synonymous to the ancient Slavs (cf. below). In this way, he united two genealogies into one (Myl'nikov 1996: 26).

Aside from these genealogical discussions, historiographers also had geographically oriented theories. Once they had agreed that the Slavs were descendants of Noah, they had to determine how they had come from Babylon, after the scattering of the languages at the tower of Babel, to the lands they now inhabited. One of the first theories about the origins of the Slavs had its roots in Byzantium, was taken over by the Slavs and can be found in ancient Russian chronicles. It claimed that the Slavs had inhabited the land around the Danube, and is known as the Balkan theory, in the terminology of A. N. Robinson (1963: 101), or the Danube theory, according to Z. Kohut (2004: 59–60).

Another theory, which had its origins in West European, Catholic sources and first won acceptance in Polish and Czech history writing, was based on the assumption that the Slavs had migrated through the Asian area called Sarmatia. Jan Długosz and several other Polish historiographers, among them Stryjkowski, promoted this theory (Kohut 2004: 60–62). As the importance of the Polish state rose, after the Eastern and Southern Slavs had been weakened by Turks and Tatars, the Sarmatian theory gained strength, and in the 15th–16th centuries it became the predominant theory, not only among the Western Slavs, where it had originated, but among all the Slavic peoples (Robinson 1963: 101).

When the Asian Sarmatians, according to the theory, had settled in Europe, their new land was also called Sarmatia. Miechowita, in his Tractatus de duabus Sarmatis (1517) and Chronika Polonorum (1519, 1520), wrote about the “two Sarmatias,” one European and one Asian or Scythian, that were divided by the Don. According to him, Slavic peoples lived in both these areas (Myl'nikov 1996: 97; 1999: 125). Guagnini (or Stryjkowski, if the latter’s claims about plagiarism were true, cf. Section 2.2.2) devoted his work Sarmatiae Europeae descriptio to this question and emphasized the common Slavic language of the peoples who lived in this area (Myl'nikov 1996: 104). Bielski also distinguished between Scythian Sarmatia and European Sarmatia (Myl'nikov 1996: 102). It was not obvious, however, what was meant by European Sarmatia. Many Polish authors chose to identify it with Poland or the Commonwealth. Others (Kromer, Bielski, Stryjkowski and non-Polish authors) had a wider definition that included Muscovy (Myl'nikov 1996: 129). This variation in usage can be found in the texts of non-Slavic authors as well. It has for instance been documented that Swedish 17th-century writers used the terms Sarmatae and Sarmatia either for Eastern
Europe and parts of Asia in general, or only for the Poles (Helander 2004: 274–276).

The West-Russian Chronograph from the 16th century presented the same basic thought as the Polish historiographers, but talked about the “two Scythias” (Mylnikov 1996: 106). The ethnonyms Scythians and Sarmatians were frequently used interchangeably, but according to Stryjkowski, they referred to two distinct peoples with different languages and habits. To him, as can be gathered from the following quote, Scythians were Tatars, and Sarmatians were Slavs (cf. Radziszewska 1978: 97):

This combination of the Sarmatian theory (through Hazarmaveth) with the Meshech-Moscow theory was a way of covering the origins of all the Slavs. Stryjkowski described all Slavs as one people with originally one single language. These ideas were elaborated in the Kievan Synopsis, which, because of its many editions and reprints (cf. Section 1.4), helped spread the ideas. In the Synopsis, the Slavs are said to have a common language, called slaveno-rossijskij: Slavo-Russian, using the translation of S. Plokhy. Kiev was identified as the core of the Slavo-Russian nation, but Muscovites were also included, as well as, in certain contexts, the Poles and other Slavs (Kohut 2004: 67–70; Plokhy 2006: 261–263).

In its 16th-century version, the Sarmatian theory served primarily to weld the people of the Commonwealth together, Poles and Lithuanians alike (Kulicka 1980: 10–11). Stryjkowski equated the Sarmatians with all Slavs (Mylnikov 1996: 263). As time passed, however, the Sarmatians became associated primarily with the Polish nobility, not with Slavs in general, which in the 17th century estranged other Slavic peoples from this idea. This explains why Andrej Lyzlov, in his translation of the Kronika, tried to play down the role of the Sarmatians and subordinate Asarmot (Sarmatians) to Meshech (Muscovites), cf. Section 3.2.3 (Das 1986: 348).

When fully developed, the Sarmatian theory served to prove that the Polish nobility, the szlachta, was not of the same descent as the rest of the Polish people. The szlachta was said to have come from the Sarmatians, who, when they came to the Dnieper and Vistula valleys, became the masters of the Slavs who inhabited the land before them. The Sarmatians were hence the ancestors of the szlachta, as opposed to the peasants, who were the descendants of the enslaved Slavs (Mylnikov 1996: 264). Lithuanian nobility could also be included into this notion of the Sarmatians, as explained further in Section 2.5 (Kulicka 1980: 16).
2.5 The origins of the Lithuanians

Stryjkowski was also very much concerned with the origins of the Lithuanians, particularly of the nobility. As was the case with the Slavs, there were legends about the origins of the Lithuanians and attempts to give them as honorable roots as possible. Usually, the Lithuanians were said to have their origins in Rome instead of in biblical tradition.

A connection between the Romans and the Lithuanians was already by Jan Długosz, who in his chronicle from around 1470 compared the names Lithuania and L'Italia, drew parallels between Lithuanian and Roman pagan beliefs and saw similarities between the Lithuanian language and Latin. He came to the conclusion that Romans had come to Lithuania during the time of Julius Caesar, but did not name any individuals or families (Zachara-Wawrzyńczyk 1963: 18–21; Kulicka 1980: 4–5; Ułaščik 1985: 135). It is less probable, however, that Długosz, himself a Pole and not overly concerned with Lithuania, invented the legend than that he documented a circulating tale (Niendorf 2006: 59).

Another version of the legend was to be found in Lithuanian chronicles. According to them, the Roman nobleman Palemon left Rome with his family and five hundred other noblemen and came to Lithuania. The chronicles differ as to when and why this happened. Some claimed that he left because of Nero’s cruelties in the 1st century A.D., others added that he also may have fled before Attila the Hun in the 5th century (Zachara-Wawrzyńczyk 1963: 24–25; Myl'nikov 1996: 207). The first type of chronicles has survived in for instance the Evreinškaja letopis’ (PSRL XXXV: 145–172) and the Letopis' Račinskogo (PSRL XXXV: 214–238), whereas the second type has a lot in common with the Chronika Bychovca (PSRL XXXII: 128–173) and the Chronika litovskaja i žmojtskaja (PSRL XXXII: 15–127). All in all, there are six surviving chronicles that tell about Palemon’s flight from Rome (Rogov 1966: 123–125; Ułaščik 1985: 130).21

Stryjkowski devoted chapter II: 7 of the Kronika (Stryjkowski 1582: 47–56) to this legend and related both versions, referring to the chronicles that were his sources with the following words: “To własna rzecz Latopiszców Litewskich po Rusku pissanych” (Stryjkowski 1582: 47) and “Drugi ząs Latópiszec […] tak też Kronike Litewską y Zmodzską/ poczyna prostymi słowy” (Stryjkowski 1582: 48). Afterwards he retold the legends in verse.

To give the legend a more solid foundation, it was necessary to identify Palemon in Roman sources. Marcin Kromer, in his De origine et rebus gestis Polonorum from 1555, derived the name Palemon from Publius Libo, whom he found in the works of the Roman historian Florus (Zachara-Wawrzyńczyk

---

21 The Letopis' Račinskogo is, however, of a later date than Stryjkowski’s chronicle and can therefore not be one of his sources, cf. Rogov (1966: 233).
E. Kulicka (1980: 8) points out the contradiction that the closest correspondences to the name Palemon in antique history are in fact Greek: the deity Palaemon and the Pontic kings Polemon I and II.

Stryjkowski followed Kromer’s hypothesis. In chapter III: 1, he referred to his sources among classical authors:

Liuius naprzednieyszy Rzymski Historyk/ y Iulius Florus z niego w księgach 4. w rozdziele 2. Publiussa Libona być morskim Hetmanem Pompeiussowym przeciw Cesarzowi wspomnianią.

Trogus też Pompeius niemniej sławny Historyk/ y Iustinus z niego/ iako Palemoná/ tác Publiussa Liboná częstokroć wspomnianią (Stryjkowski 1582: 58).

According to M. Zachara-Wawrzyńczyk (1963: 35), the legend about the Roman origins of the Lithuanians was first employed by the Teutonic Knights to emphasize their own right to power over these lands, and not until Lithuania needed to assert itself against Poland and Russia did they themselves claim it. Most scholars in the field disagree with this theory (Kulicka 1980: 1–4; Niendorf 2006: 59). Kulicka (1980: 5–10) thinks that the legend had its origins among prominent Lithuanian families in the 15th century. However, she also stresses that it filled the function of claiming their status against Poland. It is also possible that these claims were directed towards Muscovy or even aimed at Ruthenian families in an internal conflict within the Grand Duchy (Niendorf 2006: 59–60).

The Lithuanian and the Sarmatian legends were originally opposed to each other, competing for prestige, but in Strykowski’s interpretation, they were compatible. According to him, when the Roman noblemen arrived in Lithuania, it was already inhabited by the Lithuanians, who were descendants of Japheth and thereby one of the Sarmatian peoples. They mixed with the Romans and together with them formed the people of the Commonwealth. In this way, the two legends were united (Kulicka 1980: 12–14; Niendorf 2006: 61–63).

At a later stage, in the 17th century, Polish magnate families also began tracing their genealogy back to Roman ancestors. This led to a situation where the lesser nobility in both parts of the Commonwealth traced their lineage to the Sarmatians (cf. Section 2.4) and the magnates, likewise in both parts, saw themselves as descendants of the Romans, so that the two myths were used by different social strata rather than by different nationalities (Niendorf 2006: 62).

---

3 The East Slavic translations and the manuscripts

After this presentation of the author and the Polish original text, it is time to return to the main concern of the thesis, namely the Russian translations of the Polish chronicle, especially the one from 1673–79. The Ukrainian translation and the Ukrainian Chronograph that relies heavily on it will also be discussed here. The aim of the chapter is, however, to determine the relationships between the manuscripts belonging to the 1673–79 translation, since this is of importance to the edition as well as to the reasoning in the remainder of the thesis. Some of these manuscripts are of special interest and are accordingly given more attention. Two identified translators are also introduced here.

3.1 Russian-Polish relations in the late 17th century

Where documentation is absent, it is difficult to know the exact reasons why a particular text was translated and copied. Nevertheless, the situation in Russia, and especially its relations with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, at the time when Stryjkowski’s chronicle was translated, may explain the interest in Polish books in general and, perhaps, this historical work with its emphasis on the common ancestry of the Slavic peoples in particular. There are many aspects to be considered, and this can only be a very general outline of the history and culture of that time.

The monographs by D. Stone (2001) and S. Plokhy (2006), introduced in Section 2.1, will be among the main sources in this section as well. Since they concentrate on the borderlands between Russia and Poland, i.e. Ruthenia, they will be supplemented by The Cambridge History of Russia (2006), which also provides an outline of internal Muscovite events. P. V. Sedov (2006) has devoted a monograph to the last years of Aleksej Michajlovič’s reign and to that of Fëdor Alekseevič, describing the distribution of power and the events at court in great detail. A classical work on the connections
between Ruthenia and Russia from the mid-16th century to 1762, especially – but not exclusively – within the religious sphere, is Charlampović (1914). The cultural life of this period, especially the expressions of baroque in Russian literature, has been described by L. I. Sazonova (2006).

### 3.1.1 Historical background

The relations between Russia and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the 17th century were complicated. The beginning of the century had seen Poland’s intervention in Russian politics during the Time of Troubles, beginning with the Polish support of the first False Dmitrij. After Dmitrij’s death, King Sigismund III of Poland attempted to become tsar of Russia, while his son Władysław was invited by some of the Russian boyars to claim the throne, none of which came to pass. Polish troops occupied Moscow. Russia even sought Swedish aid against the Poles, but the credit for liberating Moscow in 1613 goes to Minin and Pożarski. Still, Poland did not give up its claim to the Russian throne until 1634 (Stone 2001: 140–142; *The Cambridge History* 2006: 409–431; Plokhy 2006: 204–206).

The desire to win back the territories around Smolensk that the Commonwealth had taken over from Russia during the Time of Troubles led to Russian involvement in the conflict between Poland and the Ukrainian Cossacks, siding with the Cossack uprising or, as others describe it, the Ukrainian struggle for autonomy, under Bohdan Chmel'nyc'kyj. The Perejaslav agreement between Russia and Chmel'nyc'kyj in 1654, which joined Ukrainian territories to Russia, started the Thirteen Years’ War. After Chmel'nyc'kyj’s death in 1657, discontent with Russia grew in the Ukrainian and Lithuanian areas, and there were internal conflicts between those who sought an alliance with the Poles and those who looked to Moscow for support. When the threat arose of the Ukraine breaking free with the support of the Crimean khan, the Commonwealth and Russia finally, in 1667, signed the Treaty of Andrusovo, which meant that Kiev, Smolensk and left-bank Ukraine were turned over to Russia (Stone 2001: 165–166; *The Cambridge History* 2006: 500–506; Plokhy 2006: 303–304). Kiev was supposed to be returned to the Commonwealth in 1669, but this was not done (Izotova 2004: 154–155).

In the second half of the 17th century, ambassadors were sent between Russia and Poland almost every year until they exchanged more permanent representatives in the 1670s (Nikolaev 2004: 86). The relations between the countries were intertwined with internal Russian affairs. A. L. Ordin-Naščokin, who was the head of *Posol'skij prikaz* (the Diplomatic Chancellery) during the years 1667–71 (cf. also Section 5.1), was of the opinion that peace with Poland should be sought even if it meant losing Kiev, and that the main aim in international affairs should be to challenge Sweden for the Bal-
tic lands. Not many people shared this view; instead tsar Aleksey Michajlovič and many others thought it very important to keep Kiev. A. S. Matveev, who replaced Ordin-Naščokin as the head of Posol'skij prikaz in 1671, shared the tsar’s opinion (Sedov 2006: 119–122).

The conflict between Russia and Poland also had religious implications. When Chmel'nyć'kyj appealed to tsar Aleksey Michajlovič, he did it in the name of Orthodoxy, and the areas taken over by Russia were those with mainly Orthodox population. This left the Commonwealth with a stronger Catholic and Uniate dominance, and increased the Russian notion of being the protector of Orthodoxy with the right to intervene on behalf of Orthodox believers. Another reason why the Orthodox church in Russia was strengthened was because left-bank Ukraine was a cultural center with many well educated clergymen (Skinner 2009: 150–154, 167).

Even after the truce at Andrusovo, all was not calm. Russia felt that its control of the left bank was threatened and feared that the Commonwealth would break the truce and try to reassert control of the area. There was also a fear of an invasion from the Ottoman Empire. The right-bank Cossacks still hoped for a united Ukraine and applied to the Ottoman Empire for help, which led to negotiations between Poland and Russia and the idea of a mutual defense pact against the Ottoman Empire (The Cambridge History 2006: 507–516). The conflict with the Ottoman Empire was partly a result of the Russian policy after Ordin-Naščokin’s replacement by Matveev, which focused on control over the Ukraine. With the Ottoman Empire as the main enemy, relations with Poland grew friendlier (Sedov 2006: 121–122). During these years it was even suggested that Aleksey Michajlovič or his son Fëdor become king of Poland, but religious differences were an obstacle (Sedov 2006: 182–183). The change towards a more positive Russian view on Poland in the 1660s and 1670s was probably to some extent due to the fact that the older generation that still remembered the Time of Troubles and had a very negative opinion of Poland was succeeded by a younger generation with more experience of Western cultural influence and an attitude towards Poland as a possible ally. This generation shift took place gradually and the positive attitude did not always prevail (Sedov 2006: 346–349).

Russian and Commonwealth diplomats met in Andrusovo in 1669, 1674 and 1678 to discuss the questions that still remained after the Treaty, but not only did they not manage to solve the remaining problems during these meetings, there even arose new ones. In numerous accusations, both sides tried to show that the other party had broken the agreements. For instance, during the meeting in 1674, which took place in the middle of a war between Poland and Turkey that had begun in 1672, Poland complained that Russia had not helped them enough against the Turks and against Cossack troubles in right-bank Ukraine in connection with this war. Muscovy denied these accusations and began to claim all of the Ukraine, even the Polish-controlled
right bank, with the motivation that Poland was not doing well in the war and would probably turn those areas over to Turkey (Izotova 2004: 150–160).

In connection with the Russo-Turkish war of 1676–81, Muscovy’s position was strengthened. A few years later, the Commonwealth, which had been weakened and was anxious not to stand alone, sought to form an alliance with Russia. The Treaty of Eternal Peace, which brought some advantages to Russia, was signed in 1686 (Izotova 2004: 161–163; The Cambridge History 2006: 507–516).

The intensity of Russo-Polish relations can to some extent be measured by the number of books filled with documents on the subject in Posol'skij prikaz. For the whole of the 17th century, the number of books filled was 234, almost twice as many as were devoted to Swedish affairs, and far ahead of any other diplomatic area (Kamiński 1993: 98–100; cf. Rogožin 2003: 194–216). The inventory of Posol'skij prikaz which was made in 1673 also shows the dominance of Polish-Lithuanian affairs: it lists some 2,100 documents on this topic, which surpasses the number of documents devoted to Crimean and Swedish affairs taken together (Rogožin 2003: 161–163).

3.1.2 Cultural background

As borders changed, people moved in new ways, and political contacts were accompanied by cultural ones. The areas incorporated by Russia in 1654 had until then been part of a Western cultural sphere, and when people instead began to move from there to Moscow and other Russian cities, they brought new influences with them. Many people who later had great impact on Russian cultural life came from these areas, such as Simeon Polockij, Epifanij Slavineckij and Feofan Prokopovič. The influence of the Orthodox but Western-influenced Kiev Mohyla Collegium, founded in 1632, on Russian cultural life is also well attested (Kamiński 1993: 184–185; Plokhy 2006: 253; Sazonova 2006: 36–45).

In Moscow, the end of the 17th century was characterized by tensions between groups with different ideas about the direction society should take. The so-called Latinizers embraced Western influences, mediated by Poland and Ruthenia, and their ideas of reform were to a large extent centered on education. Simeon Polockij and Sil'vestr Medvedev were among the leaders of this group, which was supported by Fëdor Alekseevič and Sof'ja Alekseevna at court. The Graecophiles, led by Epifanij Slavineckij and Evfimij Čudovskij and supported by Patriarch Ioakim, were oriented towards Greek orthodoxy, but rejected other aspects of Greek culture (Uspenskij 2002: 426; Sazonova 2006: 85–112).

Culture and trends at the tsar’s court changed during the second half of the 17th century. The changes could be felt in many areas, and they were
often connected to Western influence. A new form of church singing was introduced, based on Ukrainian and Polish models and often performed by singers from these areas. Polish clothes became fashionable among Muscovite men in the 1670s – although, because of the Sarmatian ideology (cf. Section 2.4), Polish fashion was in turn inspired by Turkish and Oriental clothing. The women at court began wearing Polish-style hats in the 1680s (Sedov 2006: 494–519).

In the light of the contacts with the West, it is not surprising that the interest in Polish books and history was great in Russia. A number of Polish books and pamphlets were known in Russia in the 17th century. Many of them were bought by Posol'skij prikaz, whose library in 1673 contained 17 Polish books, or 14.4%, second only to the number of books in Latin (Luppov 1970: 196–198). The role and importance of Posol'skij prikaz will be examined more closely in Chapter 5. Private persons, such as Simeon Polockij, tsar Fëdor Alekseevič, A. S. Matveev and Epifanij Slavineckij, also owned books in Polish, to a lesser or greater extent (Luppov 1970: 148–150).

Polish literature also had a great influence through translations. A. I. Sobolevskij, in his Perevodnaja literatura moskovskoj Rusi XIV–XVII vekov, stated that most of the translations in 17th-century Russia were made from Latin, the language of science in “Poland and Western Europe” at that time, followed by Polish as the second most common source language. The geographical origins of the source texts are more varied, but many of them were not translated from the originals, but rather via Polish translations. Sobolevskij points out that the influence by Polish authors was not very large, i.e. even though translations from Polish were common, the share of Polish authors was not as great (Sobolevskij 1903: 49–50).

S. I. Nikolaev, in his bibliography of Russo-Polish relations during the 16th–18th centuries, has listed 60 Polish authors whose texts were translated into Russian during this time, as well as 17 anonymous Polish texts. Twenty-six authors of Antiquity or from Western Europe were translated into Russian via Polish translations. Four translations have been mentioned in documents but cannot now be found, and there are 18 texts that can be assumed for different reasons to be translations from Polish, but the originals are not known (Nikolaev 2004: 244–247).

The Polish books and translations from Polish concerned many different subjects, such as geography, cosmography, astronomy, politics and history. There were also translations of literary works, including poetry of different types (cf. Sobolevskij 1903; Moiseeva 1973; Nikolaev 2008). Polish pamphlets and occasional poetry were translated for diplomatic reasons (Nikolaev 2004: 87).
3.2 The translations of Stryjkowski’s *Kronika*

One of the more important historical texts translated was Stryjkowski’s *Kronika*. Sobolevskij (1903: 79–80) recognized two translations, the first of which he characterized as Church Slavonic and the second as bad Church Slavonic, written by a person with a tendency to switch into Russian.

A. I. Rogov in his above-mentioned monograph *Russko-pol'skie kul'turnye svyazi v epochu vozroždenija* lists four translations of Stryjkowski into Russian: two partial and two complete ones (Rogov 1966: 269–287). He gives a survey of the manuscripts containing the two complete translations, based on previous descriptions of the manuscripts and completed by his own observations (Rogov 1966: 274–287). A more recent and slightly more complete list has been made by S. I. Nikolaev (2008: 101–102), who, on the other hand, does not describe the manuscripts, but only refers to existing descriptions. These two scholars give no complete list of the manuscripts containing Lyzlov’s translation; for that information, one must turn to books about the Kurbskij Collection, such as Keenan (1971), *Perepiska* (1979) and *Erusalimskij* (2009). Neither of these scholars takes into consideration the Ukrainian translation discussed in Section 3.2.5.

Table 3 shows the history of the chronicle on East Slavic territory, beginning with the earliest translation, the Ukrainian one. The translations will be described in more detail below, and the manuscript situation is accounted for in Sections 3.5 and 3.7, but some parts of the table need a brief explanation here.

*Table 3. East Slavic translations of Stryjkowski’s *Kronika***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Parts translated</th>
<th>Known copies</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1608–22</td>
<td>The whole <em>Kronika</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ukrainian translation</td>
<td>3.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668–70</td>
<td>IV: 1–3</td>
<td>(9+1)</td>
<td>Preserved in mss. together with 1668 translation and parts of 1673–79 translation</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673–79</td>
<td>The whole <em>Kronika</em></td>
<td>11 (12 mss.)</td>
<td>Translated by Čičinskij et al.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td>I: 2, part of II: 1, IV: 1–3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Translated by Lyzlov</td>
<td>3.2.3, 3.7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>I–III?</td>
<td>9+1</td>
<td>Preserved in mss. together with 1668–70 translation and parts of 1673–79 translation</td>
<td>3.2.4, 3.7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The partial translation from 1668–70 does not exist as separate manuscripts, but is preserved only together with the 1688 translation and parts of the 1673–79 translation, for which reason the number of known copies is set in parentheses.

There are eleven copies of the 1673–79 translation, but one copy is divided into two manuscripts that have different call numbers and are kept in
different libraries (cf. Section 3.5.2), and there are therefore twelve manuscripts.

It has not been definitely established what parts of the text were translated in 1688, but it is known that the translation from 1668–70 is incorporated into the mss. containing this translation, and that large parts of the text are very similar to the 1673–79 translation. Nine mss. belong to this translation, and there are references to one more copy that perished in 1812, which is expressed in the table by the figure “9+1”.

Nikolaev (2008: 103) listed yet another manuscript, which my studies have shown contains some other historical text, not Stryjkowski’s chronicle, although I have not been able to identify the text. The manuscript is RNB f. 659, sobranie Archeologičeskogo obščestva, No. 33 (previously No. 36), from the 17th century. Nikolaev erroneously listed it as BAN sobranie Archeografičeskogo obščestva, No. 36, i.e. he was mistaken in the library and the collection to which it belonged.\(^{23}\)

Radziszewska (1978: 102) also mentions a Russian translation of IV: 1–2, made in 1688, but without reporting her source. No one else mentions this translation, and it is probably some kind of misunderstanding. Her list contains one more mistake: she claims that Lyzlov’s translation was of books I–III, which is incorrect. Therefore, this otherwise unknown translation from 1688 may also be a misunderstanding on her part.

The earliest Russian documents mentioning the chronicle date to the 1680s. One document (RGADA f[ond] 159, op[is'] 1, no. 825, l[isty] 47–50) speaks of the translation of Stryjkowski’s chronicle being bound, with gilded edges, by the bookbinder Ostafij Fëдоров for Posol'skij prikaz. He was paid for this, and for the binding of another book, which we will return to later (cf. Section 3.3.2), in October 1681.

According to a description of tsar Fëdor Alekseevič’s library, it contained a copy of Stryjkowski’s chronicle bound in white leather and with marbled edges. A year after Fëdor Alekseevič’s death, twelve of his books, among them this copy of the Kronika, were delivered to Peter I (on March 19\(^{24}\), 1683), and on April 12\(^{24}\), 1683, they were passed on to the Masterskaja palata (Zabelin 1915: 602–607; Luppov 1970: 116).

Besides the translations listed in Table 3, there is another text that has sometimes been referred to as a Belorussian translation of Stryjkowski and will therefore be discussed in Section 3.2.6, even though this attribution is incorrect.

---

\(^{23}\) Cf. also Prozorovskij (1879: 56–60), who was the first to define this as a translation of Stryjkowski’s chronicle in his catalog of the Sobranie Archeologičeskogo obščestva.

\(^{24}\) «Матвей Стриковского, въ белой кожѣ, по обѣду пышкомъ (и 19 Марта въ 19 день сѣю книгу Великаго Государя Царя и Великаго Князя Петра Алексѣевича въ хорыы принятъ околоичей Тихонь Микитичь Стрѣшневъ» (Zabelin 1915: 604).
3.2.1 The translation of 1668–70

The first Russian translation was made during the years 1668–70. To begin with, only a part of the chronicle was translated, namely the part that the Russians were supposedly most interested in, i.e. chapters IV: 1–3. They concern the origin of the peoples of the world, particularly the Slavs, and the early history of Kievan Rus'. As already mentioned, this translation has not survived as an independent work, but was included in manuscripts together with later translations, cf. Section 3.2.4 (Rogov 1966: 269–270).

The date 1668 is found in the heading to chapter IV: 1 (RGADA f. 181, no. 59, fol. 127r),\(^{25}\) and the date 1670 in a passage in chapter IV: 3:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{и от лѣтъ .об. [72]} & \text{до инѣшнаго .вѣ. [1670] уже есть .афчи. [1598] лѣть (RGADA 59, fol. 155r)}
\end{align*}\]

In this translation, Stryjkowski’s name is omitted from the chapter headings, and the comments he made in the Polish original on what he had seen during his travels and the places he had visited were left out. Rogov (1966: 269–271) sees this as an attempt to disguise the fact that he was the author and give him the status of a source among others.

For instance, when describing the weapons hanging on the walls of Adrianople, Stryjkowski refers to his own experience, but this is omitted in the translation:

\[\begin{align*}
(1) \quad & \text{A ty wszystki dźiwne woienne Instrumenta są zwieszone na murze […] u wielkiew bramy/ ktworymem sie ia dobrze przypatrzył. (Stryjkowski 1582: 88)}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
& \text{a тв всѣ дивны военны орудия повѣшены суть на стенѣ […] у великои башни (RGADA 59, fol. 129v)}
\end{align*}\]

A similar example is found in the beginning of IV: 2, when discussing the origin of the Slavs:

\[\begin{align*}
(2) \quad & \text{wlasnymi dziedzicami Paflagonskiey Ziemi z stárodawnych wiekow być sie powiádaię/ o czymem ia tez sam z niemi miał częste rozmowy/ Roku 1574, gdym tám był w tych kráinach. (Stryjkowski 1582: 94)}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
& \text{истинными наследники повелагонскон земли из древних лѣть повѣдаемы быти (RGADA 59, fol. 137r)}
\end{align*}\]

---

\(^{25}\) Hereafter, for the sake of brevity, called RGADA 59.
\(^{26}\) In quotes such as this, where numbers are of particular importance, the corresponding Arabic numerals are given in square brackets.
The words left out in example (2) are missing in the 1673–79 translation as well (example (70)), even though there, Stryjkowski was acknowledged as being the author (cf. also Section 5.3.2).

The following is yet another example:

(3) s stárej Kroniki Moskiewskiej/ ktorey ia też Exemplarz mam/ opissuie. (Stryjkowski 1582: 128)

во описании старого лѣтописца московскаго описует (RGADA 59, fol. 172v)

In many cases, anything that defines Russians as “them” and the Polish as “us” has been reversed or changed. For example, expressions such as “iák Ruś pisze” have often been left out (e.g. Stryjkowski 1582: 123, cf. RGADA 59, fol. 167r) or altered, so that “ktorego dziś Ruś używa” (Stryjkowski 1582: 141) turns into «коего мы имен россияне употребляемъ» (RGADA 59, fol. 185v), and when Stryjkowski uses expressions such as “naszy polskie,” the word “naszy” has often been left out in the translation.

In chapter IV: 2, Stryjkowski quoted the beginning of different passages from Ovid’s Epistulae ex Ponto and then wrote his own translation of larger parts of the same verses (cf. also Section 5.3.1): two lines in Latin followed by eight in Polish, then two in Latin and twelve in Polish, two in Latin and four in Polish. In the 1668–70 translation, both the Latin and the Polish text have been translated, but with these introductions to the Polish verses, respectively:

Матвей же Стриковский Полскими вещи пишет сице (RGADA 59, fol. 148v)

А Стриковский сиц пишет, (RGADA 59, fol. 148v)

Стриковский, (RGADA 59, fol. 149r)

Thus, the only time Stryjkowski’s name is mentioned, it gives the impression that he was the translator of the poems from Latin into Polish rather than the author of the whole chronicle. At this time, a translation was often regarded as a separate work by a separate author, so this way of treating translated texts was not considered as deceiving the reader (cf. Nikolaev 1989: 29).

The manuscripts in which this translation is included are listed in Section 3.7.2.

3.2.2 The translation of 1673–79

Shortly after this first, partial translation, the whole chronicle was translated. Rogov (1966: 278) dated this translation to approximately 1673–79. The
The date 1679 is found in one of the manuscripts, RNB Èrm. 551, which in itself is a late manuscript, but with a title page (vol. I, fol. 1r) which pronounces it to be a copy of a manuscript from 1679 (cf. Section 3.5.3). It is true that the same title page also claims that the Polish original was printed in 1580, not 1582, so the information might not be entirely trustworthy.

J. E. Šustova (2008: 15–18) refutes Rogov’s reasoning and instead dates the translation to 1672–73. The earlier date is based on documents that mention the binding of a Polish chronicle in November of 1672 (cf. Section 3.5.3). She believes that this refers to the Polish original of Stryjkowski’s chronicle that was bound in preparation for translation. Assuming that the text referred to is the Kronika, which we do not know for sure, it was bound so late in the year that we cannot be certain that the translation work actually began in the same year.

As for the translation being completed in 1673, Šustova believes that no more than a year was needed for the translation of the chronicle, considering the speed with which books were translated at Posol'skij prikaz. This assumption cannot be proved for certain, since too little is known about the time needed for such tasks. For instance, there may have been translations of high and low priority. In any case, she claims, the translation was probably finished before the death of Aleksej Michajlovič in 1676, or else his death would in some way have been mentioned in the note in Slav 26, fol. 5r (cf. Section 3.6.2). However, she assumes that the note was written in connection with the completion of the translation, whereas it was actually made by Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeld, the Swede who received the manuscript as a gift in 1685, and was therefore added long after Aleksej Michajlovič’s death anyway.

A weighty argument against Šustova’s dating of the translation (and at the same time an argument in favor of the assumption that several translators took part in the work) is that Stepan Čižinskij, who was involved in translating the Kronika, did not start working as a translator until 1678 (cf. Section 3.3.2). Therefore, I will use the date suggested by Rogov, which also has the advantage of being the one most widely used by other scholars, which minimizes the risk for misunderstandings.

This is the translation I am primarily concerned with, and the 12 manuscripts belonging to it are described and discussed in Section 3.5.
3.2.3 The translation of 1682

In 1682, the Russian historian Andrej Lyzlov made a translation of I: 2, the beginning of II: 1 and IV: 1–3 (except the end of IV: 3), i.e., IV: 1–3 were translated a third time. Chapter I: 2 is about the division of the earth between the sons of Noah after the flood, and about the peoples that originated from them and their sons. As a whole, the text translated by Lyzlov explained the origin not only of the Slavs, but of other peoples as well. Perhaps he meant in this way to emphasize the position of the Slavs as a part of world history. These parts of the *Kronika* interested him as a sort of introduction or pre-history to later Muscovite chronicles. At the end of his translation, he suggested the *Stepennaja kniga* as further reading (Das 1986: 345–347).

Lyzlov was especially interested in the Slavic peoples’ struggle against the Crimean and Ottoman enemy, and this interest was expressed in his translation. The Polish text was accurately rendered, but Lyzlov supplied it with marginal notes that gave the story a Muscovite bias. He especially elaborated on everything that concerned Noah’s son Japhet and his sixth son Meshech, who was seen as the forefather of the Slavic peoples (cf. Section 2.4). In his marginal notes, he emphasized the link between biblical past and 17th-century Muscovy through Meshech. He did not, however, stress the connection between Hazarmaveth and the Sarmatians, who by that time had become synonymous with the Poles rather than with all Slavs. Stryjkowski used Rus’ and Moscow to signify two different entities, but in Lyzlov’s translation – unlike the other ones – Rus’ was turned into Rossija, which was more or less the same thing as Muscovy, and thereby Moscow’s role in Russia’s early history was strengthened, as opposed to Kiev (Das 1986: 346–349).

Lyzlov’s translation is preserved in some of the manuscripts belonging to the so-called Kurbskij Collection (*Sbornik Kurbskogo*), cf. Section 3.7.1.

3.2.4 The translation of 1688

There are a number of manuscripts with the year 1688 on the title page that contain a Russian translation of the chronicle (and some without this date, but containing the same translation). Rogov (1966: 280–285) lists nine manuscripts belonging to this translation, one of which perished in 1812. Nikolaev (2008: 102) mentions yet another manuscript.

However, this was not an entirely new translation. As mentioned above (cf. Section 3.2.1), the translation from 1668–70, i.e. IV: 1–3, was incorporated into it. Furthermore, Rogov (1966: 290) put forth the idea that other parts of the 1688 translation were only an edition of the one from 1673–79,
and not a separate translation. My comparisons show that the two translations differ mainly in books I–III. From book V onwards, some parts seem to be direct copies from the translation of 1673–79, and some parts are slightly altered. This is only a preliminary conclusion, however, and one of Rogov’s text examples, from the very end of book XXV, shows a great difference between the two translations (Rogov 1966: 290). This study does not attempt to solve the question of the relationship between the two translations, but one may safely say that only parts of the chronicle were translated anew in 1688 – perhaps only the first three books.

The manuscripts in which this translation is found are listed in Section 3.7.2.

3.2.5 Two Ukrainian manuscripts

Most scholars have concentrated on these Russian translations, but there are also two manuscripts that have been defined as containing a Ukrainian translation.

One of these manuscripts is kept in the Kiev National Library (NBUV) under the call number f. 1, no. 57487, previously Laz. 48 (Ul’janovs’kyj & Jakovenko 1993: 6; Toločko 1996: 159), although it has also been referred to as VIII 106m/Laz. 52 (SUM 1: 44). Ul’janovs’kyj and Jakovenko (1993: 6–9) explain that the translation of Stryjkowski’s chronicle takes up the first 660 folios of a total of 675. The remaining folios contain a Kievan Chronicle (Kyivs’kyj litopysec’) from 1618. The scholars have described the manuscript thoroughly and accounted for its history. Among other things, they identified several different watermarks that they dated to the first half of the 17th century. Based on the layout of the text as well as on the degree to which Latin quotes and marginal notes were translated, they reached the conclusion that the text was translated by several people. Toločko (1996: 159–167), who dated the manuscript to some time between 1608 and 1622, studied insertions in the text, made by one of the translators, and traced them to the Sofij-skaja pervaja letopis’ or a chronicle similar to it. This manuscript is used as source material for the Ukrainian historical dictionary, SUM.

The other manuscript is RGADA f. 181, no. 365, which belonged to Petr Mohyla, as is seen from a note in his handwriting. Fols. 1–27 of this manuscript are said to contain excerpts from the Ukrainian translation of the Kronika, and have a watermark dated by Ul’janovs’kyj and Jakovenko (1993: 10–11) to 1614–15. The text corresponds to book I of the Polish text, except for the last few phrases. It is written in poluustav with initials and occasional marginal notes written in, seemingly, red ink (I have only seen the manu-
script in a microfilm copy). In this manuscript, all parts originally written in Latin have been left out, usually with a space in the text, perhaps so that some other person could fill in those parts later, which, however, was not done.

After comparing the manuscripts, Toločko (1996: 167–168), came to the conclusion that they belong to the same translation, although there are minor differences between them. I have not seen the NBUV manuscript, but judging by the articles by Toločko and Ul'janovs'kyj and Jakovenko, I do not, in any case, believe that the text in the RGADA manuscript is a copy of that in the NBUV manuscript. One reason for this is that Ul'janovs'kyj and Jakovenko (1993: 8) claim that Latin quotes are translated faithfully in the first folios of the NBUV manuscript, whereas they, as mentioned, are left out of the RGADA manuscript. There would be no reason to leave blank spaces instead of copying text that had already been translated; it is more probable that a translator who did not master Latin omitted the quotes. There are also some cases where the RGADA manuscript is closer to the Polish text than the NBUV manuscript is, at least if Toločko’s transcription of it is to be trusted.

A comparison of these manuscripts with each other and of the Ukrainian translation with one or all of the Russian translations is a project for the future.

3.2.6 The Ukrainian Chronograph

The manuscript RNB F.IV.688 has sometimes been called a West-Russian (Sobolevskij 1903: 80; Ptašickij 1905) or Belorussian translation (Avanesaũ 1961: 387) of Stryjkowski’s chronicle. Therefore, it will be discussed among the translations of the Kronika even though it is in fact a copy of the Ukrainian Chronograph (Knjaz'kov 1984). Rogov expressed himself rather contradictorily about this manuscript, once speaking of it as a reworked edition (pererabotka) of Stryjkowski’s Kronika, incorporated into the chronicle of Leontij Bobolinskij (Rogov 1966: 17), once calling it Slavjanorusskaja krojnika and saying that it used Stryjkowski as a source (Rogov 1966: 295–297). The latter definition is closest to that expressed by Knjaz'kov.

As a matter of fact, as Toločko (1996: 169–175) shows, the source of this Ukrainskij chronograf was not the Polish original of Stryjkowski’s chronicle, but the Ukrainian translation, which he bases on the fact that the insertions from other chronicles are found in this text as well. This was also stated by Knjaz'kov (1984: 23, 93, 149).

28 Ptašickij (1905: 381) admitted that it was a translation «с небольшими видоизменениями и сокращениями». 56
The text in RNB F.IV.688 is divided into two parts, which have been considered to be translations of Bielski’s and Strykowskii’s chronicles, respectively. Knjaz'kov (1984: 9–10) instead calls the first part the general part of the chronograph (obščejistoričeskaja čast’) and the second the Slavjano-russkaja krojnika. The first part is based on Bielski’s chronicle and Caesar Baronius’ *Annales Ecclesiastici* to almost equal shares (Knjaz'kov 1984: 90). The second part can be divided into a Russian, a Lithuanian and a Polish section. According to Knjaz'kov (1984: 96), 70% of the material in the Russian section is taken from Stryjkowski, and the Lithuanian section is also largely based on his *Kronika* (Knjaz'kov 1984: 116–117), whereas the Polish section relies mainly on Guagnini (Knjaz'kov 1984: 121–122).

Ptašickij (1905: 381) also mentioned RNB F.IV.342 in a footnote as belonging to the “West-Russian translation.” RNB F.IV.342, however, is a collection of 18th-century copies of documents from tsar Fëdor Ivanovič’s reign. Perhaps Ptašickij was referring to the manuscript RNB F.IV.372, which is a fragment of another copy of the Ukrainian chronograph (PSRL XXXII 5–6; Knjaz'kov 1984: 45).

Although the Ukrainian Chronograph exists in other manuscripts as well (cf. Knjaz'kov 1984: 216–217), only these two have been mentioned in connection with Stryjkowski.

Avanesaũ (1961: 387) claims that the “Belorussian translation” was made in the first half of the 17th century. Knjaz'kov dates the compilation of the chronograph to some time after 1625 but not later than the early 1630s, judging by the sources used and the watermarks of the earliest manuscript (Knjaz'kov 1984: 32, 61), and dates the manuscript RNB F.IV.688 to the 1670s (Knjaz'kov 1984: 37, 81).

Excerpts from the manuscript RNB F.IV.688 have been published by Avanesaũ in a textbook of the history of the Belorussian language, where the text is presented as a translation of Stryjkowski’s chronicle (cf. Section 1.2). It is used as source material for the Belorussian historical dictionary HSBM. Knjaz'kov (1984: 156), however, characterizes the language as Ukrainian. Leeming (1968: 284) uses Avanesaũ’s edition in his study of polonisms in Ruthenian. Facsimiles of pages from this manuscript can be found in Avanesaũ (1961: 392) and Knjaz'kov (1984: 232).

### 3.3 The translators

We do not know the names of all the translators involved in the different translations of the chronicle. All the translations are anonymous, except for the 1682 translation, which was made by Andrej Lyzlov. With the help of archival documents, one name can be connected with the 1673–79 translation, namely that of Stepan Čižinskij.
3.3.1 Andrej Lyzlov

Andrej Ivanovič Lyzlov was born in a noble family in Moscow in the 1650s or 1660s. He participated in several military campaigns during the 1670s–1690s (Das 1992: 502–503; SKK 1993: 305–306). He was a well-educated man, and beside his military duties, he translated a number of texts: the aforementioned parts of Stryjkowski’s chronicle, possibly the sections of Alexander Guagnini’s *Sarmatiae Europaeae Descriptio* that appear in the Kurbskij Collection along with his translation of Stryjkowski, and Szymon Starowolski’s *Dwór cesarza tureckiego i rezydencja jego w Konstantynopolu*, originally printed in 1646 (SKK 1993: 306; Nikolaev 2008: 98–100). He also wrote a historical work of his own, called *Skifskaja istorija* (Lyzlov 1990), which was strongly influenced by Stryjkowski and in which he quoted extensive passages from the *Kronika*, as well as his own translation of *Dwór cesarza tureckiego*, which he included as a final chapter in his book (Čistjakova 1963: 351–354).

In E. M. Isserlin’s comparison of the lexical properties of six translations of *Dwór cesarza tureckiego* (cf. also Section 3.3.2), she found Lyzlov’s translation to be written in an archaic manner, with a tendency to use abstract words where the others preferred a more concrete wording, to use general expressions instead of specific terminology, and to use one polysemic Russian word for several Polish – more specific – ones (Isserlin 1961: 16–19).

It is sometimes said that Lyzlov introduced to Russian history writing the practice of presenting historical material in parts and chapters, with marginal notes and a table of contents, which he had learned from the Polish sources he used – among them Stryjkowski (Das 1992: 504).

His translation of Stryjkowski’s chronicle is discussed in Section 3.2.3.

3.3.2 Stepan Čižinskij

In November 1681, Stepan Čižinskij, a translator at *Posol'skij prikaz* and *Malorossijskij prikaz*, asked for a pay raise because he translated books “day and night and at home.” His request was granted because of the large number of books he had translated – among them Stryjkowski. It seems to have been common among translators to take work home (Rogožin 2003: 56–57).
Stepan Čižinskij was from the county (powiat) of L'viv and came to Moscow in 1675 (Lukičev 2004: 337). He soon became active in the first court theater, which had been founded in 1672. He was in charge of the theater until it was closed down after the death of Aleksej Michajlovič in January of 1676 (Kudrjavcev 1963: 238–239; SKK 2004: 229–232). During that time, four plays were staged, two at the end of 1675 and two in January of 1676, but only two of the four plays have been preserved. Čižinskij is sometimes said to have been the author of these plays, and in any case he was responsible for staging them. Since the main figures at the theater before him, notably the priest Johann Gottfried Gregorii (SKK 1992: 226–229) and the teacher Georg Hübner (SKK 1992: 203–204), had been Germans, some scholars claim that with Čižinskij, the repertoire of the court theater changed from translated plays to original Russian ones (Istorija russkogo dramatičeskogo teatra 1977: 71–72). However, the question of the authorship of the plays is disputed, and the language in which they were written has yet to be established.

After the closing of the court theater, Čižinskij was employed at Posol'skij prikaz as a translator from Polish and Latin (Kudrjavcev 1963: 238–239; SKK 2004: 229–232). He was employed there from February 1st, 1678 (RGADA f. 138, op. 1, no. 20, l. 385). As already mentioned, he also worked for Malorossijskij prikaz.

Besides Stryjkowski’s chronicle, he also translated for example Johannes Hevelius’ Selenographia: sive, lunae descriptio (which he called книга о луні in his request, cf. note 30) from an edition printed in 1647 (Sobolevskij 1903: 147–148; Nikolaev 2008: 56),31 Szymon Starowolski’s Dwór cesarza tureckiego (Sobolevskij 1903: 90–92; Nikolaev 2008: 97–98), Caesar Baronius’ Annales Ecclesiastici (Барониусъ в the request from 1681, which may be the year of the translation, cf. note 30) from the Latin original from 1607 (Sobolevskij 1903: 83–86; Nikolaev 2008: 158), and several other texts. Čižinskij died in 1709 (Kudrjavcev 1963: 238–239; SKK 2004: 229–232).

The translation of Stryjkowski that he worked on must have been the one from 1673–79, since he had not yet come to Moscow when the first translation was made, in 1668–70, and the documents concerning his pay raise are from 1681, i.e. before 1688, when the next anonymous translation was made. His participation also helps to verify the latter date of the 1673–79 translation, since he only began working as a translator in 1678 (cf. also Section 3.2.2). Furthermore, it is an argument in favor of the hypothesis that the text was translated by several people (cf. Chapter 6), since he was not yet em-

31 The lexical properties of the translation have been studied in Sablina & Sacharovskaja (1982).
ployed at Posol'skij prikaz in 1673, when the translation work had already begun.

Isserlin stated, in her comparison of the lexical properties of six translations of Dwór cesarza tureckiego (cf. Section 3.3.1), that Čižinskij’s translation is characterized by great attention to correct Church Slavonic orthography and lexicon, without being unusually archaic. Despite this attempt to maintain a bookish language, he used numerous concrete words and terms, well known from Russian everyday life (Isserlin 1961: 23–24).

In archival documents, Stryjkowski’s chronicle and Hevelius’ Sele-nographia often occur together, but there is slightly more information to be found about the latter. Both books are mentioned in a document from October 1681 concerning payment for the bookbinder Ostafij Fëdorov (cf. Section 3.2). There it is said that the книга о лунѣ was brought to the tsar, but there is no such indication regarding the chronicle (RGADA f. 159, op. 1, no. 825, ll. 47–50). The pod’jačij Andrej Ivanov received payment for having written the fair copy of the книга о лунѣ alone (ll. 41–43), but we do not know the names of the scribes who wrote the chronicle. In the description of Fëdor Alekseevič’s library, also mentioned in Section 3.2, the chronicle is once again found alongside a книга о лунѣ.32

3.4 The edition: choice of chapters
After this introduction of the different translations, the choice of text for the edition should be explained.

The chapters IV: 1–3 were the first to be translated into Russian and were translated more times than any other part. That makes it fair to assume that this was also the part that was the most interesting for the educated strata of the Russian society, as well as the most widely spread. This is why these chapters have been chosen as the main object of study.

That particular section exists in three Russian versions: the 1668–70 translation, the 1673–79 translation and the 1682 translation, found in the Kurbaskij Collection. The choice fell on the 1673–79 version for several reasons.

First of all, it exists in slightly more copies than the others, which might imply that it was more widely spread than the others. Also, as Rogov (1966: 276–277) points out, it seems to have been the officially sanctioned translation, since a copy of it was made especially for Catherine II when she studied Russian history.

32 «О лунѣ и о всѣхъ планетахъ небесныхъ» (Zabelin 1915: 604).
Rogov (1966: 291–292) also suggests that a copy of the 1673–79 translation (BAN 31.4.32) was later prepared for printing, which I, however, wish to argue against (cf. Section 3.6.1).

Moreover, since one aim of this study is to compare different parts of the chronicle, this translation is better suited, since it was, as far as we know, a whole new translation, whereas the manuscripts dated 1688 are a patchwork of old and new parts. Comparing, for instance, books I, IV and VIII of the so-called 1688 translation would actually mean comparing parts translated in 1688, 1668–70, and 1673–79, respectively, which would not suit the purpose of the study.

3.5 The manuscripts of the translation of 1673–79

The 1673–79 translation is in focus for this study. As has already been mentioned, it exists in eleven copies, one of which has been split between two libraries, for which reason there are twelve manuscripts. They can be divided into three different groups based on similarities in the text. Because I needed to study the chapters IV: 1–3 closely in preparation for the edition, the comparison between the manuscripts has been conducted mainly on these chapters. The manuscripts are listed in Table 4, which contains references to sections where they are discussed in more detail.

Table 4. Manuscripts belonging to the 1673–79 translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sigla</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Call number</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>BAN</td>
<td>31.4.32</td>
<td>3.5.1, 3.6.1, 3.6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>GIM</td>
<td>Muzejskoe sobranie, no. 1391</td>
<td>3.5.1, 3.6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RNB</td>
<td>F.IV.103</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5.1, 3.6.3, 3.6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>RNB</td>
<td>F.IV.131</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5.1, 3.6.3, 3.6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>JaGPU</td>
<td></td>
<td>B-596</td>
<td>3.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>UUB</td>
<td>Slav–28</td>
<td>3.5.2, 3.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>Egorovskoe sobranie, f. 98, no. 243</td>
<td>3.5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>RGADA</td>
<td>f. 181, no. 58</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>CGIA SPb</td>
<td>58922</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>RNB</td>
<td>F.IV.172</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>RNB</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ėrmitažnoe sobranie, no. 551/1–2</td>
<td>3.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>RNB</td>
<td>Pogodinskoe sobranie, no. 1759</td>
<td>3.5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following short characteristic of the manuscripts is partly based on existing descriptions (with Rogov as a starting point), partly on my own observations. The emphasis is on information that is relevant to dating the manuscripts and setting them in relation to each other, as well as the facts on
which the choice of manuscripts for the edition has been based. Other information, not found in existing descriptions, is in some cases also included.

For different reasons, I have not been able to study the watermarks of all the manuscripts, and have therefore had to rely on Rogov in many cases. There are, however, several problems with his information about watermarks. To begin with, he often gives countermarks and other letter symbols in the Cyrillic alphabet, even when they are actually in the Latin alphabet, e.g. ДМ instead of DM. More seriously, he sometimes gives inaccurate references to watermark albums, e.g. he describes a watermark as having the countermark CA, but his reference is to a watermark with the countermark CAS, or he describes a Seven Provinces watermark but refers to a watermark with the Amsterdam coat-of-arms. It is of course impossible to know, without turning to the manuscripts for verification, if the descriptions or the references are correct in these cases. Last but not least, he expresses himself very briefly when dating watermarks, which gives the impression that a certain watermark can be dated to a precise year or interval of years, when the correct way to express this would be that the watermark in question has been found in a book or document from that year. If the watermarks are similar but not identical, the dating is of course even more uncertain, and even more so if the countermarks are incorrectly deciphered, as there is reason to believe here. Despite these problems, I have included Rogov’s dates below, but have in most cases refrained from repeating his descriptions of the watermarks.

Whenever I have had the opportunity of studying the watermarks myself and made new findings or drawn new conclusions, this information is naturally included in the descriptions of the manuscripts.

3.5.1 Group 1

1. BAN 31.4.32
This is a manuscript in two volumes, written in late 17th-century skoropisi in several different hands. Volume I contains books I–XI (except the end), volume II contains books XI (the end) –XXV.

The watermarks were dated by Rogov (1966: 277) to 1676 and 1697, but according to the library’s own description, the watermarks in 31.4.32 are only similar to the ones found in the albums. Most importantly, the watermark with the double-headed eagle, said to resemble Trominin’s watermark no. 1349 from 1697 (Trominin 1965: XCV), is actually more similar to the watermarks no. 1027 and 1028 from GIM’s catalog of watermarks. These

33 The expressions used are for example «того же типа, как», «сходен с», «имееет сходство с» (Opisanie 1959: 40–41).
are from 1679 and 1677, respectively (Filigrani XVII veka 1988: 199). The difference is obvious: Tromonin’s eagle has its wings spread out, whereas the eagle in the BAN manuscript, and in GIM’s catalog, has the tips of the wings turned down.

A watermark not mentioned in Rogov’s or the library’s descriptions is the five-pointed Foolscap with the countermark PORE in an oval. This corresponds to no. 353 in GIM’s catalog, from 1675 (Filigrani XVII veka 1988: 101).

Although precise dating with the help of watermarks is very difficult, the signs point to the end of the 1670s. If the translation is correctly dated, this manuscript may be from the very last years of that decade and is probably the earliest of the extant manuscripts. It will be discussed in more detail in Section 3.6.1.

The text contains many changes and corrections in two different hands, and its wording after the changes corresponds to that in the other manuscripts. Parts of volume I are foliated with Cyrillic alphabetic numerals (cf. Section 3.6.4).

The manuscript has been described in the library’s series Opisanie Rukopisnogo otdela BAN (Opisanie 1959: 40–41).

In the critical apparatus and in the text, this manuscript will hereafter be called B.

2. GIM Muzejskoe sobranie, no. 1391
The manuscript is written in late 17th-century skoropis’ in several different hands. Rogov (1966: 274) identified watermarks from 1676–82, 1684 (with an incorrect reference to Tromonin (1965)) and 1708 (with a reference to Klepikov (1958)). Nikolaev (2008: 101) dates the manuscript to the 1680s. A few pages in the beginning are missing. On fol. 1r, the text begins:

This passage is found on fol. 7v of UUB Slav 26 (cf. no. 6 below), which is the verso of the second folio of text, since the text in that manuscript begins on fol. 6r (cf. Section 3.6.2). This leads one to believe that 1–2 folios are missing in the beginning of the GIM manuscript.

Some marginal notes are added in another, perhaps later, hand (hand G6, cf. Section 8.3.2). They do not correspond to marginal notes in the Polish original, although they are sometimes found in similar places. Some of these marginal notes have correspondences in the manuscript JaGPU B-596 (cf. no. 5 below).

As can be seen in the edition, this manuscript has much in common with ms. B and is probably a copy of it. This is confirmed by numbers in the mar-
gin, corresponding to the foliation in volume I of ms. B (cf. Section 3.6.4). It is included in the edition to show the development of the text in this group of manuscripts.

In the critical apparatus and in the text, this manuscript will hereafter be called G.

3. RNB F.IV.103
The manuscript is written in late 17th-century skoropis’ in several different hands. Rogov (1966: 276) identified one watermark that he dated to 1691–1712, but his reference to Klepikov (1959) is inaccurate, and this date is of little use. The manuscript has been described by Stroev (1825: 106).

Many variants found in ms. G can also be found in this manuscript, and it is very closely related to RNB F.IV.131 (cf. Section 3.6.3). It is not included in the critical apparatus, since this group of manuscripts is represented by mss. B and G, from which it derives.

4. RNB F.IV.131
This manuscript is written in late 17th-century skoropis’ in several different hands. Rogov (1966: 275–276) found one watermark that he identified with one from 1697 in Geraklitov (1963).

It has many readings in common with ms. G, and it is very closely related to RNB F.IV.103 (cf. Section 3.6.3). It is not included in the critical apparatus, since this group is represented by the manuscripts B and G.

5. JaGPU B-596
This is a manuscript in quarto from 1819. It is written on light blue paper, possibly in one single hand. Each of the chronicle’s books is bound separately, but the first one is missing, thus leaving 24 books (vol. II–XXV). Each book is paginated, starting anew from 1. A note at the end of vol. XXV says:

Кончено 17 Октября, 1819 года во Сельце Игрищахъ

There are marginal notes, some of which are very similar to the ones in ms. G. Others are not, but occur in approximately the same places as the ones in ms. G. Some marginal notes in this ms. do not have correspondences in ms. G, and some found in ms. G are missing here.

---

34 This is the call number given by Luk'janov (1955: 470) and Nikolaev (2008: 103). The number could also be read as B-5961, but the library does not seem to use this number in its records at all.

35 Igrišči is located south of Jaroslavl’, in the province of Ivanovo.
Below are examples of cases where the marginal notes are so similar that it is unlikely that they have been written independently of each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. G</th>
<th>JaGPU B-596, vol. IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Болгары приёмлют законъ греческий</td>
<td>Болгары приёмлют законъ Греческий и премьна Князей ихь (p. 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Премьна князей ихъ (fol. 121v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Святъ Ієронимъ далмацкиї</td>
<td>Святый Ієронимъ Далматскій</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Кирилъ и Меодії (fol. 122r)</td>
<td>Кирилъ и Мефодії (p. 67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Твореніе Овидія Назона (fol. 127r)</td>
<td>Твореніе Овидія-Назона (p. 87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Мужество Прокліо (fol. 128v)</td>
<td>Мужество Прокулово (p. 95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Оружіе сарматов (fol. 129v)</td>
<td>Оружіе Сарматовъ (p. 98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>О произведений россовъ, или россианъ (fol. 132r)</td>
<td>О произведений Руссовъ, или Россіанъ (p. 108)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below are a few cases where the marginal notes are found in corresponding places and are similar, but may have been formulated independently of each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. G</th>
<th>JaGPU B-596, vol. IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Константинополскиї црь</td>
<td>Первыя письмена у Славянъ дання имъ Греческимъ Царемъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Крополать присла славяномъ письмена (fol. 108r)</td>
<td>Михаиломъ Курополатомъ (p. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Начало писменъ полскыхъ (fol. 108v)</td>
<td>Первыя письмена Поляковъ (p. 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Вржє древнихъ (fol. 109r)</td>
<td>Воицкия орудія древнихъ (p. 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Древность языка московскаго (fol. 131r)</td>
<td>Древность языка Славянскаго (p. 103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Осколдъ и Диръ въ Киевѣ Ихъ осада на Цръгрдъ (fol. 141v)</td>
<td>Княженіе Оскольда и Дира въ Київѣ Походъ ихъ въ Грцію и осада Царя-Града (p. 145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Возвратъ къ Киевѣ (fol. 143r)</td>
<td>Возвращеніе Олегово въ Київѣ (p. 151)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the JaGPU manuscript is a copy of ms. G, the 19th-century scribe may have recognized that the marginal notes were written in another hand and that they did not belong to the text, so that he felt free to copy some, alter others, leave some out altogether and add some notes of his own. In some cases the notes in the JaGPU manuscript are more substantial, in other cases they are simply phrased differently. As was mentioned above, the marginal notes do not coincide with the ones in the Polish original, i.e. neither scribe translated the Polish marginal notes directly.
Rogov was not aware of the existence of this manuscript, and Nikolaev listed it without having been able to establish which translation it belongs to. It has not been included in the critical apparatus because this group is already represented by two manuscripts. It has been summarily described by Luk’janov (1955).

3.5.2 Group 2

6. UUB Slav 26–28
This manuscript, written in late 17th-century *skoropis’* in several different hands, consists of three volumes: Slav 26 contains books I–VII, Slav 27 books VIII–XVI, Slav 28 books XVII–XXV. It was a gift to Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeld in 1685 and is described in Nikolaj Glubokovskij’s handwritten Russian catalog (Glubokovskij 1918), translated into French by Alexandre de Roubetz (Glubokovskij 1919). It is also discussed in an article about the library’s Slavic manuscripts (Davidsson 1975: 71–75), which contains a facsimile of Slav 26, fol. 260r.

The manuscript is described in more detail in Section 3.6.2. This is the main manuscript in the edition, and it will hereafter be called U.

7. RGB Egorovskoe sobranie, f. 98, no. 243
The manuscript is written in late 17th-century *skoropis’* in several different hands. Headings, initials in paragraphs and, in some places, marginal notes are written in red ink. It is foliated in pencil by a modern hand from 1 to 519, but a mistake has been made in the foliation: after fol. 141, the next folio has been numbered 132, and from there the foliation goes on until the end, so that there are actually 529 folios.

Rogov mentions only one watermark: the Amsterdam coat-of-arms, without countermark, and does not date it (Rogov 1966: 275). There are some isolated quires (with the numbers 4, 20 and 21) of lighter and slightly thicker paper with the watermark Seven Provinces without countermark. The letters under the coat-of-arms could possibly be read &I (cursive), which would correspond to Klepikov’s no 1145, found in a printed book from 1696 (Klepikov 1959: 85). There is a *skrepa* in the manuscript mentioning Игнатьева с[ы]на Шапкина.

The order of the chapters seems to have been confused towards the end, possibly in the same way as Rogov observed in RGADA f. 181, no 58 (cf. no. 8 below). The books XXIV and XXV seem, in any case, to be missing. The last words on fol. 519v are the following:

[…]* уст*8
пиль с литовским воиском от поляков хитро поставил прежде в тайных м*ѣ*стах п*ѣ*ших ратмистров в […]
The last few words are hidden under a paper patch.

The manuscript might be a copy of ms. U. The text has much in common with RGADA f. 181, no. 58, which was possibly copied from it.

In the critical apparatus and in the text, this manuscript will hereafter be called E.

8. RGADA f. 181, no. 58
The manuscript is written in late 17th-century skoropis’ in several different hands. Headings and initials in paragraphs are written in red ink. Rogov (1966: 274–275) identified a watermark which he dated to 1708, but his reference to Klepikov (1959) is inaccurate and the date of little use. The manuscript contains a note from 1707. Nikolaev (2008: 101) dates it to the early 18th century. The order of parts of the text has been confused from book XXII onwards (Rogov 1966: 274–275).

Certain details in the text relate it to mss. U and E, of which it might be a copy. In the critical apparatus and in the text, this manuscript will hereafter be called R.

9. CGIA SPb, library, inventory no. 58922
This manuscript is written in 18th-century skoropis’, probably in one single hand. It contains books I–X of the chronicle, although the beginning of I: 1 and the end of X: 6 are missing. Rogov (1966: 277) identified two watermarks: the Amsterdam coat-of-arms with the countermark CA, from 1730 (with an inaccurate reference to Klepikov (1959)), and the Jaroslavl’ coat-of-arms, from 1750. I did not find either of these, but instead identified the Amsterdam coat-of-arms with the countermark LVG, similar to Churchill’s no. 29, which he dated to 1693 (Churchill 1935: 67), although I have not been able to establish if the watermarks are identical. A scrap of paper in the binding contains the date 1738. The manuscript bears the stamp of the Moscow Archeological Society, which also owned other manuscripts that now belong to this archive (Rogov 1966: 277). There are a few pencilled notes in the text, one of which contains the date 1857, and some changes, made in ink, also in a later hand.

It has been summarily described by Malevanov (1957: 575).

There are some differences between the text in this manuscript and that found in mss. E and R, and it does not seem to derive from them, but forms another branch of this group. It is probably not a direct copy of ms. U, which was brought to Sweden long before this copy was made.

It forms a unity with the manuscript RNB F.IV.172 (cf. below). I have not viewed the manuscripts side by side, since they are kept in two different libraries, but the text portions included in the two manuscripts match, the hand is similar, possibly the same, and quire numbering is continuous.
throughout the two manuscripts. They do not, however, have any watermarks in common.

10. RNB F.IV.172

The manuscript is written in 18th-century skoropis’, probably in one single hand. Rogov (1966: 276) identified two watermarks: the Amsterdam coat-of-arms with the countermark H, from 1720, and with the countermark HK, from 1733, but his references to Klepikov (1958) are inaccurate and at least one of them should instead be to Klepikov (1959). The manuscript contains only the second half of the text, from book XI onwards.

This manuscript forms a unity with the manuscript CGIA SPb no. 58922. The assignment of the text to group 2 has been confirmed by a comparison of chapter XXIV: 3 and half of chapter XXIV: 4 of RNB F.IV.172 with mss. U, B and N (cf. no. 11 below), as the best representatives of the three groups.

The manuscript has been described by Stroev (1825: 157).

3.5.3 Group 3

11. RNB Ėrmitažnoe sobranie, no. 551/1–2

This is a manuscript in two volumes, written in 18th-century skoropis’. Rogov (1966: 276–277) identified one watermark, which he dated to 1786, but his reference to Klepikov (1959) is inaccurate. The binding and the index in vol. I suggest that it was made for Catherine II.

As mentioned in Section 3.2.2, the title page of this manuscript is used to date the translation. The text found there is as follows:

Кроника королевства полскаго великаго княжества литовского, русскаго, прусскаго жмудскаго и гродна московскаго, чрезъ Матвея Стриковскаго Осостовича каноника полскаго на польскомъ языкѣ изданная въ 1580 году и напечатана въ Краковѣ переведена на славенской съ котораго перевода списана въ Москвѣ [ургоз.гол 7187=1678/79] года (vol. I, fol.1r)

The title page is followed by an index of the books and chapters of the chronicle (vol. I, fol.1 2r–19v).

After this, the chronicle begins, and the foliation starts anew with fol. 1. The beginning of the text is slightly modernized. To illustrate this, a sample is given below alongside the corresponding text from ms. U. Relevant differences are set apart in boldface, although there are, as can easily be seen,
other differences as well. These differences cease after a few folios and are not found in other parts of the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. U, Slav 26, fol. 6r</th>
<th>Ms. N, vol. 1, fol. 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>О создании мира необходимаго, земли, неба, и началов вещей: аще на нихъ съть различны бахъ, читателю любезный, мненья, и доводы философовъ и творцовъ еллинскихъ, инн и бо бяхъ иже от пропасти [cogr. chao]38, се есть от смыщеня вещени и стихи миръ сотворенъ быти повѣствованъ: о сёмъ и Овидии въ а.х книгахъ метаморфоеосъ, се есть преображенія приводить сими словесы</td>
<td>О создании мира неба и земли, и о началѣ вещей, что есть на нихъ различные были читателю любезный, мнѣнія и доводы философовъ и творцовъ еллинскихъ, нѣкоторые отъ бездны или отъ смещенія вещей и стихи мѣру сотворѣнную бысть повѣствовали, какъ о томъ и Овидій въ 1й книгѣ метаморфоеосъ (преображенія) приводить сими словами:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The manuscript has been described together with the rest of the Єрмитацное собрание (Al'sic 1968: 52).

In the critical apparatus and in the text, this manuscript will be called N.

12. RNB Pogodinskoe собрание, no. 1759
This manuscript is written in 18th-century skoropis'. Rogov (1966: 277) identified one watermark, similar to watermarks from 1754 or 1762–63, but his reference to Klepikov (1959) is inaccurate. The text is very closely related to that in ms. N, but is less carefully written and contains more mistakes. It is therefore not included in the critical apparatus.

3.6 Manuscrits of special interest

Some of the manuscripts listed above deserve special attention for one reason or another. There are also certain points of interest that arise when comparing two or more of these manuscripts.

3.6.1 BAN 31.4.32 (ms. B)
The manuscript BAN 31.4.32 attracted Rogov’s attention because of the numerous changes in its text. He interpreted them as an editor’s notes in preparation for printing, but I wish to suggest that these changes were made

---

38 This correction has been made by Sparwenfeld.
in connection with the process of translation. There are no known documents that speak of plans to print the *Kronika*, and indeed it would be unusual to choose to print a secular text such as this. The interpretation of the changes as part of the translation work is strengthened by a comparison with other manuscripts, as will be explained below.

Volume I of ms. B is in part foliated with Cyrillic numerals, probably contemporary to the writing of the manuscript (hereafter called the old foliation). A later foliation (the new foliation), probably the library’s, includes five empty folios before the text starts, so these numbers (on every tenth folio) differ by five folios from the old foliation. There is a gap in the old foliation, and when the scribe began foliating again, a mistake was made, so that after the gap, the old and new foliation differ only by one folio. Volume II only has the new foliation, beginning again from 1.

In the following, I use the new foliation, but the old foliation plays an important part when determining certain manuscripts’ relations to each other (cf. Section 3.6.4). Table 5 shows the relation between the new and old foliation.

*Table 5. Foliation in BAN 31.4.32, volume I*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New foliation</th>
<th>Old foliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fols. 6–184</td>
<td>fols. 1–179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fols. 185–192</td>
<td>(no foliation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fols. 193–205</td>
<td>fols. 192–204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quires are also numbered, both in Cyrillic and Arabic numerals. Quire 25 (vol. I, fol. 185)\(^{39}\) bears the numbers \(\text{ке.} \text{ и. кес.} \text{ и. kес.} \text{ и. кес.} \text{ и. кес.} \text{ и. кес.} \text{ и. кес.} \text{ и. кес.} \text{ и. kес.} \text{ и. кес.} \text{ и. kес.} \text{ и. kес.} \text{ и. kес.} \text{ and. 25, and after that the Cyrillic and Arabic quire numbers, when present, differ by one throughout the volume. This quire probably contains the text from two quires in the exemplar from which the copy was made. In volume II, the Cyrillic numeration of quires is continued, but the Arabic numeration begins over again – for instance, we find the numbers \(\text{об.} 72\) together with (probably) 2 (vol. II, fol. 11r).

The text is full of corrections and changes, which Rogov claims to be made in a hand of the early 18th century. Actually, however, changes are made in two different hands: in volume I of the manuscript and sporadically in volume II, they are made in a hand similar and probably contemporary to that of the original text (cf. Illustration 7). It may even be the same hand, but this is difficult to determine. In volume II of the manuscript, many of the changes and especially marginal notes are made in a different, more careless hand (cf. Illustration 8). It is probably also contemporary to the original text,

\(^{39}\) In this section, all manuscript references, unless otherwise stated, are to ms. B.
since it has many superscript letters, characteristic of 17th-century skoropis', and more importantly, since the marginal notes added in this hand are also found in other manuscripts. The changes are more frequent in some parts of the text, but continue throughout.

After the changes, the text corresponds to that of the other manuscripts. This gives the impression of the manuscript being a draft of some sort, which was then corrected before the text was considered to be finished and copies were made. Rogov apparently did not notice that the text in ms. B (before the changes) differs from the other manuscripts. He mentioned that dedications were crossed out (Rogov 1966: 291), but did not reflect on the fact that the other manuscripts do not contain any dedications.

Some remnants of the text as it was before these changes were made can nevertheless be found in other manuscripts. In ms. N, the beginning of chapter XII: 3 is similar to what we find in ms. B before the corrections, and in one ms. belonging to the 1688 translation, Érm. 551b, fols. 1–2 contain the beginning of I: 1 as it was in ms. B before the changes were made, but the text then continues in another hand and according to another translation.

Since the changes are so numerous, it is difficult to systematize them and cover them all here. The examples given below are only a small selection, and this manuscript would deserve to be the object of a separate study. The changes concern many different aspects of the text: orthography, morphology, lexicon and syntax, as well as layout. Below are some examples from different parts of the text. In the examples, the parts that have been changed are set in bold face, both before and after the changes. If nothing is set in bold face, it means that the whole example was subject to change (this can apply to single words, such as in example (9), or whole phrases, such as in example (27)). The corresponding expression in the Polish original is in each case provided for comparison.

In some cases, the new letters or words have simply been written on top of the old ones, sometimes the old ones have been crossed out and the new ones added between the lines. These different ways of making changes have not been distinguished here.

Orthographical changes include the correction of misspelled words or names:

(4) кирипелские → киркелские (vol. I, fol. 165v), Polish: Kirkielscy (Stryjkowski 1582: 97)

(5) Гелестоントом → Гелеспонтом (vol. I, fol. 167r), Polish: Helespontem (Stryjkowski 1582: 98)
There are numerous lexical changes, some of which are also corrections of mistakes:

(8) которая посемь одна бысть в сёмрежество → которая посемь отдана бысть в сёмрежество (vol. II, fol. 32r), Polish: *która byłą potym wydana w małżeństwo* (Stryjkowski 1582: 427)

In some cases, a word has been replaced by a more or less synonymous one:

(9) зракъ → образ (vol. I, fol. 7r), Latin: *forma* (Stryjkowski 1582: 1)

(10) свѣта → мира (vol. I, fol. 12r), Polish: *Świata* (Stryjkowski 1582: 3)

(11) по правѣ → по истинѣ (vol. I, fol. 12r), Polish: *słusznie* (Stryjkowski 1582: 3)

(12) вскорѣ → абѣе (vol. I, fol. 325v), Polish: *wnet* (Stryjkowski 1582: 243)

(13) злоречения → х8л8 (vol. I, fol. 398r), Polish: *bluźnierstwâ* (Stryjkowski 1582: 312) (cf. also example (27))

(14) ω корѣнований повторяемой → ω корѣнований с8г8бом (vol. I, fol. 413v), Polish: *O Koronáciew dwojakiey* (Stryjkowski 1582: 330)

Rogov (1966: 291) suggests that these changes may be due to a modernization of the text:


I am not convinced that this is the case, since morphology and syntax have not been systematically modernized in the same way, and because it is difficult to judge the connotations of a word for a 17th-century reader. However, I have not tried to resolve this question.

---

40 The page number is erroneously printed as 314.
41 This is also a correction of morphology: while Polish *koronácia* is feminine and requires a feminine ending on the adjective, Russian *корунование* is neuter.
Some lexical changes seem to be a matter of avoiding polonisms, since the crossed-out word is closer to the Polish original. Such changes are discussed more closely in Section 5.4.1.1, dealing with lexical polonisms.

(15) от природения → естеством (vol. I, fol. 11r), Polish: s przyrodzenia (Stryjkowski 1582: 3) (cf. also examples (28) and (97))

(16) твердях8 → глуще (vol. I, fol. 12r), Polish: twierdzili (Stryjkowski 1582: 3) (cf. also example (99))

(17) великои удълности → великои храбрости (vol. I, fol. 413v), Polish: dzielności (Stryjkowski 1582: 330) (cf. also example (100))

(18) заведения и погъбления → отдачи и погъбления (vol. I, fol. 415v), Polish: zawiedzenia/ u utráczenia (Stryjkowski 1582: 331) (cf. also example (101))

(19)  от крыжаковъ заложены → от крыжаковъ встроенные (vol. I, fol. 416v), Polish: od Krzyżakow zdalożone (Stryjkowski 1582: 332) (cf. also example (102))

In some cases, the translation is more similar to the Polish original after the change:

(20) взятые князства рёские в предълы в вѣзды обратиъ → взятые князства рёские в повѣты обратиъ (vol. II, fol. 37r), Polish: Ruskie Xięstwá podbite w powiáty obrocił (Stryjkowski 1582: 429)

(21) татарове ж без супротивлення с великами лѣпы ышли → татарове ж без отпору с великами лѣпы ышли (vol. II, fol. 557r), Polish: ą Tatarowie z wielkimi lupy uszli bez odporu (Stryjkowski 1582: 775)

As for morphological changes, there are some cases of mistakes being corrected, such as case endings of nouns being altered and adjectives or verbs being brought into agreement with their corresponding nouns (cf. also examples (14), (30) and (36)):

(22) мнози йші предки дьяниї темномрачныхъ ноною удѣшенныхъ → мнози йші предки дьяннї темномрачною ноною удѣшенныхъ (vol. I, fol. 149r), Polish: wiele naszych przodków dzieciów ciemnomglistą nocą záduszonych (Stryjkowski 1582: 87)

(23)  от людеи с очиї ящерчы → от людеи с очиї ящерчы (vol. I, fol. 159v), Polish: od ludźi z lászczorcími oczymá (Stryjkowski 1582: 93)
(24) о [...] князях [...] вольнскон — о [...] князях [...] вольнских (vol. I, fol. 184r), Polish: O [...] Xiążętach [...] Wołynskich (Stryjkowski 1582: 110)

The syntactic changes are of various kinds and affect the text to different degrees. Sometimes, prepositions have been added, crossed out or changed:

(25) со отчаяния → от отчаяния (vol. I, fol. 150v), Polish: z desperaciey (Stryjkowski 1582: 88)

(26) в лётописи в княжества московского → в лётописи княжества московского (vol. I, fol. 153v), Latin: in Chorographia principatui Moschouiae (Stryjkowski 1582: 90)

(27) злоречения над Литвою → хдл8 Литвъ (vol. I, fol. 398r), Polish: bluźnierstwá nád Litwág (Stryjkowski 1582: 362) (cf. also example (13))

Sometimes the verbal tense has been changed, a main clause altered into a participle construction or vice versa. It should be noted that there are examples of a seemingly more archaic construction being changed into a more modern one, as well as of the opposite:

(28) Кайнъ же бысть от прирождения соль → Кайнъ же сый естеством соль (vol. I, fol. 11r), Polish: A Cain iż był s przyrodzenia zły (Stryjkowski 1582: 3) (cf. also examples (15) and (97))

(29) Кайнъ ж в то время прииде на мът8 → Кайну в то время пришедш8 на мът8 (vol. I, fol. 12r), Polish: á Kain w ten czas tráfil sie ná cel (Stryjkowski 1582: 3)

(30) Кайнови же ãнове [...] изобръло → Кайнови же ãнове [...] изобрěтша (vol. I, fol. 12v), Polish: Kainowi záś Synowie [...] wynáleźli (Stryjkowski 1582: 3)\(^{42}\)

(31) которые уж в то время к Полъше слѣжах8 → которые уж в то время к Полъше слѣжили (vol. I, fol. 317v), Polish: ktores iusz ná ten czas ku Polszcze služyły (Stryjkowski 1582: 233)\(^{43}\)

(32) вся грады над рекою Сълмо воймаша → вся грады над рекою Сълмо поймали (vol. I, fol. 319r), Polish: wszystki zamki nád Rzeką Sulą pobrali (Stryjkowski 1582: 235)

\(^{42}\) This is also a case of morphological correction, from the neuter singular to the correct plural form.

\(^{43}\) The construction служити къ + dat is not found in SRJas, but a corresponding construction for Polish is exemplified in SSP.
(33) гсердтова и повелба → гсердтова и повелба (vol. I, fol. 414v),
Polish: пановал y roskázował (Stryjkowski 1582: 330)

Some of these cases may also have to do with avoiding polonisms, when a
word-by-word translation has been changed into a freer one:

(34) еже имьло быти яко тако есть → бывшее яко тако есть (vol. I,
fol. 160v), Polish: Co musiålo byç isz ták iest (Stryjkowski 1582: 94)

Sometimes a word or a part of a word had originally been inserted in the
wrong place in the text, but the change restored the correct order:

(35) Анастасию Соено ли → Аннатазию или Соено (vol. I, fol.
154r), Polish: Anotazja/ álbo Zophiq (Stryjkowski 1582: 91)

(36) ежскпъ еглине, или новыз завьть вверхе во огны, великий, не
вреди, яже в цылости [...] быша → ежскпъ еглине, или новыз
завьть вверхе во огны, великий, еже в цылости и невредимо [...] пребыть
(vol. I, fol. 220v), Polish: Biskup księgi Ewangeliy álbo No-
wego Testamentu wrzucił w ogień wielki/ ktore namniej nienáruszone w
cále [...] zostáły (Stryjkowski 1582: 142)44

(37) рымляне мбла Квирина Кастора и Полюза, Зевесака, Вебру
Трясивицу, Арисать, рымляне Кастора и Полюза, Зевеса,
Эартэну Эвер8 или Трясавицу, Ариса Ромула, и Квирина, и
про8 (vol. I, fol. 223r), Polish: Rzymínie Castora y Poluxá/ Jowiszá/
Fortune/ Febre álbo Trząscê/ Marsá/ Romulusá/ y Quirinusá etc.
(Stryjkowski 1582: 145)

In example (35), both readings are possible, but given the Polish original, the
translator had almost certainly intended to use или.

Misplacements such as these may indicate that the manuscript is a copy of
an obscure exemplar, where these words were written between the lines or in
the margins and were inserted in the wrong place when the copy was made.
The manuscript from which it was copied, in that case, is not known.

The contents of the manuscript are also affected. The most obvious case is
the question of the dedications. As seen in Section 2.3.2, Stryjkowski dedi-
cated many chapters in his chronicle to different patrons. Judging by this
manuscript, some of them were translated into Russian but later considered
unnecessary and crossed out. Chapters with crossed-out dedications are IV: 4
(vol. I, fol. 222r), VI: 1 (vol. I, fol. 304v), VI: 8 (vol. I, fol. 331r), VI: 10
(vol. I, fol. 340r), VII: 1 (vol. I, fol. 371v), X: 1 (vol. I, fol. 463v) etc. The

44 Note that this correction also changes two words (one reflexive pronoun and one verb) with
plural reference to the singular. The Polish księgi Ewangeliy is plural, but the Russian evžne
is singular.
other manuscripts belonging to this translation do not contain these dedications.

In volume II, the second correcting hand has added marginal notes in many places, of which the ones below are just a few examples. These marginal notes are found in the other manuscripts as well.

(38) крижаки войну Литвъи поляком сказали (vol. II, fol. 183v)

(39) татары з Литвою языческам обычаем разаряют (vol. II, fol. 187v)

(40) Корибута паки просят чехи на королвство (vol. II, fol. 229v)

In the example below, a comment, which was not present in the Polish original, has been added and then crossed out:

(41) но [яко глѣть аутор сеа книга] аз [...] → но аз [...] (vol. I, fol. 167r)

Finally, some changes concern the format of the text, its layout. The word отставка is found in several places, of which at least some (vol. I, fol. 220v; vol. II, fol. 33r) correspond to paragraph breaks in other manuscripts (I have not compared all instances to the other manuscripts). In vol. II, fol. 559r, there is the note страницы близ не оставляват, after which fol. 559r–559v are left blank.

These notes seem to be instructions for a scribe copying the manuscript: not to leave a blank page, to make a paragraph break etc. Rogov interpreted them as instructions for a printer, but the other facts discussed above make this less probable.

At the bottom of the first page of some quires, someone – probably the person who made the changes – has written чтена (vol. I, fol. 93r; vol. I, fol. 101r), as a sign that the text had been read and corrected.

3.6.2 UUB Slav 26–28 (ms. U)

The three-volume manuscript UUB Slav 26–28 has several traits that are missing in the other manuscripts of the 1673–79 translation.

Slav 26, fol. 1r (cf. Illustration 1) contains a note on the provenance of the manuscript, written in J. G. Sparwenfeld’s hand:

Сією книгою меня пожаловал
бояри и казанскіи воевода
князъ Иваш Иванович Голицій болшои
Лоб Москвъ лгта огт воплошений
Бгъ слова „ахіе в ѣня мйе."
ъванъ Гаврил Спарвенфелдт
Since this note reveals that Sparwenfeld, who spent the years 1684–87 in Russia, received the manuscript in June of 1685 as a gift from the boyar and voevoda Ivan Ivanovič Golicyn the elder, it must have been written before that date.

Prince I. I. Golicyn, with the nickname Lob, was promoted from stol’nik to boyar on April 19th 1685 (Crummey 1983: 207), or, according to another source, on March 19th of that year (Golicyn 1892: 122). He became a voevoda in Kazan' in 1685 (Golicyn 1892: 122) and died on June 8th 1686 (Crummey 1983: 207) or on September 9th 1686 (Golicyn 1892: 122) in Kazan'.

Golicyn is mentioned several times in the diary Sparwenfeld kept during his years in Russia (Birgegård 2002: 169, 179, 183, 189 etc.) and the two men seem to have been fairly well acquainted. It is not known where Golicyn got hold of the chronicle. In the description of Fëdor Alekseevič’s library, an Ivan Ivanovič Golicyn is mentioned as having brought books to him,45 but it is not known if it was Ivan Ivanovič the elder or the younger, who was also a stol’nik at that time (Golicyn 1892: 122).

Fol. 2r of Slav 26 (cf. Illustration 2) contains a copy of the first page of the Polish edition, also written in Sparwenfeld’s hand. It differs in two ways from the title page of the printed original. In the manuscript, the title begins KRONIKA Sarmatska, Polska, Litewska, i.e., the word Sarmatska has been added. The rest of the title page is faithfully copied, including the information about the printing of the Polish original, Drukowano w Krolewcu u Gerzego Osterbergera MDLXXXII, after which Sparwenfeld has added Po slawensku perewedena w Moskwe.

Fol. 2v contains a copy of Stryjkowski’s list of sources, also written by Sparwenfeld. Instead of the Polish heading (Historikowie y Autorowie rozmáiči z rožnych Bibliotek...), he has written AUCTORES Quibus usus est auctor.

The list is copied faithfully, except for the fact that the names of the biblical prophets Esajas and Ezechiel have been left out. Also, Sparwenfeld often uses the Latin versions of names where Stryjkowski uses the Polish ones or abbreviates the names in a different way. One can also notice that some of the sources are written slightly larger and more distinctly, namely Olaus Magnus and Swedskie kroniki, testifying to Sparwenfeld’s interest in Stryjkowski’s Swedish sources.

Fol. 3r contains copies of dedications. It begins with one paragraph of a dedication to the three brothers Jerzy, Szymon and Aleksander Olelkowicz,

45 E.g. «и 192 году Октябрь въ 30-й день сию книгу одну къ Великому Государю въ хоромы принять столникъ князь Иванъ княжъ Ивановъ сынъ Голицыны» (Zabelin 1915: 599).
found on page X6v in the printed original (cf. Sections 2.3 and 2.3.2). Thereupon follows a Latin dedication, copied from page XX7v in the original, where it also has a Polish translation. The Polish version is left out by Sparwenfeld.

Fol. 3v contains another Latin dedication, which is found on page XX8r in the original. It also has a Polish translation there, but only the Latin version is copied into Slav 26.

Next, also beginning on fol. 3v, there is a copy of the Latin introduction to chapter II: 1 (cf. Stryjkowski 1582: 21–23), which is, as mentioned in Section 2.3.2.1, a dedication to Melchior Giedrojć. Some minor parts are left out in the copy. It ends on fol. 4r. The dedication is left out from the Russian translation of II: 1.

Fol. 5r (cf. Illustration 3) contains a translation into Russian of the title page, written in a calligraphic poluustav by an unidentified hand. It is a complete translation of the Polish title page, and here also, just as on the copy of the Polish title page, the title begins КРОНИКА САРМАТСКАЯ. At the bottom, Sparwenfeld has added that it was translated

въ послоскомъ приказѣ, егоже роздныхъ
перевоциковъ власны руки здѣ
обретаются, которые сами сьо
славную кнѣту перевели
по указу цѣря Алексея
Михаиловича

The text of the chronicle itself begins on fol. 6r.

This leads to the conclusion that Sparwenfeld had access to the Polish original and that he knew something about where it had been translated and perhaps by whom. We will return to his statement about several translators later (cf. Chapter 6). The addition of the word Sarmatska is enigmatic, but probably means that the scribe was familiar with Sarmatism (cf. Section 2.4) and recognized the chronicle as related to that ideology (cf. Myl'nikov 1996: 106). The word was probably added in the Polish original, from which the Polish title page was copied and the Russian one translated. Since the Polish title page was copied by Sparwenfeld and the Russian one written by a professional scribe, it seems improbable that they would both have added it independently of each other. It is likely that Sparwenfeld’s notes about the circumstances of the translation were added at the time he heard them, which means that the two title pages were probably written in Moscow.

There are several different watermarks in Slav 26–28. The first two of these are by far the most frequent throughout the three volumes:

1) Amsterdam coat-of-arms with the letters LL/B underneath (B written beneath LL) and with the countermark CATINA (?).
2) Foolscap, 7 points, type IV (Klepikov 1963: 408–410) with the letters *AI* in italics underneath, without countermark. Cf. no. 894 in Klepikov (1959: 76; 1963: 419), found in a document from 1682 and a printed book from 1697, and no. 322 in Dianova (1997: 76), found in books from 1678, 1679 and 1680.

3) Foolscap, 7 points, type IV (Klepikov 1963: 408–410) without countermark.

4) Foolscap, 7 points, type IV (Klepikov 1963: 408–410) with the countermark PM. Cf. no. 2645 in Laucevičius (1967b: 366), from 1664–65 (Laucevičius 1967a: 211).

5) Foolscap, 5 points, type I (Klepikov 1963: 408–410) with the countermark PCH written in an oval. Cf. no. 1287 in Klepikov (1959: 91), found in a document from 1682, also listed as no. 218 in Klepikov (1963: 437) with additional reference to a document from 1687.

6) Foolscap, 7 points, type IV (Klepikov 1963: 408–410) with the letters *AI* in italics underneath, with the countermark IV.⁴⁶ Cf. no. 11 in Klepikov (1963: 419), found in documents from 1677–79.

7) Amsterdam coat-of-arms without countermark.

The manuscript was donated to Uppsala University Library in 1721, and in connection with this, Sparwenfeld listed all the manuscripts that were part of the donation. His description of Slav 26–28 (which is listed as no. 111) has the following wording:

NB Mathei Stricowski Chronica Slavorum omnium, &c &c &c Cod. mss, ex cancellaria Russica, pereleganter exscriptam et tribus tomis distractam [?] in folio ipsum Tsaris Theodori Alexeievici autographum, unicum in toto regno Moscovitico (Bibl. Ark. K 52:3).

Tsar Fëdor Alekseevič died in 1682, two years before Sparwenfeld came to Moscow, so the origin of the information that the tsar’s handwriting is found in the manuscript is not clear. It is difficult to imagine the tsar fulfilling the duties of a scribe, and moreover, Fëdor Alekseevič was, according to Sedov (2006: 183), not a skilled scribe, which is evident from the strained handwriting in two letters from the tsar to Sil'vestr Medvedev, written in 1682 (RGADA f. 5, op. 1, no. 1). Fëdor Alekseevič’s hand as represented by those letters is not found anywhere in ms. U.

The library’s description of the donation does not contain this information; it reads as follows:

---

⁴⁶ IV stands for Jean Villedary, a French paper-maker who was active from 1668 and made paper for, among others, the Dutch factor Abraham Janssen, who usually placed his initials AI beneath the main watermark in his paper (Churchill 1935: 21–27).
3.6.3 The relationship between RNB F.IV.103 and F.IV.131

The manuscripts RNB F.IV.103 and RNB F.IV.131 have been left out of the critical apparatus, since they descend from mss. B and G, which are better representatives of that group of manuscripts. Nevertheless, they have some interesting features that deserve comment.

A comparison of these manuscripts with the others shows clearly that they are closely related to each other and to ms. G. This can be seen in numerous places, where words have been left out or distorted in all three manuscripts. The relationship is confirmed by the existence of numbers in the margins that are connected to the foliation of ms. B (cf. Section 3.6.4). The question of whether they are both independent copies of ms. G or if one is a copy of the other is less easily resolved. In some places, RNB F.IV.103 and F.IV.131 differ from G but coincide with each other. This would seem to speak for one being a copy of the other. Such instances are:

- кропики писати начаши (F.IV.103 and F.IV.131, fol. 109r) instead of кропики писати начаши (GIM Muz. 1391, fol. 108r; cf. Slav 26, fol. 151r), родиша (F.IV.103, fol. 130r; F.IV.131, fol. 131r) instead of родиша (GIM Muz. 1391, fol. 129r; cf. Slav 26, fol. 180r), устроии (F.IV.103, fol. 130v; F.IV.131, fol. 131v) instead of устроии (GIM Muz. 1391, fol. 129v; cf. Slav 26, fol. 181v), зумныъ (F.IV.103, fol. 135r; F.IV.131, fol. 136r) instead of разумныъ (GIM Muz. 1391, fol. 134r; cf. Slav 26, fol. 187r) and many more. In several of these instances, however, ms. G bears signs of changes or corrections, so that it may originally also have had the readings found in the other two mss.

In one place, there is a sign of F.IV.103 being copied from F.IV.131. On fol. 185r, something has smudged the text in F.IV.131. In F.IV.103, the scribe has left blank spaces where the smudges are in the other manuscript. This particular part, then, was copied from F.IV.131 to F.IV.103, since the scribe would not have left blank spaces if he had had another exemplar to verify the text by.

However, in an earlier part of the text, approximately in the folios 108–120, where there are different hands in the two manuscripts, the scribe of F.IV.131 has made very many mistakes in spelling, confusing a and o, e/b and у/і more than is usual in the other manuscripts, to such an extent, and often in such a way (in names etc.), that it is not likely that a scribe could reconstruct all the correct readings while copying. Examples of this are:

- Дрогою и Совою (F.IV.131, fol. 118v) instead of Дрэвою и Савою (F.IV.103, fol. 117v; cf. Slav 26, fol. 163r), орэнаутов (F.IV.131, fol. 119r) instead of аргэнаутов (F.IV.103, fol. 118r; cf. Slav 26, fol. 164r), болгры или волгры (F.IV.131, fol. 120v) instead of болгры или волгры
(F.IV.103, fol. 119v; cf. Slav 26, fol. 166v). Therefore, in this part of the manuscripts, F.IV.103 can hardly have been copied from F.IV.131, but possibly the other way around. However, the numbers in the margins, explained in the following section, make it more likely that they were both independent copies of ms. G in this part.

A page-by-page comparison of the manuscripts from a codicological and paleographical point of view reveals that similarities can be found here as well. For example, the scribes have gone to great lengths to make the quires begin and end with the same words in both manuscripts. The text has been stretched or compressed, sometimes in one manuscript, sometimes in the other. This suggests that they both are copies of the same exemplar with the same distribution of the text among the quires.

Even more striking is the fact that in parts of the manuscripts, notably in the beginning, the same scribes have written corresponding quires in both manuscripts. Sometimes, not only are the manuscripts written in the same handwriting, but even the flourishes are identical. This may suggest that both copies were made at the same time. It can be added that the two manuscripts do not have any watermarks in common, which may speak against this theory.

As we see, the relationship between these two manuscripts is complicated, but it is certain that they were written partly by the same scribes, probably within a short period of time, and that they interacted closely. For the reasons previously mentioned, however, they will not be included in the edition. Further study could reveal interesting paleographical information about, for instance, the variations that take place in a text copied twice by the same scribe within a short period of time, and similar questions.

3.6.4 Foliation in mss. B, G, RNB F.IV.103 and F.IV.131

As mentioned in the description of ms. B above, there is foliation (in the top right corner of the recto side of the folios) in parts of the manuscript, contemporary with the text itself. There are no other numbers in the margins (cf. Section 3.6.1).

Three other manuscripts contain numbers in the margins, also contemporary with the manuscripts themselves. In ms. G, RNB F.IV.103 and RNB F.IV.131 there are two overlapping series of numbers. They are related in the following way.

An examination of ms. G shows that it is a copy of ms. B. Ms. G has Cyrillic numbers in the margins next to the text in a large part of the manuscript. These numbers are not always in the top right corner of the folios and do not give the actual number of the folio they are on. Instead, they appear next to the same words as does the foliation in ms. B, as if they were copied from B in the belief that they were marginal notes.
When the number 148 was copied in this process, it happened to coincide with the top of fol. 111r in ms. G. This is the last folio of a quire, written by hand G1. The next quire was written by another scribe, hand G2, who evidently glanced at the last sheet of the previous quire and interpreted the number 148 as the number of the folio, since it is at the top of the page. He then continued foliating the pages (as he believed) for as long as he wrote, and the following scribe, G3, also continued with this for as long as he wrote, which was to fol. 140, which, however, he foliated as 177. Fol. 141 is again the first of a new quire, written by a new scribe, hand G4, who copied the number 192 from B but did not continue foliating what he himself wrote.

Table 6 shows the relationship between the incorrect foliation and the actual folio numbers in G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual folios</th>
<th>Incorrect foliation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to fol. 110</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>hand G1, “marginal notes” from B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 111</td>
<td>fol. 148</td>
<td>hand G1, last folio in quire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fols. 112–140</td>
<td>fols. 149–177</td>
<td>hands G2 and G3, foliation but no “marginal notes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 141</td>
<td>fol. 192</td>
<td>hand G4, “marginal notes” from B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fols. 142–</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>hand G4, “marginal notes” from B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RNB F.IV.103 and RNB F.IV.131 are copies of ms. G. This can be seen from the fact that in these two manuscripts, the foliation series from both B and G have been regarded as marginal notes and copied – though with some omissions – next to the words in the text where they are found in B and G, not in the top right corners of the folios. There are different omissions in the two manuscripts, which points to them each being independent copies of G, not one of the other, in this part of the text, i.e. approximately fols. 108–123 (cf., however, the conclusions in Section 3.6.3).

3.7 The manuscripts of the other Russian translations

The Ukrainian translation is only preserved in two manuscripts, which have already been introduced in Section 3.2.5 and will not be discussed further. The remaining Russian translations, however, are preserved in more copies, which will be listed here.

3.7.1 Lyzlov’s 1682 translation

Lyzlov’s translation of Stryjkowski can be found in some manuscripts containing the Kurbskij Collection (Shornik Kurbskogo). The core of this collection consists of letters written to Ivan IV by his former vassal Andrej Kurb-
skij and the tsar’s answers during the period 1564–79 (SKK 1988: 496–497). As time went by, other texts were added to copies of these letters, hence the name “collection.” The manuscripts are usually grouped according to the redaction of the first letter. The copies of the Kurbskij Collection containing Stryjkowski’s Kronika all belong to the same group and can be dated from the end of the 17th to the later half of the 18th century (Perepiska 1979: 287–289).

There is plenty of literature dealing with Kurbskij’s letters and the Kurbskij Collection, and they also contain information on the contents of the different manuscripts involved. Therefore, the manuscripts containing the translation of Stryjkowski are simply listed below in approximate chronological order. The list is based on Keenan (1971: 193), Perepiska (1979: 283–286) and Erusalimskij (2009: 565–635).

1) RNB sobranie Pogodina, no. 1494 (sobranie Stroeva, no. 18) Late 17th or early 18th century
2) RGADA f. 181, no. 60/82 Late 17th century
3) GIM Uvarovskoe sobranie, no. 302 18th century
4) RGB f. 310, sobranie Undol'skogo, no. 779 18th century
5) GIM Uvarovskoe sobranie, no. 242/1582 18th century
6) RGB f. 209, sobranie Ovčinnikova, no. 500 18th century
7) NB SPbGU Otdel redkich knig i rukopisej, ms. E.IV.47 18th century

3.7.2 The 1668–70 and 1688 translations

As explained in Section 3.2, the translation dated by its title page to 1688 actually consists of one part translated in that year, one part from 1668–70 and a large part of the 1673–79 translation, slightly reworked. The manuscripts that contain this compilation of translations have been listed by Rogov (1966: 280–287) and by Nikolaev (2008: 102), whose lists have been used as a base for the one below. Information about earlier descriptions of

---

47 Poslanija (1951); Keenan (1971); Perepiska (1979); Erusalimskij (2009), cf. also SKK (1988: 501–503).
48 Keenan (1971: 5–6) is mainly concerned with arguing that the letters were not written by Kurbskij, but by several other persons in the 1620s or 1630s. The majority of scholars do not share this view (cf. Perepiska 1979: 222–224; Erusalimskij 2009: 19–63). I do not wish to enter into that discussion, but will nevertheless make use of Keenan’s information about the manuscripts, as it is very clear and well arranged.
the manuscripts is, in most cases, not given here, but can be found in Rogov’s and Nikolaev’s works.

1) GIM Uvarovskoe sobranie, no. 4
   Late 17th century
2) RGB Piskarevskoe sobranie (f. 228), no. 171 (formerly Muzejnoe sobranie, no. 606)
   Late 17th century
3) Ul’janovskij Dvorec knigi, Otdel redkich i rukopisnych knig, no. 8
   Late 17th century
4) Vladimiro-Suzdal’skij istoriko-chudozestvennyj i architekturnyj muzej-zapovednik, Vladimirskoe otdelenie, no. 405
   Late 17th century
5) BAN Archangel'skoe sobranie, C no. 136
   Late 17th century
6) RGADA f. 181, no. 620/1130
   Late 17th century
7) RGADA f. 181, no. 59/81
   Early 18th century
8) RNB Êrmitažnoe sobranie, no. 551b (1–2)
   Early 18th century
9) BAN 32.11.4
   Dated 1758
10) Sobranie professora Bauze (perished in 1812) (Moiseeva 1980: 334)

3.8 Chapter summary

Rogov’s picture of the history of Stryjkowski’s chronicle in East Slavic translations has been updated here to comprise one complete Ruthenian or Ukrainian translation (early 17th century), three partial Russian translations (1668–70, 1682 and 1688) and one complete Russian translation (1673–79). In 1688, the translations from 1668–70 and 1688 were combined with parts of the 1673–79 translation to form a translation of the whole Kronika.

Two translators have been identified: Andrej Lyzlov, who made the 1682 translation, and Stepan Čižinskij, who participated in the 1673–79 translation, although he cannot have been involved from the beginning, since he did not begin working at Posol’skij prikaz until 1678.

The 1673–79 translation was chosen as the primary object of study because it is a complete translation and not a compilation, as well as because it may have been more widely spread and held in higher esteem than the others. Chapters IV: 1–3 were singled out for the edition and closer study because their subject matter made them especially interesting for Russian readers.
The manuscript situation for all the translations has been sketched, with special emphasis on the 1673–79 translation. This is the first time that information on the manuscripts of all the Russian translations of Stryjkowski’s chronicle, including that found in the Sbornik Kurbskogo, has been published in one place, alongside information about the Ukrainian translation. The alleged Belorussian translation was also discussed, but as some earlier scholars have shown, it cannot be considered an independent translation of the chronicle.

There are eleven copies of the 1673–79 translation, but twelve manuscripts, since one copy of the text has been split up into two manuscripts, kept in different libraries. The manuscripts can be divided into three groups according to the variant readings, marginal notes and other characteristics they display. Group 1 contains five manuscripts, the best of which is ms. B. Group 2 contains five manuscripts (but four copies of the text), the best of which is ms. U. Group 3 contains only two manuscripts, the best of which is ms. N. The main manuscript in the edition is ms. U, and representatives of all three groups have been selected for variant readings.

Ms. B was identified as the earliest extant manuscript. The history of the 1673–79 translation can be reconstructed as follows: the Polish original was divided between at least four translators (cf. Chapter 6), one of whom, according to archival documents, was Stepan Čižinskij. The Polish original was possibly bought and bound in 1672, and the translation may have been begun in the same year, but Čižinskij’s part of the work was not done until after 1678. We do not know if the text was immediately divided between translators or if they worked on it in succession. A copy of the translation was bound in 1681.

The original draft of the translation is no longer extant. Possibly, some editorial changes were made in that original draft. Ms. B is a copy of it, and seemingly, the draft was unclear in places, which led to some mistakes in ms. B that later had to be corrected. Mss. U and N, it seems, copied the text correctly from the beginning, or else used a better copy as their exemplar. Ms. N also shows signs of the original draft in one place.

Mss. U and B are the best manuscripts, in the sense that the text in them is more complete and less corrupted than in the others. In most places, the readings in ms. B are better or equal, but in vol. I, fol. 191v, it has a lacuna of three words that are present in Slav 26, fol. 195r. For this reason, ms. B cannot be the original copy of the translation, and we must assume that there was an even earlier draft. Mss. U, B and N together give a picture of what the language of the first draft must have looked like and what the translators had in mind.
4 The language of chapters IV: 1–3

The object of study in this chapter is the text found in the edition, i.e. chapters IV: 1–3 of the translation, based on the main manuscript, ms. U. Whereas the three following chapters aim to shed light upon different aspects of the text and take into account only such features of the language as serve their respective purposes, the intention in this chapter is to describe as many aspects as possible of its morphology and syntax that may be of interest. Contexts where variation occurred, either in this text or in the language of the period in general, have been seen as especially worthy of attention. The text is set in relation to discussions about the language situation of the late 17th century, which involve such concepts as diglossia, literary language and registers. It is also compared with studies of other texts, mainly from the same period.

4.1 The language situation of the late 17th century

The nature of the language situation in pre-Petrine Russia has been the subject of some debate, and scholars disagree as to whether one can speak of a literary language (literaturnyj jazyk) during this period.

A. V. Issatchenko’s definition of a literary language, cited here according to D. S. Worth (1975: 6), is that it is polyvalent, i.e. “accessible to all members of the given society and serving their various communicatory needs,” normalized, obligatory for all members of the given society, and stylistically differentiated (cf. also Živov 1996: 14; 2009: 2). This does not refer only to the language of literature, but rather means ‘standard language.’ 49 Scholars of Slavic languages writing in English disagree as to which term is preferable, ‘literary language’ or ‘standard language,’ but I will use the former, which is well established in the field.

Worth (1975: 1–7) relates the opinions of many earlier scholars on the origins of the Russian literary language. According to one well-known theory, promoted by B. A. Uspenskij and others, Church Slavonic and Russian were in a situation of diglossia, which means that they were two separate

49 Cf. Worth (1975: 8–9): “There was a language of literature […] but there was no standardized literary language per se.”
languages but were not perceived as such by their users. They had wholly different spheres of usage, Church Slavonic assuming the role of literary language, and Russian being the spoken language and the medium of non-bookish written texts (Uspenskij 2002: 23–32).

A modification of this is the view, supported by M. L. Remnëva and others, that Church Slavonic was the only literary language in Russia before the 18th century, but that it existed in two varieties, a strict, standardized one and a less strict one that allowed some variation of Church Slavonic and East Slavic forms. Scholars of this opinion recognize that yet another norm existed, based on East Slavic and used for business and law, but unlike the two Church Slavonic varieties, it is not given the status of literary language (Kijjanova 2010: 16–19).

Most convincing, however, is the theory that there was no literary language in Russia during that time at all, and that the term cannot be applied to the Russian situation before the 18th century if the criteria listed above are to be fulfilled. Worth (1975: 6–9) argues that a literary language is monocentric, i.e. it has a neutral core, and all stylistic variations are regarded in relation to this core, which is what is meant by stylistic differentiation. The language situation in Russia at this time, however, was polycentric, in the sense that there was not one single neutral norm with stylistic deviations, but several norms or conventions, depending on the type of text.

V. M. Živov, in his monograph Jazyk i kul'tura Rossii XVIII veka (1996), which has been translated into English with the title Language and culture in eighteenth-century Russia (2009), provides similar arguments, and also points out that the written language as a whole was not codified in the 17th century. Church Slavonic was described in e.g. Smotrickij’s grammar, but the other language types, or registers (cf. Section 4.1.1), were not explicitly regulated, although some norms can be deduced from texts. The 16th and 17th centuries saw the appearance of some texts written in a manner not motivated by their genre, but this was only a step towards a literary language. Only in the 18th century, as the result of a conscious language policy, did some of the registers disappear or become marginalized. The language was codified and adopted some features of the former registers, filling them with stylistic connotations, which led to stylistic differentiation and the formation of a literary language (Živov 1996: 14–16).

Since much of what is to follow is hinged on the existence and use of the simplex preterites, aorist and imperfect, it should be pointed out (stating the obvious) that these were no longer in use in the spoken language by the late 17th century. Although some aorist forms, known from religious texts or prayers, could be part of the passive knowledge of Russians of that time, one may assume that only a person with experience of the written language would be able to form this tense independently. In other words, the simplex preterites were wholly a factor of the written language, and without a certain
amount of experience, a scribe would not know how to apply them, which can be seen from texts where forms are used incorrectly (e.g. Živov 1995: 53–55). This study, then, concerns the written language, and does not pretend to give a picture of the spoken language of 17th-century Russia.

4.1.1 The registers
The diglossia theory is based on the parallel existence of two languages, Church Slavonic and Russian, covering different spheres of usage. Considering the great variation between texts, and especially the number of texts that present neither pure Church Slavonic nor pure vernacular Russian, it seems appropriate to distinguish between more than two such spheres of usage. A primary division into bookish and non-bookish registers (knizhne vs. ne-knizhnye registry) can be made – the term ‘register’ being preferable to ‘language.’ The registers differed in the structuring of information and by the presence or absence of markers of bookishness (priznaki kniznosti). For instance, Church Slavonic, with some orthographical and morphological adaptations to East Slavic traits, but with Church Slavonic syntax, was used for biblical and liturgical texts, whereas a variety of Church Slavonic, which can be called the hybrid register (cf. Section 4.1.3), is found in other texts, for example chronicles (Živov 1996: 15, 31–32). There were also several varieties of non-bookish Russian, of which chancellery language is the one that is most relevant in this thesis (cf. Uspenskij & Živov 1983: 150–157). Inherent in the notion of registers is that the same person could express himself in different registers depending on the type of text he was creating, and even within the borders of a single text (Uspenskij & Živov 1983: 162–166; Živov 1998: 223).

Speaking of bookish and non-bookish features, rather than Church Slavonic and Russian or East Slavic ones, stresses that what was important to the scribes was not the genetic, but the functional factor, i.e., not the Church Slavonic or Russian origin of a linguistic feature, but the status associated with it (Živov 1996: 19–20). An originally East Slavic phenomenon could for instance be adopted in the Russian redaction of Church Slavonic, and Church Slavonic and East Slavic elements could be seen as stylistically equivalent and equally acceptable in written texts. Also, what was seen as a marker of bookish language depended on the characteristics of the spoken language, and therefore these markers could vary over time (Živov 1996: 26–33).

4.1.2 Mechanisms for text production
Until the 16th century, the East Slavs did not possess any dictionaries or grammars of the Church Slavonic language. The usual way for a person in
medieval Russia to learn Church Slavonic was not to study it, as one would study a foreign language. Rather, he would learn to read by spelling out syllables and later by reading and memorizing passages from the Psalter and other texts. In doing this, he would compare what he had read with his native language, and his mother tongue would serve as the basis for his written language as well. Professional scribes probably received additional education, but it seems to have concerned mainly orthography, not the lexical and syntactic levels of the text. Reading texts and imitating them still probably made up most of the scribes’ education. Not everyone who learned to read also learned to write according to orthographical rules (Živov 1996: 20–23; 1998: 218–220; Uspenskij 2002: 119–121). The imitation of model texts expressed itself both in the contents of a literary work and in its linguistic traits (Živov 1998: 225).

Even in the 17th century, despite the fact that by this time there were guidelines such as Smotrickij’s grammar (1st ed. 1619), it seems that many scribes still mainly used texts they had read as models for what they wrote. Therefore, one may assume that such models played a role even for skilled scribes when determining how to construct the text lexically, morphologically and syntactically.

There were two main mechanisms at work when a new text was being written, two ways of relating to the model texts. One was the mechanism of conversion (mechanizm peresč ē ta), which meant that a relationship was established between the spoken language and the written text, so that a person with active knowledge of Church Slavonic could exchange, for instance, the perfect forms of his spoken language for simplex preterites. This was useful when a wholly new thought was to be expressed, and no set phrase had been learned that could express it. The second mechanism was text orientation (mechanizm orientacii na teksty). Since people learned the written language by learning large portions of text by heart, in many situations they would find that they already knew a suitable phrase and would not need to construct a wholly new one. This could concern the sentence level, but also syntagms and probably individual forms. Both mechanisms were put to work when a new text was being written (Živov 1996: 23–25). The principle of text orientation is essential to the reasoning in Chapter 7.

It must not be supposed that the intention of a scribe was always to write in correct Church Slavonic, and that all texts that contain Russian elements were badly written. The aim was usually to convey information and to do it in a manner that corresponded as closely as possible to existing texts of the same kind (Živov 1998: 225).

---

50 Cf. also Kijanova (2010: 285), who explains that Remnëva’s school is of the same opinion in this case.
4.1.3 The hybrid register

The term “hybrid Slavonic” was coined by R. Mathiesen (1984: 47–48) to describe a mixture of Church Slavonic and vernacular elements in different proportions, not as a random conglomerate, but as a “secondary linguistic system in its own right.”

Živov (1996: 25–29) links the emergence of the hybrid register to the mechanism of conversion (cf. Section 4.1.2). A scribe who mainly used the mechanism of text orientation would produce a text very similar to the biblical texts, written in Church Slavonic. However, a scribe who mainly applied conversion would produce a text that differed in some ways from Church Slavonic texts, since the conversion might sometimes fail. This is the origin of the hybrid register. Situations arose when an element in the spoken language could, in different surroundings, correspond to different elements in the written norm. The scribe would then use the two elements alternately, and variation would arise. Because of this, variation became characteristic of hybrid texts.

It can be assumed that the scribe’s own linguistic background, dialect, etc. had more influence on texts that were written with the help of conversion than those that were the result of text orientation. Hybrid texts can therefore be expected to differ greatly from each other.

Eventually, as the hybrid register became the basis of a new text tradition, we must no longer assume that scribes aimed at creating standard Church Slavonic texts, and that any deviation was considered a failure. A scribe could choose to apply only some markers of bookish language, namely the ones that were best suited and would most easily set the standard of the text. The important thing was that they were used at all, not that they were used consistently. This variation between bookish and non-bookish elements makes the label “hybrid” very suitable (Živov 1996: 32–33).

One may say that the hybrid register emerged in the chronicle genre. When the first chronicles were written in Rus', there were no models for them, which means that the mechanism of text orientation could not be used. Byzantine chronicles had been translated into Slavonic and could have served as models, but they were not written in the same way – they were not annalistic – and, moreover, they were not the kind of texts that were learned by heart. This meant that the scribes had to use the conversion mechanism, which led to deviations from the Church Slavonic norm (Živov 1998: 229–230, 242).

The chronicles were based on annual notes that were then compiled and elaborated. They often contained fragments of folk tales, treaties and hagiographic texts. Therefore, the chronicle genre can in itself be said to be a “conglomerate of different genres” (Kijanova 2010: 10). The very narrative was heterogeneous, and this was accompanied by linguistic variation (Petruchin 2003: 142). Later chronicles could use earlier ones as models, so that in
later chronicles, the variation was a product both of conversion and of text orientation, where earlier chronicles served as model texts. Thus, the chronicles became the origin of the hybrid register, which then spread to other types of texts and became the main register into which translations were made in the 16th and 17th centuries, when the opposition between secular and religious literature was formed (Živov 1998: 230–232).

Since the chronicles were compiled over a long period, they may reflect language development with older parts written in a more archaic language (Živov 1995: 49–50; Petruchin 2003: 15–16). Still, it must be remembered that older parts were compiled and edited, so that more modern language can appear in a section of the text dealing with very early events, and formulaic expressions from earlier sources were used when describing certain later events, so that the language of these later events can contain archaic traces (Živov 1998: 237).

Contrary to this, Uspenskij (2002: 100–101) believed that Byzantine chronicles did in fact serve as models for Russian chronicles. In his diglossia paradigm, he placed chronicles firmly in the Church Slavonic tradition, noting, however, that they often contained a certain number of Russian traits. In his view, the dominating use of the simplex preterites and other syntactic constructions qualified chronicles as Church Slavonic.

Remněva and the scholars who follow her theory (cf. Section 4.1) believe that even though Russian forms abound in the chronicles, the scribes still perceived their language as Church Slavonic. Because the different elements of the chronicle influenced the language, the result was not pure Church Slavonic, but Church Slavonic with a less strict norm (snižennaja norma) (Kijanova 2010: 15–20).

I adhere to the view that chronicles represent the hybrid register. As will be shown below, the translated text under discussion here shows many traits characteristic of the hybrid register.

4.2 Description of IV: 1–3: morphology

The chapters IV: 1–3 of the 1673–79 translation are the main object of this study. The reasons for this choice have been explained in Section 3.4. The linguistic features of this portion of the chronicle will be examined more closely against the background of the language situation explained above. Because orthography and phonology vary greatly between manuscripts and scribes, investigating them would have been too extensive a task. Instead, the description will concentrate on some aspects of the morphology and syntax of the text, even though some variation between manuscripts can be seen here as well.
The study describes the language of the main manuscript, ms. U (Slav 26–28), and exact figures for the occurrences of linguistic features only refer to the situation in this manuscript, but differences between manuscripts will be commented on when relevant, and features that vary to a particularly high degree will be especially stressed. All manuscripts included as variants in the edition have been used for reference and are referred to by their sigla (cf. Table 4).

4.2.1 Verbs

4.2.1.1 The aorist

In the 17th century, the aorist and imperfect were no longer actively used, and any knowledge of them was the result of some degree of education or at least imitation of model texts. The degree of correctness in the use of these tense forms can show something about the scribe’s (or, in this case, translator’s) background and perhaps also about the model texts he used (Živov 1995: 45).

Most of the forms found in the text have the correct person and number form (cf. however  beyne in Section 4.2.1.4). They are also for the most part found in the etymologically correct forms, spelled according to Church Slavonic of Russian redaction, e.g. 3rd person plural aorist forms ending in -иа instead of OCS -ила. They have been checked against Nandriš (1965) and the online OCS morphology website http://rhss1.uni-regensburg.de:8080/OCS. Some verbs show parallel aorist forms and deserve comment.

The 3rd person singular aorist of дать in this text is даде, which was an innovative form based on the present stem of the verb and replaced OCS дастъ or да (Pennington 1980: 277). The 3rd person plural, however, is the original form дада. Of the related preficated verbs, some have the old aorist forms and others have innovative ones: здати has the aorist зда and создати becomes созда (three times), but вдати is found in the form вдаде (four times), отдать in the form отдалие (twice), вздати in the form вздале and поддатися in the form поддалеся. There is no variation between manuscripts in this regard.

The verb  ятъ belonged to a group of verbs that in the 3rd person singular aorist could take the ending -тъ (Borkovskij & Kuznecov 1963: 256). Such aorist forms can for example be found in the Степенная книга (Otten 1973: 235). This form, however, was identical to the past passive participle ятъ. The form ятъ occurs twice in the edited chapters (in all manuscripts). In the following example, the verb form corresponds to the Polish poimany, and I therefore consider it to be a participle:

(42) y Asbaldus Hetman Rzymski poimány  żywo iest spalon od Bulgarow ná ofíářę (Stryjkowski 1582: 99)
In another instance, the Polish finite form zgwałcił is translated as ятн і насилова. I have interpreted this instance of ятн as an aorist with the ending -тъ:

(43) Zonę Brátá zábitego Greczkę zgwałcil (Stryjkowski 1582: 131)

и жен8 брата своего гречанк8 ят и насилова (Slav 26, fol. 213v)

This is the only instance of this ending, and one may assume that it was motivated by the fact that the aorist would otherwise have consisted of only one letter. Aorist forms of corresponding prefigated verbs (взяти, прияти, поняти, поняти) do not have the ending -тъ.

The 3rd person singular aorist of the verb жити is живе rather than OCS же, but the prefigated verb прижити is found in the form прижи (cf. Borkovskij & Kuznecov 1963: 255–256). This applies to all manuscripts.

4.2.1.2 The l-participle
This section deals with the form of the l-participle that forms part of the perfect tense (with or without an auxiliary verb), the pluperfect and conditional constructions. The distribution of elliptic and full forms of the perfect tense will be treated separately in Sections 4.3.1.2 and 4.3.1.3.

The forms found in this text for the most part correspond to those of today’s Russian past tense. Verbs with consonant stems yield forms such as отвеь, отвели, унесь, клалъ, могло, могли, достигли and изобрели. The forms реклъ, обыкъ, могълъ and перемогъ differ from the state in modern Russian. According to Pennington (1980: 277), such forms betray Polish or Ruthenian influence. There is no variation between manuscripts regarding these forms.

The Polish original has vowel alternations of the type poczьł/poczёli. This is reflected in one Russian plural form, which is found in all manuscripts: зачелсь (Slav 26, fol. 198v). In other cases, ms. U uses forms with Russian vocalism: начали (Slav 26, fol. 150v) and начали (Slav 26, fol. 202v). There are, however, variant readings with the vowel -e- to both these instances in other manuscripts (most notably ms. B, which has -е- in both cases).

The form пренебрехъ has been classified as a perfect form in the masculine singular, where -съ is the voiceless counterpart to a fricative pronunciation of -съ. Mss. ERN show the spelling with -съ.

The reflexive particle in perfect forms ending in a vowel mostly has the form -съ, sometimes -ся.
4.2.1.3 The infinitive

Until the 16th century, the original infinitive endings -ти, -чи/-чи and -сти dominated in texts from all registers, except in everyday texts (бытовые тексты), even though the final vowel had begun to disappear in the spoken language several centuries earlier. In the 17th century, however, the new endings -ть, -чь and -сть became more frequent, and the registers began to diverge more in their usage (Živov 2004: 131–137).

There are 274 infinitive forms in the text as found in ms. U. Two of them have a superscript final -т, and it can therefore not be determined if this stands for -ти or -ть. Four occurrences of the form чать, originally an infinitive but by this time a particle (cf. Section 5.4.2.2), are also excluded from the table below, as well as four forms of идти and related prefigated verbs. The remaining 264 infinitive forms are distributed as seen in Table 7.

Table 7. Infinitive endings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-ти/-ть</th>
<th>-тися/-тися+/-тца</th>
<th>-чи/-чы</th>
<th>-сти/-сть</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old forms</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New forms</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2+1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% new forms</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total share of new forms is 19.3%, which stays within the limits of what is common for hybrid texts: 25% or less (Živov 2004: 158). It can be observed here, as in connection with certain other hybrid texts (Živov 2004: 141, 155), that forms of the type съчи, i.e. with East Slavic consonantism but with the Church Slavonic infinitive ending, do not occur. Another typical characteristic is that reflexive verbs show the lowest share of new forms. The spelling -тца may have been associated with chancellery language (Živov 2004: 148–150).

Eleven forms have variant readings in one or several manuscripts. The most common variation is the occurrence of the ending -ть where ms. U has -ти, six times all in all (twice in ms. R, three times in mss. ER and once in mss. BGN). There is also variation in the reflexive endings.

As a whole, the distribution of infinitive forms in this text is similar to that in the second half of the Mazurinskij letopisec (Živov 2004: 140–141).

4.2.1.4 The verb быти

The verb быти differed from other verbs in OCS and Old Russian texts in that it had three paradigms of simplex preterite forms, exemplified by the 3rd person singular forms быши, бых and бысть. That быше was imperfect and бысть aorist is well known, but the character of бых is disputed. C. H. van
Schooneveld (1959: 64–69) reports on different views on this, and comes to the conclusion that Ǿŋ was an imperfective aorist.⁵¹

The use of these forms in chapters IV: 1–3 in ms. U is as follows. There are 42 forms from the бы́сть paradigm: 19 бы́сть, 2 бы́хь (one of which is an auxiliary verb in a conditional construction) and 21 бы́ша (one of which is an auxiliary verb in the pluperfect). There is also one instance of пре́бы́сть and one of пребы́ша. There are 47 occurrences of Ǿŋ (four of which are auxiliary verbs in the pluperfect) and two of Ǿху́. There are four instances of the бы́ше paradigm: one бы́ше and three бы́ху́. The form бы́ше, however, is incorrect, since it belongs to a plural subject. In ms. B, бы́ше has been corrected to бы́ша, which is also found in ms. G. The only other variation between manuscripts, aside from scribal errors such as Ǿо for Ǿŋ or omissions, is that the form Ǿху́ has been changed to бы́ху́ in both instances in ms. G and in one instance in mss. BN. Thus, the distinction between the Ǿŋ and бы́ше paradigms is somewhat blurred in that several scribes changed Ǿху́ to бы́ху́ at least once, and the only occurrence of the form бы́ше is incorrect.

It should also be mentioned that the forms from the бы́сть paradigm do not exclusively carry the meaning ‘to become’ in this text, as was often characteristic for them (cf. Uspenskij 2002: 238–247).

4.2.1.5 Adverbial participles

As explained in more detail in Section 7.3, by the 17th century, active participles in adverbial (or predicative) function had largely lost their inflection and were on their way to becoming the gerunds we find in present-day Russian. In the translation of the Kronika, adverbial participles take several different forms that have their origins in old inflectional endings.

The most common ending in the present tense is -а/-я, which was the masculine singular ending in certain conjugations. The ending -бы/-и occurs in e.g. живы́ (Slav 26, fol. 157v), сын (fol. 166r, 205r, 206v), моги́м (fol. 181v, 199r) and искы́м (fol. 210v). This is a remnant of the long (pro-nominal) form of the participle in the masculine singular of other conjugations. The ending -учи, which occurs for instance in веду́чи (fol. 152r, 153r), буду́чи (fol. 156r, 202v, 215r) and ду́ды (fol. 168r), has East Slavic consonantism, and the vowel -и has its origins in the feminine singular form (cf. below).⁵² Forms ending in -у́че/-ю́че/-я́че have Church Slavonic consonantism, and -е originates in the masculine plural. Examples of this are веду́ще

---

⁵¹ Van Schooneveld uses the 1st person singular to symbolize the paradigms, i.e. бы́хь, бы́хь and бы́ша, which in my opinion is not quite appropriate, since the form бы́хь is a construct. I will therefore use the 3rd person singular.

⁵² In the First Pskov Chronicle, Bjørnflaten (2010: 23) also found that participles with East Slavic consonantism all ended in -у, and Cocron’s examples (Cocron 1962: 221–222) testify to the same thing.
Participle constructions with the verb быть were originally a calque from Greek and thus a sign of Church Slavonic syntax (Uspenskij 2002: 256). The use of this construction is a strong marker of bookishness, especially since the Polish original does not have anything similar.

The present tense adverbial participle of the verb были is found in three different forms in the text: сы, суще and будучи. The form сы has masculine singular reference and суще masculine plural, but будучи is used without agreement in gender or number.

The past tense is dominated by forms ending in -о, which was the masculine singular form in some conjugations. The forms иешъ (also found with the corresponding prefixed verbs), зажегъ, рекъ/нарекъ and всхъ have a zero ending, which was the masculine singular of other conjugations. There are also forms in -вие, which was the masculine plural form of the paradigm ending in -о, and forms where -и or -ие have been added directly to the verbal stem, which was the feminine singular or masculine plural, respectively, of the paradigm with a zero ending. Examples of the latter are обрътишъ (fol. 164г), пришёдше (fol. 172г), рекъше (fol. 209в) and разбег-шисъ (fol. 217г). There are no examples of forms ending in -вии. There are also a few isolated forms that seem to be participles but have anomalous endings. They have not been taken into account here.

In both the present and the past tense, the ending -о originated in the feminine singular and -е in the masculine plural. In the 17th century, -о had spread to the plural, replacing the original ending -е. Once the feminine singular and the masculine plural began to be confused, the masculine singular could be used for feminine singular subjects as the only unambiguous singular form, and eventually all the forms were used interchangeably (Bjørnflaten 2010: 23–26).

The most common endings, i.e. -а/-я in the present tense and -о in the past and the zero ending in the past tense, are used here without agreement, but some of the other forms seem to be more strongly connected to their original gender and number category. Thus, -вы/-и is only used in the masculine singular and forms ending in -уце/-юце/-яще, -вие and -ие mainly in the plural.
There is quite a lot of variation between manuscripts regarding the forms of the adverbial participles. Of approximately 300 occurrences, 31 show some kind of variation. In most of these cases, some mss. have finite verb forms instead of participles, such as обрътоша in mss. ER instead of обрътили (fol. 164r) or возбраняще in ms. G instead of возбранятие (fol. 213r), although the latter case and a few others like it may be the result not of a substitution of forms, but of a general confusion of и and и in some forms of skoropis’ (cf. Uspenskij & Živov 1983: 175–176). There are also a few instances of the opposite substitution: a finite form in ms. U corresponding to a participle in other mss. In some cases, all manuscripts have participles, but in different forms. Ms. G, for instance, has two instances of пришедшее for пришёл (fols. 198v, 199v), and in a few cases, one or more mss. have changed the particle же to the ending -ие, such as утвердивше in mss. ER for утвердив же (fol. 209v).

4.2.2 Nouns

4.2.2.1 The nominative plural

The original nominative plural forms of hard-stem masculine nouns ended in -и, and a few such forms are found in the texts, although the vast majority have the new ending -ы, originally the accusative plural form. The forms with the old ending are: народы (Slav 26, fols. 154r, 164v, 166r, 224v), генеты (fol. 159r), апостоли (fol. 171r), раби (fol. 221v, 2x), диакони (fol. 224v). All these refer to humans, which is in accordance with the types of nouns that usually retained this ending in the 17th century (Cocron 1962: 65–67). Since народ refers to a group of people, it is somewhat of a special case, and there are also numerous examples of the nominative plural народы. Other nouns with human referents (most of which are ethnonyms) are also found with the ending -ы, such as болгары, сербы, дольматы, карваты (fol. 151r) or готы, кимеры, и вандалы (fol. 165r), to name only a few. There are only two instances of variation between manuscripts: ms. N has генеты for генети (fol. 159r) and mss. BG have идолы for идолы (fol. 225v).

In Polish, this distinction remains to this day: masculine personal nouns take the old ending -и, whereas most other masculine nouns take the innovative ending -ы. The use in the translation of the Kronika may therefore be influenced by the Polish system, even though the individual forms do not always correspond. The Polish narod, for instance, always has the nominative plural form narody, and the correspondence to апостоли is Apostołowie.

The form наследницы (nine times) as a nominative plural of наследникъ, источницы (once) of источникъ and священицы (twice) of священикъ show the effect of the second palatalization, which took place before the
vowel -i, but instead of the original -ці we find -ця, since -ця had become hard by this time. No variation is found between manuscripts. In Polish, masculine personal nouns ending in -k take the ending -cy in the nominative plural, which may have influenced the usage, although the individual forms in this text do not always correspond. The Russian наследники, for instance, is often used to translate Polish potomkowie.

The nominative plural of nouns ending in -анин/-янин in ms. U takes the ending -ане/-яне in most cases: there are 75 such forms, compared with three ending in -яня, one in -еня (!), two in -ани and four in -аны. The form срацины is an uncertain case and is not included in this group, since it is only found in the plural here, and the singular, according to SRJa, could be срацин or срацининъ. There is some variation between manuscripts regarding these endings, the most common being that one or several mss. may have -яня where ms. U has -яне (nine times). There are examples of this from all the other mss.

For these nouns, the ending in -е is the original one and has remained dominant throughout, although forms ending in -и and -ы can be found sporadically, cf. examples from the Hypatian Chronicle (Jordanidi & Krys'ko 2000: 108–112). The ending in -я was common in the 16th century and was still to be found in the 17th. It can perhaps be viewed as an influence from collective nouns in -а or -я, since these plural forms of nouns designating people could be seen as collectives. Examples from the 17th century can be found for instance in Avvakum’s and Kotošichin’s writings (Cocron 1962: 73, 91–92).

4.2.2.2 The genitive singular masculine
As in other texts from the same period, the translation of the Kronika shows variation between the endings -a/-я and -y/-ю in the genitive singular of masculine nouns. The ending -y/-ю is not very frequent; there are only 26 instances of 21 different nouns (or 22, if the two meanings of миръ are counted separately) in the edited chapters according to ms. U.

The following list contains all genitive forms ending in -y/-ю with references to other studies and dictionaries where such forms are quoted from 17th-century sources. Former o-stems and u-stems will not be listed separately, since the old system was no longer intact in the 17th century.

бой (Sørensen 1958: 213; Cocron 1962: 37)
с вой до бою избранными (Slav 26, fol. 203r) (Pol. bitwy)
Олех же вшёл в бою (fol. 211v) (Pol. pogromu)
множества ради народа бежащих с того бою (fol. 211v) (Pol. –)53

53 Cf. also Section 5.5.
воскъ (Sørensen 1958: 213; Cocron 1962: 37)
Олга же обеща ему ис Киева прислать воску, кож и людей работных (fol. 205v) (Pol. Woskow)

выборъ (SRJa)
ї з близьными без выбор8 и стыда гдѣ кому полюбилось, совокуплялись (fol. 192r) (Pol. roznośći)

выводъ
в начале вывод8 народа полского (fol. 161r) (Pol. wywodu)

годъ (Sørensen 1958: 214; Cocron 1962: 37)
do Хрѣта .рн. год8 (fol. 185r) (Pol. lat)
do лѣта .ѣкѣ. году (fol. 228r) (Pol. roku)

dово́дъ
из дово́ду54 греческих, латинских, еврейских, халдейскихъ писателей (fol. 149v) (Pol. dowodu)

dолгъ (Sørensen 1958: 215; Cocron 1962: 37)
отздѣ слова яко лѣтша, а не долг8 или обещанняя 8поминаемся (fol. 175v) (Pol. rzeczy winney)

dомъ (Cocron 1962: 37)
не домовить от своего, своими рѣками зданного дом8 (fol. 188v) (Pol. Domu)
Моисия с людми израилтяны от фараона от дом8 работы (fol. 206r) (Pol. domu)

Доньь (Sørensen 1958: 215; Cocron 1962: 37)
i вездѣ крѣгъ Кимерій Босеора, и черного моря, Дон8. Оки, Волги, Камы, Днепра, Бога, Десны, Днестра, Дѣная (fol. 158v) (Pol. Tanais)

миръ (Sørensen 1958: 217; Cocron 1962: 38)
в лѣто отъ создания мир8 (fol. 151v) (Pol. Swiätá)
совѣтова Ярополк8 просити мир8 и тишины (fol. 213r) (Pol. pokoiu)

54 Mss. E and R have the genitive plural довод, but the genitive singular is probably the intended form.
мость
с высокого мост сверхень (fol. 211v) (Pol. mostu)

народь (Sørensen 1958: 217; Cocron 1962: 38)
Из того ж славенского народь (fol. 171r)

нарядь (Sørensen 1958: 217)
едва Игорь с третьей частью наряду в Киевъ 8бежа (fol. 200r)
(Pol. Armaty)

покой (Sørensen 1958: 219; Cocron 1962: 39)
иже и покое не знали (fol. 180v) (Pol. pokoii)

полъ (Sørensen 1958: 219; Cocron 1962: 39)
с велии множеством киези греческих и женска55 и девяча полу56
и де (fol. 223r) (Pol. Fraucimeru)

полонь (Cocron 1962: 39)
и множество полону и добычи в печеньжскомъ обосе набрали
(fols. 217v–218r) (Pol. polony)

поминокъ
вмѣсто поминкъ дрѣжбы томѣже цесарю Август свел послали (fol.
180v) (Pol. za upominek)

счетъ (Cocron 1962: 41)
с числом, лѣть вышеиманованных греческого и латинского счет8
(fol. 152r) (Pol. rachunku)

урядѣ
гедрство и земля йша велика и обилна рядж в немь нѣть (fol.
194r) (Pol. sprawy)

чинѣ (Sørensen 1958: 224; Cocron 1962: 42)
томы по меня противъ моего чину пришлите люди честнѣй-
шихъ (fol. 202r) (Pol. stanu)

55 Mss. E and R add. и вранцы миром, which is a distorted rendering of the Polish fraucimeru.
56 Mss. B, G and N have пола, i.e. an a-genitive.
100
Most of these nouns are listed either by Sørensen (1958) or by Cocron (1962) as being found with the genitive ending \(-y\) in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century. The word \textit{выборъ} is found in this form in several examples in SRJa. Others (\textit{выводъ}, \textit{доводъ} and \textit{мость}) correspond to genitive forms ending in \(-u\) of their Polish cognates, which could have evoked the choice of this form. The occurrences of \textit{поминокъ}, \textit{урядъ} and \textit{языкъ} in this form are less easily explained, but such forms may be attested in other sources than the ones Sørensen and Cocron had access to. It should also be emphasized that many of the nouns mentioned above are also found in this text with the genitive ending \(-a\). For instance, there are 39 occurrences of the form \textit{народа} and 19 of \textit{языка}.

There is little variation between manuscripts. Aside from the variant noted above – \textit{пола} for \textit{полу} in mss. B, G and N – there are four instances where mss. E and R have a form in \(-y/-ю\) where the others have one in \(-a/-я\: Ноя, нарроду (2x) and уставу instead of Ноя, нарроду and устава, respectively.

In Polish, far more nouns take the genitive ending \(-u\). One might have expected a larger share of \(-y/-ю\) in the Russian translation than is the case, and the translator seems to have followed Russian norms rather than copying the Polish pattern.

4.2.2.3 The locative singular masculine

As in the genitive singular, there was variation in the ending of the locative singular masculine. Here, the alternatives were \(-b/-e\) and \(-y/-ю\). There are 14 occurrences of the locative ending \(-y/-ю\) in this part of the text in ms. U, but only six different nouns.

Just as in the previous section, references are made to studies and dictionaries where these forms are mentioned. Former o-stems and u-stems are listed together.

\textit{бродъ} (Cocron 1962: 42)

\textit{сотвори ж Владимир на том броду, идъже бъ побъда дръгий} Переясловль (Slav 26, fol. 218r) (Pol. \textit{ná tym brodzie})

\textit{Донъ} (Cocron 1962: 42)

8 черного моря, или на \textit{Дон8} и по Волгъ рекамъ посълились (fol. 190r) (Pol. \textit{nád Tanais álbo Donem})
The words брать, Донъ and листъ are attested in this form in Cocron’s sources. In the case of Изборскъ and possibly холмъ, the Polish original may have served as an influence. The noun рядъ, which still has a u-locative in modern Russian, is found in this form in several of the examples in SRJAs.

The noun листъ is never found in these chapters with any other locative ending. The words рядъ, холмъ, брать and Донъ are only found this one time each in the locative, so there is no material for comparison. Изборскъ is found once with the ending -b.

There is no variation between manuscripts regarding the distribution of these locative endings.

As seen in the list above, the word листъ is constructed with the preposition въ up to and including fol. 207r, and with на beginning from fol. 209v. This distribution of prepositions is the same in all mss. that have been consulted. Two possible explanations have been found. Firstly, four of five constructions with въ are series of the type въ книгу […] въ главу […], which may favor the use of the preposition въ once again, whereas in the constructions with на, the immediately surrounding text is less formulaic. Secondly, in ms. B, there is a change of scribes between fols. 205v and 206r in volume.
4.2.2.4 The a-expansion in oblique cases of the plural

The process known as the a-expansion concerned nouns of the o-, jo-, i- and consonant declensions in the dative, instrumental and locative plural and refers to the replacement of the original endings of the respective declensions by what was originally the endings of a- and ja-stem nouns. In other words, the endings - amendments and - amendments spread at the expense of - amendments, - amendments, and - amendments, respectively.

The exact circumstances of this process and the internal chronology of the development of the cases in the spoken language have been debated, but in the written language, innovative forms spread in the dative and locative earlier than in the instrumental (Živov 2004: 270–271). Eventually, the use of new forms in the instrumental became more frequent, and in the second half of the 17th century, masculine o-stem nouns had the highest share of new forms in the locative, lower in the instrumental and even lower in the dative, i.e. L > I > D, which can be called the neutral distribution. There were differences between the registers in terms of both the share of new forms and their distribution between the cases. The neutral distribution was characteristic of non-bookish everyday texts (bytovye teksty) and of the hybrid register. Chancellery texts, on the other hand, showed the distribution I > L > D, which can be explained by a normalizing effort to avoid homonymy of the instrumental plural with the nominative and accusative plural. This distribution, but with much lower shares of new forms, can also be found in some standard Church Slavonic texts under the same normalizing influence. Thus, a high degree of orientation on model texts led to a low share of new forms, and a high degree of normalization led to the distribution I > L > D (Živov 2004: 314–319).

The a-expansion in the studied part of the Kronika is extensive, or širokoe (Živov 2004: 284), amounting to 34.3% (132 out of 385) if ambiguous cases are included (cf. below), or 40.2% (132 out of 328) if they are not.

The results for the instrumental plural of masculine o-stems, jo-stems, consonant stems and i-stems are partly uncertain due to the fact that the old o- and jo-stem ending -by/-u was homonymous with the accusative and, later, nominative plural. An important theme in the text is explaining the names of the Slavic peoples, and constructions such as нарицаться о речи быть are common. It seems that the normal way to construct these verbs was with the instrumental, but nevertheless, there are some cases where a nominative form, not homonymous with the instrumental, is used, as in example (45) (cf. also Slav 26 fols. 161v, 165r, 171v et al.), indicating that it was also possible to construct these verbs with the nominative.
Forms ending in - médec or -i without attributes are therefore ambiguous in such contexts. Because of this ambiguity, two tables will be shown below, one where the ambiguous examples are included and one where they are excluded. The difference will be noticed in the cells containing instrumental endings for masculine o-stems, jo-stems, consonant stems and i-stems. The number of ambiguous cases amounts to 57, which means that they make up a large share. The greatest difference is seen in the masculine o-stems, where the exclusion of ambiguous cases reduces the number of old endings by more than half. In the tables below, the numbers in parentheses are the shares of new forms in percent.

**Table 8. The a-expansion in oblique cases, ambiguous cases included**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ending</th>
<th>m. o-st.</th>
<th>m. jo-st.</th>
<th>n. o-st.</th>
<th>n. jo-st.</th>
<th>m. cons.</th>
<th>m. i-st.</th>
<th>f. i-st.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.3)</td>
<td>(26.3)</td>
<td>2 (100)</td>
<td>1 (100)</td>
<td>– (0)</td>
<td>– (0)</td>
<td>1 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(64.3)</td>
<td>(44.4)</td>
<td>15 (100)</td>
<td>– (0)</td>
<td>– (0)</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>И/и</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>И амп/ами</td>
<td>49 (37.4)</td>
<td>– (0)</td>
<td>6 (31.6)</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td>7 (7.7)</td>
<td>– (0)</td>
<td>– (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ми</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9. The a-expansion in oblique cases, ambiguous cases excluded**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ending</th>
<th>m. o-st.</th>
<th>m. jo-st.</th>
<th>n. o-st.</th>
<th>n. jo-st.</th>
<th>m. cons.</th>
<th>m. i-st.</th>
<th>f. i-st.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.3)</td>
<td>(26.3)</td>
<td>2 (100)</td>
<td>1 (100)</td>
<td>– (0)</td>
<td>– (0)</td>
<td>1 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(64.3)</td>
<td>(44.4)</td>
<td>15 (100)</td>
<td>– (0)</td>
<td>– (0)</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>И/и</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>И амп/ами</td>
<td>49 (59)</td>
<td>– (0)</td>
<td>6 (31.6)</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td>2 (12.5)</td>
<td>– (0)</td>
<td>– (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ми</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see from the tables above, new forms are almost completely absent from the consonant declension, represented by nouns ending in -инъ. They show only two instances of the new ending in the instrumental. This is in accordance with evidence from other texts, where this declension has also been seen to be resistant to innovations (cf. Živov 2004: 277). The masculine i-stems, represented by the two nouns людь и дати, also lack new endings, but are not very well represented to begin with. The instrumental forms воеводы and добычи of a-stem nouns are innovations not included in the tables above.

In masculine o-stem nouns, the locative is the most progressive in adopting new forms, followed by the instrumental and then the dative, i.e. the text follows the neutral distribution, as may be expected of a hybrid text. If the
masculine o- and jo-stem nouns are taken together, they are also in accordance with this distribution, whereas the jo-stem nouns by themselves show a larger share of new forms in the dative than in the instrumental.

The instrumental ending -ми is not uncommon even outside of the i-declension. This can be seen as a marker of bookishness (Živov 2004: 300–301), although the a-expansion as a whole (or absence of it) was not always a part of the system of markers of bookishness (Živov 2004: 318–319).

As for variation between manuscripts, it is mostly a question of isolated substitutions with no apparent tendency. The only exception is the dative plural, where ms. N has new forms instead of old forms in six instances. As opposed to these more modern forms, ms. N has the archaic instrumental plural тьльцы instead of тьлами (Slav 26, fol. 211v).

All in all, the distribution of innovative forms according to cases reminds of the one in the Letopisec 1619–1691 gg., where, however, the share of new forms is only 19.17%, and of the distribution in Lzlov’s Škifskaja istorija, with 25.6% new forms (Živov 2004: 304–307). Thus, the share of new forms in the translation of Stryjkowski is higher than in these texts, although they can be said to belong to the same tradition, which testifies to a lower degree of connection to the tradition of the genre. However, the distribution of new forms according to declensions and cases is approximately the same. With its high share of new forms and the distribution L > I > D between the cases, this translation actually comes closest to the everyday register in its usage, although such extensive usage of new forms has been attested in other hybrid texts as well.

4.2.2.5 The vocative

Vocative forms are regularly used in the contexts where this is appropriate. It can be noted that the Polish original also has vocative forms, so the use of the vocative in the translation could be either a bookish element or a sign of influence from Polish. There are vocative forms of masculine as well as feminine nouns, some of the most frequent being читателю любезны (six times), with the adjective always in a form identical with the nominative, and царю (four times). Other forms are Риме (Slav 26, fols. 178r, 178v), велики княже (fols. 198v, 216v), Елено (fol. 205v, 2x), сыну (fol. 208r), Свадолче (fol. 211v), Владимиру (fol. 216v) and Владимире (fol. 220v). The endings correspond to Church Slavonic norm, except in the case of the name Владимиръ, where two different endings are used. The ending -е is the etymologically correct one, and the ending -y may have been motivated by the Polish form Włodimierz.

There are also a few instances of a nominative used in a vocative context, especially of feminine nouns, such as госпожа княгини (fol. 203r) and княгини Ольга (fol. 205r). The plural господа сватове (fol. 201v) – where
the ending -ове is probably influenced by the Polish panowie swatowie – and the former consonant stem дуци did not have a separate vocative form.

The vocative forms do not differ between manuscripts.

4.2.3 Adjectives

4.2.3.1 The nominative and accusative plural of adjectives

The declination of long forms of adjectives, participles and ordinal numbers (for the sake of brevity, I will simply speak of adjectives below) in the nominative and accusative plural displays a combination of “old” (Church Slavonic of Russian redaction) and “new” (East Slavic) forms. The old forms were -ий in the nominative masculine, -ыя (here usually spelled -ыя) in the accusative masculine and the nominative and accusative feminine, and -ая (here usually spelled -ая) in the nominative and accusative neuter. The new ending -ыб (here usually spelled -ые) originally belonged only to the accusative masculine and the nominative and accusative feminine, i.e. it was the East Slavic counterpart to -ыя, but could by this time be used for all genders and both cases under consideration (cf. Živov 2004: 409–410).

In this part of the text according to ms. U, the new ending -ые/-ие is found in all gender and case combinations discussed here and is dominant in most of them, but all the old endings can also be found. It should be noted that in a few instances, the case and number of an adjective have been difficult to establish, especially in translations of Latin book titles that were not integrated into the syntax of the Polish text, or in other cases of obscure syntax. These instances do not affect the results to a great extent.

There are 141 adjectives in the nominative plural masculine. The most frequent ending is -ые/-ие, with 86 occurrences. The old ending -ий is found 52 times in the text. In twelve of these forms, adjectives of nationality with the suffix -ск- have the bookish ending -стыи, due to the effects of the 2nd palatalization. This development was present in OCS and is also found in Church Slavonic texts of Russian redaction, but it was absent in East Slavic (Uspenskij 2002: 197). There is also one instance with the ending -ый in a participle (Slav 26, fol. 188v), a form that had arisen in the language as a result of -ый becoming a general plural marker (Živov 2004: 410). This form is included with the ending -ий in Table 10 below. The ending -ыя/-ия is found three times.

The accusative plural masculine shows five instances of the old ending -ыя/-ия and 24 instances of -ые/-ие.

In the nominative plural feminine, the ending -ые/-ие dominates (12 instances), but in one case the originally masculine ending -ий is used, perhaps because the adjective is separated from the corresponding noun by a few other words (Slav 26, fol. 171r). In the accusative, there are 45 instances of -ые/-ие, 12 of the old form -ыя/-ия, and one of the originally neutral ending
"-ая", alongside an adjective ending in "-ия", which qualifies the same noun. Here, the adjective ending in "-ая" was probably influenced by the fixed expression "и протчая" ‘and so forth’:

(46) принесе же с собою и мощи свято Климонта, и иконы и книги и ризы и протчая 8твари црконыя (Slav 26, fol. 224r)

In both the nominative and the accusative plural neuter, three endings are found: "-ия/-ия" (three in the nominative and six in the accusative), "-ая/-ия" (one in the nominative, 15 in the accusative, including the syntactically more independent occurrences of "и протчая") and "-ие/-ие" (eight in the nominative, 25 in the accusative).

There are some cases, such as example (46), of adjectives with different endings modifying the same noun, a type of variation that was characteristic of the hybrid register (cf. Živov 2004: 421, 428).

As a whole, the new ending "-ие/-ие" constitutes 66.6% of all the nominative and accusative plural adjective endings, which exceeds that of all hybrid texts studied by Živov (2004: 418–437) except one. 41.4% of the instances of the ending "-ия/-ия" (12 of 29) occur in positions where this ending was not originally used, but it is much less frequent than in some other hybrid texts, where "-ие/-ие" and "-ия/-ия" are used for all gender-case combinations studied. 28.8% of the endings are correctly used old endings, which is approximately the same as in the later part of Mazurinskij letopisec.

Table 10 is patterned on the tables in Živov (2004) to facilitate comparison with the texts discussed there. The numbers for etymologically correct old endings have been set in boldface.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Npl masc.</th>
<th>Apl masc.</th>
<th>NApI fem.</th>
<th>NApI neut.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-ия&quot;/&quot;-ия&quot;</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-ия&quot;/&quot;-ия&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-ая&quot;/&quot;-ия&quot;</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-ие&quot;/&quot;-ие&quot;</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variation between manuscripts is quite frequent with respect to these adjective endings; approximately 45 of the 300 forms have another ending in one or more manuscripts. The variation goes in different directions and is difficult to describe in a general way, but the most common trend is that mss. E and R often have the ending "-ия" where ms. U has "-ие". This variation occurs in all gender-case combinations studied, so these manuscripts illustrate the above-mentioned tendency to use both "-ие/-ие" and "-ия/-ия" without considering the etymology. There is also some variation regarding the old nomina-
tive masculine ending: on the one hand, ms. R often has what looks like a short form of the adjective (cf. Section 4.2.3.3), on the other hand, ms. N has a few instances of the ending -ны where the others have -ны.

4.2.3.2 The genitive singular of masculine and neutral adjectives

In the genitive singular of adjectives referring to masculine or neutral nouns, the two endings -о or -о compete. The ending -о prevails in ms. U with 204 against 74 -о, or 73.4% and 26.6%, respectively, of the 278 instances. There is also one occurrence of the ending -о.

The choice of form varies considerably between manuscripts: approximately half the instances show variation in at least one other manuscript. Moreover, there is variation between hands within the manuscripts. Ms. N, especially hand N1, uses -о to a much greater extent than the others. To a lesser degree, ms. E also tends to use -о where ms. U has -о. In ms. R, hand R1 often uses -о where ms. U has -о, whereas hand R2 does the opposite. These differences between hands in a single manuscript, as well as between mss. E and R, which are usually very close to each other, probably show that it was acceptable for each scribe to apply the adjectival ending he preferred in these cases. The form ending in -о has the ending -ова in mss. E and R, which have this ending in one other instance as well.

4.2.3.3 Short forms

There are a number of short forms of adjectives and participles in the text. Ordinal numbers, however, are always found in the long form when they are spelled out with letters. Possessive adjectives (except those with the suffix -ск) form a category of their own (cf. Larsen 2005: 221) and are always used in the short form in this text. They will not be discussed further here, since variation is not possible (cf., however, Section 4.3.4).

The toponyms Новгород, Новгородъ and Белоозеро are also excluded here, even though the first elements are declined as short adjectives, because of the fixed form of these combinations and the absence of variation. The case forms of these toponyms attested are the nominative, the genitive, the dative, the accusative and the locative, i.e. all short forms that were possible at the time are found here.

With these excluded, there are 122 adjectives (of a total of nearly 2000) and 100 participles (of a total of approximately 225) in the short form. Of the total of 222 short forms, 124 are used predicatively, i.e. with verbs such as быть, бывать or пребывать or in a context where a verb of that type is implied or understood from the Polish original. 26 short forms are in a position that could be interpreted as either attributive or predicative. The ambiguity arises when the adjective or participle is modified in some way, which allows an interpretation of it as part of an elliptic relative clause. In example
(47), the adjective медянь is clearly an attribute to котлокъ, whereas the participle посвящень is ambiguous:

(47) В тож время гепиды предки жмёлдскей и литовскей котлокъ медянь по обычаю своеем поганскомъ посвящень вмёсто поминкъ дрёжбы томже цесарю Августъ послали (Slav 26, fol. 180v)

Six of the forms are participles forming part of dative absolute constructions (always in the singular – as we will see below in Section 4.3.5.1, the two occurrences of dative absolutes with the plural have the participle in the long form). 62 forms are used as genuine attributes. Four forms are used independently of nouns, either because they are substantivized or because they are named simply as words, e.g. as explanations or translations of other words, such as in the following example:

(48) вмёсто Сарматы еже от ёврейского толжется высокъ и честен, савроматы нарещи можа8 противнымъ обычаємъ от саврос (Slav 26, fol. 184r)

Passive constructions with a predicative use of a past passive participle account for the large share of short forms in participles. Participles do not occur in an attributive position as often as adjectives do. Present passive participles are also used in the short form as part of passive constructions, but are more rare than the past passive participles. Present active participles are rarely used in the short form; this is the case only when they are part of dative absolute constructions.

Predicative short forms and the short forms in the ambiguous positions explained above are always in the nominative, which is inherent in the constructions themselves. The purely attributive short forms are found mainly in the nominative and accusative, both singular and plural, but there are also a few genitive singular forms and, in addition to the participles in dative absolute constructions, one more dative singular form. The instrumental and locative singular and the oblique cases in the plural are not attested. Adjectives in the short form follow the noun more often than they precede it (cf. Larsen 2005: 217), but prepositive short form adjectives are represented here in all existing case-number combinations except the dative singular.

In the nominative plural, the adjectives and participles can take either the ending -u (the old masculine nominative plural ending) or -ы (the old masculine accusative plural ending). To some extent, this follows the division between animate and inanimate nouns. For instance, the form речени (суть) is used frequently and always refers to people. The form речены (от речениы) can also refer to people, but once it refers to руские земли, which is not animate. This distribution of the endings -u and -ы also holds true in most
cases for other adjectives and participles. There is also one instance of the neuter plural form различна.

In a few cases, ms. R has the short form -i in the masculine plural nominative where the other mss. have -иш (cf. Section 4.2.3.1). However, adjectives in the masculine singular nominative, which end in -ыш/-ишь in other mss., also frequently have the ending -ы/-и in ms. R, such as in example (49).

(49) Прокопий также славны и дрэны поветописец (RGADA 58, fol. 75r; cf. Slav 26, fol. 162r)

Since this is not the correct short form in the masculine singular, it is probable that this shortening of the ending was not an attempt to use the short form of adjectives and participles, but an idiosyncracy of the scribe’s spelling, possibly reflecting his pronunciation.

4.2.3.4 Degrees of comparison

Comparative and superlative forms of adjectives and adverbs are discussed here together, since their forms do not differ from each other (cf. Pennington 1980: 256).

There are declinable as well as indeclinable forms of the comparative in ms. U. Among the declinable forms we find мениши, лутчи, юниши and болвиш, although it can sometimes be discussed if this last form is positive or comparative. The context and comparison with the Polish original have served as determining factors.

Forms with the suffix -иши, such as древниши, or -иш with a preceding palatalization of the stem, such as крвльшии от твержшии, can also be declined. This suffix originated in the feminine singular form of the comparative. In the 17th century, it was a slavonicism and, according to Cocron (1962: 129), used mainly in the titles of sovereigns. His observation does not, however, hold true for this text.

The most common ending in the undeclinable adjectives and adverbs is -бе. There are also many forms with the ending -е, such as позже and выше. Some indeclinable forms have the ending -и, such as лутчи, болви, хужи and горшиi, although several of these have variant readings ending in -е in other manuscripts, especially in ms. N.

The forms крепчae (fol. 150r), сильяе (fol. 186r) and скоряе (fol. 217r) show an ending that had developed from -бе and that was often used with adjectives whose stem contained the letter -е-, in order to avoid having the same vowel in three consecutive syllables (Pennington 1980: 257–258). This, however, is not the case in the last of the three examples.

Aside from the above-mentioned variation between the endings -и and -е and various ways of spelling the consonant cluster in the word лутче/ лутше/ лучше, there is no variation between manuscripts.
4.2.4 Pronouns

4.2.4.1 Personal pronouns

The nominative of the first person singular in ms. U is either азъ (nine times) or я (three times). The accusative is меня (two times), мя (seven times) or мне (three times). The dative is expressed by мнъ (ten times) or ми (six times). The genitive, the instrumental and the locative do not occur.

In the oblique cases of the second person singular, the forms found are: in the genitive тебе (two times), in the accusative тебъ (one time) or тя (three times), in the dative тебъ (two times) and in the locative тебъ (one time). The instrumental does not occur.

The reflexive pronoun is usually used in its long forms A’Къ (eleven times), A’Къ (three times) and A’Къ (thirty times), but the accusative также also occurs (once). The majority of these forms are in the dative case, which always has себъ. The locative form is also always себъ, whereas the genitive and accusative vary between себъ, себе and себя. The enclitics of reflexive verbs are not included here.

There is little variation between manuscripts, except such that can be put down to scribal errors. One of the instances of тебе instead has the form тебъ in mss. B, G and N, and one occurrence of себъ is instead found as себъ in mss. G and N.

The use of the short forms мя, ми and тя is a sign of bookishness (Cocron 1962: 136–137). Originally, the use of one form or another was connected with their status as full words or clitics. The long forms were used when they needed to be stressed, and the position of the short forms (which were enclitics) in the phrase was determined by certain rules. The earliest rules prescribed the use of the enclitics except in some very specific cases, but during the course of time, long forms became possible in all contexts (Zaliznjak 2008: 130–134). The choice of form in this text should also be viewed in relation to the Polish original, since the Polish system of personal pronouns included full and clitic forms, some of which (such as the enclitic mię in the accusative, which occurs frequently here) have since disappeared (Klemensiewicz et al. [1955] 1981: 321–322).

In the cases where the use in the Russian translation differs from that in the Polish original or from the old rules, it is nearly always a question of the long form appearing where a short form is to be expected. The only exception is the phrase аз тя о Елено избрахъ (Slav 26, fol. 205v), where a short form occurs instead of an expected long form. The position immediately before an appeal, such as Елено, was a situation where even according to the original rules the long form was preferred, although the short form was also possible (Zaliznjak 2008: 132). Moreover, the Polish original of this phrase has the long form ciebie. This makes the use of the short form in the translation all the more surprising. The general impression is that the short forms
were markers of bookish language and not applied regularly, but also that the translator knew something about their proper use, since he used a short form incorrectly only once.

The forms of the personal pronouns in the third person singular and plural are largely identical to the ones used in modern Russian. In the nominative, the forms used are онъ, она, оно and они, and the oblique cases are also the modern ones.

In the accusative of masculine and feminine pronouns, however, there was still some competition at this time between the old accusative forms у and я, respectively, and the forms that originally belonged to the genitive, i.e. его and ея or ей, respectively. In the masculine accusative, ms. U shows only the form его, originally the genitive form (sometimes spelled ево), and the original accusative у is not found. In the feminine accusative, on the other hand, the original accusative form я prevails, and the genitive form ей or ея is never used in an accusative context. In the plural, the form ихъ is more frequent than я, which was the original accusative form.

Aside from one instance where ей in ms. U corresponds to ея in mss. B, G and N, the only variation between manuscripts concerns a few instances of confusion of его and егоже and similar cases.

The difference between the usage in the masculine and feminine may reflect the fact that его for the accusative was introduced earlier than ей or ея in the same contexts. However, this development took place several centuries earlier (Kryśko 1994: 130–133), so that if it has any bearing on this text, it must be because of the usage in model texts, perhaps through different degrees of acceptability of the various forms.

### 4.2.4.2 Relative pronouns

In ms. U, there are 22 instances of the relative pronoun который in different forms. Far more common, however, are forms of иже, with approximately 200 occurrences.

In eleven instances, который is followed by a noun that echoes the word in the main clause to which the relative pronoun refers. All these occurrences correspond to an identical structure in the Polish original. Of these, only example (50) repeats the same noun in the main and subordinate clauses:

(50) Tego dopiero wnuk Wasili wielki Xiądż Moskiewski/ Zamek Moskiewski począł murem y wieżami obwodzić/ które mury potem przes lat trzydzieści calę potomkowie jego ledwo dokonali (Stryjkowski 1582: 91)

tого внъкъ Василії, великій князь московскії, града Москвѣ нача стѣною каменною и башнями обводити, которые стѣны въ.

.Л. лътъ наслѣдницы его одна совершенша (Slav 26, fol. 156r)
In the other instances, the noun in the subordinate clause can be e.g. a synonym, a hyponym or a hypernym of the one in the main clause. The following example is typical:

(51) Drugą ząs Columnę widzialem za **Andrino-poli-m/ ná ktorym mieyscu**
Bulgárowie niewdzięcznie oddając dar pismá Hlaholstocké […] przechonego Česzárâ Michálâ Kuroplátâ wzruszywszy mu przymierze porâzili (Stryjkowski 1582: 88)

**држїй же стоїть видех за Андринополем на котором мѣстe боїтары неблїгодарно воздая дар писmealный [..] выше-реченного ћръ Михайлa Кврополата мир разорывъ побиша** (Slav 26, fols. 152r–152v)

This construction was represented in different registers, but mainly in chancellor language and only sporadically in chronicles (Hüttl-Folter 1996: 54; Žílov 2004: 111–112). S. C. Gardiner (1963: 124–125) remarks that it was found in the language of *Posol'skij prikaz*, but not in other Russian 17th-century sources, unless they were influenced by other languages. W. Witkowsk (1978: 35) points to the fact that it became widely spread in Russian precisely during a time of Polish influence, and that Polish had used it for a long time, patterned on Latin constructions.

When the Polish relative pronoun was followed by a noun in this way, the translator seems to have preferred the translation **ktorphy**. In a few cases, **który + noun** was translated using **лежа**, but always without a following noun; the construction **лежа + noun** was probably impossible. The translation **ktoropy + noun** was closer to the original in these cases, which is probably the reason why it was preferred.

In some cases, forms of **лежа** – most often its neutral singular form **лежа** – are also used as a translation for Polish **co**, referring to a whole phrase. It may also be a translation for Polish relative **któro**.

An oddity is the form **оноже** (Slav 26, fol. 150r), which is used to translate a form of **który**.

The relative pronouns are as a rule declined according to their role in the subordinate clause. In a few cases, the relative pronoun does not agree formally with the noun, but rather semantically, such as on fol. 183r, where the Polish **Russacy** with a following plural relative pronoun is translated as the singular **Рысь**, followed by a plural pronoun. The plural pronoun is probably motivated by the collective meaning of the word **Рысь**, which also often takes plural verb forms. Another case is found on fol. 191v, where the Russian translation, like the Polish original, has a masculine relative pronoun referring to the toponym **Коревица** (**Korewica**). The Russian choice could be motivated by an underlying **градъ**, as well as, of course, by the Polish original, but the Polish use of the masculine is more difficult to explain.
4.2.4.3 Other pronouns

Forms of the pronoun иной occur 82 times in ms. U, whereas the form иныи with -ин- only occurs twice. There are three occurrences of the short form инъ. The form with -ин- can be seen as a polonism (Moser 2007: 235). There are a couple of more instances of the spelling with -ин- in other mss., and some additional variation that can probably be put down to scribal errors caused by the similarity of the letters и and и in some hands.

Forms of тотъ and той both occur frequently. Forms of сей are also very frequent. The demonstrative это, however, does not occur at all.

The pronoun ‘every’ takes the form кійкіді (five instances), with no variation between manuscripts. It is mainly used independently, meaning ‘everyone’ (e.g. fol. 165r), but also together with a masculine noun (fol. 204r). The etymology of this word is къ + жъдо (Leskien 1886: 97), and originally, the first element was declined and the second was undecidable, unlike today’s каждый.

4.2.5 Numerals

Numerals (cardinal as well as ordinal) are often given as Cyrillic alphabetic numerals in ms. U, especially in the case of large numbers, such as years, but also in references to books, chapters and pages in Stryjkowski’s sources. Ms. G (hand G2, cf. Section 8.3.3) uses alphabetic numerals in a few cases where the other mss. spell the numerals out in full. Ordinal numbers written as alphabetic numerals are often, but not always, followed by an indication of the case form as a superscript letter. This also varies between manuscripts, and will not be commented on below. The discussion below is based on the numerals that are spelled out in full in ms. U, and the variation that is mentioned also refers only to forms that are spelled out.

4.2.5.1 Cardinal numerals

Both одинъ and единъ are used approximately ten times each in different case forms. As in Kontośichin’s text (Pennington 1980: 248–249), единъ shows long forms in oblique cases.

The forms of the number ‘two’ found in the text are два (accusative neuter, twice), девъ (accusative feminine, three times: twice animate, once inanimate), деву (once genitive neuter, once accusative masculine animate, once genitive masculine animate), двух (once accusative masculine animate, and once genitive neuter as part of a compound numeral), дьемя (instrumental masculine), дьъма (instrumental neuter, as part of a compound numeral). The only variation between manuscripts is that ms. R has the form дьемя instead of дьъма.

These forms show that the distribution known from contemporary Russian, where два refers to the masculine and neuter and дьве to the feminine,
applies to this text, as to several other 17th-century texts. The variation between *дев* and *двух* is also known from other texts of the period (Cocron 1962: 189–190; Pennington 1980: 265), although it is unusual for *дев* to prevail as it does here. The instrumental form *девьма* is the original one, and the form with the ending *-мя* is more recent, but there is no example here of the contemporary form *девьма*, where the vowel from the genitive form has spread across the paradigm. This is in agreement with Cocron’s findings (Cocron 1962: 190–191).

The distribution of *оба* and *объ* corresponds to that of *два* and *двъ*. There is also an occurrence of *обои* in the nominative neuter. This is originally a collective form, which later disappeared in Russian but remains in the oblique cases (Cocron 1962: 195–196). The other forms attested are *обоихъ* (accusative masculine animate and genitive feminine), *обоимъ* (dative masculine) and the unusual form *обою* (accusative feminine), which is probably also a heritage from the flection of *обои*. Mss. E and R have *оба* for *обои*, and ms. N has *объимъ* instead of *обоимъ*.

The forms of the numeral *три* that occur, aside from the nominative-accusative form, are the genitive *трех* (nine times), the dative *трем* (once) and the instrumental *трема* (once). Both the dative and the instrumental forms are the old ones (cf. Cocron 1962: 191). Mss. G, E and R have the newer form *трема* instead of *трема*.

The number ‘four’ is only found spelled out in the instrumental *читырма*, which, like *трема*, has an old ending that gradually fell out of use in the 17th century (Cocron 1962: 191). Mss. B and G have *читырма* here, and ms. N has *читырмя*, with the newer ending.

The genitive of the number ‘six,’ *шест* (in a compound numeral), is found once and was normal for this period (Cocron 1962: 192; Pennington 1980: 266).

The number ‘ten’ is found either with hard or soft final consonant, which varies between manuscripts.

The number 12 occurs once as *дванадесяти* (accusative), and the number 15 is found twice in the form *пятьнадесять*. In contrast to this, Cocron (1962: 193) and Pennington (1980: 266) list only the contracted forms known from contemporary Russian.

The number 20 is found both in its full and contracted form: *двадесять* and *двенадцать*. *Пятьнадесять* and *семьнадесять* are also found. More surprising is *четыредесять* (in a compound numeral) instead of the expected *сорокъ*, which may be explained by the fact that the Polish has *czterdzięści*. There is variation between manuscripts as to whether the final consonant in these numerals is hard or soft, and mss. R and N have *сем*- instead of *семъ*.

Higher numerals (hundreds and thousands) have the forms still found in today’s Russian.
4.2.5.2 Ordinal numerals

Most of the ordinals have the same forms as in contemporary Russian. The following forms deserve to be mentioned.

According to Pennington (1980: 268), the normal word for ‘second’ at this time was другоу, and it is also the only one attested in Cocron’s sources (Cocron 1962: 202). In ms. U, however, the ordinal второй is found eight times in different cases. Другоу is also used, but it can sometimes be hard to tell if it is intended as a numeral or as the pronoun ‘other.’

The ordinal ‘third’ shows a variety of forms, which is in line with what is observed in other 17th-century texts, since it was influenced by other ordinals and shows endings belonging to the original flection of adjectives in -въ- as well as endings borrowed from ordinary adjectives in the long form (Cocron 1962: 202). The forms found here are the following: nominative-accusative masculine третий (seven times), genitive masculine and neuter третийго and третыго, genitive feminine третей (twice), dative masculine третелему, accusative feminine третию, instrumental masculine третийм and instrumental feminine третьею.

Other ordinals do not require comment, and there is no variation between manuscripts.

4.2.5.3 Other types of numerals

A few examples of numerals of multiplication or repetition can be found. These are: единожды, дважды (mss. E and R have дважды), трижды and многажды (once) or многочи/многочи (twice; ms. R has многочи in both instances). Вдвоем also belongs here.

4.3 Description of IV: 1–3: syntax

4.3.1 Verbal tenses for past events

As explained in Section 1.3, chapters IV: 1–3 of the translation of Stryjkowski’s chronicle are part of a large segment of text (segment A) where mainly aorist and imperfect forms, i.e. simplex preterites, are used.

The perfect tense without auxiliary verb (elliptic perfect, cf. van Schooneveld 1959; Matthews 1995) is also well represented in the text. For reasons explained in Section 4.3.1.3, it will be discussed apart from perfect forms with an auxiliary verb in the present tense, or “the Perfect tense proper, the full form” (Matthews 1995: 301). Not all scholars distinguish between full and elliptic perfect forms. When earlier studies are used as comparison below, it will be noted in each case if they treat these forms separately or jointly.
Full perfect forms are rare, as is the pluperfect (with an auxiliary verb in the aorist, imperfect or perfect). Table 11 shows the distribution of the tenses used for past events in IV: 1–3 according to ms. U.

Table 11. Distribution of tenses for the past in IV: 1–3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense or form</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliptic perfect</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>Without auxiliary verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full perfect</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>With auxiliary verb in the present tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluperfect</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>With auxiliary verb in aorist, imperfect or perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The simplex preterites – aorist and imperfect – dominate. Together they account for more than 80% of the verbal usage for past events. The elliptic perfect is more unusual, and the full perfect and the pluperfect rare exceptions. Some situations have been identified where they are especially liable to be used (cf. Sections 4.3.1.2 and 4.3.1.3).

4.3.1.1 The use of the aorist

Although approximately one tense form in six, referring to the past, is an elliptic perfect tense form, there are some verbs that occur more than six times, but always or almost always in the aorist. One may suspect that they are used formulaically. These verbs are listed below with details as to their occurrences. Only verbs that occur nine times or more in ms. U, and that have no more than one occurrence there in another form than the aorist, have been included.

Table 12. Verbs with a great majority of aorists in IV: 1–3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Total past forms</th>
<th>Aorists</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>взять</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1 elliptic perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>возвратиться</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дать</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>идти</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1 imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>начать + начатись</td>
<td>23 + 2</td>
<td>22 + 2</td>
<td>1 elliptic perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>повелеть</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>принять</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>прийти</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1 elliptic perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>речи</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>сотворить</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>умереть</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1.2 The use of the elliptic perfect

Elliptic perfect forms amount to 16.6% of the verbs for past events in IV: 1–3. Some semantic, lexical and other patterns in the use of this tense can be discerned. Of the verbs that occur frequently enough to allow discussion, few have a large share of perfect forms. Therefore, unprefigated verbs are in some cases discussed together with their prefigated counterparts.

The verb поселиться

The verb поселиться is in ms. U (and most other mss.) almost evenly divided between the aorist (seven instances) and the elliptic perfect (five instances). In ms. G, the distribution is six aorists and six elliptic perfect forms. The verb also occurs once in the pluperfect. The earliest occurrences of this verb are from the 17th century (SRJa), so perhaps it seemed like an anomaly to use it in an archaic form. It is mainly used as a translation of Polish osieść, which in other cases is translated as овладети, usually in the aorist.

The verb съя with and without prefixes

The verbs съя (twice), отсъя (once) and посъя (once) only occur in the elliptic perfect (all in the plural). However, several of these occurrences are also found in the context of ‘conquering the enemy’ (cf. below) and may therefore be semantically motivated.

The verb мочь with and without prefixes

The verb мочь is almost evenly divided between the aorist (four instances) and the elliptic perfect (three instances). Возмочь is only found in the aorist (four instances) and перемочь in the elliptic perfect (once), so that this verbal root, with or without prefixes, occurs eight times in the aorist and four times in the elliptic perfect, which is quite a large share. No explanation for this has been found.

Verbs with the prefix вы-

In the analyzed chapters, as found in ms. U, 13 verbs with the prefix вы- occur one time each. Eleven of these are in the elliptic perfect and two in the aorist. This predominance of the elliptic perfect may be connected to the fact that the prefix вы-, which is of Russian origin, had stylistic connotations that could trigger the use of the perfect. Verbs with the prefix из-, which was the bookish counterpart of Church Slavonic origin, are mainly used in the aorist. There are only two minimal pairs, where the same verb occurs with both prefixes: выбити/избити (used in different senses) and выйти/изошт. They follow the expected distribution of tenses, i.e. the verbs with the prefix из- are used in the aorist (cf. also Uspenskij 2002: 253).
Negated forms
Where the verb is negated, the share of elliptic perfect forms is unusually high, even though the simplex preterites, when added together, still dominate. Out of a total of 36 negated instances, 14 are in the aorist, 11 in the imperfect, 11 in the elliptic perfect, and one in the full perfect tense. Thus, in negated clauses, perfect forms (full or elliptic) make up 33.3%, clearly encroaching more on the aorist than on the imperfect.

The use of the perfect tense in negated clauses has been attested in the Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis'. There it has been explained by the fact that the perfect was often used to convey background information, in clauses with what P. V. Petruchin (2003: 119–121) calls lowered communicative status. As D. Matthews (1995: 303–304) phrases it, events expressed in the perfect tense (full or elliptic) are often “under absolute negation,” negation not referring to any specific time, and they do not form a part of the narrative chain.

‘Conquering the enemy’
There are three passages, similar in subject matter, where several (four to six) elliptic perfect forms are used together, which may mean that the use of the perfect tense is semantically motivated here. In the descriptions of how Olga massacred the Drevljans (example (52)), how Svjatoslav conquered the Greek (example (53)) and how Rus' conquered the Pečenegs (example (54)), the elliptic perfect is used for the actions:

(52) множество древлян побили, посъклицì, и потопили, а ини з жenами и з дìтми погоръли, иных ж зло много в Киев в неволю огвели, а иных яко скоет продавали (Slav 26, fol. 204v)

(53) бежащих ж грекой побивали, съклицы иных поеме живых, потом Святослав употребляя побдьы греческия страны, разорял и постопил (Slav 26, fol. 210v)

(54) Рус же остъкающих были съклицы, кололи, ловили, иных в Трубеже рекъ потопили, и множество полону и добычи в печенъжском ободе набрали (Slav 26, fol. 217v–218r)

This can be labelled ‘conquering the enemy’ or, viewed more broadly, ‘violent or dramatic action.’ The use of the perfect tense here remains to be explained, but it seems to have been an active choice, especially in example (52), since the Polish parallel to this text passage does not have finite verb forms, but uses an impersonal passive construction.

4.3.1.3 The use of the full perfect
The full perfect (with the auxiliary verb быти in the present tense) will be treated separately, despite the fact that, as we will see below, the choice be-
ween it and the elliptic perfect (without auxiliary verb) is partly dictated by the subject, and their distribution is thus complementary. However, since the forms with auxiliary verbs were no longer in use in the spoken language of the 17th century (cf. Gorškova & Chaburgaev 1997: 330–331; Uspenskij 2002: 247–249), these forms can be seen as marked, which justifies treating them as a separate category.

There are only nine instances of the full perfect tense in these chapters, and all except one (Slav 26, fol. 174r) are found in direct speech. Since there is an obvious connection between direct speech and the full perfect tense, we will look more closely at the overall distribution of tenses referring to past events in direct speech. There are a total of 22 such verbs, and the distribution of tenses is as follows: 11 aorist forms, one imperfect form, two elliptic perfect forms and eight full perfect forms. In other words, 36.4% of the instances are in the full perfect, and the full and elliptic perfect forms together make up 45.5% of the instances. A similar proportion has been observed by Matthews (1995: 299) in direct speech in the Galician Chronicle, which relates events of the late 13th century.

All instances of the full perfect, including the one that is not found in direct speech, have the auxiliary verb in the first or second person (singular or plural). This is not surprising, since even in early texts, perfect forms in the third person singular or plural were sometimes used without an auxiliary verb, whereas the full perfect form remained in use much longer in the first and second persons (Zaliznjak 2008: 236, 239–240). Since it is natural for first and second person forms to appear in direct speech, rather than in narrative parts of the text, this explains the connection between the perfect and direct speech. In this way, one may argue that the distribution of elliptic and full perfect is complementary in this text.

As for the choice between the aorist and the full perfect in direct speech, it can be assumed that when rendering a person’s speech, the translator might tend to use a form that was a little closer to his own spoken language. The full perfect, even if it was not in use in the late 17th century, probably seemed closer to the spoken language than did the simplex preterites. There are, however, instances of simplex preterites in the first person, both in direct speech and in the author’s comments.

A connection between the perfect (full or elliptic) and direct speech in chronicles has been observed by other scholars as well, and it seems to have been a tradition of that genre (Matthews 1995: 299; Živov 1995: 73; cf. also Kijanova 2010: 57).

A typical occurrence of the full perfect is shown in example (55), where the narrative is written using only the aorist, whereas the full perfect is used in Jaropolk’s speech to Svađolt (the elliptic perfect occurs in a marginal note not quoted here):
4.3.1.4 The use of the pluperfect

There are eleven instances of the pluperfect in these chapters. However, since all these forms except one correspond to pluperfect forms in Polish, it is more appropriate to speak of the translation of the Polish pluperfect than to discuss its use independently of the original. For this reason, the pluperfect will be dealt with in Section 6.8.2, where the translation of Polish pluperfects in the different segments will be compared.

4.3.2 The use of dual forms

Dual forms of verbs are not used in the sample chapters chosen from the chronicle. Some dual forms of nouns are found in chapters IV: 1–3, but only in the context of paired objects, such as eyes or hands, e.g. от очио его (Slav 26, fol. 223v), впах в рукъ немилостьны (fol. 225v), от руку их (fol. 227v). This is in accordance with the usage noted by Kijanova (2010: 282) in many other late chronicles. However, the tendency found in her sources that instrumental forms were used in a higher degree than other cases cannot be confirmed here.

In most contexts of duality, plural forms are used, especially when they refer to two objects that are not inherently paired, such as two brothers or two rivers, cf. for instance между Дравою, и Савою реками (fol. 163r), над [Днепрол и Донон реками (fol. 177r), Осколод и Дыръ [...] возвратишася (fol. 197v), кесари же гречесии Василии и Костянятинь послаша (fol. 209r), з дыми стю (fol. 212r), х Костянятину и Василию сюном (fol. 222r). There are also examples of the plural with inherently paired objects, such as по обоим57 берегам (fol. 166r), своими руками (fol. 188v, 2x), в рукахъ (fol. 214r).

If we look outside the chapters under consideration here, there is a part of the text that contains many dual forms. It is a short chronicle, quoted in its entirety by Stryjkowski, known as the chronička and discussed by several earlier scholars (cf. Section 2.3.1). It is quoted in chapter V: 4 of the Kronika (Stryjkowski 1582: 184–186) and found in Slav 26 on folos. 288v–291r. In this part of the text, the Russian translation contains a large number of dual forms, often used incorrectly, in singular or plural contexts. This incorrect use of dual forms is not limited to the quoted chronicle, but is also to be found in the text surrounding it, although it seems to be more frequent in the

57 Ms. N has обымиь.
Translation of the quoted text. Hypercorrect use of dual forms can be found in original Russian chronicles from the 17th century and has been explained as a way for the scribes to set the bookish standard of the text, i.e. they used them as markers of bookishness (cf. Živov 1995; Kijanova 2010: 50–51, 62). The beginning of the chronička may serve as an illustration.

посемь егда Ярославъ Владимировичь великий київський умре, сынове же его трие свободиста дядю своєго Свідслава ис поробля, сей абие бысть инокъ а Игорь в Смоленскѣ 8мре, и разделиста Смоленескъ на три доли, устрои Игорь в Переясловле цѣкь свято Михайла камению. умре же Свідславъ старецъ, а 8 Заслава київского київь родися сынъ Стополькъ Михайло. родися Стаславъ синъ Олексъ, а по немъ втрьй Глѣбъ, посемь приниста половцы в рѣскѣ землю противъ ихъ изъдоста трие ярославовичи Заславъ, Стаславъ, и Всеволодъ, и бѣста на Олѣ, снйдостаса рати. и гнѣвом Бѣримъ поражены сѣть христиае, и бѣжаста воевody рѣския со множеством ратных людей. (Slav 26, fol. 289r)

4.3.3 The category of animacy

The use of genetical genitive forms to express the accusative of animate nouns (hereafter A=G) in certain gender-number combinations in Russian has developed over time. The original accusative forms for the groups of nouns concerned were either identical with the nominative (hereafter A=N), as in the masculine singular, or coincided with them at an early stage, as in the masculine plural. Even though masculine nominative plural forms, distinct from the accusative plural, can be found in this text (cf. Section 4.2.2.1), the situation in the 17th century was such that it is possible to speak of variation between A=N and A=G.

The use of the A=G form for animate nouns began in the masculine singular and then spread to the masculine plural and later, because of the tendency towards unification of the genders in the plural, to the feminine and neutral plural (Krys'ko 1994: 126). Words for animals showed variation between A=G and A=N longer than words for humans, both in the masculine singular and in the plural (Krys'ko 1994: 200–201).

The distribution of A=N and A=G forms in this text, according to ms. U, is as follows.

In the masculine singular, humans, animals (a horse, fol. 198v) and gods (including the noun ідолъ, fol. 224r, cf. Krys'ko 1994: 4) have A=G forms. This applies both when the noun is an accusative object and in positions after prepositions. This form is also used when the accusative object is the name of an author, used as a metonymy for his works, e.g. чты Горбестениа (fol. 209v). All in all, this fits in with Cocron’s observations, although he found
that the word конь varied between A=N and A=G in the singular (Cocron 1962: 98–99).

In the masculine plural, the use varies. The A=G forms dominate with personal nouns; there is no example of A=G for animals. There are some cases of A=N forms, that include ethnonyms such as немцы (fol. 187v) and печенье (fol. 208r), other humans such as послы (e.g. fols. 169v, 222r) and жители (fol. 174v), and the animals кони (fol. 207v). There is also an instance of A=G plural of a masculine a-stem, воеводъ. Constructions with the prepositions въ and на, especially formulas such as иде на… (cf. Section 7.4.2) and послати въ... (e.g. fols. 193v–194r, 194r, although this verb is usually constructed with κъ + dative), seem to be a special case, and in these positions the A=N form is favored. Cocron (1962: 100–102) also noted a tendency towards the A=N form after prepositions, as opposed to uses without prepositions, where the form A=G prevailed in his sources.

There are not many instances of animate feminine plural objects, but in most cases where they do appear, they have A=N. This concerns humans, жены (fol. 222r), as well as animals, рыбы (fol. 180r) and овцы (fols. 201r, 203v). The A=G овец (fol. 177v) also occurs once. According to Cocron (1962: 101), it was unusual for feminine personal nouns to have A=N in the plural, but variation was common for feminine animals.

In Polish, the category of animacy developed at different times in the singular and the plural. For the accusative singular of animate masculine nouns, A=G forms are attested in early texts, in the 16th century it was a rule for persons and had also spread to animals, although that category was more conservative (Klemensiewicz et al. [1955] 1981: 271–272). Isolated instances of genitive forms for the accusative plural of masculine personal nouns are found in texts from the 16th century; they became more common in the 17th century, and by the 18th century the use of the old accusative forms had an archaic character (Klemensiewicz et al. [1955] 1981: 281–282). In Stryjkowski’s Polish text we see variation between the two constructions, but A=G forms in the plural are by no means unusual or exceptions.

Sometimes the choice of form in the Russian translation is identical to the Polish original and can be considered to be modeled on it, but sometimes they are different, in which cases it is mostly Polish that has A=N and Russian A=G.

4.3.4 Possessive adjectives

In Old Russian as well as in Old Polish, possession could be expressed with a possessive genitive or a possessive adjective (in Old Russian, there was also a possessive dative, which, however, is not found in this text). The choice between them depended mainly on whether the possessor was expressed by a single word or several. Single-word possessors were typically
expressed by a possessive adjective, and multiple-word possessors by a possessive genitive (Eckhoff 2006: 40–45). However, there were exceptions to this norm in Russian as well as in Polish (for Polish examples, cf. Pisarkowa 1984: 129).

Both the Polish original and the Russian translation of the examined chapters of the *Kronika* follow this principle quite faithfully, with no great differences between the manuscripts of the translation. An exception in the Polish text is the name *Noe* ‘Noah,’ which does not form a possessive adjective (but itself is declined as an adjective, since it ends in -e), whereas the Russian equivalent *Hou* regularly forms a possessive adjective, *Ноевъ*. In some instances, a possessive genitive in a Latin quote in the text is translated as a possessive adjective in Russian in accordance with the aforementioned norm. All in all, the translator seems to have been aware of the norm, applying it even when the Polish original diverged from it, when the original was in Latin, or when the text was altered in some way. When two single-word possessors were coordinated with a conjunction, they were treated as single-word possessors and translated with possessive adjectives (cf. example (59) below). H. M. Eckhoff (2006: 165–167, 212, 282) treats such examples as constructions with a complex possessor that should normally have been expressed with the genitive case.

The following examples illustrate cases where the original and the translation differ, although it is difficult to say if different norms applied in the two languages or if the Polish original diverged from the norm and the translator corrected this. It is a question of whether paratactic constructions are interpreted as one single (multiple-word) noun phrase or as (single-word) head nouns with (single- or multiple-word) appositions. The presence of the conjunction *albo* in example (56) seems to have put the translator in favor of treating it as a single-word possessor with an apposition, whereas in example (57), no conjunction is inserted between the elements, so the translator perceived them as a multiple-word possessor:

(56) co iesliby tąk było/ tedyby ći Xiążęta potomkámi *PＡlemɔnã* álbo *Publiussa Liboná Rzymskiego Xiapęcściá* álbo towärzyszámi iego być musielí (Stryjkowski 1582: 118)

еже аще бы сице было, тогда тѣн князни наслѣдницы *Палемоновы* или *Півля Ливона римскаго кнѣзя*, или товарщи ихъ бяхъ (Slav 26, fol. 195v)

(57) A ieszcze zá Žywoť *Olechowegu опiekунá swegu* poiał sobie w małżeński stan Ołchę Práwnuczku Gostomisselowę ze Pskowá. (Stryjkowski 1582: 121)

а еще при животъ *Охеха* [sic] дядки своего пов сеbь в супружество Олìг правнìчку Гостомиловид изо Пскова (Slav 26, fol. 200r)
In the following example, the Polish original has a two-word possessor in the genitive, but in the Russian translation, one element has been removed and the construction has accordingly been altered to a possessive pronoun:

(58) A naprzód Swadolt nijaki przednieży Pan rádny niebosczyká Swentosław przyiáchawszy ná Kijow do Jarozelká [sic] Xiążęciá Kijowskiego stárszego z bráтов (Stryjowski 1582: 129)

в начале первый дёмный Святослав боярин именем Свадоль, приехал в Киев к Ярополк князю киевскому больному от братьев (Slav 26, fol. 211r)

In example (59), the Polish original names two authors joined by a conjunction and therefore expresses each single-word possessor as a possessive adjective. The conjunction has been omitted from the Russian translation, or else it has merged with the following name, which begins in the same letter, but the names are still given as possessive adjectives:

(59) Wywodzą też niektórzy Rusaki z Kolchis kráiny oney sławnej/ do ktorey lason po złote runo álbo wólnę żeglował/ o czym sie iusz wyższej z Historiey Trogussowey y Justinowey powiedziálo. (Stryjowski 1582: 113)

показывают же нёцы росаков от страны колхисских славных, в ноже Иасон по златое рño хыйд, о чем выше сё в повести Трогови Ивстиновой речеся (Slav 26, fol. 188v)

An interesting example is врюсьция в гёдя нёего Иисус Хрёста (fol. 219v), where the first element is not declined at all, showing that this was perceived as a single name rather than as two. All other consulted manuscripts, however, have the first part in the form Æ=G as well.58 There is a similar instance with a genuine genitive (not an Æ=G), namely в произведении родословия Иссю Хрёста (fol. 159r), where the first element is undeclined in all manuscripts. In the phrase в познание истинного Бéи и Исуа Хрёста сёя его едипородного приведеша (fol. 228r), which is also a genuine genitive form, both elements of the name are declined in all manuscripts.

There are no examples in the Polish text of a possessive adjective formed from a feminine noun, but in one case, the genitive of the name Holha is replaced in the Russian translation by the possessive pronoun Олгинь.

The translation contains one possessive adjective formed from an i-stem noun, namely по обычаю звёрниту (fol. 192r). This corresponds to обyczáj-em zwierзécem in the Polish original. The Russian гёдня corresponds to Polish Pańiska. Both languages have the suffix -bê- in Воьý/Божии.

The flexional morphology differs between the two languages. The Polish text mainly uses pronominal forms of the possessive adjectives. In the Russian translation, mainly nominal forms are found, except in the oblique cases of the plural, which had always had pronominal forms, and in the genitive and locative singular feminine, where pronominal forms had begun to spread at this time. This text has only nominal forms in the locative singular masculine, where pronominal forms were also spreading (Cocron 1962: 121–123).

In Polish, the last remnants of the nominal flection of possessive adjectives with the suffixes -ow- and -in- gave way to pronominal forms in the late 16th century. The two sets of forms are found alongside each other in the nominative and accusative of the masculine and feminine during the last decades of the 16th century (Burzywoda et al. 2002: 127–129). The process of the disappearance of the possessive adjectives and their replacement by the genitive case of the corresponding nouns began, according to K. Długosz-Kurczabowa and S. Dubisz (2006: 468), in the 16th century. According to M. Siuciak, this process was practically finished in the 18th century (Burzywoda et al. 2002: 127–129). Among the examples listed by Siuciak, there are very few formed with the suffix -in-. Although nothing is said in the consulted grammars about the distribution between possessive adjectives and nouns in the genitive case, all their examples of constructions with possessive adjectives have a single-word possessor.

In the context of the Nikonian reforms, the Russian possessive genitive began to spread into the realm of the possessive adjectives and the possessive dative, patterned on the Greek genitive, which had a broad field of application. For this reason, the use of possessive adjectives in the 18th century became a non-bookish marker (Uspenskij 2002: 450–458). Since there are no traces of such corrections in the translation of the Kronika, we can conclude that it followed earlier Slavic tradition and was not influenced by the Nikonian reforms in this respect. This is to be expected, since the Nikonian corrections were mainly applied to translations from Greek.

4.3.5 The dative absolute

In Old Church Slavonic and in early stages of other Slavic languages, the dative absolute was used as an alternative to subordinate clauses of different kinds or to constructions containing adverbial participles, i.e. the equivalent of today’s gerunds (cf. Section 7.3). It could express temporal, causal or other circumstances and had a backgrounding, subordinating function (cf. Corin 1995). In East Slavic it was frequently used in bookish texts, but never in non-bookish texts (Živov 2011: 148, cf. also Corin 1995: 269). In some late (18th-century) chronicles it was more or less the only Church Slavonic element, setting the level of bookishness in a surrounding of East Slavic verbal tenses and conjunctions (Kijanova 2010: 176–177, 203).
The dative absolute in its classical form, where the logical subject of the absolute construction is not identical to the subject of the main clause, was characteristic of bookish language in general, including chronicles. The tautosubjective dative absolute, with a subject identical to that of the main clause, is also frequently attested in East Slavic texts, including chronicles (Corin 1995: 276–277). No such constructions have been found in the translation of Stryjkowski’s chronicle.

The dative absolute existed in Polish, but was, according to Długosz-Kurczabowa and Dubisz (2006: 475), due to Latin influence via Czech. The authors do not, however, give any Polish examples, only Church Slavonic ones from an earlier period (Długosz-Kurczabowa & Dubisz 2006: 439). Corin (1995: 270–272) believes that the dative absolute was inherited from Common Slavic, but that it was lost first in West Slavic. It is less well attested in Old Czech and Old Polish than in East Slavic.

As a rule, Stryjkowski does not use the dative absolute in Polish; Karplukówna (1985: 44) only found one instance (outside the sample chapters used here), probably with a Ruthenian chronicle as its source, where the noun is in the dative but the participle undeclined. The ablativus absolutus occurs in his Latin quotes. Since the choice of the dative absolute was independent of the Polish original and the construction was a bookish one, the examples cited below from the Russian translation are a sign of independence from the original and of the translator being acquainted with the bookish norm.

The four sets of sample chapters (cf. Section 1.3) have been searched for dative absolute constructions. The samples from segments B and D contain no such constructions, which is perhaps not surprising, since they, with their dominance of the elliptic perfect tense, have a less bookish character, and they are more influenced by the Polish original (this holds especially true for segment B, cf. Section 5.4.2.4). The occurrences from segments A and C are listed below.

4.3.5.1 Dative absolutes in chapters IV: 1–3

The translation of chapters IV: 1–3 contains seven examples of the dative absolute. In example (60), found in chapter IV: 1, it corresponds to a Latin ablativus absolutus:

(60) vbi asserit Sarmatas esse Slauos & Venedos, Ipsosque esse priscos Sar- matas, vel ut Graeci dicunt Sauromatas: dispersisque a turris Babilonicae edificatione, post diluuium uniuersae terrae hominibus, has oras occupasse opinentur (Stryjkowski 1582: 922)
идъже глаголе сарматом⁵⁹ быти словянъ и венедянъ, и тѣхъ быти древнихъ сармат, или яко греки глаголе сауроматы и рас-сѣаннымъ по здѣни столпа вавилоенска по потопе всѣ земли людемъ, сия страны овладѣвшихъ непщѣютъ (Slav 26, fols. 159r–159v)

The other instances all occur in chapter IV: 3. Four of them correspond to Polish temporal subordinate clauses:

(61) Gdy tedy Rurik panowal на Wielkonowogrodskim Xięstwie w Ladodze/ а́ Truwor на Pskowskim w Zborsku/ albo Izborku/ Trzeci Brat ich Sinaus ná Bialym lezierre umarł bez potomstwá (Stryjkowski 1582: 118)

Владствующъ жъ Рюрикъ на великоновгородскомъ княжествѣ в Ладогѣ, а Труворъ на псковскомъ въ Изборску, третий брать ихъ Синайсь на Бѣлозерѣ ымре без наслѣдія (Slav 26, fol. 196v)

(62) а́ gdy to wyrzekli wnet żmijá iadowita z onego lbá kuńskiego wyskoczy³a y uiádlá go w nogę (Stryjkowski 1582: 121)

сия ж ему иърекшы, абие змѣй ізо лба конского выскочила і³ жалила его в ногу (Slav 26, fol. 199v)

(63) а́ gdy wielką mocą do Konstantinopolá ciągнал/ mьяг с собы po piętnaszcь kроц tysiaç okrьtów/ y inszego nacyzienia wodnego/ zebrał sie przecв им Romanus Cesarz Grecki z pomocю Rzmską/ y inszych Pányw Chrześcijanskich (Stryjkowski 1582: 121)

велиюе же силою к Прыйградѣ идѣщъ ему, имѣющъ ж пятьна-десять краты тысячъ караблей, и іныхъ сбдовъ водныхъ, собрався⁶⁰ противъ ево Роман црь греческій с помоюсь римскою, и іныхъ гдѣренъ христианскихъ (Slav 26, fol. 200r)

(64) A gdy sie z woyskiem Sventoslaw przybližal do Konstantinopolá/ Gre-кowie odkupiaçcь sie wielká danią/ od гранич go Greckich odfrowcili (Stryjkowski 1582: 129)

Святославъ ж с воинствомъ х Костянтинопою приближающысь, греки от него искпповахъся данию велиено и от греческихъ границъ его отвратиша (Slav 26, fols. 210r–210v)

In example (65), the Polish original has a passive participle in the dative, which refers to the pronoun mi and is motivated by the modal niegodzi. The translation instead has an active participle, connected with множествомъ to

---

⁵⁹ Some mss. have сарматовъ, which is probably the correct translation, since the accusative with infinitive in the Latin original could be translated by an identical construction (cf. Section 5.4.2.3).

⁶⁰ Some mss. have собрасъ.
form a dative absolute. These forms could also be interpreted as instrumental singular, but I find this less probable.

(65) A isz mi sie wielkością nieprzyjał ogarnionemu uciekac niegodzi/ y wymknąc sie prożno/ przeto ia mężnie á státecznie będę stál (Stryjkowski 1582: 128)

а множеством неприятель и мы общедимь не подобает мнь бжать и бить невозможно, но множественно против ихь бдять стоить (Slav 26, fol. 209v)

Example (66) has a conditional meaning. This is unusual, but nevertheless attested in early sources (Corin 1995: 278; Večerka et al. 1996: 187).

(66) który hárdo stöjac [...] wołał ná Rusaki [...] á iesliby niesmial iedén/ tedy sam ná się trzech wyzywał. (Stryjkowski 1582: 134)

коейой гордо стоя вопия на рёсаковъ [...] единомъ ж не см'ющс, трех на борбии призываше (Slav 26, fol. 217v)

A fact that could be of some importance is that all these examples, except the first one, which has a correspondence in Latin, occur in the part of the text that relates information from original Russian chronicles, beginning with Rurik’s reign, as we see in the first example. This could imply that the translator connected this syntactic feature with chronicle language, even though late chronicles, at least, differed greatly in this respect, as seen in Kijanova’s study, where she found that some chronicles used this feature extensively and others lacked it altogether (Kijanova 2010).

4.3.5.2 Dative absolutes in chapters XII: 3–5

There are two instances of the dative absolute in chapters XII: 3–5. They correspond to subordinate clauses in the Polish original, which have a predominantly temporal meaning, although gdy had a wide range of uses.

(67) Czego gdy Xiąże Constantin Koriaćowic niechciał uczynić/ aní ná to pozwolić/ aby miał wiarę odmienić/ wzgárdził (powiadája Látopiszcze) successiá ná Krolestwo Polskie (Stryjkowski 1582: 427)

ки́нью жъ Костя́нтыяи́е сотворити сего не хочьщь, ниже на то соизволити, дабы имьль врёмечь. пренебреже (лгополют летописцы), наслдие королевства посского (Slav 27, fol. 193v)

(68) Ale gdy omieszkal [Fiedor Koriatowic] przydz ná odsiez swoim Wołochom/ W tym czasie Olgerd z Litwą dobył Bráswlawia/ Skály/ Sokolecá y Smotrycy zamkow pod Wołochy. (Stryjkowski 1582: 428)
4.4 Chapter summary

This chapter has been devoted to the language primarily in the chapters IV: 1–3 of ms. U, but also to some extent in other parts of the translation of Stryjkowski’s chronicle, against the background of the language situation in 17th-century Russia. During this period, the language was not codified, at least not to any great extent. Studies of different text genres show that they can be arranged into four registers, two bookish and two non-bookish ones, and that the registers had different norms, which could probably be more or less pronounced and obligatory. The mechanism of text orientation led to continuity within each genre and influenced the language development.

The study shows that this text fits well into what has been called the hybrid register. It is dominated by simplex preterites, but has a 16.6% share of elliptic perfect forms, and other linguistic features display variation of a kind that has also been observed in other hybrid texts.

The linguistic features of the text can be placed along two scales. One concerns the use of bookish and non-bookish forms, or functionally Church Slavonic and Russian forms. It was apparently not always necessary to use bookish forms throughout; instead a few markers of bookishness could be used to signal the bookish character of the text. The other scale determines which forms tended to vary between manuscripts and which did not. If a feature varies, it may either vary freely – there may be substitution in both directions – or there may be conscious substitution in one direction. The norms concerning variation and conscious substitution could vary between scribes, and of course over time. Five of the manuscripts consulted for the edition were probably written within three decades, from 1679 to the first years of the 18th century. Ms. N is a century younger and therefore sometimes differs from the others.

The verbal system is quite typical of the hybrid register, dominated by simplex preterites and with frequent use of the bookish adverbial participles (the precursors of today’s gerunds), which are found with a variety of endings. Polish influence can be suspected in some perfect forms. Variation between manuscripts is mainly found with regard to adverbial participle forms (approximately 10% of the participle forms have variant readings in one or more mss.), but also in the infinitive.

The nominal system shows some bookish traits, such as the use of old nominative plural forms of masculine nouns with the ending -u and vocative forms. Polish has both these features, and influence from the original can therefore not be ruled out, but in that case it would be influence from the
system as a whole, not from individual forms, since they do not always match. The α-expansion in the oblique cases of the plural is more extensive here than in most hybrid texts, but the distribution of new endings according to cases and noun stems follows a pattern typical of this register. The presence of genitive and locative singular endings in -у/-ю is also quite consistent with what is found in other texts. The only studied nominal ending that varies to any considerable degree between manuscripts is the plural ending of nouns ending in -антъ/-янть, which mainly varies between -ане/-яне and -аня/-янъ.

The declension of adjectives shows variation similar to that in other hybrid texts. In the nominative and accusative plural, the “new” form -ые is dominant, but at the same time, there are such bookish traits as nominative plural masculine forms ending in -стии. In the genitive singular of masculine and neutral adjectives, -ого prevails over -ого. These two categories of adjectival endings show great variation between manuscripts and between scribal hands within manuscripts. Some scribes seem to have had conscious preferences, especially regarding the genitive singular forms, whereas others were inconsistent in their substitutions. Short forms of adjectives are found mostly in predicative position, but are also found attributively in several case forms.

The pronoun system shows signs of bookish language, such as the dominance of ась over я and the use of the short (enclitic) forms я, ли and тя. The latter are mostly used correctly, except in one case. The Polish original, which also has both long and short pronouns, may have influenced the use of these forms. Regarding third person pronouns in the accusative, a more archaic form prevails in the feminine and more modern forms in the masculine and the plural. The bookish relative pronoun иже is much more frequent than the non-bookish который. The pronoun system does not vary much between manuscripts.

The numerals show some archaic features, such as the instrumental forms двьма, трьма and чатьрыма. The forms дванадесяти and пятнадесять are also archaic compared to other 17th-century texts, which show contracted forms. Among ordinals, вторы is used rather than друго, and третьи shows a variety of endings. There is occasional variation between manuscripts regarding numerals, but there are too few occurrences to tell if it is systematic.

As mentioned above, simplex preterites dominate the verbal system. The elliptic perfect is also quite frequent, and is especially liable to be used of certain verbs, under negation and in contexts involving violent or dramatic action. The full perfect is used almost exclusively in direct speech, and always in the first or second person.

Dual forms of nouns are used in some instances referring to inherently paired objects. The plural is, however, more common in these contexts. Dual
forms of verbs are not used in this part of the text, although there are examples from other parts.

The accusative of animate nouns is A=G in the masculine singular, varies between A=G and A=N in the masculine plural and is mostly A=N in the feminine plural. The Polish original also shows variation, but is more inclined towards A=N.

Possessive adjectives are used with single-word possessors in accordance with tradition. Dative absolute constructions are used sporadically, which shows that the translator (at least of chapters IV: 1–3) commanded the Church Slavonic language quite well and consciously aimed at bookishness.

Syntactic features do as a rule not vary between manuscripts, which means that the text as found in ms. U is probably very close to what the translator intended in that respect. Morphological variation is much more frequent, which may have practical reasons – it is easier to replace a flectional ending than to rewrite a dative absolute construction – but probably also means that variation was accepted, especially in some categories.

In most of the studied cases, this text fits well in with what earlier scholars have found in hybrid texts from the same time period. It is not an archaic text through and through, but has some very obvious markers of bookishness.
5 Evaluating the translation

Aside from being set against the more general background of the language situation of the late 17th century, the Kronika should also be studied as a translation in relation to its source text and to other translations of the time. Therefore, this chapter will be devoted to translations in general and the strategies used in this translation in particular.

There are two main questions to be asked. The first is how accurate the translation is and was meant to be, as well as how to judge this. As an attempt at answering this question, some characteristics of the translation will be described, such as instances where the Russian translation differs in some way from the Polish original, or solutions to problems posed by particular Polish constructions. The second question is to what extent the language of the translation was influenced by the original or, possibly, by the translators’ language. For this purpose, lexical and syntactic polonisms will be sought out and discussed.

5.1 Posol'skij prikaz and its translation activities

According to a note by Sparwenfeld in ms. U (cf. Section 3.6.2), the chronicle was translated in Posol'skij prikaz by several translators. Even without being aware of this note, some scholars have stated that the translation was rather precise and made in the tradition of Posol'skij prikaz (Lukičev 2004: 340).

It should be mentioned that Rogov (1966: 278–279) quotes a document connected with Malorossijskij prikaz, in which the binding of a Polish chronicle is mentioned, and believes that the chronicle in question may have been Stryjkowski’s (cf. also Section 3.2.2). Both A. L. Ordin-Naščokin (head of Posol'skij prikaz in 1667–71) and A. S. Matveev (1671–76) were also responsible for Malorossijskij prikaz (Rogožin 2003: 77–78). Apparently, the two institutions also partly shared employees, since Stepan Čižinskij, in his aforementioned request for a raise (cf. Section 3.3.2), called himself a translator for Posol'skij and Malorossijskij prikaz. There was undoubtedly a connection between the two, which makes it possible that the Polish chronicle was indeed Stryjkowski’s, but Posol'skij prikaz is more probable as a candidate for the location of translating activities.
*Posol'skij prikaz* played a very important role in 17\textsuperscript{th}-century Russia, being in charge of diplomatic relations with other countries. Because of its diplomatic duties, the need for translators and skilled scribes was great, and from the 1670s onwards, these translators and scribes were also employed in making books. Translating literature and poetry became a part of their duties. Poems and other literary works supplied information about other countries and were seen as sources of news (cf. for example Kudrjavcev 1963: 181; Moiseeva 1973: 438–439; Nikolaev 1989: 50–54; Lukičev 2004: 336).

Because of the intensive relations between Russia and Poland at the time (cf. Section 3.1.1), many documents and books were translated from Polish, and Russia was especially interested in anything that concerned Polish-Turkish relations. Pamphlets that slandered Russia were actively sought out (Rogov 1966: 260–262; Nikolaev 1989: 32–36). Russian ambassadors travelling to Poland were instructed to buy books in Polish and Latin – the two most common languages in the growing book collection of the *prikaz*, cf. Section 3.1.2 – such as historical works and dictionaries. This activity became especially intensive in the period 1667–71, under Ordin-Naščokin’s leadership (Luppov 1970: 196–198).

*Posol'skij prikaz* employed not only translators and scribes, but also illustrators, bookbinders and gilders who had their part in completing the books (Belokurov 1906: 54; Luppov 1970: 42–43). Some books were kept in *Posol'skij prikaz* to serve as exemplars for later copies, and perhaps to be shown to foreign visitors (Kudrjavcev 1963: 186). They were often made alongside elaborate copies for the court. During the years 1671–76, when Matveev headed the *prikaz*, the writing and decoration of manuscripts for the court began to take place on a regular basis (Sazonova 2006: 372–375).

In the 1670s and 1680s, there were an average of 20 translators at a time in *Posol'skij prikaz*, of which three or four usually translated from Polish. Many of them were foreigners who in one way or another had entered Russian service, although there were also some Russians who had learned foreign languages. Some of the translators of foreign origin eventually became Russian subjects and converted to the Orthodox faith (Rogožin 2003: 46; Nikolaev 2004: 104–105). A. V. Beljakov, in his dissertation about the employees at *Posol'skij prikaz* in the late 17\textsuperscript{th} century, has stated that in 1673–80, the number of translators from Polish usually varied between five and seven, except for the last year of the period, when there were only three. During this time, translators from Polish formed the third most numerous group, after Tatar and Latin (Beljakov 2002: 118, table 5). As was stated already by K. V. Charlampovič (1914: 430), Ruthenians (West-Russians, in his terminology) were often employed as translators in *Posol'skij prikaz*, since their knowledge of Polish and Latin usually surpassed that of the Muscovites. Thomson (1993: 194) claims that much of the translation activity in
Muscovy was due to Greek, Polish, Moldavian, Ukrainian and Belorussian immigrants.

If the anonymous 1673–79 translation of the *Kronika* was indeed made at *Posol'skij prikaz*, the translators may eventually be identified among those employed there in the 1670s, or at least they text may be characterized as Muscovite Russians, Ruthenians or Poles.

Stepan Čižinskij has already been mentioned and identified as having participated in translating Stryjkowski’s chronicle (Section 3.3.2). A comparison of his known texts with the translation of the chronicle could perhaps lead to the identification of his contribution. Similarly, other identified translations could be compared to the Stryjkowski translation in an attempt to find similarities. This is not within the scope of this study, but may be a future project. As a basis for further study, the names of other possible translators will be listed here.

Known translators from Polish at *Posol'skij prikaz* in the 1670s–80s are: Semën Lavreckij, Grigorij Kulčičkij, Ivan Gudanskij, Gavrila Dorofeev, Ivan Vasjutinskij, Stachej Gadzalovskij, Stepan Čižinskij, Petr Dolgovo and Ivan Tjažkogorskij (Nikolaev 2004: 105). This list, which Nikolaev set up with the languages as a starting point, fits well in with the list made by Charlampovič (1914: 430–435) of translators with Ruthenian (West-Russian) names. The only one not mentioned by Charlampovič was Petr Dolgovo, which means that all the translators from Polish at that time except one had Ruthenian names. None of them, except Čižinskij, have been set in connection with the translation of Stryjkowski. The following is known about them.

Semën Lavreckij worked as a translator from Polish and Latin for *Posol'skij prikaz* from 1660 to the beginning of the 18th century. He was involved in the translation of *Velikoe zercalo* in 1675–77, cf. Section 6.2 (SKK 1993: 213–214).

Grigorij Kulčičkij translated from Belorussian and Polish starting in 1669 and was also involved in the above-mentioned translation of *Velikoe zercalo*, although by that time he was instead employed by *Malorossijskij prikaz* (Charlampovič 1914: 431; SKK 1992: 166).

Ivan Gudanskij worked as a translator from Polish and Latin for *Posol'skij prikaz* from 1666 to the 1680s. He was also involved in the translation of *Velikoe zercalo* (SKK 1992: 244–245), and in 1677, he made one of the two translations of the Melusina Saga (SKK 1993: 127–129).

Gavrila Dorofeev (or Dorofeevič) may, according to Charlampovič (1914: 432), be identical to Gavrilo Bolotinskij, who worked as a translator from Polish and Latin from 1674 to 1678.

Ivan Vasjutinskij worked for *Posol'skij prikaz* from 1675 to 1678. It is not known if he translated from other languages than Polish. He was also involved in the translation of *Velikoe zercalo* (Deržavina 1965: 27–28).
Stachej Gadzalovskij (or Godzalovskij) was a Pole from Vilnius who worked for Posol'skij prikaz from 1667 to at least 1689 and translated from Polish and Latin. Among his translations from Polish were Alkoran Machmetów (from an original printed in 1683), Hippica albo nauka o koniach, which he translated in 1685 (SKK 1992: 191) and a book about Polish heraldry, in 1682 (Sedov 2006: 477). According to Charlampovič (1914: 431), he translated a chronicle from Polish in 1671–73 while accompanying Muscovite troops in the Ukraine. He taught Sparwenfeld Russian and perhaps also Polish, and sold a Latin-Slavic dictionary to him (Birgegård 1985: 74–75).

Petr Dolgovo worked for Posol'skij and Malorossijskij prikaz until his death in 1678, with translation as one of his duties. He helped Nikolaj Spafarij translate a number of books, although his part in the work has not been determined (SKK 1992: 276).

Ivan Tjažkogorskij was a Catholic, possibly of Ukrainian origin, who worked in Posol'skij prikaz at least from 1668. He took part in the translation of numerous books from German, Latin and French, as well as from Polish. He died after 1704 (SKK 2004: 52–53).

Charlampovič (1914: 432) also mentions Christofor Silobratskij, who is never listed as an employee at Posol'skij prikaz, but who is mentioned in documents regarding a transfer from Aptekarskij prikaz.

### 5.2 Translation theory

The aim of this section is to provide the background and terminology for the remainder of the chapter, where the translation of Stryjkowski’s chronicle will be characterized.

Many scholars who deal with translations try to determine their fidelity to the original, using categories such as literal, word-for-word or free. Such labels are mostly intuitive and only loosely defined. In our case, this can be illustrated by the contrast between M. P. Lukičev’s (2004: 340) characterization of the 1673–79 translation of Stryjkowski’s chronicle as rather precise (cf. Section 5.1) as opposed to the opinion expressed by C. Davidsson (1975: 74–75) that the sentence and clause structure of the translation often deviate considerably from the original. To some extent, this is a matter of which level of the text the observations are based on. For instance, major alterations and omissions are rare in the chronicle, and one would therefore be tempted to agree with Lukičev, but a more detailed study may yield different results. This should be attempted not only for the sake of placing the text in a category, but in order to be able to identify instances where the influence of the Polish original has been especially strong or weak.
G. Toury (1995: 53–69) has emphasized the role of norms in translation. Norms occupy the large space between rules and idiosyncrasies, and can bear more or less resemblance to either of these extremes. It is in the nature of norms that they vary across space and time, between different schools of translators, etc. There may be extratextual and textual sources for the reconstruction of translational norms, and Toury gives priority to the textual sources (the translations themselves) as primary products of the norms, whereas the extratextual sources (prescriptive theories and statements) are secondary and often do not agree with what can be observed from the actual texts.

The information gathered from extratextual sources can also be called explicit translation theory, i.e. translators’ own statements about their work, their decisions and principles (Koller 2004: 34–35). Such statements about this period of Slavic translation exist only regarding Greek as a source language, and there are none about e.g. the norms at Posol'skij prikaz. Although we know that the translations made there were evaluated (Rogožin 2003: 264) and that translators had to prove their skills before they were accepted (Rogožin 2003: 41), we do not know the criteria by which they were judged, and no written instructions for their work have been preserved. Section 5.2.1 will be devoted to explicit translation theory regarding early Russian translations from Greek, even though we can be fairly certain that these norms only applied to a particular group of texts.

The textual sources provide us with implicit translation theory, i.e. the principles that can be deduced from studying the relationships between source texts and target texts (Koller 2004: 35). Section 5.2.2 describes some studies on early Russian translations where observations of this kind have been made.

A central concept in translation studies is that of equivalence, a term that refers to the relationship between the source text and the target text, which can be of different kinds. One pole on the equivalence scale is formal equivalence, which is oriented towards the original text, i.e. the source text. A formal-equivalence translation attempts to reproduce consistency in word usage and use the same grammatical forms as in the source text. Rather than rephrasing idioms, word play etc., marginal notes or footnotes are often used. The opposite pole can be called dynamic equivalence, which means that the translator focuses on the receptor response of the translation, which ideally should be the same as the response of the receptors of the original. No knowledge of the source culture should be necessary to understand the text (Nida 1964: 165–171).

A dichotomy of a similar kind is that of adequacy and acceptability. An adequacy-oriented translation aims at retaining the norms of the source language and source culture, whereas striving towards acceptability means adapting the translation to the target language and target culture (Toury
In this study I will use Toury’s terminology, which I find convenient and suitable to my purposes.

In addition, I will use the term *domestication* or *domesticating translation*, which, according to L. Venuti (2008: 13–20), is the adaptation of a translation to the target language and the target culture. In its mildest form, domestication is simply the effort to make the translation seem as fluent and natural as possible, to make the reader forget that it is a translation. The term can also be applied to the practice noted in Section 3.2.1 of not including the author’s name, in order to disguise that it is not an original work, as well as to several other more serious interventions in the text (cf. Venuti 2008: 24–25; 43–46; 54–55). Venuti considers every act of translation to be an act of violence, but sees domesticating translations as more violent than their opposite, *foreignizing translations*. In this study, the term domestication will be reserved for the instances where information has been consciously adapted to Russian practice, such as the ones discussed in Section 5.3.3. The use of Venuti’s term does not mean that I subscribe to his moral judgement on the translator’s choice.

### 5.2.1 Explicit translation theory and early translations in Russia

Much of the literature on translations into Church Slavonic or Old Russian concentrates on translations from Greek, especially of religious texts, which is understandable, because their status as holy texts demanded that they be translated as faithfully as possible. This attitude towards holy texts was of course not unique to the Slavic context; it may suffice here to refer to St. Jerome, the translator of the Vulgata, whose famous claim that he translated not word by word, but sense by sense, was modified by “absque scripturis sanctis, ubi et verborum ordo mysterium est,” ‘except for the holy scriptures, where even the word order is a mystery’ (cf. Ågren 1995).

Conflicts and reforms regarding religious texts reveal the explicit translation theory of translators and editors. For instance, the importance of being true to the Greek text and the awareness of the elements of language became apparent in the case of Maksim Grek. He systematically changed 2nd person aorist forms to perfect forms in order to avoid homonymy with the 3rd person aorist, since there was no corresponding homonymy in Greek, but was accused of heresy because of how others perceived these changes. Such changes were also made later during Nikon’s reforms (Mathauserová 1976: 45–50; Uspenskij 2002: 230–238). Other examples from Nikon’s reforms are the introduction of new forms in the masculine genitive plural in order to avoid homonymy with the nominative singular, and an increased use of the genitive case instead of the dative or possessive adjectives, again because of the situation in Greek (cf. Section 4.3.4). It is evident from editorial notes
and polemic writings that the innovators actively oriented their work on Greek grammar (Uspenskij 2002: 450–467).

Another conflict related to translations took place in the 1680s between the Graecophile Evfimij Čudovskij and the Latinizer Simeon Polockij (cf. Section 3.1.2). The former had translated many religious texts from Greek and argued for literal translation. He preferred to use Slavic words with an etymology that corresponded to that of the Greek words, rather than the Slavic words that were actually in use. The latter, on the other hand, had published the controversial Rhymed Psalter, Psaltir' rifmotvornaja, in 1680, and in general had, one might say, a more acceptability-oriented view of translations (Mathauserová 1976: 42–44; Sazonova 2006: 92–93, 97–98). Evfimij Čudovskij famously expressed himself as follows:

И подобает истинно и право преводити от слова до слова, ничто разума и речений премения, и той есть преводитель върный, иже и разум, и речения преводит нелживо, ничто оставляя или премения (after Sazonova 2006: 93).

Interestingly enough, Simeon Polockij expressed himself in a very similar way, also attaching importance to the central concepts rečenie and razum, but stressing that neither should be left out rather than that they should not be changed. He also gave the word rečenie a broader meaning than Evfimij Čudovskij did (Mathauserová 1976: 53–55).

5.2.2 Implicit translation theory and early translations in Russia

As already mentioned, all explicit statements about translations made in Russia until the 17th century concern religious texts. Early secular translations were made according to other norms that allowed much greater liberties, but there does not seem to have been much discussion at the time on the nature of such translations, so that in these cases, we must rely on implicit translation theory (Mathauserová 1976: 37–38).

Although so many translations from Polish were made during this period, no comprehensive study of the translation techniques has been published. Observations on different approaches to translation have been made on the basis of single texts, text collections and genres, often in connection with editions. Besides the studies listed below, others that concentrate primarily on lexical aspects are mentioned in Section 5.4.1.

S. I. Nikolaev, whose bibliography of translations from Polish to Russian has already been frequently mentioned, has written a study of Russian translations of Polish poetry from 1650 to 1730, with a section on translation technique, although its pronounced main aim is to draw attention to the texts themselves and provide information about them (Nikolaev 1989).
E. M. Isserlin’s study of the lexicon in six translations of Dwór cesarza tureckiego has already been mentioned in Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2. The translations that used a language she called delovaja reč't tended to prefer concrete words and terms, whereas those that were written in a language variety with archaic elements used abstract words and avoided terminology. She saw a connection between the type of words used and other linguistic features (Isserlin 1961: 16, 22).

G. Bergman’s edition of the Melusina Saga, another translation from Polish, contains a commentary on translation technique (Bergman 1964: 166–183). She found instances of what she calls “censorship,” i.e. omissions due to domestication. She also compared the clause structure of the original and the translation and found some tendencies, such as the use of the dative absolute in Russian for Polish subordinate clauses (cf. Section 4.3.5) or Russian active clauses for Polish impersonal passive constructions.

There are also studies on texts from the same time period translated from West European languages other than Polish. I. Maier (2008: 153–190) has commented on certain types of strategies in the Vesti-Kuranty, 17th-century translations of mainly German and Dutch newspapers into Russian. For instance, information deemed to be less important was often omitted, as were foreign names that were probably unknown to the translators. In other cases, changes were made in the translation compared to the original to make it more easily understandable: deictic expressions were replaced by more specific references to people or places, the location of cities was specified with additional information, and verbal forms could be changed to adjust to the time that had passed between the writing of the original news article and its translation (cf. the changed years in the Kronika, Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2). The transcription of toponyms and anthroponyms is also discussed there, as well as some words and constructions that might have presented difficulties for the translators.

Several texts from Vesti-Kuranty have also been studied separately. Perhaps the most relevant in relation to the present study is an article about a translation of a pamphlet from 1666, printed in Polish and German (Maier & Pilger 2003). Lexical and syntactic parallels show that the Russian translation was made from the Polish, not the German, text, which is illustrated with numerous examples. The scholars come to the conclusion that the translator was not a Pole.

A letter, translated from English to Russian in 1673, has been studied by S. C. Gardiner (1963), with a discussion of misunderstandings of the original, omitted words, calques and what Gardiner calls transformations, e.g. substitutions of a clause for a single word or one type of clause for another.

G. Hüttl-Folter’s (1996) monograph on 18th-century translations from the French and their influence on Russian syntax concentrated on the translation
of different types of clauses from French to Russian, providing tables of the amount of correspondences in three texts.

Studies such as these can, when taken together, give an impression of the implicit translation theory of a certain time period. They can also, of course, provide inspiration for work on translations that have not previously been studied.

5.3 Aspects of the translation technique

Aided by the terminology introduced in Section 5.2, we will now discuss different aspects of the translation. The study of the translation technique for verse sections is inspired by an earlier study, whereas the other aspects have been chosen because they strike the eye when comparing the source text and the target text. Depending on the point of view, the scope of the text studied will vary: sometimes only the chapters included in the edition will be treated, sometimes the four sets of sample chapters, sometimes text passages outside the sample chapters. The choice will in each case be justified by the approach taken (cf. Section 1.3).

5.3.1 Translation of verse

As mentioned in Section 5.1, translating Polish poetry was a part of the duties of the translators at Posol'skij prikaz. Some prose texts, among them Stryjkowski’s chronicle, contained verse fragments, which meant that the translators were confronted with different tasks in the main text and in the verse sections.

In his monograph on Russian translations of Polish poetry in the 17th and 18th centuries, S. I. Nikolaev (1989: 113–116) examined the treatment of a verse from Ovid’s Epistulae ex Ponto in five different translations into Russian, three from translations of Stryjkowski’s Kronika (from 1668, 1673–79 and 1682) and two from translations of Guagnini. Here, as in several other places, Stryjkowski first quoted two lines of the poem in Latin, and then translated a larger part (eight lines) into Polish (cf. Section 3.2.1), including the two lines already quoted (Stryjkowski 1582: 105). In the 1673–79 translation, the Latin beginning was omitted and only the Polish text was translated, which shows that the translators preferred using Polish as their source language. The same tendency can be seen in translations of other poems as well (Nikolaev 1989: 58–60, 66–67). In the case of Stryjkowski, this probably only shows that the Polish text was given to translators whose preferred source language was Polish, and when confronted with Latin parts, they were capable of translating them (as can be seen by the many instances of
Latin text with no Polish counterpart that were nevertheless translated, but preferred working with Polish whenever possible.

Nikolaev (1989: 113–116) compared the three Russian translations of Stryjkowski’s Polish version of the poem and commented on the number of syllables, word order and rhymes. In the translation from 1673–79, each line contains 13 syllables, like the original. The word order corresponds to that in the original, but in most cases, new rhymes are found. In contrast, the 1668 translation copies all the rhymes from the Polish verse and keeps very close to it in general, which results in a variation of syllables from 13 to 16 per line. Lyzlov’s 1682 translation has not copied any rhymes and has 13 syllables per line.

Looking beyond this one poem, Nikolaev (1989: 62–63) also evaluated the general impression of the different translations of all verse sections in the Kronika, quotes as well as Stryjkowski’s original verse descriptions of e.g. battles. In the 1673–79 translation, verse quotes, such as the ones mentioned above from Ovid, were translated as verse, but larger verse sections, written by Stryjkowski himself, were sometimes translated as verse, sometimes in prose. The latter is the case for example in chapter II: 7, as can be seen in Zoltán’s (2006) edition of that chapter (cf. Section 1.2). In that case, even Stryjkowski’s reference to the verses was abolished: “ále iusz czytay Rytmy násze” (Stryjkowski 1582: 49) was turned into the meaningless «но чити наш» (Slav 26, fol. 106r). Nikolaev says nothing about his general opinion of the 1668 translation, but comments on the fact that Lyzlov translated all Polish verse parts as isosyllabic verse in Russian. This was rather unusual for translated poetry at the time, even though it was becoming more wide spread in poetry originally composed in Russian (Nikolaev 1989: 67).

Since verse quotes make up only a small part of the chronicle, it is unlikely that the translators had a certain strategy for translating poetry; it was probably a result of their overall translating technique (Nikolaev 1989: 115). Neither can one detect a consistent way of translating poetry at Posol'skij prikaz: the choice of technique seems to have depended on the character of the poem and the purpose of the translation (Nikolaev 1989: 52, 113).

Whatever the attitude of the translators toward the verse sections may have been, it had practical implications for the linguistic properties of the result. Within segment A (books I–VI), where simplex preterites prevail (cf. Section 1.3), there are some chapters and parts of chapters that are written using almost exclusively the perfect tense, for example VI: 2, the second part of VI: 5, the first part of VI: 7 and the first part of VI: 8. All these parts are written in verse in the Polish original.

The choice of the perfect tense might have been a strategy on the part of the translator to keep as close as possible to the Polish source text. For instance, if a pair of line-final, rhyming Polish past tense forms did not refer to the same grammatical person, it would be difficult to replace them with
aorist or imperfect forms. However, perfect tense forms do not only dominate in line-final position.

For the sake of comparison, Nikolaev’s criteria have been applied to a few other portions that were originally written in verse. The Russian translation is given according to ms. U, and the syllable counts apply only to that manuscript. The layout of the text has been checked in the best manuscripts from each of the three groups (cf. Section 3.5), mss. B, U and N.

Chapter VI: 2 is written wholly in verse in the Polish original, and it is also translated as verse. In mss. B, U and N, the text is even divided into lines in the beginning, although this is not done throughout.

Kazimir Polskie Xiąże Siestrzeńcă Msćisławă/
Chęć posadźć ná Xięstwo dźiedźiczneho prawă/
Przyciągnąwszy pod Halicz z woyskiem sie położył
Patrząc iákby y s ktorey strony Zamku pożyl.
(Stryjkowski 1582: 229)

Племянника Казимер польской кнëзь Мстислава,
хотя всади́т на кня́жество дьди́чно право,
пришел под Галичь с войском своим стал,
смотря како бы и с коею стороны града досталъ.
(Slav 26, fol. 347v)

The number of syllables in the Russian translation varies from 10 to 16. The first two rhyming words correspond to the Polish original, but the next two do not. The choice of the perfect tense in line three does not tell us much, since it has to rhyme with the l-participle in the conditional construction in line four, but the perfect tense is also used further on in the text.

In the Polish original, the first half of chapter VI: 5 is written in prose and the second in verse. In the translation of the prose section, simplex preterites dominate, but this changes when the Polish text switches to verse. Below, the beginning of the verse part is given in the Polish original and the Russian translation. In mss. B, U and N, the Russian text is not divided into lines, but for the sake of clarity, such a division is made below.

Roman Xiąžę upháiąc härdzie w swoiey mocy/
Y w szczęściu które dziwnie ludzkie spráwy toczy/
Pod Zawichwostem ležąc bespecznie woiował/
W Polszcze przez swe zagony lud siekl y mordował.
(Stryjkowski 1582: 240)

Романь кнëз надъяся гордо на своя сильы
и в счастье еже дивно члёвческие дела были,
под Завихвостомь безопасно стоя воевал,
в Полше своими нагоны людей мёчилъ и посекалъ,
(Slav 26, fols. 360r–360v)
The number of syllables varies from 14 to 17. The word order is chiefly retained, but three of four line-final words are new, only the pair woioval – воевал is left. Nevertheless, only the perfect tense is used, no simplex preterites. Aorist forms are, however, found further on in the text.

Chapter XIV: 5 contains several verse sections with short prose paragraphs between them. The Russian translation is not, in mss. B, U and N, divided into lines, and does not seem to be a conscious verse translation. Nevertheless, it will be divided into lines here, for the sake of comparison.

Witold chciwy y sławy/ y państwâ wielkości/
Postânowiwszy Litwę/ y Ruś w bezpiecznośći/
Zebral wojyskâ/ a ciągnął polni od Kijową/
Aż przyszédł przez Tanaim do Zamku Azowâ:
(Stryjkowski 1582: 506)

Витолтъ желательны славы и гêдрыства величества
оставивъ Литвâ и Росцию безбêднê
собра воинская идяше полами до Киева
dajc чрезъ Донь па иде к твердыни Азова
(Slav 27, fol. 363r)

The translator does apparently not aim at a verse translation. Simplex preterites are used, just as in the surrounding text. It can be noted that he translates od Kijowâ erroneously as do Kueva.

A large part of chapter XVII: 2 is written in verse in the original. The Russian translation is not divided into lines in mss. B, U and N, but to facilitate comparison this will be done here.

Potym Swidrigieł z nowu w Witebsku mieszkâiâć/
Zebral wszystkê Ruskâ moc/ y sąsiad wzywâiâć/
Z Kniażiem Twierskim/ z Moskiewskim/ y z Mistrzem Liflandskim
Ciagnâl w Litwę y z Cárzem woiuâc Kâzáâskim.
(Stryjkowski 1582: 582)

Посемъ Свидригель паки в Витебскую пребывая
собрали всю рóсской силâ и сосѣдь взыывая
с кйêемъ тверскимъ с московскимъ и с мистръмъ лифляндскимъ
шедь в Литвâ и с йêемъ воюя казанскимъ
(Slav 28, fol. 5r)

Here, the translation rhymes, and three of four line-final words correspond to the Polish original. It is difficult to judge if a conscious attempt has been made to render the verse form, or if the translator simply followed the Polish text very closely. Some instances further on in the text suggest that the latter is the case.

As we see, the translation technique differs, and one must agree with Nikolaev’s conclusion that there was no general norm for translating verse.
It is often difficult to identify even the individual norms. As opposed to Nikolaev’s findings from IV: 2, none of the examples above were translated with isosyllabic verse.

### 5.3.2 Omissions and additions

In this section, omissions from and additions to the text in the sample chapters, mainly in chapters IV: 1–3, will be discussed. Omissions of whole paragraphs will not be mentioned here, if it is probable that they result from mistakes rather than conscious choices. Such omissions are noted in the edition, however; cf. for instance Slav 26, fols. 154r, 199r and 227v.

To begin with, the dedication to chapter IV: 1 of the original has not been translated, or rather, it was translated and later crossed out in ms. B but is not found in the other manuscripts (cf. Section 3.6.1). However, the dedication to chapter XXIV: 4 was translated and not crossed out, and is therefore present in other mss. as well. The other sample chapters have no dedications in the original. Chapter headings, when present in the original, are always translated.

As was mentioned above (cf. Section 3.2.1), references to the author’s experience were sometimes left out in the 1673–79 translation, just as in the one from 1668–70. The following examples are found in IV: 1–3:

(69) **a stąd też y nazwisko Sauromatow wywodzi/ iako ludzi gniewliwych/ y straszliwych/ ktorym popedliwosc y iadowita srogość z oczu iako łaszczo-rom okrutnym (ktorychem sie ia w Turcech miedzy skåliami nápátrzyl)** pierszáł (Stryjkowski 1582: 93)

и оттуда напечение сауроматов производить, яко людей гнъקבלых и страшныхъ, имъже ярость и жестокость ядовита из очей, яко ящерицым свирѣьнымъ явился (Slav 26, fol. 161r)

(70) **własnymi dziedzicami Paflagonskiej Ziemi z stárodawnych wiekow byê sie powiadáa/ o czymem ia tez sam z niemi miał częste rozmowy/ Roku 1574. gdym tám byê w tych kráinach.** (Stryjkowski 1582: 94)

но истинной дѣдчи паолянские земли из древнихъ вѣковъ быти сказываются (Slav 26, fol. 162r)

(71) **od Braiowá/ Dźiurdźiewá y Urusciuká/ Zamkow podunaiskich/ gdzieśmy sie my dwá kroć y tám y sám przewożili.** (Stryjkowski 1582: 98)

от Браилова, Дюрдьева, и 8рстюка городов поднайскихъ (Slav 26, fol. 167r)

Outside the sample chapters, the following example from chapter II: 1 deserves to be mentioned. Had not the author’s comment been omitted, it might have provided support for the dating of the translation:

145
(72) Bo gdy długo näd tym Morzem/ ktore Prussy/ Duńska/ Swediska/ Zmodźką/ Lotewską Ziemię zálewa/ mieszkali/ y ktem ia tež Morze swoją własną bytnością Roku przeslego 1580. zwiedził/ tráfilo sie […] (Stryjkowski 1582: 25)

ibdo wegend długo nad tym morzem, eje prěsdy datykęo švedskąu jmoindskuę lotowskąu zemļu obliwaęt'iži slōciesi [...] (Slav 26, fol. 55v)

There are also instances (although not ubiquitous) of ‘us’ and ‘them’ changing places or being left out, as there was in the 1668–70 translation (cf. Section 3.2.1):

(73) á stolicę swoją zalezałw w Sworcech álbo w Izborku/ á według Miechouúsá w Zborku/ ktory ono nászy zá spráwą Kniážiá Alexander Polubienskiego byli wziéli/ Roku 1566. ále go odzierże nieumieli. (Stryjkowski 1582: 117)

gradž kostnot sótorwi w Sworce ili wIzborsk, a po Měxhynio: w Zbork, egože nękogla za promyslon kńža Alexendra polubienskoj wzięsa poljaki w lęto „afzs. no dëržat ne źměli (Slav 26, fol. 195r)

(74) Roku 6486. według Russi od stworzenia Swiätá. (Stryjkowski 1582: 132)

w lęto ot sotworzenia mira „syüns.e (Slav 26, fol. 213v)

There are also other cases where the translator has omitted or modified something. There may have been different reasons for this: in some cases the translator may not have understood the source text completely, in other cases he may have aimed at an acceptability-oriented translation.

In IV: 3, when speaking of the genealogy of the Russian princes, the wording is changed to become more general, since, of course, when the translation was made, Ivan IV was no longer tsar:

(75) od ktyrch tež wielcy Kniážiowie Moskiewscy/ y dźisieyszsy Iwan Wasilewic Ród swoj byćć z Rzymian twierdzą (Stryjkowski 1582: 118)

ot nihxj velikie kńži moscowskie i ññeshnie velikie gódri rod svoi byti ot rimonyt tverdyt (Slav 26, fols. 195r–195v)

In the following example, describing the struggle between the man from Perejaslav’ and the Pečeneg, Stryjkowski compares them to Hercules and Anteus (Hercules and Antaeus). The names of these heroes were left out in the translation, but it cannot be determined if this was done by mistake or in an attempt at acceptability – perhaps they were not well known to Russians. The name Hercules occurs elsewhere in the chronicle as well, and there it is not omitted from the translation, cf. example (151).
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(76) zatym go zá gárdło uchwyciwszy/ nieináczezy háko Hercules Anteusá ták długo dušil/ ász ná onym plácu duszę z niego wytłoczył. (Stryjkowski 1582: 135)

и за горло его 8хватён даже 6шу на томъ мѣсте выломили (Slav 26, fol. 121v)

There are cases when the Polish original gives two synonyms and the Russian translation only gives one word, presumably the one that would be familiar to Russian readers (cf. also the treatment of parallel name forms, Section 6.6.2):

(77) Roku czwartego pánowania Ninusa Krolá trzeciego Babilońskiego Twiska G8as álbo Obrzym Sarmaty Praw álbo ustaw uczu u Rhenu/ etc. (Stryjkowski 1582: 93)

в лѣто сего Нина четвертое, вавilonского третьего орда Твисконъ исполнъ сарматов закона и устава поучает у Рена (Slav 26, fols. 160r–160v)

(78) Leoná trzeciego Cesárzá/ ktery byl názwan Ikonomachus/ to iest obrázow borzyčiel (Stryjkowski 1582: 99)

Лв8 третім8 ордо, иже бѣ образобрєць речен (Slav 26, fol. 168r)

(79) Bo Pausanias pisze/ isz sam widzial Pancerz Sarmatski/ z rogow/ kopyt końskich/ ná xtal Karacenys álbo luski Smokowey uczyniony (Stryjkowski 1582: 108)

пишеть бо Пахзаны, яко самѣ видѣ пансырь сармацкой, из рога копыть лошадинныхъ по подобиу чешиб змийной 8чинень (Slav 26, fol. 181r)

(80) Niktorzy tež chcą ich miánować od pléi y barwy smladey álbo z ru- miánoczarnę/ co iest pospolita płeć Ruskiego/ zwłaszcza Podolskiego y Wołyńskiego narodu (Stryjkowski 1582: 113)

иний жъ хотятъ именовать от цвѣта п8са, иже есть общѣ цвѣть п8скою и подольского, y вольнского народа (Slav 26, fol. 188r)

(81) Wywodzą tež niektorzy Rusaki z Kolchis kráiny oney sławnjej/ do ktorej jason po złote runo álbo welnę żeglował (Stryjkowski 1582: 113)

произвоьдятъ же нѣцы п8сакоv ot страны колхиския славныя, в нюже Иасон по златое п8но 6дили (Slav 26, fol. 188v)

(82) á miasto dani y hołdu z kãdrego domu biełczáne álbo wiewiorcze skorki wybieráli (Stryjkowski 1582: 116)

и вмѣсто дани ѣ подданства со всякого двора белые кожицы выбирали (Slav 26, fol. 192v)
The following are only a few Polish wordings, sometimes to the Latin alphabet Moskiewskie he could not have translated into Russian.

In example (88), the Polish text has probably served as
basis for the translation. The strongest argument for this assumption is that the words in bold typeface are absent from the Latin version:

(88) Málo záš potym pisze: *Num qui uero supra Roxanos habitent, ignotum est nobis, Roxani quidem adversus Mitridatis Eupatoris Ductores belligerarunt.* A teras powiada coby zá narody dále po Roxanach mieszkały/ nie-wiemy/ etc. *Iednák to pewna/* isz Roxani przeciw Hetnam Mitridates-sa Eupatora walczyli (Stryjkowski 1582: 111)

Мало ж ниже письм, а ййе какє по роѦнэхъ народы живѫть не вѫмы и прѫч, однакож тѡ извѣстно якѡ роѦане противъ воєвод МиѦридаты Еупатора билиѫ (Slav 26, fol. 185v)

An exception is found in chapter IV: 2, where both versions are translated, even though the shorter Latin quote could easily have been left out:

(89) Тамже тёз писє нѧ коццу. *Omnibus ad occasum & meridiem paratis gentibus &c.* Гдѣ іў м нѧ западш Слонѧ нѧ поўднине усмерял Augustus woyną wszystki narody (Stryjkowski 1582: 108)

Тамъже писѣть на коцц, всѣмъ на запад и полдень ёмирийшымся народомъ, внегда на запад слѣща и на полдень умири Авгѣсть войною всѣ народы (Slav 26, fol. 180v)

There are isolated instances where the translator has added information that is not present in the Polish original:

(90) там им опowiedzial/ co z nim zѧ rozmowę miał окоło wiary Chrześiâнskiei Kirus Grecki Philosoph/ isz ktoby sie ochrzäил/ umárwszy ma wstäć з nowu/ y krolowаć nѧ wieki (Stryjkowski 1582: 136)

тамо возвести имъ бесѣдѦ о вѣре хрѦнѧнскѦ Кирила єилосова, аще кто крѦстиѧся водою ѕ дѦном во имя оѦца и сѦна и сѦтаго дѦха, умерѣн имать востати, и цѦствовати во вѦки (Slav 26, fol. 220r)

The reason for this addition is unclear. Perhaps this was a fixed formula in the translator’s mind, added out of pure habit, or from a sense of piety. The following is an example of a minor change:

(91) wedlug Ptolomeussѧ y inszych stаrodawnieyszych: Roxolanow y Roxanow imie iѦsne bylo: Wszakже от того остатeczного do Missiej альбо Bulgarie wтаргениемia *Roxolanow* y от roku 72. do dzisiejszego 1580. ist iusz pultor тysiаця lat y oѕm. (Stryjkowski 1582: 111)

по Птоломию, и ѭнымъ древнейшимъ рoѦлановъ и рoѦановъ, има бѦ славно, а от того нашеистя послѦдняго рoѦлановъ и рoѦановъ в Миссиию, или Болгарію, и от лѦта .Ѧи. до йнешняго .ѦѦбѦгѦ есть .ѦѦѦ. с лишкомѦ лѦть (Slav 26, fol. 186r)
The addition of the parallel ethnonym in the translation is probably explained by the fact that both variants were used in the preceding sentence.

5.3.3 Domestication

As explained above in Section 5.2, domestication is a term used for an adaptation of the translation to the target culture, sometimes involving quite substantial changes in the text. Below are some examples of changes that have been made in the Russian translation of Stryjkowski’s chronicle. As opposed to the omissions in Section 5.3.2, which can at least theoretically be the result of the translators’ limitations, these alterations are quite clearly due to a strategy of acceptability, and testify to the translators’ knowledge of both the source and target cultures. The examples below are some of the most obvious changes made in the different sets of sample chapters.

Names

The transcription and adaptation of names into the Cyrillic alphabet is a separate question that will be discussed in Section 6.6.2, but in the tale about Olga’s conversion to Christianity in chapter IV: 3, a more significant change has been made:

(92) Ten cię sam wybawi ma/ iakosz y zbawił […] trzech młodzieńcow Sid-rachá/ Misacha y Abdenago z pieć ogniștego (Stryjkowski 1582: 125)

той тя избавить, якоже избави [...] трех отрокь Ананию, Азарну, Мисанлу от пещи огненного (Slav 26, fols. 205v–206r)

This refers to the Book of Daniel, chapter 3, where the Jews Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego refuse to bow down to Nebuchadnezzar’s image of gold and are cast into a fiery furnace, but not burnt. In Daniel 1: 3–7, it is explained that the men’s Hebrew names are Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah, but when they enter Nebuchadnezzar’s service they are given new (heathen) names. They are then called by these names, but use the Hebrew names among themselves (as in Daniel 2: 17). Thus, there are two sets of names used in the Bible, of which Western tradition uses one set and the Russian tradition the other.61

The substitution here shows that the translator was well acquainted with the Bible and with the different traditions, i.e. he recognized the names used in Polish but assumed that his readers would be more familiar with the ones frequent in Russian tradition. In contrast to this, the 1668–70 translation transcribes the Polish set of names:

61 Cf. in NPL (1950: 39): “въ имя святыхъ 3-и отрокъ: Анания, Азария и Мисанла”.
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The subject of the fiery furnace was well known in Muscovy. It was the subject of a liturgical drama, the Peščnoe dejstvie, which was performed every year. Presumably, the Russian naming tradition was followed in the drama. The subject was taken up by Simeon Polockij in a play written around the year 1673 (Istorija russkogo dramatičeskogo teatra 1977: 58–62), but he used the Western names.

**Measurements of distance**

Different measurements of distance were used in Poland and Muscovy at this time. A Polish mile (before 1819) was 7146 m, whereas a Russian versta or poprišče was approximately 1077 m (Günther-Hielscher 1995: 240, 375). Thus, a Polish mile was approximately 6.6 Russian verstas. There was also a Lithuanian mile, longer than the Polish mile, and a Lithuanian versta, longer than the Russian. One Lithuanian mile was equal to five Lithuanian versts (Brockhaus, Efron: миля). Pamva Berynda’s dictionary probably refers to the Lithuanian measurements where it says: «Връста: пятая часть мили» (SRJa: верста).

The two Russian measurements versta or poprišče were identical in length and are used alternately in different sources, although poprišče prevails in religious texts and versta in secular sources, as can be deduced from the sources of the quotes under the two entries in SRJa. This division is not absolute, as the examples in the dictionary include parallel readings from different chronicles where one uses versta and the other poprišče (SRJa: поприще). In an example from a 17th-century text, poprišče is explained as «Поприще – верста, яже имеять саженей 750» (SRJa: верста, поприще). Most of the chronicles listed in Section 7.2 seem to prefer versta.

In the translation of Stryjkowski’s Kronika, Polish miles have usually been converted into Russian measurements, either poprišče or versta, by multiplying by five. There are eleven occurrences of the word mila in sample chapters A, and they are usually translated as versta, as in example (93). These chapters have only one occurrence of poprišče. The ten occurrences in sample chapters C are all translated as poprišče, as in example (94).

(93) ***á Stolicę swoię ná wyspie Ieziorá Ładogi (ktorego iest wszerz mil 60. á wzdłuž sto/ iák Herberstein pisze) trzydzieści y siedm mil od Nowogrodá wielkiego zalożył. (Stryjkowski 1582: 117)***

---

62 Published in Tichonravov (1874: 324–336).
The correspondence one Polish mile – five versta was the one usually used at Posol'skij prikaz (Maier 2008: 190). Deržavina (1963: 329) observed in the translation of Velikoe zercalo from 1677 that 12 plus five miles in the Polish original were turned into 70 plus 30 poprišče. Thus, the correspondence in Velikoe zercalo was one Polish mile to six versta or slightly less.

In sample chapters D, the measurements have not been changed or recalculated. Instead, milja is used for all three occurrences of the Polish mila, such as in the following example:

The different ways of treating the Polish mila in sample chapters A, C and D speak in favor of the hypothesis that the segments were translated by different people (cf. Chapter 6), and show that the translators of segments A and C aimed more at acceptability than did the translator of segment D. There are, however, no examples from sample chapters B, and therefore this criterion will not be used in Chapter 6.

**Monetary units**

In one place in sample chapters D, a Polish monetary unit is recalculated into a Russian one:
The Polish *kopa* was associated with the number 60, and as a monetary unit it corresponded to 60 *groszy*. When the Ruthenian lands were incorporated into the Muscovite state, a *kopa* was considered equivalent to half a ruble (Brockhaus, Efron: *kona*). One ruble was equal to 200 *den'ga* (Günther-Hielscher 1995: 298) and an *altyn* to six *den'ga* (Günther-Hielscher 1995: 17), which means that one and a half *kopa* was indeed equal to \( \frac{150}{6} = 25 \) *altyn*. The situation in the Ruthenian lands probably made it necessary to master the conversion of these monetary units, and it is perhaps not surprising that a translator at *Posol'skij prikaz* had that ability.

*Planet name*

The name of the planet Saturn (Stryjkowski 1582: 87) was changed to *Кронъ* (Slav 26, fol. 150r), which was the usual name of that planet in Russian at the time (SRJa: *кронъ*).

### 5.4 Polish influence

An important criterion for characterizing the translation is identifying the influence of the Polish language, recognizable in the frequency of polonisms, i.e. words of Polish origin (lexical polonisms) or syntactic structures typical for Polish (syntactic polonisms). The influence of Polish on Russian was great during this period. Therefore, the occurrence of polonisms in the text may testify either to the character of this particular text or to the Russian language of the period in general. In the case of lexical polonisms, comparisons with historical dictionaries allow at least a tentative solution to that question.

From the point of view of the history of the Russian language, it is also important to take into account the influence of Ruthenian, which was geographically closer, and was spoken by many people even in Moscow. Many of the words characterized as polonisms may have been introduced into the Russian language not directly from Polish, but by way of Ruthenian (Kochman 1975: 22–27). Many of the translators employed in Moscow were of Ruthenian descent. Therefore it can be difficult to judge whether an apparent polonism is not in fact an influence from the dialect of the translator (cf. Isserlin 1961: 39). Either way, this influence characterizes the translation and the translator. In this study, I do not have the ambition to differentiate between Polish and Ruthenian influence, but it should be kept in mind that
although I mostly speak only of polonisms, Ruthenian influence is equally probable.

In some cases, spoken Russian and Polish were similar to each other in usage, but opposed to Church Slavonic (e.g. Russian который and Polish który vs. Church Slavonic иже). In such cases, it is difficult to say if a certain feature in the text is a sign of Polish influence or of the influence of a non-bookish register in the Russian language. Other Polish features were instead similar to Church Slavonic grammar (e.g. the use of the vocative in Section 4.2.2.5), so the use of these features in the translation may be either a polonism or a marker of bookishness.

Lexical polonisms will be treated in Section 5.4.1 and syntactic polonisms in Section 5.4.2. Previous research on each of these topics will be presented in the respective sections.

5.4.1 Lexical polonisms

When speaking of the influence from Polish, most scholars have concentrated on lexical polonisms, either as their primary topic of investigation, such as Kochman (1975), Leeming (1968, 1973, 1976) and Ruposova (1982, 1985), or in connection with studies of individual texts, such as Kosta (1982: 114–119). Three of these studies will be used for reference below, especially in Section 5.4.1.2, and will therefore be presented here.

S. Kochman’s monograph Polsko-rosyjskie stosunki językowe od XVI do XVIII w. (Kochman 1975) is dedicated to Polish influence on the Russian lexicon from the 16th to the 18th centuries, including most of the latter, since he does not share the opinion of many other scholars that the Polish influence subsided in the 1730s. This monograph considers words of Slavic origin as well as international words borrowed into the Russian language by way of Polish, and determines the status of the words as polonisms by comparing the history of the cognates in the Slavic languages (Kochman 1975: 10–13). Kochman also points to semantic calques from Polish, i.e. Russian words whose meaning changed under the influence of the corresponding Polish word (Kochman 1975: 17–22). He examines approximately 100 words and gives examples from numerous Russian sources from the three centuries – mostly printed texts or later editions of manuscripts, but his sources also include some manuscripts. He also consults dictionaries contemporary to the texts, as well as historical dictionaries of all the languages involved (Kochman 1975: 147–154).

H. Leeming concentrates on so-called internationalisms and tries to emphasize the paths by which these international words have entered into the language – in this case, through Polish into the East Slavic languages. In his

63 Cf. also references to her articles in Nikolaev (2008: passim).
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monograph *Rola języka polskiego w rozwoju leksyki rosyjskiej do roku 1696. Wyrazy pochodzenia łacińskiego i romańskiego* (Leeming 1976), he studies the Russian vocabulary until 1696 (the beginning of the reign of Peter I) and lists more than 720 words that have their origins in Latin or the Romance languages. There are additional sections for words that were not morphologically adapted to the Russian language and for calques. His sources include printed texts and some manuscripts. The texts are of different kinds: translations from Polish and from other languages as well as original texts, e.g. ambassadorial reports, travel accounts, diplomatic correspondence and other documents (Leeming 1976: 21–27).

In a study of polonisms in a Ruthenian text, Leeming (1968) constructed a scale on which he placed the polonisms he found, with the points Highly active – Very active – Active – Passive, according to the types of texts where the words appear. He used four groups of texts: dictionaries, Ruthenian legal texts, original writings in Ruthenian and translations (from Polish). The first three were called active contexts. A word that occurred in three active contexts was considered highly active, one that was found only in translations was considered passive, and the intermediate steps referred to words that occurred in one or two active contexts. A classification based on Leeming’s article will be used here, but with only three categories, not four.

The term “polonism” is used here to cover several types of words, all of which had their origins in the Polish language. Some of them were introduced into Russian as a result of Polish influence, but soon became an integrated part of the language, without most speakers being aware of their foreign origin. Some words were used regularly, but mainly in interference texts, i.e. translations from Polish, texts written by Ruthenians or by Russians who had spent much time in Poland (cf. Moser 1998: 48–49). Some words were not incorporated into the Russian language, but are only found in isolated instances, probably as a result of misunderstandings or mistakes. All these types will be covered by the term “polonism,” but inspired by Leeming (1968), they will be divided into very active, active and passive words.

These three types of words have to be defined anew for each time period: every polonism, even one that becomes a very active, fully integrated word, must at some stage have been passive and used only sporadically. It is therefore important to use the language of that time as a starting-point, and not compare only with the presence or absence of a word in modern-day Russian. There is a risk of seeing polonisms where there are none, since words that had developed independently in several Slavic languages may have been in use in 17th-century Russian and disappeared later. For instance, in the translation of Stryjkowski’s chronicle, we find words such as возрастъ ‘build, size’ and нагло ‘suddenly,’ which would appear to be polonisms but which, according to N. Sablina (1982: 103), are not.
In Sections 5.4.1.1 and 5.4.1.2, words that can be suspected to be polonisms have been retrieved by methods that will be explained in the respective sections. These words have then been studied in the following way to determine their status in late 17th-century Russian.

To begin with, the sample chapters of the translated Kronika (cf. Section 1.3) have been searched for other occurrences of the Polish word corresponding to the suspected polonism, and alternative translations into Russian have been registered.

In addition to this, Russian historical dictionaries have been consulted, primarily SDJa, SRJa and Sreznevskij’s dictionary, and in some cases also Vasmer’s etymological dictionary. Sparwenfeld’s Lexicon Slavonicum, which belongs to the time period under consideration, has also been used. The source material on which these dictionaries are based must be taken into account when evaluating their evidence. SRJa, in particular, has many interference texts among its sources, and Sparwenfeld’s dictionary was largely based on Pamva Berynda’s and Epifanij Slavineckij’s dictionaries, both of which were Ruthenian rather than Russian, even though he used the second redaction of Slavineckij’s Latin-Slavic dictionary, which was more oriented on Russian Church Slavonic than the first (Birgegård 1985: 31–32).

The Ukrainian historical dictionary SUM has been used to compare with the Ukrainian language from the 16th and early 17th centuries, and the Belorussian historical dictionary HSBM, with its main emphasis on the period from the end of the 15th to the middle of the 17th century, has provided information about the Belorussian language. As explained in Section 1.6, I prefer the term Ruthenian, but will not question the classification of texts as Ukrainian or Belorussian by the editors of these dictionaries. None of my conclusions depend on their distinctions.

Two Polish historical dictionaries, Słownik staropolski (SSP) and Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku (SP XVI), have been consulted, as well as Linde’s dictionary. References to them will not always be given explicitly in the text, only where it is deemed necessary.

Last but not least, the word index to the edition of Vesti-Kuranty (2009) from approximately the relevant time period (1656, 1660–62 and 1664–70) has been used as reference, since these texts, mainly translated from German and Dutch, are known to contain few polonisms, and an occurrence of a word in them would indicate that it was well incorporated into Russian. Below, references to Vesti-Kuranty are to this volume, unless otherwise stated. There is one identified translation from Polish in this volume, and one of the words discussed below (изаумный) occurs only in that text. Words that occur in that text and many other texts as well have not been commented on.

If a word is used consistently in the Kronika, if the historical dictionaries show examples not only from interference texts and if it is furthermore found in Vesti-Kuranty, it is considered to be very active. These are words of
Polish origin but in the late 17th century integrated into Russian to such a degree that they were a natural choice to many scribes and translators, even when the source language of the text was not Polish.

If a word is found in the chronicle, but not as the only alternative, if dictionaries mainly give examples from interference texts and if it is rarely used in Vesti-Kuranty, the word is active. This is seen as a sign that although the word was in use, it was not a part of everyone’s vocabulary and was perhaps perceived as foreign.

If it is a rare exception in the chronicle, not registered in dictionaries as used at this time and not found in Vesti-Kuranty, a word is considered passive. Again one must remember that this label is only valid for this particular time period. A word that was passive in the 1670s may very well have been integrated into the language at a later stage.

The object of this study is not to list all the polonisms in the translation. Instead, a number of words that for some reason can be assumed to be polonisms are classified according to their degree of integration into the Russian language in the 1670s. In Section 6.9, the results of this classification will be discussed again with the aim to characterize the translation of the different segments of the Kronika.

5.4.1.1 Corrections and alterations

One way of determining if a word was perceived as foreign is to see if it is explained, or glossed, either in the text itself or in the margin. In this particular text, marginal glosses occur sporadically, but many of them are explanations of words of Greek origin, and the glosses have been left aside as not very relevant to the study of polonisms.

Other possible ways of detecting polonisms would have involved methodological difficulties. For instance, if a word was translated differently in different parts of the text, this might be a sign that it was a foreign element, but it would be extremely time-consuming and complicated to compare the translation of every Polish word, and therefore this is used as one of the defining factors in the classification of a word, not as a way of identifying words to study. To give another example, it could be interesting to look at words that were distorted by later scribes when copying the text, since this might mean that they did not recognize the word. This would have to involve comparing virtually every word in all manuscripts, and yet this method would not be quite reliable, since on the one hand there can be other reasons for such distortions, and on the other hand later scribes might have known Polish and recognized the polonisms, or else copied faithfully even words they did not know.

However, some of the lexical changes in ms. B (BAN 31.4.32, cf. Section 3.6.1) have already been mentioned as possible corrections of polonisms. These changes will now be examined more closely.
In the examples below, Russian cognates of Polish words have been crossed out and replaced by synonyms. This suggests that the crossed-out words were perceived as unacceptable, and the task here is to see whether this may have been due to their similarity with the Polish words. With this method, of course, only potential polonisms that were then removed from the text are identified. Those polonisms that remained and are found in the other manuscripts as well are not found by this method, even though it would perhaps be interesting to spot precisely these, since they were the ones that later scribes and readers came in contact with. Some of these are instead identified in Section 5.4.1.2.

Although the words discussed below did not remain in the text, most of them are attested in other Russian sources, which means that the discussion here of whether they are polonisms or not can still be relevant in relation to the language of the period as a whole.

In the examples below, bold typeface is used to mark the results of changes in the manuscript, and the words in square brackets, marked with “ante corr[ectionem],” are the ones that have been crossed out, and are thus under discussion as possible polonisms. In some cases, other changes have also been made, but this will not be indicated in the examples. Unless otherwise indicated, manuscript quotes in this section are from ms. B. References to this manuscript will therefore only indicate the volume and folio. The examples are given in the order in which they appear in the manuscript.

Прирождение

(97) A Cain iż był s przyrodzenia zły (Stryjkowski 1582: 3)

Каинъ же сынъ естеством [ante corr. от прирождения] соль (vol. I, fol. 11r)

SRJa has separate entries for прирождение and прирождение, but with similar meanings and examples. The meaning ‘nature, character’ of the word прирождение fits well here. One example of this meaning is taken from the 16th-century Naziratel’, which is a translation from Polish (there it is given as a synonym to естество: Прирождение или естество содволяает на древесех листвие), one is found in the 16th-century Lucidarius, which is probably a translation from German but has been said to contain polonisms (SKK 1989: 73) and one in a military instruction, translated64 in the early 17th century.

In Sparwenfeld’s dictionary, the word occurs several times, once as a synonym to естество (Lexicon Slavonicum I: 378), but this entry is taken

---

64 The list of sources to SRJa does not provide information on the source language for the translation.
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from Pamva Berynda’s dictionary, which confirms the Ruthenian association of the word (cf. Birgegård 1985: 54–55). The word was, according to Leeming (1968: 296), highly active in Ruthenian, meaning that it occurred in several kinds of texts, not only in translations from Polish. It is found in HSBM in the form прироженье, with examples beginning from the 15th century.

The word прироженье occurs twice in Vesti-Kuranty (2009), once as a translation of the German ‘Ursprung.’ The noun ествество, on the other hand, does not occur.

The Polish word przyrodzenie is found more times in the examined chapters, but there it is translated with an adjective:

(98) á widząc isz trudno było mocą Miastą y Zamku dostać/ dla twárdosći z przyrodzenia mieysca/ udala sie do fortelu przemysłnego (Stryjkowski 1582: 124)

видя же яко неудобно бъ силою града взяти кръпости ради естественные мѣста пред восприя промышль творити (Slav 26, fol. 204r)

The word прирождене can thus be defined as a polonism that was well established in Ruthenian and had been in use in Russian for a long time by the late 17th century. It is so rarely used in the sample chapters that its status cannot be established from this text, but the historical dictionaries and Vesti-Kuranty suggest that it was very active.

Твердити

(99) Bo были Heretikowie obrzydliwi/ ktorzy go zá Patriarchę swoiego wielbili/ á zwáli sie Caianámi/ y twierdzili to iż on słusznie Ablá zábił (Stryjkowski 1582: 3)

благо бо еретики сквернї иже патриарха своего, величающїй его: нарницщ же ся канане, гћлоще [ante corr. твердящ] ж яко по истини Авеля 86и (vol. I, fol. 12r)

Sreznevskij lists the word твърдити with four meanings, none of which, however, fits the Polish sense ‘to claim.’ SRJa, however, lists ‘утверждать, констатировать’ among other meanings, and has a few early examples of this use, as well as several from the late 17th century. SUM and HSBM have not reached the letter T. This verb does not occur in Vesti-Kuranty (2009).

In chapters IV: 1–3, the verb twierdzić occurs five times. Once it is translated as гћролеть (Slav 26, fol. 156v), but the remaining four times the Russian cognate твердити is used (all in the present tense), which implies that the word was not perceived as foreign, at least not by that particular translator. Thus, the substitution in ms. B can probably not be explained only by the fact that it was similar to the Polish word, especially since two other words
in the same sentence were also changed (мерзостности to скверни и
правды to истинн).

Since the Polish word is only found in one set of sample chapters and
there is little other information to go by, it is difficult to be certain, but the
ey early examples in SRJa and the fact that твердити is used four of five times
as a translation of the Polish cognate imply that it was very active, if it was a
polonism at all.

Удъльность

(100) Мściслав Хробры Xiążę ruskie/ Мąż wielkiy dzielności (Stryjekowski
1582: 330)

Мстислав храбрый кнѣць рѣский мѣж великомъ храбрости [ante corr.
удъльности] (vol. I, fol. 413v)

The word удъльность is not listed by Sreznevskij, who only gives the word
удъльный, associated with удъль ‘lot.’ The scribe probably meant to write
dвльность, which would be closer to the Polish word. SRJa has двльный,
deefined as ‘fit for battle,’ but no corresponding abstract noun. SUM, how-
ever, gives ‘courage’ as one of the meanings of the noun in Ukrainian, and
HSBM confirms this for Belorussian as well, with several quotes from what
it defines as the Belorussian translation of Stryjekowski (the Ukrainian
Chronograph, cf. Section 3.2.6). Neither двльность nor двльный is attested

In the other examined chapters of the Kronika, the word дзельность ‘cour-
age’ is usually translated as мужество or храбрость, and the word двло is
used when the meaning is ‘action.’ This confirms the impression that the
Russian translation in the example above was influenced by the Polish text,
and it could be called a polonism, although one that apparently was not
widely used since it is not recorded in dictionaries or by scholars. The word
dвльность should therefore be labeled passive.

Заведение

(101) Mendog Krol Litewski/ álbo żalem zźowiedzenia/ y utrácenia ziem swoich/
Zmodzkiej/ Litewskiey/ Latwieźskiey/ Weizeńskiey/ y Kurlandskied po-
ruszony (Stryjekowski 1582: 331)

Мендогъ король литовскй или жалостю отдачй [ante corr.
заведения] и погблення земель свеихъ жмидцкой литовской,
лятвиской войженскй і кърландской движмъ (vol. I, fols. 415v–
416r)

---

65 "Пригодный для военных действий
c. 160"
The Polish verb *zawieść* has several meanings, one of which, ‘encumber with debt,’ is illustrated with this very quote in Linde’s Polish dictionary.  Neither SRJa nor Sreznevskij list *заведение*, and it does not occur in *Vesti-Kuranty* (2009). The verb *завести* does not seem to have this meaning in the dictionaries or in *Vesti-Kuranty*. The noun is found in SUM, but not in this sense. HSBM, however, gives an example of this meaning in Belorussian.

In Russian, the word *отдача* was clearly a better choice than the crossed-out word, which was almost certainly influenced by the Polish text. It was a passive word that did not gain a foothold in the Russian language.

Zalogitü, byvorotitü

(102) Miástá wszystki nowo od Krzyžakow záložone z gruntu wywroćl (Stryj-kowski 1582: 332)

городы всь ново от крыжаковъ встроенные [ante corr. заложенные]
dо основания разориµ [ante corr. выворотыµ] (vol. I, fol. 416v)

Both SDJa and SRJa list the verb *zalogitü* in the sense ‘to found’ (as do SUM and HSBM), and rather than being a polonism, this meaning seems to have developed independently in each of the languages concerned. The *Lexicon Slavonicum*, however, only gives the meaning ‘pawning, mortgaging’ for the noun and ‘to put down’ for the verb. *Vesti-Kuranty* (2009) contains two instances of this verb, one of which has this meaning.

In chapters IV: 1–3, the noun *zalóženie* and the verb *zalóžyć* are in most cases translated not by the Russian cognate, but by some other word, such as *устроить*, *поставить*, *свтворить* or the noun *основание*. Thus, the dictionaries and the evidence from the *Kronika* contradict each other. Perhaps the Polish and Russian words did not convey quite the same meaning, or perhaps there was some other reason for substituting them. This word is difficult to classify because of the contradictive information, but as a compromise it will be put into the middle group and called active.

As for *выворотитü*, it is listed in SRJa as meaning ‘to deduct, keep back (money or payment),’ with an example from 1648, but this is not the meaning intended here. Nor is it found in *Lexicon Slavonicum*. In SUM, however, the verb is represented by four quotes, all from the same text: a chronograph from the mid-17th century. Three separate meanings are listed, but they are all related: ‘to ruin,’ ‘to defeat’ and ‘to overturn.’ HSBM shows a similar situation, with examples from different texts from the beginning and middle of the 17th century. It is not found in *Vesti-Kuranty* (2009).

66 "[S]eine Güter mit Schulden, mit Verschreibungen belasten, oneriren, beschweren".
This verb (or its aspectual partner, *wywracać*) is only found two more times in the sample chapters. In segment A, *wywracać* is translated as *искореняты*, and in segment C, *wywrócone* is translated as *развернуты*.

The situation in the dictionaries shows that the Russian verb *выворотить* in the sense under discussion here was not yet a part of the Russian language and that it was also quite new in Ruthenian at this time. This, together with the fact that it is absent from the sample chapters, shows that it was a polonism and a passive word.

Издавна, служити

(103) такжь теж Zamkow Litwie zdawná служящих wiele pobral. (Stryjkowski 1582: 658)

також города многи Литвь исконно належащий [ante corr. издавна служашыхь] побрали (vol. II, fol. 366v)⁶⁷

According to SRJa, the word *издавна* is known in Russian since the 10th or 11th century. There is, however, no entry for *исконно*, although the corresponding adjective and the adverb *искони* are found in the earliest texts. SUM shows the same situation in Ukrainian. HSBM does not list the adjective or the adverb *исконно*, but has entries for *издавна* and *искони*. In *Vesti-Kurancy* (2009), *издавна* is attested, but not the other two words.

Throughout the sample chapters from segment A, zdawna is translated as *издавна*. In sample chapters B and C, zdawna occurs one time each and is translated both times as *дравле*. Based on the evidence from dictionaries, however, there is no reason to believe that the substitution in the example above had any connection to polonisms.

As for *служыть*, the Polish verb meant ‘to serve,’ but sometimes, in connection with words for property, ‘to belong to.’ The Russian cognate does not seem to have had the latter meaning, according to SRJa, nor is it found in *Vesti-Kurancy* (2009). The dictionaries SUM and HSBM have not reached the letter *S* and could therefore not be consulted.

The reason for the substitution here was probably that the word *городъ* (ante corr. *градъ*) was interpreted not as a metonym representing the people in the city, which would have allowed the translation *служити*, but in a direct sense, making the verb *належати*, ‘to belong to,’ preferable. The use of *служити* with that interpretation would have been a polonism. As explained below in Section 5.4.1.2, *належати* was also a polonism, but at least one that was in use.

---

⁶⁷ This whole phrase is crossed out in the main text and the correction added in the margin. Aside from the words discussed here, the only difference is that *градовъ много* is changed to *городы многие*.
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Opustimy

(104) dla tego Husárze Węgierscy mimimájac by o nászych bylo więcey/ nocą omýlní uciekli opušćiwzy Krolewicá Albrichtá (Stryjkowski 1582: 664)

togo radi gşaary węgierské razuméj ýšíých byti bölších nošíu poblédiýu bějaça оставить [ante corr. опставить] королевиça Албріхта (vol. II, fol. 377r)

The Polish opuścić means ‘to leave, desert,’ and according to SRJa, opustimy could have the same meaning, exemplified with a quote from the Gennadij Bible (1499). The verb оставити in this sense is also well attested, and as opposed to opustimy, it is also found in SDJas. It was probably a more frequently used word, and opustimy could be interpreted as a polonism here. HSBM shows that both verbs existed in this sense in Belorussian, whereas SUM has not reached the letter O. In Vesti-Kurany (2009), opustimy occurs twice, but one of these instances is a crossed-out occurrence in a draft, and in the fair copy it is replaced by отставить.

The Polish word is found in similar contexts twice in sample chapters A, where it is translated as оставитi, once in sample chapters B, where the verb отложити is used, and twice in sample chapters D, also translated as оставити. This variation, in combination with the substitution in Vesti-Kurany, speaks in favor of treating opustimy as a polonism. It can be classified as active.

Скарбъ, лупъ

(105) у Miástо zburzyli/ gdzie wielkich skárbow y łupow dostáli (Stryjkowski 1582: 772)

и город збрылий гдě много казны и добычи [ante corr. великих скарбоў и люпов] достали (vol. II, fol. 553r)

The word скарбъ is well attested from Russian texts of different kinds, such as chronicles, meaning both ‘riches’ and ‘treasury,’ but Vasmer considers it to be a loan word from Polish. It is found once in Vesti-Kurany (2009).

In sample chapters A, the Polish skarb is translated either as сокровище or as казна, depending on its meaning. The Russian cognate was apparently not seen as the most appropriate translation, and perhaps it was considered a polonism. The dictionaries SUM and HSBM have not reached the letter S and cannot contribute to our knowledge of this word. The fact that it is found in Russian texts but avoided in this translation allows us to characterize it as active.

The Polish lup means ‘loot’ (noun). The word лупъ is not listed in SRJa, but it has the words лупежъ, лупитель and лупити ‘to undress; rob.’ The noun is not found in Vesti-Kurany, but the verb occurs once in the text iden-
tified as a translation from Polish. *Lexicon Slavonicum* mentions *łup* twice, as a synonym to *корысть* (II: 52) and *обряща* (II: 292), but in both cases it is taken from Pamva Berynda’s dictionary, which points to its Ruthenian nature.

The word *łup* occurs twice in sample chapters A, where it is translated as *добьча*, and six times in sample chapters B, all translated as *здобьча*. Sample chapters C present one occurrence, translated as *корысть*, and sample chapters D have both *корысть* and *добьча*. All these words – *добьча*, *здобьча* and *корысть* – are found in SRJa and *Vesti-Kuranty* (2009) as well as SUM (which has, however, not reached *корысть*) and HSBM. Interestingly, the article for *здобьча* (*сдобьча*) in SRJa has the remark “cf. Old Polish *zdobycez,*” which might mean that it should be regarded as a polonism. The word *здобьча* is also among the synonyms to *обряща* in *Lexicon Slavonicum*, which supports this assumption. In any case, the crossed-out *łup* would have been a polonism, and it should be characterized as passive.

### 5.4.1.2 Polonisms according to other scholars

This section is based on Kochman’s (1975) and Leeming’s (1976) monographs. The sample chapters of the translated chronicle were searched for words listed as polonisms by these two scholars. If a word is found at least once in the Russian version of the sample chapters, the translation of the Polish cognate in the rest of the sample chapters is studied. As above, the words are categorized as highly active, active or passive with the help of historical dictionaries, *Vesti-Kuranty* and the variation within the *Kronika*. These words will be discussed again in Section 6.9.

### взаимный

Many Slavic languages have adjectives corresponding to *взаимный*, but in several of them, the word has been borrowed and not developed independently. In Russian, this is shown by the fact that the Polish phrase *w zajem* went through a semantic development that formed the base for the adjective *wzajemny*, whereas the Russian cognate did not. The word entered the Russian language through Ruthenian, and Ukrainian and Belorussian still retain the vowel *-e*-. It is first attested in interference texts, often in the form *взаимный* (Kochman 1975: 133–138). According to SRJa, it is attested since the late 17th century. It is found only once in *Vesti-Kuranty* (2009), and this is in a translation from Polish. Ukrainian mainly showed the form *взаємний* (SUM) and Belorussian *взаемный* (HSBM).

In the sample chapters of the *Kronika*, it is found once in sample chapters A as a translation of Polish *wzajem* and twice in sample chapters C, translating *wet za wet* and *wzajemny*. The adverb *взеймь* is found once in sample chapters D as a translation of *wzajem*. No other translations are found for these Polish words, which shows that although *взаимный* may have been of
Polish origin, it was at this time integrated into the Russian language. It can therefore be called very active.

граница
According to Kochman (1975: 62–68), Common Slavic granь originally meant ‘pole, post,’ and the meaning ‘border’ was a West Slavic innovation. He also claims that the derivate granica was originally West Slavic, which is shown by its occurrence first in Polish, then in Ruthenian and from the end of the 15th century in Russian diplomatic acts, often concerning the western borders of Muscovy. Therefore it is to be considered a polonism in Russian.

In SRJa, the only occurrence listed in the meaning ‘border’ is from 1685, and there it is glossed: границу, то есть рубеж. The word is frequent in Vesti-Kuranty (2009), although рубежь is even more common there. It seems to have been well attested in 16th- and 17th-century Ukrainian (SUM) and Belorussian (HSBM). There is, however, an occurrence of the word граница in a birch-bark letter dated to the 1430s–1450s, which complicates the picture (Zaliznjak 2004: 680–681).

It is found several times in the sample chapters as a translation of Polish granica: once in segment A, four times in segment B and once in segment D. Sample chapters A mainly use рубежь and sample chapters C use пределъ to translate granica (cf. Section 6.7.3). The variation in the ways of translating the Polish word implies that граница was perceived as foreign, at least by some translators, and that it was an active word.

dоводь
The noun доводь is derived from the verb pair доводить/достести, which originally meant ‘to investigate’ and then ‘to prove,’ a shift in meaning that occurred earlier in Polish and Ruthenian than in Russian. However, the noun доводь in the sense ‘argument,’ connected to the latter meaning of the verb, occurred first in Ruthenian. In any case, this speaks of influence of the western neighbors on Russian (Kochman 1975: 55–56). The first example in SRJa in that sense is from 1532, but it does not occur at all in Vesti-Kuranty (2009). 16th-century Ukrainian shows this meaning (SUM), and the first examples in HSBM are from the middle of the 15th century.

It is found four times in sample chapters A. The adverb доводно, not mentioned by Kochman, also occurs four times in those chapters. These words are used to translate Polish dowod and dowodnie, respectively. There are, however, several other ways of translating the two Polish words, of which свидетельство and свидетельствовань occur three times in sample chapters A and приводь three times in sample chapters C. The variety of translations indicates that this was a polonism and not fully integrated into the language, i.e. an active word.
доказати
The original meaning of the verb доказати in all Slavic languages was ‘to finish speaking.’ The modern meaning ‘to prove,’ which is represented in most Slavic languages, developed in Polish in the 15th century, probably under the influence of Latin docere. According to Kochman’s sources, the first occurrences in Russian are from the beginning of the 18th century (Kochman 1975: 51–53). In other words, the example in the translation of Stryjkowski’s Kronika is two decades earlier than the occurrences previously known. SRJa does not list this word, and neither does Sreznevskij. It does not occur in Vesti-Kuranty (2009). SUM gives Ukrainian examples in this sense from the early 17th century and the earliest Belorussian examples in HSBM are from the late 16th century.

It occurs once in sample chapters A as a translation of Polish dokazować. The Polish verb appears three more times in the sample chapters, although sometimes it is difficult to determine the exact meaning of the verb. It is translated differently every time: творить in segment A, учить in segment B and получить in segment C. This variation, together with its absence from the dictionaries and from Vesti-Kuranty, shows that доказати was a polonism and very rare in the language of the time. It is therefore classified as passive.

знакъ
The noun znak is well attested in 16th-century Polish texts, but in Russian texts from that time, other derivatives of the same root are used, such as знамя and знамение. Знакъ did not appear in Russian until the 17th century, and then primarily in interference texts. The word appeared in Ruthenian in the second half of the 16th century (Kochman 1975: 138–140). According to SRJa, it is first attested in a translation from Polish, made in 1628. It is found several times in Vesti-Kuranty (2009), which also has знамение, but never знамя in this sense. Both SUM and HSBM contain numerous examples from the 16th and 17th centuries.

It is found twice in sample chapters A, once in sample chapters B and once in sample chapters D as a translation of Polish znak. In addition to these occurrences, znak is translated three times as знамение and once as знамя in sample chapters A, which shows that although знакъ was rather well integrated, it nevertheless competed with the older Russian words. It can be characterized as active.

костель
The word костель is, according to Leeming (1976: 72), a polonism, which is not surprising, since it refers to a Catholic church. He gives numerous examples from the 17th century, and SRJa also has some from the 16th century. HSBM has examples from as early as the 14th century.
It is found twice in sample chapters A, five times in sample chapters B, once in sample chapters C and seven times in sample chapters D as a translation of *kościół*. In some cases, *kościół* is translated as *церковь*, and in sample chapters C, the most frequent translation is *храм*. The word *костел* usually refers to Catholic churches, but given the variety of translations in the different segments, the consistency of this has not been verified. Since this word refers specifically to a West European concept, it has not been placed in a category.

**ле́жати**

The geographical meaning of the verb *leżeć* ‘to be situated’ appeared in Polish in the 15th century, probably under Latin influence. Examples of the Russian *ле́жати* in the same sense can be found in interference texts from the 16th and 17th centuries (Kochman 1975: 83–84). The earliest example in SRJa in this sense dates from the 14th century, which does not fit this picture, but the other two examples cited there are taken from 17th-century texts. The earliest examples in HSBM are from the 15th century. The verb is found in this sense in *Vesti-Kuranty* (2009), although it is rare.

This meaning of the verb is found ten times in IV: 1–3, where the geography of the Slavic world is described. The Polish original has *leżeć*. The Polish verb is used in this sense only twice in the other sample chapters, but neither of these occurrences is translated as *ле́жати*: once (in segment B) the Polish phrase *na południe leżącej* is translated as *полуденной*, once (in segment D) the verb is translated as *стоять*. Despite this, due to the consistency in the translation in segment A and the fact that it is used in *Vesti-Kuranty*, it can be labeled a very active word.

**му́зыка**

*Му́зыка* and its derivatives, originally from Greek but borrowed via Latin *musica*, was adopted from Polish *muzyka*, as can be seen by the choice of the vowel -у- (Leeming 1976: 82–83). In SRJa, it is listed as an alternative spelling to *му́зика*, and the earliest occurrences for both spellings are from the 17th century. HSBM gives the spellings *му́зыка* and *му́зика* in examples beginning from the early 16th century. *Vesti-Kuranty* (2009) shows one instance each of *му́зыка* and *му́зика*.

The Polish-influenced spelling is found once in segment D, whereas elsewhere in the text, we find *му́зика* (segment C) and *му́зикйскй* (segment D). Both these words are attested earlier than *му́зыка*, according to SRJa. In the Polish original, the word is sometimes spelled in the Polish way, sometimes in the Latin way, but the variation between these forms does not coincide with the Russian variation in spelling. The variation justifies calling this an active word.
Миа

Miia comes from a Latin word (missa) that was borrowed into Russian by way of Polish msza. It is found in Russian texts since the 16th century (cf. Leeming 1976: 81). Since it refers to the Catholic mass, it is not surprising that a word from the closest Catholic neighboring country was borrowed. According to HSBM, it is found in Belorussian since the late 15th century.

Here (in sample chapters D) it occurs once as a translation of msza, in the immediate vicinity of such polonisms as музыка and костел (cf. Section 5.4.1.3). Because it refers to a foreign concept, it has not been placed on the scale.

належати

The verb належати could have many meanings in the early stages of the Slavic languages, some of which are found for instance in OCS, such as ‘to advance,’ ‘to take by force’ and ‘to threaten.’ However, the meanings ‘to rely,’ ‘to depend’ and ‘to be appropriate,’ which developed in Polish in the 16th century, were probably not derived from the earlier meanings, but rather from the construction ležeć na + locative, the existence of which makes it probable that this is a Polish innovation. In this case, however, chronology does not support this claim, since Russian diplomatic documents from the 16th century show examples of the meanings ‘to depend,’ ‘to be appropriate’ and ‘to belong’ (Kochman 1975: 95–98). SRJa lists 13 meanings for this verb, but ‘to depend’ is not among them. The earliest example of ‘to be appropriate’ is from the 15th century, and two more are from the late 17th century. All the examples for ‘to belong’ are from the late 17th century (cf. also Section 5.4.1.1). All the meanings discussed here are attested in Belorussian since the 16th century, according to HSBM. Vesti-Kuranty (2009) has several instances of the verb, and although it is sometimes difficult to determine the exact meaning, it can at least be established that it is found in the sense ‘to be appropriate’ a few times. The meaning ‘to belong’ is, however, much more frequent.

J. Besters-Dilger (1997: 21) sees the impersonal modal надлежит or належит ‘it is appropriate’ as a borrowing from Polish or Ruthenian, independent of the development of the verb належать. She does not comment on the status of other meanings of this verb as independent developments or polonisms.

Here, the verb is used in the senses ‘to belong’ (once in segment A, once in segment B, twice in segment C) and ‘to depend’ (once in segment B). The Polish original has należeć or przypadać. The Polish verb należeć is never translated in any other way in the sample chapters. All in all, the history of this verb is complicated, but the lack of variation in the translation shows that even the more recent meanings were not perceived as foreign, and it can therefore be labeled very active.
Панцирь

Панцирь and пансырь were two alternative spellings, of which the first shows influence from Polish, the second, according to Leeming (1976: 85), from German. SRJa gives examples of both spellings, but пансырь is attested already in Gennadij’s Bible from 1499, whereas the earliest occurrence listed in the dictionary of панцирь is from the 17th century. Both spellings, as well as панцеръ, панцирь and several more, are found in HSBM, but their chronology in Belorussian can not be established. Vesti-Kuranty (2009) has one instance of the noun, spelled пансырь, as well as the adjectives пансырный and панцерный.

Both spellings occur close to each other in the translation of the Kronika (segment A):

(106) пишется бо Пашань, яко самъ видъ пансырь сармацкй, изъ рога копыть лошадиныъ по подобию чешй зминной 8чйниень, которй крпосто и легкою не хзжы былъ греческого (каковы нйе 8 над) панцыръ (Slav 26, fol. 181r) (cf. also example (79))

The Polish word in both cases (Stryjkowski 1582: 108) is pancerz. Mss. E and R use the spelling пансырь in both cases. These are the only occurrences of the Polish word in the sample chapters, so that there is no variation in translations that could shed further light on the status of the Russian word as a polonism. Judging by the evidence from dictionaries and Vesti-Kuranty, it should probably be called active.

Папежъ

Папежъ is attested already in the Ostromir Gospel from 1056/1057, but despite this occurrence in a Church Slavonic text, Leeming (1976: 86) considers the word to be a polonism when found in 17th-century texts. According to Uspenskij (2002: 74), however, the presence of this word is a sign of West Slavic influence even in the case of early texts. HSBM shows several 16th-century examples. In Vesti-Kuranty (2009), nana is much more frequent than папежъ.

In all sample chapters of the Kronika, the translation nana prevails, but in sample chapters B, the translation папежъ occurs once, next to nana.

(107) выправи также Болеслав Пйдик у Алевзопра папежа четвертаго привиля [...] обаче то к дйл не пришло, аще папа писалъ к арцибископу гнзинскому [...] (Slav 27, fol. 35r)

The Polish word in both cases is papieś (Stryjkowski 1582: 340). Curiously enough, a 17th-century example of this word in SRJa also is a quote that contains the words nana and папежъ alongside each other. Due to its foreign reference, this word has not been categorized.
Kochman (1975: 110–111) claims that Polish *porządek* is attested since the mid-16th century, Ruthenian borrowed the word in the late 16th century, and Russian *предокъ* is attested since the late 17th century. SRJa confirms the date for Russian, but according to HSBM, there is one occurrence of this word in Belorussian from as early as 1499. The word occurs twice in *Vesti-Kuranty* (2009).

It is found only once in sample chapters B as a translation of Polish *porządek*. In another instance, in sample chapters A, *porządek* is translated as чинъ. The material from these chapters is too small to contribute to a characterization of the word *предокъ*, but the fact that there is an alternative translation, together with the information from SRJa, motivates characterizing it as active.

*предокъ*

According to Kochman (1975: 114–115), *предокъ* is found in diplomatic correspondence, under influence from Ruthenian, from the 15th century, and in Russian literary texts from the 18th century. SRJa gives an example from a 15th-century interference text, but also several from the 17th century. HSBM has many examples from the late 15th century. The word occurs twice in *Vesti-Kuranty* (2009).

In the translation of the *Kronika*, this word is of course especially frequent when the ancestry of different peoples is discussed, and hence it is used 20 times in the sample chapters from segment A, but only once each in the other sets of sample chapters. It is used as a translation of Polish *przodek*, which is never translated in any other way. This gives the impression that the word was not perceived as foreign, but was fully integrated by this time, and thus very active. This does not quite agree with the picture conjured up by Kochman that it was only used in specific contexts before the 18th century.

*склонный, склонение*

The adjective *склонный* and the nouns *склонность* (not found here) and *склонение* are borrowed from Polish. They appear in interference texts from the middle of the 16th century and more frequently in 17th-century translations (Kochman 1975: 21, 125–126). Most of the examples of *склонный* in SRJa are from the 1690s, and only one, taken from *Vesti-Kuranty*, is earlier, from 1646. In the sense found here, *склонение* is first attested in the *Naziratel’* from the 16th century, which, as has already been mentioned, is a translation from Polish. These words are quite frequent in *Vesti-Kuranty* (2009).

*Склонный* occurs once in sample chapters A as a translation of the comparative *sklonniejsze*. The noun *склонение* is found once, also in sample chapters A, as a translation of *nachylenie* ‘inclination.’ There are no other
occurrences of the Polish words, and there is too little material here to characterize the Russian words further, although the evidence from *Vesti-Kuranty* indicates that the words were fully integrated into the Russian language at this time and should be labeled very active.

5.4.1.3 Polonisms in context

The following example is intended to show a larger context with several polonisms. Some of them have been discussed above, whereas some have not been mentioned and will be commented on below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stryjkowski 1582: 748</th>
<th>Slav 28, fols. 294r–294v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mikołaj też Rádziwił/ y Stánisław</td>
<td>Миколай также Радзивиль и</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastolt z wielkim kosztem z Polski w</td>
<td>Станислав Гаштольд с великим</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musice ćwiczonych mieli przez sto/</td>
<td>накладом не Полши в мѣзыке</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>po Moskiewsku/ y po Tatarku/ y</td>
<td>совершенных имѣли болеи ста</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozácku przybranych m³dzieńców/</td>
<td>помосковскую и потатарски</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>którzy z Instrumentámi rozmáitymi</td>
<td>показаццю устроенных молодцовъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musices z Száblámi y z Saydakámi ná</td>
<td>которые с розными инстручмёнты и</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krzywych botách przed Cesárzem w</td>
<td>наряды мѣсикическими с саблями и з</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kościele figurą zawaždy Msze y</td>
<td>саадаками в кривых сапогахъ пред</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieszpory spiewáli</td>
<td>цесарем в хостелемъ всегда мшу и</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>вечернюю пьли</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides the polonisms *музыка, костёл* and *мша*, that were mentioned above, it is fair to suppose that the adverbs *помосковскую* and *показаццю* were influenced by the Polish original, where such adverbs have the ending -u. Ms. N also has *потатарскую* instead of *потатарски*. Цесарь was not a polonism as such, but the use of this word rather than царь may have been influenced by the Polish *cesarz*.

5.4.1.4 Summary of lexical polonisms

The study of the alterations in ms. B showed that some polonisms were removed from the text in connection with editorial work. Their status as polonisms is attested by dictionaries and by the treatment of the corresponding Polish words in other places in the text. In some cases, the substitutions were apparently made for other reasons, even though the removed word was a cognate of the word used in the Polish original. This is the case with the replacement of *издавна* by *исконно*.

To identify polonisms that remained in the text, earlier works on the Polish influence on the Russian lexicon were taken as help. Some of the words listed in them were found in the text, and their status as polonisms was investigated with the help of alternating spellings or translations, historical dictionaries and other texts from the same period.
Words referring to Western concepts, such as папежъ, миса and костель, form a separate category, and their status as polonisms is not disputed. A number of other words of Polish origin were grouped into very active, active and passive words. Among the very active words is предокъ, which is so frequent in the Russian text that it does not seem to have been a foreign element at all. Possibly, Kochman’s sources led him to draw a mistaken conclusion about its status as a polonism.

At the other end of the scale we find доказати, which has not previously been attested in 17th-century texts, and was probably still quite foreign to the Russian language at this time.

The following table shows the classification of the polonisms studied in Section 5.4.1.2. Their distribution among the sample chapters will be discussed again in Section 6.9. The words in question are marked in boldface, and other translations of the Polish cognates are also included. Empty cells signify that the Polish cognate does not occur in the original of those chapters and that the Russian word does not occur in the translation. The word “other” means that there is no single word in the Russian translation that corresponds to the word in the Polish original. The number of times a word occurs is not given in this table.

Table 13. Lexical polonisms in the sample chapters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very active</strong></td>
<td>взаимный</td>
<td>взаимный</td>
<td>взаемъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>лежати</td>
<td>(other)</td>
<td>стояти</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>належати</td>
<td>належати</td>
<td>належати</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>предокъ</td>
<td>предокъ</td>
<td>предокъ</td>
<td>предокъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>склонный</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>склонение</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active</strong></td>
<td>граница</td>
<td>граница</td>
<td>предель</td>
<td>граница</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>рубежъ</td>
<td>рубежъ</td>
<td></td>
<td>рубежъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>доводь</td>
<td></td>
<td>приводь</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>доводно</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>свидетельство</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>язы́къ</td>
<td>язы́къ</td>
<td>язы́къ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>знамение</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>знамя</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>панцы́рь</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пансы́рь</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чинъ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>порядокъ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passive</strong></td>
<td>доказати</td>
<td>учинити</td>
<td>получити</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>творити</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.2 Syntactic polonisms

The syntactic influence from Polish on Russian has been less frequently studied. The main scholar on that area is Michael Moser who, in his 1998 monograph, examined some syntactic structures that can be assumed to originate in Polish or Ruthenian influence on 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th}-century Russian (Moser 1998: 73–76). In a later article, he studied some types of subordinate clauses that were rare before the days of Peter I, but that are not necessarily polonisms (Moser 2000).

W. Witkowski (1978) also concentrated on Polish influence on Russian hypotax, but stressed that this mostly took place through the mediation of Ruthenian.

In the following, all four sets of sample chapters have been examined for some of the constructions that were classified as syntactic polonisms in Moser’s 1998 monograph. The choice of these particular constructions was quite subjective and motivated mainly by the fact that they were relatively easy to identify.

5.4.2.1 The spread of  đỏo + genitive

In OCS as well as in Old East Slavic, the construction  đỏo + genitive with a local meaning could only be used in limitative contexts, expressing movement to a limit but not beyond. From the late 15\textsuperscript{th} century, this construction had gained ground in Polish and occurred in many cases where w or k had earlier been used. From Polish, the usage spread to Ruthenian texts, as well as to Russian interference texts. The use of  đỏo + genitive to express finality is also a sign of interference. Such constructions were common in Russian until the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, but then they disappeared (Moser 1998: 260–273). In the Kronika, this use of  đỏo + genitive is found, but not with equal frequency everywhere.

In the sample chapters from segment A, the construction  даже  đỏo + genitive is frequently used with the names of rivers, seas and cities in a limitative sense. Aside from that, there are only two occurrences of  đỏo + genitive, compared with approximately 140 instances where the construction is translated by other means. In the first case, the Polish original has two constructions with 菪o next to each other, one of which is translated using  κь + dative and the other  đỏo + genitive:

(108) Ci gdy przypłynęli  do vyścia Dunayskiego/ ciągnęli wzwodę swoie navy/ аž przyżegłowali  do uścia Sawu y Drawu rzek/ potym Sawem rzeką pod gory Włoskie Alpes przyszli (Stryjkowski 1582: 96)

тін пришед  к  дільсько дійанському влекоша вверхъ воды карабли свои, таж приїдоща  до устья рькъ Савы и Дравы, потом рекою Савою под горы волоське алпийскіе приїдоща (Slav 26, fol. 164r)
The other occurrence has final meaning, and the local construction in the same sentence is translated using ęb + accusative:

(109) Holha też iako obiecalą/ z Kijowską Slachtą/ mężami do bitwy prze-bránymi/ ná čas náznačzony/ do Choroscienia przyiachal (Stryjowski 1582: 123)

Олта же яко обеща с киевскою шляхтою, с вой до бою избран-ными на время назначеннее в Хоростын прывиде (Slav 26, fol. 203r)

In the translation of sample chapters B, as a contrast, the construction occurs frequently, 21 times, but the Polish counterpart is also translated by other means 33 times. The following is a typical example, where the great dependence of the translation on the original is also shown by the large share of lexical cognates:

(110) wyjechał z Monasteru Pinskię/ do Nowogrodzká/ á potym zebrawszy się z Nowogrodzany w Xiażyczem potcie ruszył się do Kiernóvá/ gdzie go wszyscy Pánowie/ Boiáre/ y Pospolstwo […] przyieli (Stryjowski 1582: 338)

выеъхал из миств ринской до Новгородка, а посемь собравши с новгородчаны в книжонпочт, двигнáся до Кернова гдево всь господа бояря ть пыспольство […] приняша (Slav 27, fol. 32r)

In example (111), the construction of the Polish verb is transferred into Russian. Nawiedzać do + genitive was acceptable in 16th-century Polish, but historical dictionaries do not give any examples of посецати do in Russian:

(111) iż ktobykolwieck wtorego dniá Miesiącá Czerwca nawiędzał do Kościolá Sendomierskiego Páanny Maríey (Stryjowski 1582: 333)

чтоб хто ни есть второго дня месяца ѣоня посъеда до костела сендомирского приетые дьвы Марий (Slav 27, fol. 20v)

The sample chapters from segment C offer only seven examples of do used in this manner in the Russian translation, as opposed to nearly 60 cases where the construction is translated by other means. The following is one of the seven occurrences:

(112) Przeto skoro Olgerd do Wilńy przyiachal z Moskiewskiey wyprawy/ ná przełożenie słuszny skárgi Gąstółtowey dal sciąć pięć set Wilnowcow (Stryjowski 1582: 424)

tого ради кой часъ Олгердъ до Вилны с московского походу прии́де, на предложение праведная жалобы Гостодовон повель. Ф. виленцовъ въкьнёти (Slav 27, fol. 185r)
The translation of sample chapters D contains 12 instances of this use of *do*, whereas the corresponding Polish construction is translated in other ways approximately 100 times. In example (113), two different translations are used close to each other, one in the main text and one in a marginal note (marked by asterisks). In another similar case, however, on fol. 307v, *do* is used both in the main text and in the margin.

(113) Przeto Pánowie Koronni w niebytności Krolewskiej posłali do Węgier Janá Laskiego Arcibiskupą Gnieznińskiego/ y Krystophá Szydłowieckiego woiwodę Krákowskiego *Posłowie Polscy do Węgier* (Stryjkowski 1582: 749)

tого ради корѣнные в небытій королевское послані к венграхъ
Ана Льскара арцябископа гнезинского и Криштофа Шидловьского воводу краковскому *послы полскіе до венгров* (Slav 28, fol. 298v)

The following is another example of two different translations in close vicinity to each other:

(114) A potym tegoż Roku odiáchal Króle Sigmunt z Litwy do Polski ná Siem Piotrkowski/ ktery odpráviwszy/ iáchal do Krákowá (Stryjkowski 1582: 756)

a потом того ж году отъехал король Жигмѳнтъ с Литвы до Полши на сеймъ петковскии которои соверший поѣхал в Краковъ (Slav 28, fol. 311v)

To sum up, all sets of sample chapters contain instances of this syntactic polonism, and it is especially frequent in segment B. It is difficult to say if the occurrences of the construction are due to the influence of the Polish original or the translators’ own usage, or both. A tentative guess would be that in the chapters where it occurs only sporadically, these instances are due to carelessness in translation, whereas in segment B, where it occurs frequently, it may have been part of the translator’s language.

5.4.2.2 Necessity expressed by imët’i + infinitive

The modality of necessity in the Slavic languages has some qualities that have made it a subject of study in several articles (e.g. Besters-Dilger 1997, 2005; Hansen 2000). The earliest stages of the Slavic languages did probably not have an auxiliarized expression of necessity. In OCS, for instance, all words that conveyed a sense of necessity or obligation – aside from the most common way of expressing necessity, the construction *dative + infinitive* – also had a lexical meaning and were restricted syntactically, which disqualifies them from being fully-fledged modal auxiliaries (Hansen 2000: 86–90).
Many of the Slavic languages filled this gap in the system of modals, so
to speak, by borrowing the German müssen, among them (before the 14th
century) Polish, where it took the form musiće (Hansen 2000: 80–82).
Through Polish influence on Ruthenian, the verb was adopted by the prostma
(Besters-Dilger 2005: 239–240, 247), and eventually by Ukrainian and
Belorussian, which still use the verbs мусити and мусять, respectively

The spread of the Polish construction mieć + infinitive, which expresses a
weaker necessity than musiće, is less obvious. In OCS, the verb мышь had
three functions: it expressed possession, modality (of necessity or possibi-
lishy) and future. By the 17th century, the use of this future-tense construction
in Russian texts was a clear sign of Church Slavonic influence (Moser 1998:
330–331).

In Polish, the modal meaning seems to have been present even in the ear-
liest preserved texts, which can be illustrated with a very well-known ex-
ample from the Kazania gnieźnieńskie (late 14th century), where it is found as a
gloss for musiće (Besters-Dilger 1997: 23–24). There are also plenty of Ru-
thenian examples from the 16th century where this construction expresses
deontic necessity. Russian interference texts from the 16th and 17th centuries
often contain this construction, which points to it being a syntactic polonism,
although it cannot be excluded that the influence came from Ruthenian

The examples below will be divided into three types: future (or future
preterite) meaning, counterfactual meaning (cancelled future preterite) and
modal meaning (deontic or epistemic). Epistemic meanings have not been
widely discussed in previous literature. It is often hard to distinguish the
modal use from the future meaning that was influenced by Church Slavonic,
and classification can sometimes be difficult. The meaning of the verb is
often determined and emphasized by words in the context. To enable the
reader to verify the classification, page and folio references to all examples,
even those that are not quoted, are given below in the form (118–26: 195v),
which should be read as (Stryjkowski 1582: 118 vs. Slav 26, fól. 195v).

Only мышь is studied in Moser’s monograph, but below, the different
ways of translating both musiće and mieć in all sample chapters will be
listed, since both constructions open possibilities for polonisms.

Constructions with musiće
The Polish original of the sample chapters from segment A contains six oc-
currences of musiće. In the translation, the modal is omitted and a finite form
of the main verb used five times (118–26: 195v; 118–26: 196v; 134–26:
216v; 137–26: 220v; 137–26: 221r), whereas мышь is used once:

(115) A tu Czytelniku miły rzecz y porządek spraw Wlodimirzowych trochę
przerwać muszę (Stryjkowski 1582: 143)
The sample chapters from segment B have only one occurrence of Polish *musieć*, which is translated with a modal construction using the verb *dолженствовать*:

(116) A gdy Litwa most ná Preglu zbudowalá/ s kteorego do Zamku sturmowali/ wiele ich zbitych strzelbá od Krzyżakow poleglo/ tak iż *musielí* od obłęzenia odciagnac (Stryjkowski 1582: 332)

а егда Литва мост на Прегле устроила с которого к городу пристгпали много их збитых стрельбо от крыжаков полегло, так что *должествовали* от осады отить (Slav 27, fols. 17v–18r)

In sample chapters C, the Polish construction with *musieć* occurs once and is translated with *принуждение*:

(117) Teodricus z Aldemburgu Mistrz Pruski [...] w ciągnal do Litwy Zimie [...] ale gdy się Litwa i Zmódz stale bronilá/ obaczywszy prożną pracę/ u usilowanie swoje daremne/ także utratę w ludziach pod często przegrany-mi szturmami/ *musial* się do Prus wrocić (Stryjkowski 1582: 426–427)

Θεόδοριτις α Αλένσβργα μαγιστρά προσκύνη [...] вниде в Литвъ зимою [...] но егда Литва и Жмойд мъежественно защищашъся, уразьмьъся тщетный тьд и 8церствованье свое праздное, також гибель людемъ в частых пристгпех, *принуждение* возвратитись в Прось (Slav 27, fol. 191r)

Sample chapters D have seven occurrences of *musieć* in the Polish original. In the translation, the construction is replaced with a finite form of the main verb five times (752 – 28: 305v; 753 – 28: 307r; 755 – 28: 311r; 756 – 28: 311v; 758 – 28: 316v) and translated with *должень* once (762 – 28: 323v). Once, it is slightly altered in that the modal is removed and a finite verb used instead, but it is not a direct translation of the verb in the Polish original:

(118) Mikołaj Fierler z Dąbrowie Hetman wielki Koronny z Pány y z Sláchtą Ruską/ y Podolską gonił ich áż do Wisniowcá/ ále iż nie rowną widzial/ *musiał* dać pokoy. (Stryjkowski 1582: 750)

Миколай Єирле з Добровиць гетьман великий коршиний съ гдами и з шляхтою рякою и подолскою гнал ихъ даж к Вишневця но понеже неравную себе ихъ силѣ видѣлъ *отстѣпили* от нихъ (Slav 28, fols. 300r–300v)

The Polish construction *musieć* is thus sometimes translated with a finite form of another verb, sometimes with a modal construction, but never with the cognate in the sample chapters. A search of the entire online text of the
Kronika in the 1846 edition (cf. Section 1.2) and comparison with ms. U reveals that of the 190 hits for forms of musieć, only one is translated by the cognate mycumu. This example does not belong to the sample chapters, but is nevertheless given below. It is, however, found in a verse section, which might mean that the translator felt bound by the rhyme:

(119) Przeto Litwinie bracie niezayrzy też Rusi/
Gdyż też są niemniey sławni zeznac kądy musi/ (Stryjkowski 1582: 247)

cego radi litwine brate ne zazri je R8ci
ponenje nemenshi slawy s8ty istinn8 wszk8 rechi m8cni
(Slav 26, fol. 368r)

Thus, modal words of different kinds sometimes occur as translations of musieć, but it is more common to use a finite form of the main verb.

Constructions with future mieć
As mentioned, mieć or im bmi as an auxiliary verb to form the future tense (or the future preterite, if the auxiliary verb is in a past tense) is an old construction that is also found in OCS, but here it occurs as a translation of the Polish cognate, which probably motivated its use. It is often difficult to draw a clear line between temporal and modal uses, but I have chosen to interpret examples as temporal if they describe something positive, intended or done voluntarily, so that obligation and necessity are less probable.

There are four cases in sample chapters A where mieć is used as a part of a future or future preterite construction, and these are all translated using im bmi. Besides the one given below, they are found on 125 – 26: 205v (close to the counterfactual example (125)), 130 – 26: 212r and 136 – 26: 220r.

(120) Drzewlanie będąc temu rądzii/ isz iusw wszzkie Xięstwa Ruskie ich Xiężęciu/ z tày wielką Małżonką będą podąne/ zà ktorym powodem nàd Russaki wzaïem/ będąc pirwey poddànymi/ Pány być mieli (Stryjkowski 1582: 123)

drevlyane je tom8 obradowavshye, yako vs8 k uninswa r8ske kîzîy ih
s tol'y velikiyu jueno poddanye bëdëť, i têmy nad rëcakamis
vzaimno bëdëtîil primo poddannymi, gëdami byty im'ëxu (Slav 26, fol. 202v)

There is one example in sample chapters B of a future preterite (future in the past), translated using the same construction. The phrase “co się y sstalo” prevents a counterfactual interpretation:

(121) Bo tâk rozumiaľ/ co się y sstalo/ iż łatwieżowie iâko do zwyçijestwâ/ tâk
do mężnej śmierci uporni/ mieli mu dâć bitwę/ choćby też y przegrâli
(Stryjkowski 1582: 339)
There are no examples in sample chapters C of this use of mieć.

The following instance from sample chapters D is an example of the future preterite, translated with the same construction:

(122) Tegoż cząssu Mendlikierę Carz Prekopski gdy był wziął żold od Krolá Sigmuntá/ y mial ciagnać zaráz z Litwą na tę woynę przeciw Moskiewskiemu/ tedy w tym chytrze postępuiąc/ położył się nie daleko od woyská Królewskiego (Stryjkowski 1582: 747)

в тóж врéме Мéндликиреи целé перекопский вýзвéл кáзну от корéлы Житигiméhta и имь́лъ и́тти в тóт жé чась с Литвою на ту войну против московского тогда в тóм хитро чина́ сталъ недалéче от воîска корóлевского (Slav 28, fol. 292v)

Thus, имь́ти is always used in the translation when the construction carries a future meaning. This was to be expected, since this use was not entirely alien to Russian.

Constructions with counterfactual mieć

If the verb mieć is part of a conditional construction with the particle by, it often has a counterfactual meaning, i.e. it points at something that was going to happen, or was supposed to happen, but did not. Events assumed to be true but that prove not to be, i.e. hearsay, are also included here. It is to some extent an additional meaning that adds to a meaning of future or obligation. Sometimes, the fact that the event did not come to pass is expressed very clearly, sometimes it can only be deduced from a wider context.

This meaning is found three times in the Polish original of sample chapters A. One of these is translated with a modal construction using имь́ти:

(123) A iżby Miásto Moskwá inszym krá́inom przezwisko od siebie dác miálá/ to nie pewna (Stryjkowski 1582: 91)

áko дабы градь Москва иным странамъ прозвание от себе даться имь́ло⁶⁸, сȋе не подлинно (Slav 26, fol. 156r–156v)

In one case, the modal verb is removed and a finite form of the main verb – which happens to be имь́ти – is used:

(124) Wsázêże y to swoio mniemáenie/ y ono żebы od Twiskoná/ mieli początek mieć Sarmatowie samže Bielski kassie (Stryjkowski 1582: 93)

---

⁶⁸ Some mss. have имьла.
One occurrence is translated with a dative + infinitive construction. This example also contains an instance (имаши [...] поняти) that expresses intention and has been labeled as future (cf. above):

(125) y iákosz mię masz poiąć ochrziwiwszy mię sam iáko Ociec/ y názwawszy mię sobie corkę/ gdyź w zakonie Chrześcijańskim/ y u Pogánow to iest rzecz obrzydliwa y niestýchana/ áby mial ociec corkę poymowáć. (Stryjkowski 1582: 125)

In the sample chapters from segment B, there are two examples of this counterfactual construction in Polish, where the verb umbmu is used in the translation:

(126) Bo Korone otrzymawszy/ Krolem sie wszystkiewy Ruśi tytulowal/ á w Greckiey wierze (Rzymskiey zaniechawszy) po stáremu trwal/ y co mial Chrześcjan od Tatar bronie/ to ich sam przez Hetmany swoie/ y Litwę z Swarnem Sztehrzećem swoim/ á z Mendagiem Krolem Litewskim do Polski násywał. (Stryjkowski 1582: 331)

ибо обдержаў венец королемъ всея Россиї имяновася. а в греческому въре (римскому отложа, по прежнемъ пребывалъ), ѳ что ъмъ хръстяня от татър боронить, то ихъ самъ чрез гетманы свои и Литвы с Сварном племянникомъ своимъ ѳ съ Мендогомъ королемъ литовскимъ на Пола́д насылалъ (Slav 27, fol. 14v)

(127) á danią się małą okupili/ nižby mäńnie wszyscy od száble okrutnej pogáńskiye/ y z zamkiem zgináć mieli (Stryjkowski 1582: 333)

а данью малюю оккупилися нежели бывя все от сабли мьчительской поганской и з городомъ погибн̄ти ъмьля (Slav 27, fol. 19r)

Sample chapters C show three instances of the construction, two of which are translated with umbmu and one with a dative + infinitive. They all express hearsay:

(128) A iesliby się tu komu rzecz niepodobna zdálâ/ áby Olgerd z Litwą/ mial ták bez wieści pod Miásto Moskwę przychąńac z Witebska/ Tedy o tym wiedz Czytelniku miły (Stryjkowski 1582: 423)

аще ли бы комъ здѣ нен добна являлся вещь, дабы Олгердъ с Литвою имьль толь безвѣстно. изъ Витебска подъ Москвомъ прийти, вездѣ ḥбо о любымъ читателю (Slav 27, fol. 182r)
The sample chapters from segment D contain no examples of the counterfactual construction. All in all, the translations are varied, but often contain a modal element, either umbytu or a dative construction.

Constructions with modal mieć
There are several constructions with the verb mieć (often in the present tense) where the main meaning is a modal one. Several of these describe the conditions of an agreement or a promise, and although they also have a temporal aspect, the element of obligation involved in such agreements calls for a modal interpretation. There are also a few examples of epistemic necessity, i.e. something supposed.

The translation umbytu is used three times in sample chapters A, two of which are identical contexts close to each other:

(130) Bo Sławacy màią być własne y prawdziwie zwani wedlug zdania màdrych ludzi Sławakami od slawy (Stryjkowski 1582: 102)

понеже славаки имють быти своиственно и истинно реченйй по разсéждению разёмных людей словаки от славу (Slav 26, fol. 172v)

(131) iáko gdy màią mowici digna, mowiqà dina uel dinia [...] Tàkże tez gdy màią mowici Slauo Slauonía uel Slauones, mowiqà Siauo, Siauonia, y Siaui (Stryjkowski 1582: 103)

внегда бо имёть гѓолати, дигна, говорят дина, или диния [...] сиже же егда имёть гѓолати, славо, славонія, или славонескь, гѓолоть сиявоонїа, сияво, и сияви (Slav 26, fols. 174r–174v)

Once, the Polish construction mieć + infinitive is translated with the particle чать ‘probably,’ etymologically an infinitive (cf. Pennington 1980: 264), that expresses epistemic modality:

(132) y Powiat Radimicki Polskiego Xięstwà (ma być podobno Radomski) podbìt pod swoię moc (Stryjkowski 1582: 132)
In the Polish original of sample chapters B, there are two instances of the construction with *mieć* in a modal sense. One of them is found in close vicinity of the counterfactual example (126). In both cases, the same construction is used in Russian:

(133) Tegoż Daniela znowu w Drohiczynie ná Krolestwo Ruskie koronowáli/ á wzieli od niego przysięge/ iž opuściwszy Ceremonie Greckie/ tak on sam/ iako wszystek narod Ruski/ *miał* Kosciola Rzymskiego wiernie á szczzerze *násladowáć* (Stryjkowski 1582: 331)

(134) W czym Sabinom/ Samnitow/ Weinentom/ Equom/ Campanom/ Kartagénencykom/ Spartenom *ad* Termopillas, y inszym razmáitnym narodem [...] przyrownáni á snaše y sowito w Rycerskich dziełnościach nád nich przełożeni *być mâiąą* (Stryjkowski 1582: 340)

There are six occurrences in the Polish text of sample chapters C of *mieć* expressing modality. One is in a marginal note that has been omitted in the translation. Three are translated into Russian using *имѣть*:

(135) Suriwil (podobno *ma być* Swidrigel) (Stryjkowski 1582: 425)

Стрѣвилъ, чако *имать быти* Свидригиле (Slav 27, fol. 188r)

(136) Czego gdy Xiaże Constantin Kriotowicz niechciał uczyniĉ/ áni ná to poz-wolić/ áby *mial* wiáru *odmieniáć*/ wągárdził (powiádájâ Látopiszce) successiá ná Krolestwo Polske (Stryjkowski 1582: 427)

кѣ̆нно жъ Костянтинь сотворити сего не хотявъ, ниже на то соизволити, дабы *имѣлъ* върѣ *пременяти* пренебреже (глѣ̆дьют летописцы), наслѣдие королевства полскаго (Slav 27, fol. 193v)

(137) zgodził się/ iž Yurgi Narimuntowic *miał* do pewnego czássu ná Krzemieńcu *pánować* (Stryjkowski 1582: 429)

---

69 The other half of the parenthesis is missing in Slav 26, but is present in, for instance, mss. B and N.
In one case, the translation omits the modal verb and uses a finite form of the main verb:

(138) postępując nakładów wojennych nagrodę/ záchovanie státteckého pokoju raz potwierdzonego/ y gráncie z Litwą takie iákieby słusné byť miály/ y nó kýchy Olgerd z rycerstwem swoim przestánie. (Stryjkowski 1582: 421)

обещая 8быткоэ воинскихъ воздаяние сохранение постоянного мир8, единожды подтвержденного, и предъы с Литвою, таковы каковы истинные были, на которые Олгерд8 с воинствомъ его 8годны б8д8ть (Slav 27, fol. 179v)

In another instance, the verb mieć with its implication of obligation has been replaced by обещать, which conveys a similar meaning:

(139) támże przydano/ iż Krol Kážimierz y Lubárt/ mieli sobie zobopólną y wzaiemną pomoc ná kádgo nieprzyjaiciél dawáć (Stryjkowski 1582: 429)

тамже приложено, что король Казимеръ и Любартъ обещаша себя общюю и взаимною на всякого неприятеля давати помощь (Slav 27, fol. 197v)

The following examples of mieć in a modal sense occur in the Polish original of sample chapters D. They all describe agreements, and the translation always uses имѣть:

(140) A tá bylá Summá rzeczy postánowionych/ y spolne uchwalonych ná tym slawnym ziedzie [...] Przymierze też z Moskiewskim przeciw Litwie postánowione miał wypowiedzieć (Stryjkowski 1582: 748)

a то было овершенн вщени постановленныхъ и единомысленно ухваленныхъ на том славном съдѣ [...] примире тож и с московскимъ против Литвы учинное имѣъ отказать (Slav 28, fols. 294v–295r)

(141) Mistrzá tákże Pruskiego do uczynienia y wypelnienia powinności y do posłuszeństwá/ y áby Koronie Polskiej/ y Krolowi przysięga/ przywieść/ álbo go ostapić miał iáko spolnego nieprzyjaiciél (Stryjkowski 1582: 748)

мистра також пр8ского ко 8чинению и исполнению должности и к подданству и что короне полскои и королю прсягнуль привести или отступити имѣль аки от общаго неприятеля (Slav 28, fol. 295r)
In one instance, a Polish construction with *mieć* is translated using *dолженъ*. The modal meaning is made clear by the words *według postanowienia y powinności*:

(143) Potem Carz Prekopski ná Nowie Czerwcá Miesiácá/ który *miał* według postánowienia y powinności do Moskwy *wtárgnáć* (Stryjkowski 1582: 749)

Потом царь перекопский в началъ мяча июня который *долженъ* былъ противъ постановления и *должности* Москвъ нашествие *учинити* (Slav 28, fol. 299r)

The modal construction with *имьту* is thus represented in all the sample chapters, and there are also a few cases where other modal words are used.

Whereas *mieć* was regularly translated by modal words and often simply by its cognate *имьту*, Polish *musieć* was usually replaced, sometimes with modal constructions, sometimes with indicative forms. The Russian cognate *мусити* occurs only once, outside the sample chapters. The expression of necessity with *имьту* was a polonism that, as seen in these chapters, was quite frequently used in the Russian language during a certain period. The fact that *имьту* was used as a translation not only of *mieć*, but also in one case of *musieć*, shows that it was in active use.

The reason why *musieć* was replaced but *mieć* often translated by its cognate may be that *musieć* was perceived as more foreign – *имьту* existed with another meaning, but *мусити* did not. There might also be a semantic explanation. Since *musieć* expresses strong obligation, it implies that the main action referred to did indeed take place, and it can therefore be expressed without a modal construction in the translation. Weak obligation, as expressed with *mieć*, may tend towards a counterfactual meaning, or does at least not imply as strongly that the action took place, and therefore a modal is needed in the translation as well.

5.4.2.3 The accusative with infinitive

The accusative with infinitive (*accusativus cum infinitivo*, abbreviated *aci*) is a syntactic construction well known from Latin and Greek, in which the subject of a subordinate clause is in the accusative case and the verb in the infinitive. The construction arose in Polish as a calque from Latin. According to K. Długosz-Kurczabowa and S. Dubisz (2006: 474), this construction
was rare in 15th-century Polish, because translations from Latin were often made with Czech texts as support in that period, but from the 16th century, as more translations were made without the help of Czech texts, the frequency of *aci* constructions grew. It declined in the 18th century, as the influence of Latin became weaker (Klemensiewicz et al. [1955] 1981: 436).

K. Pisarkowa (1984: 152–154) emphasizes the frequency of examples with the verb *być* in contexts where it is actually redundant. In such cases, the accusative in the construction is usually a reflexive *się*. This use of the *aci* is not found in classical Latin, but was a Polish innovation. In some cases, the infinitive *być* is not overtly expressed, but D. Ostaszewska still counts these as an “incomplete” (*niepełne*) variety of the construction (Burzywoda et al. 2002: 270–271). Such examples have not been counted below, only occurrences where the infinitive is expressed.

In Church Slavonic, the *aci* could occur as a calque from Greek (Uspešnaskij 2002: 256–257). It could also originate in supine constructions, which expressed finality. In later East Slavic texts, however, it was rarely used in such contexts, and was instead the result of Polish influence. This can be seen by the fact that it spread earlier in Ruthenian than in Russian, and that it was typical of interference texts (Moser 1998: 182–202).

The original text of sample chapters A contains 31 instances of the *aci*, either in Polish or in Latin. 23 of these are translated using the same construction. In the majority of cases, the infinitive is *być*, as in example (144), but there are a few exceptions, such as example (145):

(144) Albertus záś Crantius Niemiecki Historyk mieni być názwanych Słowa-

kow od wielamowności słow (Stryjowski 1582: 102)

аАлбeртъ же Крaнтъи немецки повьстникъ глаголеть быти

реченныхъ славакoвъ от многорчая словъ (Slav 26, fol. 172v)

(145) á potym według swego rachunku roku od stworzenia Światá 6370. Xiążąt

Wareckich trzech Bratow rodzonych/ Rurika/ Trurowa y Sinaussa w

Xięstwach swoich […] pānować piszą. (Stryjowski 1582: 89)

потомъ же по своему щету в льто от создания мира итіто, Кнези

варяговъ трех братов Рюрика, Тривора, и Синавса, в

княжествах своихъ […] гёдрствовати пишт (Slav 26, fol. 153v)

However, there are also a few examples of some other construction being used in the translation instead: a gerund, a prepositional phrase or a subordinate clause.

Sample chapters B have only one instance of a Polish *aci*. The same construction is used in the translation.

In sample chapters C, the Polish original contains two instances of the *aci*. In both cases, the translation has the same construction. There is also one instance of a subordinate clause in the Polish original that corresponds to
an *aci* in the Russian translation, which shows that this construction could be used independently of the Polish original:

(146) Witółtowi Synowcowi iego przypissu niebacznie/ niepátrząc w tey mier-ze rożnosti czassow/ y prawdziwego doswiadczenia istotney rzeczey y porządku lat/ Bo **mniąją by tylko ieden Witold** w Litwie **byl slawny** (Stryjowski 1582: 423)

Витолдї племяннику его безразсъдино приписываютъ, невзирая в томъ разности времени, истинного испытания самого дыла, и лътораопложения, **мнят бо единого** точию **Витолдъ** в Литвъ **быти славної** (Slav 27, fols. 181r–181v)

Sample chapters D have only one instance of a Polish *aci*. It is translated using the same construction.

This polonism is thus represented in all sets of sample chapters, and the corresponding Polish or Latin construction is translated by other means only in a few instances.

### 5.4.2.4 Summary of syntactic polonisms

These three syntactic polonisms are all to be found in the translation of Stryjowski, and what is more, they are present in all four segments of the text. Table 14 shows the data for these types of polonisms in the sample chapters. The figures for *mieć* show first the counterfactual examples, then the purely modal ones, i.e. “1+2” means that one counterfactual example and two modal ones have been translated as indicated. The figure “2+1” for *aci* in sample chapters C means that the construction is used twice as a translation of *aci* and once of another construction.

**Table 14. Syntactic polonisms in the sample chapters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>do → do</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do → other</td>
<td>ca. 140</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>ca. 60</td>
<td>ca. 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mieć → имѣти</td>
<td>1+2</td>
<td>2+2</td>
<td>2+3</td>
<td>0+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mieć → other</td>
<td>2+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1+2</td>
<td>0+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aci → aci</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2+1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aci → other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the reservation that some of the constructions are much more frequent than others in the Polish original, the table indicates that the use of the construction *do* + genitive in Russian was avoided to a higher degree than the other syntactic polonisms. Possible explanations for this could be either that it was perceived as more foreign, and therefore generally avoided even in the segments that otherwise use a large share of polonisms, or that it was easier
to avoid than the other constructions, in the sense that substitution of a preposition is easier than changing the other constructions.

The sample chapters from segment A avoid syntactic polonisms to a higher degree than the others. Although the aci is frequent in these chapters, there are other ways of translating the construction as well. The three remaining sets of sample chapters do not present other solutions for the aci. B and D tend to translate modal mieć with umińmu. Segment B has a far larger share of Russian do + genitive than the others, and must therefore be said to be the richest in syntactic polonisms. As will be discussed in Section 6.9, segment B is also characterized by lexical polonisms of the active category.

5.5 Comparison of text passages

To catch elements of the translation technique that have not been covered in the sections above, parallel passages will be shown and discussed. I have chosen passages where the translation differs more than usual from the original.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stryjkowski 1582: 129–130</th>
<th>Slav 26, fol. 211v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ták tedy Iaropolk Swadoltowá rádą poduszczyony/ podniósł woynę ná Brátá/ y porázil woysko iego Drewlanskie/ á Olech sámo Xiązę uciekájac z pogromu ná Zamek swoy Waraž (według Mie-chouiussa) niemiół sie wćisnąć przed wielkim tumultem Ludu uciekájacego.</td>
<td>Сище ж Еропольк по совěт8 Свадольтов8 подущень подя войн8 на брата, и вой его древлянские поби, Олех же 8шед з бою (по Меховию) множества ради народа бежащих с тогож бою, не возможно вгнести во град свой Варяж.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The translation of Swadoltowá rádą poduszczyony is not quite correct. The translator evidently began by changing this construction into по совěт8 Свадольтов8, but then added подущень as a translation of the Polish participle.

The word order in the translation of porázil woysko iego Drewlanskie has been changed in that the verb has been moved to the end. Also, the noun has been transferred to the plural (the spelling with ń is only an orthographical trait and does not indicate a singular ending), perhaps because the Polish adjective has an identical form for the neuter singular and the plural.

The attribute samo Xiązę has not been translated.

The constituents from á Olech onwards have changed places in the Russian translation. The relation between finite verbs and participle forms has been preserved, but the information about the crowds is given before the information of where Oleg was going. Also, the information с тогож бою has been added by way of explanation.
Here, the two participles ubieżawszy and opánowawszy have been replaced by the finite verb видите, which does not express the process of conquering. This is instead expressed in the temporal по взя́ти́и града.

The location под мостом is left out of the translation, as is the explanation зá ukazá́nim iednego Drewlaníна. The Polish relative clause in which these elements occur is transformed into a main clause, coordinated with the preceding one with the conjunction у.

The Polish original continues with the participle construction kazawszy [...] пры́ня́сть, whereas in the Russian version, the finite form принесо́ша is used instead.

Then the Russian translation calls Jaropolk by name again. The Polish gerund пáтрzáц is turned into the aorist видě́, which might have been a scribal error but for the fact that all consulted manuscripts show this reading. The constituents rzekł do Swadołta and пáтрzáц ná trup Braterski have changed places in the translation.

The Polish impersonal construction go pochowáno is changed to по́гребо́ша его.
Here, the Polish participle pośilony in the first clause is replaced by the ger-
und спереться in Russian. The word order in the main clause has been altered
by bringing the verb to the front.

The clause á gdy mu iaropelk niesmiał polá stáwić has not been trans-
lated, but it is difficult to say if this is because the translator was inattentive
or because he did not know the expression pole stawić ‘to give battle.’

The phrase Wlodimirz tež Kijowá ušilnie dobywał has been slightly sim-
plified. In the following phrase, an accusative with infinitive has been altered
to an infinitive construction.

The word order in the presentation of Blud has been changed, so that in-
stead of his name coming first and then the explanation of who he is, as in
Polish, it is the other way around in Russian.

The relation between main and subordinate clauses has been changed, so
that instead of the verb sequence zowić […] obiecuć […] prośił, the Rus-
sian translation has нарицая [...] посла [...] моля. The end of the sentence
has been simplified.

5.6 Chapter summary

This chapter has been devoted to the translation of the Kronika as a target
text in relation to its source text. Against the background of explicit and im-
plicit translation theory in connection with early Russian texts, some aspects
of the translation were highlighted.

As a parallel to an earlier study by S. I. Nikolaev, the translation of a
number of verse sections was studied. They differed as to their adherence to
rhyme and syllable count.

Obvious departures from the source text were discussed, such as omis-
sions, additions, the numerous instances where two Polish near-synonyms
were expressed by only one Russian word and cases where Polish names or
measurements were adapted to Russian practice. The latter procedure (do-
mestication) shows that the translators were capable of identifying informa-
tion that would not be understood by a Russian reader and adapting it, i.e.
their strategy was acceptability-oriented.

The influence of Polish on Russian – possibly mediated by Ruthenian –
was quite significant at the time when this translation was made. Therefore,
the occurrence of polonisms (lexical or syntactic) may characterize either
this text or the language of the time in general. Historical dictionaries, edi-
tions of other texts and the works of earlier scholars were used as material to
try to solve this question.

The lexical influence was discussed on the basis of words that have been
crossed out in ms. B, probably because they were cognates to the words in
the Polish original. Two monographs on this subject were also used to iden-
tify polonisms. The studied words were characterized as very active, active
or passive in relation to the Russian language of the time. The very active
words can be said to reveal Polish influence on the language in general,
since these words were already integrated into Russian, whereas the active
words are more indicative of the influence on this particular text, since
words from this group were used by some translators and not by others and
otherwise occurred mainly in interference texts.

The results regarding some individual words were contrary to expecta-
tion. For instance, in ms. B an instance of the word издавна, found many
times in the translated Kronika and attested in dictionaries and sources, has
been changed to исконо, a word that is not found anywhere else. The oc-
currence here of доказати is two decades earlier than those previously
documented. The word предок is used here so regularly that it was catego-
rised as very active, contrary to the statement by S. Kochman that it was not
in general use before the 18th century.

Three syntactic structures, identified by previous scholars as polonisms,
were also studied. The use of до + genitive with a local but not limitative
meaning is found in all sets of sample chapters, but the corresponding Polish
construction is more often translated with the expected в + accusative or к +
dative. The translation of modal мієч as имвті also occurs in all sets of
sample chapters and is either dominant or occurs in equal proportions with
alternative translations. In connection with this, the translation of Polish
мусієч was discussed. The accusative with infinitive, or aci, is also found in
all sets of sample chapters, although some have very few occurrences. Only
in one segment are other solutions to translate this construction sometimes
found.

The sample chapters from segment B have the highest frequency of (ac-
tive) lexical and syntactic polonisms. The differences between the segments
in this regard will be discussed more closely in Chapter 6.
6 Variation between different segments

As mentioned in Section 1.3, the text of the translated *Kronika* can be divided into segments according to the distribution of verbal tenses referring to past events. Table 1 from that section is repeated here as Table 15.

*Table 15. Division of the chronicle into segments according to dominant tenses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Dominant tenses</th>
<th>Segment label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I–VI</td>
<td>Aorist/imperfect</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII–X</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI–XIV</td>
<td>Aorist/imperfect</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV–XXV</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chapter will be devoted to these segments and ways of distinguishing between them. The indications that the translation was divided are strong, but based on the verbal tenses alone, it cannot be determined if there were two, three or four translators. Answering this question is one of the aims of this chapter. The other aim is to evaluate the criteria used for distinguishing between translators and discussing their usefulness for this and other similar studies.

6.1 Previous studies on authorship attribution

The field of authorship attribution – establishing the authorship of a given text, mostly with the help of identified texts by possible authors as comparison – is well developed. Less work has been done on what could be called translation attribution, which poses slightly different problems. Many of the parameters used in authorship attribution must be ruled out when the object of study is a translation, especially if the translation is close to the original, since they are properties of the original text rather than of the translation. If they are to be used, they cannot be computed without comparing the results with the original.

According to B. M. Kloss (1980: 105–106), moreover, early Russian texts are more difficult to study in this way than modern ones, since many traits of the text were determined by the genre and theme, which led to less pro-
nounced stylistic differences between authors. The compilative character of many texts also adds to the difficulties.

In the following, I will avoid the term ‘style’ (стиль), since I consider it to be ambiguous. Kloss uses it for the sum total of an author’s individual preferences, but it also echoes Lomonosov’s three styles of language, and to avoid that association I will speak of authors’ preferences rather than their style, and use the term ‘register,’ introduced in Section 4.1.1, for ‘style’ in Lomonosov’s sense.

Despite the difficulties connected with early Russian texts, Kloss (1980: 106) gives examples of studies that have been made on chronicles, where scholars have been interested in identifying sources and learning when one scribe took over after another. He has investigated the authorship of the Nikonovskaja letopis' (16th century), comparing it with the works of some authors of the period. His methods include comparing the frequency (or existence) of certain lexemes, identifying biblical quotes preferred by the different authors, as well as observing rhetorical strategies (Kloss 1980: 112–130). The particular lexemes used in his study cannot be applied to Stryjkowski’s text, despite the fact that both are chronicles, because Kloss has chosen words from the religious sphere that are not as widely represented in the Kronika. Also, the Nikonovskaja letopis’ is more than a century older than the translation of Stryjkowski’s chronicle.

A. A. Gippius (2006) has performed a detailed study of the Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis', using the distribution of 76 parameters on different linguistic levels to determine the borders between the scribes of the manuscript from which the extant copy of this chronicle was made. The parameters were grouped into features of codicology and palaeography, graphics, orthography and phonetics, morphology, syntax, lexicon, structure and style (Gippius 2006: 129). In his work he also lists other attempts to segment chronicle language (Gippius 2006: 119–120).

When the object of the study is a translated text, some of the difficulties mentioned by Kloss are avoided. For instance, a translation is not a compilation in the sense of e.g. chronicles. Also, the presence of the original provides something with which to compare the variation. Nevertheless, I have not been able to find many such studies, at least not on early Russian texts.

E. M. Isserlin’s comparison of the six translations of Dwór cesarza tureckiego (Isserlin 1961) has already been mentioned several times (cf. especially Section 5.2.2). Its aim is slightly different, since the material consists of several translations of the same text and the author does not need to prove that there were different translators, but the methods may perhaps be applied to other texts as well.

70 «Мы бы сказали, что стиль – это определяемая задачей исследования совокупность характерных для данного писателя особенностей его творчества» (Kloss 1980: 103).
Regardless of whether one is working with an original text or a translation, one can choose criteria from different levels of the text. When working with a manuscript, the graphical and orthographical levels could be useful, but mainly when dealing with an autograph, since spelling, punctuation etc. can vary greatly between scribes. There are exceptions, such as Gippius’ above-mentioned study, in which he found that the scribe probably copied the graphics and orthography of the exemplar faithfully, so that such criteria could be used (Gippius 2006: 130–139). Many computerized methods of authorship attribution that have otherwise proved successful are problematic because they would merely show the variation between scribes, not between authors or translators. This is true of for instance the distribution of letter bigrams or trigrams, i.e. the distribution of two- or three-letter combinations (Graham, Hirst & Marthi 2005: 409–412).

Lexical markers have often been applied. In some cases, synonym pairs can be used, or the presence or absence of certain words, but it can be difficult to find enough such pairs or characteristic words to reach certainty (Mosteller & Wallace 1964: 10–14). Some factors that Isserlin (1961) noted in the aforementioned study, such as the distribution of general and specific words or the use of terminology, could probably also be used to distinguish between translators within the same text. Good results have been reached by looking at the frequency of so-called function words (Mosteller & Wallace 1964).

Morphological and syntactical factors have been less frequently applied, since they are more difficult to search for automatically, and authorship attribution is a computer-dominated field. Word bigrams and trigrams, i.e. the distribution of two- or three-word combinations, combine elements of lexicon and syntax (Juola 2006: 265–266).

6.2 The practice of dividing translations

As seen in Section 3.6.2, Sparwenfeld wrote in his copy of the chronicle that it was the work of several translators. Sobolevskij (1903: 42) mentioned, when discussing the role of Posol’skij prikaz in the translation activities of the period, that it was not unusual for larger texts to be divided between several people. There are also 17th-century documents – from Posol’skij prikaz, no less – that tell about instances of books being divided between translators.

For instance, the French text L’instruction du Roy en l’exercice de montes à cheval by A. de Pluvinell was divided into six parts of 50 folios each, which were distributed between six translators, although not all of them fulfilled their duties (SKK 1992: 242–243). Another example was the compilation Wielkie zwierciadło przykładów, originally written in Latin (Speculum magnum exemplorum) but translated into Polish and from Polish into Rus-
sian in 1675–77 (*Velikoe zercalo*). Documents reveal that it was divided into five parts, which were given to different translators (Deržavina 1965: 27–28; SKK 1992: 165–171). The manner of translation is, according to scholars, similar throughout the text and executed in a way typical of translations from *Posol'skij prikaz*, and it is therefore difficult to identify the translators. The text has probably been the object of later editorial work. The parts translated by different individuals can perhaps be determined mechanically: many “examples,” or chapters, were not translated into Russian, which may be explained by assuming that each translator only managed to translate part of his task before the work was interrupted for some reason. The gaps would in that case correspond to the breaks between translators (Deržavina 1965: 29; Walczak-Sroczyńska 1976: 504–506; SKK 1992: 244–245).

In some cases, later scholars have believed certain texts to be the works of several translators, judging not by documents, but by the character of the texts themselves. Sometimes their reasons for believing this are not stated explicitly. For instance, O. A. Djačok, who has written about translations of Guagnini’s *Sarmatiae Europeae descriptio*, claimed such a division in connection with two of the translations (one of which may be connected with *Posol'skij prikaz*). In neither case, however, can we be absolutely certain that the evidence speaks of different translators, rather than simply different scribes (Djačok 1990: 22, 29).71

Since this practice is documented, there is no reason to doubt that Sparwenfeld’s note is true, although it still remains to find a way to determine the borders between translators and characterize their different individual preferences.

### 6.3 The segments

The segments mentioned above are not completely homogeneous within themselves, even with regard to verbal tenses. There are variations that can be explained thematically, lexically, syntactically or by other factors (cf. for example Sections 4.3.1.2 and 5.3.1). However, since the dominance of the different tenses in the respective segments is so great, such factors can probably explain the variation between simplex preterites and the perfect tense only *within* the segments, not *between* them.

The variation between the segments could be a sign that several translators have been at work. The possibility that a single translator chose different linguistic means for the translation in different parts should, however, also be taken into consideration. Two well-known examples of authors switching

---

71 One of the translations is a Ukrainian translation of Guagnini that, according to Djačok (1990), was the joint work of 47 translators!
registers within their texts are Kotošichin, who used genetic Slavonicisms mainly in the historical account of the tsars in the first chapter of his text (Pennington 1980: 382–385) and when writing about icons (cf. Uspenskij 2002: 95), and Avvakum, in whose autobiography, dominated by the perfect tense, some parts with mainly doctrinal content show a higher share of aorists (Timberlake 1995: 37–38). In these texts, however, the variation is usually thematically motivated.

Even assuming that the differences between segments point to several translators, we cannot distinguish between segments A and C, and between B and D, respectively, without using additional criteria (cf. Section 1.3). To determine whether one person worked with several parts of the text, or whether all four segments were translated by different people, we need to find other factors that can express the individual preferences of the translator, and that are not too easy for a scribe to alter. If they coincide with the borders between the segments, we may assume that we have identified the borders between translators.\textsuperscript{72}

Finally, it is possible that there were more than four translators, and that there are segments in the text that happen to coincide in their use of verbal tenses and therefore have not been detected in the initial examination. This risk was inevitable when dealing with a manuscript text of this size, since it could not be searched digitally. One such possible border within the sample chapters will be discussed in Section 6.10.

6.4 The sample chapters

The Kronika is a large text, too large to be examined in its entirety in search of differences between translators. Therefore, sample chapters from each of the four segments have been chosen and compared. One set of sample chapters is IV: 1–3, which are the object of the edition. For comparison, three consecutive chapters from each of the other segments have been chosen. The only criterion was that they had to be written in prose in the Polish original, since the translation of verse seems to differ from the translation of prose, at least as far as verbal tenses for past events are concerned (cf. Section 5.3.1). Table 16 shows the selected sample chapters, the approximate number of

\textsuperscript{72} It is not entirely certain that the borders between the segments lie precisely along chapter boundaries. For instance, one would assume that the easiest place to divide a book would be along the quires, if the book itself was taken apart and distributed to the translators. The borders mentioned here do not coincide with quire boundaries, book VII beginning on the third leaf in a quire and books XI and XV on the fourth leaves of their respective quires, all in quires that contain six leaves. Books VII, XI and XV all begin on a right-hand page, however, so that division could still have been made at these boundaries. The consulted copies of the Kronika all have the same quire boundaries.
words they contain (in the translation) and the headings of the chapters or – for chapters that do not have a heading – a short characterization of what they are about.

Table 16. The sample chapters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Sample chapters</th>
<th>No. of words</th>
<th>Headings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A       | IV: 1–3        | 18,160       | IV: 1 The writing systems of the Slavic peoples. The origins of the name Moskwa.  
IV: 2 О производь славного народа рѣского, словенского, сармацкого, и для чего речени сѣть славане  
IV: 3 О бѣлой и черной Роси,  
Восточныхъ, полѣношныхъ, и о полѣдненныхъ народахъ древнихъ, и ихъ князьяхъ великоногородскихъ,  
изборскихъ псковскихъ бѣлоозерскихъ киевскихъ лѣцкихъ володимирскихъ вольскихъ галицкихъ подгорскихъ, подолѣсскихъ и иныхъ |
| B       | VIII: 3–5      | 5,390        | VIII: 3 Сѣ коронований сѣтбомъ на королевство рѣское  
Даниила Романовича литовскаго, галицкаго,  
владимирскаго дрогицкаго, и прочанъ, кнѣзъ лѣта от  
Христа „аѣм.р“[1246] а посему „аѣлг.ѣ“[1253]  
VIII: 4 О разоренѣн сѣтбомъ Мазовѣчъ черезъ Литвѣ и Рѣскъ  
лѣта „аѣлг.ѣ“[1262] и о всенарѣн Семовѣта кнѣзь  
VIII: 5 Воиселѣкъ или Волстинникъ ей Мендога  
короля бѣдѣчѣ первовѣн закономъ закона рѣскаго из  
mистрия яко Казимерь первыя полскія на великое  
княжество литовское и жмовдикое избранный ѵ  
воѣѣшненилъ лѣта „аѣлѣ“[1264] |
| C       | XII: 3–5       | 5,120        | XII: 3 О городѣ охвате Дмитрея Сьмечка великого  
кнѣза московскаго Олегра и великимъ княжествѣ  
литовскомѣ посланомъ и о отданіѣ великоденнаго  
ѣйца лѣта „аѣлѣв. [1332]  
XII: 4 О разореніѣ Мазовѣчи оѣт Литвы и преславной  
храбрости литовской вѣнца ополченѣкъ крыжакомъ в  
городѣ Пскенѣ лѣта „аѣлѣв. [1336]  
XII: 5 завладѣніѣ рѣскія странѣ великимъ  
Казимеромъ королемъ полскимъ, и о умрѣнѣ его с  
кнѣзь литовскими лѣта „аѣлѣ“.[1340] |
| D       | XXIV: 3–5      | 7,380        | XXIV: 3 The Congress of Vienna in 1515.  
XXIV: 4 О разореніѣ земель рѣскія чрезъ татары и о  
войнѣ рѣскомъ  
XXIV: 5 О коронаціѣ Жигмѣнта Аѣлѣста великаго  
кнѣзь литовскаго на королѣство полскіе лѣта „аѣлѣ[1530] |

6.5 Parameters for comparison

Based on what was said in the beginning of this chapter, the parameters with which to compare the segments may be chosen from different linguistic levels, and the choice depends in part on the type of text. In this case, the deci-
sive properties of the material are that it is a 17th-century Russian text, preserved in manuscripts and translated from another language.

The first property forms the basis for the primary division of the text into segments, since during this time there were different registers that could be used in written language (cf. Section 4.1.1). The choice of verbal tenses for past events can be said to be determinative of the register chosen by the author or translator. In 17th-century texts, other morphological variables tended to follow this distribution, according to the so-called principle of register harmony (Timberlake 1995: 26; Živov 2004: 155). Even when they did not coincide fully, there was often a tendency towards a certain distribution of different variables. Thus, for example, the use of -mu and -mb in the infinitive of verbs followed much the same pattern as the distribution of verbal tenses and would say little about individual preferences (cf. Živov 2004: 181–182). Such register-dependent variations are therefore not suitable parameters for this study.

Because of the second property, that it exists only in manuscripts, it is important not to use criteria that vary between scribes. By comparing the different manuscripts, a number of criteria can easily be ruled out. For instance, orthographic variation does not help in identifying the translators. Some morphological factors, such as the plural adjective endings discussed in Section 4.2.3.1, can also be seen to vary between manuscripts, and are unsuitable for this reason. An exception to the rule about orthographic variants may be the spelling of foreign names. One could imagine that foreign toponyms and anthroponyms, not well known in Russian, may be transcribed differently by different translators and not changed deliberately by later scribes who were not acquainted with the names. Therefore, the transcription of names will be studied in Section 6.6.

The third characteristic of the text, the fact that it is a translation, might prove more helpful. This makes it possible not only to count the occurrences of certain words, a method which in itself has been seen to yield good results when applied to other languages (Mosteller & Wallace 1964: 10–14), but to compare the ways of translating words from the original. Here, pairs of synonyms or near-synonyms can be useful. If a Polish word had two translations into Russian, which were more or less synonymous, the use of one or the other of these could tell something about the preferences of the translator. In connection with the work on the edition, it was established that variation between manuscripts in this regard is very rare, which means that the choice of words is that of the translators, not of the scribes. It is of course important to bear in mind that some lexical pairs may have been dependent on register harmony, as some were associated with Russian and some with Church Slavonic. This must be judged from case to case. Sections 6.7.1, 6.7.2, 6.7.3 and 6.7.4 deal with sets of synonyms.
Usually, it is said that the less meaning a word carries, the more suitable it is for studies such as this one, since it will be more topic-independent (Mosteller & Wallace 1964: 17; Juola 2006: 242, 265). This means that conjunctions and prepositions would be preferable. However, there were in many cases parallel sets of conjunctions, some of which were used as markers of bookishness (cf. Kijanova 2010), and this group of words has therefore not been used to a great extent. The occurrence of the preposition do in contexts not typical for Russian, which has been dealt with in Section 5.4.2.1, rather belongs to the syntax.

Syntactic criteria can be difficult to apply, partly because they may be dependent on the register rather than on individual preferences, partly because it can be difficult to find a significant number of them in a reasonable amount of text. The translation of Polish pluperfect is treated below, but certain other syntactic features that have been discussed elsewhere in this study and seen to vary between segments, such as the dative absolute (Section 4.3.5), are probably connected to register harmony and therefore not suitable for this purpose.

In the following sections, tables with the numbers of occurrences of different words or forms will be shown. It should be noted that they represent the distribution in those parts of the original that were actually translated. That is to say, an occurrence in a marginal note or paragraph that was left out of the Russian translation is not listed at all in the table, whereas the notification “translation: none” means that that particular word or construction was left out, even though the surrounding text was translated. The entry “translation: other” may mean that the whole context was rewritten so that no single word can be said to correspond to the one under discussion, or that the word used in the translation is so isolated that it has not been necessary or possible to include it. In some cases, such translations are commented on in the text.

6.6 Anthroponyms, toponyms and ethnonyms

Whereas the study of lexical or syntactic variation is a question of finding different target-language correspondences to one source-language element, studying the transcription of names in the translation of the Kronika involves an element of generalizing. Since the sample chapters deal with such different periods of time and different places, it is natural that the same names do not occur in all sample chapters. Instead, one must search for patterns, and therefore, before turning to the sample chapters, a categorization of the names must be made according to the questions we wish to answer.
6.6.1 Categories of names

The text contains names of different origin. Presumably, Russian names would be more easily recognized by the Russian translator than foreign names and therefore easier to transcribe correctly. Greek and Latin names – and other foreign names as well – may not have been well known to a Russian scribe. Therefore, looking at the way the names were transcribed might provide some information about the translators, their different strategies and possible mistakes.

Maria Karplukówna, in her monograph on Stryjkowski’s language, has devoted a chapter to Ruthenian influence on his language, which is noticed primarily in his treatment of Russian and Ruthenian words and names (Karplukówna 1977: 43–70). Her results have been taken into account when examining how these names were then transcribed back into Russian.

Polish or other Slavic names that have a Russian equivalent could either be transcribed or “translated,” i.e. the corresponding Russian name could be used. They do not always refer to Polish people; what matters here is the form of the name. A person who translated from Polish would probably be familiar with both the Polish and the Russian form of the name, and individual choices could become apparent in this category.

Latin forms abound, since the (mainly) Polish text of the Kronika is interspersed with Latin elements, longer quotes as well as the names of Stryjkowski’s sources (authors and their books). Latin names and Latin forms of other foreign names were declined either with Latin endings, and in such cases usually additionally marked by being printed in an antiqua typeface, or with Polish endings, in which case they were printed in blackletter together with the rest of the text. Polish names occur either in their Polish form or Latinized. This is connected to the fact that Polish authors often wrote in Latin and were probably well known in Poland by the Latin forms of their names. The important feature here is again not the nationality of the bearer of the name, but the Latin ending. Greek endings are treated in the same way as Latin ones.

In Polish, as in most Western European languages, Latinized forms of Greek names were and are used. Russian, on the other hand, had borrowed these names directly from the Greek, which meant that the Russian transcription reflected a later Greek pronunciation. Therefore, the Russian and the Polish ways of transcribing the names differed (cf. Uspenskij 2002: 449). Sobolevskij (1903: 79–80) mentioned Greek names as a criterion for describing the translation of the Kronika. He stated that the translator of 1673–79 knew Greek, because he sometimes used Greek versions of names, whereas there were no Grecisms in the 1688 translation. It may be interesting to see if this applies to the different segments in equal degree.

In the Polish original, the spelling of many Russian (and other) names varies. This is probably due to the fact that Stryjkowski used sources in dif-
ferent languages, primarily Polish, Latin and Russian. Variation in the original does not always coincide with variation in the translation.

To sum up, four questions can be posed: How are Russian names transcribed? Are other Slavic names transcribed, or have the translators chosen the corresponding Russian names? How are Latin and Greek endings treated? How are Greek names transcribed?

6.6.2 The transcription of names in the sample chapters

The types of names included in this part of the study are anthroponyms, toponyms and ethnonyms, including adjectives derived from these. They are divided into groups according to the questions posed above. Other frequent names or names worthy of comment are also discussed, as well as the treatment of parallel name forms.

Ms. U has been used as material for all sample chapters, but in segment A, other manuscripts have been consulted for comparison. For the other segments, this has only been done in isolated instances.

6.6.2.1 Transcription in segment A

Russian names

In chapter IV: 3, tales from early Russian chronicle tradition are told, such as the arrival of the Varangians and the reigns of Rurik, Igor, Olga, Svjatoslav and Vladimir. Therefore, numerous names associated with Russian tradition (although partly of Scandinavian origin) occur in segment A, many of them several times. Some names have unexpected forms in Polish, but the translator has transcribed many of them according to Russian tradition. The names, in normalized forms, are listed below in alphabetical order according to the Latin alphabet. The conclusions from this section will be repeated and discussed in Section 7.5, with an emphasis on the possible influence from chronicle language. Here, the primary goals are to see if the translator has been consistent even when the original is not, and if so, which form he has chosen.

_Dir_ (the brother of Askold) is spelled in several different ways in the Polish original: usually _Dzir_, with two instances each of _Dyr_ and _Dir_. The spelling in the Russian translation varies between _Диръ_ (two times, once for _Dir_ and once for _Dzir_) and _Дыръ_ (eight times, once for _Dir_, mostly for _Dyr_ and _Dzir_). This shows that in the case of this name, the translator did not use one form consistently, but neither does the translation reflect the Polish spelling.

_Igor_ is usually called _Ihor_ in the Polish text, but sometimes _Ikor_ or _Igor_. One instance of _Ikor_ is mentioned as a misprint in the errata list after the end of the chronicle, but there are other occurrences that have not been corrected, and in some instances, variation in spelling is intended, as is shown by such cases as _Ihor álbo Igor_ and _Ikorus álbo Igorus_ (Stryjkowski 1582: 121).
Karplukówna (1977: 58) believes that variants with $k$ may have their origins in the Ruthenian habit of writing $\kappa\varepsilon$ instead of $\varepsilon$ to indicate a non-fricative pronunciation, although she does not give any examples of this particular name with that spelling. The familiar form Игорь is always used in the Russian translation.

Jaropolk is sometimes called Jaropolk, sometimes Jaropelk in Polish, where Jaropelk is a polonized form, showing a Polish development of $\text{\&}9$, i.e. syllabic $l$ (Karplukówna 1977: 47; cf. Klemensiewicz et al. [1955] 1981: 121). There is variation in the Russian translation as well, but of a different kind: sometimes Ярополькъ, sometimes Ерополькъ. The spelling varies between manuscripts.

Oleg can refer to two persons: Rurik’s successor or Oleg Svjatoslavich. Both of them are usually called Olech in Polish and Олегъ in the Russian translation. This spelling might be the result of a fricative pronunciation of $\varepsilon$, i.e. [$\gamma$], which became voiceless [$\chi$] in word-final position. Pronouncing the letter $\varepsilon$ as a fricative was at this time characteristic of Ruthenia and of bookish pronunciation all over Russia (Uspenskij 2002: 155–159) and is still known from southern Russian dialects, Ukrainian and Belorussian. When referring to the former of the two men, this spelling occurs not only when the consonant is word-final, but also in inflected forms, e.g. Олеха. Here, as opposed to the case of Игорь, the translator seems to have followed either the Polish original or a Ruthenian norm. In the case of the latter Oleg, however, there is some variation in the Polish text, which is partly mirrored in the translation. Some Polish inflected forms seem to be forms of the feminine Olga: the first dative form in the phrase Oldze álbo Olhowi (Stryjkowski 1582: 127), the accusative forms Olhę and Holhę (Stryjkowski 1582: 129, 130) and the genitive Olhę and Holhę (Stryjkowski 1582: 132). In the translation, these forms are sometimes treated just as Olech, e.g. Олеха. In some cases, however, they are rendered as Олец (dative) and Олга (accusative and genitive). In ms. N, two instances of the genitive are altered to Олгэ.

In the Polish text, Olga is sometimes called Olha and sometimes Holha. There are also a few instances of the spelling Olcha. The initial $H$- in Holha occurs in other names and words of Ruthenian origin as well (often before the letter -o-), as well as in some words of other origin. It may be either a feature of Stryjkowski’s dialect, or an influence from Ruthenian (Karplukówna 1977: 34–35, 55–56). The second -h- or -ch- may reflect the pronunciation, just like the -ch in Olech. Despite this variation, the name is always recognized in the Russian translation as Олга. The spelling of this name thus differs from that of Oleg in being more consistent with Russian tradition.

In the name Svjatoslav, the -ja- has its origin in an old nasal vowel, which is rendered in different ways by Stryjkowski, although rarely with a Polish nasal $\varepsilon$ or $\eta$. The forms Swatosław and Swetosław probably originate in
Stryjkowski’s chronicle sources, and Swentoslaw and Swantoslaw in Polish historical works using the Latin alphabet (Karplukówna 1977: 49–50). In the Polish text of these chapters, Swentoslaw is the most common spelling. It is always transcribed Святославъ in Russian. The translator seems to have followed Russian tradition rather than the Polish original.

The name forms Wołodimierz, with pleophony, and Włodimirz, without pleophony, were used alternately by Stryjkowski, although Włodimirz is more frequent (cf. Karplukówna 1977: 44). The Russian translator wrote the name without pleophony, but with variation in the second part of the name: Владымир или Владимиръ. There is great variation between scribes (within and between manuscripts) in this regard.

The relative adjective derived from the name Moskwa has the Polish form Moskiewskie, but is always московское in the translation (cf. Karplukówna 1977: 47).

Karplukówna (1977: 49–50) notes the unusual spelling Pereaslaw, which can be found in Russian chronicles, albeit rarely. The Russian translation has Пересла́въ or Переславль. The spelling varies both within manuscripts and between them.

The Pechenegs are usually called Piecynigowie in the Polish text. Karplukówna (1977: 51) takes the spelling -nig- as an example of the Ukrainian development *ě > i. This does not, however, explain the spelling with -су-. In ms. U, this word is always spelled печения, and although this spelling dominates in other manuscripts as well, some of them also have forms such as печинеги, печиниги or печениги.

Polish and other Slavic names
When Polish name forms occurred that had a corresponding Russian form, that Russian equivalent was normally used in the translation. For instance, the name of the author himself, Maciey, was turned into Матвеи or Матфеи, Michał became Михаилъ, Миколай became Николаи. It may be noted that Ian (i.e. Jan) usually became Иоаннъ, the canonical, Church Slavonic form of the name, rather than Иванъ (Uspenskij 1969: 5–7; cf. also Sections 6.6.2.3 and 6.6.2.4). In one instance, however, it is transcribed as Янъ.

Latin and Greek endings
When dealing with Latin and Greek names or foreign names in Latin forms, the translator usually replaced the Latin and Greek endings with Russian (or Church Slavonic) ones, just as is done in modern Russian. For instance, Livius became Ливиус, Iosephus Flavius became Иосифъ Флавиус, Eneas Sylvius became Енеи Сильвиус and so on. This also holds true for the inflected forms of the names, including possessive adjectives formed with the suffix -ов-, such as in the following example:
The result of this replacement of the endings is that although the Polish original used the forms *Kuroplates* and *Kuroplat* alternately, the Russian form was always *Куроплатъ*, and the form *Кромеръ* was used for both *Cromerus* and *Cromer*.

According to the same principle, *Moises, Moisz* and *Moses* were all rendered as *Mouceu* and *Karolus* as *Карлъ*.

*Transcription of Greek names*

Greek names were usually given in Russian, not Latinized, transcription, but there is some variation. As mentioned above, Greek endings were replaced by Slavic ones. The Polish *Berosus* (from Greek Βῆροςσος) was always given as *Веросъ*, and *Mitridates* (Greek Μιθριδάτης) became *Миридатъ*. *Strabo* (Greek Στράβον), however, was alternately called *Страбонъ* (twice), *Стравонъ* (twice), and even *Стравонъ* (once), and *Herodotus* (Greek Ηρόδωτος) was written *Иродотъ* (twice) or *Геродотъ* (once).

This Grecoized way of transcribing names was sometimes even applied to names that were not Greek, such as the Latin *Publius Libo*, transcribed as *Пувлии Ливонъ*, with -е- instead of -о-, although this was supposed to be the Roman nobleman from whom the Lithuanians descended (cf. Section 2.5). Examples of such “purism,” in the words of H. Leeming (1976: 12–13), or hypercorrection, can be found in other texts as well, where words of non-Greek origin have been changed in this way. Such examples as these led Sobolevskij to believe that the translator knew Greek, although I would rather say that he knew how Greek names were to be transcribed into Russian.

*Parallel name forms*

Other patterns, not directly connected with the categories discussed above, can also be discerned in the translation. For instance, in many cases Stryjkowski used two parallel forms of a name, either from different languages, such as one Slavic and one Latin, Greek or German form, or two forms found with different spellings in different sources, where both forms could be Slavic or the origin difficult to determine. The translator could then either transcribe both names or choose one that was familiar to him.
A typical example of this is the river Don. In the Polish text, it is often called Tanais albo Don, the first being the Latin name form and the second Slavic. Sometimes only the Latin form was used. The translator, however, always used the form DON, even when the Polish text only had Tanais, such as in the following example:

(148) ciagnęto dalej potomstwo jego w północne krainy zá pontskie albo czarn- ne morze/ gdzie nád Tanais albo Donem y Wołgą rzekámí/ y nád Ięzio- rem/ albo odnogą morzą Meotis/ w ktoré Tanais wpada w polach szeroko osiedli (Stryjkowski 1582: 92)

The Black Sea was called by both its Latin and Polish name, and both names were expressed in the translation. Usually, however, only the Russian name was used, even when the Polish text had the Latin form Pontus Euxinus.

In cases where two Slavic name forms or different – sometimes distorted – versions of a name were used, the translator could also choose between transcribing both names or only one. One may assume that the translator was more disposed to transcribing both names if they were unusual and unknown to him, or if they were so distorted that he could not judge which one was correct. In the following example, both names have been translated in all cases:

(149) Trzecie Xiąże Warackie Truwor albo Trubor wziął Xięstwo Pleskowskie albo Pskowski w udział trzydzieści j sześć mil od Wielkiego No- wogrodu/ á stolicę swojá zalożył w Sworčech albo w Izborku/ á według Miechouissá w Zborku (Stryjkowski 1582: 117)

The -l- is an original part of this name, and the form Pleskow is found for instance in the Primary Chronicle. In the 17th century, however, Pleskow might have been associated with the German form Pleskau. It is difficult to say if Stryjkowski found the name in an early Russian source or in a German one. The translators at Posol'skij prikaz had probably seen the German form in texts.

Only a little further on, however, w Zborsku/ albo Izborku was translated as w İzborsku, and w Pleskowie albo we Pskowie as wo Пскове.

---

73 The -l- is an original part of this name, and the form Плесковъ is found for instance in the Primary Chronicle. In the 17th century, however, Pleskow might have been associated with the German form Pleskau. It is difficult to say if Stryjkowski found the name in an early Russian source or in a German one. The translators at Posol'skij prikaz had probably seen the German form in texts.

74 Some mss. have Зборске.
Generally speaking, the practice of transcribing or translating only one name was used mainly for familiar places, such as the Black Sea and the Don, although there are exceptions, as shown above. In approximately 35 out of 60 cases where the Polish original has two names, there are also two names in the translation. Instances where two names are cited for the express purpose of comparing them are excepted from this count, and the difficulties of drawing that border is the reason for the approximate numbers.

Another pattern is the variation between names and their adjectival forms, such as the Sea of Azov in example (148). In the Polish text, it is called by its Latin name, Meotis (for Maeotis), but the translator transformed this into an adjectival construction. The same relationship between nominal forms in Polish and adjectival forms in Russian occurs in several places in the text, although it seems to be limited to a few names. The Sea of Azov is treated in this way two more times, and we also find Iezio Ladoga vs. озеро ладожское (117 – 26: 194v), 75 Babel Wieża vs. столп вавилонски (94 – 26: 162v; 109 – 26: 183r) and gory Włoskie Alpes vs. горы волоские алпийские (96 – 26: 164r). There are two examples of the opposite: Dźwinnych у Немповых vs. Двина и Немна (92, 26: 158v) and Bramy Korssunskie vs. града Корсуня врата мѣдныє (137 – 26: 221r).

Variation in the Polish original is found with respect to the city of Constantinople. It is usually called Konstantinopol or Constantinopol, with only four instances of Czarygrod. Two of these occur in the tale about Oleg and his horse, one in the report of Igor’s campaign on Constantinople and one in the tale about Olga’s christening, which suggests that the name may have been taken from Russian sources. Regardless of the Polish form, it is usually translated as Царьградъ (28 times, including derivations), but 14 times it is transcribed as Константинополь (most of these are instances of the derived adjective). The Greek name is especially common in some contexts, associated with the emperor and the church. For instance, the emperor of Constantinople is called царь константинополский five times, compared to only one instance of царь цареградскій (Slav 26, fol. 153r). The translator may have wished to avoid the repetition of the root царь. It is also used when speaking of the patriarch of Constantinople (three occurrences vs. one with цареградскій) and in the phrase римскій и константинополскій (twice). A typical example of the treatment of this name is the following:

(150) gdy z wielką Armatą ciągnął do Konstantinopolá wodną bitwą był porażon od Romaná Cesárzá Konstantinopolskiego/ y wielką poraszką był odbity y odpędzony od Czarygrodá. (Stryjkowski 1582: 121)

75 The same system for references is used here as in Section 5.4.2.2.
The treatment of names in IV: 1–3 can be summarized as following Russian tradition in most cases. Most Russian names are given in their familiar form even when the Polish original shows variation (although there are exceptions), Russian equivalents are usually given of other Slavic names, and Latin and Greek endings are always replaced by Slavic ones. The treatment of parallel name forms varies, possibly according to the degree to which the names were familiar to the translator.

6.6.2.2 Transcription in segment B

Russian names
Chapters VIII: 3–5 relate the actions of the Russian prince Daniil Romanovič, who in the Polish original is usually called Daniło, but also (twice) Daniel, whereas the form Даниилъ is always used in Russian. His brother is called Wasilko in Polish, but in the translation, he is called Василко the first two times he is mentioned and Васили у the third time. In other words, variation in Polish corresponds to invariation in Russian and vice versa.

Name forms ending in -o and -ko were typical of Polish dialects under Ruthenian influence, and Karplukówna (1985: 39) believes that Stryjkowski had found them in chronicles.

Polish and other Slavic names
Here, as in segment A, Russian equivalents of Polish name forms were used: Michał, which occurs twice, was turned into Михаилъ, Matheusz, which occurs once, into Матфей, IAN (once) into Иоаннъ, Jerzy (once) into Георгий, Hrehor (twice) into Григорий, and Andrzej (five times) into Андрею. Not all Polish names have Russian correspondences, of course, so that for instance Agnieszka (sic) is transcribed as Агнияка.

Latin and Greek endings
Latin and Greek endings in names were usually replaced. Miechovius was usually rendered as Меховии, sometimes as Меховий. The name forms Cromer and Cromerus were both turned into Кромеръ, except for one instance (Slav 27, fol. 14r) where we find the spelling Кромери, which actually would be the equivalent of the non-existent form Cromerius. Petrus was given as Петръ and Paleologus as Палеологъ. In one instance, however, the name Bolesław Pius was given as Болславъ Пиоусъ (335 – 27: 24v).

Other names and parallel name forms
When two forms of a name or two parallel names were used in Polish, both of them were usually given also in the Russian translation. An approximate
14 cases of 17 were treated in that way, whereas in the remaining three cases, only one of the name forms was transcribed. It may be observed that most of the names featured in these chapters were not Russian, so that a Russian translator might not be able to judge which of two forms was preferable.

There are many names in these chapters that do not fall within the categories dealt with above, such as *Mendog, Konrad, Dowmant* and *Woisielk*. They were probably unfamiliar to the translator and were transcribed fairly accurately, except that *Dowmant* was usually changed to *Довмантъ*. *Woisielk* was transcribed as *Воиселкъ* or *Воиселкъ*, although there is occasional variation between manuscripts. In ms. B, for instance, *Воиселкъ* has in a few instances been altered to *Воиселкъ* in connection with the changes made in that manuscript (cf. Section 3.6.1).

6.6.2.3 Transcription in segment C

**Russian names**

The most frequently occurring Russian name in these chapters is *Димитрий*, which in Polish is spelled *Dimitr*, but in Russian usually *Димитрий* (once *Димитрий*, once *Димитръ*).

As in segment A, the Polish name form *Włodimirz* (pleophony occurs only once, in the derived adjective *Wołodimirski*) can be rendered as either *Владимиръ* or *Владимиръ*. There is some variation between manuscripts in this regard: in ms. N, for instance, only the spelling *Владимиръ* is found in these chapters (in segment A, however, there is variation between the two forms in ms. N, just as in the other mss.). There are no instances of a spelling with pleophony in the translation.

There is also one occurrence of the name *Swatosław*, transcribed as *Святославъ*, and one of *Wassil*, given as *Василий*. The name *Iurij* occurs twice, and it is given as *Юрий*. It may be noted that the Polish version of the name is declined as an adjective (genitive: *Iuriego*).

The name *Siemion Iwanowicz* (which refers to a prince) is translated as *Симеонъ Ивановичъ*. Despite the fact that both the name and the patronymic in the Polish original seem to be adapted from Russian *Семен Ивановичъ*, the canonical name forms *Симеонъ* and *Иоаннъ*- have been chosen in the translation (cf. Uspenskij 1969: 5–7). See also Sections 6.6.2.1 and 6.6.2.4 for the names *Иванъ* and *Иоаннъ*.

**Polish and other Slavic names**

The name form *Иоаннъ* is also used once in correspondence to the Polish name *Ian*.

The most frequent Polish name is *Kazimierz*, which is mostly transcribed as *Казиме́ръ*. The spelling *Казимиръ* occurs once in ms. U, but mss. B and N have *Казиме́ръ* in all instances. The first part of the name seems to be
transcribed according to the spelling rather than the pronunciation of the Polish name.

Piotr is transcribed, as expected, as Пётр.

Gregorz – a Polish name form, although it refers to a saint – is rendered as Григорий.

Iurgi occurs five times, and the Russian translation varies: twice it is Георги, three times Иори.

Latin and Greek endings
Throughout most of the sample chapters from segment C, the translator has attempted to replace Latin and Greek endings in names. We find, for instance, the usual Меховий for Miechovius and Кромерь for Cromerus, as well as Бельскій for the unusual name form Bielscius.

This treatment of the names is, however, less consistent than in the other sample chapters. The following passage from chapter XII: 3 about the absence of heroes in Polish, Russian and Lithuanian history shows several deviating forms:

(151) Nálázłoby się wiele w Polszcze/ w Litwie y w Ruś Herculesson/ Hекторов/ Ахіллесов/ Еврипиллесов/ Диомедесов/ Пандарусsson/ Патроклесов/ Несторов/ Аіаксов/ Антеноров y Енассов kiedyby byli Homerussowie/ álbo Maronowie/ a ku temu hoyni Mecaenassowies/ Polioniew/ Augustowies, etc. (Stryjowski 1582: 423)

мнози обрелися бы в Полше, и в Литвъ, и в Руси Геркулесы, Гекторы, Ахиллесы, Еврипиллесы, Диомедесы Пандаресы, Патроклесы, Несторы Аіаксы, Антеноры, и Енаассы, когда быша Гомиры или Мароны, и к томъ щедрые Меченаассы, Полионы, Авіясты, и иные (Slav 27, fols. 181v–182r)

As we see, in most of the cases, the Latin and Greek endings were not replaced; instead the Russian endings were simply added to them. Perhaps the translator did not recognize the names, and only in the case of Homer, whom he may have known better than the others, did he use a Russian form.

There are other examples of Latin or Greek endings being included in the Russian translation. In chapter XII: 3, contrary to the usual translation of Miechovius as Меховий, the words и Miechouiuszá/ Cureussá are translated у Меховиуса у Кореусса. The form Herculesowego is translated as Геркулесова. In chapter XII: 4, Metellus is turned into Метулусь.

In contrast with segment A, where the name Karolus was translated as Карль, the endings of three inflected forms of this name in chapter XII: 4 are included in the translation: Karolussa vs. Карлуша, Karolussowego vs. Карлушова and Karolussa vs. Корлуша. The variety of spellings indicates that this name was not familiar to the translator.
Other names and parallel name forms
There are two occurrences of parallel name forms in the Polish original of these chapters. Twierskie álbo Tuwierskie is given as Тверское (although in most cases the Polish text also has only one form: Twierskie). In the other instance, both forms are transcribed: Ugré álbo Iuhré Rzéké is transcribed as Угру и́о Ио́рь ре́к. Since these are the only two instances in these chapters, no certain conclusions can be drawn. The river Ugra, which, as the chronicle explains, originates close to Smolensk and joins the river Oka near Kaluga, could have been familiar to a translator in Moscow. There is thus no reason to believe that the translation of both name forms is due to the tendency found in other chapters, that only one name was translated in the case of familiar (Russian) names, whereas both forms were transcribed when they were less familiar.

Polish or Lithuanian names with no Russian equivalent are frequent in these chapters. Examples are Kieystut, which is consistently transcribed as Кюстутъ, Gedimin vs. Гедиминъ, Olgerd vs. Олгердъ, Witold/Witolt vs. Витолдъ and Gastolt, which is alternately spelled Гастолдъ, Гастольъ or Гостольдъ. The alternation between -дъ and -тъ can be explained by devoicing in word-final position.

6.6.2.4 Transcription in segment D

Russian names
There are few Russian names in the sample chapters from segment D. The most frequent name is Vasilij, in Polish somewhat inconsistently written as Wasi, Wasil or Wasiley, of which the last form testifies to Ruthenian influence (Karplukówna 1985: 37). It was usually rendered as Василеу, but once as Васишиу, which amounts to a difference between Russian and Church Slavonic endings.

Iwan and Iwanowic are given in the Russian forms Иванъ and Ивановий, respectively.

Siemion is treated in different ways: we find Семенъ, Симеонъ and the unusual Семипъ.

Polish and other Slavic names
In these chapters, the correspondence of Russian equivalents to Polish names varies. Some names are given predominantly in their Polish form, other in the Russian variant. The ones listed below are the most frequently occurring.

Andrzey is given as Андреу (four times).

Ian is transcribed eight times as Янъ, 18 times the equivalent Иванъ is chosen and once Иоаннъ. We see, then, that in these sample chapters, as opposed to those from segments A and C, the Russian form of the name is preferred to the Church Slavonic one (cf. Sections 6.6.2.1 and 6.6.2.3), although the Polish name form also occurs.
Iurgi (nine instances) and Ierzy (one instance) are mostly translated as Іорги. Only once is Iurgi transcribed as Іоргій.

Maciej is turned into Матвеу (five times), but the name Maciejewski is transcribed as Мацеевський.

Mikolay/Mikolaiewic is rendered as Микола/Миколаевич 14 times and as Николаевич only twice.

Piotr/Piotrowic is, as expected, given as Петръ/Петрович (three times).

The frequently occurring names Wladislaw or Stanislaw do not seem to have presented a problem to the translator, and were transcribed as Владиславь and Станиславь, respectively.

Latin and Greek endings
Latin and Greek endings in names were mostly replaced by Russian ones, such as Iodocus Decius vs. Иодокъ Ѓекій, but there are a few exceptions: Piotr Mraxius is rendered as Петръ Мракиусъ, Woyscieh Fontinus as Вушехъ Фолтинусъ (sic) and Pirrus as Пиррусъ.

The name Carolus/Karolus occurs three times in these chapters in the forms Karolusowe vs. Карлусовы, Carolus vs. Карлусъ and Carolus cesarz vs. Король (король?) кесарь.

Other names
One name that occurs very frequently is Sigmunt or Sigismund. The Russian form is either Жигмунтъ or Жигмунть, approximately 15 times each, with one single instance of Жигмонть. The spelling with Жиг- was not oriented on the Polish spelling or pronunciation, but rather on Russian tradition, as it occurs in Vesti-Kuranty (2009) and in various chronicles.

The name Helzbieta is rendered twice as Елизавефа and four times as Елизавета or Елизаветъ. Isabella is given as Есавель.

There are no instances in these chapters of two name forms being used together.

6.6.2.5 Summary of the transcription of names
The four segments are fairly similar in their intention to use Russian versions of Latin names, but this is executed less consistently in the chapters from segments C and D than in the other sections. When it comes to giving the Russian equivalents of other Slavic names, the chapters from segment D frequently use the Polish forms of Mikolay and to some extent of Ian.

Since the sample chapters deal with different historical events and therefore mention different persons and places, it is difficult to find material that is useful for comparison. Still, the two differences mentioned above are not without importance.
6.7 Lexical variation

Some Polish lexemes can have two or more Russian translations that are more or less synonymous. The distribution of these near-synonyms can give a clue to the translators’ individual preferences. Since the choice between them may have been influenced by the register of the text, some comments on their history have been included to help evaluate the findings and increase the validity of the results.

The Polish words discussed below have been chosen because they occur in all sample chapters and, more importantly, can be translated in several ways into Russian. On account of the difficulty of finding lexemes that fit both demands, it has been necessary to use lexemes that are not equally frequent in all parts of the text. This makes the results difficult to rely on in some cases, but some tendencies may nevertheless be discerned.

As was explained in Section 6.6.2, the sample chapters have been examined as found in ms. U. In some cases, mss. B and N, as the best representatives of their groups (cf. Section 3.5), have been used for comparison, and variation has sometimes been discovered, but for the sake of consistency, the numbers given in the tables always apply to ms. U. Variation between the manuscripts will be commented on, however.

6.7.1 The translation of różny and rozmaity

The Polish words for ‘different’ and ‘difference’ occur rather frequently in the text. Two adjectives are used: rozmaity and różny. The corresponding noun is różności. Adverbs formed from these adjectives also occur sporadically. They are counted together with the adjectives, since they are too few to justify separate treatment.

The two Polish adjectives (and adverbs) are represented in Russian by розный and различные (usually with this distribution of the spellings with раз- and роз-, although there is some variation between manuscripts) and the two nouns разность and различие.

Розный and различные seem to be more or less synonymous, although this is not entirely certain. The distribution of the spellings раз- and роз- could possibly point to a connection with register harmony, since ro- was the result of an East Slavic development of Common Slavic *or-, whereas ra- was the corresponding Church Slavonic result (Uspenskij 2002: 192).

These words occur very frequently in the sample chapters from segment A, whereas they are less frequent in segments B, C and D.

6.7.1.1 Translations in segment A

In IV: 1–3, the word różny occurs 13 times, rozmaity 29 times and różność nine times. The translation различные is preferred for both adjectives, but there are also examples of розный for both adjectives. They are also some-
times left out in the translation. The treatment of the noun is inconsistent: it is translated as \textit{разность} twice and as \textit{различие} five times. Once a different construction is used, involving the adjective \textit{различны}, and once the noun \textit{выбор} is used in the translation.

The dominance of the translation \textit{различны} can be seen in the following example:

(152) insze \textit{rozmáitych} Narodow języki początki rozmnożenia/ własności/ y \textit{rozne} dla \textit{rozności} granic wymowy swoie máją (Stryjkowski 1582: 95)

иные различных народах языки начала умноження свойства, и различны различных ради рёбёжеи ръчи свои имъют (Slav 26, fol. 162v)

Table 17 shows the distribution of translations in ms. U. Differences between manuscripts amount to a few omissions and two instances of the spelling \textit{разлучие} for \textit{различие} in mss. E and R.

Table 17. \textit{Translations of \textit{różny}, rozmaity and \textit{różność} in IV: 1–3}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>różny</th>
<th>razny</th>
<th>rozmaity</th>
<th>różność</th>
<th>różnic</th>
<th>различие</th>
<th>other/none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>różny</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rozmaity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>różność</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.7.1.2 Translations in segment B

In VIII: 3–5, the Polish word \textit{rozmaity} occurs four times, \textit{różny} once and \textit{różność} twice. The adjectives are always translated as \textit{розны} or \textit{разны}. The spelling varies between manuscripts, and in fact ms. U seems to be an exception here, since both mss. B and N have only \textit{разны}. The noun \textit{różność} is translated as \textit{разность}.

Table 18. \textit{Translations of \textit{różny}, rozmaity and \textit{różność} in VIII: 3–5}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>różny</th>
<th>rozmaity</th>
<th>różność</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>różny</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rozmaity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>różność</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.7.1.3 Translations in segment C

In XII: 3–5, the adjective \textit{rozmaity} occurs four times and the noun \textit{różność} once. The preferred translation for \textit{rozmaity} is \textit{различны}, which is used three times of four. \textit{Разны} occurs once (mss. B and N also have this spelling).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>różny</th>
<th>разны</th>
<th>различных</th>
<th>разность</th>
<th>различные</th>
<th>other/none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>różny</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>różność</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.7.1.4 Translations in segment D

In XXIV: 3–5, the adjective *rozmaity* and the adverb *rozmaicie* are used 15 times, whereas *różny* is used only once and the noun *różność* does not occur at all. The Russian adjectives *розны* and *различны* occur with nearly equal frequency. The spelling varies between manuscripts: mss. U and B both have only *розны*, but ms. N has three instances of *разны*/*разно*. Once, the adjective *всякий* is used, and once the adjective is omitted in a slightly obscure translation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>różny</th>
<th>разны</th>
<th>различных</th>
<th>разность</th>
<th>различные</th>
<th>other/none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>różny</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rozmaity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.7.1.5 Summary of *różny* and *rozmaity*

It is difficult to compare the segments, since these words are more common in some sample chapters than in others. The sample chapters from segments B and C contain so few examples that only a tendency towards a certain distribution can be seen. Still, it seems that segments A and C prefer the translation *различны*, segment B prefers *розны* and D has even shares of *различны* and *розны*. In segment B, *разны* is used alongside *розны* in ms. U, and it is the only spelling used in these chapters in mss. B and N. In segment D, ms. N shows variation between *разны* and *розны*.

### 6.7.2 The translation of *zamek* and *miasto*

As we will see below, the Polish word *zamek* ‘castle, fortress’ was usually not translated in this text by its cognate *замок*, but by *город* or *град*. This indicates that at the time of translation, the distinction between modern Russian *город* and *замок* had not yet been established. Therefore, there is some variation in the translation of the Polish words *zamek* and *miasto* ‘city, town,’ with the diminutive *miasteczko*. The distribution of the translations of these Polish words may reveal the practice of different translators.
Variation in the translation of the Polish words *zamek* and *miasto* has also been observed in a study (Bergman 1964) of the two Russian translations of the Melusina Saga, one from 1676, one from 1677 (SKK 1993: 127–129). In the major part of the manuscripts belonging to the first translation, *miasto* was translated as градъ and *zamek* as городь. In the latter part of one manuscript, *zamek* was instead translated as крепость. The manuscripts of the second translation use mainly градъ or местъ, and sometimes замокъ (Bergman 1964: 22–26). This shows that these words presented a challenge to translators, and confirms that they may be subject to individual choices and therefore useful for our purpose.

In the tables below, occurrences of two words together have been listed separately, since some unusual translations can be found in these contexts. Thus, an occurrence of *zamek y miasto* does not add to the count under *zamek* and *miasto*, but is only counted under its own heading. Occurrences of *zamek* or *miasto* in combination with the Polish word *twierdza* ‘fortress’ have also been included. The expressions stolica, stoleczne miasto and główne miasto ‘capital’ have been noted, since they have a lot in common with the studied words and appear in the same contexts. Since they do not occur in all sets of sample chapters, they are only discussed in the text and do not appear in the tables.

### 6.7.2.1 Translations in segment A

In IV: 1–3, *zamek* and *miasto* occur frequently, miasteczko four times on its own and once in combination with *zamek*, and *twierdza* occurs only once together with *zamek*.

In most cases where they stand alone, *zamek* and *miasto* are translated as градъ. *Zamek* seems to have presented a challenge to the translator, since it is translated in a variety of ways, although градъ is predominant. *Miasteczko* is translated as городокъ three times, once as городъ and once, in combination with *zamek*, as местечко. It also occurs once in a marginal note that was not translated.

*Zamek* and *miasto* seem to have been perceived as synonymous, because even when they occur close to each other in the text, they are usually translated with the same Russian word, so that in Polish, there is an opposition – in example (153), the city was surrounded, and Olga barricaded herself in the castle – whereas in the Russian translation, this distinction is ignored:

(153) Piecinigowie [...] przyciągnęli do Kijowá/ y oblegli Miásto/ à ná Zamku Kijowskim záwárlá sìe bylá Holha (Stryjkowski 1582: 127) печенъги [...] придоша под Киевъ, и осадиша градъ, во граде же киевскомъ заперлась была Олга (Slav 26, fols. 207v–208r)
When the two words occur together in the Polish text as *zamek y miasto*, this combination is most often translated only as градъ (seven times). Only once has the translator chosen two different Russian words. In the two cases when *zamek* is combined with other words than *miasto*, both words are translated.

Table 21. Translations of *zamek, miasto* etc. in IV: 1–3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>городъ</th>
<th>замъкъ</th>
<th>крепость</th>
<th>городокъ</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>miasto</em></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>zamek</em></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>miasteczko</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>zamek y miasto</em></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>miasto y zamek</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (грады и замки)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>zamek y miasteczko</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (грады и местечка)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>zamek y twierdza</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (грады и крепости)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Polish expressions for ‘capital,’ such as *stolica, stołeczne miasto, miasto y zamek stołeczny, główne miasto* and *główny zamek*, are usually translated as столны градъ. Since *stolica* could at this time also carry the meaning ‘throne’ (cf. SSP), it is sometimes translated as престолъ, including instances when either reading was possible.

The general picture in these chapters is that *zamek* and *miasto* are seen as practically synonymous, and замъкъ occurs rarely. When *zamek* and *miasto* occur together, they are usually translated with one word. Градъ is used rather than города, which is probably due to register harmony (simplex preterites dominate in these chapters).

6.7.2.2 Translations in segment B

In VIII: 3–5, *zamek* and *miasto* are frequent, and *miasteczko* occurs once. *Twierdza* is used twice, but always in combination with another word. The Latin word *urbs* also occurs once, in the name of a church.

The dominating translation for both *zamek* and *miasto* is города, and городокъ is used for *miasteczko*. The two words *zamek* and *miasto* were probably perceived as synonymous, since they were both translated as города, even when they occurred next to each other and referred to different things:

(154) Sendomirskie Miásto spalili/ Potym Zamku na ktorym si byâla wszystka Sláchtá Sendomirska […] záwárlí […] dobywáli (Stryjkowski 1582: 333)

сендомирского города сожгли, посему города в котором была вся шляхта сендомирская […] заперлись […] доставали (Slav 27, fol. 18v)
In example (155), it seems that the translator did not even understand that the words *zamek* and *miasto*, used next to each other in the original, refer to the fortress and the town around it, and translated the passage as though there were two different fortresses or towns:

(155) **Zamek** Lubelski/ ktory byl ná ten czas drzewiány/ y **Miasto** spalil (Stryjkowski 1582: 331)

**gorodъ** любелский который бы́л в то время деревяный \*дрёго́й**

**gorod** сожже (Slav 27, fol. 16r)

In these chapters, the translator has apparently tried to find two words in Russian where two words occur together in Polish. As shown in Table 22, this is solved in different ways. The following translation is perhaps not very adequate:

(156) Helzberk/ Krutzbork/ Konigsberg álbo Krolewiec/ Bartenstein **Zamki y Miástā** pod Krzyżaki wzieli. (Stryjkowski 1582: 334)

Гелзберкъ, Крёжборкъ, Конисбергъ ёли Королевецъ, Бартенштеин, горо́дки и горо́ды под кръжаки взяли (Slav 27, fol. 23v)

The translation of the Latin *urbs* is also curious:

(157) tácik iákie w Rzymie ma Kościol ktory zową Sanctae Mariae de *urbe*. (Stryjkowski 1582: 333)

сіцевые каковы в Риме їмьеть костел которы зовьть свѧтыя Марії с мьста (Slav 27, fol. 20v)

Even though the original here is in Latin, not Polish, where *miasto* could have motivated the choice of *mьsto*, this unusual translation is chosen.

**Table 22. Translations of zamek, miasto etc. in VIII: 3–5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>градъ</th>
<th>городъ</th>
<th>замокъ</th>
<th>городокъ</th>
<th>others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>miasto</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>zamek</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>miasteczko</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>zamek</strong> y <strong>miasto</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>miasto</strong> y <strong>zamek</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(городки и города, город и замокъ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>miasto</strong> y <strong>twierdza</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(грады и твердыни)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>zamek</strong> y <strong>twierdza</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(городов и башень)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>urbs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(мьсто)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The word *stolica* occurs four times and is translated three times as престоль, once as столица. The combination *stolice zamek* is translated as столный город.

The translator of these chapters probably considered *zamek* and *miasto* to be more or less synonymous and preferred the translation город for both, but did not think it appropriate to use only one word for them when they occurred together. Instead he tried to find ways to express both in Russian, and he was consistent in using two Russian words to translate two Polish ones. The word твердыня was a part of the translator’s vocabulary, but he apparently did not think it was the most suitable translation of *zamek. Город* was used rather than град, which is probably due to register harmony.

6.7.2.3 Translations in segment C

In chapters XII: 3–5, the Polish words *zamek* and *miasto* are used frequently. *Twierdza* occurs twice in combination with *zamek*. The Latin *arx* is found once. Adjectives formed from these nouns are also used, mainly zamkowy.

In these chapters, город or град are often used for both *miasto* and *zamek*, but the translator also introduces твердыня as a translation for Polish *zamek*, which is chosen almost half the times when *zamek* occurs. It should be noted that the translation замок does not appear at all.

The word крепость also occurs as a translation for *zamek*, alone or together with *twierdza*, as in the following examples:

(158) także insze wszystkie zamki/ y twierdze Podolskie […] posiadł y opánował (Stryjkowski 1582: 428)

також. крьпости подол‡ские […] осъль и облада (Slav 27, fol. 194v)

(159) wziął Miasto z obeimá Zamkami przez podánie (Stryjkowski 1582: 429)

взял град с обьма крепостьми здачею (Slav 27, fol. 196v)

Often when two words are used in Polish, they are translated with two words in Russian as well:

(160) (Bo sámo Miasto y Zamek Tuwer tylko 36. mil od Miasta Moskwy) (Stryjkowski 1582: 423)

(самый град и твердыня. Тверь. рвп. поприщь от Москвы града) (Slav 27, fols. 182r–182v)

---

76 Cf. Section 5.3.3 regarding the recalculation of the measurement.
In one instance, one Polish word is translated by two Russian words, although in the corresponding marginal note, \textit{zamki} is translated only by твердьны:

(162) á \textit{zamki} iž были дрзевяне спалил (Stryjkowski 1582: 429)

\begin{table}[h]
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Table 23. Translations of zamek, miasto etc. in XII: 3–5} & градь & городъ & замокъ & крепость & твердьны & none & others \\
\hline
miasto & 7 & 1 & & 1 & (столыны град) \\
\hline
zamek, zamkowy & 14 & 4 & 2 & 17 & 1 (твердьны или грады) \\
\hline
zamek y miasto, miasto y zamek, & 1 & & & & 2 (град и твердьны, твердьны и грады) \\
zamkowy y miescky & & & & & \\
\hline
zamek y twierdza, twierdza y zameczek & 1 & & & 1 (крепостей и городов) \\
\hline
arx & & & & & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textit{Miasto stołeczne} is translated as столыны градь and \textit{stolica} as столица.

In these chapters, then, there is an attempt to distinguish \textit{miasto} and \textit{zamek}, but it is not carried out consistently. The occurrences of the translations твердьны and крепость for \textit{zamek} (but never for \textit{miasto}) may suggest that the translator did not see the Polish words as being entirely synonymous. Градь is used more often than городъ, which is in accordance with the register of these chapters.

6.7.2.4 Translations in segment D

In chapters XXIV: 3–5, the Polish words \textit{zamek}, \textit{miasto} and \textit{miasteczko} are used. Городь is the most common translation for both \textit{zamek} and \textit{miasto}, and it is also used once for \textit{miasteczko}, which is, however, usually translated as городокъ. Замек can also be translated as замокъ и крепость, and in example (163), where it means ‘prison’ rather than ‘fortress,’ it is translated more freely into Russian:
Two of the three times when *zamek* and *miasto* occur together, they are translated as one word. One instance is more unusual:

(164) Soliman potom wził Budzyń y insze *Zamki y Miást* (Stryjkowski 1582: 754)

Солиман потом взял Будзьнь й иныя города и места (Slav 28, fol. 308v)

Here it seems that the translator first chose his usual translation, *города*, for *zamki*, and when he then wanted a separate translation for *miasta*, he wrote the similar-sounding *места*.

*Table 24. Translations of *zamek*, *miasto* etc. in XXIV: 3–5*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>miasto</th>
<th>градь</th>
<th>городъ</th>
<th>замокъ</th>
<th>крепость</th>
<th>городокъ</th>
<th>others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zamek, zamkowy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(в ссылку и в тюрмы, королевских)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miasteczko</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(города и места)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zamek i miasto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(города и места)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The word *stolica* occurs only once and is translated as *столица*.

The translator seems to have regarded *zamek* and *miasto* as more or less synonymous and preferred the translation *города* for both of them, but *zamek* also gives rise to some rather free translations. The occurrences of *замокъ* are all found within a small part of the text. The use of *города* rather than *градъ* is in line with the register of these chapters.

### 6.7.2.5 Summary of the translation of *zamek* and *miasto*

Judging by the sample chapters, there are similarities between the four segments in that *zamek* and *miasto* are treated more or less as synonyms in all of them, but there are some differences as well. The most obvious difference is the frequent use of *твердые* in segment C. The segments also differ in how they handle combinations of Polish words: whether they translate them as one word or two, and which translations they choose. Segment B is the most consistent in using two Russian words for two Polish ones, although such occurrences are rare in all the sample chapters. These differences, taken together, are large enough to point towards different translators.
Градь and городь are found in very early Russian texts, and they both originally designated a fortification as well as – later – the towns that emerged around them. This translation is from the period when the words градь and городь were going from this more general meaning to the later, more specific one, and a part of their sphere of usage was taken over by new words (Isserlin 1961: 36–37).

The earliest attestation of the word замокъ in this sense in SRJa is from 1549, found in a document concerning Polish and Lithuanian lands. Vasmer defines it as a loan from Polish, and Leeming (1973: 346) considers it to be a loan word in Ukrainian by virtue of its semantics and prosody, although the vowel shows the expected East Slavic development of Common Slavic *затъкъ. It can be noted that it has the stress on the penultimate syllable, as all Polish words do. The use of замокъ in the translation, although rare, could therefore possibly be informative as to the origins of the translators.

The word крепость was originally an abstract noun, connected with the adjective крепкий, i.e. meaning ‘strength’ (it is found in this sense in Slav 26, fol. 204r). In the 16th–17th centuries, it took on more concrete properties, referring, on the one hand, to a document that confirmed (“strengthened”) an agreement and, on the other hand, to a stronghold, a fortress (Isserlin 1961: 35–37). In SRJa, the earliest example of крепость in the sense of ‘fortress’ is from 1613. At the time the translation was made, this word had not been in use for very long, which could be the reason why it was not used throughout the text. However, it probably does not speak of any Polish influence.

The modern Russian столица did not occur in texts until the early 17th century and was evidently not common. The earliest example in SRJa is from 1610, and Kochman (1975: 130), who lists it in his monograph over polonisms in Russian, quotes an example from 1607–08, found in a document regarding diplomatic relations between Muscovy and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Before this word entered the language, there were several other expressions, one of which was the noun phrase столный градь (or городь), found in the translation of the Kronika and attested from very early texts (Kochman 1975: 129–130).

6.7.3 The translation of granica

As mentioned in Section 5.4.1.2, there is some variation in the translation of the Polish word granica ‘border.’ It occurs a handful of times each in sample chapters A, B and C, but unfortunately only twice in the sample chapters from segment D. Within each of the first three segments, the translation is rather homogeneous.
6.7.3.1 Translations in segment A
In chapters IV: 1–3, two words are used as translations of granica: рубежъ is used nine times and граница once. The use of граница may be a lapse by the translator, since Kochman (1975: 62–68) considers it to be a polonism, as discussed above.

6.7.3.2 Translations in segment B
All four occurrences of granica in chapters VIII: 3–5 are translated as граница.

6.7.3.3 Translations in segment C
All six occurrences of granica in chapters XII: 3–5 are translated as пределъ.

6.7.3.4 Translations in segment D
There are two occurrences of granica in chapters XXIV: 3–5. It is translated once as рубежъ and once as граница. The word пределъ occurs only as a translation of kaplica, meaning ‘chapel.’

6.7.3.5 Summary of the translation of granica
Only sample chapters A, B and C contain enough occurrences of the word granica to allow a conclusion. They all prefer different Russian words, but there is little variation within each set of sample chapters, which is a sign that these were the preferences of different translators. The use of граница in the translation is probably influenced by the Polish cognate, although, as explained in Section 5.4.1.2, it is not entirely certain that the word is a polonism. It is more difficult to draw any conclusions about what motivated the choice between рубежъ and пределъ.

6.7.4 The translation of roku
Throughout the chronicle, annalistic formulas are frequent. They can be divided into introductory formulas, such as roku 454, roku od Christusa Pana 713, roku od stworzenia świata 4074, and the connecting formula tegoż roku. They are so frequent in all the sample chapters that variation in the translation will show clearly. Such expressions are well known from Russian Chronicles as well, and variation may say something about to what degree the translators were acquainted with chronicle tradition. Therefore, the results from this section will also be commented on in Section 7.4.1.

Not all expressions occur in all sample chapters, which makes comparison difficult in some cases. The most obvious example of this is that the use of od stworzenia świata and od Christusa depends on the sources Stryjkowski was referring to. In the tables below, complex expressions have been di-
vided, so that roku od stworzenia świata 4074 appears both as an instance of roku and of od stworzenia świata. For practical reasons they are separated into different tables. Occurrences of the word rok outside of the formulas are not included in the tables, but are in some cases discussed in the text.

6.7.4.1 Translations in segment A

This section relates the ancient history of the Slavs according to writers of the Antiquity as well as Russian chronicles. Therefore, the dates here refer to diverging views as to when something happened and form part of the narrative, rather than occurring as chronicle formulas. In several places, there are chains of references, including dates according to old Russian and European chronology, sometimes also from the foundation of Rome.

The Polish introductory formula roku is nearly always translated with a prepositional phrase: въ лѣто. Twice it is translated with a bare genitive: лѣта. The word годъ is sometimes used, but never in this formula. Evidently, both words were part of the translator’s vocabulary, but the norm seems to have required the use of лѣто in the annalistic formula. The connecting formula tegož roku does not occur in these chapters.

Table 25. Translations of roku… etc. in IV: 1–3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>roku…</th>
<th>в лѣто</th>
<th>лѣта</th>
<th>году</th>
<th>того же лѣта</th>
<th>того же году</th>
<th>в томже</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tegož roku</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expressions od Christusa and od Christusa Pana are usually translated as от Христа, with two instances of от Христа господа.

The translation of the expression od stworzenia świata varies in an interesting way. In the beginning of these chapters, it is translated as от создания мира (the last time is Slav 26, fol. 204v), but in one instance as от сотворения свѣта (Slav 26, fol. 211v), using cognates of the Polish words. The remaining five times, the expression is translated as от сотворения мира. This gives the impression that something changed in the translator’s work (cf. Section 6.10).

Table 26. Translations of od Christusa etc. in IV: 1–3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>od Christusa</th>
<th>от Христа</th>
<th>от Христа господа</th>
<th>от создания мира</th>
<th>от сотворения мира</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>od Christusa Pana</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>od stworzenia świata</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(от сотворения свѣта)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.7.4.2 Translations in segment B

In these chapters, the Polish introductory formula roku is usually translated using a bare genitive: лѣто. Outside of the introductory formula, i.e. in the connecting formula tegoż roku or in less formulaic constructions such as na drugi rok, the translation involves the word годь, such as того же году, въ томъ же году отъ другого году (three times, not included in the table). Just as in the sample chapters from segment A, годь was a part of the translator's vocabulary, but the annalistic formula triggered the use of the word лѣто.

Table 27. Translations of roku… etc. in VIII: 3–5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>roku…</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tegoż roku</td>
<td>2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are only two instances of od Christusa and one of od Christusa Pana. They are translated as отъ Христа and отъ Христа Бога, respectively.

Table 28. Translations of od Christusa etc. in VIII: 3–5

| od Christusa | 2 |
| od Christusa Pana | 1 (отъ Христа Бога) |
| od stworzenia свiata |

6.7.4.3 Translations in segment C

Here, the Polish roku is usually translated with the bare genitive лѣто. The word лѣто is also used outside of the introductory formula, i.e. in the connecting formula того же лѣта or in non-formulaic expressions such as въ будущее лѣто or во второе лѣто (these are not included in the table). The word годь is also used in such contexts, but less frequently than in other segments.

Table 29. Translations of roku… etc. in XII: 3–5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>roku…</th>
<th>15 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tegoż roku</td>
<td>5 1 1 (того лѣто)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expression od stworzenia свiata is translated as отъ создания мира, and the only occurrence of od Christusa Pana is translated as отъ рождения Христа.
Table 30. Translations of od Christusa etc. in XII: 3–5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>от Христа</th>
<th>от Всевышнего</th>
<th>от сотворения мира/миру</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>od Christusa Panu</td>
<td>1 (от рождества Христова)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>od stworzenia świata</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.7.4.4 Translations in segment D

In these chapters, the Polish roku is most frequently translated as the bare genitive года, and the word году is also used outside of the fixed formula. Only seven times do we find the translation лет in formulas, compared with a total of 63 instances of году.

Table 31. Translations of roku… etc. in XXIV: 3–5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>в лето…</th>
<th>лета…</th>
<th>году…</th>
<th>того же лета</th>
<th>того же году</th>
<th>в том же году</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>roku…</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (в… году)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tegoż roku</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The formulas od Christusa and od stworzenia świata do not occur in these chapters.

6.7.4.5 Summary of the translation of roku

The sample chapters differ clearly with regard to the translation of the annalistic formulas. Segments A, B and C all prefer the lexeme лет in the translation of the introductory formula roku, although in segment A, it is usually в лето, and in segments B and C a bare genitive, лета. Segment D prefers the translation году (genitive). In the connecting formula, as a translation of tegoż roku, only segment C uses лет, whereas segments B and D have году, and the formula does not occur at all in segment A. Segments A, B and D use the word году in other contexts, outside the formulas, but segment C prefers лет in those contexts as well.

Since the expressions od stworzenia świata and od Christusa Pana do not occur in all sample chapters, it is not possible to draw any conclusions based on them.

6.8 Syntactic variation: the pluperfect

Although syntactic structures can be difficult to use as a criterion for identifying translators because of their possible connection with the opposition
between Russian and Church Slavonic, or between non-bookish and bookish language, an attempt has nevertheless been made to study the translation of the Polish pluperfect.

6.8.1 The pluperfect in Russian texts

There are two types of pluperfect found in early Russian texts. Both kinds consisted of an auxiliary verb and an I-participle, but differed with regard to the tense form of the auxiliary verb. The Church Slavonic pluperfect, often simply called the pluperfect, had the auxiliary verb были in the imperfect or imperfective aorist. The other, often called the Russian pluperfect, had the auxiliary verb in the perfect tense, full or elliptic (Uspenskij 2002: 251–252; Petruchin 2003: 56–58). In this text, there are no instances of the full perfect form as an auxiliary verb, only elliptic perfect forms.

The pluperfect is traditionally said to refer to an event preceding another event, expressed in a past tense form, typically the aorist. It could also be used to signify absolute remoteness in time, i.e. that an event happened very long ago (Živov 1995: 48). Some scholars consider the Church Slavonic and Russian pluperfect to be identical in meaning, but in early non-bookish texts, the Russian pluperfect may also signify an interrupted event or an event that happened but was later cancelled (Gorškova & Chaburgaev 1997: 361–364; Petruchin 2003: 56–58). The modern Russian construction with было, that has a similar meaning, is usually said to be a continuation of this usage (Petruchin 2003: 89). The bookish pluperfect could also carry this meaning, but probably under influence of the Russian pluperfect (Petruchin 2003: 190).

Until the 17th century, the auxiliary verb of the Russian pluperfect was conjugated, but in the 16th and 17th centuries there are also occurrences of a pluperfect with the auxiliary in the neuter singular, but with the main verb agreeing with the subject. This construction achieved the modern sense of an interrupted event. Gorškova and Chaburgaev (1997: 361–364) seem to consider the shift between agreement and non-agreement to have taken place in the 17th century, as they cite examples like пошли были and дошли было from the 1620s. Pennington (1980: 283) speaks of “isolated instances” of agreeing forms in the 1640s. Cocron (1962: 236–238) lists only occurrences with the auxiliary in the neuter singular (было) from the 17th century, but among these there are examples of the original, temporal meaning, as well as the meaning of an interrupted event.

77 Cf. also Petruchin (2003: 91–92) for examples from chronicles.
6.8.2 The pluperfect in the sample chapters

For the sake of brevity, the two types – Church Slavonic and Russian pluperfect – will both simply be called the pluperfect below, but this does not mean that the form of the auxiliary verb is without importance. In fact, when the translations of Polish pluperfect forms are listed, the tense of the auxiliary verb will be the main criterion by which they are categorized. The results will be summed up in Section 6.8.2.5, Table 32.

In the Polish pluperfect, both the main verb and the auxiliary verb were always in agreement with the subject. This tense could be used both for an event preceding another event, expressed in the past tense, and for an event that was unrelated to other events but had occurred long ago. It was common in the 16th and 17th centuries, but is almost out of use in modern Polish (Burzywoda et al. 2002: 171–173).

There are a few occurrences in the Polish text (as a matter of fact, one in each set of sample chapters) of the combination by the auxiliary verb + l-participle, which conveys a conditional meaning, and which Długosz-Kurczabowa and Dubisz (2006: 316) call “more complex forms of the conditional mood” (“bardziej złożonych form trybu przypuszczającego”), common in 17th-century Polish. Three of these constructions are translated as był + l-participle. Although the conditional is a mood and not a tense, these constructions will nevertheless be referred to as “conditional pluperfect” and “conditional perfect,” respectively, to capture the distinction between them.

6.8.2.1 The pluperfect in segment A

In the Polish original of chapters IV: 1–3, the pluperfect occurs 30 times, one of which is a conditional pluperfect. Three of these occur in text sections that were not translated, which leaves 27 pluperfects to study.

Ten of the Polish pluperfect forms are translated as pluperfects. The auxiliary verb is the aorist ćwiczy once, the imperfective aorist ćb four times, a perfect form with agreement once and a perfect form in the neuter singular four times.

17 times, other tenses or constructions are used in the translation: the aorist 12 times, the imperfect one, the elliptic perfect once, participles twice and an infinitive once (the conditional example).

The following example can be interpreted in two ways. As I see it, there are two pluperfect forms with a single auxiliary, byli zábili y pogrzebli, since both these events precede the main narrative. The translator, however, probably interpreted only the first of the two as a pluperfect, since he translated the second one as an aorist:

(165) Wyzwolił a potem sobie u nich isz poszl a ná miejsce/ gdzie iey mąż pierwszy Ihor Rurikowic Xiążę był pogrzebiony/ bo go támże w Chorostinie Drewlanie byli zábili y pogrzebli (Stryjkowski 1582: 123)
In one case, the Russian translation uses a pluperfect construction (with the auxiliary verb быть) when the Polish original does not:

(166) Ale Rochmidá [...] niechialá ná to pozwolić/ ále zá iaropelká Brátá iego y nieprzyiačielá w malźenstwo sje brálá/ od końrrego tež dziewosłěbow oczezkiwáľá. (Stryjkowski 1582: 130)

Рохмída ж [...] не воэхоть за него ити но за брата его и неприятеля Ярополка от негож и сватов ожидала быть (Slav 26, fol. 212r)

There is great variation in these chapters, with the aorist and the pluperfect as the most common choices and a variety of tenses for the auxiliary verb of the pluperfect.

6.8.2.2 The pluperfect in segment B

In the chapters VIII: 3–5, the pluperfect occurs 15 times, one of which is conditional. This conditional pluperfect is translated with a conditional perfect construction. The remaining 14 pluperfects are all translated using a pluperfect, always with the auxiliary verb in the perfect tense. In 12 of these cases, the auxiliary verb is in agreement with the subject, and twice it is in the neuter singular. The following example is typical for these chapters:

(167) Bowiem Bolesław Xiążę usłyszawszy iż Sendomierzáb dobyli Tatarowie/ uciekl był z żoną do Węgier. (Stryjkowski 1582: 333)

но убо Болеслав кнěзъ услышав, что Сендомиръ взяли татары, ушлě былъ з женою до венгъеръ (Slav 27, fol. 20r)

This is the conditional example:

(168) Iuż bardzo duszno y cięszko [...] nietylko Mázowszu/ ále y Bolesławą Wstydliego WXiążćía Krákowskiego y Sendomirskiego Monarchy ná ten czás Polskiego krájnom od Litwy było/ by był Pan Bog sam pomocy y rátunku z niebá zeslíć nie raczył. (Stryjkowski 1582: 335)

уж бѣло дѣшно и тяжко [...] не токмо Мазовѣць но и Болеслава стѣдливого кнѣзя краковскаго и сендомирскаго манарха в то время полскаго странам, і от Литвы было, егда бы гдѣ Бѣть помощи с нбѣї сослати не сонзволилъ (Slav 27, fols. 25r–25v)

One example shows disagreement between the auxiliary verb and the main verb both in the Polish original and the Russian translation. This is probably
motivated by the incongruency of the feminine singular *szlachta* and its plural meaning:

(169) Potym Zamku na którym się była wszystka Sláchtá Sendormska/ Paniáty y pospólsto z žonami/ z dziaatkámi/ y maiennościámi záwárli przez cáłą noc y dzień uísñum sturmowánim dobywáli (Stryjkoñski 1582: 333)

посем города в которомь была вся шляхта сендомирская, гëда i посполїство з женами и з детми ї с йменемъ заперли через всю ночь и дëнь сильнымъ пристëпомъ доставали (Slav 27, fol. 18v)

The preservation of almost all the Polish pluperfects in these chapters indicates that the translation keeps very close to the original, an observation that is confirmed by the fact that the grammatically dubious construction in example (169) was copied so closely.

In ms. N, both instances that here have the auxiliary verb in the neuter singular instead have an auxiliary verb that agrees with the subject. Unfortunately, it was not possible to consult ms. B in this respect, since this was discovered at a late stage in the work. However, as will be seen in Section 6.8.2.4, mss. B and U have identical readings in segment D, whereas ms. N shows a trend towards agreement in the auxiliary verb. Therefore, it will be assumed that this is the case here also, and that the results from ms. U represent the original readings.

6.8.2.3 The pluperfect in segment C
In the Polish original of chapters XII: 3–5, the pluperfect occurs ten times, one of which is conditional. One instance is in a marginal note that is not translated into Russian at all. In correspondence to the Polish pluperfect, the translator has chosen the aorist seven times, a conditional perfect construction once (for the conditional pluperfect example) and a participle construction once. In other words, the pluperfect is never used in the Russian translation of these chapters.

6.8.2.4 The pluperfect in segment D
In the Polish original of chapters XXIV: 3–5, the pluperfect occurs 20 times, one of which is conditional. 14 of these instances are translated into Russian using the pluperfect. In nine of these 14 instances, the Russian auxiliary verb agrees with the subject; in four instances, it is in the neuter singular and does not agree with the subject; and in one instance the subject is in the neuter singular so that it can not be determined if the auxiliary verb is meant to be in agreement or not. The pluperfect is translated with perfect forms five times (one of which is a conditional perfect as a translation of the conditional pluperfect) and a participle once. In the following example, the pluperfect is used in the translation, although there are some other changes in the syntax:
(170) Potym ná schodzie Novembrá/ Tátarowie ktorzy z Moskwy wyciągnawszy/ položyli się byli u czarnego lása/ rozdzielili zagony ná cztery wojská/ z którymi do Rúsi y ná Podole wtárgnèli. (Stryjkowski 1582: 752)

попом в выходе ноября татаровъ которые с Москвы вышли стали было под Чорнымъ львомъ и разделили на четыре части войска с которыми в рускіе стороны и в Подолье вступили (Slav 28, fols. 304r–304v)

In ms. N, two more auxiliary verbs, that are in the neuter in ms. U, are in agreement with the subject, i.e. the proportions are 11 in agreement, two not in agreement and one in agreement with a neuter singular subject. The usage in ms. B coincides with that in ms. U. Since two of the three manuscripts deemed to be the best in their respective groups show the same readings, and moreover, since these two are 17th-century manuscripts, whereas ms. N is from the 18th century, the readings in mss. U and B probably convey the original intention of the translator.

6.8.2.5 Summary of the pluperfect
Table 32 shows the translation of the pluperfect in all sample chapters. “4+1” in segment A refers to the occurrence in IV: 1–3 of a pluperfect with imperfect auxiliary without Polish counterpart, whereas “9+1” in segment D refers to the form with a neuter singular subject, where it cannot be determined if the auxiliary is meant to be in agreement.

Table 32. Translation of the pluperfect in all sample chapters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Segment A</th>
<th>Segment B</th>
<th>Segment C</th>
<th>Segment D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pluperf. with aux.  быша</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pluperf. with aux.  бьбы</td>
<td>4+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pluperf. with agreeing l-aux.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pluperf. with neut. sg. l-aux.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aorist</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperfect</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (cond.)</td>
<td>1 (cond.)</td>
<td>5 (1 cond.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>1 inf. (cond.)</td>
<td>1 part.</td>
<td>1 part.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 part.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other words, the four segments behave rather differently with regard to the pluperfect. In segment A, it is translated with the pluperfect approximately one third of the times it occurs in Polish, using a variety of tenses for the auxiliary verb. In segment B, it is translated in close keeping with the Polish original, usually keeping the verb agreement in the auxiliary verb. In segment C, the pluperfect is absent from the translation altogether. In segment D, it is usually translated as pluperfect, but less consistently than in segment
B. Verb agreement of the auxiliary verb is also less common than in segment B. The Church Slavonic pluperfect is only used in segment A, and then only in half of the cases.

The form with the auxiliary verb ętšina stands out from what other scholars have observed about the pluperfect. Gorškova and Chaburgaev (1997: 325–326), for instance, discuss only forms with auxiliary verbs from the ętšiie and the ęb paradigms (cf. Section 4.2.1.4), and van Schooneveld (1959: 122) says outright that a form with ętšina, found in the Primary Chronicle, “stands alone and is obviously a corruption.”

The share of pluperfect forms in chronicles decreased with time. In the Primary Chronicle and the First Novgorod Chronicle, it was 1%, whereas in the Mazurinskaja letopis’ from the 17th century, it was only 0.1%. This probably means that the pluperfect was no longer recognized as a part of the tense system by later scribes and was replaced by other tenses (Živov 1995: 60–61, 73). The Stepennaja kniga contains only 53 examples, all forms of the Church Slavonic pluperfect (Otten 1973: 333). No percentage is given in Otten’s study, but since there are 12 000 instances of the aorist alone, the share of pluperfect forms is considerably less than 0.01% (Otten 1973: 62).

In the sample chapters studied from the translation of the Kronika, the pluperfect is used with varying frequency: 1% in the chapters from segment A (cf. Section 4.3.1), 3% in segment B, 0% in segment C and 2.5% in segment D. These numbers, except of course for the one in segment C, might be said to be quite high. What they reveal, however, is the degree of dependence of the translation on the original, rather than any independent use.

In this light, one might say that the translator of segment A probably knew the most about the bookish language, since he was able to transfer Polish pluperfect with auxiliary verbs in the perfect tense to Church Slavonic pluperfects, but he was perhaps not entirely sure of their use, since he also chose other tenses. The translators of segments B and D were the most dependent on the Polish original, and the translator of segment C was the most independent, but probably not well versed in the use of the pluperfect tense.

6.9 Polonisms in the sample chapters

In Section 5.4 above, lexical and syntactic polonisms in the sample chapters were studied. Some differences between the sets of sample chapters could be seen, but as this was not the primary goal of that section, the results reached there will now be discussed again with focus on this aspect.

In Section 5.4.1.2, 15 words that have been pointed out as polonisms by earlier scholars were studied, and 12 of these were categorized as being either very active, active or passive. It was mentioned that this classification may reveal something about the translators of the different sample chapters.
For this purpose, only the active words are used. This is based on the assumption that very active words, which were already integrated into the language, would have been used by most people, perhaps without their realizing that the words were of Polish origin. Passive words, on the other hand, were so rare at the time that they may simply have been mistakes, due to misunderstandings or inattentiveness rather than the translator’s language usage.

Table 33, which is a section of Table 13, shows the distribution of the six active words (in boldface) in the sample chapters, along with other translations of their Polish cognates. In this table, the number of times each word occurs as a translation of the respective Polish cognates is included in parentheses.

Table 33. Lexical polonisms in the sample chapters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>граница (1)</td>
<td>граница (4)</td>
<td>предель (6)</td>
<td>граница (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>рубежь (9)</td>
<td>рубежь (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>доводь (4)</td>
<td>приводь (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>доводно (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>свидетельство (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>знакъ (2)</td>
<td>знакъ (1)</td>
<td>знакъ (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>знамение (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>знамя (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>мусикия (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>музыка (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>мусикински (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>панцырь (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пансырь (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чинъ (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>порядокъ (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the six words that were categorized as active, only one can be compared in all four segments, since the only Polish cognate that occurs in all sets of sample chapters is granica. Nevertheless, the table shows that when sample chapters A contain a polonism categorized as active, the corresponding Polish word is also translated in other ways in the same chapters. Sample chapters B contain three active words and no alternative translations. Segment C, on the other hand, never chooses a polonism as a translation for these Polish words. Segment D shows parallel translations in two cases and one polonism without a parallel translation.

Judging from the active category of words, segment B is the most prone to use lexical polonisms, segment C the least, and segments A and D vary in their use.

Section 5.4.2.4 shows that sample chapters B also have a larger share of syntactic polonisms, although the only syntactic polonism that occurs in numbers large enough to judge is the construction with do + genitive.

Both these criteria also point to the segments having been translated by different people.
6.10 Other possible borders in the text

The division into segments is based on a linguistic feature that is easy to detect: the choice of tense for past events. During the work with the text, however, other variations have been revealed that are not as obvious, but that bring into focus the question of the history of the text.

The importance of ms. B was established in Chapter 3. As was explained in the summary of that chapter, the alterations in the text would make it probable that this was a working draft of the text and the exemplar for later copies, were it not for the fact that there is a lacuna in the text where other mss. do not have one. This makes the early history of the text somewhat unclear.

Nevertheless, in at least one place, a change of hands in ms. B coincides with variation in certain features. It concerns the border between hand B3 and B4, between fols. 205v and 206r of volume I (cf. Section 8.3.2), which corresponds to Slav 26, fol. 208r in ms. U. Several differences have been noticed between the text written by hand B3 and that written by hand B4.

In the part of the text that was written by hand B3, marginal notes from the Polish original are not translated. The first six pages of text written by hand B4 have marginal notes, but then they cease.

As noted in Section 4.2.2.3, hand B3 writes въ листу whereas hand B4 writes на листу.

When translating the phrase od stworzenia świata, discussed in Section 6.7.4.1, hand B3 writes отъ создания мира and hand B4 writes отъ сотворения свѣта отъ сотворения мира.

Despite these differences, I do not believe that this particular border points to different translators. Firstly, it seems more plausible to shift between translators at the beginning of a chapter than in the middle of a paragraph. Secondly, as mentioned, this is probably not the original translation, although it is an early copy. Thirdly, compared to other features of the text that are consistent throughout sample chapters A, these differences are rather small. They are probably the result of editorial work rather than a shift in translators.

6.11 Chapter summary

The point of departure for this chapter was the assumption that the 1673–79 translation of Stryjkowski’s chronicle was the joint work of several translators. This was suggested by Sparwenfeld’s note in ms. U, by the use of different verbal tenses in different parts of the text and by the fact that although the date 1673 occurs in the text, the one translator known by name who participated was not employed until 1678, and could therefore not have been the only one. It was not unusual for larger texts to be divided among translators.
Since it seems quite certain that several people were involved, one aim with this chapter was to use the text as material to identify criteria that can distinguish between translators. The other aim was to apply these criteria to four sets of sample chapters (A, B, C and D) to find out if they had all been translated by different people, or if the same person had translated A and C or B and D, respectively. The parameters for comparison were chosen with regard to the facts that this is a 17th-century text, preserved in manuscripts and translated from a known source text.

A division of proper names according to origin or type of name proved to be a useful method, but the treatment of names was to a large extent similar in all segments, and the characteristics of the segments often consisted of isolated deviations from a norm that all translators seemingly had in common. For instance, sample chapters C and D stood out by not consistently replacing Latin endings by Russian ones, but there were few examples of this.

The distribution of the synonyms розныи, разныи and различных as translations of Polish różny and rozmaity was seen to coincide with the distribution of tenses, and without further knowledge about these two words, it cannot be excluded that this difference is a matter of register harmony, rather than of individual preferences. The translations of Polish zamek and miasto were more varied, which made this criterion very interesting, but complex. The results would have been difficult to judge without support from the other criteria. The translations of the word granica were helpful, since there was a clear distinction between the sample chapters, but little variation within each set. Annalistic formulas were frequent and therefore useful. The sample chapters were quite consistent in this regard as well.

The only syntactic criterion applied was the translation of the Polish pluperfect. The sample chapters treated it rather differently, although the distinction was not as clear-cut as with some of the lexical criteria.

The active polonisms from Section 5.4.1 were difficult to use, since most of them did not occur or have correspondences in all sets of sample chapters. When treated as a group, they showed a certain tendency, which would probably be strengthened if a larger number of polonisms were studied.

The chapters from segment A were characterized by the following: they consistently adapted names to Russian practice, translated zamek and miasto mostly as градъ and granica as рубежъ, used the annalistic formula въ льто, a variety of translations for the pluperfect, and there was also variation in the use of lexical polonisms.

The chapters from segment B had the following properties: names were mostly treated according to Russian norm; zamek and miasto were mostly translated as городъ and rendered with two words when they occurred together; granica was translated as граница; the introductory annalistic formula was льта and connecting formulas were formed with the word годъ;
the pluperfect was strongly influenced by the Polish original; and lexical and syntactic polonisms were frequent. Some of these facts point to a translator with Polish or Ruthenian as his native language (cf. also Section 5.4.2.1).

In the chapters from segment C, Latin and Greek endings of names were not as consistently replaced by Slavic ones as in other segments; the word твердьня was introduced as a translation for замек and used more than half the time, with градь as the other alternative; граника was translated as пределъ; the annalistic formulas were similar to those in segment B; the pluperfect was never used in the translation; and lexical polonisms were rare. The latter two characteristics suggest that the translator actively tried to avoid words and constructions similar to the Polish original.

The chapters from segment D had the following characteristics: Slavic names were not consistently given in their Russian form; городь was the most frequent translation for замек and міясто, but with a few occurrences of замокъ; граника was translated as рубежъ or граница (although only once each); the annalistic formulas were mainly formed with the word годь; the pluperfect was strongly influenced by the Polish original; and there was variation regarding the lexical polonisms.

It seems fairly certain, then, that the four segments were all translated by different people, but there are examples of variation within segments that still remain to be explained. A study devoted exclusively to ms. B would probably reveal more about the history of the text and help identify the results of later editorial work.
Comparison with original chronicles

7.1 The chronicle genre in the 17th century

The task of the chronicles differed very much over time, and with it their form. As a rule, the earliest chronicles were kept in monasteries and to some extent at princely courts. Most chronicles from this period take a local view of events, depending on which town they were kept in, and there were such chronicle centers in many different Russian towns. In the late 15th century, however, Moscow assumed a leading role in Russia and consequently took over chronicle writing, making its interpretation of history the official one. Local chronicles were more or less replaced by chronicles kept for the benefit of the Grand Princes and, later, the tsars. State officials took over the task.
of chronicle writing from clerics, and state documents began to be incorporated into the chronicles (Kijanova 2010: 10–12).

Early Russian chronicles have received much attention, but chronicles written from the end of the 16th century onwards have been less thoroughly studied. At this time, the old kind of annalistic chronicle, beginning from the creation of the world, had given way to new kinds of texts. On the one hand, there were chronicles with a traditional, annalistic structure, but with a lesser scope, covering perhaps the reign of one or a few tsars. On the other hand, historical narratives that were not annalistically organized appeared and partly replaced the chronicles. Instead of continuing older chronicles, they were based on other sources (Lichačëv 1947: 376; Vovina-Lebedeva 2004: 376–377; Kijanova 2010: 11–12). This form of narrative, in Russian called chronograf (as opposed to letopis’), had become dominant on Eastern Slavic territory in the 17th century, influenced by Polish and Western European sources (Myl’nikov 1996: 16). A well-known example of this tradition is the Novyj letopisec. Instead of the annalistic form it has short chapters that deal with such subjects as a battle, the coronation or death of a tsar, the building of a town or monastery (Lichačëv 1947: 384; Vovina-Lebedeva 2004; cf. PSRL XIV: 23–154). Another innovation was the appearance of short chronicles, a form that probably indicates that they were accessible to more people. Noble families also began keeping their own chronicles (Kijanova 2010: 13–14).

At the same time, from the middle of the 16th century onwards, official Moscow chronicle writing decreased. One reason for this may have been that the chronicles could no longer satisfy the state’s needs for documentation. Diplomats and state officials needed more information than chronicles could supply, and that role was taken over by archives. Thus, the official Moscow chronicles were replaced by documents on the one hand and historical narratives on the other hand (Lichačëv 1947: 375–376, 423). In the 17th century, the centers for chronicle writing were instead to be found in the provinces. Regional chronicles were kept in a traditional manner, primarily in Novgorod and Pskov (Lichačëv 1947: 375, 386; cf. also Kijanova 2010: 156–157). In 1657, there was an attempt to centralize official chronicle writing to Zapisnoj prikaz, headed first by Timofej Kudrjavcev and then by Grigorij Kunakov, but its work was not successful, and it was closed a few years later (Lukičev 2004: 362–375).

In short, early and late chronicles differed greatly from each other, and the variation between different types of late chronicles was great. A comparison of the three chronicles from the last quarter of the 17th century that have been published in volume XXXI of PSRL gives an example of the varieties of chronicles at that time. The Mazurinskij letopisec (PSRL XXXI: 11–179) continues the tradition of beginning the tale from Noah and his sons (cf. Section 2.4). It also retains, to some extent, the annalistic form, arranging the
information according to years rather than under any other sort of headings, but it does not count empty years, as the earliest chronicles did. The *Lëtopisec* 1619–1691 gg. (PSRL XXXI: 180–205), as the heading tells us, begins in 1619 and consists of additions to other historical texts in a compilation (PSRL XXXI: 6). It is also written in an annalistic form, but with many long accounts. The *Letopisnoe skazanie Petra Zolotareva* (PSRL XXXI: 206–233), on the other hand, does not attempt to give any early history, but has a set theme: the invasion of Astrachan by Stenka Razin’s troops in 1670. Some paragraphs open with references to years, but it is mainly arranged under thematic headings. The list could be made much longer, but these three will suffice to give a picture of the diversity of the texts that fit under the name of late Russian chronicles.

The heritage from the chronicles continued to be present for some time, even in historical works of the new kind. For instance, the traditional appeal of the chronicler to his readers to correct any mistakes they might find in the text can be found also in later, non-anonymous texts (Robinson 1963: 46–47; cf. also Kijanova 2010: 168). On the one hand, the authors had made a conscious choice to write a new type of historical text and not to continue the tradition of chronicle writing, which was seen as insufficient (Robinson 1963: 53), but, on the other hand, they knew that genre so well and used such sources that the result was often a compromise between chronicle and chronograph (Robinson 1963: 57).

### 7.2 Method of comparison

Because of the long time span of Russian chronicle writing, and because of the hybrid nature of chronicles and their language (cf. Section 4.1.3), it is not easy to determine what is typical of chronicle language. Early and late chronicles differ, and many chronicles reflect the development of the language from their earliest parts to the latest (cf. Gippius 2006). The development of new types of chronicles probably also introduced new characteristics of chronicle language.

To capture at least some aspects of chronicle language, the comparison in this chapter has been conducted with two different starting points. The first is to make use of earlier studies of chronicle language, especially the language of late chronicles, and study the translation of Stryjkowski’s *Kronika* to see if similar patterns can be found there.

However, most earlier studies (some of which were presented in Section 1.7) do not aim to single out what separates chronicle language from other types of texts, but either use chronicles as material to study some linguistic feature, such as Petruchin (2003), or show the variation between individual chronicles, such as Kijanova (2010). In other words, it is impossible to say if
the results achieved in those studies characterize a genre – chronicles – or a
certain time period, geographical area, etc., and their results are not easily
compared with the translation of Stryjkowski.

For instance, the parameters used by Kijanova (2010) – simplex
preterites, the dative absolute and the dual number – are indeed interesting
when determining how archaic or bookish a 17th-century text is, but the fact
that she has not quantified her results in any way makes it difficult to relate
the translation of the Kronika to them. Also, when she reports her findings of
dual forms in late chronicles, this does not necessarily mean that the use of
dual forms is typical of chronicle language; it only means that the chronicles
were written in a bookish register. Another problem is that constructions
such as the dative absolute may not be very frequent even in a bookish text,
which makes any statistics very uncertain. Nevertheless, considering the
great number of chronicles included in her study and the different types of
chronicles represented, it provides an interesting point of comparison.

The second starting point is to single out formulas in the translated text
that strike the eye as reminding one of chronicle language – a very subjective
choice, but reminiscent of the process of text orientation, and therefore suit-
able nevertheless – and then comparing them with the Polish original, on the
one hand, and Russian chronicles, on the other hand. If one of these expres-
sions in the Russian translation corresponds to several different expressions
in the Polish original, this has been seen as evidence that the expression is
formulaic. If the same expression is frequent in original chronicles, it shows
that chronicle language may have been the inspiration for using that partic-
ular expression. This does not exclude the possibility that the same expres-
sions may have been frequent in other text genres as well. A further study on
formulaic expressions could include comparisons with several genres.

Even though we know to some extent which chronicles Stryjkowski had
access to (cf. Section 2.3.1), this does not mean that precisely these chroni-
cles are the most probable models for the Russian translation, since the trans-
lators may have been acquainted with wholly different chronicles. They may
have come in contact not only with 17th-century chronicles, but also with
considerably older texts. Therefore, parallels have been sought in various
types of chronicles, listed below, that represent possible types of model
texts, but it can naturally not be assumed that these very chronicles were role
models used by the translator. In some cases this would not even be possible:
the Mazurinskiij letopisec used Stryjkowski’s Kronika as a source (Živov
1995: 53) and the first edition of the Synopsis was printed when the transla-
tion work had already begun. Instead, these texts should be seen as other
representatives of the tradition of history writing, and similarities with these
chronicles do not mean that they influenced the translator, but that they and
the translation of Stryjkowski’s Kronika belonged to the same branch of that
tradition. The chronicles listed below have been chosen for different reasons,
but share the trait that they contain a relation of the events described in IV: 1–3 of the *Kronika*, so as to facilitate the comparison of phrases and formulas. The following chronicles were chosen:

1) The Primary Chronicle (*Povest' vremennych let*, PVL) according to the Laurentian manuscript, because of its central position among chronicles and its great accessibility. The first 60 pages of the 123-page edition have been studied (PVL 2007: 7–66), up to and including the year 6544 (1035/36). An online word index, covering the whole chronicle, has been consulted.78 The Hypatian copy, in the digitalized version in the Regensburg Diachronic corpus of Russian,79 has also been used to some extent.

2) The First Novgorod Chronicle (*Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis' staršego izvoda*, NPL), as another representative of the earliest chronicles (NPL 1950: 15–100). It has been thoroughly studied by Gippius (2006), which facilitates comparison. An online version has also been consulted.80

3) The *Piskarëvskij letopisec*, a chronicle from the first half of the 17th century, as a representative of late chronicles (PSRL XXXIV: 31–220). Some aspects of the text have been studied by Petruchin (2003). An online version has also been consulted.81

4) The *Mazurinskij letopisec*, another late chronicle, approximately contemporary to the translation of the *Kronika*. The first 50 pages of the 170-page edition, up to and including the year 6662 (1153/54), have been used (PSRL XXXI: 11–60). It has been studied by Živov (1995).

5) Belorussian-Lithuanian chronicles (cf. Section 2.3.1), because they are similar to Stryjkowski’s sources and because if the translators were of Ruthenian descent, they may have been acquainted with chronicles of this kind. The main emphasis is on the *Suprasl'skaja letopis'* from the 16th century (PSRL XXXV: 36–67), since few of the other Belorussian-Lithuanian chronicles accessible in print contain accounts of early Kievan history. The 15th-century *Nikiforovskaja letopis'* (PSRL XXXV: 19–35), which is very similar to it, but slightly shorter, has also been used to some extent. Online versions of these chronicles have been consulted.82

6) The Kievian *Synopsis* in the 1681 edition, by virtue of its being a widely spread printed book, approximately contemporary to the translation of the *Kronika*. It has a different character than the annal-

78 www.lrc-lib.ru/rus_letopisi/Laurence/lavrfrm.htm
79 www-korpus.uni-r.de/diakorp
80 www.litopys.org.ua/novglet/novg.htm
81 www.krotov.info/acts/17/azaryin/b61.htm
istic chronicles and represents another branch of the tradition of history writing. The first 88 pages of the 254-page text in a facsimile edition have been chosen for comparison, since they correspond to the subject matter in the relevant chapters of Stryjkowski’s Kronika (Rothe 1983: 143–231).

In the cases where a chronicle is available online or where there is a concordance, these resources have been used alongside the printed editions. It will not be specified in each case which of these sources has been used. Page references and quotations given below apply to the printed editions.

7.3 Coordination of finite verbs and participles

In modern Russian, the relationship between a gerund and a main clause is a hypotactic one, which means that they are asyndetically linked: no conjunction is used to express the relationship between them. The same rule applied to participial constructions in Greek and, under Greek influence, in Old Church Slavonic. This rule was sometimes broken in OCS, so that the participle and the main clause were syndetically linked, usually with the help of the conjunction у (Večerka et al. 1996: 204–205). In Old Russian, syndetic linking was even more common, such as in the following example, found in an early entry in the Primary Chronicle:

(171) И заутра вставъ и рече к сущим с нимъ ученикомъ: "Видите ли горы сия? [...]" (PVL 2007: 9)

Several scholars have pointed out that this construction was quite common in chronicles (Alekseev 1987: 188; Živov 1995: 56–57; 2011: 143–144). Therefore, the translation of the Kronika has been searched for such constructions. Before proceeding to the study, however, a matter of terminology should be cleared up, and the history of what we know as the gerund should be outlined.

In OCS and early Old Russian texts, participles – active and passive, long and short forms – were as a rule declined, regardless of their function, according to the gender, number and case of the word to which they referred. The active participles in some positions later lost their inflection and developed into today’s gerunds, namely when they were used adverbially, i.e. as secondary predicates, or copredicates (cf. Haspelmath 1995: 17–20).

---

83 Cf., however, Weiss (1995: 268–270) on some constructions that border on syndetic linking.
84 “This is not to be confused with the Russian term vtorostepennoe skazuemoe, which has been used to describe precisely the contexts with syndetic linking and other constructions that
The modern term ‘gerund’ cannot be applied to the Old Russian situation, but using the term ‘participle’ without further specification would also be incorrect, and therefore a term is needed that covers all the stages of development of this construction. There have been numerous suggestions for such terms, cross-linguistically speaking. One term widely used in Slavic linguistics is ‘adverbial participle,’ since these forms are verbal adverbs (Haskelmath 1995: 45–46), or “a nonfinite verb form whose main function is to mark adverbial subordination” (Haskelmath 1995: 3). Because of their status as predicates in a subordinate construction, they have sometimes been called ‘predicative participles’ (Bjørnflaten 2010: 19–20). Haskelmath (1995: 45–46) prefers the term ‘converb.’ Here, ‘adverbial participle’ has been chosen to describe the form during the whole of its development, since the construction studied below originates in a time when the form in question was still a participle, but in the 17th century probably should be seen as containing a gerund. In this way, the origins of the form as a participle is emphasized, and the choice is also in keeping with Slavic scholarly tradition. In unambiguous contexts, for the sake of brevity and to avoid repetition, ‘participle’ will also be used.

The loss of declension of adverbial participles seems to have begun before the 14th century, and in texts from the 17th century, uninflected forms are widely used. The change began with adverbial participles with a plural reference (in both the present and past tense) adopting the ending -u instead of -e. This resulted in ambiguous forms and the deterioration of the declension system. Several endings competed for dominance, and in the 17th century, the endings -а/-я and -учи in the present tense, and -въ and -вии in the past tense, respectively, were not distinguished (Bjørnflaten 2010: 21–27). The distribution of the endings represented in the Kronika can be found in Section 4.2.1.5.

According to A. A. Alekseev (1987: 192–193), syndetic linking was especially common when the adverbial participle construction preceded the finite verb, and especially after a past adverbial participle, where his material, Skazanie o Mamaevom poboïščë in a redaction from 1526–1530, shows a share of 41% syndetic constructions (cf. Alekseev 1987: 188–189). In the Hypatian copy of the Primary Chronicle, the share is 24%, and in the Kievan chronicle 40% (Živov 2011: 144). It is frequent in other later texts as well (Živov 1995: 56–57). Examples abound in Kijanova’s material (late chronicles), and she states that the construction is common in chronicles, even though she does not specify if it characterizes them as opposed to other genres.85

---

85 Cf. for example Kijanova (2010: 57, 133, 186, 241).
There are examples with postpositive adverbial participles as well, and Živov (1995: 56–57) considers the independent predicative status to be especially emphasized in such cases.

The syndetic construction shows the tendency in chronicles towards parataxis and the “stringing” (nanizyvanie) of clauses (Alekseev 1987: 195). If we look beyond participle constructions, the high frequency of the conjunction u between main clauses and in the beginning of sentences testifies to this tendency (Alekseev 1987: 195–196; Gippius 2006: 170–171). Dative absolute constructions, that were also subordinate constructions with a participle form as one of their constituents, could also be syndetically linked to the main clause (Corin 1995: 262–264). Several other constructions also attest to the independence of participles in OCS and the early stages of other Slavic languages (Večerka et al. 1996: 199–214; cf. also Weiss 1995: 274–275). Corin (1995: 272) mentions the common Slavic character of the syndetic construction and sees its origins in Czech.

Syndetic linking of adverbial participle constructions existed in Polish throughout the 17th century, but disappeared towards the end of the 18th century (Grybosiowa 1973: 91–92; Sokolowska 1976: 73–77; Pisarkowa 1984: 224–225, 245). T. Sokolowska (1976: 73–77) specifies that different conjunctions were generally used with prepositive and postpositive participles: a when the participle was postpositive, i when it was prepositive. She gives examples of both positions, but it can be noted that there are very few examples of postpositive past participles. D. Ostaszewska lists a few examples with postpositive adverbial participles, mainly in the present tense, but the distribution of conjunctions proposed by Sokolowska cannot be observed here (Burzywoda et al. 2002: 274).

With this in mind, we turn to the translation of the Kronika. Participles with no apparent link to a preceding or following main clause have been excluded from the counts below. This applies to a few instances of participles in parentheses, and also to the adverbial participles идучи and едучи, which seem to function differently than other verbs. Идучи in Slav 26, fol. 152r appears in parentheses, making the link to preceding clauses less strong, and where it appears on fol. 153r, the subject in the preceding main clause is inanimate and cannot in any way be the subject of the adverbial participle. This also applies to the form едучи on fol. 168r. Therefore, these forms are not connected to a main clause. Hüttl-Folter (1996: 270, 286–287) gives similar examples of what she calls absolute gerund constructions, where the adverbial participle does not refer to the subject of the main clause, but has a more general meaning. Several of her examples also contain verbs of motion. This independent use of adverbial participles is attested in Old Polish as well as in Old Russian (Sokołowska 1976: 111–112).

The study is based on the text found in ms. U, and it may be noted that there are some differences between manuscripts in this regard: not primarily
in the presence or absence of conjunctions, but in verb forms that are finite forms (e.g. aorists) in some mss. and participles in others. For instance, in Slav 26, fol. 212v, there is a whole chain of participles that are not connected with a finite verb form, since the finite verb form in the Polish original has been altered to a participle in ms. U. This form is an aorist in some other mss., so that if the study had been based on ms. B, one prepositive past participle and one postpositive present participle would have been added to the material. This means that the percentages of syndetic constructions in the table below may be slightly different if calculated on other manuscripts, but the general picture would probably be the same. Variation between manuscripts will be commented on in connection with the examples below.

The share of syndetically linked participle constructions in the Russian translation of the Kronika is not as large as in the original chronicles studied by other scholars. There are 18 examples of the construction in IV: 1–3. The conjunctions used are u, a and no. Ho is not traditionally found in this role and is not mentioned by Večerkas et al. (1996: 204–208), but is found here twice.

The 18 occurrences are distributed as follows according to the tense of the adverbial participle and its position in relation to the main clause.

Table 34. Constructions with adverbial participles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>prepos. synd.</th>
<th>prepos. asynd.</th>
<th>postpos. synd.</th>
<th>postpos. asynd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>present participle</td>
<td>7 (9.7%)</td>
<td>65 (90.3%)</td>
<td>5 (6.9%)</td>
<td>67 (93.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past participle</td>
<td>6 (5.2%)</td>
<td>109 (94.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>13 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we see, the hierarchy of frequency of the syndetic construction established by Alekseev (1987: 192–193), prepositive past participle > prepositive present participle > postpositive participle, does not show here, but instead we see prepositive present participle > postpositive present participle > prepositive past participle. Since there are rather few examples, they will all be listed below. The primary division will be according to how the construction relates to the Polish original, but within those groups, a subdivision will be made according to the tense of the adverbial participle and its position. As for the primary division, the relation between the original and the translation can be one of the following:

a) there is an identical construction in the Polish original,

b) the Russian translation uses the same verb forms as the original but has inserted a conjunction, i.e. participle + finite verb becomes participle + conjunction + finite verb or finite verb + participle becomes finite verb + conjunction + participle,

c) a finite verb has been changed to an adverbial participle, i.e. finite verb + conjunction + finite verb becomes finite verb + conjunction + participle or participle + conjunction + finite verb,
d) an adverbial participle has been changed to a finite verb, i.e. *participle + conjunction + participle* becomes *participle + conjunction + finite verb* or *finite verb + conjunction + participle*.

There are three examples of case a), where the Polish original has an identical construction. In all cases the adverbial participle is prepositive. One example contains a past participle:

(172) zebrał sie przeciw im Romanus Cesarz Grecki z pomocą Rzymską/ y inszych Pánow Chrześcijańskich/ á stoczywszy srogą bitwę z Ruską Armątá ná Morzu czarnym/ y porażił wielkie woyská Ruskie ná głowę (Stryjkowski 1582: 121)

собравшись против ево Роман църк греческий с помощью римскою, и ихъ гдѣре христянскихъ, смотрѣй ж ополчение с рускимъ нарядомъ на чорномъ мори, и побѣ великие воиска русские (Slav 26, fol. 200r)

The other examples contain present participles:

(173) A iżnych tu krotkosti y teskliwemu czytelnikowi folguyć/ y inszych Cesárzow Greckich/ Rzymskich/ także tysiąc dowodow o Sarmatskiej Rycerskiej dzielności opuścil/ tedy to sámá pokózuje (Stryjkowski 1582: 108)

и дабы здѣ кроткости, и тоскливомъ читателю норовь, и ёнихъ цесарей греческихъ римскихъ, также же свидѣтелствъ о сарматкои воинской храбрости оставил (Slav 26, fol. 182r)

(174) Ktorego wielkiego гwałту Ceszar Constantinopolis nie могъ wytrzymać/ á pomocю ná odsiecz zniśkád sie nie spodziewał/ przejednał Olecha wielkimi dârâmi/ odkuwając pokoy (Stryjkowski 1582: 120)

и тотъ насилья църк константинополскій не могъ выдержать, і помощи на вырѣчку ниякъ явь не чаяя, ѣтоли Олеха великими дарь покой покѣпая (Slav 26, fol. 199r)

The following examples illustrate case b), where the Russian translation uses the same verb forms as the original but has inserted a conjunction. The majority of these contain prepositive past participles:

(175) ktorey potym кошц Wlodimirz wnuk ochrzscywszy sie/ zá свiте podniosł y ist miedzy свiте policiona (Stryjkowski 1582: 127)

кости ж ея внѣкъ Владимѣръ крестиася, и в мѣста свѣты подя, и междѣ свѣтыя причтенна (Slav 26, fol. 208v)

---

86 Mss. B and G have собраться.
87 Ms. N has інныхъ instead of і ихъ, i.e. an asyndetic construction.
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(176) Nátychmiast tedy pośliwyszy Ricerstwo/ z wielkim pędem rzućili sie y gwałtownie uderzyli ná przeci w stojące woysko Greckie/ á przerwawszy y przebilszy uprzemiamy nawalnością ich uffy szykowane/ zwycięstwo otrzymáli (Stryjkowski 1582: 128)

8twierdziw je тогда воинство идя с великою скоростью и 8дари жестоко напротивъ стоящее воинство греческое, разорвать же и розбивъ великимъ нашествиемъ полки 8строенные ихъ, и тако побьдь возприяша (Slav 26, fol. 209v–210r)

(177) Potym Włodimirz będąc iusz zupełnymy jedynowłaycą wszystkiej Rūsǐ/ zebral wielkie woysko/ s którym przeprawiwszy sie przez Dunay/ opânował Ziemie Bulgarską […] (Stryjkowski 1582: 133)

и бдьдчи совершенным самодержцем всея Росии, Владимиръ шед с велиймъ войскомъ чрезъ Днѣнъ и овладѣ земли болгарскую […] (Slav 26, fol. 215r)

(178) á Pereslawiánin przyskoczyszy nie dał mu się powtore poprawowáć/ ále go záraz osiodlawisy poczál tłuc w szcze ki áž mu zęby wsupołek ze krwiá padráły (Stryjkowski 1582: 135)

рѣсищъ же не даде емѣ встать всѣд на него и нача бити по щекамъ, что збыдь с него с кровью выпадали (Slav 26, fol. 217v)

Two examples contain prepositive present participles:

(179) á Popowie dawàjac kájdely gromádzie z ossobná imie/ Timochwiey/ Wa- sil/ Piotr/ álbo Siemion/ polewáli ich woda/ á modlitwy nád niemi zwykle odprawiajíc/ chrzci lili wszystkich̆ męskych̆ y niewiaasty̆ w Imie Oycâ y Syná y Duchá swiętêgo. (Stryjkowski 1582: 140)

сйценицы ж хрестящи их̆ во имя обда и сіна і сітӑ хз̆, и даваху имь имяна, Васильи. Петръ, Иоан̆, Тимофей Симеон̆ и проч̆ (Slav 26, fol. 224v–225r)

(180) со râchuiç z dzisieyszym Rokiem Páńskim kiedy to piszą 1579. uczyni 599. Lat. (Stryjkowski 1582: 423)

и счита́я с нйешнимъ лтотмъ гдннимъ /афовы и и тогв бддеть, /фчэ. лт̆ь (Slav 26, fol. 226v)

Yet another example has a postpositive present participle:

(181) woyská z obudwu stron staly spojokynie pàtrzàc ná onę biesiàdę chłopká mâlego z obrzymem (Stryjkowski 1582: 134)

войска же с обоих страни́ сто́яхдти, и еряще на борбу малого мужичка со исполнином (Slav 26, fol. 217v)
In the following cases, examples of c), Polish finite verbs have been changed to adverbial participles in the Russian translation. In example (182), two finite forms have been turned into prepositive past participles:

(182) ale skoro sie wywiedzieli liczby Zolnierzow iego/ wnet tez woyskacie swoje Greckie spissali/ y wiedli przeciw Swentoslawowi (Stryjkowski 1582: 128)

egda же убивавшее число войнства его, вскоре воя свои греческие собравше, и против Святослава ведоша (Slav 26, fol. 209r)

Two examples have prepositive present participles. Both of these use the conjunction no:

(183) Widząc to Piecingowie/ isz sie im potężnie Wlodimirz stawil/ nie smieli nácierac wstępnym boiem/ ale poslali do Włodimirza z taką kondicjia [...] (Stryjkowski 1582: 133)

видя же печенгазы яко Владимиръ противъ ихъ стоить во множестве силы, не смъя на него боемъ настѣпати, но просиша 8 него [...] (Slav 26, fol. 216r)

(184) gdy ich tâże słudzy [...] puścić nie chielii/ iako nieприяциол у прожод- niow/ âsz ich tâże [...] rozgâmi y puhami roploszyli eť. (Stryjkowski 1582: 138)

takож слгги и пльники [...] хозяевь своих [...] яко неприятелеи в домы пбстити не хотяще, но по многих бранях хозяева изгнаны их такожде и прпч (Slav 26, fol. 222r)

The majority, however, contain postpositive present participles:

(185) A gdy go insze Xiążęta dârâmi blâgâty/ odkupiâc pokoy/ á Swentoslaw Złotâ y Panadokmi Kleinotow (iako ich Ruskie Kroniki мiâniuâ) nie chcial brác y gârdził nimi/ A tylko száty y bronii/ Zbroie/ Tarcze/ Miecze od Grekov przyslâne przymowal. (Stryjkowski 1582: 128)

и едя Святослава или кнзя 8молях8 дары, прося покоя, златом и панадокми бисерэв (яко рâские лътописцы имьнбютъ,) не вос- хотъ приимати, и гншась немъ, токмэ от грековъ одежды, орэзия збры щиты. мечи присланые приемля (Slav 26, fol. 210r)

(186) Y poczal rådziê Blud Iaropolkowi znovu/ aby pokoju i Bráta näd się dáleko mocnieszego prošî do Wlodimirzâ tez potâiemnie wskazal/ isz mu iusz wnet chcę bráta wydadâ/ y przedeñ przywieść. (Stryjkowski 1582: 131)

видя ж извнжение ихъ Блэд, совтовь Ярополк8 просити мир8 и тишины 8 брата своего Владимира, а Владимир8 предозввщая,
что 8же Ярополка хочет видать, и пред него привесть (Slav 26, fol. 213r)

(187) á naprzód Báltan bardzo wysoki postawil Piorunowi albo Porskunowi/ Bogowi gromow/ chmur/ y łyskawic. Ktorego nabożniej z wielką uczciwością chwałili (Stryjkowski 1582: 132)

и построили начальной болванъ здѣло высокъ Пер8ямъ или Перкѣму богѣ громовъ темныхъ облаковъ и молѣй и блѣочинно его почитая (Slav 26, fol. 214r)

(188) Drugie Báltwany byly miанowane/ Usład/ Korssa/ Dassubá/ Stribá/ Syma- ergla/ Makosz/ etc. Ktorych Russacy Kumerami jednostánie názywáli/ y tym ofiáry czynili/ y modlitwy Boskie wyrządzáli (Stryjkowski 1582: 132)

инъя ж болваны нарече Слад, Корса, Дассба, Стриба, Сима, ергла [sic], Макошь, и протчая, иже Р8ѣ къмірами нарицах8. и жертвы имь творящe88 (Slav 26, fol. 214r)

There is one example of case d), where a Polish adverbial participle has been changed to a finite verb in Russian. This example contains past participle forms in Polish, but the participle that remains in the Russian translation is in the present tense.

(189) Ták tedy Syny opatrzywszy Swantosław y rozdzielwszy im Xięstwá porządnice/ niemogl gnusniec w pokoiu (Stryjkowski 1582: 127)

И тако Святославъ сны 8строю и раздели имъ княжества, самъ ж в покое не возможе пребывати (Slav 26, fol. 209r) (cf. also example (197))

In some of these examples, the translation also differs from the Polish original in choice of words, word order or syntax. These are perhaps the most interesting examples, since they show a conscious choice by the translator.

All the examples listed above, except no. (173), which corresponds to an identical construction in the Polish original, are found in IV: 3, the chapter that relates events from Russian chronicles. This fact may imply that the construction was perceived as inherent to chronicle language. Still, the share of such constructions in this translation does not come close to the numbers mentioned for original chronicles. Also, Alekseev’s information about the conditions under which this construction is most common does not hold true for the translated Kronika. The reason for this difference in distribution is unknown.

When compared to the Polish original, different alterations (or absence of alteration) seem to be connected to different tenses and placements of the

88 Ms. R has творих8, making this an ordinary coordination of finite verbs in that manuscript.
Russian adverbial participle. This is illustrated by Table 35. The reason for these differences has not been investigated.

Table 35. Types of translations in relation to the position and tense of the participle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a: no alteration</th>
<th>b: conj. added</th>
<th>c: finite → part.</th>
<th>d: part. → finite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>past prepositive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. prepositive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. postpositive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample chapters from segment B contain one instance of case b), where a conjunction has been added in the Russian translation:

(190) á Dowmant też iako Holdownik z nimi był poszedł ná tę woynę według powinności/ upatrywyszy czás pogodny wrocił się nážad z ludem swoim/ wymowiwszy się u Hetmáná Mendogowego wielką á gwałtowną potrzebą. (Stryjkowski 1582: 336)

а Довмонть таж яко ғольдовникъ с ними быў, пошёл на тое войнь противь должности, а ̀демтра время согласное возвратилися назад с людми своими, ̀и просившис у гетмана Мендогова великою ї н下沉ою потребою (Slav 27, fol. 27v)

The sample chapters from segment C do not contain any examples of the construction.

The sample chapters from segment D contain six occurrences. Five of these are concentrated to chapter XXIV: 5. There are three instances of case b), where a conjunction has been added:

(191) A w tym Prokop y Alexander Sieniawscy z Herbu Leliwy rodzoni Brácia/ przypadwszy z Rotámi sweżyymi w bok Wołochom/ rozerwali ich (Stryjkowski 1582: 757)

а в томь Прокопь и Александрь Синаєски з гербов леливы. родныя братья прийкча с ротами свяжими в бокъ воолоховъ и розорвали ихъ (Slav 28, fol. 313v)

(192) skoczyliz wszyscy zápalczywie do Wołochow/ którzy zárzązem tył podáli/ różno po polách uiekáiac (Stryjkowski 1582: 757)

скочили всѣ с храбростью к воолохомь которыe тотчась возвратилися и розно по поламь утекая (Slav 28, fol. 314r)

(193) A ták złączywszy się z Polaki ciągneli zá Moskwą/ wzięli Zamek Homel w Siewierskiej ziemi nad Rzeką Sós. (Stryjkowski 1582: 758)

и тако соединившеса с поляками и шли на Москвою и взали город Гомель, в северской земл другой рекою Сожъ (Slav 28, fol. 316r)
There is one instance of case c), where a Polish finite verb has been changed into a participle:

(194) Tegoż czásu Mendlikieren Carz Prekopski gdy był wziął żóld od Krolá Sigmuntá/ y miał ciągnąć zaráz z Litwą na tę woynę przeciw Moskiewski-ému (Stryjkowski 1582: 747)

в тóж время Менделкиреи царь перекопский ввя́въ казну от короля Жигимонта и имь́лъ итьи в тóт же часть с Литвою на ту войну против московского (Slav 28, fol. 292v)

In these chapters, we also find two instances where a finite verb has been changed to a participle and a conjunction has been added, i.e. a combination of b) and c):

(195) Tegoż roku Piotr Opalenski poszedł do Turek/ ziednal przymierze z obi- emá Krolámí dożywotne/ od Turków/ Tátarow y Wołochoów. (Stryjkowski 1582: 757)

togóh gydu Пeйрь Opalenenski, пòshóи до тóрòк и прымиривó со юбема королами до живота, ωτ тóрковъ, татаровъ и волоховъ (Slav 28, fol. 314v)

(196) Tám tež skárbow y inszych rozmáitych wzdobycy Litwá y Polacy bárdzo wiele dostáli/ wszákže ogień nie málo попсова́l. (Stryjkowski 1582: 758)

тамже богатства и иных различных здобичи Литва и поляки зело побрали, а обаче немало и огонь пòпали́я (Slav 28, fol. 316v)

These two examples may have another explanation, however. In both cases, the participle is in the past tense with the ending -b. In this part of the text, there are several more cases of Polish past tense forms in -j being translated as Russian forms in -b (cf. also example (194)). This raises the question of whether these forms are really meant as participles, or if they might rather bear witness to the translator’s Ruthenian origin, since the corresponding ending in modern Ukrainian is -b and in Belorussian -ў.

Because of this uncertainty in how to define the forms in -b, the proportions of syndetic and asyndetic participle constructions in sample chapters D have not been calculated, but as we see, all four possible combinations of tenses and positions are found: present and past participles, prepositive and postpositive.

### 7.4 Formulas

It has been observed that chronicles used fixed formulas and clichés to a great extent, especially when reporting recurring events: births, deaths, natu-
ral phenomena or battles. Some of these formulas could vary over time.\footnote{Cf. Čiževskij (1960: 57–58, 102, 205, 259–260) for examples from different periods.} In late chronicles, some such expressions still remained as a reminder of chronicle tradition even when most other traditional elements had been abandoned (Kijanova 2010: 154–155). If these formulas were familiar to the translators of the *Kronika*, one might expect that they would insert them in appropriate places of the translation, according to the principle of text orientation.

Due to the fact that little has been written about formulaic expressions, there is no easily applicable method with which to compare the texts. Those that have been mentioned by earlier scholars have been sought out, with the addition of others that, on reading the translated *Kronika*, strike the eye as frequent.

As explained in Section 7.2, occurrences of the selected constructions in the translation of the *Kronika* have been compared to the corresponding places in the Polish text. If a construction in the translation differs from the one used in the Polish original, or if it corresponds to several Polish expressions, this has been seen as an indication that it presented itself as a formula to the translator and was an active choice on his part. Similar contexts have then been sought out in the original chronicles used as material for comparison to determine whether chronicle language may have been the source of the formula in question. This procedure has not been applied to the annalistic expressions, since they are undeniably formulaic.

### 7.4.1 Annalistic formulas

As seen in Section 6.7.4, the translation of annalistic formulas differs between segments. In segments A and B, the word *зво* is used in the introductory formula, whereas the word *годъ* occurs in other contexts, and their distribution is rather consistent. The fact that both words were part of the translators’ vocabulary makes the choice of *зво* seem formulaic. In segments C and D, *зво* and *годъ*, respectively, are dominant throughout, so that it is more difficult to judge to what degree they are formulaic. The most relevant results from that section are summarized in Table 36.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>в льто…</th>
<th>льта…</th>
<th>году…</th>
<th>того же льта</th>
<th>того же году</th>
<th>в том же году</th>
<th>non-formulaic use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>годъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>годъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>льто/годъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>годъ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{Cf. Čiževskij (1960: 57–58, 102, 205, 259–260) for examples from different periods.}
Original Russian chronicles differ in their way of expressing this. According to V. N. Ščepkin (1967: 157–158), в льто dominated in early texts, but льта took over in official documents in the late 15th century and in ecclesiastical and literary texts in the course of the 17th century. The use in Ruthenia varied, but льта dominated in the 16th century. The expression року spread there in the 17th century.

The consulted chronicles point in the same direction. The Primary Chronicle mainly uses the introductory formula в льто (от сотворения мира), and connecting formulas include в сеже льто, в тоже льто, тогоже льта and в также льта. The word льто is used outside the formulas as well, whereas the word годъ is rare. Segment C of the translated Kronika comes close to this use, in that it also has льто in both formulas, but the introductory formula in the Primary Chronicle is the one found in segment A.

Similarly, the First Novgorod Chronicle uses в льто as the introductory formula and several different versions of the connecting formula: в тоже льто ог тогоже льтъ and, in the later part of the chronicle, тогоже льта (Gippius 2006: 181–183). The construction тогоже льтъ is not found in the translation of the Kronika. Again, there are similarities with segment C and segment A.

The Piskarëvskij letopisec has almost exclusively the word льто. The introductory formula is въ льто ог въ льта, the connecting formula тогоже льта. The word годъ is found only sporadically. This is also reminiscent of segment C.

The Mazurinskij letopisec uses льта (от сотворения мира) and the phrase тогоже году very frequently, although other expressions are used as well. There are also instances of от рождества Христова. This reminds of the expressions in segment B.

Not all Belorussian-Lithuanian chronicles are annalistically organized, but the annalistic formulas still occur. The Suprasl'skaja letopis' and the Nikiforovskaja letopis' mainly use въ льто as the introductory formula and тогоже льта as the connecting formula, although the Suprasl'skaja letopis' also contains other connecting formulas, such as въ тоже льто. The word годъ is not very frequent. This is similar to what is found in segment C, and the introductory formula is identical to that in segment A.

The Synopsis is slightly differently organized, and although there are annalistic formulas in the text, they do not introduce every year’s entry, as they do in more traditional chronicles. There are some occurrences of expressions containing the word рокъ, such as року от создания мира (Rothe 1983: 178, 182, 187, 190), року от сотворения све́та (Rothe 1983: 214, 236) and року от рождества Христа (Rothe 1983: 270, 272, 351, 357–360), i.e. containing the Ruthenian word for ‘year,’ which is not found in the translation of Stryjkowski’s Kronika, but also of expressions with льто, for in-
stance льта (ор въ льто) от создания мира ог от рождения Христа (Rothe 1983: 234, 275, 362, 381). The Synopsis, then, is rather heterogeneous and it is difficult to draw parallels with the Kronika, in particular because of the frequent use of рокъ in the Synopsis.

Judging by this criterion only, segment A is closest to the Primary Chronicle and the Belorussian-Lithuanian chronicles, segment B to later chronicles, in particular the Mazurinskij letopisec, and segment C to the First Novgorod Chronicle, the Piskarëvskij letopisec and Belorussian-Lithuanian chronicles. Segment D seems to be less connected to chronicle tradition.

As we see, it is not easy to generalize about the use of annalistic formulas in original chronicles, since for example the two late chronicles differ in their treatment of the connecting formula – the Piskarëvskij letopisec seems to follow earlier tradition, and the Mazurinskij letopisec is more innovative. Later chronicles of course relied on earlier ones, and the variation may depend either on their different sources or on their differing degree of faithfulness towards them. This, in turn, demonstrates the difficulties in determining the influence of these chronicles on the translation of the Kronika.

7.4.2 The verb ударить referring to military campaigns

In Old Russian from the 11th and 12th centuries, the verb ударить and its prefized forms had a broader meaning, to be compared with the English verb ‘to go,’ whereas бьшати and its prefized forms was marked with respect to the manner of motion. By the 14th century, their roles had been reversed, so that бьшати was unmarked and ударить could only mean ‘to walk’ (Gippius 2006: 176–177).

The early stage is found in for instance the Primary Chronicle, where reports of military campaigns and diplomatic undertakings often begin with иде на + ethnonym or toponym in the accusative (cf. Section 4.3.3), such as иде Игорь на Греци (PVL 2007: 22), иде Володимеръ съ вои на Корсунь (PVL 2007: 49) and many more. Prefixed forms of the verb ударить were also used in such contexts, such as Михаиль царь изиде съ вои брегомъ и moremь на болгары (PVL 2007: 12), where the word moremь indicates that it is not a matter of walking.

In sample chapters A of the Russian translation of Stryjkowski’s Kronika, this use of the verb occurs 20 times, most often as a translation of the Polish verb ciągnąć (12 times), but also for wyprawić się (four times) and other verbs (przypuścić, przybliżać, wrócić się, pospieszać się, one time each). The translation ударить for ciągnąć is also the usual one in contexts other than military or diplomatic, but the verb wyprawić się can be translated in other ways, even in a military or diplomatic sense. The frequent use of ударить, especially in the aorist, which gives a very formulaic impression, may reveal that this
was a fixed formula in the translator’s mind, especially since it is used to translate so many Polish verbs. The following is a typical example:

(197) Ták tedy Syny opátrzywszy Swantosław y rozdzieliwszy im Xięstwá porządnio/ niemogł gnusnieć w pokoiu/ znowu **sie wypráwil do Bulgáriey** (Stryjkowski 1582: 127)

И тако Святославъ бьы строи и раздели им княжства, самъ ж в покое не невозможно пребываў́ паки и́де на болжары (Slav 26, fol. 209r) (cf. also example (189))

Here, the aim of the campaign is changed from do + toponym to na + ethnonym, which is reminiscent of the use in Russian chronicles.

The Primary Chronicle has already been mentioned, and it is very consistent in this regard: **bxamu** is only used three times in the whole chronicle, whereas **udmu** occurs more than 200 times.

The First Novgorod Chronicle uses this construction in its earlier part, whereas **bxamu** is first found under the year 6754 (1245/46) (Gippius 2006: 177).

The **Piskarëvskij letopisec** uses **udmu** in a formulaic way, both the unprefigated and prefigated forms. It is also to be found in the **Mazurinskij letopisec**, even if this chronicle seems to prefer prefigated forms to the unprefigated verb.

In **Suprasl'skaja letopis'**, prefigated forms of **udmu**, such as **noude**, are common, but the unprefigated verb is less frequent. Forms of **bxamu** are used, almost always prefigated. The situation is the same in the very similar **Nikiforovskaja letopis'**.

The **Synopsis** sometimes uses **udmu** or its prefigated forms in this way, but it does not give the same formulaic impression as other chronicles. The following example illustrates this:

(198) Събраши же Владимірь великіи силы воинскіи, пойде къ Таврикйи, юже ньй Перекопом нарицають (Rothe 1983: 212)

The fact that this use of the verb is found even in late chronicles shows that the language in them was influenced by their sources. However, this meaning of the verb **udmu** in earlier times was of course not unique to chronicles, so that for the translated **Kronika** we cannot exclude the possibility that other text genres served as models. Still, it seems certain that the translator perceived it as a fixed formula, and the inspiration probably came from early texts, whatever their genre.

If this can be seen as the opening formula for campaigns, the closing formula known from the Primary Chronicle and other chronicles – **воззва́ра́тишась въ своясіи** (cf. PVL 2007: 13, 21–23, 57; PSRL XXXV: 29, 47, 48) or similar constructions – is not found in the Russian translation of Stryj-
forms of the verb are used on their own, without the addition of въ свояси.

7.4.3 Deaths

Deaths and births are often considered to be formulaically expressed in chronicles, usually in the aorist (cf. Kijanova 2010: 42–43). There is only one reference to a birth (the birth of Christ) in sample chapters A of the Kronika, so that no conclusions regarding its status as a formula can be drawn.

When reporting deaths in the past with the help of a finite verb, the translation of the Kronika mainly uses умре. There is one occurrence of (от жития) преставились, i.e. in the perfect tense, as opposed to the nine aorist instances of умереть. The prevalence of this verb is not surprising. The Polish correspondences of these occurrences are mainly umrzeć for human beings and zdechnąć for animals (more specifically, Oleg’s horse). One of the instances of умре (Slav 26, fol. 211v) is a free translation of the Polish passive phrase был зăтăлочоный у зăдузоный (Stryjkowski 1582: 130), and the occurrence of от жития преставились (Slav 26, fol. 192r) corresponds to žywot z смiercią przemienili (Stryjkowski 1582: 115).

It can also be noted that throughout the Kronika, even in the segments that use mainly the perfect tense, the verb умереть almost always occurs in the aorist, which confirms observations by other scholars that this was a very widely spread formula. Uspenskij (2002: 110–111), for instance, points to the fact that умре was still used alongside умер as late as in the 18th century.

The three verbs that dominate in original chronicles are умереть, преставиться and скончаться. They are partly used in different contexts.

The Primary Chronicle mainly uses умре for both human beings and animals (cf. for instance PVL 2007: 41–44, 58–65). There are also instances of скончать животь от скончаяся (e.g. PVL 2007: 10, 58, 60), and quite many examples of преставился, concentrated in parts of the text (e.g. PVL 2007: 57–58).

The First Novgorod Chronicle has a handful of occurrences of умре, (e.g. NPL 1950: 22, 27), but преставился prevails in most parts (especially NPL 1950: 28–44, 79–98). There are only a few instances of скончать животь or скончаяся (NPL 1950: 76).

In the Piskarëvskij letopisec there are numerous occurrences of умре, especially in some parts of the text (e.g. PSRL XXXIV: 49–70). However, in most parts преставился is prevalent (e.g. PSRL XXXIV: 69–84, 97–119, 139–144). The form скончаяся is only used about a dozen times, mostly towards the end of the chronicle.

In the Mazurinskij letopisec, the verbs have different spheres of usage in that сконча(ся) is used mainly for saints and martyrs (cf. especially PSRL
XXXI: 15–25 and 32–35), умре (PSRL XXXI: 26, 28, 36, 38) or преставися (PSRL XXXI: 53, 54, 56, 59, 60) for princes and умре for Oleg’s horse (PSRL XXXI: 37).

Nikiforovskaja and Suprasl'skaja letopis' are not quite as consistent in this division. Умре is widely used (PSRL XXXV: 19, 20, 23, 27, 29, 32 for Nikiforovskaja letopis' and 37, 38, 45–47, 49, 54, 61 for Suprasl'skaja letopis'). They also use преставися (PSRL XXXV: 23, 28–33, and 41, 45, 46, 49–57, 61, respectively), often for church officials but also for princes. The following example from Suprasl'skaja letopis' shows two verbs with different subjects:

(199) В льто 6885. Приставися Алексеен митрополит феврала 12. Того жъ лъта умре князь велики литовскыи Олгирдь, и сяде по немъ сынъ его менши Ягайло. (PSRL XXXI: 49)

The Synopsis has издие (from издохнути) for Oleg’s horse (Rothe 1983: 171), otherwise умре (e.g. Rothe 1983: 172) and погибъ (e.g. Rothe 1983: 176), but often avoids this formula altogether, instead referring to a person’s death with по смерти or similar expressions.

The form преставися is common in many other late chronicles as well (Kijanova 2010: passim); умре is less frequent in these, but it does occur (Kijanova 2010: 214–215).

Here, then, the usage in the translation of the Kronika is formulaic compared to the Polish original, but does not quite reflect the more diverse pattern from original chronicles.

7.5 Names

Section 6.6.2.1 discussed the Russian renderings of the anthroponyms, toponyms and ethnonyms used by Stryjkowski in chapters related to Russian chronicles, with the purpose of finding patterns that could distinguish between translators. Here, some of the Russian names discussed in that section will be compared with occurrences of the same names in Russian chronicles. Of course, many anthroponyms were common in the 17th century and known not only from chronicles, and toponyms and ethnonyms could also be known from other sources or from experience. Therefore, the most interesting points here will be names that occur in an unexpected form.

As we have seen, the translation of the Kronika knows two spellings of the name Дирь: Дърь and Дърь, of which the second is more common. However, the Primary Chronicle, the Piskarëvskij letopisec, the Suprasl'skaja letopis', the Nikiforovskaja letopis' and the Synopsis all use only the form Дирь. The First Novgorod Chronicle of the older redaction does not contain this tale, since the beginning is missing, but the younger redaction only has
the form Диръ. In this case, then, all chronicles agree, and the translator uses a different form than they do. There is only one person by that name in the chronicles, and the name occurs only a handful of times in each chronicle, so that tradition was probably not strong here.

In the translation of the Kronika, corresponding to Polish iaropolk and iaropolk, we see a variation of the spellings Ярополкъ and Ёрополкъ, within and between manuscripts. The Primary Chronicle, the First Novgorod Chronicle and the Synopsis have only Ярополкъ (or Ёрополкъ), and other names with the same first element are also spelled Яро-. The Piskarёvskij letopisec and the Mazurinskij letopisec show mainly the form Ярополкъ, but also isolated instances of Ёрополкъ. The Suprasl'skaja letopis' and the Nikiforovskaja letopis' only have Ярополкъ, but the index of names in PSRL XXXV (288) shows that the spelling Ёрополкъ for Ярополкъ can be found in one of the Lithuanian-Belorussian chronicles. This variation in spelling is thus probably typical of late texts.

The Polish original of Stryjkowski’s chronicle has the spelling Olech for Oleg, and the Russian translation spells the name Олехъ. In a few cases, the Polish original has what seem to be forms of the feminine name Olha or Holha instead, but the translation uses masculine forms beginning in Олег-. The Primary Chronicle, the First Novgorod Chronicle, the Mazurinskij letopisec, the Suprasl'skaja letopis', the Nikiforovskaja letopis' and the Synopsis all know only Олегъ (or Ольгъ), usually with the stem Олг- in inflected forms. In the Piskarёvskij letopisec, the spelling Олегъ also dominates, but there is one single occurrence of Олехъ. Inflected forms vary between the stems Олг- and Олег-. However, as seen from the index of PSRL XXXV (291), Belorussian-Lithuanian chronicles using the Latin alphabet have forms such as Oleh and Olh. The spelling Олехъ in the Russian translation of the Kronika is probably dependant on the Polish original rather than on chronicles, but it is not without interest that there are chronicles where a similar form can be found. The forms in Олг- agree with what is found in chronicles.

The name Olga has the forms Olha, Holha or Olcha in the Polish original, but is always Ольга in the translation. Ольга is the common spelling in all chronicles (and probably other texts). The Primary Chronicle also occasionally has Вольга. Belorussian-Lithuanian chronicles written in the Latin alphabet use the form Olha (PSRL XXXII: 222). As opposed to the treatment of the name Oleg, this name follows Russian tradition.

Although the Polish original of the Kronika uses the spellings Swatoslaw, Swetoslaw, Swantoslaw and Swentoslaw alternately, this name is spelled Святославъ throughout the studied chapters of the translation. This is also the usual form in for instance the Primary Chronicle, the First Novgorod Chronicle, the Mazurinskij letopisec, the Piskarёvskij letopisec and the Nikiforovskaja letopis'. It dominates in the Suprasl'skaja letopis', which, how-
ever, also has two instances of Святославъ. In the Synopsis, the form Святославъ is used in the first (1674) edition and Святославъ in the third (1681) (Moser 2007: 259). In the Russian translation of the Kronika, the translator has used what is apparently the original form of the name and not the alternative form, which may be Ruthenian, since it occurs in a Belorussian-Lithuanian chronicle and in the Kievan Synopsis.

As for the variation between Владимиръ and Владимиръ in the translation of the Kronika, it relates in the following way to original chronicles: the Primary Chronicle uses forms with pleophony, mostly Володимиръ, with some instances of Володимиръ. The First Novgorod Chronicle also usually has pleophony, with many instances of both Володимиръ and Володимиръ, but the latter dominates. The Mazurinskij letopisec does not have pleophony; the usual form here is Владимиръ. The Piskarëvskij letopisec has approximately equal shares of Володимиръ and Владимиръ. The Suprasl'skaja letopis' and the Nikiforovskaja letopis' are dominated by Володимиръ, with slightly fewer instances of Владимиръ and isolated cases of forms ending in -миръ, with or without pleophony. The Synopsis has Владимиръ. Forms of this name without pleophony appeared in the 14th century in connection with the so-called Second South Slavic influence (Uspenskij 2002: 42). It seems, then, as if variation in the second part of the name, as in the translation of Stryjkowski, was common in chronicles, and that a consistent spelling without pleophony in the first part was typical of late texts. All possible spellings of the name are attested from chronicles.

7.6 Chapter summary

In this chapter, the history of the chronicle genre was briefly summarized, with the emphasis on late chronicles, with which the translation of Stryjkowski’s Kronika might perhaps best be compared. By the 17th century, the original annalistic way of writing chronicles had partly given way to thematically organized historical narratives, some of the roles of chronicles were instead filled by archival documents, and new text types such as short chronicles had appeared. This means that there were several types of chronicles that differed greatly from each other, something that must be considered when discussing the validity of the conclusions. If we suppose that the translators oriented their work on chronicles and other historical texts of which they had experience, the result may turn out very different depending on if they associated it with annalistic early chronicles, later chronographs, short chronicles, etc. A diverse selection of chronicles was chosen as material for comparison, in order to represent different types of history writing, early and late, from various regions.
The language of the translated *Kronika* was compared with that of these original chronicles by searching the translation for traits mentioned by other scholars as being typical for chronicles. The syntactic construction *participle + conjunction + finite verb* was found to be present in the translation, but to a lower degree than in original chronicles. In the sample chapters from segment A, this construction is mainly concentrated in chapter IV: 3, which presents events from the Primary Chronicle. It also occurs several times in the sample chapters from segment D.

Formulaic expressions have also been mentioned as a typical feature. The annalistic formula varies between segments of the *Kronika*, but most segments have something in common with the formulas used in chronicles of different kinds. The exception is segment D, which seems to be less oriented on chronicle language in this regard. The use of the phrase *и́дем на* + ethnonym in connection with military campaigns and the aorist *умре* to report deaths both seem to have a formulaic character, but it is difficult to determine if chronicles have served as model texts for them. In the former case, the influence may have come from other early texts, and in the latter case, chronicles use a more complex array of verbs.

The spelling of names partly coincides with that in chronicles, and in some cases, influence from Belorussian-Lithuanian chronicles can be suspected. These names may of course have been familiar to the translators for other reasons.

Thus, the translation of the *Kronika* seems to follow chronicle tradition to some extent, since there are instances where it is more similar to Russian chronicles than to the Polish original text, but there is a limit to the influence from chronicles. Due to the variety of chronicles and their different features, it has been difficult even to say what characterizes chronicle language.
8 Editorial principles

The editor of a manuscript faces the decision of how closely the edition should follow the manuscript text. To begin with, there is a choice between a diplomatic and a critical edition.

A diplomatic edition is as exact a copy as possible of a single manuscript, often without variant readings (Lichačëv 2001: 484). A critical edition, on the other hand, aims to establish the readings of the protograph and involves emendations that are not found in any of the manuscripts (Öberg 1992: 60).

A so-called modified diplomatic edition unites features from both these types. Which features are taken from which type of edition may vary, but the main principle is that the text of one manuscript is followed faithfully. Reading may be facilitated by insertion of capital letters, word division and punctuation. Errors in the text can either be corrected, which is marked somehow, or left as they are, but commented on in the critical apparatus (cf. Öberg 1992: 85–90). This edition is a modified diplomatic edition, and its characteristics are explained in Section 8.2.1. The readings of the Polish original have been given in the apparatus where deemed necessary.

Lichačëv (2001: 483) claims that a diplomatic edition of a single, early, well-preserved manuscript without variants from other copies may be suitable for linguists who are not interested in the changes that the text underwent. I wish to argue, on the contrary, that a very interesting aspect for linguists is to see which linguistic features vary between manuscripts and which do not.

The aim of this chapter is to explain the choice of manuscripts for the edition, clarify the principles according to which they are reproduced and explain the abbreviations and symbols used. It also contains a description of the scribal hands found in the relevant chapters in all the manuscripts included in the edition.

8.1 Choosing the manuscripts for the edition

Since the Polish original is available for comparison, choosing the main manuscript has been a matter of finding the one with the least omissions and mistakes compared with the original. A comparison of the manuscripts with each other and with the Polish original has shown that there are three groups
of manuscripts (cf. Section 3.5) that together give a good picture of how the first draft of the translation may have looked.

Manuscripts from all three groups have been included in the edition. Besides the best one from each group (U, B and N), manuscripts derived from these (G, E and R) have also been included to illustrate how the text developed. The remaining five copies of the text (in six mss.) have been excluded because they are more recent or more corrupt representatives of their groups.

The relationship between the manuscripts has been established with the help of lacunae and other major differences that would have been difficult for a scribe to correct. Such differences might, of course, be eliminated by a scribe using two exemplars, i.e., contamination is possible. Since the readings in the various manuscripts are so similar, it is difficult to determine if contamination has taken place, but this does not seem to be the case.

The possibility of a scribe correcting his copy with the help of the Polish original cannot be ruled out (cf. Lichačëv 2001: 394). For example, Sparwenfeld evidently had access to the Polish original, since he copied its title page etc. (cf. Section 3.6.2), and if he did, so might the scribes who originally copied the manuscript. It is perhaps not so likely that a scribe would look up the errors he found in the manuscript he was copying and correct them according to the Polish original, but it is not impossible. There are occasional signs that later scribes had access to the Polish original, such as the addition of и врацы миром in mss. E and R, corresponding to the Polish fraucimeru (cf. Slav 26, fol. 223r), but this is only an isolated instance, and there does not seem to have been any systematic correction.

8.2 The reproduction of manuscripts in the edition

There are different opinions as to the edition principles for early Russian texts. Editions aimed at linguists differ from those published for the benefit of historians and scholars of literature (Lichačëv 2001: 470–474). This is a linguistic edition, and the principles for the reproduction of the main manuscript, as well as the variants in the critical apparatus, have been chosen accordingly.

8.2.1 The main manuscript

The edition principles for the main manuscript are based on the ones used by Anne Pennington in her edition of Kotoščihin (Pennington 1980: 13), as well as the ones used in the editions of Vesti-Kuranty (2009: 62), since these are two highly regarded editions of texts from the same century as the Kronika. Since they are diplomatic editions, the question of variants from other manuscripts is not discussed there. The handbook Pravila lingvističeskogo
izdanija pamjatnikov drevnerusskoj pis’mennosti (Pravila 1961) has also been consulted.

According to the principles of the abovementioned editions, I distinguish between e and b, u and i, y and δ, z and s, я and А, o and ω. The letters i, i and j are all represented by ɨ (which is here, unlike in the two other editions, preferred to i because it is the more common variety), and e and ε are represented by e (cf. Pennington 1980: 191). I have chosen not to distinguish between я and iotized a, as the edition of Vesti-Kuranty does. Several Greek letters occur in the text, some only as numerals, some in words, and they are also rendered in the edition: B, , C, D.

The text contains two letters that were not entirely typical for the 17th century. There is one instance of the letter ژ, which at this time was a sign of chancellery usage, influenced by Ruthenian practice (Pennington 1980: 191). The letter ฏ, which occurs sporadically in the manuscript, was not regularly used in Russian before the 18th century, but could be found under Ruthenian influence in the 17th century (Pennington 1980: 193). It is sometimes difficult to distinguish from the letter u with a spiritus, which could be written over a vowel following another vowel (cf. below).

Superscript letters are printed in the line in italics. Abbreviations have not been expanded. Capital letters are introduced in the beginning of paragraphs and for proper names, including possessive adjectives derived from proper names by way of the suffixes -ов- and -ин-, but not adjectives formed with the suffix -ск-, since they have a more adjectival character. As for words that can be either toponyms or ethnonyms, such as Москва, Литва, Лотва, Жиондь and Русь, they have been capitalized throughout.

Word division in the text has been normalized. The scribes often did not leave spaces between words or were inconsistent in word division. For instance, compound nouns and adjectives were often written as two words but have here been written as one word. Prepositions have been separated from the following word, although they were at the time often joined into one.

Some words consisting of two parts are almost always separated in the manuscripts, although we would write them as one word today (most notably Царь градъ and Новъ городъ and related words). These have been joined into one word, except where they are divided by e.g. a punctuation mark.

The particle же deserves to be mentioned separately, since it can have different meanings. Etymologically, what we in Russian see as one же are two different words, of which one, derived from *-dje, had the form же in OCS, whereas the other was же in OCS as well as in Old Russian (Vaillant 1951: 288; cf. Gippius 2001: 158, 175). The former was a particle with an identifying function that formed demonstrative and relative pronouns and adverbs. Such words are here written jointly, because their meaning is formed by both elements together, and же does not carry a meaning of its own. This applies to forms of the relative pronouns иже and оноже, the
demonstrative pronouns *тоже* and *сей же* ‘the same’ and adverbs such as *идъже*, *еограф* and *тамже*, among others. The other *же* was a conjunction and carried a meaning of its own, for which reason it is written here as a separate word. To determine which meaning of *же* is meant, and thus if it should be written jointly or separately, the Polish original has been used for reference. If the Polish text has *a* or *też*, the Russian *же* has been seen as a translation of this and separated from the preceding word. In this way, *tenże = томже* and *a ten = тóмь же* can be kept apart. There are some cases that are on the border between the two meanings, and where the Polish original does not provide help. In these cases, individual solutions have been found, which may be questioned, of course.

The punctuation of the main manuscript is followed. This includes commas, a comma followed by a period, and parentheses. The square brackets used in the manuscript have been changed to regular parentheses, and square brackets are reserved for the editor’s comments. Asterisks mark text that was written in the margins. Unlike in the editions mentioned above, line breaks are not marked here, but page breaks are marked by two vertical lines.

In a few instances, the last letter of one word is also the first letter of another, such as in *наднепром*. If the latter word, in this case *Днепр*, also occurs outside of this combination, so that one may assume that the scribe knew the proper form, this has been rendered by *над [Д]непром*. In other cases, I have hesitated to make such corrections, since there are no signs to show what the scribe perceived to be the correct form. It is for instance difficult to know if *устин* (for Latin & *Iustinus*) is meant to be *Устин, и Устин* or *и [И]устин*. In this particular case, I have opted for *Устин*.

As mentioned above, abbreviations are not expanded. Such abbreviations are usually covered by a *titlo*, which is rendered in the edition. A *pokrytie* over superscript letters is also reproduced. Sometimes, a *titlo*-like sign appears next to superscript letters. This sign, which seems to fill the same function as a *pokrytie*, is not reproduced.

The acute accent *oxia* (Steensland 1997: 15–19) and the grave accent *varia* (Steensland 1997: 19–26) are reproduced, as well as *paerok* (Steensland 1997: 68–70), which originally stood for an omitted й or ё, but can here be written between any two adjoining consonants. The *spiritus* (Steensland 1997: 48–49), often written over initial vowels and vowels following another vowel, is omitted. The placement of diacritical marks in the manuscript is very inconsistent. It is often difficult to determine the placement of accents, as well as to distinguish the oxia and the paerok.

In general, the goal has been to produce a text that gives a faithful impression of the main manuscript but is nevertheless clear and legible. It is not within the scope of this thesis to comment on all the graphical variants used by the different scribes, but they will hopefully not disturb the reading of the text, and possibly arouse curiosity in some readers.
8.2.2 The critical apparatus

In the critical apparatus, I give variant readings from five further manuscripts. One aim of these variants is to come as close as possible to the protograph, i.e. the translation as it was first recorded in a manuscript, as we can suppose that if the correct reading (when compared to the Polish original) is found in one or several manuscripts, it is probably taken over from the protograph.

Furthermore, the variants show the different forms in which the text lived on. This may be of interest when studying the development of language norms, determining what difficulties the scribes had in copying the text and what liberties they took with it.

Variants include errors, corrections and omitted, added or substituted words. The placement of words or phrases in the margin or above the line is also commented on. Orthographical as well as morphological variants are included.

The variations between e and Ь, u and ã etc. are not included, nor the purely graphical alternations between Cyrillic and Greek letters, such as Θ and φ, ξ and κς. A special case is ν, which can alternate with both γ and ζ. Such variants are therefore included. The alternation between abbreviated and non-abbreviated forms is as a rule left out, unless the abbreviation is very unusual. In general, it can be said that ms N, which is a late manuscript, has nearly no Greek letters (except when used as numerals) and fewer abbreviations. The variation between numerals spelled out in full and Cyrillic alphabetical numerals is not included. Ms. G has alphabetical numerals more often than the others.

In most manuscripts, voicing assimilation of prepositions to the following word is reflected in the spelling, e.g. из Володимера but ис корабля. In ms. N, the prepositions have in most cases achieved their modern form. The preposition κъ before words beginning with κ- is regularly dissimilated in all manuscripts except ms. N, e.g. х королю vs. κ королю. These alternations are not reproduced in the apparatus, except for the few cases where such alternations occur in other manuscripts than ms. N. I do, however, include variation between voiced and voiceless prefixes (безчестие/бесчестие) and between forms of prepositions such as въ/во.

Variations in paragraph breaks and punctuation are not shown in the apparatus, with an exception for the placement of parentheses. Neither is variation in spacing between words included, except in isolated cases when it affects the meaning or implies that the scribe did not understand the text he was copying. Line breaks are usually not marked in the variants, but if an unusual reading can be explained by a line break, it has been marked with a vertical line. Diacritical marks are not reproduced in the apparatus.

Alterations and corrections in ms. B are always included in the apparatus. As for the other manuscripts, alterations are mentioned when they seem to be
the result of conscious work on the part of the scribe, e.g. when a word in the exemplar can be read in different ways and the scribe has first written one and then corrected it to the other. Corrections of apparent slips of the pen, unrelated to other mss., are not included in the apparatus. When alterations have been made by writing the new letter on top of the old one, it can sometimes be difficult to determine what the original reading was, in which case the uncertain letter or letters are enclosed in curled brackets: {}.

In some of the cases when text has been lost in one of the manuscripts, due to e.g. trimming of the pages, it has been supplied from other manuscripts and enclosed in square brackets.

The manuscripts are quoted in the order BGERN. When several of the manuscripts in the critical apparatus have similar readings, but differ among themselves in details, such as the use of superscript letters or variations between e and ë, u and û, etc., the form given in the critical apparatus is the one found in the first of the mentioned manuscripts. Additional marginal notes, mainly found in ms. G, are separated from the other variants and designated by letters instead of numbers.

8.3 Properties of individual manuscripts

Six manuscripts are involved in the edition, and each manuscript is the joint work of several scribes. Therefore, many elements in the manuscripts are characteristic of one scribe only – this is particularly true of the graphic variants and superscript marks used, but orthography and morphology are also affected. Many factors, such as spelling, spacing and the use of certain graphemes and diacritical marks, vary greatly not only between manuscripts, but also between different scribes within a single manuscript. It is, of course, important to separate the traits of the text and of the scribe when examining the text. Below, the division of the text between different hands in the relevant chapters is given for each of the manuscripts in the edition, and some characteristics of each hand are listed.

References to the tables of letter shapes in L. V. Čerepnin’s Russkaja paleografija (1956) are given when possible, so that the reader will not have to rely only on verbal descriptions. Unless otherwise indicated, references are made to the table of 17th-century skoropis' (Čerepnin 1956: 365–366), with the variants of each letter numbered from left to right.

8.3.1 Ms. U

The edited text is found in Slav 26, fol. 148v–228v. The distribution of hands in the selected chapters is as follows:
U1, fol. 148v (and before) to fol. 154v (cf. Illustration 4). A very ligatured hand that adds flourishes to many letters. The letter ж is quite flat (cf. же, line 4 from the bottom). The letter м in word-final position is often superscript as an almost vertical wavy line (cf. том, line 5). At the end of a paragraph, this hand sometimes uses a period and a comma after each other, and once (fol. 150v) above each other in the shape of a semicolon.

U2, fols. 155r–188v (cf. Illustration 5). This is a clear and distinct hand that uses the letters A and W and sometimes hyphenates words. The letter Y is occasionally written with the "tail" in the middle, in the old way, like Ćerepnin’s variant no. 2 of that letter (cf. дщерь, line 4). The letter A is used frequently. Several varieties of В are used, of which one is tall with two rounded parts that do not meet in the middle (cf. великого, line 4). The letter 8 is sometimes written not in one stroke, but the top and the bottom part seem to be written separately (cf. δδδδι, line 7). The letter 3 is often written carefully, with the “tail” traced rather than scribbled. The letter ж is found mainly in two designs, one with a connected bow to the right, like Ćerepnin’s no. 3, and one where the stroke from the upper left to the lower right is very pronounced. Superscript м has the same shape as the ordinary letter. There are very few examples of superscript х.

U3, fols. 189r–228v and after (cf. Illustration 6). A more ligatured hand. The letter ж is often small and round, у (rather than 8) is more common than in the other hands. Superscript з and м are very similar and wavy. Superscript х is frequent and looks like a horizontal 8. In punctuation, this hand uses a big round dot, comma or semicolon, and also dashes.

8.3.2 Ms. B

The relevant chapters are found in vol. I, fols. 146v–221v. The distribution of hands is as follows:

B1, fol. 146v (and before) to 168v and fols. 180r–192v (cf. Illustration 7). An upright hand with many ligatures and superscript letters. The letter и is often quite large and similar to Ćerepnin’s no. 9. The letter 8 often has a sweeping left stroke. The letter и in the beginning of words is often large. The word же is often written in full in superscript. Whether in the line or as superscript, these letters are ligatured so that the lower right stroke of the ж curves around and connects to the top of the е (cf. line 8 and 8множения, line 9). The letter в is often written with a box on the left and then a bow, like Ćerepnin’s no. 10. In superscript м, the left arch is more pronounced than the right. Marginal notes from the Polish original are absent.

B2, fols. 169r–179v. This hand is very similar to B1, but does not have the characteristic ligature of же. Also, it has two variants of the letter д, one similar to the printed one and one with a downward tail, whereas B1 prefers the former kind. Marginal notes from the Polish original are absent.
B3, fols. 193r–205v. A hand that is similar to the other two and that has the ligature же found in B1, but without the superscript м so typical for that hand. The letter ж is often connected on the left side, and both sides droop a little. The printed-style ҃ prevails. Marginal notes from the Polish original are absent.

B4, fol. 206r (foliated as 201) to 221v (and after). A small hand with low letters and the rows close together. There are many superscript letters. Marginal notes from the Polish original are translated.

8.3.3 Ms. G

The relevant chapters are found on fols. 106v–165v. The distribution of hands is as follows:

G1, fol. 106v (and before) to 110v. An upright hand with rather low and regular letters. Dots are sometimes used to separate words. The letter κ is one of the more pronounced letters, reminiscent of Ćerepnin’s no. 9, and its tail is often written with the broad side of the pen, which makes it even more prominent. The letter я is sometimes written as an iotaized a, similar to Ćerepnin’s no. 13.

G2, fols. 111r–121v. This is a slightly inclined hand with few ligatures. Superscript м is often simply a stroke or a bow, like Ćerepnin’s no. 7, but more bent. Superscript р is very similar to Ćerepnin’s no. 5, but with a downward hook on the right end. The letter ж, when written in the line, consists of three separate strokes, but as a superscript it is written in one stroke and is rather flat.

G3, fols. 122r–140v. This hand, which uses a broad pen that makes some lines very pronounced, has many letter shapes in common with hand G2, such as the superscript р and the difference between in-line and superscript ж. The bow-shaped superscript м, however, is not found at all. The letter з is also written in a different way, with a more pronounced upper part. This hand uses the letter s (dzelo). The shift between G2 and G3 takes place in the middle of a quire.

G4, fols. 141r–148v and 157r–165v (but not after). A very upright and narrow hand with relatively few superscript letters, but with many tall letters and pronounced strokes in for instance κ, с and ж. The latter has an unusual shape, where the top-left to bottom-right stroke is made separately and the other two form a diagonally flattened loop. The letter ω is frequent.

G5, fols. 149r–156v. A small hand with many flourishes and round shapes. Superscript м is wavy. Superscript в forms a pretzel and then continues to form a titlo for itself, rather like Ćerepnin’s no. 12, but horizontal.

G6, marginal notes and occasional corrections in the text. A hand with narrow, angular letters.
8.3.4 Ms. E

The relevant chapters are found on fols. 70r–119v. The distribution of hands is as follows:

E1, fol. 70r (and before) to 79v. A rather irregular hand with many superscript letters, sometimes low but sometimes sprawling. The letters e, i and ĩ are often very high. The letter ď is often connected to the preceding letter and written in one stroke that starts with the vertical line, then traces the bow, crosses the vertical line to the left and then to the right. This is the most characteristic trait of this hand. It can also begin with a top stroke and not really have a crossing line, so it is shaped rather like a high and large ď. The letter y is sometimes large and curved to the left so that ď resembles the letter э. This is another very characteristic trait.

E2, fols. 80r–119v. An irregular hand, similar to E1 but lacking its characteristic traits. The letter ď instead often is similar to Čerepnin’s no. 10, where the crossbow is written first and the line is then looped down to cross it. In the letter ž, the three strokes are sometimes not connected at all, like in Čerepnin’s no. 1. The letter y can have the leaning shape in this hand as well. The letter ꞌ occurs frequently in a shape like Čerepnin’s no. 5. In the preposition or, the letter τ is often superscript and shaped like a bow or a horseshoe with the opening facing downwards. The letters де are often superscript, but in a form not mentioned by Čerepnin.

In this manuscript, prepositions are sometimes omitted. This is also typical for ms. R.

8.3.5 Ms. R

The relevant chapters are found on fols. 70r–113v. The distribution of hands is as follows:

R1, fols. 70r–77v. This is an even and regular hand where most of the letters are low, but there are also flourishes and superscript letters. The letter ř in the beginning of words is often very large. The letter s (dzelo) is used rather frequently and in many different words. The letter ž is often written elaborately in one stroke, rather like Čerepnin’s no. 1 in the table of 16th-century skoropis’, but larger and more sweeping (Čerepnin 1956: 362).

R2, fols. 78r–113v (and after). This is also an even and regular hand with letters that are just as low as the ones of hand R1, but with fewer flourishes. This hand also uses the letter s (dzelo) in many words. It is sometimes written not smoothly, but with a point before it curves to the right, in a way not shown by Čerepnin. The letter e is often shaped as a mirrored 3 with the upper bow larger than the lower, like Čerepnin’s no. 2 in the 17th-century table. The letter κ is sometimes tall with a part in the middle where the two strokes overlap, so that they look like a single line. The letter ω is frequent. The vertical lines in the letters μ and ι are sometimes slightly wavy.
In this manuscript, the adjective ending -ты is often written -ты (cf. Section 4.2.3.3).

8.3.6 Ms. N

The relevant chapters are found on folios 108v–168v. The distribution of hands is as follows:

N1, fol. 108v (and before) to 158v. This is a small hand with rounded letters and practically no superscripts or flourishes. The letter д is usually like no. 11 in Čerepnin’s table of late 18th-century skoropis’ (Čerepnin 1956: 481), but can also have its upwardly stretched tail shaped differently, have a tail that points straight downward or be shaped almost like a modern printed д. The letter к often consists of two parallel lines. The letter в is sometimes box-shaped. The letter б is similar to the modern handwritten letter, like no. 3 in Čerepnin’s table of early 18th-century skoropis’ (Čerepnin 1956: 478). The letter г is shaped like the modern handwritten letter.

N2, fols. 159r–168v (and after). This hand is very similar to hand N1 but the tips of some flourishes are more tightly curled. The letter д is often similar to the modern printed letter but can also have a tail that points downward and to the left or, sometimes, upward, but more curled than the similar variant in hand N1. The letter б is similar to the modern printed letter, like Čerepnin’s no. 5 from the early 18th century (Čerepnin 1956: 478). The letter г is similar to the modern printed letter, but with an upward curl at the end.

This is the latest manuscript, and some unique features of the language set it apart from the other manuscripts. Firstly, as mentioned above, prepositions are not assimilated to the voicing of the following word. Secondly, hand N1 regularly writes the genitive singular ending of masculine or neuter adjectives as -асо, not -осо (cf. Section 4.2.3.2). Thirdly, while the other manuscripts regularly have the form есн, this manuscript often has есб instead.

8.4 Abbreviations and symbols used in the edition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ad., add.</th>
<th>Added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ante corr.</td>
<td>Before correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in marg.</td>
<td>Written in the margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ras.</td>
<td>Erased or crossed out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in textu</td>
<td>Written in the text, as opposed to in marg. or suprascr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>om., omm.</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suprascr.</td>
<td>Written above the line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{}</td>
<td>Uncertain readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[]</td>
<td>Text supplied by the editor; editor’s comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Text written in the margin of the main ms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the wave of translations from Polish into Russian in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century, Maciej Stryjowski’s *Kronika Polska* was one of the few historical works to be translated. It was translated several times, however, in part or in whole, and there are 28 known manuscripts preserved of the Russian translations added together, as well as two manuscripts belonging to a Ukrainian translation. It was thus an influential text, and the 1673–79 translation, which is preserved in more copies than the others, is especially interesting for several reasons.

This thesis had as its aim to describe as many aspects as possible of the 1673–79 translation, its history and language. Three chapters, approximately 80 folios in the main manuscript, were in focus. They were edited with the aim to be of use to linguists. There are twelve manuscripts belonging to this translation, but two manuscripts, kept in different libraries, are two halves of a single copy of the text, so there are eleven copies. The manuscripts can be divided into three groups according to the relationships between them. The best manuscripts of each group are ms. B (BAN 31.4.32), ms. U (UUB Slav 26–28) and ms. N (RNB Ėrmitažnoe sobranie, no. 551).

According to my observations, ms. B is the earliest extant manuscript, probably from the end of the 1670s. Corrections and changes in the manuscript, previously believed to be part of preparations for printing, were shown to be editorial corrections at an early stage of the history of the text. The changes are numerous and diverse, and although some of them may have been made in order to avoid polonisms, others remain to be explained.

Ms. U is the main manuscript of the edition. It is also an early manuscript – written before 1685 – and contains copies of a number of pages from the Polish original, a translation of the title page and a note, written by its owner, Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeld, that reveals that it was translated in *Posol’skij prikaz* by several translators at the behest of tsar Aleksej Michajlovič.

Ms. N is a late manuscript, made in the 1780s for Catherine II, but according to its title page, it was copied from a manuscript from 1679.

There was no standardized written language in 17\textsuperscript{th}-century Russia. Instead, the situation can be described as an interplay of four registers, two
bookish and two non-bookish. In the translation of the *Kronika*, some parts have many features typical of the bookish hybrid register, whereas other parts have some non-bookish characteristics and may perhaps have been influenced by chancellery language.

The language of the edited chapters, as found in ms. U, was subject to particular study. These chapters are typical of the hybrid register. The simplex preterites, by that time purely a feature of bookish written language, dominate over the elliptic perfect tense, used in speech and in non-bookish texts. There are numerous examples of morphological variation, often following patterns that can be found in other hybrid texts as well, although sometimes more reminiscent of chancellery texts. Several syntactic structures that were markers of bookishness can be found in the text, such as the dative absolute and occasional dual forms of nouns.

Besides this variation of bookish and non-bookish forms within the chapters as recorded in one manuscript, the variation between manuscripts was also studied. It was found that some linguistic features, such as adjectival endings and the forms of participles, tended to vary between manuscripts to a higher degree than for instance pronouns, the choice of verbal tense or the syntactic structure of the text. Where there was variation, it could be seen that some scribes had consciously replaced, for instance, the adjective ending -o with -s, whereas others had made substitutions in both directions. This implies that some scribes accepted variation where others followed a norm that prescribed one ending.

The relation between the Polish source text and the Russian target text was studied and described in terms of adequacy and acceptability. In many cases, it was seen that the person who translated chapters IV: 1–3 identified information that may have been unfamiliar to a Russian reader and adapted it, e.g. recalculated measurements of distance from Polish to Russian standards. However, the text contains both lexical and syntactic polonisms, i.e. words and syntactic structures influenced by the Polish language. It could not be established with any certainty if this is due to the influence of the Polish original or of the translators’ own usage – many translators employed in Moscow were Ruthenians, and the Ruthenian language had long been under Polish influence for geographical and political reasons.

There is reason to believe that the translation was the joint work of several people, and a preliminary division of the text into segments was made on the basis of the verbal tenses used to relate past events: simplex preterites or the perfect tense. These segments were used throughout the thesis, but the number of translators and the exact division of the text between them was not known. Therefore, one chapter was devoted especially to this question, and to identifying criteria that may be helpful in future attempts of a similar kind, such as comparing the distribution of a number of synonyms and near-synonyms in different text segments. The study confirmed that there were
quite obvious differences between the four sets of sample chapters chosen for comparison, but further study is needed to establish if there are still more segments that have not been identified. If the same parameters were used to compare the segments of this text with identified works by translators known to have been active in the 1670s, it would perhaps be possible to attribute parts of the *Kronika* to specific translators.

Since it is a historical text and genre tradition was strong in this period, the *Kronika* was compared to a variety of original chronicles in order to see if they influenced the language of the translation. It was stated that the translation contains some formulaic expressions that may have been inspired by chronicles, but on the one hand, influence from other text genres cannot be ruled out without further study, and on the other hand, the chronicle genre is very diversified and difficult to characterize.

The 1673–79 translation of Stryjkowski’s *Kronika* can be described in terms of tradition – chronicle tradition and the chancellery tradition of *Posol’skij prikaz* – and translation – the influence of the Polish source text and the translators’ strategies when they chose to deviate from it. The tradition of the hybrid register was strong in the chapters that were in focus, but a comparison between manuscripts shows clearly that this tradition allowed a certain amount of variation, at least with regard to some linguistic features.

Although a number of lexical and syntactic polonisms were found in the translation, there are also numerous instances where the translator could have chosen a cognate of the Polish word but did not, used a syntactic structure that did not exist in Polish or followed Russian norms and traditions in some way. It is therefore quite informative as to the norms of the written language in late 17th-century Russia.

This thesis treats many aspects of the text, some of them in a cursory way. I therefore have many suggestions for further study. Ms. B and its numerous changes deserves more attention, not only because this may answer some questions about the history of the translation, but also because a systematic study of the changes may reveal more about the norms of *Posol’skij prikaz*. I have already mentioned an extension of the comparison between text segments to involve translations made by people employed at the *prikaz* in the 1670s, in order to attribute text segments to individual translators and to characterize their language.

A comparison of the Russian translations with each other would say something about the translation norms during the last decades of the 17th century. The Ukrainian translation could also be used for comparison. Last but not least, an edition of the whole chronicle would be desirable.

Contact has been established with the Regensburg Diachronic Corpus of Russian to make the edited text searchable within that project.
Appendix: Edition

148v Матвея¹ Стриковского² Осостёвича³
Крона³а⁴ полская рѣская киевская московская, ||

149r И³ известный⁴ вѣдь всѣх народов словенских с великим радѣнием и трѣдолюбным тѣшаніем собраны.
Кніга Д. а
Глава . а
Бѣ срдцѣ чѣпческих известнихий⁸ свидѣтель внѣ вѣсть коль великая преизящный и неудобной трѣд⁷ и крѣплизй паче
гордиско¹⁰ *казамскогов¹¹ узла Алесяндромъ¹² разсѣченовъ¹³
(понеже бѣ¹⁵ невозможно¹⁶ развязати¹⁷ бызл.),¹⁹ подъ читателю любезный, радѣя с прилѣживъ, дабы тѣ¹⁸ истинный и¹⁹
свидѣтельствованⁱ⁰ вывод народов наших¹¹ сарматыскъ²²
славейских²³ рѣскихъ, а притомъ литовских извѣлъ. какъ откѣдѣ каковымъ обу́чаемъ от наслѣдия Ноева пои́дцо, какъ ж и какымъ
прилѣживъ в сих странахъ поселѣшися, и отъ малыхъ начальн, в толь
великихъ народы и пространство владѣнія || произрастоще сего
намѣрения части, яко в началѣ сей кронакъ моего при выводѣ народов
литовскаго²⁴ пространійно и дово́дно, из²⁶ истиныхъ²⁶ и различных
повѣстописцов²⁷ извѣлъ;²⁸ также народов всѣхъ подъ йбо́мъ на сей
вселѣнъней²⁹ живящихъ²⁸, отъ Ноевыхъ же сыновъ³¹ и наслѣдникомъ³¹
изряднымъ родословіемъ идящихъ, начала и умножения³², яко ис³³
корабля³⁴ изведованъ тогда паки егда прийдос къ дѣ́нимъ³⁵ рѣскаго³⁶
народа изстари³⁷ славнаго³⁸, а чаять предревнейшаго, источника

1 В Матвѣя GER Матвѣя | 2 EN Стриковского R Стрияского | 3 N Осостёвича | 4 R крона R омм. | 5 BN извѣстны G извѣстнымъ | 7 U ante сот. воеводъ
ER воеводы | 8 N извѣстнѣйш. | 9-9 BGN in marg. | 10 В гордиско ER гордискогъ |
¹¹ В in marg. на поле кафимскаго G кафимска ER омм. N кафимскаго | ¹² G Алексѣйра |
¹³ G рченого ER разсѣченаго | ¹⁴-¹⁴ N om. parentheses signs | ¹⁵ G бо | ¹⁶ ER нечно |
¹⁷ G развязати | ¹⁸ BGN ти | ¹⁹ ER омм. | ²⁰ G свидѣтельствованъ ER свидѣтельствова.
²¹ G вѣшнихъ | ²² BGERN сарматскъ | ²³ BGRN словенскъ | ²⁴ GR литовскаго | ²⁵ ER и |
²⁶ G ястинныхъ | ²⁷ GN повѣстописцевъ | ²⁸-²⁸ B in marg. | ²⁹ G извѣлъ | ³⁰ R селенен и |
³¹-³¹ B superscr. | ³² E умноженія | ³³ R и | ³⁴ R корабля | ³⁵ BGN дѣ́ниамъ G
dемниномъ R дѣ́ниемъ | ³⁶ ERN рѣскаго | ³⁷ R итари | ³⁸ R славнаго
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словенских всѣхъ земель и народов, яви ми ся вещь 1 быти потребна, на семъ пѣрвомъ начале крбников2 рѣской, паеч ж родословием народов словенскихъ рѣскихъ изряднѣмъ по возможству разума и силь нашихъ, из доводу3 греческих, латинскихъ, еврейскихъ, халдейскихъ писателей положити, дабы, на основаній 4 гораздо укрепленнымъ удобнѣе и крепче могли сличать дѣянія рѣскихъ и литовскихъ народов.

Многия бо повести яже безсмертием 5 дѣла чудѣческая 6 украшаютъ, полские. литовские. рѣские, и иных народов скѣдости ради люди разумных погибша сего ради зачаи народов своих дѣтелства и владѣния 7 къ знѣніи, и 8 ѣзвѣстнаго 9 времени 10, а во онѣже что бысть вѣдать не могъ?, народы бо наши словенские сарматпци 11 в стѣдныхъ странахъ 12 полнѣнныхъ 13 положены склонны бяхъ всегда к ссобрамъ 14, к мѣчительствамъ и ко владѣнію чужихъ земель, нежеди ко учѣнію сие же за поведением и собствомъ неприятнаго 16 нѣба и браливааго 17, емѣже сия страны подлежатъ, Крона и скорпия 18, иже рѣскихъ земель большою частью заслони. сего ради мнѣдѣ наші предѣ дѣяній темнорачного 19 ночью уѣденныхъ 20 въчномѣрныхъ вертепа 21 и пропастех 22 *слепыхъ 23 погибоща, от нихже бы 24 нѣе наслѣдницы зраки прилоѣ, и поученія 24 добродѣтелей и дѣяней 25 воинскихъ избирати, и постороннымъ народомъ доброе разумѣніе, и вѣдомость 26 о славныхъ предкахъ своихъ, и сѣмы о себѣ къ великомѣ и славному розглашенію, имѣні 27 своего учинить могли;

Сѣдากож, Рѣсь, Московъ, и болгары, или волтары от Волги реки (по которои простоянно издавна живяхъ) речени 28, такожде иные славянѣ 29 первее, нежеди мы поляки писать почали 30. Михайлъ бо, Кѣрополатъ 31 цѣ койститпци гѣлѣскій 32, б ратъ 33 болгары 34, съ славяны 35 народъ рѣскаго 36, иже въ то время греческий 37 годствра разорихъ, и Ораціи, такожде Дѣмакцы 38 часть великѣ овладѣли, по дѣтѣхъ бояхъ примирися с нѣми въ лѣто от рѣкѣ 39 Хрѣтова, и на

1 BGN вещь | 2 Е кромники | 3 ER довод | 4* E written twice, the first time circled | 5 R безмертнѣй | 6 N человѣческій | 7 Е владѣнія | 8 ER omitt. | 9 R извѣстнаго | 10 N времени | 11 BG ERM сарматы | 12 В ante corr. странахъ | 13 ER полнѣнныхъ | 14 N полнощыхъ | 15 Е сорамъ R соромъ | 16 ER событвомъ | 17 R браливого | 18 R ядовитого | 19 B ante corr. темнорачныхъ | 20 G ѣдѣнныо | 21 BGN вертепахъ ER ввертепахъ | 22 E пропастехъ | 23 B suprascr. GERM in textu | 24 ER подчение | 25 N дѣяній | 26 Е вѣдоманія | 27 ER имѣні | 28 ER речени | 29 BG славня N словинъ | 30 BR почел. | 31 ER Кѣрополать | 32 G костинитопольскій | 33 ER костинитопольскій | 34 R болговы | 35 Е славяны | 36 ERN рѣскаго | 37 ER греческая | 38 G Дѣмакці | 39 R рѣкѣ

a G in marg. характеръ сѣверныхъ народовъ | b G in marg. костинитопольскій цѣрь

Кѣрополать присла славаномъ письмена
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знаку 1 дрёжбы и 2 общего примирения речённый црь Кёровоплат, всьмь болгаром и словяномъ послан въмѣсто дара слова. 4а. б. в. 4 и прочая, яже тогда из греческих новозобрѣтеньи быша славянѣ ради., Тѣх слов яко всѣда бывает новая вѣчь, всѣка приятѣлѣшная, абие ухватились болтары, сербы, дохматы, карваты 6, и Рѣсь, и тьми словами дела свой и кроники писати начаша не токмо тѣх || дѣл чинь в книгѣ снося, яже 8 них и от них твориимъ 7 бѣх, но и 8 яже долго память в разумѣ своеемъ 10 от древних предков своихъ слышаня на имѣхъ писомъ на вѣчно слѣдвъ, в книгѣ свои 11 собиралы и сокровиществовали, выразуемъ 12 яко повести сокровище безсмертныя 13 славы сѣтъ.,

Поляки 14 же нынѣ едва начаша писацти отъ Хрѣста въ лѣто .лѣв. въ вѣкъ Мечислава 15 первого 16 хрѣтіянского 17 князъ полскаго, и Болеслава храбраго 18 первого 19 короля коронованнаго 20 Стонтономъ 21 цесарем въ Гіѣне въ лѣто .лѣв. ѣхже однако Рѣсь, со лѣтъ въ древности повести и писма своего предвариа, 22 рѣсиане 23 бо 22, 24 начаша писати, въ лѣто отъ созданія мира 19 яко грѣки и Рѣсь, считаютъ, рѣс. 25 се есть 25 отъ Хрѣста .рѣч, или мао что позже, а по римскому щету 26 въ лѣто отъ созданія мира .рѣме. отъ заложенія Рима въ лѣто .рѣфна, отъ Хрѣста 27 ж. 28 .рѣч, 29 и 30 о том всѣ латынские, и греческое 31 повѣстописѣ цы согласлясыя и 32 въ лѣто .рѣфна, въ Пріградѣ 33 самѣ искѣнных, издѣже истязѣ прильжно, о древностяхъ 34 греческихъ и визанѣтскѣхъ видѣхъ стоять мрѣмоврѣнній съ написаніемъ црь Михайла Кёровоплату 35, и съ числомъ, лѣтъ вышедшемовѣнныхъ 36, греческаго 37 и латынскаго 38 счѣтѣ. егоже речённѣй црь постави 39 вѣ. Едикула 40 идучи старомъ замокъ великогъ 41 Константины 42-43 въ знаменіе побѣды на болгарамѣ и сражаѣхъ полѣвѣнныхъ 43. дрѣги же стоять видѣхъ за Адрианополямъ 44 на которомъ мѣстѣ болгары неблѣгодарно 45 воздая даръ писменный 46 и ймѣ въ знаменіе дрёжбы присланный 47.

---

1 G з/икъ 2 ER omm. 3 GER славяномъ 4-4 4 В ante Exit. Б. Б. 5 ER. Б. Б. 6 BGRN вещь 7 U ante Exit. кр/ойаты G кѣвраты Е каврать R къврать 8 N творимы | 9 ER omm. 10 ER рѣздѣмъ 11 Е своімъ 12 ER своєй 13 ER врѣдѣмѣ 14 Г безсмертныя | 15 R Мѣчислава 16 R первого 17 Г христіанскогъ EN христіянскаго 18 GK храбраго 19 R первого 20 BEN коронованнаго R коронованскаго 21 B ante Exit. Охтомонъ 22-23 R рѣсныѣ анебо 24 В рѣсныѣ G рѣсныѣ N руссѣнѣ 25 Г омѣ. 25-25 N счѣтъ 26 G счѣтъ 27 R рѣжекста 28 G омѣ. 29 Е. В. 30 ER omm. 31 R греческага | 32 ER omm. 33 GER Прѣградѣ 34 G древностяхъ 35 R Кёровоплатъ 36 GER вышедшемовѣнныхъ 37 BERN греческага 38 EN латынскаго 39-39 BG in parentheses N in parentheses, in textu 40 ER Единокула 41 EN великаго 42 G Костантіна BER 43 Н полученныеъ 44 BG Адрианополемъ ER Одрианополемъ 45 ER блѣгодарно 46 G писмени 47 GN присланнаго

2 В marg. начало писменъ полскыхъ
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вышереченного 1 ὑπὸ Михаила Кёпролата 2 мир разорявъ 3 побиша, ако с погрода едва сам убежа, потомъ 4 отчаяния монахъ бысть, однакожь отъ тѣхъ болгаровъ убиенъ бысть., Кто быналъ во Айданополѣй 5 или бѣдеть узнаеть знаменія 6 тѣхъ дрѣвнихъ боевъ болгарскихъ 7 э греки бѣлявы кѣзаны и древныя дѣйнымъ образомъ сотворены 8, 9, ядра 9 на чемъ рогаты жедьны, ослопы 10 съ великими гводыми 11, сѣлицы съ жѣлзомъ острымъ накрѣтъ обостренными, ихьже пехота римская 4, 12 пышет, на встрѣче первое 13 употреблѣяхъ обломки сабель старыхъ, и тѣ всѣ дѣйныя воинские 14 ордія, повѣшены сѣть на стѣнѣ, идѣчъ чрезъ лѣвѣки исъ тѣрскаго 15 города во Айданополѣй 16 кѣменный христіанскій в у великихъ вратъ, котоѳымъ я гораздо присмотрѣлъ., Суть того тогда Михаила Кёпролата 19 ὑπὸ ἑργαδρικого 20, болгары, Рось, и всѣ славианѣ 21 кромѣ полякої, и чеховъ писема прияя дѣла свои писатѣ начаша, по убиехъ 22, 23 Ке Прополатовѣ гѣдрствова 23 на щрѣтъ греческомъ Левѣ ормийскѣ, иже Хрѣна болгарскому 24 кѣзы уби, во время Карла 25 великаго 26 цѣсаря, въ лѣто 27 отъ Хрѣта 28 и въ во времена Иоанна третія въ ряду 29 чѣ. 30 папы. Сице ж россіянѣ 31 аще отъ 29. 32 пѣлт, ес есть отъ Хрѣта 28 писмо имѣютъ 30, однакѣ всѣ лѣтописи 32 рѣскіе, токмо тѣхъ бытѣ первыхъ кѣзей въ гѣдрствахъ своихъ сказываютъ, Кія, отъ нежогъ 34 Кіевъ Стѣка, отъ нежогъ Стевакиша Корѣва и сестрѣ ихъ Лебедѣ, Оскольда ж и Діа наслѣдниковъ ихъ, потомъ же по своему щѣту въ лѣто отъ создания 35 мѣра, 36, 37 кѣзы варговѣ трехъ братоў Рюрика, Тривора, и Синеыса 35 въ князѣвъ 36 ихъ новгородскихъ, псковскихъ, изборскихъ и бѣлоzerosкихъ гѣдрствовать пишутъ 38 и отъ тѣхъ уже чыйнъ и наслѣдие известное Рось всѣ великіе кѣзы московские производают, далѣльшихъ же и древнейшихъ началъ народа своего произвести не могъ стѣдости ради повестей. и повестописцѣвъ 39, 40, 41, 42.


9 G in marg. 46 G in marg. ἑργαδρικος Левѣ | 5 G in marg. Кій, Шекъ, Коревъ, и Лебеда кнѣзя россій, наслѣкъ ихъ Дыръ (in ras.) | 9 G in marg. Рюрикъ, Тѣяръ и Синеевъ кѣзы зъ варговъ призваны на щрѣтъ новгородскаго (in ras.)
нестарого, ини же пышео въка лётописцы, Мерецкії, Викен'тиї; Кадилбскій, аныоним еранцизъ, Д'ягошъ, Меховії, Іость, Декіи в древностяхъ полъскихъ и родъ Агедоновъ, Ваповскії Кромеръ въ книгъ и и. и въ гьѣвъ и и. и. и. и. Вълскій полскіе, Тилеманть, Стелла Гесарию, Карйонъ Онільть Меланктона Ксрей немецкіе, Еней Силвій, Воллераун Датрауви, италискіе, и ческе повѣстописцы, Мосоха и Москвъ, началоводца и странъ того ймені воспоминовѣніе на мнѣихъ мѣстехъ изрѣд' но творять, Теодоръ, також'де Библиандръ, о из'раздномъ роѣ толкованія еврейска главлете, || Мозохъ, или Месохъ чѧсть Асії къ Пон'тв въ з'ѣ, вдѣже мос'хъть или мос'ховіи, и москитскіе горы, и съмеж'наго Кападокій мѣстъ.

И аще б з'ѣдъ к'то рѣк'лъ, Wohnung меншняя Москва бѣлои. Росіи народа недавнихъ въковъ, нача з'ватися Москвою отъ реки и града стольнаго. Москвья тогда сіѧ есть. Москвабѡ бо з'амокъ изъ давнихъ в'ременъ, тѣмце отъ древа срѣбленъ и нез'ятень, бѣ ако о томъ же Гер'берст'енівъ въ лѣтописи въ княжества московскаго пишеть, даже великѣй киѣвъ Ив'анъ Даниловичъ до .сл. лѣтъ изъ Володимеръ прѣстоль с'вой пр'енесетъ по совѣт' Петра митрополита киевскаго, и рѣс'кого, митрополитъ бо той Пётръ та' прѣстоль с'вой митрополитъ избралъ бѣ, д'ла сѣтаго нѣкоторого Алеж'ла, у его же гроба въ Москве киевскаго 26, содеса' 27 ав'ляхся, тѣмъ же Москва г'радъ 28 прославися 29, содесы тѣми и великихъ киѣвъ прѣстоломъ, по смерти бо || Ивана Даниловича, того же йменъ, дѣцъ Иванъ Ив'ановиѣчъ таъ прѣстолъ дер'жаше, по нѣмъ Димитрий, по Димитрий Василій, иже по лѣвъ д'щерь, у Витол'та великаго великаго киѣвъ литовскаго, Андатаиню илѣ 38 Собино, Василія сѣл'пого по себѣ нас'лѣдника ос'тави, отъ него же потомъ Ив'анъ бѣд'чи великимъ киѣвъ моск'вскимъ въ сцеас'ливш'ыхъ, ияспѣ сіѣлъ и подд'ант'ства

---

1 ER add. и N нестараго | 2 B ante corr. Вякентій | 3 В Кадилбскій Н Калдубскій | 4 R om. | 5 ER Вѣлскій | 6 ER Тиліманъ | 7 R Ene | 8 E италіскіе R италіанскіе | 9 ER греческіе | 10 B suprascr. GRN in text | 11 ERN ймені | 12 GR воспоминание | 13 ER Оси | 14 G Каподокій R Кападокскій | 15 G йеншня R йеншня | 16 G бѣло | 17 E столягаго | 18 G льтописи | 19 B в рас. GN omm. | 20 EN московскаго | 21 ER Володимъера | 22 ER принесь | 23 EN киевскаго | 24 E кърскаго R кърскаго P русскаго | 25 Е нѣкотораго | 26-26 U in marg. B suprascr. | 27 N чудesa | 28 B suprascr. | 29 B ad. градъ въ рас. | 30 ER имьні | 31 ER Дмитрий | 32 E Василій | 33 D шер | 34 N Витонта | 35 EN великаго | 36 N литовскаго | 37-37 B ante corr. Анастасию Соцію ли | 38 ER илѣ | 39 R Василія | 40 ER всѣчаствлившимъ N всѣчаствлывшымъ

---

а G in marg. Москва Блондъ, Свідъ, Адбертъ Крантий, немъ: Лѣя Францъ, немъ: а Зонаръ, гречъ: б G in marg. великии киѣвъ Иванъ Даниловичъ до 230 лъ: престоль своей прпенесе изъ Владимира въ Москви | в G in marg. Петръ митрополитъ московскій | д G in marg. Иоаннъ Иоанновичъ | е G in marg. Дмитрий Василій темный Иоаннъ грозный
татарского выбился казанский орды, Пермь, Сибирь, Лопянь, Югрия отнюдь не предвзят венгеров, Болгария асийскому и иными странами силы своей покори, и поработи, от литовского гдерьства. Градов въ зала, съ швейцы и съ ливенцы великие воины веда, и той нача писаться. црь и градь въ ссвя Росии того въ нья Василии, великій князь московскихъ, град Москвь нача стыною каменною и башнями обвоздитель, которые стыны въ лѣть насельницы его одва совершиша, оба и самъ Гербъстеренъ Жигимонть выше во описаниї града Москве сице гголеть, ако дабы градь Москва и инымъ странамъ прозва ньте от себѣ дать имѣло, сѣ не подълино, но воисгипъ вѣсть, возможна, ако от реки градь имя прѣала, ибо аще сам градь Москва прежде сего не бысть стольный и глау того народа, однако изъ вѣстина вѣсть есть, яко имя московского народа бь знатно повѣстописцомъ дѣревнимъ от Мосоха, тождѣ и Кромеръ въ глау. и въ книгу. и кроникъ полскихъ, по долгих произвожденіяхъ сармацскихъ народахъ, о Москве гголеть, сице же глау. и въ книгу. и заключасть, ни же есть невѣрно имѣ, (съ есть Москве) Моськомъ Модокомъ, али Амазовитомъ дрѣв.предѣчѣныма нѣкогда во имя сосѣдовъ, и ближѣнихъ россій, или розолановъ прѣйти или премености, потомъ же сарое и московское воспрѣатъ, Москь хъ въ сѣмъ Иаевтовъ шестьи, въ нѣкъ Новъ за Сарматомъ ближѣннымъ своими, егоже Мойсея въ. и глау. иоифъ и дѣревъпосѣтѣй еврѣйскихъ въ книгу. и въ глау. ит. Истрова, или Екстапова сѣя, вѣска Симова, правѣнка жъ Новѣ быти свидѣтелствующіе, шедь отъ Бавилона по съмѣщеніи язык съ народом своими всѣмъ и зѣ стны Истровыми, се есть вѣйравныхъ которые къ нимъ присталя, ако Виро пышетъ, идоща оба чрезъ арменскіе горы, и скискѣ, или татарскіе пола, отъ восточнѣхъ странъ, къ полюнщимъ частемъ вѣселенными, въ началѣ же на брегах поѣтскаго или чернаго моря поселилась, въ лѣто. ил. и потомъ отъ владѣнія же Нимвротова въ Бавилонѣ въ лѣто. иѣ., а
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157r
противъ иныхъ повстописцовыхъ и землемѣрьвъ отъ потопа рѣч. отъ Адама. 
157в

Иаѳетовича, не отъ йщиней новой Москвы,ѣже || аще сѣть одного ж 
народа рѣскаго, или розолянского, отъ того Мосоха, обѣчѣ 
пренебрегло было того имени употреблять во многихъ вѣки, токмо 
рос'сяня[ы]ъ, отъ трехъ братовъ князей варяжскихъ и отъ Ол'ти, или 
Елѣны и В'яадимира монарха, и дѣбаго Мономаха, и иныхъ 
князей нарицашся, ихъ потомъ до двѣхъ сотъ иъ нѣскол'ко десятъ лѣтъ, 
в'егда Москва отъ Москвы града, и отъ реки по пренесений престола изъ 
Володимера звата' начаша, но к' дѣл' прис'т'пао,

158г 
Тотъже Москѣ с'яти Иаѳетович живыъ || у чорнаго мор'а в' великій 
народъ 8м'ножися, потомъ въ тѣхъ поляхъ колховъ, к'ралевство з'латымъ рѣномь 
с'лавное 8троихъ, и пр'осстрапано населѣвъ, и 
народ с'лавенскій, рѣскіи в' немъ ум'ноживъ идѣ далѣе нас'лѣдие его въ 
п'олнощия страни за похтское или чернов морѣ, идъже надъ 
Дономъ и Волгою реками, и надъ озеромъ мотейскимъ в' которомъ 
Донъ впада'еть, въ степахъ пр'остранно поселиша, и во м'нотія 
народы в'кр'атъце вреаний ѳм'ножиша' тако, ако въ нас'лѣдій 
Иаѳетове и Мощохове с'в'остѣхъ имянъ ихъ исполнился, Иаѳетъ бо 
отъ халд'ейскаго и евр'ейскаго 41 языка пр'остранно или 
пр'осстрапаніїся. 42. Мощохъ же ростягиваяся 43, и дал'нѣе 
*толкѣтца тогда наслѣдницы ихъ по счасльвомъ прив'ятстви и

1 Р повстописцевъ | 2-2 Р отдано | 3 G Адама | 4 Р начала | 5 Н словенскаго |
6 Р йзаданва | 7-7 N herpesстаны [sic] | 8 ER россказаны | 9 G мсхи | 10 BGN мосохи | 11 ER 
месихи | 12 ER моисень | 13 G колынакачалника | 14 ERN рѣскаго | 15 N роксольскаго |
16 В имении ante согр. имъ[ене] GERN ими[ций] | 17 BERN россказаны G росианы |
18 В Владимира | 19 В Мономаха ante согр. Мономаха Е Мономаха N Мономаха |
20 GR великановгородские N великановгородскіе | 21 N живаху | 22 ER ниже | 23 G или |
24 ER нетол'ко | 25 В колынакачалника G колынакачалника | 26 E RN рѣскаго |
27 N самарскаго | 28 R воскресели | 29 ER Володимирра | 30 GR черногоре | 31 ER омм. |
32 В кол'хор а согр. колховь G колхор N колгорь | 33 R злотымъ |
34 ER словенскій | 35 R мотейскомъ | 36-36 R второе | 37 R многие | 38 BN времени |
39 G умножился | 40 BR халд'ейского | 41 В евр'ейскогъ | 42 ER прострачиваяся |
43 G растягиваясь E ростягивалися R ростягивались | 44 B suprascr. G толкуется in 
textu RN in textu | 45 E щастливому N щасливому

a G in marg. & Мощоха Колхова и златое рѣно
Свойством¹ имени предковъ съвоихъ, и по благословенію Ноа патріарха, селенія своя далече² распространя³, яко въ са полнощныя⁴ страны и межвесточныя часити въселенныя народами⁵ словенскаго⁶ языка исполнити, начавъ же отъ канпападокийских⁷ ⁸ и колхійских⁸,⁹ краlevствъ и вездѣ крѣбъ Кимерія¹⁰ Босоры, и черногорской, моры, Добъя, Окь, Волти, Камы, Днепра, Бого¹² Десны, Днепра,¹³ Днѣща,¹⁴ даѣже до Двины и Немъна долгимъ разстояніем⁴⁵ источниковъ въсѣ береги владѣщца, также даѣже до ледьянаго и валелѣйскаго¹⁶ и венедиискаго¹⁷ помохсковскія¹⁸ варѣжскаго¹⁹ моры же и не ледянаго Лиюліяда²⁰ и Свѣю²¹ обливаетъ, и до Норвегіи достигаетъ имѣ силѣ и властъ словенскаго²² языка распространялъ²³.
Сарматъ²⁴, а также или Сарматъ²⁵ съ Иеккнановъ въ вѣкъ Симовъ, правнукъ Ноа патріарха, по Иосиф⁶ въ книгѣ и въ главѣ Дп. древностей²⁷ еврейскихъ и по Моисею бытие и еже иже такождѣ бѣ въ сихъ странахъ полнощныхъ съ Мосохомъ дѣломъ двоюроднымъ²⁸, поселялся²⁹ бѣ сарматомъ, даѣже имѣ и прозваніе яко насть въсѣхъ саръматахъ съ естъ высокими народами отъ него зовутъ³⁰. Тилеманъ въ произвездѣній родословія³¹ Иису Христова, сие сармата речение излагаетъ, сего ради отъ Риоата сна Гомерова, рианане иже съять³² саръмата и генеты, имъ же генети³³ зnamенѣтъ³⁴ у естрововъ, пришелствовивающія греки имяноваща³⁵ домы, есѣ есть вездѣ³⁶ иной пажить³⁷, иныхъ мѣсть ищущи³⁸, сармать же толкѣтся вождь высоты, или вождь вѣшняя³⁹ страны.
Кромеръ епѣкъ варменскій, такождѣ въ лѣтописи своей, еюже дѣланна полская изъ тѣмъ и изъ марченлѣбокихъ³⁰ пропастей изъ треѣбенъ, освѣти³¹ сиѣ разсѣженіе³² благоразумное о прозванія и выводе сармать, въ началѣ книгѣ первыхъ въ главѣ. пышетъ подъ иманованіемъ³³, идѣже глаголеть сарматомъ³⁴ быть съ ловкъ и венедынъ, и тѣхъ быти дрѣвныхъ сармать³⁵, или яко греки глѣлолютъ сауроматы³⁶ и разсѣляннымъ по здѣнѣи столпа вавилонаскаго по

¹ R воинством ² ER далеко ³ R распространя ⁴ В полнощные ⁵ R отм. ⁶ GEN словенска ⁷ G канпаподокийских ⁸ ER канпаподокийских ⁹ G отм. ¹⁰ N Кирлера ¹¹ EN чернаго ¹² ER Бра ¹³ N Днепра ¹⁴ G surprasr. ¹⁵ ERN распространя ¹⁶ GN валяскаго ¹⁷ ER валяскаго ¹⁸ GN венедиискаго ER венедиискаго ¹⁹ R помохсковскій ²⁰ N варежскаго ²¹ BGERN Лиюліяда ²² GN вѣео ²³ N словенскаго ²⁴ ER распространяли ²⁵ ER Сарматъ ²⁶ ER Сарматъ N Самартъ ²⁷ N Исифу ²⁸ ER древности Н древствъ ²⁹ ER родъмъ ³⁰ R поселялся ³¹ ER зовѣт ³² Е родословія Р родословія ³³ G есть ³⁴ N генеты ³⁵ BGERN имениоша ³⁶ UB ante corr. { на } G ad. на ³⁷ BGERN add. и ³⁸ R идѣшці ³⁹ BN вышине ³⁰ G марченлѣбоких ³¹ N остави ³² R разсѣженіе ³³ BGERN имениоше ³⁴ BGН сармата ³⁵ ER отм. ³⁶ G сауроматы N сауроматы
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после все зем'ля людем, си' страны ов'ладдывших неп'щдют, а не от [T]вискёна но от Сармёта1 или Сарматы, егоже Моисеин2 Иосифъ ев'рейстии3 писатели, Истрова или4 Иектанова5 с'на Симова вн'ка, Ноева прав'нка бывша6 поминаютъ имя и7 начало вед'ще и8 прочее З'дй имаш и читатель любёбный, паче иныхъ моихъ вв' сличений раздовой9 раз'личнихъ пов'стописатей10 [sic] доводы, и паче моего изв'естьныхъ11 свидетельства укреп'ленное раздёмніе великого12 и честного13 м'жа разсуж'дениемъ о сармат'кхъ, ако от Сарматы14 или от15 Сармата с'на Иектанова16 вн'ка Симова прав'нка Ноева речени с'ть, а не от [T]вискона или Аскины17 Гомерова18 с'на, яко н'цыны л'товпицы немек'кіе, а часы и Длатошъ писали, ни от Авана и Ел'с'сы19, || яко Мехов'іи в' гл'въ .и в книг'е .и. и же в' лис'тъ .и. и же, в' произ'веденіи пер'ваго20 начала полского21 положи мимо дѣла: Аванъ бо и Елисъ22 с'ть его греческія23 нар'ды ум'нішица, и лат'нск'е, а не сармать, и'же языкомъ и н'равами др'в'ными, далеке с'ть отъ грековъ латиннникъ, такожда и отъ н'мцова разл'чи'чи24. 

А25 яко Виръся халдеяниовъ26 пишет в книг'е .и. и Твискона27 быти краlem сarp' мацкимъ отъ Дона даже до Рена рек'къ, такожъ д'е в книг'е .и. и вос'поминаетъ, яко въ л'тъ. р'ля. от потопа Твискона сар'маты велики'е нар'ды ум'нігъ, тогда тамъ аб'не полагаетъ, яко Мосъхъ Мотошъ, или Москъ москов'ск'е ѣрства во28 Аси, къйно и во Европе29 вм'нішъ. Тамъже в тойже к'н'іе пишетъ,30 въ л'тъ30 сего Н'йна четвертъ, вавилонск'го31 третьаго пр'ва Твиск'нъ ис'полинъ || сarp' матовъ зак'она и уставъ32 поучаетъ у Рена.

Тогда Кромер33 гля изър'д'ными с'казаними яко с'лавяне и сар'маты не с'ть н'мъц'ы в' гл'въ .и в книг'е .и. и сие разделятъ, ако и Вирос'са при п'равд' его пов'ости ост'в'ви34, и сар'матовъ или с'лавяновъ не от [T]вискона но отъ Ассармоты35, или Сарматы ум'ножены быти изл'в'въ. а Срация Иорандъ36 и Иораниш'ка, Иорикъ пов'ствописецъ37 немецкихъ, сильною38 мочною п'рав'ды поб'ж'денныхъ сиса, и разд'мышля ихъ с'в'тъльными ихъ же выводами3940 отвелъ, о41 сен и Плинии изър'д'но ученъ, землеъ м'бръ и пов'стописатель вв' естестве'ннъ42 пов'сти в книг'е .и. и въ гл'въ .и.43 св'д'тельств'еть с'йми44 с'ловесы гля, сарматы жъ пойс'тинъ не с'ть н'мц'ы, но от

нихъ Вислою рекою прєк'лон'са к востокъ сліцца отдёлені, 
Тож раз'єм'ніе Плинієво о сарма'тъ подкръпляють изв'стными 
свид'тельствъ Корніллъ, Тацітъ, Страбонъ, П'таломъ, 
и они с'лавніі пов'єстописць и зем'лем'бръ.
Инъ паче же Белскій, в' начале выводъ народа полскаго пишть, 
савроматій бьты реченьи от людей с' оч'и щеричны, 
во гречески ІІІІ щерича, омол, глазъ, в' от'єдь нареченіе савроматовъ 
п'роизводить, яко людей гн'бливыхъ и страшныхъ, им'же яростъ 
ж'єстокость ядовита из' очей, яко щеричамъ с'вир'пымъ явл'сяя, 
однакож и то свое м'ѣнніе, и яко от [Т]искона им'ть начало 
сарматы, с'амъ же Белскій отставляетъ и на раз'єд'ніи 
б'єг'ораз'ємнымъ, доктора Кромера, яко от Ассармата с'на 
Иєктанова в' щвка Симова, произходящая с'арматы полагается, 
pонеже и Тилеман С'тел'ля ученьй, на дея ро'дос'ловля 
Хр'сова савромата, не от савросъ, || и омина греческихъ с'ловъ, но 
от халдейскаго азъка из'раднымъ раз'ємомъ, вожъ 28 высоты, иль 
vожъ да вышня страны толк'еть.

IV:2

Мат'в'я Осоствича Стриковскаго, о произ'водъ с'лав'чого народа р'скаго, 
с'ловенскаго, сармацкаго, и для чего реч'еньи с'отъ с'лавваніе.

Глава І.А.
О с'ловенакъ и с'лавена'скихъ зем'ляхъ, народа р'скаго иль 
сармацкаго, отк'дь с'е ихъ прозваніе произ'рас'т', различ'ны с'ть 
м'ѣннія различных' пов'єстописц'овъ читатель любезны, 
обаче то д'вть показ'єтъся, яко с'лавяне, иль с'лаваки 
пред'ки наши быща с'лавніі в'ой'скою храбростю, во в'ремя еще войны 
тра'янской, но понеже селенія свои им'ахъ в' Паэлигоніи, и в 
стран' Асій мен'шои у чорного моря, ид'же ѣй не т'рки и греки

---

1-1 G ко с'втъ | 2 В Плинев а сот. Плининов N Тинье | 3 R подкръпл'яеть | 4 BGN 
Птоломей | 5 R om. | 6 R славни | 7 ERN полскаго | 8 B савроматию G савроматию | 9 B 
речень G речень N речень | 10 B анте сот. оч'и N оч'и | 11 R щерничъ | 12 GR саврос 
N саврос | 13 B гречески анте сот. гречески GN гречески | 14 B анте сот. савроматы 
G савроматовъ EN савроматовъ R савроматовъ | 15 R явл'сяся | 16 R Б'ккъ | 17 R 
оставляетъ | 18 BGN б'єг'ораз'ємномъ | 19 U анте сот. Ассармата Е Сярмтора R Сярмтора 
| 20 R Нектанова | 21 ERN произходяща | 22 G Стеля | 23 N досто'ръ | 24 BG савромата ER 
саврамата | 25 BG саврос | 26 R омина N омина | 27 GERN халдейскаго | 28 ER пожда 
| 29 ER т'олк'еется | 30 BG Матея N Матфея | 31 EN Стриковскаго | 32 BGEN славна' | 
| 33 ERN р'скаго | 34 GEN словенска' | 35 N сармацкаго | 36 ER словенскихъ | 37 
| 38 EN р'скаго | 39 R любе'ны | 40 Е славяки R славяки | 41 R славни 
| 42 R храброст'ю | 43 N троинской | 44 EN чорнаго
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живъть, междѣд ий же ж с'лавян, сербовъ, болгаровъ, болшая часть, иже не пришельцы, ако тер'ки живъть но истинный дѣдичи палегонские зем'ли из древнихъ въкъ быти сказывают'сл.

П'рокопиі' також'де с'лав'ный и д'рев'ний пов'етописецъ п'реже арг. л'ть о войн' готской пиша во времена Иустиниана ц'ры константинопольского, в л'то от Хр'ста.ф'ки и папы.ме.хы.гы.иляр'она поминает о славаках', Иорнан'дь. Алянъ також'де дрв'ний пов'етописецъ пишетъ, яко 12-тво ийль 12-й или прозваніе с'лавянь 13, во времена его ново бъ в л'то от Хр'ста.учч. но р'чь с'лавенскью, ея же н'не в'сій 14 употребляютъ, дрзв'нюю 15 были с'видетелствуютъ, Бывшее 16 яко т'ко есть, по с'м'шения бо языковъ у столпъ вавилонская, первы б' 17 языки халд'ейскіи и ев'рейскіи, или жидовскіи, потомъ скинскіи или татарскіи, т'же египецкіи, евоин'скіи и ин'д'йскіи, потомъ греческіи, латинскіи, и нашъ с'ловенскіи, шести отъ Мосока шестаго 23 ц'на Иневтоа, по немъ немецкой от Тьвискона, тъ языки с'ять по всей вселенной лячч'е, от нихъ яко от источниковъ живыхъ, инъе различныхъ 25-26 народовъ языки начала умножения свойства, и различны раз'личныхъ 26 радъ р'беей р'чи свои им'ютъ еже всякомъ покажетъ, аще кто вопросить, аще и .бв. языка против важ'д'въ и к'йзей переменило у столпъ вавилонскаго 29 отъ одного, но благоразм'нныя бывалой и иск'сенъ языкомъ самъ собою то раз'д'в'т мо'жесть, с'йце же еже Иорнан'дь 32 яже п'режде но. .дйр. л'ть писа л'тописъ с'вою, с'видетелствуетъ языкъ с'ловенскій быти д'рев'ний, и т'во из'р'дано пишетъ, по потопъ бо тачач'въ л'то. .пля. по Вироссъ.

Т'тьже Иорнан'дь иже в л'то от Хр'ста.ф'йд. п'ри Мачрикии 34 ц'фъ, ле.мъ 35 пишетъ, ако славаки над Ист'ромъ, или 36 Дванемъ къ пол'ноц'нымъ с'тренамъ жизнъ, потомъ же п'ре'ш'дъ Даний, Миц'е'й, объ Пан'коню 38, в'тръы, и ракушень, Македонию, Оракию, Ист'рио разориша и п'лениша, сотворивъ же мечемъ безопасн'е соебъ жил'ц'е в т'хъ с'тренахъ, инъи 41 въ т'хъ тамъ зем'ляхъ, инъи же

1 R серпо' 2 G пришлецы | 3 ER истинныи | 4 Phrase untranslated, cf. example (70) | 5 R славны | 6 R д'вни | 7 E прежде R om. N прежъ | 8-8 R om. | 9 R И'стина | 10 GE константинопольскъ | 11 BGN словакъ E славакъ R слава | 12-12 R тития | 13 N словянять | 14 N всѣ | 15 R д'вно | 16 В ап'е соръ еже им'ло быти | 17 N om. | 18 ER греческий | 19 ER египетскии N египецкій | 20 BGN греческог | 21 BGN латинског | 22 BGN словенског | 23 E шестаго | 24 N востока | 25 ER различны | 26-26 R om. | 27 В покажко | 28 E переменило | 29 N вавилонскаго | 30 ER бывало | 31 R om. | 32 G Иоанн | 33 R д'вни | 34 R Мачрикикъ | 35 E н'мъ RN немъ | 36 ER add. надъ | 37 N Миц'и | 38 G Пан'конию | 39 ER в'тръы | 40 R бъзопасенъ | 41 R и ёни | 42 N ad. и

a G in marg. Прокопиі | b G in marg. Іорнандь | c G in marg. первые языки | d G in marg. причина реком'денъ славанъ
меж'до Д'р'аюо, и Савою реками во Иллирикъ и в' Дал'мать поселніпласа, я и в'ск' к'п'но с'ми соболь т' зе'м'ли славен'скими от слав'ныхъ своихъ д'л наре'коша п'рос'тран'я 3 ж р'б'ежи с'вои, безпрестан'ными войнами, покой с'бъ и нас'лд'никъ || с'воимъ в' нихъ 8кр'п'ля. р'им'ск'ие 4 и константинопол'ск'ие 5 црства в' конецъ ослабиша 6, и пол'ки 7 ихъ сл'бъбы сот'вори, о сем пр'ос'траннѣе обър'аешь у реч'ьнныхъ повъстописателей, Ипп'ръанда 8 и П'рок'оппоа. Б'л'он'джеъ же, и'же 9 за с'то и за д'ват'цать л'ть о с'клоненіи к' п'оги'бели р'им'скаго 10 црства пов'сть писа, ид'же Ар'кад'ева 11 и Опор'иева 12 в'ластвованія 13, иже б'ахъ ц'рыми, в' л'то от Хр'ста с'чи. поминовѣніе д'рев'нѣйшее т'вори'тъ, 14, помина'етъ же и сл'вън'ск'іи 15 народъ, яко в' то в'р'ема уже б' славенъ.

Гр'отъ же Пом'пей, т'хъ в'скъ повъстописатель 16, д'рев'нѣйшии повъстописец р'им'скій, иже до р'ж'ства еще Хр'ста различнихъ народовъ дъянила писа, Іѣст'ійъ изъ него в' к'нѣ .л.и о народѣ 17 словенскомъ, ихъѣй йстрии 18 зов'ять си'це п'в'шъ, яко Оетъ или Аетъ 19 ц'ръ кол'хисское 19 зе'м'ли, надъ чорнымъ моремъ лежашія, недалѣче отъ реки Д'она съ Москвъ некъпи, в'нега емд' Иас'сонъ 20 со ар'танауты 21 Ми'д'іо д'церъ 22 сок'р'овищъ 23 (еже 24 сокровище р'йн'о з'латое творцы нарич'ютъ) унесъ, пос'ла'за 25 за нимъ в' пог'онъ .л.и. людей 26 на с'дахъ чернымъ моремъ 27 т'ти приш'едъ къ 8сту д'наисскому 28 влекоша в'верхъ водъ кар'бля 29 своемъ, т'жъ при'доша до устья р'къ Съвы и Д'равъ, потому рекою Савою подъ горы волоскъ алъп'исской при'доша, а чр'езъ горы на п'лечахъ къ брегамъ 30 м'ора адриатическаго 31, корабли с'вои п'ринесоша, го'н'а и и'ща ар'гонаутовъ 32 Иас'сонъ з'лолдо въ и з'мънникъ и хищниковъ, краля 33 с'воего Оеты, но ихъ т'мо не обр'ты'шъ, 34, яко ча'ахъ ос'тавишъ корабли с'воя 35 при'доша на пола итальянскѣ, ид'же и'не Аквили'я градъ с'лавный, и т'мо улюб'виш' положеж' доброй 36 земл'и обилныя поселніпласа, не 37 вос'хот'въ назад в' домъ краля кол'хисскаго 38 в'з'вратища, или бо'лься короля свое?|| Оеты, яко не догон'иша воровъ с'воихъ, или яко ск'чило имъ п'лаваніе по морю и волокітъ,


a) G in marg. колхиса
Сица 1860 поселив'шеся2 наши с'ловаки в полях италійских п'ри брегах моря адріатическаго,3 иже в'йне Виницюю,4 и страны ея обливают, рекоша а йстры 5 от Істыр или Д'ной реки, еюже из і мора от своей страны кол'хиды прип'лыша, аки бы р'кль істричички,6 7 или д'нятьчики, с'лаваки до Д'ной 8 наричуют Виестьрь, и латинники9 Истеръ, яко Овидій О Пон'тъ10 и Маз'имъ11 и іній народы, идже от морозовъ с'та истеръ, Ип'дъ же в' книге З.и.12 

З'йщи13 14 уже въчитъ Истровыхъ вод' ташкѣ15 возы, пастѣхъ жество къ атвижскій16 проводить, ||

Той же д'воименнаго17 Истра 18, также19 іній пов'стописатели20 и землєм'брцы Д'ной Истръ наричуют, с'ловаковъ21 же над морем адріат'ск'ем22 пространно жив'щихъ, істричики или істры зов'щъ, и отъ здѣ судово и я в'ню кійх'до зр'ти мож'єть, ако с'лаваки во Асіи и во Европ'ю 23 из'давна24 ом'ножинаяся, италійскихъ25 и елиснскихъ26 стран м'ного ов'ладьша 27 но в'си28 от наслѣдія Иаевтова, и Мосоха с'на ег'о, началань29 с'вои им'я в'сегда, искѣ странъ яже в'йне Москва держитъ, и от озера мeousйскомъ29 и чернаго30 мора въ сия странъ европ'ск'емъ31 вь нихъже пространно и в'йне жив'щъ, п'риходи от стран с'т'деньнихъ ища неба л'тчетаго32, и странъ ом'ноблійшихъ, въ начал'е сарматы, розоляны, и р'саки33, с' Мидридатомь34, а королемъ по н'т'ск'емъ35 велике войны и дол'тъ36 воевавшій37, по нихъ потомъ готовы, кмивры, и вандалы, іихъ же ч'сть въ т'хъ странахъ, идже въйне || Лит'ва, Лотва, и Ж'м'ойдъ38 поселилъ39, яко с'в'йские и датицкіе40 д'лнія, и Килікиі, Кимвры в начале войны дитмарскія 41, Кар'йны 42 въ книгахъ вторыхъ, монар'хій третей в'ка втораго43, Иоакимъ К'рей, ерейст'дайской44 въ пов'сты ш'ленской, пороюо ім'цы с'видательств'ютъ,

Д'р'галь же ч'сть т'хъ ван'далитовъ, готтовъ45, и км'вровъ всю Европ'ю46, елико есть вен'герскію47, греческію48, італійскію49,
оранжевственно, и гишпрансково земл'ю, словенскими и немецкими, такожде с литовскими народы, силы общие совокупив повоевавша.

Тъж ва пандалиты. И Аеурукъ трете части в'селен'ныя, и Римъне с'п'оствили иже жестоко разориша, и во Аерикъ двести летъ жиша, о чем понеже яв'няя свидетельства имамы, не хочь долго мешкать,

|| По ва пандалит'хъ, сарматъхъ, готъ-тьхъ, и розолняхъ, от т'тьже поль и странь пол'ночныхъ и восьточныхъ московскихъ, ини народи того ж словенскаго языка произыходя, иже волтары, или велтарь, от Волты реки иминоваше, болтари я же и Волтания есть великая страна по обоимъ берегамъ реки. Волги меж Еуропою и Асию, та река начался во р'жовской землицы московской, или езеро Волго, набравъ же в себя много р'къ великихъ течет чрезъ московские страны далече, потом чрезъ казанскось, заволскось, нагайскось, астараханскось, и иные татарские орды прешед за Астараханью в кастикскомъ, или гирканскомъ и порскомъ, мьре, яже Москва хвалынскимъ моремъ нарочито седьмдесят двьма усты впадает, помосковскямъ.

Волга, а потатарски Еделе, Птоломей и греки Уго има ей даша, Белскй же ньшь заодно имя къ бать вмьсте с Дономъ нев'домъ сынъ московскихъ стра.

От той в'д'я реки Волги и съ тъхъ полъ (ихъже и ньне кйнъ московский гдерь болгарскій) пышется, пошед съ великою ордою и м'южествомъ людеi предки ньши словенскіе болгары или волтары прийдюша в начале к черномъ морю, ища льтнихъ странь, аще н'цынь пышется яко ихъ исъ тъхъ полъ татарь синъ, и то не къ дль, яко ньже льтчи объявимъ, и тамъ у черного моря меж Дономъ и Днепромъ р'ками, идже ньне киркелскъ, крымскъ и маньколскіе татары многое время спокойно жиша в'негда же въ тъхъ поляхъ умножиша ов'ладца по в'ремени и Таурикъ, иже ньне перекопскій царь столнымъ градомъ ов'ладъ, потом успльшавъ о раздорѣ римскіхъ цесарей, а понеже и Атила в
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1-1 R om. | 2 ER воинскими | 3-3 N om. | 4 R повоевавше | 5 N пустили | 6 Г и | 7 B ante caret. яко | 8 ER воиндитехъ | 9 GERN add. и | 10 GRN словенскагъ | 11 ER проицдоша | 12 ER полтары | 13 R богоры | 14 R Богі | 15 BGN именовавшагъ ER именовався | 16 N объимъ | 17 G om. | 18 GR Ероппю R Еропьовъ | 19 GR ржейскій | 20 B ante caret. землицы | 21 ER ермисъ | 22 G om. | 23 GR астараханскую | 24 GR Астараханью | 25 ER кастикское | 26 R поморское | 27 В седьмдесятъ RN седьмдесятъ | 28 R двери | 29 ER помосковски | 30 ER потатарскій | 31 U ante caret. Pro B Pro ante caret. Лого | 32 R Pro N Pro ante caret. отъ [Pol. Rho] | 33 R ньв'домъ | 34-35 R сы | 36-37 ER р'ки тогда | 38 N полъ | 39 R болгарскій | 40 R множество | 41 N лучшеи | 42 R льтъ | 43 EN чертарго | 44 B ante caret. кирпильскихъ N кирпильскихъ | 45 BGN кирпильское | 46 GER временъ | 47 BGN Таурикъ N Таврикъ | 48 N еже | 49 R р'дворъ
то врема с' гёнами, или юграи ¹ от реки ² Югры, ис ³ тыхже стран местных предед ⁴ бол'шою часть и Европы ⁵, владев б' венгерскому зем'лю, разорил б' подвигнувшаяся и болгари с'хим и воданым ⁶ || п'тев с' к'н'зем ⁷ своим Дер'балом ⁸, в Дакию в т: врема римскому стран', идже й'не во'лошь м'ст'няя между Д'на и Д'нестра жывтъ, и т' страны из'т'нав даков сами силою ов'ладъшь в льто о Хр'ста .ук. потом в льто .уйд. улышав ⁹ о смерти Теодосия ц'ра: прещуша в Мисинъ ¹⁰ чрез Д'наи, сице же обою Мисинъ малъ и великъ удоб под греческимъ ц'рьми, вида ихъ раздоры вн'тр'нняя ов'ладъша, и от своего нареченія т' страны Болгар'ею нарекоша, аже и днесь тако наріченъ, ако и сами болгари ¹¹ н'н'шеинъ ав' вт: ¹² испов'дъютъ, ако предки ихъ из' местскихъ странъ изъдоша. жывть ж болгари с'лавянъ ¹³ меж высокими каменнымъ горами за Д'наемъ выхвав из' м'лт'нскй земли, от Браилова ¹⁴, Дордьева ¹⁵, и гр'стока ¹⁶ городовъ ¹⁷ подальнейшихъ, ¹⁸ тинъ же потомъ болгари, с'лавянъ, Оракиъ ¹⁹ болщию ²⁰ часть ов'ладъша. Зинона || ц'ра констан'тинопольскаго ²¹, въ льто от Хр'ста .уй. поразиша, и Ц'рьг'радъ поб'дительства въз'шья и сож'гоша. сего ради въ льто .уйв. ц'рь Анастасій пятьдесятый вида великю сила и на'зъды ²² болгарскэ, устрои долгобъ ст'нъ от Силивр'й ²³, аже над самимъ Галеопонтъмъ лежить даже ²⁴ до черного ²⁵ мор', хотя им'ти покой съ' своими ц'рг'ражанъ ²⁷ за тою ст'нью от болгаровъ, Оракиъ же съ Арианополемъ остави безъ кр'ности, иже въ'цо ов'ладъша болгари, и ст'ны тых роз'мета' ²⁸. п'ки въ волости ц'рг'радк'къ ²⁹ на'з'жали, о чемъ К'ром'еръ во иманованіи ³⁰ сарматскихъ ³¹ народовъ въ главъ .й.нъ пишв въ свид'тельство приводить Помпоніа Лета, но ³² азъ быт'емъ ³³ своимъ изъ въкрытъ шии, и очевидъной ³⁴ с'вид'тель, иже быхъ дв'щи ³⁵ въ Силивр'й ³⁶, который городъ надъ моремъ Галес'понътомъ ³⁷ съ ³⁸ тврскимъ городкомъ съ к'м'не висить, .мъ верстъ от Ц'р'града, а ст'нъ тых н'с'колько десять ³⁹ верстъ || за Сибириею, и й'не йвъны з'н'кай со р'вами и валаами ⁴⁰, и к'нъжь иже того п'дъ пр'дъ уз'р'вы возможетъ. п'че же ⁴¹ к' черном'б' морю от Ц'р'града въ Б'льгородъ

¹-¹ⁱ R om. ² N щь ³ ¹С прир. ⁴ BG Европы ⁵ Е вад'нымъ ⁶ ER Дербила ⁷ ER Нестра ⁸ B ante corr. укшовъ ⁹ Г ante corr. Мисинъ Н Мисинъ ¹⁰ N нар'ич'мъ ¹¹ E болгари ¹² B suprascr. ¹³ N словъне ¹⁴ ER Дордьева ¹⁵ B ante corr. ¹⁶ GR В аге ¹⁷ ER гр'стока ¹⁸ [Phrase untranslated, cf. example (71)] ¹⁹ Г Ораки ²⁰ R болгуюю [sic] ²¹ В константинополскъ GERN константинополскаго ²² N на'зъды ²³ R Силивр'й ²⁴ N дажъ ²⁵ ER чернаго ²⁶ ER omm. ²⁷ B ц'рг'ражанъ GERN ц'рг'ражаны N ц'раб'ражаны ²⁸ ERN размета' ²⁹ BRN ц'рг'радк'е ³⁰ ER именованъ ³¹ R сарматскихъ ³² ER omm. ³³ B ad. (яко 'Глеть аутор сеа книгу) в гас. ³⁴ B быт'имъ R бытемъ ³⁵ GERN очевидно ³⁶ ER дв'жи ³⁷ R Силивр'й ³⁸ B ante corr. Галес'понтъмъ ER Галес'понтътомъ ³⁹ ER omm. ⁴⁰ BRN десять ⁴¹ ER яв'на ⁴² N валаами ⁴³ ER add. и

⁸ G in marg. къзь Дербаль
воло́ском ёдёчи, зани. К. лётъ¹ тъ с'тъны б² зйж'даи³. Анас'таси́й ц'ря в числъ пятьёсияный, во вьс'ве врёма гсдествованіи с'воего.
совер'шивать же црства с'воего. К. лётъ громом бниень бы́съть,
болгари ј с' кйззём с'воимъ X'брным т'ретим⁴ по с'мерти⁵ его гре́сскеме гсдества п'лении и овалдъв бе́зотное,
Потомъ в'лъто ωτ Хрёста. Φйи. Л'въ т'ретям⁶ ц'рьо, иже бъ
образоборец реченъ вышеиманован'вн'и⁵ болгари⁶ помошствовах⁸,
в'негда с'рацьніи ЦР'аграда добывах⁸ .лътъ, ихъ же болгари
с'лавяне⁷ в конецъ из'біша, зани ихъ м'ръ и глад одольваше⁸ з'лъло,
с'вер'хъ того с'рацьнскіе корабль⁹ и катор'ти¹⁰, тъжъ болгари на
Елес'пьонътъ и Пропон'тідъ¹¹ из'ра́днымъ бъхтреніемь, подъ воно
бгъ под'ложивъ¹² воз'жегоша¹³, о семъ и Каріон⁴ нем'чичъ¹⁴ в'
лътовписи¹⁵ своюе¹⁶ в' книгъ Γ.Η¹⁷ монар'хи¹⁸ .Η вька .Η
вос'поминаеть.
Потомъ в'лътъ .Фй. а отъ созд'анія мира по р'им'скомъ с'чото¹⁹, р'бод. а
отъ основаніи мира²⁰, аф'на. Никееора ц'ря кон'ста́клинополскаго²¹,
тъжъ болгари со всьмъ воискомъ грекескимъ и римскимъ из'біша и
самого²² убіша, пото́мъ Михайла К8рополата²³ у Адрианополя²⁴, яко
в т'мъ в' началъ п'росстранише речеса в конецъ побіша, акъ и²⁵ самъ
едві́ 8бнже²⁶ с от'чаниемъ²⁷ ж не совершивать на црствъ д'въ лътъ в
мистъ постріжеся, и т'ямъ в'євъ воиска р'им'скіе в помощъ²⁸ гре́комъ
п'ришёд'ший падоша,²⁹ и Ас'валдъ²⁹ воевода римскій асть и живь
сожжень³⁰ отъ болгараевъ на жертва, ||

От того ж Михайла К8рополата³¹ реченний³² болгари азьб'чные
слова, ихъ же нєе в'євъ Р'ось употребляеть³³, вм'сто да'ра п'рияша, по
той побьдь³⁴ Бос'нія, Далматію³⁵, Иллирикъ, и в'є страни рим'кіе
над моремъ егейскимъ лежаше³⁶, да'же до мора адриатскаго³⁷
ов'ладьша, и народами с'ловэньскими да'же до ѣныйшихъ време
н наполниша, Истринополь³⁸ градъ на р'вбечахъ итальйскихъ³⁹, егоже⁴⁰
нєе виницьане⁴¹ дер'жатъ, силою в'єща, издъе , .з,т. людей

¹ B suprascr. | ² G om. ER β | ³ B ante socr. зиджа ad. и in ras. | ⁴ ER третим | ⁵ Е 
вышеиманованй R вышеименованнй | ⁶ ER болгороы | ⁷ ГЕ славия R славия | ⁸ Е одольше R одольвье | ⁹ N корабли | ¹⁰ BGERN категри | ¹¹ ER Прополите | ¹² N положивъ | ¹³ B suprascr. | ¹⁴ G нем'енинъ | ¹⁵ Г лътописи | ¹⁶ G своеем | ¹⁷-ⁱ⁷ ER .т. 
¹⁸ ER корархі | ¹⁹ BGN щёт ER съцтъ | ²⁰ GN Рима [Pol. Rzymа] | ²¹ B в костянтинополскаго | ²² ER констянтинополскаго | ²³ N самаго | ²⁴ GR Адрианополь | ²⁵ ER omм. | ²⁶ BGN убъжа | ²⁷ ER оччтаня | ²⁸ ER помощ | ²⁹-³⁰ ER Насвальдъ | ³¹ BГN сожжень | ³² G Курополата | ³³ ER Каратопола | ³⁴ ER потребляютъ ER потребляется | ³⁵ R Далматио | ³⁶ RN лежаши | ³⁷ ER адиацскаго | ³⁸ ER Истринополь | ³⁹ ER итальйскихъ | ⁴⁰ ER add. и | ⁴¹ Е виницьане

² G in marg. кйзз Хрёны
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лётчих в' неволю взаща. внегдá же Ал'тимбáлдыр корóль лен'гобарскýй с воисkom на нихъ собрас' хотя иíхъ отгáлыв выгнать, на головё его побища, яко в тьх странах и íие слáвянъвеликиé осади имьт, Ов'ладьша потомъ Епиромъ и Албанéне ид'же Абланечь5, С'вятъград6, Яйца, Ли́с'чъ7, Мóк'р8 Бьлгород, Добрýю9, К'рóю, Нов'город, слáв'н'скýми10 имáнь11 || реченные города и зáм'ки сос'тро́йша.

Пáпа рымскý12 Николай и. а. пос'ле Іоанина13 жéны трéти13,14 в льто от Хрéта 3630 писа к нíмъ слóвесы млястивы, да крíдение с'втёе, и врёд Христовв8 воспринимьт, на ч'tо они охотно соблóговолиша, íбо меж'dá íими много хрéтиан15 того ж с'ловенского16 языка бышаа, паче же греческá вьры, пос'лó тогда к' нíмъ Николай пáпа пос'лъ своý17 и люде18 дёновыхъ' м'но, иýних с'лáвянь19 во Ора́кии и в Миси́я крьстиша, и науши хрéтианской21 в'бе по рим'скýмъ22 чинъ, ерё'тииáны23 ж с'бýценикý греческéй, иýже п'режде сего законъ с'воему и изушича, от нихъ изгнáшь24, называля ихъ от с'в'п'никýми.

Сíце внегдá в'сн25 болтары единомыш'ленно26 п'рîяша с'втёе к'решение, усльыша с'рацьны Гиш'панио и италíйскéе27 зéм'ли. и Ора́н'цію с'вирь'по повоеваща, и частью Гиш'панин28 овладьша, и Гарганум29 горь с'лавенью во Андлией30 в'заша, зане цесары хрéтианскéе31 не можахь с'прóтивища, собраша добровольно болтáрь32, с'ловьн33, идóша же моремъ и землею во Андлийо, ид'же с'рацьновъ34,, л. из'биша, потомъ же у прис'таниша ан'кконскý35, и неapolitанскý36 д'вь с'прóтивыми37 вóйски с'рацьны'скýми38 бóи, корабли39 и кáторг40 дивнымъ вымышлом сож'гоща, и в'сьх махмет41 разыпаша, бысть сие от Хрёта в' льто 3645. пíне.42 при цесаре Людикв второмъ сие Лотариеве, от Махмета ж прорóка с'рацьнскý43 в льто .м.т. по щёд蔡 卡 ráновь. кнýзъ же бол'тарскý44 по той с'лож'бе хрéтианской45, при46 закон пóстýнный,
св8 с'воем8 зда в'ласть, иже занеже недоб'ръ влас'ства, к' том8 върою, ортвнинау цфрагдакихъ б' напанъ, повель с'ъть емъ очи выл'пить вышедш и из нестр'а || сва6 же юн'шаго бол'таромъ дад' квзла, с'амъ же в мнст'ъ возв'ративсъ, тамо жит'е совер'шъ, однако жем потомъ болгры и едва не всѣ с'лавяне дла соосдственного1 с'м'жства во греческии2 законъ п'ревратилися, в нем'же и ийне съть, Сице тог'д' заитъ реского9 кол'на болтаровъ и болгровъ10, иже отъ Вол'ги реки из московскихъ странъ изидоша11 12 т' народы12 с'лавёнскк'е13 от моръ оракийскаго14, даже до венедийскаго15 простишно16 долблиствемъ17 воин'скимъ 8м'ножиша, яко сер'бы иже тою землео овлад'въ, ид'же бъ преж'д'сего Мисс'к'а мала ийне Сер'б'ео зов'тъ, или Сёрв'ео. болгры18 ид'же преж'д'сего Мисс'к'а великая Босна, ид'же прежде19 сего20 бъ21 Лив'рий20,22, ийне босенскал зем'ля, а гд' преж23 сего быль21 Илирикъ и Долматиі, ийне рацизы, кар'в'тье раски || или рачеве, карниольне, алб'ны, ис'тране, и пр'отчии24 меж горъ жив'щии25 26 над моремъ адриатикимъ, в'снъ т'хъже бол'тареи или волгареи28 московскихъ отъ Волги реки нас'льдницы съть ис'тимнні и с'лавен'ск'къ30 азыкомъ даже до йнешнихъ в'ременъ общие говоражъ, и с'лавань нарич'тсъ31, паче же същій во Илирикъ в Долматиі и въ Лив'рийъ33, Изъ того в славенскаго34 народъ бъ с'вѣты35 Еронимъ36, с' далмацкій учитель и с'толть костела повсемстенного37, иже благоат'йнъ жит'я ц'в'тища въ л'то отъ Хр'ства.38 Изи. також Кирилъ и Меодіи первій с'ловенстій апос'толи отъ того въ народъ болт'арскогъ39 быша въ л'то 39. во в'рема Юдіана отъсп'нніка противъ егожъ40 Кирил писа книги из'раднія41 с'лавенскимъ42 азыкомъ и латинскимъ поборя въре хр'ст'янск'къ43, а т' к'ниги ако Кар' іон свид'телств'в'ет в книгахъ 33. и ийне с'лавенскій44 в книговхранительниче Анъ Реук'л'ина славнаго45 || б'гос'лова во г'раде п'еоренской.
А чего ради, и каковы рады винь и приличча, богары1, Рѣсь, карваты, далматы2, сербы, босны3, илирики4, и інші5 того ж народа предки наше6, с'явяне с'ять речени7, различных8 с'ять пов'стописц'ов раздмѣния, ѧко выше сего написахъ.

Сѣйдь6, в' книгахъ с'воихъ, слаб'ѣн'скѣй10 народа быти с'лавный11 за Ис'стромѣ илі Дѣнаем полагаетъ, ид'ѧже ѵ'не богары и сербы реченинъ12 ж от' шлахгества13 и с'лавныхъ дѣловъ в'ойнск'ихъ с'лавоны, или славаки14, а не склавоны, ѧко италіан15 г'л'голютъ который проз'в'аніемъ хотаху различны быти от' скіиовъ и татар, понеже гр'еки меж' генеты илі сар'маты16 народами словенскими,17 и межъ17 татары якакова различ'я не творахъ18, о с'емъ Іоакимѣ19 К'реи в'о истор'и шленск'ой немчин' породою воспоминаетъ, генеты и ва'н'д'алиты || с'ловяны быти от' Мосока рожденными писа, ѵже готовъ с т'ять поль, ид'ѧже20 ѵ'не Литва и Рѣсь была из'г'наша, інші же с' т'ями готами въ западны21 с'страны при'йд'оша, такожъ съ ким'враны, ѧко інші предки с'лавяне из'давна въ немецк'ихъ земл'ахъ осады постр'анные22 им'б'ша даже до л'ыта,' ар'ме.23 в'н'ед'а на нихъ вс'4 к'й' і нов'я в'осташи при' цесаре Кон'раде25, и26 из'г'наша ѵ'хъ изо27 Ми'с'ніі28 и29 из' р'н'б'еж'е королевствъ дат'ц'комъ30 смѣжныхъ ѵ'бо. ф. л'ять пребыша во ід'олос'л'женіе, т'тъже31 К'реи немalinkъ писетъ, ѧко егда по смерт'и Ат'ильы корола вен'герскаго32 жестокаго33, народы сармацк'и с'лавенскаго34 языка отъ моря леденаго35 и отъ озера м'еотйскаго36 изъ р'в'ск'ихъ с'страли московскихъ великую силою при'шед'е из'г'наша, ис' т'ять поль ѵже ѵ'не Полша в' себ' с'одерж'итъ н'м'цовъ сеноновъ, гем'п'нд'р'овъ и бо'въ37, о чемъ и Ваповской38 кан'торъ кра'ковскій || полякъ въ льтописи с'воей, ѵже не совер'ша и не выдавъ 8м'р'е, пише39 с'с'це, ѧко с'лаваки, или с'лавяне наши предки отъ озера с'ловенного40 ѵже е'сть въ московск'ихъ с'стр'анахъ речени41 с'ять, и того для поляки, чехи42 богары, и43 інші вс' ѵ' нов'я и Рѣсь ѵ'мътъ произв'жденіе с'вою от' Мосока, или45 Москвы с'на Иа'етова, понеже изъ с'странъ московскихъ произ'изд'оша46,47 о с'емъ47

---

1 ER бол'торы | 2 ER д'л'маты | 3 Р бо́йны | 4 BG илирика | 5 Г ѵ'ни | 6-6 N предки наши тогожъ народа with numbers above: 3 4 1 2 | 7 Р реченинъ | 8 Е раз'ыхъ | 9 Е антъ корр. С'ятъ Р С'ятъ N Снудъ | 10 E словя́цкъ | 11 E славны | 12 ER реченинъ | 13 B антъ корр. шлахгества G шлахгества Е шлахгества Р шлахгества | 14 G словакъ | 15 BGN итальяне | 16 ER сор'маты | 17-17 N имъже | 18 B ad. и въ ras. N ad. и | 19 Е Іокъмъ | 20 B антъ корр. іже | 21 R саподы | 22 ER пр'ст'ращ'ны | 23 R ad. a | 24 N всѣ | 25 R Кондратъ | 26 ER omn. | 27 B антъ корр. | 28 G изъ | 29 R Мисцъ | 30 ER omn. | 31 Е дац'кому | 32 ERN т'д'же | 33 Е в'ен'г'скаго RN в'ен'г'скаго | 34 G жестакаго | 35 ER словенскаго N словенскаго | 36 BGR леденого | 37 ER м'еот'скаго N м'еот'скаго | 38 G обонѣвъ | 39 ER Ваповскій | 40 R п'ш'ітъ | 40 ER славенаго N словенаго | 41 R реченинъ | 42 ER adv. и | 43 Е om. | 44 Е всѣ N всѣ | 45 ER adv. отъ | 46 ER произ'ид'оша | 47-47 B антъ корр. с'с'це

---

a B in marg. отстав
та́ко Ваповской пишет.
Альберт1 же Кра́пёнкін пове́стник глаголеть быть реченных сла́ваков2 от многорбьдія с́лова́ іже есть явное бездълее перездѣнного3 раздмѣнія его, понеже сла́ваки имѣютъ быть своественно и истино реченій4 по раздѣленію раздмѣнныхъ людей сла́ваки5 от славы, ибо сами сла́ваки6 и болгары от природно7 азъки рѣскаго8 то имя единомышлѣнно даша от славы, и от своихъ славныхъ воинскихъ дѣл, сица же ако они сами сла́вными и сла́ваками се́бь нарицах8, тогда и латы́нники9 с ними́хъ долго ратовах9 в гдѣствѣ ради греческыхъ и10 італійскихъ11, начаша ихъ нарица ть сла́вны и сла́вы, странны же ихъ Сла́воніѧ а не сла́вны12, или словы13, и не от14 Сла́воніѧ15 от словъ но от славы16, того ради рѣскаки, поляки, и 17 чехи древнѣе18 наши предки, ако в'сегда лѣч'ши19 сла́вѣ нежелі сокровища люблазах8, тогда кѣйемь и ѣйомь свойимь, и ѣйными своего народа людемъ обче20 имени дазвах8 союзны и сложены с21 славою, ако Святосла́въ, Промыслосла́въ Сто́сла́въ, Бори́сла́въ, Преслосла́въ, Выробосла́въ, се есть иже своймь мѣстовъ сла́в8 сѣбѣ выработалъ, Имисла́въ емляса за слав8, Стонасл22 становляй23 се́бь сла́в8, Дивисла́въ22, Мечисла́въ от мѣча славны24, Заисла́въ, В'ладисла́въ, Аросла́въ, Бредисла́въ, Мirosла́въ23, Добросла́въ, Прибисла́въ, Засла́въ, Болесла́въ || Венцесла́въ, Вѣш26 убо пра́вде подоб'а, о чемъ и Кромер в повестяхъ и во в'сѣхъ ученіяхъ свободныхъ божественныхъ свидѣтелствѣв т27 главѣ .п. в книге .а. о дѣляхъ полскихъ, ако тѣй болгары, иже надъ Днаемъ и надъ греческимъ моремъ жиша, вс'негда вѣлія и пр'еславная дельеса воискала противъ римскаго28 и коств'ян'тинопольскаго29 црѣства яко выше рекохомъ творях8, и частые30 повѣдительства надъ римланы и надъ греки полѣчах8, честъ ради и хъвалы пр'еслав'ышихъ сѧ дѣлъ своихъ особое има самь сеbь даша, и нарицах8 сла́ваки31, или славніи, или имь то 32има ии32 ихъ народа люди, Рѣсь Москва, и поляки даша, желая земняномъ33 своймъ доброя сла́вы, тогда от ихъ щас'лѣвыхъ и славныхъ дѣлъ нарекоша ихъ сла́вйны, или славаки, а насъ бы свойхъ нас'лѣдникоv || нар'кляли сла́ваки от сла́бости, занѣ зѣлѣ ослабляли ес'мы34,
Въ томъ же зѣлъ погрьщаютъ итальйANE35, и ихъ лѣтописцы, иже нась и

1 ER Албърдъ | 2 BGN словаковъ | 3 RN неражудано | 4 ER речени | 5 ER славаки |
6 G словаки | 7 G преродного ERN природаного | 8 ERN рѣскаго | 9 ER латы́нски |
10 ER omm. | 11 ER італійскихъ | 12 ER славныы | 13 ER славы | 14 BGN omm. |
15 ER Славоніѧ | 16 B ad. но от славы ін ras. | 17 ER omm. | 18 N древній | 19 Е лѣтши |
20 Г лучшій | 20 G обыта ER общѣ | 21 ER omm. | 22 G suprasct. | 23 ER становлялъ |
24 R славы | 25 N в marg. | 26 N вѣща | 27 ER во | 28 RN римскаго |
29 BN коств'ян'тинопольскаго G коств'ян'тинопольскаго ER коств'ян'тинопольскаго |
30 ER частыя | 31 N словаки | 32 N имыемые | 33 G ante cot. семляномъ RN семляном |
34 R естмы | 35 BG італьянне R итальяне
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иных бол'таровь народа р'скаго с'лавонь, и склавы, в латинскомъ а'язк' пиш'ть и зов'ть, во итальянскомъ же склавы, и скявы вмьсто с'лаваковъ, или скловоновъ которое погребеніе от неумышія нашего а'язка вор'вало и вкрадоло, в повести Прокопіцевы Іоранан'довы, и Бл'довы з'натно от писцоі витальскыхъ, иже хотя по малодобною юнош'скъ младенчески молвить многощія и слово вмЬсто ну.  

174в

175г

1 ERN р'скаго | 2 Е итальпскъ R итальпскъ | 3 Е склавонь R склавы | 4 R склавы | 5 B ante corr. славековъ | 6 N ad. (или славоновъ) | 7 ER которыя | 8 N Иранандовъ | 9 ER итальпскихъ | 10 E юніскъ R юніскую | 11 BN множаці G множаці R множаці | 12 N людъ | 13-13 G агелъ | 14-14 B ante сошъ. т. же | 15 N глаголь | 16 B ante сошъ. в р'вы G р'чцмъ | 17 BGN итальпскихъ | 18 ER неіпъ | 19 B ante сошъ. іе | 20 ER слово | 21 ER славовъ | 22 R словенскъ N словенскъ | 23 ER различія | 24 ER сіява | 25 ER слово | 26 ER людъ | 27-27 R сія | 28 N вмещаютъ | 29 N словахъ | 30 N словоны | 31 R на | 32 ER скавы | 33 N имянемъ | 34 BGN итальпскихъ | 35 N всѣ | 36 EN всѣкаго | 37 N купленого | 38 R склавы | 39 BGN итальпскихъ | 40 N Адратіцаго | 41 BG живоцѣ R живші | 42 B ante сошъ. лонгабардцы ER лонгабарды | 43 BG безпрестанныхъ | 44 ER славоками N словаки | 45 N скявоны | 46 BG итальпыхъ | 47 ER разозой | 48 R кандиково N кандикиновъ | 49 BGN катарахъ | 50 R итальпихъ ЕР | 51 R денгаур | 52 BGN наричът
Сице тогдачитателюлюбезнный¹, славаки речени свѣть от славы, и славных дѣѣсвоих, понеже ихѣ и латинскѣ всѣ² лѣтописцы славоны и славяны пишѣт, или потомъ яко нѣе сами себѣ наричуютъ³ словаковъ⁴ возмогоша то имѣ́ ⁵ себѣ ⁶ дать, акѣ бы рѣкъ истиннѣй извѣстнѣй⁷, послѣйнѣй неложнѣй в словѣ от слова учтивого⁸, и истинных⁹ обещаней¹⁰, и извѣстнаго¹¹ речения свое, понеже то еще до нѣешнаго дня 8 чеховъ карватов¹², и у насъ поляковъ хранимо есть, яко добрѣѣмъ и честнѣм⁴⁴ словомъ обещащица¹⁵ заплатитъ, исполнить¹⁶ и доставить отзѣдь слова¹⁷ яко лѣтша¹⁸, а не долгѣи или обещаний поминаемъ сла еже не исполнитъ 8 людеи¹⁹ истинно благородныхъ добротѣ и славѣ люблышихъ бываетъ великое безчестие²⁰, яко и нѣ лѣтчы бы ранѣ приняла¹¹ нежели слову своеемъ не быть гдѣиномъ, но нѣе нѣцы⁴² говорить обыцѣли²² или²³ а чемъ слова²⁴ держатца²⁵, отзѣдь является²⁶ яко нѣпи²⁷ предки славѣ и честѣ и правѣдивые слова всегда любили, того для и толь славное, от славы и от правды свѣтъ имя подѣчива, яко ²⁸ ихѣ нѣе иници²⁸ сѣлавныхъ славакъ, славоны²⁹, и іници³⁰ ж словаки³¹ наричуютъ³².

Аще тогда от сѣлавы, лицѣ честныхъ и ісѣчныхъ словъ речени³³ свѣть славаки и словаки³⁴, вѣе то добро и одна рѣч, понеже мало различѣ³⁵ в первомъ слогѣ, сѣлѣ, и сѣлѣ, ибо и болгары вмѣсто слово³⁶, глаголютъ сѣлаво³⁷, також сербы вьнегда комѣ что обещаютъ, тако ми Бѣга на мою вѣрѣ⁸, на мое сѣлаво³⁸ витежское.

Такожде Иорнѣдь прѣж³⁹ дѣлѣт помина о народѣхъ нашихъ в повѣсти сѣвоѣли однако ихъ сѣлаваками⁴⁰, славинами, и славаками наричащемъ сими словесы, яко славаки⁴¹ сѣ лѣвой сѣтороны сарманѣцкихъ горъ, которые Безкѣдѣ, и латыры наричаеъ жива во времена его, а иные надъ Вислою рекою пространные осады імѣли, еже раздѣлѣтъ сла о рѣсахъ галицкихъ, острожскихъ, подолскихъ бѣлскѣнъ, хелмскихъ⁴⁲, лиѣвовскихъ пѣремышльских⁴³, которые страны, и нѣе подоргскѣмъ⁴⁴ наричаемъ для того понеже починаються от горѣ венгерскихъ, а что пишеть тотже Иорнѣдь яко⁴⁵ інѣі славаки надъ Вислою во время его въ лѣтѣ³¹, дѣв. осады імѣли, то раздѣлѣтъ⁴⁶ о нашихъ полякахъ (йже отъ широкихъ поль и отъ ловѣ"

---

¹ R любезны ² BG вси ³ BN наричает ⁴ Е славокъ R славанов ⁵ ER add. в ⁶ ER ивсевъ ⁷ E постолный ⁸ BGERN учтиваго ⁹ Р истинныхъ ¹⁰ GER обѣщание ¹¹ ER omм. ¹² ERN известнаго ¹³ R ыравтовъ ¹⁴ ER честнымъ ¹⁵ RN обещающе ¹⁶ R исполнить ¹⁷ ER слава ¹⁸ В лучшаго Г лѣтаго Л лучшаго ¹⁹ Е люде ²⁰ Г бѣдствіе Н бѣдствіе ²¹ G приницѣ ²²-²³ B supra. ²⁴ GN інѣй ²⁵ E ad. der in ras. ²⁶ N держатея ²⁷ ER авьлетца ²⁸ G supra. ²⁹ Н нынѣ ихъ іници with numbers above: 2 1 3 ²⁰ R славаны ²³ ER и інѣ ²⁴ ERN славаки ²⁵ N наричать ²⁶ GE речени R реченій ²⁷ ER славаки ²⁸ ER различа ²⁹ R слова ³⁰ ER слово ³¹ ER прежде ³² ER славаками ³³ G славаки ³⁴ B ante cot. холмскихъ N холмскихъ ³⁵ N перемышльскихъ ³⁶ N подоргскѣмъ ³⁷ ER add. и ³⁸ В раздѣлѣтца
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которое полеваньем² зовьть речени съть) о поморчикахъ, касябахъ, мазбрахъ, чехахъ, иже також'де изъ рѣски³ болгарскаго⁴ словенского⁵ народа и странь начаша произвож'денія с'вои имѣя с розными⁶ воеоводы и с⁷ кѣзнъ рѣз'нѣ въ тѣхъ земляхъ перед тысячью⁸ и нѣсколко въ сѣть³ выбиравъ нѣмцовыхъ поселилисъ, исъ тѣхъже болгаровъ или волгаровъ⁹, отъ Волги реки московской, ии народъ рѣской отдѣлился иже¹⁰ въ тѣхъ странахъ, ажнѣ ии Вольную нарицаемъ послилися, а¹¹ отъ Волги реки, и отъ волгаровъ волгицы¹² зъ землею || своею Волгинемъ речени съть.

Которой¹³ народа ии въ войнскихъ¹⁴ дѣляхъ яко и п'редковъ их видимъ быти славныхъ¹⁵, ажко¹⁶ съть, лѣчане, володимерцы, кременчане, гродъяне, оврдѣчане, житомиряне, корчане, збаражане, иже потомъ киевскіе подлдскіе¹⁷, подолскіе, и иныя с'мѣж'ныя рѣски страны народомъ своимъ наполнилиша, ииных¹⁸ же въ тѣхъ поляхъ (идѣже ии низовье¹⁹ казаки живѣть) також¹⁰ надъ [Д]непром²⁰ и Дономъ реками и въ Таврикѣ, идѣже ии татарь перекопскѣе осталисъ, а съ ними готты, аттижки, половцы, печенѣгги²¹, и иныя сарматы²² дрѣжбѣ юко съ побратымами изъ одного народа идѣчимъ жили, ииных остатки ихъ съть надъ чернымъ моремъ, межъ перекопскою ордою и между волхое, которые нарижоюсь безкаравы²³, словенскимъ языкомъ глголющи, ||

О тѣхъ написа Овидії²⁴ Насонъ творецъ изърадный, вмѣстѣ велико²⁵ дива къ римляномъ егда²⁶ бѣ въ сылькѣ, въ Таврикѣ, идѣже ии Карѣ, Кримѣ, и Бѣгородѣ²⁷ волской, и идѣже очаковъ, каневѣ, черкесы и Кіевъ²⁸, Пишеть же ии о Понтѣ къ Маѣмъ²³.

Посреди неприятель живъ азъ увѣчный²⁹, аки ми²⁰ съ отечествомъ отвжать есть³¹ миръ вѣчный³², иже ядомъ³³ ащеричимъ³⁴ мажѣтъ стрѣлы свои³⁵, дабы къ смерти прідѣлали, винѣ великихъ вдвоѣ, здѣѣ воинъ орѣнныя стѣны вѣмъ осадитъ, бѣдно³⁶ овецъ въ хлевине волкъ страшный³⁷ оградилъ, крѣвы отъ стрѣль ежасъ, съ сторонѣ напѣренныя, и одна здержитъ крѣпость воротъ затворенныхъ, ||

---

² G in marg. творение Овидії[и]я Насона
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178g К томъ же Мазимъ, 
Или ч'то савроматы, атвизи свирѣпъ1, творать и із Таврики2 люди много лѣпи, гдѣ Дѣнай становится тамъ повѣръ2 воды, бѣгаютъ скорымъ конемъ ч'резъ3 рекѣ въ заводы, большая часть людей Риме, 
тебѣ не бойтесь, ни же орѣжія воевъ аузонскихъ страшаться, 
устремляютъ ихъ льки, и полны саадакъ6, и въ дальнѣ7 привычны8 п'ти аргамаки, къ томъ привычны8 тер'пѣть жажды и голды, а 
неприятель гоня ихъ не найдетъ воды, 
Тойже9 въ книге .д.и 
Зриши что атвеженіе тол тяхкіе10 возы, гонит съ ред Дѣнайскихъ водъ надъ лѣки въ морозы, зриши отрав8 съ острымъ смѣщеніи8 желѣскомъ, 
дабы однѣмъ смерти винъ здѣлали12.13 потискомъ14, 

178v Иная м'нога со удивленіемъ писа Овидій15 о сарматѣхъ, и дѣв'ной16 храбрыости готтовъ и геттовъ, и с'лаваковъ въ17 своихъ элегіяхъ18 о Пон'тѣ, 
и львъ то показъетъ, ако п'ши сарматы, Рѣюсь, ят'вижане, волъныцы19, 
Лит'ва, Ж'мойди, и Москва не были подданы сильъ и владѣнію 
римскомъ егда гѣлолеть, 
Большая20 часть людей Риме тебе не боятся, и прочалъ, яко мало что 
выше сего написасть, 
Писа такожде Овій21 с'лавенскимъ22 азъквомъ и рѣскимъ стихи, къ 
тому бо его блѣдъозубыръ р'чи приведе яко научися ея совершенно 
внага гѣлолеть, 
Сие вы знайте геть и вы савроматы23, изуичис'ся сармацки24 и 
гетскі26 глѣлолати, || 

179r О семъ и йродотъ27 в' книгу .д.и с'видѣтелствъет, ако сарматы народъ 
рѣского28 иже паче місковъ29 съ есть волгаровъ, и паче скивоевъ 
татары въ то врѣмѧ краснѣйшею30 рѣчь имѣли, в' начале вмѣст'го 
дебельне31 рѣчь красотѣ с'ловъ изобрели отздѣ является, яко сарматы 
п'ши разлизваны были нравами32 и народомъ и языкомъ отъ скиевъ, или 
татаръ, аще древности повѣстописцы греческѣ латинскѣ, всѣ народы 
полънчны33 и межд'досточныя скиова и сар'матами засадо 
нарицахъ, полаковъ рѣсковъ, Литвѣ и Московскѣ и татарь одинъ народъ 
быти ложно, разземля въ кв'ю лож приводя ихъ равное свирѣпства 
въ войн'скихъ дѣлехъ, ихъ же яко природнаго34 ремесла войн'скаго35 
безпрестанно36 учились37, того для и П'рокопи38 солгав сище пишеть 

---

1 ER свирѣпны | 2 R Таврики | 3 G через | 4 BGN болѣша | 5 BGN тебѣ | 6 В саидаки ante сорт. саадаки GN саадаки | 7 ER даліне N далінье | 8-8 ER om. | 9 N тоже | 10 ER тяхкия | 11 BGN отраву | 12-12 B ante сорт. дѣви вины | 13 ER здѣлати | 14 B ante сорт. потаскомъ | 15 ER Овидій | 16 ER дѣвоно | 17 N om. | 18 Е улгейахъ R улгейахъ | 19 B ante сорт. волгницъ N волгницъ | 20 R ошила [space left for initial] | 21 G Овидій ante сорт. Овій | 22 ER словенскімъ | 23 R савроматы | 24 BGN сармацки | 25 B in ras. N om. | 26 GN гетскі | 27 B ad. тов' ин ras. | 28 ERN рѣскаго | 29 R місковъ | 30 N краснѣйшему | 31 ER дѣвьніе | 32 ER нравомъ | 33 ER полуносныя | 34 G природнаго | 35 ER воинскаго | 36 G безпрестанно | 37 N улилось ante сорт. улились | 38 ER Прокопи
о словаках 1, склявонь народъ скиськой во время Иустиниана 2 нападоша 3 на Илирикъ 4, и велёй беды сотвориша, о чемь обращеши 5 простиранъе || у Волатерана 6 въ книге .и.и во Илирикъ потомъ несхоже осмотрелись во †жие своеи повстотпицы греческие, яко тогда Волатеранъ 7 въ книге .и.и въ Сармацкъ 8 воспоминаеть, токмо жъ потому на тъ нарочы сьлавенскіе 10 сарматами нарицаху, иже межь Виссюлою, Дономъ, и межъ моремь немецкимъ и горами венгерскими, 11 жиша, яко полки, мазды, пръбсы старые, Литвь, Жмойдь 12, Рьсь и Мостьвь, тъй же вси 14 о силь 15, 16 римской нимала ч́то радъшь, аще Светони и 16 Еутропий пишуть, еже и 17 Мехови въ книге .и.и въ главѣ .и. и Волатеранъ въ книжѣ 18 .и. воспоминаеть, яко Домитианъ 20 въ начале против 21 имь воевд, но 22 краява 23 побьдъ 24 полычи, понеже двѣ воевд, Аурелия 25 Тьская, и Олиния Савина 26 съ полками и съ войску великими сарматы наши ѵбили, Антови Пий такожъ, и Антонии Верь цесари со инъми 28 сарматы и съ рѣсаки у реки Дона, частые бои имьхъ 29, но съ малою || корыстью 30, съ тьмь сарматы Валентинианъ 21, Галенъ, Мазиминий 31, Галенинъ, Дикоклитанъ, 33 Провъ, Каръ, Дрьсъ, и 34 инъи цесари, и мънози воеводы римскія 36 долго, но 37 во тцѣ воевдъ,

*Прокъ* 38 же хвалится 39, о съвомъ мѣжесстввъ, яко и зъ Сармати съ то девиць поимад, от нихъже въ однѣ ночъ 40 десять 41 съвоевать, а въ пластадать 42 деней (сколко моголь ггтеть 43) всѣ перемоглъ,

Помпони 44 жъ Меллъ 45 въ книжѣ .и.и въ главѣ .и.и пишет, яко сармацкіе народы сьлавенскіе всегда быша съвободны и нѣскромы, 46 того дѣла и Автъкь кесарь обладавый 47 всѣю всѣленною 48 всѣю въ его врёмѣ Хрѣсьть родиса 48 венуга совѣтоваша 49 ему воевать противъ сарматъ сицѣ гголя, яко мѣнъ не лѣть есць злато удою рыбы ловить, ыки бы рѣкъ не хочо болши потерять нежели сыскать, || о семь ч́ти простиранье въ Светониа 50, тогда Автъкъ кесарь писа къ Лентѣю воеводѣ съвомъ, да не дерзаетъ дранить воянно сарматовв, иже и покао не зналъ, и въ силъ войнской мѣчъь быша, о семь Олерь въ книгахъ .д.x.

---


a G in marg. мѣжество Прокъла | b G in marg. Автъкъ кесарь
Тамъже пишеть на концѣ, всѣмъ на запад и подленъ 8миришшымъся1 народомъ, в'негда2 на запад слѣца и на3 подленъ умирь Авгѣсть войною в'сѣ народы пос'вали к немѣ послов скѣйны и сар'маты дрѣжбы сосѣдственной4 просла, яко свободны люди,
В4 тож в'ремя геніды пр'д'ки жмовидскіе5 и литовскіе6 котлыхъ медань по обычаю с'воемѣ поганскомѣ посвящень вмѣсто поминкѣ дрѣжбы томѣже цесарю Авгѣст47 пос'вали, о чемъ Киликии8 Кимвры9, в произволе кимвры и Свентоніи10. ||
A у Ж'мойди11 Лотѣвъ и 8 кр'совъ паче же у людей поселскихъ12 и пѣне видимъ лѣчшее12 быти сокрѣвъ, котликъ14 или горшкѣ15 мѣдный16.
Сице тогда Авгѣсть кесарь сильвишй разсѣждаше себѣ дрѣжбы нашихъ сарматовъ, славя16, тѣже Троян сотвори, яко внегдъ даковъ и ятвйовъ17 поѣди, сарматовъ в дрѣжбахъ себѣ прия,18 да безпосѣдиншйи18 от ихъ наѣздовъ бѣдеть, о чемъ Дион Каси в трояне, Орѣвне19 ихъ бѣ, лѣки, самострѣлы, рогатины мало, мечей19, сабель20 скѣдостъ ради жѣльба и рѣжва долгова не з'нали, пишеть бо Павзании21, яко самъ видѣ22 панъсерь сар'матскій23, из рога копыть лошадинны по подобию чешѣвы зминой 8чиненъ, которыя крѣпостию и легкостю24 не хѣжи25 быти греческого26 (каковы пѣне 8 на27 панъцъра28. ||
Иустьнівъ29 же .иъ. цесарь30 не могъ ни войною ни дрѣжбою сарматовъ смирить31, города и крѣпости противъ ихъ здѣше, хотя32 имъ проход до Дѣная заборонить33 но ихъ и то не страшы, о семъ чи П'рокопія о з'даняхъ И8стиниана34, Тѣж сар'маты ныпи, Атилию с'лавномъ35 короля, иже страхъ36 вселенныя писаас на поляхъ каталогонскихъ37 побиша, в память же толь с'лавные38 побѣды, на щитахъ с'воихъ дѣвыхъ воиновъ верховыхъ39 з гольми мечами40 обыкли было писати, дабы тѣмъ явили мѣдосте41 с'вое воинское, з'же в' толикой цѣнѣ 8 нихъ бѣсить42, яко Гипократь въ книгахъ о воздѣсѣ ихъ водъ43 пишеть, ако не ток'мо мѣдѣ44 нѣ и жены упражняхъ44 воюю,45 а кая бы трехъ

\[1\] N умилившимся | \[2\] B ante corr. всегда | \[3\] ER omm. | \[4\] R сосѣдственно | \[5\] R жмодская | \[6\] ER литовская | \[7\] N Августа | \[8\] ER Килики | \[9\] Е Кимвръ | \[10\] BN add. отъ | \[11\] GR Жмоди | \[12\] U ante corr. поселскыхъ ER посолскихъ | \[13\] ER лутшее | \[14\] B ante corr. котлить | \[15\] BGERN горшокъ | \[16\] G словянь | \[17\] R ятвйовъ | \[18\] ER дѣвъ зопасный | \[19\] R дѣвы заопаснышшыи | \[20\] B ante corr. мечи | \[21\] B ante corr. сабли | \[22\] ER Поузани | \[23\] B виделъ | \[24\] N сармоцъ анте сармашкій | \[25\] B ante corr. то гостюю | \[26\] ER греко | \[27\] GRN хуже | \[28\] ER греческаго | \[29\] B ante corr. нахъ | \[30\] ER панцыръ | \[31\] BGERN Иустьини | \[32\] B ante corr. смирить | \[33\] B ante corr. запоронить | \[34\] BGERN И8стиниана | \[35\] ER славнаго | \[36\] B ante corr. сирахъ | \[37\] GRN каталонскихъ | \[38\] BGERN славня | \[39\] ER верховыхъ | \[40\] ER мечи | \[41\] G множество | \[42\] B ante corr. на волтѣ | \[43\] GN на волтѣ
межей на войнѣ не было, || таковыхъ недос’тойныхъ к сѣмъ размѣтрахъ и дабы здѣ’ краткости, и тосклившимъ читателю норовъ, и ’ныхъ цесарей греческихъ римскихъ, также о сармацкій войн’ской храбрости ос’тавилъ, тогда т’о само дѣ’ло выявляетъ, яко подлинно не лѣ’нью, ни с’паніемъ, толь великаго и широкаго владѣній достигли, отъ моря ледяного далече за московськими странами также отъ моря балтійскаго еже прѣ’сы, лишеня и Свѣ’ю обливаетъ, даже до адриацкаго морѣ вищицкаго, и даже до Гелеспонта и черного моря, въ которой ок’рѣ’ше нѣ’е вез’дѣ народъ сармацкій и словенскій осады с’вои [и]мѣютъ, подача’ Але’зандря великаго подтвержденныя нѣ’емы, и с’отцомъ его Олипомъ до р’жства Христова въ тѣ’ по Иосифъ древесностии еврейскихъ во владѣніи вселенныя работахъ, твердятъ же т’о чеки под’лиенно, яко при Але’зандре великому предки ихъ быша с’лайній, и для с’лайныхъ дѣ’ отъ славы с’лакви речени с’ть, яко и привилѣ Але’зандрю въ держ’пне с’воей лѣ’тописи словенскими языкомъ писанной оказываютъ, карвать ж и бол’тары т’вердятъ, яко привилѣ подлинный на хартии Але’зандровъ с’лаковъ даны, и з’латьыми с’лова’ми во Але’зандрии писанъ, и нѣ’е въ казѣ’ тѣрскіи, егоже в’зя Магметъ царь в’мѣсте съ Црѣмъградомъ, понѣ’е и тѣрки не иными народомъ толь м’ного стрѣ’нья в’селённыхъ овладѣла, ток’мо с’ловен’скимъ, из него же апачанъ, и аддамагланы творят. Но понѣ’е т’ наро ды сармацк’е, болгарск’е, рѣ’ск’е, готск’е, полск’е, вольн’ск’е, ван’дальск’е, чес’к’е отъ Аетова сына Мисоха 8м’ноженные, толь з’лос мо’хъ’ры бывшя, яко в’сьевъ Ев’ропѣ, Аси об’ и Аерикъ повоеваша, тогда язык с’вои природный для разно’с’ти рѣ’бежей, и час’то того меж’ чюйми народы обиженъ помышали, яко единъ народъ 8 отр’гово мы’ье едва рѣ’чъ языка общего выразьм’tie м’жеть, аще и отъ того народъ сармацкаго, и отъ того языка с’ловенскаго отъ с’мешенія языковъ 8 стол’на

1 R тоскловомъ 2 Н нароя 3-3 Н инныхъ 4 ER такожд’ 5 N свидѣтельствомъ 6 ER a 7 ERN великаго 8 ERN широкаго 9 N ледяного 10 N також’ 11 BG балтійскаго ERN балтійскаго 12 GER da 13 G одрацкаго ERN адриацкаго 14 ERN вищицкаго 15 B аnte соъ. Гесопора Р Гелерсполта 16 ERN чернаго 17 BGERN свои им’ютъ 18 EN великаго 19 ER подтверждение 20 BGN со 21 BGN отцемъ 22 GER ево 23 BGN Олифомъ 24 ER omm. 25 R по 26 B аnte соъ. славы 27 R речени 28 U аnte соъ. дѣрвени 29 BGERN древненъ 30 ER пиано 31 ER подлинны 32 ER словаковъ 33 G данъ 34 G злыми 35 ER его 36 ERN Магметъ 37 ERN Цеаремъградомъ 38 G вселенны 39 G инненъ 40 N om 41 E сармацкіе R сармацкіе 42 ER вондальскіе 43 ER повове 44 E природны 45 G словенскій ER словенскій N слованскій 46 ERN частаго 47 ER a 48 ER др’гово 49 ER общаго 50 N того 51 EN сармацкаго 52 BG словенскаго ER словейскаго
Вавилонского1 зачато2, и от того ж кольцоначалника3 Иаиета и Моноха сына его произведения4 полное имею. сего рады собственных5 языка словенского стародревний является6 быти роскей московскй7, понеже та Русь их же Московью зовется8 издавна в тых странах полноземных9 и восточних гдѣ10 и11 не поспели еще дале не волочились, того за нравовь и общчья11 и языка древнего12 не могли изменить, яко то иным народомъ иже ис13 тых странъ14 московскихъ || вышпнъ привлчйлось14, понеже въ различныхъ странахъ въселенныя въ15 воинъ упражнялись16, того рады сёрбы, карата, рачи, болгары17, з греки, с венгры, и с тёрки, долматья жъ, кариниане сътрийане18, истриане19, иллирики, с волохи, шленскiе, моравяне20, чехи, миссиане21, поморяне, касцвайане22, с ньмцы, Польша бѣляя съ Москвою, и съ татары, подгорье, мазды подлящене, Русь черная, вольницы, и Литвы часть23 съ поляки23, а поляки со всѣми народы нравы пльатье24 и языкъ отчасти25 природной25 помышали, яко по достоинствѣ насе обезяни, хамалеонами въ языку нареции можеть.

Сие тогда имыя читатели любезный26 произведение27 народы литеовскiiе28, жмойдискiiе29, сарматовъ, славянъ, Русciiе30, и31 аныхъ, и яко сарматы речени суть отъ Асарматы32, или || Сарматы, о немже чьти быти лѣ домъ, у Іосиева древностей ееврѣйскихъ книги лѣ домъ. или речени суть сарматы яко скиевъ народъ татарскiй изгнали, и выбили33 изъ Сармакiя34, ихъ ветхъ греки яко выше сего речеса силѣ ихъ поэзовъ вмѣсто Сарматы35 же отъ ееврѣйскаго36 толквется высок и честенъ, сарвоматы37 нареции можахъ противнымъ обычаи отъ заврсъ же отъ греческаго38 размыслется ащеирциа и олма, око, се есть народъ съ ащерцями очиымъ съирѣплія рады войнскаго39, славаки жъ нарчютъ отъ славы, и отъ славнаго40 

воинскаго40 дѣла, иллъ славаки отъ сълова, яко во исполщенѣи41 слова обещаня усердно постояннѣи42 были, ий же къ самой повести роской43 во имя всѣхъ вещей начала Бгя пристѣпаемъ44, ||

---

1 ERN Вавилонъскiя | 2 N зачатаго | 3 ERN кольцоначалника | 4 RN произведение | 5 BG сопственный Е собственны N собственной | 6 G являтся | 7 G московскъ | 8 В зовемъ antе corr. зову GN зовемся | 9 BGN полнооныхъ | 10 ER omn. | 11 R объчая | 12 BGERN древнаго | 13 ER съ | 14-15 R suprascr. | 15 B въ antе corr. во | 16 B antе corr.  


a G in marg. древность языка московскаго | b E in marg. о платы | c E in marg. сарматы тол[...]| высокъ и честе[...] R in marg. сарматы толкуется высокъ ж и честень
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184v Матфея 1 Стріковского (Самосотвіча; о б ё л ё й ч е р ' н ой Росії, Востоцних, пол'нашних 3, і 0 4 полъдненых народах дрьвних, і їхніх 5,6 князех великіновородицкъ, і зборских псковскихъ белозерскихъ киевскихъ лѣцкіхъ 8 володимерскихъ 9 волынскихъ 10 галицкихъ подгорскихъ, подольскихъ и іныхъ, Глава 1. Древних всѣх славенскихъ 11 народовъ источнici 12, а и отрас'ли росской земли, и їхь сла'внье родоссловія 13 отъ 8 до 8 были, и коей р'ды вины или собства 14. Р'сь имьнованы 15 были, различныхъ сдѣть 8ченьихъ людей о том ми'нния 16 и произведения, ибо такожде быша Р'сь греческимъ и латинскимъ пов'чство|пис'цомъ незнаями 17, яко и і8 иные полъношные 10 народы ихъ въсяхъ въ сдѣть заодно скнеями, или сарматами нарицахъ, аще р'зол'няновъ, и р'за'новъ имя, еже с' р'сана или росаны и Росіею сличаетъ, не б' таинъ древнимъ землепис'цомъ ибо и П'толомій всю вселенію опис'въ, також 20 Стрбов пов'ствописецъ | Плини*20 полагаютъ 21 селения, и дер'жавы р'зол'няскія въ сармацц'й недалече отъ моря или озера мейтискаго 22 въ которо Д'нъ впадаетъ, ид'же московскъе, и белорские народы жив'тъ, и к'н'цы белицк'яне, потивляне 23 резаютъ, чер'ніговцы 24, ти' р'зол'няне 25, или р'зане, яко Волгатер' воспоминаетъ 26 по Стравонъ 26, великие 27 воины имьхъ 28 с Миератомъ 28 Евпаторомъ сильнымъ королемъ Таскою воеводою своимъ до Хр'ста ръг'д' Стивонъ же самъ въ своемъ землем'ря с'воего | св'тм'ыхъ 29 пишеть сище 29, о древнихъ роскихъ осадахъ, р'зани ж или р'бани 30 8к'лонас с к 31 межвестинымъ и полъношнымъ 32 странам меж Дономъ 33 и Д'непрь реками 34 в поляхъ 34 жив'тъ.
Мало ж ни'же пишеть, а ноне как'е по р'занехъ 35 народа жив'тъ не въмы и п'ро'ч, однакож то изъвестно ыкъ р'зане 36 прость воевод Миерата Евпатора билисъ, сия сдѣть с'щиня 37 с'ловъ Стравоновъ.

1 BGRN Матфея Е Матвея | 2 ERN Стриковского, ER add. s | 3 ER полъношныхъ | 4 ER omm. | 5–5 Е Ииихъ | 6 R Иныхъ | 7 Е великіновородицкъ RN великіновородицкъ | 8 N in marg. | 9 N володимирскихъ | 10 B ante сор. волынскъ | 11 ER словѣйскихъ | 12 N источнici | 13 ERN родославлія | 14 ER события | 15 BGN именовани | 16 GER и'ня | 17 N незнаями | 18 ER omm. | 19 R полъношныхъ | 20–20 BGN in textu | 21 G полозако | 22 G мейтиского ER мейтискаго N мейтискаго | 23 BGERN п'тилияне | 24 G чер'ніговцы | 25 BG р'зол'ня | 26–26 ER пестранову | 27 ER велика | 28 E Миератамъ | 29–29 BGN сище пишеть | 30 N русани | 31 R и N ко | 32 BGN полънашемъ ER полъношныхъ | 33 B ante сор. Домомъ | 34–34 N suprascr. | 35 R р'занехъ | 36 ER р'зане | 37 BGN с'щиня

a G in marg. о произведении р'сова, или россиянъ
Корнилий Тацит писал в своей книге "Анналы" также о древних повествованиях, идущих впереди времён, в "Одиссее" Оптана. Сильвия, вместе с Илийским кесарем Галлом, и Оптологами Сильвией и Вителлием, в "Наглядении" войны, в своих записках, о розыгрыше, в тех местах, где армия Карпованов была снаряжена два войска, и прошёл с ними в великой надежде до Миссиония по дороге Геракля, убегая от создания мира, по Карповановым счётам, в книге "Гад" и монархии, и в Гаде и в книге "Гад", а от освобождения Рима, "За"; от Геракля, хотя и нечто до ржаного Христова за низколюдейский лёгкий, непонятно, и "Новый" древнейшим розыгрышем 17 и розанов, именуемого подчинено, а от того нашествия посредственного розыгрыша 19, и розановая в Миссионии, или Болгарию и от лёгкий об. до "Новый", именуемый "Аког", есть, с лишком лёгкий;

Но 21 отскочили бы розыгрышем, 22 россами, и россами 22, или Посью именованием 23 были трёх лёгких догадать, а
В начале обретаем у Езекиля пророка в главах 1 и 2. непонятно, 

{|<|к|ё|и|л|а| Росцем, Мисошем, Тобольском и что согласны, Евсееви кесарийскими, Теодотиони Симмахом, и т. преводниками библией, о чем Иероним святой 27 помышлят, аще ли собственное какова народа сие слово росцем 28 Езекиля 27 является, или ний 29, но яко Миссохъ 8 Монсей московских народов кольвмномачалика является, також у Иосифа древностей в книге 31. в главе 32. Асармъ 32 или Сарматей, является сарматовъ, Аханзис 33 или Твисковъ 34, нёмцов, Гомер 34 же ким^вроя, Теодиро, готтов 25, "Аван" еллиновъ, 36 и волощан, и прочъ, яко 38 уже о том выше сего 38 достаточно рекохом, тогда то имя Росъ 39 Езекиля 40 пророка близъ сличается 39 с прозваниемъ Посьи и 42 россовъ или 42 россовъ аще то имя Росъ 44 не обретается нигдь кромъ библии 8 Езекиля но ни 8 Вироца ни же у Иосиева, ||

---

1 BG Taarcht | 2 ER лътописи | 3 BG Иллй | 4 ER розалянхъ N розалянхъ | 5 R Отошъ | 6 G въннтренимъ | 7 ER Отош N Отошъ | 8 G Галбъ | 9 ER voina | 10 ER надеждо | 11 BG Миссие E Миссие R Миссия | 12 BGN лътъ | 13 BGN щотъ ER щотъ | 14 ER манархии | 15 E откъе.фъ | 16 G o | 17 ER розаляномъ | 18 G себъ | 19 ER розалявъ | 20 G Миссие аnte сорт. Миссие | 21 R no | 22-22 BG россами | 23 BGN именованием | 24 E кесаринскъ R кесарийскъ | 25 BGN Сыммахъ | 26 ER проводниковъ | 27 E selbst | 28 ER росъ | 29 BG Езекиля ERN Езекиля | 30 BG омм. | 31 E аnte сорт. книгъ | 32 ER Асарматъ | 33 BG Аханзисъ | 34 R Твисковъ | 35 BG готтов R готтовъ | 36 ER еллинамъ | 37 R прочихъ | 38-38 N выше уже о томъ сего with numbers above: 3 1 2 4 | 39 BG Росьцъ | 40 E Езекиля R Езекиля | 41 BG слѣваетъ | 42-42 BG омм. | 43 N россовъ | 44 ER Россъ

---

a G in marg. Оттонъ, Га {д} ба, Сильви и Вителлий
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Евсевий жъ тъмъ с'л'овъмъ рос' съ, римлянъ раздмѣти хоцѣть, но сѣтьй Еронимъ что бъ тъмъ ав'лдлосъ не обрѣть, а рим'янъ жъ отъ Ромла реченныхъ быти, и осннованныхъ крѣпко вменяютъ, о чемъ пространнее ч'ти у Волятряна въ книгахъ. такъже Мирсиля, Портія, Катона и ихъ, иже ныддже творять поминъ произведенія Рима отъ Рос'са, хотя ихъ тысяча, о томъ различными производства гранятся, произведя Римъ отъ различныхъ ктиторовъ различно быти, и отъ различныхъ винъ реченный то токмь извѣстно ако греки древнѣй и пишущи, Рос'съ не Рос'сью, но Рос'сіею зовѣть и пишѣтъ, чаять для того ико Рос'съ отъ тога с'лова рос-'съ у Ескіила речени бысть чаяютъ, еже азъ раздмныхъ людеи разумномъ разсж'денію врѣчаю. ||

Д'л'гошъ же и Мехо'ввъ въ книге. въ глѣбъ. въ лис'тв. и мъ лът'от'п'ис'цы н'шія полскіе пишѣть, обѣдо роскъ з'мѣля речены, и см'ножжителнѣй быща отъ Рос'сса, виная, или ако н'цыи г'л'голютъ отъ роднаго бр'ата Лехова и Чехова, сице Лех, лехинк'ю, лилацк'ю, юже н'шв' зобемъ полскъ (отъ пространныхъ полъ, и полеванъ, или поленевъ сар'мачкихъ народовъ речени) землію ов'ладѣть и см'ножилъ. Чехъ же второй брать чески страни вынавъ боемъ н'вмцы, с'лавенскимъ народомъ осадиль, ихъ же чехи отъ тогожъ Чеха ішъ нарицаемъ, потомъ Рос'съ, иль Рос'сса (егожъ има однимъ словомъ. у. не соглас'с'ется со Ескіилемъ) Рос'съ, трети брать, Леховъ и Чеховъ свойственны и насл'дникъ землями къ Авеста великѣ и пространные народы роскіе въ пол'нност'нъхъ и межвосточнѣхъ странахъ, и на полдней умножи, осади, и отъ своего иманы т' земли Рос'сіею (ако ішъ братья ево лехи и чениа) имена, Ишъ жъ отъ ро'л'яновъ народовъ сармачкихъ московскихъ, иже с' Микридатомъ, королемъ пон'т'скимъ ратовахъ, роскаки ро'л'янн', і росканы вмѣнажъ быти речены, ішъ жъ хотятъ именовать отъ цв'т'а роска, иже естъ, об'ще цв'тъ роскагъ и поддольскаго, і волынскаго народа, то'для н'шъ ихъ н'шъ называютъ роскаками.

---

1 В Ев'севіи G Ев'севіи N Евсевій | 2 ER россъ | 3 G бытиї | 4 N Волятрена | 5 E к'п'них | 6 ER і. | 7 ER и Отона | 8 BG омм. | 9 G ч'ыта | 10 R слава | 11 В росъ G росъ ERN россъ | 12 G речено | 13 BG вво | 14 ER разрушенде | 15 BR б'гто | 16 G р'дкіе | 17 G реченні ЕР речъ | 18 GN смножительнъ | 19 N роднаго | 20 R ледику | 21 BG полско | 22 BG полевой ER полеваля N полеваля | 23 ER реченні | 24 N немъвъ | 25 ER слов'йскимъ | 26 GRN росъ | 27 BGN Ескелыми ER Ескилемъ | 28 BGN омм. | 29 right parenthesis sign | 30 ER п'лъвъ N Россъ | 31 R св'дств'в'т' | 32 GEN полъвомънихъ | 33 BG стра H | 34 BGN именъ | 35 BER р'лънновъ | 36 BG Микридатомъ | 37 ER ро'лъскымъ | 38 ER р'лъныя | 39 BGN и'ны | 40 ER хотахъ | 41 BE оръ H | 42 BG с'ть прускр. | 43 RN роскаго | 44 BGN омм. | 45 N поддольскаго | 46 BGN н'шъ | 47 E р'лъкакам

* G in marg. народы роскіе
се есть русские волосы имущими,
Съесть ньщии же рускую землю и русаки от Рождества города зело предревняго от Новагорода великою на полнок [sic] ?. верстъ


304
даже до каспийского, естественно, грецеского, елеспонтского моря насылали и наполняли, аще въ иныхъ мѣстяхъ иные народа́ вы Литва, Лотва ѣ татары греши италиане, и нѣмцы меж славянъ по смѣшествѣ различию стран смѣшали. но, откъ дніи есть рѣсаки, и иные рѣскіе народа́ имы и прозванье имьт, однако всѣ словенскаго языка употребляють, и всѣ сдѣть ужъ хрѣстиане, любы по чинѣ ихъ есть болгашая часть, греческомѣ яко Москвѣ бѣлая Рѣсь болгарь босны сербы. любы по римскому 8 ченію, яко полѣвы мазры, чехи, моравяне, карваты дайматы, поморчики, шлен'заки, каринты, стиранные, ратьшане, и Ѳѣнъ мною народа́ сваляскаго 26 рѣскаго 21 языка употребляющих; пишет такожде 190 р
Дѣлошъ въ лѣтописи своен в листѣ. в книгах ||. а.хъ яко Одонакръ кнѣзь рѣскіи Римъ взя и владѣ имы, еже и я обрѣть у Волтерана, в книгѣ. имъ но 22 того кнѣзя нарицаеть Одоакръ, мало что отмѣнны, обаче его не рѣскаго 23 нарицаеть, то 24 италианына 25 и како за помочию 26 готовъ 27 Римъ възя, и владѣ 28 имъ дѣ. лѣть, в тымъ Дѣлошъ съ Волтераномъ пѣсть споръ чинять, я 29 въ томъ 29, 30 не вдаюся;
Тѣхъ ж рѣсковъ часть перво 31, 8 чернаго 32 мора, илѣ на Донѣ и по Волѣ рекамъ посѣлышъ, ины же о чемъ кѣпны всѣ 33 лѣтопицѣ рѣскіе согласуютца, над дѣнѣскими берегами страны овладѣли идѣже йное венгерски и болгарскіе 35 земли, ихѣже тогда норцы или норцы нарицаху потому ж ины народа рѣскіе славѣнскіе по различнымъ странамъ распростерлись и разсѣялись, иже различными именами отъ рѣкъ съ странъ и кнѣзь 36 своихъ различно именованы суть яко волгары или болгары, и вольцы отъ Волги, моравяне 37 отъ Моравы реки, илѣ отъ Мората кнѣзя, полочане отъ Полоты реки, чехи отъ Чеха, поляки отъ полъ или 39 поляновъ народа въ рѣскыхъ иже въ тѣх странахъ издѣже йное Киевъ, селѣнія свой 40 имѣх 41, потомуя вѣдя надъ Дѣломъ поселились, изгнали ихъ волоши и ихъ тѣхъ странъ, а ины ихъ тогож народа надъ Всюлою рекою 8 нѣмцовъ и надъ Одрою у сасовъ страны позавладывали 42 съ кнѣземъ

---


G in marg. Одонакръ кнѣзь рѣскій
своим Лехомъ от негож до пине насть ляхами а тьрки лехами¹ вентры лентевами, Литва и Жмойдь² льньшами Лотва лейсами нарічютъ³ а иных нарицахъ дрьвкани от дрьвъ зане в лѣсахъ в гьстыхъ и поросныхъ роцахъ живяхъ, ||

Дроговици⁴ же надъ Двиною бьша⁵, ини же надъ Десною и Сѣлою реками северскими, ини гдѣ Днепрь и Волга начинается кривча⁶ речени быша, измѣчье бѣ стольны⁷ град Смоленскъ⁸. такоже сербы карвать⁹ белине попонячии, и⁰ иѣ'ые¹¹ славенскаго¹² языка народа рѣскіе, различными прозвань̆¨ от различныхъ стран и кѣзей речени сѣть, но подлинныхъ повѣстописцовъ имѣть не могутъ даже до Кия Стѣка, и¹² Корева¹³ кѣзей. тотъ Кий или Китъ Стѣкъ и Корѣвъ¹⁴ кѣзя рѣскіе братья¹⁵ были родные четвертая ж сестра¹⁶ их Лебеда или Лебедь от народа и наслѣдна¹⁶ Жаева и Мосоха сна его, и тѣ властвовати начаща. Кий или Китъ старйышій, град Кієвъ от своего имени¹⁷ на рекѣ Днепрѣ постави, идѣже потомъ бѣ стольный град и глава самодержавства¹⁸ рѣскаго¹⁹; || вторый брать Стѣка недалѣчѣ²⁰ Киева сострої град на горѣ Стекавицѣ²¹ от своего имени²². такоже²³ Коревъ трѣтій брат их Коревицѣ в вѣдѣмомъ своемъ княжествѣ²¹ острогъ его же потомъ Вышгордъ²² звали сестра ж ихъ Льбеда²³,²⁴ на рекѣ Льбедѣ²⁴ селѣнія свои положи тамъ городокъ Льбед или Любаву²⁵ постави на высокомъ холмѣ. Тѣ кѣзя верховьнйшій братья²⁶ родные²⁷ имѣхъ иныхъ кѣзей под своею властью мѣнаго иже часъто 8 нихъ воеводы быша из³ нихъ бѣ перъвый Радзими от негож речени сѣть радимчане, над рекою Саскою²⁸ Вяткою²⁹ от³ негож вятчане над рекою Волою и Вятъкою, Дѣлева от³ негож дѣлебяне над Бѣгомъ ихъъ пине лѣчанами зовѣмъ, но тѣ народа рѣскіе, же от Радима от Дѣлебы и Вятъка произволеніе имѣли || по обычаю звѣринѣ в лѣсахъ жили, і з ближними безъ выборъ и стыда гдѣ кому положилося, совокуплія, о чѣмъ крѣники русские Дѣлгощѣ и Мѣховѣ в кѣѣ³⁰ и. в главѣ д. в листѣ³¹ пространнѣ в свидѣтелствуютъ; Потомъ вѣнѣа три брата речѣнныя³² кѣзі рѣскіе Кий Стѣкъ³² и

---

¹ G летами | ² N Жмойдь | ³ N наричутъ | ⁴ G ad. и | ⁵ G стольны | ⁶ N Смоленскъ |
⁷ BG къвѣтъ | ⁸ ER омм. | ⁹ bgER иные | ¹⁰ В славенскаго E съловенскаго ante съгр. 
¹¹ Съловенскаго R словенскаго N словенскаго | ¹² ER прозваными | ¹³ G om. |
¹⁴ ER Кореза | ¹⁵ bg Коревѣ | ¹⁶ bg братья | ¹⁷ ER имѣни |
¹⁸ ER самодержавства | ¹⁹ N русакаго | ²⁰ ER имѣни | ²¹ ER княжествѣ | ²² ER Вышград |
²³ bg Лебеда | ²⁴ bg Льбеди | ²⁵ bg Лебедь | ²⁶ bg братья | ²⁷ GER родныя |
²⁸ R Саскою | ²⁹ U ante съгр. Вятко BGN Вятъ | ³⁰ BGN кѣѣ | ³¹ ER речѣнны | ³² В Скѣгъ ГЩѣкъ 

---

³³ G in marg. дриговици | ³⁴ G in marg. кривичи | ³⁵ G in marg. Кѣи | ³⁶ G in marg. Щекъ |
³⁷ G in marg. Хоревѣ | ³⁸ G in marg. Лебеда | ³⁹ G in marg. Радимѣ и радимичи | ³⁰ G in marg. вятчане |
³¹ G in marg. Дѣлева | ³² G in marg. дѣлеччане

---

36}
Корёвъ от жития преставились, сиове и наслѣдники ихъ после ихъ долго кнійдѣ на своемъ здѣшь с миромъ властовали, даже потомъ въ ихъ мѣстъ Оскальдъ Аскольдъ, и Осколодъ, и Дыръ кнѣзъ от ихъ же народа настѣпили. ийнъ ж рѣчи въ полѣношныхъ странахъ простоянно над дѣромъ Ильменемъ или Ильмеръ, егож въ ширинѣ, върѣста а въ длина. вѣрѣста, сидѣли, тѣй же Новгород великій, на Волховѣ рекѣ, яже иѣне средѣ града идетъ поставили, и Гостромилъ въ послѣдѣ себѣ въ кнѣй изѣбраша. толійка ж тогда бѣ мѣчъ великіоновгородцѣвъ и въ толіко чести и разумѣніи, въ иностранѣнныхъ тотъ градъ великій Новгородъ, бѣ, яко Кранѣгъ немецкѣй повѣстописецъ въ книгѣ. а въ главѣ. такѣй прѣчно о нихъ воспоминаѣть, кто мнѣть и смѣть что противъ Бѣга и великого Новагорода, общѣтѣясть же се въ лѣтописяхъ рѣскихъ древѣнихъ яко косынны (иже каковы народъ вѣдати не мѣжемы) нѣкоторыми частыми рѣскихъ странѣ и здавана владѣшия, и вѣдѣсто дани подданства со всѣкого другѣ рѣли же, еже прибытия, также вареги или варяги владѣли ими мѣччо, о тѣхъ варегахъ откѣдѣ бы они были различна сѣть размѣнія, понеже рѣскихъ лѣтописи кромѣ саомѣ и ихъ прозвѣнія, далняя о нихъ произведенія не творятъ, но понеже Москва, великіоновгороджане, пскѣвичи, балѣтйское мѣрѣ, еже прибытия, Свѣю дѣтчанъ, лиелянты, Финляндію, и часть московскѣхъ странъ обливаютъ варяжское мѣрѣ нарицаютъ, тогда видится вѣщь бытия явленѣ, яко или сѣвѣсны или датѣцкѣ, и прибыли сѣвѣсны для смежства общихъ рѣбежей ими обпадахъ.

Есть ж Варгра въ градѣ и здавѣна зело славенъ отъ вандалитъ постѣлѣнъ недалече Любка, на рѣбежахъ голшѣвѣскихъ, отъ ного ж балгѣйское мѣрѣ, варажское именовано нѣцыбы быти разумѣютъ, но понеже вандалиты того ж словаѣсковыя языка по разсѣянію нѣкоторыхъ повѣстописцовъ потребляли въ тѣжемъ зѣло силии въ гѣдрѣ вѣщахъ соихъ вонѣскохъ храбростию бышъ видная вѣщъ быти извѣстна яко рѣскѣ въ то время ис тѣхъ вагровъ, или

---

1 В предѣлѣли не приставили, а въ предѣлѣся ante сорт., приставили. 2 БГ Аскольдъ. 3 В настѣпили. 4 въ Ирини. 5 BGR полѣношныхъ. 6 въ широту. 7 въ Гостомилѣ. 8 въ БГ и. 9 BGERN великіоновгородѣвъ. 10 въ размѣніи. 11 въ Новѣградѣ. 12 въ Немецкой. 13 въ Кто. 14 въ великаго. 15 въ Новѣградѣ. 16 въ всѣкаго. 17 въ откѣдѣ. 18 въ далняя. 19 въ ГЕ отъ ЕР оммѣ. 20 въ ЕР ихъ. 21 въ BГ добав. 22 въ ЕР великіоновгородѣвъ. 23 въ пскѣвичи. 24 въ балгѣйское. 25 въ вѣщъ. 26 БГЕР Варгра. 27 въ Вандалитъ. 28 въ Гельшѣвѣскахъ. 29 въ балгѣйское. 30 въ балгѣйское. 31 въ ЕР тѣхъ. 32 въ БГ силиѣвъ. 33 въ ЕР оммѣ. 34 въ Bante сорт. вонѣской. 35 въ вѣчна въ ЕР извѣстно. 36 въ ЕР или.

a В предѣлѣли не приставили. b G in marg. въ предѣлѣся ante сорт., приставили. c G in marg. варяги или вандалиты.
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варягов и вандалитовъ отъ народа словенскиа кицей себѣ и збираша и власть имъ надъ рѣками гдѣ стви врѣчноя. впредь бо на Рѣс на полдень лежащей Оскальды и Дьяръ наслѣдницы Киева на киевскомъ кицкѣ кицка, народа рѣски простоянъ во полынныхъ восточныхъ странахъ розмѣжовали. долго же безъ старлышнихъ владѣтелей общими ненавистью возжени вредительные задоры и войны домове власти рады и старлышинства на кицени и межъ себя вчиняли, и то видя Гостомиль мѣжъ честень, блѣгразумень, и великого почтѣния у новгородцевъ нача имъ совѣтовати понеж согласитесь не могли въ выборъ киця изъ посреди себя для разныя чиновъ, дабы послали въ варяги, и трѣхъ братовъ кицей варяжскихъ изъ тогда воинскою храбростью славны бѣща на гдѣство рѣское выбрали, и призвали, Сей блѣгразумный совѣтъ Гостомилой похвали Рѣсъ послаша тотъчас пословъ въ варяги и къ кицемъ ихъ, глия просто сѣце, гдѣство и земля ихъ велика и обильна 8рядъ ж въ немъ нѣть, приидите вы гдѣствовать и владѣйте нами,

То послолство принѣвъ три брата родные кицей, варяжескихъ, Рюрикъ Синайсь или Сінѣвъ, и Тріворъ или Трѣборъ идѣша въ Рѣсъ абие съ послами въ лѣто отъ создания мира по рѣскомъ счетѣ... еже кажетъ быти Кромерѣ, отъ Хрѣста. вѣдна жъ приидоша къ рѣскимъ рѣжамъ, съ великою охотою отъ всѣхъ чиновъ російскихъ приняны бѣща абие же гдѣство рѣское добровольно волными людми подданное на три части три брата кицей межъ собою раздѣлѣли, Рюрикъ старлышпіи кицкѣ великою Новагорода взя въ 8дѣль стольны же градъ на островъ озера ладожскаго (его же въ ширину т. верстъ и вдоль ф. верстъ пишетъ Герберстенъ). рѣче. верстъ отъ Новагорода постави, Синась ж или Синѣвъ облада странами рѣскими надъ бѣлымъ озеромъ, егож вдоль и поперѣтъ т. верстъ отъ Новагорода великою, а отъ Москвы ф. верстъ, Надъ тьмѣж озеромъ, въ нежож яко славятъ рѣкъ тѣ впадаетъ, а только одна река Сосна изъ него выходитъ реченный кицъ Синась

---

1 ER говорять | 2 Е словенскаго Р славенскаго | 3 U ante сорт. избираша | 4 Г надъ | 5 BG полынныхъ | 6 R розмоголи | 7 N suprascr. | 8 Е вредительныа | 9 BG oppm. | 10 E Гостомилы Р Гостомилы | 11 EN велика | 12 R и | 13 Е выбраши | 14 N благоразумной | 15 ER oppm. | 16 B ante сорт. р[8]дные | 17 BGN киця | 18 Е варяжескиа | 19 BG РоС | 20 ER oppm. | 21 BGN щету | 22 N російскихъ | 23 В принятъ G приниалъ Е приняи R приниы N прины | 24 BGRN поддатное | 25 ER поддатели | 26 EN велика | 27 ER Новаграда | 28 BGN во | 29 N ладожскаго | 30 R suprascr. | 31 ER Герберстенъ | 32 N велика | 33 ER Новаграда | 34 G поставить ER поставили | 35 Е поперѣтъ | 36 N велика | 37 BG черни

а G in marg. Рюрикъ, Синайсь и Трѣборъ | b BG in marg. Шексна
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kr̃pość i grad || стол'ны постави, идъже ённе кн̃зь велик̃й
мосъков'ск̃й йнешн̃й казыны своеi боц̃ю часть для безопасности 1
м̢ста х̢ран̣ти обык'ль,
Тр̃тий кн̃зь вар̣жск̃й 2Tŗворъ или Tŗборъ прия кн̃жство
плесковское или псков’ское 8дъльное .р̣й. верстъ от велик̃го 3
Новагорода 4 градъ ж столъный сотвор̣ в Свир̣е и ли в Иэборскъ 5,
а по Мъховио: в Збор̧къ 6, егоже нъкогда за промыслом кн̃зя
Але̣ндра полубинской5 взв̣а полыаки в л̣то ,ғ,аф8. но держать не
8м̣лы,
Свид̣тел̣ств̣уютъ л̣тописи р̣в̣ские як̣о тъ три9 бр̣ата Рюрикъ
Сина́въ 8 и Тр̧воръ 9 кн̃з̣и прежд̣еречн̣иі̣ 10 произвед̣ение народ̣а
11 своего подлиннымъ родословием11 имъяхъ из в̣елм̣ожъ р̣йм̣скихъ
касарск̃го12 р̣ода, от нъихъж велик̃е кн̃з̣и мос̣ков’ск̃и и йнешн̃е
великие г̣д̣ри родъ свои б̣ыти || от тр̣м̣лявъ тв̣ерд̣ять, еже аще бы
с̣и̣е было, тогда т̣и кн̃з̣и насл̣дники Палемо̣новъ или П8вл̣я13
Лив̣она р̣йм̣ск̃го14 кн̃з̣я, или товар̣ыщи15 ихъ б8хъ, 16 же въ с̣иъ стран̣ы
пол̣н̣ош̣ныя16, 17, ид̣же ённе Жмо̣н̣дъ 18 лилевъцы, или Лотва и
Литъва .с.ф.19 б̣л̣городных р̣йм̣ск̃ихъ и съ чат̣ыр̣м̣а р̣ды20 18ч̣ы̣ми22
д̣р̣синовъ23, кол̣юмовъ к̣есариновъ24 и к̣ит̣а́врь25, въ кора́бляхъ26 чрез
аглинск̃ъ и бал̣г̣инск̃ъ окн̣ть29 т̣ьс̣н̣отамъ зв̣ы̣нск̃ими30
*з̣емн̣ымъ* д̣в̣нымъ жреб̣иемъ31 б̣ж̣имъ приппл̣ъ32
Есть къ том̣и земл̣иа Вар̣агиа33 или Вера́гия34 въ г̣д̣р̣ств̣е35 сао́йск̃о́го
кн̃з̣и межъ италийской37 и ора̣л̣д̣жско́й38 земл̣ю нед̣ал̣е́ лът̣обр̣отовъ, и в Ко̣н̣оте́й, яже тогда бъ39 страною р̣м̣скою й340 тои
аще т̣и кн̃з̣и съ Палемо̣новъ41 въ съ стран̣ы пол̣н̣ош̣ныя приид̣оша, ||
tогда вар̣агск̃е кн̃з̣и отъ италиан’ск̃ои39 отчинъ
вар̣аги44 нарица́въся, страну ж лотовской45 въ то вр̣емъ Варагиа46
именоваша въ неиже (47егда Палемо́нь48 въ Жм̣ойи и въ Литъвъ47 со
иньми р̣м̣ьляяны поселились49) облада́ша, и съ тъжъе50 враговъ или
вар̣аговъ р̣в̣ские тъхъ тр̣хъ кн̃з̣и бра́тью помянутыхъ Рюрика Сина́вса
и Тр̧вара51 на г̣д̣р̣ств̣а р̣в̣ские прии́ща52;


a G in marg. откъда произошли кн̃з̣а вар̣жск̃ие
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Аще резаки и льтописцы их кто оных и каковы люди были, варяги сказать не умьютъ, понеже совершеною просто льтопись своою
начинаютъ сиць 1 послала де Рескъ варягомъ 2, Гл я идите вы
гдѣствыйте, и владыкъ нами, и прочъ а винъ и произведеніи 3
никакихъ не творять, того бо в то время разумъ ихъ не достиґь,
pовѣсть бо великого 4 исѣства, и различныхъ книгу чтѣния и совѣта
употребляетъ, иже аще хочетъ 5 ю || доводно 6 и изъяно на свѣть 7
произнесть яко же и мы в томъ произведенія рѣскихъ и литовскихъ
народовъ долго мыслили и мозгомъ 8 вертѣли, радъя истинью в
совершеннд вѣчъ 9 предприятію 10 привестд,
Владычествующихъ 11 жъ Юрикъ въ великоначородскомъ 12 княжествъ 13 в
Ладогѣ, а 14 Трѣворъ въ псковскомъ въ Изборскую 15, трѣтій брать ихъ 9
Синаѧсъ 16 на Белозере 8мьр безъ наслѣдія 17, на гдѣствѣ рѣскомъ
белоозерскомъ совершал токмо два лѣта, тохъ княжествъ властъ по
нѣмъ Трѣвор брать кнѣзь псковскімъ прій и 19 той недолго на пѣстомъ
мѣстѣ сѣдѣ, понеже в годъ по брать Синаусъ 20 8мре въ Псковѣ и тамъ
по обичао поганѣскомъ въ превысочно могилѣ погребенъ.
Юрикъ жъ старѣйшій 21 брать кнѣзь великоначородскімъ 22 послѣ ихъ оба
княжествъ 23 белоозерскіе 24 и псковскіе 25 прія, потомъ жъ ||
dворянномъ своимъ и дрѣзѣмъ заслуженѣмъ гряды въ рѣскихъ землѣx
роздаль. однимъ Смоленскъ 26 иномъ Полоцкъ 27, Мѣромъ Белоозеро,
Ростовъ и прочая 28;

Осколдъ и Дѣръ наслѣдницы Киевы, кнѣзь 29 рѣскихъ земель на
попольѣ лежащихъ, и како Грекю воеваша 30, и Цѣрградъ добывахъ,
На Рѣси на попольѣ лежащей на княжествѣ 31 кievскомъ Осколдъ и
Дѣръ наслѣдницы Киевы, въ то время величаво 32 обладаху тѣнъ собравъ
великое войско рѣское, яко льтописцы ихъ свидѣтельствуютъ 32, в
сѣдѣхъ водныхъ на карамбѣ 33, и на катарахъ 34 и въ 35 strugахъ идоща в
Грекию чѣрнымъ моремъ, и обидаша 36 Цѣргръ греци 37, иныя
помочи и надежды || кромѣ гѣда Бѣа не имѣа, моляхся непрестанно

1 ER omm. 2 N варианты 3 B ante corr. произведеніи G произведеній 4 N великаго 5 N хочеть 6 ER доволно 7 ER add. 8 ER mозгой 9 N вещъ 10 B ante corr. предприятія 11 G владычествующихъ R властыствующихъ 12 G великоначородскомъ 13 ER княжествъ 14 G о 15 GER Изборскъ N Изборsku 16 N Синаяуся 17 B въ наслѣдіа 18 ER княжествъ 19 ER omm. 20 B ante corr. Сивѧсе N Синяусъ 21 B старѣйшый G старши 22 G великоначородскій E великоначородскій R великоначородскій N великоначородскаго 23 ER княжествъ 24 GER белозерсксое 25 E псковское ante corr. псковское 26 EN Смоленсксъ 27 Е Полоцкъ R Полоцкъ 28 Е прочь 29 ER кнѣз и 30 N воеваша 31 ER княжестве 32 G свидѣльствуютъ 33 N корабляхъ 34 N катарахъ 35 N omm. 36 GERN обыдоша

a G in marg. смертв Синѣща и Трѣвора b G in marg. раздѣленіе Рѣси болярамъ c G in marg. Осколдъ и Дѣръ въ Киевъ d G in marg. ихъ осада на Цѣрградъ
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дабы их от того свирепой осады русаковь свободитъ так же патриархъ Сергій взялъ разу дѣвы Мариї, яже тамо в морѣ и або море восколебася, яко кораблямь русскимъ разбиватись, толико, яко Осколокъ и Дырь киїзии киевскія съ малыми людми едва в Киевъ возвратиася.

Потомъ 6 омрѣ Рюрикъ киїзъ великою городскій псковскій и белоозерскій сна ж Игорь остави, егоже со всѣмъ гдѣствомъ русскимъ вдаде в соблюдение Олехъ нѣкоемъ ближнемъ своемъ иже слышавъ, яко Осколокъ и Дырь возвратиась в Киевъ 6тервъ наряд подъ Прѣмъгородомъ, або в сѣдѣ взялъ с собою Игоря.

Рюриковича прийде в Киевъ Днепромъ рекою и привза ихъ на розговоръ приятелскій Осколода 7 и Дира 8 киїзии киевскихъ иже ническогоже неприятелскаго от своихъ не надѣясь, с малыми людми прийдоша в обоз Олеховъ и Игоревъ на Днепръ. тамъ Олехъ показа имь Игоря глядъ, сей есть наслѣдникъ всѣхъ княжествъ русскихъ бѣй Рюриковъ, а мнѣ ближни, и тако обоихъ киїзии и братовъ Осколода 9 и Дыра передъ собою повелъ убийти, овладѣ Киевомъ, всѣми русскими княжествы к немѣ належащимъ, и пространно на востокъ на полъечу, и на полдень, гдѣствомъ единообладательство свое разшири многие страны смежные силою и вымышлюкъ к послѣданию своемъ 9 и Игоревъ принѣдили.

Сице жъ наслѣдие сѣдѣй киїзий русскихъ киевскихъ, и корѣивъ в Осколода и Дыре, внегда ихъ Олехъ обманомъ избѣ, совершенось, а изъ киїзии варяжскихъ ины киїзъ от Игоря даже до щения великого киїзъ московскаго новымъ родословиемъ зачелось, Иде потомъ с воискомъ Олехъ на древляни со Игоремъ иже быша такожде народа русскаго, и покоривъ ихъ подъ власть свое 38 дѣнь на нихъ положи по пожъ жъ рядомъ в Киевъ повелъ к себѣ привести коня его же больш 48 всѣхъ любящему 41, призвавъ жъ волхвовъ вопросъ ихъ, что о томъ конѣ чаяли бы, иже 42 пришелъ рекоша, яко ты

---

1 N также | 2 ER юже | 3 ER тамъ | 4 BGN мори | 5 ER восколбася | 6 BGN кораблямъ | 7 N отдоша | 8 E великоно городскй R великоно городцй N велико городцй | 9 N псковскй | 10 N блоозерскй | 11 G соблюдени | 12 ER Ольги | 13 BGN усилившъ | 14 BGRN Прѣмъградомъ | 15 ER призвавъ | 16 ER омм. | 17 R приятелскй | 18 R Осколда | 19 N Осколода | 20 Г Дыра ante corr. Дира R Дыра | 21 G ничесо | 22 GER во | 23 BGN Игаревъ | 24 ER ce | 25 EN княжествъ R княжество | 26 BGN омм. | 27 R Оскола | 28 ER омм. | 29 E княжаты R княжаты | 30 ER корпивчъ | 31 R Оскола | 32 G Ігаря | 33 N великаго | 34 N московскаго | 35 R воискомъ | 36 ER русского | 37 ER властю | 38 ER своемъ | 39 E радуса | 40 N больше | 41 ER любище | 42 R они же | 43 G пришедшіе

a G in marg. побѣ | b G in marg. смрть Рюрика | c G in marg. Игорь | d G in marg. Олехъ | e G in marg. походъ его въ Киевъ | f G in marg. Осколдъ и Дыръ убнени | g G in marg. побѣда надъ древляны
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великій княжес от сего коня 8мрєші, того для повель его от себя оветь, и особь 1 хранити, і собравъ больши войсъ из рѣскихъ земель иде водянымъ нарядомъ чрезъ чорное 3 море въ Царьград, егоже силою великою доставаше а, безпрестанно моремъ и землею къ банным къ стянемъ приступая и то г насылиъ цѣръ костянтинопольскій 4 не могъ выдержать 5, і помочи на върчку ныоткдївне чаялъ 6, втоли Олеха великими дары покол покѣпає, і проса дабы отъ осады 7 отстѣпилъ. Олехъ же 8 видя 9 яко не можаше града добьть, дарми утолешь сотвори помирасть 10 ж сѣремъ греческимъ, и пословствовавъ съ нимъ, остави тамъ (яко Рѣсъ пішеть) скіть 11 свой, или гербъ съ щитымъ на вѣчную память, и тот гербъ или скіть 12 межъ иными древностейъ симъ образомъ, каковъ Ѵе гѣдрь московскпя употребляет на вратахъ галатскихъ 13 противъ Царьграда по древнему писанъ 14 знанє есть; Помоу возвратися 15 изъ 16 Царьграда 17 въ Києвъ, въ осьнь, і помяну о конѣ своемъ, отъ него 18 смерть ему волхвы принять предвѣщали, повель же его привѣсти къ себѣ, вненда же возвѣщива емѣ, яко 8ж 8мре || безъ него, повель проводити себе къ костемъ его, вѣдѣ ихъ, пришедъ 19 же на мѣсто извѣдѣ лежаѣз кости, саде на нихъ а иные лѣтописи пішѣять и Герберстеній 20 яко ногою въ лобѣдари Ѣля, се провѣщавали есте смерть принять отъ сего коня 21, онѣ ж яко видите 8мре, я 22 бы не хотѣлъ чтоб тоже и волхомъ 23 прилѣчйло, сиа ж ему иреквѣшѣ, абие змѣя 24 ізо лба конскаго 25 выскочила і 8жалила его въ ногъ и отъ 26 тоѣ 8мре. соверша въ гѣдствѣ киевскомъ, новгородскомъ 27 псковскомъ, изборскомъ, і белоозерскимъ 19. лѣта, погребенъ на горѣ Стелаквицы 28 по Othersca po поганскому;

Игорь 29 Рюриковичъ великий князь и самодержецъ земель русскихъ, По смертѣ Олеховы Игорь 30 Рюриковичъ нача владѣти въ Києвъ въ великому Новѣгородѣ, во Псковѣ въ Белѣозере, и на всѣхъ княженыхъ и земляхъ рѣскихъ на западе полнѣчь и на полдень лежащихъ, а еще при живѣтъ Охеха 31 [sic] дядки своего поя себѣ въ сѣпрушенство 32 Олѣвѣ право вѣщую Гостомило вѣ 33 изо Пѣскова, на древлендан данѣ 34 великую і

---


a G in marg. ослежение Царьграда | b G in marg. возвратъ къ Києвѣ | c G in marg. смерть Олера
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нестерпимую положи,1 большей2 нежели дядка3 его Олех4, собравъ ж великие войска иде моремъ в греческую землю, идже Никомидию, и Йраклио грады славны5 осадъ, и попалъ и много странъ греческого6 цръя Романа плѣни в Вифинии7, и в Понтѣ велию же силою к Цръюгад8 имѣлъ5, имѣющи ж пятьнадесять краты тысячи9 караблей10, и иныхъ сѣдовь водяныхъ, собрався11 противъ ево12 Романъ цръ греческий с помощью римской, и иныхъ12 гдреи христианскихъ,13 сотворивъ ж ополнение с русскимъ нарядомъ на5 чорномъ14 мори15, и побѣдѣ великіе16 воiska русскіе, яко едва Игорь с третьеи частию наряду17 в Киевъ 8бежа, и потомъ примирися18 с црѣмъ греческимъ; о томъ побѣди Игоровъ19, || лѣтописцы русскіе не воспоминаютъ. но Лѣтописци изрядный лѣтописецъ вещей во Европѣ сотворенныхъ писighet20 в китѣ. в главѣ. писиет22, яко Игаръ рѣсыи король сице онъ его называетъ хотя режи Игорь, внегда иде с великимъ нарядомъ к Цръюгаду, водянымъ боеемъ от Романа цръ константинопольскому23 и избиень бысть и с великимъ 8рѣномъ отогнасть бысть от Цръюгада.

А Зонаръ24 греческой повѣстописатель, не имѣя въ киже Игори писиетъ, яко 8рѣсть25 имѣвъ съ собою пятнадесать краты караблей26 Цръюгад хотяхъ взятъ идѣж от грѣкомъ зѣло избіенъ быша яко отъ толики27 числа караблей28 мало что ихъ 8бежа, тѣмъ 8рѣсть отъ наѣздовъ в греческую землю 8держалися. Игорь29 же великий киже возвратился изъ Цръюгада в Киевъ, идѣ противъ 30 дрѣвланъ в маломъ числѣ людеи, хотя съ нихъ паекъ || побоѣ брать, тогдѣ дрѣвлапы31 с киже своимъ Нискинѣмъ, а по нѣкоторымъ32 Малдитомъ33 реченнымъ начали дѣмати о тѣхъ поборахъ, и какъ бы 34 толь 35 тѣшкои неволи выбиты36, рекоша же межъ себя, внегда волкъ повацдится37 во свѣцы, тогда3 все стадо разоритъ сего ради вида Игоря в маломъ числѣ, дѣариша сильно на 8рѣчицы 8 города Коресѣнѣ38, и уби его киже дрѣвланскіе39 Малдитъ40 или Нискинѣ41, идѣже и погребень в Корестени42 43 в могилѣ зѣло высокой в лѣтъ43 отъ созданія міра.,8уи. по щѣтѣ,
Како Олта отом'стви на древлнех смерть мѣжа своего Игоря,  
По 8 дѣниий от дрѣвлян, мѣжа своего Игоря Юрийовича книгина  
Олта сиюмъ единороднымъ Святославомъ рѣски  
великого̀вгородскіе и киевские гдѣрства прия в свое правлении,  
яще не яко жен'скѣй полѣ слабыї, но яко преязрлѣвый монархъ  
8правляше, и со всѣх странь от наѣздовъ неприятелскихъ Асамды и  
Къьтѣ воеводамъ сроднником 8дѣни нѣго мѣжа своего краин'ыныя  
оборонѣ вручивъ вкрѣпила,  
Потомъ дрѣвляне возгортѣся в' свободѣ порѣгаясь киев'ляномъ,  
яко гдѣрдя ихъ убивши9, послаша 10 к Олгѣ дѣдѣсать 11 чѣльвъ честныхъ  
людеи наговаривая ю блгосклонуно, потомъ ж грозяще и хотѣще ю к  
тому принудитъ, да кѣнъ ихъ Нис'кѣнію и по нѣкимъ Малдит8  
cѣпружствѣтъ, ихѣж она выслушавъ повелъ ему велику во дворѣ  
выкотаты 12, и всѣх тѣхъ пословъ в ню живыхъ вмѣтатъ. потомъ же  
sама наклони'ся надъ ямою, вопрошаѣше ихъ, къюко ли тамо  
пребьваетъ гдѣда сватове, и повелъ ихъ землею живыхъ завалить, то  
сотворивъ, аби гонца к дрѣвляннемъ посла блгогдари ихъ яко о не'  
14, яко о вдовѣ оſиротѣвшеи 15 попеченіе имѣтъ, гляя яко 16 аз 8же мѣжа  
моего от мертвыхъ воскресить не могъ, а понеж еще млада кѣнъ  
виемъ в сѣпружество не отрѣшаюся, токмо по меня противъ моего  
чину приш'лия людеи честнѣшыхъ, и въ бѣл'шѣхъ чисѣлъ, а не яко  
первыхъ, древляне то вслышавъ съ великою радостю послаша к Олгѣ  
пятьдесясть 18 старвшихъ бо́йяръ ізбранныыхъ, иинъ 19 жъ полагаютъ  
четыредесять 20 ш'ти со множествомъ людеи,  
Иже въ Киевѣ венega прийдоза в ладиахъ 21 и въ сдѣахъ различныхъ  
рекою Днепромъ повелъ книгина 22 Олта имъ 23 баню велию  
изготовитъ и посла къ нимъ прося дабы в бане от того трѣда и далнеi  
дороги попотилисъ, и очистилисъ, потомъ же дабы с посолствомъ къ неi  
приш'лии.  
Ти же томѣ благоприятствѣ 24 ради сѣвѣ идоща в баню, внега ж  
мѣтись и вѣнниками, ае ее охѣ охѣ хвостати 25 начали 26, повелъ  
баню 27 саломою 28 и хворостомъ вокруг' обвесь, и зажечъ, яко всѣмь  
im, и съ рабы своими зат'горѣлъ 29, а Олта абие пословъ своихъ к  
древлянному посла 30 обвѣщеніемъ, яко едетъ 8же къ нимъ хотя быти  
cѣпрежницею кѣнъ ихъ, имъ же гдѣрніи 31, ток'мо дабы 8готовали  

---

1 В ante corr. книгина | 2 N единородномъ | 3 ER великоно́вгородские | 4 E слабъ и| 
R слабый | 5 В преязрлѣвый | 6 GER Осамду | 7 Е 8краиняе | 8 ER княвлинъ 
9 GN убивши | 10 R подлаша| 11 N дѣдѣсать | 12 BGN выкотать | 13 BGN имъ | 14 Р нѣ 
15 Е оſиротѣвшій | 16 Е яка | 17 N чинеъ | 18 BN пятьдесять | 19 G и ю | 20 В четвереътъ |
21 N ладиахъ | 22 GN кѣнія | 23 R ad. (имъ) | 24 Е благоприятствуи | 25 BGN хвостата 
E хвосталисъ | 26 BGN начели | 27 E банею | 28 E саломою | 29 ER згорѣть N съгорѣти |  
30 ER со | 31 R гдѣрнео  

a G in marg. Олга | b G in marg. мѣстъ Олги  
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медовый дословно к признанию, еже по обещанию своем первом виолончели Игорю поминование сотворить. дрёвляне ж том же обращавшись яко вси княжества росские князю их с толь великою женою подданы дрёвляте, и тьмь над россаками взаимно дрёвлячи перво подданьными, гдами быть измѣху тотчас в Хоростинѣ столномъ градѣ своемъ мѣды и всякое доволство на бракъ преславный уготоваша, Олга же яко обеща с кнѣвскою шляхою, съ войдою и избранными на время назначенное въ Хоростинѣ прииде дрёвляне ж въ свѣтѣхъ вкращенияхъ к неи вѣххавъ, приняса ю съ велино радостію, потомъ ж начаша вопрошати гдѣ первии и втории ихъ послѣ: она же отвѣча, яко за нею инымъ пѣтмъ по малѣй сокрѣвищи ѣдѣть, мѣстами вѣдомыми яко отченьники. 8п'роси потомъ ихъ поити на мѣсто ідже мѣжа ея первы Ігорь Рѣбриковичъ князь погребень бысть, тамо въ Хоростинѣ били быща его дрѣвляне и погребоша., 

Пришед же на могилу нача сѣльнѣ плакати, 14 сотворивъ же мѣжъ своему поминование повелъ на томъ мѣстѣ высокомъ могилу осипать, рекоша же дрёвляне 16 уса княгинѣ мѣжа твоей били есмы, бѣ воемлѣтнѣ, яко воѣкъ дрёвляне Олга же закрѣвся 20 ставъ гнѣвъ въ срды 21 умолча, одѣвъ 22 же ся въ рѣзы свѣтлы, яко на бракъ началъ гоощати дрёвлянъ, своимъ же всѣмъ бояромъ запрети пить медъ, внегда ж дрёвляне упинаша абие безвѣстно повелъ ихъ кнѣвълѣтомъ своимъ рѣбійти, мѣчки, колоти 24 бить. сѣчь, 25 8бівати, убиша жъ ихтъ тогда ,ъ съ сотворивъ же то, и отмстивъ смерть мѣжа его печали свадбу дрёвляномъ остѣви сама ж въ Кѣевѣ возратися, 28 Потомъ собрѣвъ велике войско въ Кѣевѣ на дрѣвое лѣто, подвигнѣся съ ъвоемъ своимъ Святолѣвомъ Ігоровичемъ противъ дрёвлянъ, нача его дабы и огубиенне отца своего отмѣстѣлъ, побивъ жъ рати дрѣвлянскѣе, остѣнки 33 бежащихъ съ побоищъ 34 гоняще даже до Хоростина градѣ столномѣ ідѣє множество дрёвлянъ заперло бѣ, и тою осадою целью год мѣчаше въ Хоростинѣ градѣ, вѣдя же яко неудобно 38 бѣ сильо града вѣяти крѣпости ради естественныя мѣста преградо промышели творить, и послает къ житеlemъ и ко гражданамъ, глядѣ же отмстѣъ смерть мѣжа своемъ, однако отъ вас не отстѣплъ, аще каковы ни есть дани не дадите
мн: не хочу жёл 2 дани, токмо дадите 3 ми ние вмesto дани по три голів, и по три вороh, древляне ж бѣди 4 с охото сотвориша то. Олга ж голівымъ 5 и вороhымъ 6 повел в хвосты воптать фетиль, сърою и изъ голія 6 зажегъ же головенки піссти ихь въ верхе, сие ж кицко 7 голіо и голіоиа 8 в домь свой, а вороhи 9 под застреh, или под 10 кровли, обыкное с огнемъ назад изъ воиска рѣского 11 прилетвъ 12 во многихъ мѣстах град зажглъ тостьхъ, а Олта в то время к пристпѣ со всѣхъ странъ с великимъ окрикомъ 13 и швмомъ идѣ, 14 изъ зажженнаго града бежающихъ множества древлянъ побили, посѣкли, и потопили, а иныхъ жена ихъ и из дѣтами погорѣли 15, иныхъ 16 жъ зло много въ Киевъ в неволю отвели, а иныхъ 17 яко скоть продавали 18, сие ж Олга отмъ ствъ смерть мѣва своего знанно, и добывъ всѣ ины грады древлянскіе жде того ради страха и промышла неслыханного 19 и необыкнаго 20 доброволчно поддавались 21 возвратися въ Киевъ съ великою радостью съ номъ своимъ Святославомъ црвчвемъ 22,
Потомъ 23 въ лѣто отъ создания мира, ., 24 съ гряду идѣ съ великою честю въ корабляхъ въ Црѣград, и пришелъ въ дворомъ своимъ рѣскимъ 23 боярѣ 24 къ греческому црю, Иоанну Цимисхию, отдае ему великие дары, ниже его величия 25 обилья своимъ Црѣградъ угощаше, во время же доброй 26 мысли повѣщень || благольпимъ и славою побѣдительствъ ея, къ томъ пространствомъ 27 грядствъ рѣскаго 28, рече ей, достойна ей княгини. 29 Олга быть 30 на црствъ греческому съ нами въ семъ градѣ 31 Црѣградъ, и наговаривалъ и съ сопружество 32, вдовецъ 33 бо ся 33 жена не имаше 34, Олга же отвѣща емѣ, о црю, азъ есмъ язычъка, семо жъ придохъ, да вѣръ вашей найчись 36 хрѣнъской 37, аще же хощеши ми взятъ, крестъ менѣ, тогда настѣви у патриархъ 38 црѣградскый въ вѣрѣ хрѣнъсконъ 41, потомъ жъ сло множествомъ боярѣ рѣскіхъ крести, самъ жъ цръ Иоанъ 42 по прошению ея бѣ оцѣ крестны 43 со иными кнѣгі греческими, даде же имя ей Елена, яко и первои црце своей и благослови у патриархъ гглѣя благословенныя ты въ женахъ рѣскіхъ, илибо 44 Блаженъ тѧ 44 снѣове рѣстѣ 45 въ послѣднемъ родѣ видковъ твоихъ; ||

1 ER omitt. 2 G болшие | 3 ER даите | 4 N бдны | 5-5 B suprascr. | 6 BGEN головою | 7 GER кицко | 8 GE гдѣбница | 9 ER вороби | 10 G пот | 11 ERN рѣскаго | 12 B ante сотр. прилетвъ | 13 BGN крикомъ | 14 B ante сотр. зажженъ G зажененъ ERN зажженаго | 15 GN add. | 16 В нынѣхъ | 17 BN нынѣхъ | 18 N подавли | 19 ER неслышанаго N неслышанаго | 20 BGN необыкаго | 21 BGN поддавалисъ | 22 Е црвимѣ | 23 E рѣским R рѣскими | 24 R бояръ | 25 ER великимъ | 26 G добрый | 27 E пространствомъ | 28 ERN рѣскаго | 29 N княгини | 30 Е бысть | 31 N нашимъ | 32 R супрѣжество | 33-33 R болшъ | 34 R имѣвше | 35 N емѣ | 36 G найчись | 37 BGRN хрѣнъской | 38 E патриахъ | 39 ER црѣградсконъ | 40 G горе | 41 E хрѣнъсконъ | 42 GER Иоанъ | 43 E крестны | 44-44 E блажатъ | 44 E рѣскти

a G in marg. Олга въ Црѣгддъ | b G in marg. крѣщеніе Олги съ долары
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Потомъ же призва ю к себѣ цыр по крещеніи к столу, и рече ей, 860 аз ты ць Еленo избрáхъ, яко5 и сама миb обещалася еси в женб бьти на цѣство греческое, Елена ж отцвца емб како икошни май пояти крествв самъ яко отца, и нарёкъ3 ям дцирь себѣ, понеже в законѣ хростианском4, и въ языческ вѣщъ есть сверна, и неслыхана отца дцир, поиматъ, и рече цырь. прехйтрила май еси о6 Елено, потомъ ж даде дары златы, сребрыны, серязи, и рйцы, шолковы ѣ златот'каны, Олга же обеща ему ис Киева присать воску, кож и людей работныхъ, иде же къ патриархъ мона бгословения в дбмъ свой, гля, съ мо Святославъ языческъ, да избавить май гдь от всекаго7 сл. патриархъ8 ж рече кь ней, дци9 моя върная во Христь10, яко крестилась еси и во Хрста облеклася еси, той тя избавить, яко же избави первыъ || род Новъв в ковче11, Лота от содомлянь, Моисея12 с людми ираилъ'яны от фараона от домъ работы, Двѣ от Сабла, Данила13 изъ человцъ14 лювыхъ, трѣхъ отркъ Ананию, Азариа16, Мианда15 отъ печи огненнои, сице и тебъ избавить. сия ж рекъ, даде ей бгословение, и сведовника17. Олга же со всѣмъ дворомъ своимъ всѣдъ в кораблъ возвратиться18 блженно в Киевъ, о семъ Зонара18 повъстописецъ пространно пишеть19, такъ Олга или Елена первая бязъ хростианскою20 въ Псквъ21, и многихъ росийанъ во Христа обратятъ, сего рады ю Псквъ подоблять същъ. яко смѣже бо миру осия, сіце и она сйдымъ крещениемъ рбскя народы просвѣти22, но сна Святослава никоимъ обѣчаешь ко крещенію и къ познанию истина19. Бгъ привести не можаше, бь бо злъ храбръ и всего себѣ воискомъ житья вадаш. || сего ради и материи отоваривался, яко повнага крестится мнъ, съ къмъ ратоватъ бзд8, и отечество храниты. сице же велия храбрости, и15 искусства воисковаго26 бъ преждереченный Святославъ, яко внега лтъ своихъ достигнте емъ всегда въ поле съ воисковымъ житья никакыхъ помѣшекъ27, и напрасныхъ снарядовъ в войскъ своемъ не попдтъ возвитъ, такъ28 ни котловъ никакова сдна поваренного29 единъ отъ 30 воевъ его31 не32 имяще33 мясо токмо34 ялого и хлѣб сѣвой35 само во36 всѣми всегда ядль, шатровъ и само не былъ, кромѣ шалаша и епанчи на голов4

---

1 ER omm. | 2 E яка | 3 ER нарекъ | 4 Е хростианском | 5 GN вѣщъ | 6 ER omm. | 7 BGR всѣхъ | 8 E патриахъ | 9 G дни | 10 ER Хрста | 11 Phrase untranslated | 12 GER Моисея | 13 Р Даниила | 14 Е чюлести | 15-15 ER Мисаилу Азария | 16 Б ante сотр. Азario | 17 Н священика | 18 G Зонора Е ад. д[и] чеу R ад. чеаръ | 19 Н in marg. | 20 GRN хрестианкою Е хростиансомъ | 21 G Псквъ | 22 N просвѣти | 23 GERN истинаго | 24 U ante сотр. бздѣть G бѣдѣ | 25 R отъ | 26 Е воинскаго Р воинскаго | 27 ER помѣшальъ | 28 BGN также | 29 N поваренного | 30-30 G своего | 31 E евоевъ Н воево | 32 ER omm. | 33 G имѣше | 34 N только | 35 N сухъ | 36 BGERN со

---

a G in marg. возвращение Олги въ Киевъ | b G in marg. карахтъ Святослава сна Игореви и Олги
земли под небом сиживать, такжь съдлю или арчакъ в головы положа, сьпаль, сын монархъ всѣхъ земель русскихъ сего ради сластолюбивых грековъ удобно одолѣвать и гдѣрства ихъ биранъ; ||

207г Святославъ Игоровичъ, велькинь киѣвъ или иѣръ киевъскій переяславскій и иныхъ самодержецъ всея Рѣси въ лѣто, рѣсъ рѣсъ. Святосілавъ Игоровичъ, внѣкъ Рюриковъ внѣдѣ амѣ мать Олѣ въ крѣшении Елены всѣ князства русские киевъскіе великоиогородскіе псковскіе бѣлоозерскіе, и иные во владѣніе совершенно даде, собра въ великихъ рати съ своихъ земель въ началѣ жъ на козары, или косырь людя народа рѣскаго иже исподъ владѣнія его выбивались, еже и добылъ год ихъ, стопный Белавесь реченъный, а самѣкъ козаровъ съ княземъ ихъ побѣдили къ послѣдванію приведе, и дань на нихъ положи, о семъ Дѣговъ и Мѣхойвъ въ книгѣ, въ главѣ. и въ листу свидѣтельствуютъ, потому по лѣтописимъ рѣскимъ и полскімъ, собравъ великие рати иде на бойцы даже за Дѣнай, ихъ ж многаи побѣдили взятъ от нихъ, градовъ надъ Дѣнами, и со воинъ рѣскаками осадивъ въ Переяславѣ стопный градъ гдѣрства своихъ постави, мѣриже своей Олѣтъ и велѣмокамъ своимъ дѣмымъ киевъскимъ возвести гляя, яко въ Переяславѣ возлюбленны мной стопный градъ, посрѣдъ црѣсть моихъ, понеже сюды мѣбъ изъ греческоi земли привозять злѣто, сребро драгие вѣчіе, вина и разные овощи, изъ венгеръ такожде злѣто сребрѣ и конѣ добрые, съ Рѣси коки, меды въ всѣкъ и людей работныхъ.

И въ то время печенъги ис тѣхъ странъ, индѣе Литва, отъ готовъ, ятвяжковъ половцовъ, и аляновъ смышена пръи/вотъ подъ Киеѣвъ, и осадивъ градъ, во градѣ же киевъскому заперлѣся была Олга сы Ярополкомъ и Олѣхьомъ и со Владымеромъ тремъ въкками и стрѣмъ Святославовыми, къ немѣжъ Олгѣ послѣ скорѣю помоѣ гляя, ты чожихъ землѣ взыскиваешь, а меня матеръ твою и съ стрѣмъ твоимъ печене и мало не взяли, понеже отошли было яко
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1 BGN земли | 2 Е такжъ | 3 G орчакъ | 4 ER спаль | 5 R ad. і | 6 GN in textu
ER сластолюбивыхъ in textu | 7 ERN Игоревичъ | 8 Е перъислѣйскій Н омъ | 9 Е омъ |
R лѣта | 11 ER Игоревичъ | 12 ER княжества | 13 BGN великоиогородскѣ |
E великоиогородскіе | 14 B suprascr. | 15 BN инны | 16 Н владычи | 17 BGN собра |
18 ER оммъ | 19 ER add. на | 20 ER рѣскаго | 21 Е выбивались | 22 G оммъ |
23 ER Белавесъ | 24 Е о | 25 G свидѣтельствуетъ | 26 Е многихъ R многихъ | 27 R и | 28 GE Переяславіе |
29 Е Переясловъ | 30 ER псковъ | 31 ER оммъ | 32 Е венгеръ | 33 Е кожа |
34 G мѣды | 35—35 ER во | 36 ER готтовъ | 37 Н ялановъ |
38 G БГ смѣшна | 39 R было | 40 G Ярополкомъ |
41 ER Олѣховъ | 42 ER Владимировъ | 43 ER Тери | 44 R ad. с |
45 Е Святославовыми | 46 G з Е омъ | 47 BG печинги Н печени |
48 G бы

a G in marg. Святославъ владѣеть | b G in marg. Святославъ боюеть | c G in marg. осада Киевъ отъ печенегъ
Мѣховитѣ піщет, слышевъ вѣсти отъ рускихъ языковъ будто на нихъ Святославъ съ великимъ войскомъ идетъ, но льтнинѣ рѣская свидѣтельствуетъ, яко Святославъ скорѣ пріиде ис Переяславля съ воинства своимъ разта и поби печениги, обаче же мати его зъ боляръ прильожно желаете, чтоб жилъ въ Кіевѣ онъ же не въсхотѣ въ Кіевѣ жити. и егда же Святославъ въ Переяславль возвращаешься, глагола емъ мати его Олги, сынъ мой любелыний, а зъ 8 же 8му гдѣже менѣ восъхошеши да погребешь (аки вѣдѣ смерть свою) въ третіи || день умере и погребена въ Кіевѣ, кости же вѣдѣ Владимиръ крестились, и въ мѣстѣ сѣтия пода, и междѣ сѣтия причета отъ костянтинопольскаго патриарха, день же ея празднуетъ мѣся ца июля а.г. даня, *роздѣлъ сионъ Святославовыхъ Святославъ же по смерти мѣрѣ своея Олги или Елены раздели княжения рѣскихъ тремъ сионъ своемъ Ерополку Кіевъ, Олгъ или Олеку древляны зъ грады Хоростиномъ, и Переславлемъ, Владимиру великій Новгород, понеже новгороды по совѣтѣ нѣка жены Добрыни, Владимира въ князя себѣ умоляша, бѣ же въ Новѣградѣ гостъ нѣкто велики, прозваниемъ Кально Малецъ имѣя бѣ же сѣ бо двѣ дщери имя единой Доброю и другую Малоска, Малоска же бѣ 8 книги Олги ключницею, отъ неяже Святославъ имѣ Владимиру, || И тако Святославъ сіѣ 8стро и раздели имъ княжества, *Святославъ паки на больгари и самъ же въ покое не возможе пребываѣ паки идѣ на больгари, и шед надъ чернымъ моремъ черезъ Дакію, или волосскую землю, черезъ Днѣпръ прежде, и град славный болгарскій Переславль рѣченныя вѣліймъ пріѣдѣмъ взя и овладѣ потомъ Василию и Костянтину кесаремъ юческимъ воинѣ предвозвести, въ лѣто отъ Христа гдѣа годъ. по счетѣ 43 Миховну и Дѣлношевъ *Святославъ въ греческую землю, і приїде во греки съ войскомъ рѣскимъ кесарі же гречествіи Василиі и Костянтинъ послаша къ немѣ посылы моля примиренія и тѣшки, и колико воиска имѣше, вѣдѣ отъ него желала, обещавая дань дати на

1 ER Меховъ 2 BGERN услышавъ 3 GER бѣдо 4 G Свѧтиѧлавъ 5 R om. 6 R лѣтописецъ 7 GRN Переяславля 8 R разобранъ 9 Е балыры 10 GN Переяславль 11 ER Переяславль 12 N глаголъ 13 N любезной 14 R Владір 15 UB ante сорт. мѣсто 16 E костянтинопольскаго N костянтинопольскаго 17 Р празднуюемъ 18 E розделилъ R роздели 19 BN add. ili Olenъ S E Свѧтославъ[овъъ] 20 GERN mѣrъ 21 G своему ante сорт. своимъ 22 RN Переяславлемъ 23 E Владимировъ 24 Kѣшнъ 25 BGN Новгородъ 26 R Маледь 27 GN себѣ 28 N единого 29 Р антѣ сорт. 30 G нелиже 31 R Владимировъ 32 R роздели 33 E болѣгеры 34 E болѣгеры 35 ERN черныймъ 36 ER воложскую 37 E прежде 38 ERN Переяславъ 39 E реченны 40 G великимъ 41 RN Костянтинъ 42 E предвозвести 43 ERN щету 44 N Длугошову 45 ER omm. 46 G греческую 47 E греки 48 N колика 49 BGN имѣше

a G in marg. смерть Олги  b G in marg. гость Калоуа
всякого русского, когда же уважав'ше число войнства его, 4*вымышля* греческий против росиян, 5*краскё* вскоре вон свои греческие, и против Святослава ведоша, и внедра обоими воиска против себя стаща, Рьсь же видя множество грекои пристраш'чи бьша, Святослав же видя 6*вьско* свое в бояни, рече, р'чь 7 Святослава к воинству не вижется, кое би нас здь безопасно от неприятеля скрыти могло, 8 *земли ж и с'ла'в'и рьские в рьки неприятельские подать никогда сего в мысли своеи не им'ьть ес'ть, но против неприятеля м'жествен'но вою.А 9 или смерть славн'ю приимемъ, или безсмертныя славы се'б' дожкаемъ, 10 *щеслав'но и м'жествен'но воюя 8рь8, имени своеи в'ч'ныя славы заслуживъ, егда ж побь'жж 20 в'ч'ныю срамотъ, и понос восприим' 11, а м'жествен'ому неприятелю м'я общедумнымъ не подобает мн'ть б'жати и щити невозможно, но м'жествен'но противъ ихь 66д8 стояти, и главь за отечество свое напред всьмъ на страхование положь. *о семъ чт' Гербествена 24 сию Святославовъ р'чь Гербественна 25 во описании старогъ 26 льтописца московскаго 27 на листъ. е.м описует воини ж и все воинство р'ское, 28 (перво испужа 28) глаголаниемъ к'яя своего яко прибытиемъ новье помощи ополченіе, тотчас единогласно воззюпиша, *хот'я русакъ 29 рекше гд' глава твоя црская тамо и щи да 66д8 31, 32 отвердив же тогда воинство ид' с великою 33 скоростною и 8дари жестоко напротивъ стояще воинство греческое, разорывъ же 34 и розбивъ великимъ нашеуиемъ полки 35 ихъ, и такое побь'жж в'зирянщ 36, *поб'бы росиянъ над' греки 37 бежащиъ ж грекой побиваля, с'кли иныхъ 39 поем'ще живыхъ, потому Святославъ употребляя побь'ды греческия 38 стр'ны, разорялъ 39 и п'стош'ли, и егда Святослава ини к'изи 38 молящ 38 дарь, прося покоя, златомъ и панадокъмъ 40 бисеромъ 41 (яко рьские льтописцы именнъютъ) 44 не восхотъ приимасть, и гн'щаяся ими, токм'о от грековъ одежды, 45 збр'ви щиты. мечи присланныя 46 приемля;
*симъ Святославъ грекъ себь приклони,* Сицевою храбростию велюно и мжествомъ его грецкіе народы возвѣжены4 пришедше ко кесаремъ своемъ и ко киѣмъ глаголаша4, и мы желаємъ и хочемъ быти под5 такимъ црежъ иже не злато но орѣдия взяти любить. Святославъ ж с воинъствомъ6 || х Константинополь7 приближающся, *Святославъ на Црежгороде велитъ дани взявш отъ г,8 греки отъ него исщповаѢа данино8 велено и отъ грецкіхъ граници его отватриша9, яко болши10 ихъ не воевати емѣ, и возвратися съ вѣлими стадами велѣдовъ отяченныхъ11 златомъ и съ вѣлими сокровищами въ болгари. сего Святослава Занаъръ древніи лѣтописатель12 въ книгахъ .х Святослава13 нарицаетъ. возврача14 же ся съ великими добычи къ Переясловлю15 рѣском8, и къ Киевѣ; зашедше емѣ въ пѣтъ печенѣгы на зломъ мѣстѣ, и къ бою непріостоимъ, Святославъ же биса съ ними и поражень, взять бѣ16 печенежскимъ киѣмъ Кѣрому или Кѣросомъ реченнымъ, *Святослава побили и главу ему отсыкли печенѣгы17* князъ же18 повелъ емѣ главѣ19 отсеци, и изъ черепа главы его пвелъ часи сотвори120 и златомъ обложи, и сотвори на немъ надписаніе21 таково, чѣжаго22 искъ23 свое поглѣбляетъ, и всегда блѣгъ мѣслы24 Кѣросъ искъ на ди чяси пияше, обноѣля славѣ своею поббды и памятѣ. ||

О тѣхъ печенегахъ иже Занаъръ грекъ зоветъ пацѣнниками25, Вапониѣ26 ж пѣйзнами27 каковы люди были обращеня28 об нихъ въ произведении половинѣ, і ятвожъ побратимовъ литовскіхъ, ихъ ж во оные времена всякими прозваніи нарицаху. а той князъ Кѣросъ бѣ литвинъ, яко имя его являет.

О убиѣніяхъ29 30 дрѣѵ дрѣга30 браѣі31, ейовъ Святославовыыхъ;
По смерти Сѣцата Книгоровы2, самодержца рѣского33, ейовы34 его, три, хотя гораздо35 и изрядно36, прі животъ отѣовъ, къіяженіи рѣскими раздѣлены37 бѣѣ38. но не возмощаго межѣдп собою въ тѣшинѣ житіе. въ началѣ первыѣ дѣмныѣ39 Святославовъ боиринъ
именем¹ Свадолтъ². *Свадолтъ вторый³ Ахитовел⁴,* приехав в Києвъ
къ Ярополкъ кійю київскомъ болшому отъ брата, нача емь
совѣтовати да изгнотить отъ княженія древлянског⁵ и
переилю||ског⁶ брата с'вого Олеха, рияся емь яко с'на его⁷
реченицаго Люти⁸ Олех 86и⁹ на ловахъ.
Сиже ж Ерополькъ по созвѣтъ Свадолтова⁹ пошущень подя войнѣ
на брата, и⁰ вой его дрѣв’ян’ские побѣ, Олехъ же вшедшъ з бою¹¹(по
Меховино)¹¹ множества ради народа бежашціх с тогож бою, *сего
gрада Гербестеин¹² и кроника київская не означили токмо Длугошъ
и Меховин и кроники нѣкоторые русские,¹* не возможно вгнести¹² во
гряд¹⁴ свои Варяжкъ но от войскъ Яропол’ковъ¹⁵ присчтѣпашіх ко
граду съ выского¹⁶ мостѣ свер’жень и между м’ножества¹⁷ людей
нѣжко 8мрѣ въ лѣто¹⁸ отъ сотворенія свѣта ,ъ,ъуй. Ерополькъ¹⁹ ж во
гряд²⁰ Варяжк в’ниде и²¹ повелѣ брата с’вого Олеха искати²², и по
взяті²³ града въ трет’ день обрѣтоста егого²⁴ меж тѣлами²⁵ чѣпескими
мер’тва, и принесоша тѣло пред Ерополка. Ерополькъ ж вѣдѣ тѣло
брата²⁶ своєго рече к’ Свадолт’, Свадолте²⁸ сего пожела²⁹ еси, і по
pребоша его въ Овручи³⁰. *Оврыч³¹ град, *
*Владимир³² въ³³ варяги³⁴ побѣжа³⁵ ослышавъ сие Владимиръ³⁶,
яко
Яропольк³⁷ брата своего Олга³⁸ 86и, бежа из великого³⁹

Нова||городъ³⁹ з ́ море къ варягомъ⁴⁰, а на великом княженій
новгородцем⁴¹ Ярополкъ посади намѣсника⁴² своего, и себе сотвори
самодержца всѣ Рсинъ⁴³, Владимиръ⁴⁴ же взя себѣ варяговъ на
помощь, иде на свое княженіе, и намѣсника⁴⁵ Ярополкова⁴⁶ з
великого⁴⁷ Новагорода⁴⁸ ́ятна, ⁴⁹*Владимир⁵⁰ ⁵¹ Новгород паки⁵¹
отыска⁵²,⁵³ въ его ́оз рѣ постави своего именем⁵⁴ Добрыню, самъ ж
собра войско рѣское, и соединя⁵⁴ с варягъ против Ярополк’ка вѣева
8преждя его⁵⁵ въ тѣмъ, вѣдъ⁵⁶ бо ⁵⁷ яко им’ше Ярополкъ войнѣ
подать промнѣ его,
В то ж врémя послé 1. и² к³ Решёнду² квєю п’скóвскому⁵ (иже из варяг’приде)⁶ просче⁷ 8 него в’женé дцери Рохмиды⁸ (Рохмиды⁹ ж про Владимирова вýдяще¹⁰ бытъ неистова лóха)¹¹ Святослав же с наложницею¹² Малюскою его прижизн¹³ не воéхотъ за него итти но за брата его и неприятели Яропóл’ка¹⁴ от негож и с’ватоé ожидала¹⁵ бь. Владимýрь, разнéвася¹⁶ на Решёндь¹⁷ об’рать на него войс’ка готовые свои, и Пскоé взé, самого¹⁸ ж Решёндь¹⁹, а з двемя съє его джй, а дцерев ²⁰ в’женé себъ в’зья сóлою Пóтомь Владимиръ²¹ тою побéдою и присовокуплениемб себе княжества²² псковскаго якреннився, иде х Киёву противò²³ Яропол’ка, Ярополъ²⁴ сидè²⁵ в Киеве, а Владимýрь²⁶ осадé его, и разумý яко силою не в’зяти его, посла тайно къ²⁷ Ярополковь²⁸ върномъ²⁹ дённомъ³⁰ боярину к Блёдь нарицая его отпомь³¹, и посла к нему дары довольны³², моли дабы пода†емё совьть Яропол’ка³³ бйти Выраздмыв Владимирово³⁴ послание Блёд обьщाण³⁵ Ярополка убить, ³² тóчиó б с прилежанием Киева доставать³³, Владимирь, а³⁴ Ярополкь³⁵ совьть дая, дабы в Киеве не жил повёдая яко множество киевлян³⁶ рабоé его на здравие ымышляют, ё яко ко Владимýру³⁶ пристают; Сýмь Блёдовымъ лёс’нымъ³⁷ сов’томь, Ярополкь ис Киева уиде во³⁸ градь Родень изе стоить на ыстье³⁹ ръки Юрысъ, идже чаяше здравие свое сохраñтитë. ||

Владимиръ⁴⁰ же Киёв в’зй, и осаdingъ своимъ войскé велéковновороднымъ³¹ и варяжскимъ, иде с воинствомъ за Еропол’комъ⁴² и во граде Родень⁴³ осади его. и повелъ ко граду и баш’намъ пристoтя тышкó⁴⁴ по м’ногого в’реме. войска ж Яропол’ковъ во граде бдёнчие⁴⁶ изъвдены быёе⁴⁶, видя ж изнёдженé ихъ Блёд, совтова Яропол’кë просэть мирë⁴⁸ и тишины 8 брата своего Владимëра⁴⁸. а Владýмерë⁴⁹ предозвьщéя, что 8же

---

1 ER omm. | 2 N послы | 3 N къ | 4 U ante corr. Решоло Dollars ante corr. Всеволоды | 5-5 G om. parentheses signs | 6 ER просча | 7 N Ротмиды | 8-8 G om. parentheses signs | 9 R Рыхлда Н Ротмída | 10 ER вдяча N вдяше | 11 N om. right parenthesis sign | 12 Е наложницео | 13 G om. right parenthesis sign | 14 Е Ерополка | 15 Е ожидала | 16 Е развяччався | 17 U ante corr. Решоло Dollars ante corr. Всеволода G Рыхлда | 18 N самаго | 19 U ante corr. Решоло Dollars ante corr. Всеволода G Рыхлда | 20 N Ротмиду | 21 BR Владимиръ | 22 ER княжества N княжъ | 23 Е против N против ante corr. против | 24 ER add. же | 25 N сядь | 26 R Владимиръ | 27 ER къ | 28 BGN о́день | 29 G дозволи | 30 R Владимировъ | 31 BGN обьча | 32-32 ER in marg. | 33 G достави,7 | 34 ER omm. | 35 GER киянянъ | 36 BGN Владимирë | 37 BGN лестнымъ | 38 ER въ | 39 Е ысё | 40 GEN Владимиръ | 41 ER великновороднымъ | 42 N Ярополкомъ | 43 ER Родине | 44 BGN тяжко | 45 G воиско | 46 GEN бдёнчие | 47 В ad. мша suprasct. | 48 G быша | 49 R Владимиръ | 49 В Владимиру R Владимиръ

⁹ G in marg. Владимиръ иде на Псковъ | ¹ G in marg. потомъ къ Киеву | ¹ G in marg. Киевъ взать
Ярополк хотет выдать ¹, и пред него привести, Ярополкъ ж пос'лыша сов'тъ Блъдова ле́тива² поддался в силе на мсть, ³брът⁴ своему⁵ Владымеръ⁶ жела от него еже дасть емес на пропитание, да тьмь благода́рень бдеть. Владымеръ⁶ ж сие бысть годе, потомъ Блъд сов'това Ярополкъ⁸, да идеть ко брътъ⁹ и подасть⁹ емес, вообранняя⁸ же Ярополкъ⁸ дрътни дъмной⁹ боаринъ, именемъ Вераско. Ярополкъ ¹⁰ ж Вераскова¹¹ сов'тъ пренебрежъ¹², посл'лыша¹³ Блъда, и¹³ из града и изде¹⁴ ко¹⁵ брътъ, || егда же исхождаше из врать, абие от дву варяговъ вбиен бысть, еже самь Владымеръ¹⁶, от н'кия баш'ни зрьше¹⁷ видъв¹¹ же Ярополкъ¹⁸ брътъ вбиена, тогач посла во град варяговъ войной своихъ, и женъ брътъ своего гречанъ¹⁹ ят из насила, с неюже Ерополкъ¹⁹ пока еще чер'ницею¹⁰ была прежде даже не пояти емес²¹ю в жено²¹ имъ с'на тьмь образомъ вожделенья²² ради еже гд'рствовати²³, Ерополкъ²⁴ вби²⁵ Олеха брата, Ярополкъ же²⁶ Владымеръ²⁷ вби,²⁷

Владымеръ великий С'вятославич²⁸ самодер'жец рьскй, перъвы христианин²⁹ бысть в дьто от сотворения мира, ³³ыне, Владымеръ³⁰ С'вятославичъ, вну'къ Игоревъ прави³⁰къ Рюриковъ овладь княжениями рьскими брать своихъ, Ольга³¹ и Ерополкъ³² и всю Рьсь пол'номл'нив³³, восточнию и на³⁴ польдень лежашцию, бдлью, и чернию. подъ свою державъ приведе, сего ради писасть црьмъ или королемъ, самодержцемъ и великимъ княземъ всемъ³⁵ Росии, престолъ ж свой из великого³⁶ Новагорода³⁷, въ Киевъ пренесе³⁸, а за вбиенныхъ братьи своихъ Ольга³⁹ и Ерополкъ⁴⁰, с'гомъ своимъ жер'тьвы прйнося, м'ножество боловановъ и капищъ⁴¹ поганскими в Киеве и на иныхъ горахъ и поляхъ кievскихъ наставилъ, и построилъ начальны болванъ³⁴ з'ло высокъ Пер'янъ или Пер'кынь³⁷ боговъ³⁸ громовъ³⁹ темныхъ облаковъ и молний и бл'гонич'ю его читанье, тьло же его изрядно из древа выреза, главъ же сребряны'ши златыя, ноги жел'нныя содила, в р'кахъ ж камень держа, подобиемъ грома палящаго, яхон'ты и

¹ G в'дать | ² GR листво | ³–⁴ V ante corr. брата своего | ⁵ N своенполу | ⁶ R Владимировъ | ⁷ Е Владимировъ | ⁸ Н поддаться | ⁹ В возбранеъ | ⁹ GER дъмныъ | ¹⁰ В Ерополкъ | ¹¹ N Вераскова | ¹² ER пренебръгъ | ¹³ G om. | ¹⁴ BGN изыде | ¹⁵ BGN к | ¹⁶ BGEN Владимировъ | ¹⁷ GER зръяще | ¹⁸ G Ерополкъ | ¹⁹ GRN Ярополкъ | ²⁰ ER черницею | ²¹–²¹ N om. | ²² G возжелѣв'я ER вожденья | ²³ Е гд'рстввати | ²⁴ GRN Ярополкъ | ²⁵ ER у | ²⁶ N om. | ²⁷ BGN Владимировъ | ²⁸ G Св'ятославичъ | ²⁹ BGER христианъ | ³⁰ GR Владимировъ | ³¹ N Олера ante corr. Ольга | ³² N Ярополкъ | ³³ N полуночную | ³⁴ В нъ | ³⁵ N всемъ | ³⁶ N великаго | ³⁷ ER Новаградъ | ³⁸ GRN пренесе | ³⁹ N Олера ante corr. Ольга | ⁴⁰ N Ярополкъ | ⁴¹ G капищъ | ⁴² N om. | ⁴³ ER боговъ

⁵ G in marg. Ярополкъ убйень | ⁶ G in marg. Владимировъ | ⁷ G in marg. пренесеніе престола изъ Новагорода въ Киевъ | ⁸ G in marg. кмѣръ Пер'янъ
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Созда же Владимиръ и град великій меж Волгой и Окою рѣками въ свое имя Владимиру звъло во странѣ изобиліоі отъ Москвы .].п. поприщъ на востокъ сляца и тамо ис Киева престол пренесе, и быть до князя Ивана Даниловича бelorбскаго, князь ж Иванъ Даниловичъ изъ Владимирова прѣлъ къ Москве пренесе, обрати потомъ Владимировъ мысьль свою къ вониской бородости, воевая ж въ начале Мечислава князя полскаго17, і вѣз грады Премышль18, и Цырвенъ і 8ѣдъ радимицкии полскаго19 княжества чаять радомскіи подъ свою держав покори, и дань возложи каковъ полкомъ давал о томъ Длугошъ и Мехови книга25 вѣ. глава26.ѣ. и.ѣ. страница. .Къ и произъ четвъ пишутъ, Дѣтеи28 Владимировъ отъ приобщенныхъ емѣ жен имена отъ Ромиды29 дщери31 князя Рехволя32 псковскаго, трехъ сынъ Изяслава Ярослава Всеволода и дѣвъ дщери. з грекинею Святополка съ ческою княгинею Святослава, Станислава, з болгарскою35 Бориса и Глѣба, сверхъ тѣхъ жень имѣяще 8 себя наложенъ въ Выштранъ въ Берестове, и въ себращъ. въ Бѣлѣтѣ всѣхъ было числомъ и бѣдѣча совершеннымъ самодержцемъ всѣа Росіи, Владимировъ шед съ велиимъ войскомъ черзъ Дѣнай и овладъ земли болгарскую, сербскую, карачающую, седмрагдскую, внятіную, ятишскую, дѣлеспую и страны идѣже йѣнъ воложи мѣщяне, и татары бобрудкіе, и всѣхъ къ послѣшану своемъ единѣмъ подемому пригна и дань велио на нихъ возможно, яже греческимъ кесаремъ давалъ36; во время ж сей ево войны въ рѣсся князя приидоша печенѣги, и осадиша Бѣлгород, въ немъ пребывахь владимеровъ градъ, наложенъ, печенѣги же подъ градомъ стоя и многое время, не возмогоша емѣ ничего чинити, но совѣщаха подъ нимъ стояти.
донеже грацих жителн гладом изморять, граждане ж видя печенйговъ дольгое около града облежение, помышляше имь здаться глада ради, и бы из нихъ муж в возрасте престарельном возбаранъ печенйгом града дать, и повелъ дывать киселя развести, третию ж готовати сыты медянье, и вивести печенйгом въ табор, (печенйгомъ скучно безъ дѣла стояти) глагола печенйгомъ, стоя въ поле снѣдни не имать і се белогородцы по любви своеи къ вам прислали; донеже со Владимировъ гдерьмъ своимъ для васъ приготовятся лѣтче, печенйгы ж видя се разумѣша яко гладомъ ихъ не йоморить, града же силою не взяті, и того для отидоша отъ осады; белогородцы ж малымъ вымыслномъ отшвѣлисъ;
Потомъ печенйгы собрались съ велиймъ воинствомъ идоща къ Киевъ, Владимировъ же слыща про походъ ихъ иде противъ ихъ, и ста обозомъ 8 реки Трубежи се 16 единомъ страни || печенйгы 17, з дрѣгие 18 ж Владимиръ видя же печенйгы яко Владимиръ противъ ихъ стоить во множествѣ сильы, не смя на него боемъ настѣпать, но просиша 8 него единаго 20 отъ воинъ братися со 21 единимъ 22 же ихъ страны борцомъ печенйгомъ, и аще рѣской воинъ преодольѣть печенъга тогда печенйгы Владимиру слѣжити бѣдѣть, аще ж печенйг преодолѣть рѣскаго 23 воина, тогда печенйгомъ Рѣсь подлежати и слѣжити бѣдѣть, а буде такои борецъ не обрететца между вами тогда мы русскую землю три годы 25 воевать 26 бѣдемъ, сего ради лутче вамъ безъ кровопролити одного борца за бѣдѣ поставить, Владимиръ выслѣшавъ отъ печенйгой посѣпания печаленъ бысть зѣло, помышляя въ себѣ глагола, аще не поставлю борца печенйгъ помышляя, что въ княжениях моихъ ни единъ воинъ къ бою достоиъ
|| обрестися 28 можеть, того ради на моей державе рѣской вѣчная 29

8корища бѣдѣть, едва ж поставлю съ печенйгомъ и борца отъ рѣскыхъ войскъ, печенйгъ его преодолѣть, тогда бесчестие и подданство печенйгомъ приобрѣсть; во время ж тонъ ево мысли прииѣ пред Владимиръ перейславляни 33 мѣжъ старъ гляда 34. цьрь велики княже Владимировъ 35 сѣй мои можеть братись съ печенйгомъ, о семь благодержавѣй 36 радостень бысть Владимиръ, и повелъ емѣ сѣй своего пред ся привести, едва ж прииѣ юноша пред Владимиръ 37, вопроси

---

1 В градскихъ ERN градскихъ | 2 N возбаранъ | 3 GR розвести | 4-4 N suprascr. | 5-5 G om. parentheses signs | 6 N om. right parenthesis sign | 7 GE снѣдя RN снѣдя | 8 Б благородцы | 9 Р Владимиръ | 10 G приготовца N приготовца | 11 B ante corr. имъ | 12 BERN великиимъ | 13 BERN Владимировъ | 14 ER om. | 15 N противъ | 16 G со N съ | 17 ER add. ж | 18 Е дрѣгия R другую | 19 GERN Владимиръ | 20 RN единого | 21 ER съ | 22 В единый | 23 ER рѣскаго | 24 B ante corr. оберетца R оберетца | 25 R года | 26 G воевати | 27 BG бесъ | 28 N обретися | 29 N вѣчна | 30 G воинъ | 31 BERN бесчестие | 32 ER подданствомъ | 33 Е перейславляни | 34 B a сотр. глядѣвѧ | 35 GERN Владимировъ | 36 N бладарствуй | 37 В Владимира
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его Владимир" 1, 2 смеш 3 ли братился с багатырем 4 печенъжским, рече 5 юноша црю преславный 6, 7 аз рао  твои ѣйне зриши како печенъги з багатырем 8 своим прет 9 твою державою посрамлен бдя6ьт. видя 10 Владимир 11 велию 12 храброю юноши в малом возрасте, 13 сеи бо переславления 14, яко о нем Длугошъ и Меховин в книгах, || .г. глава  л. свидѣтелствуют, бысть средняяго возраста 13, сдмншещся 15 о побыдѣ, 16однако же 17 послал к печенъгом, дабы 16 з багатырем своимъ, к бою выходили, а он их с воиномь 18 своимъ ожидает. воѣтрій же печенъги стаща во стройствѣ, и гордо поося, борца на уготованное 19 мѣсто послали, члѣвка 20 толста и плечиста возрастом подобна Голиадов 20, отъ кой 21 гордо стоявшая вония на рѣсаковъ поношная и хѣля их, скорѣе 22 же равнаго себѣ, единомъ же не смѣющія, трех на борѣ призвываше, изъда из 23 рѣскаго 24 войска переславления 25, члѣвкъ малъ но крѣнасть. вида ж его печенъгъ посмѣвъ 26 емъ и назва его желѣваком, егда ж междѣ собою сошлися, снялись оба крылько за посы, поистинѣ 27 икако Дарес с Ентьелосомъ Енесовы 27 борцы 28, печенъгъ толстой тѣла 29, рѣсаков 30 же крѣпостию управлящее, печенъгъ высоку 31 члѣвку, рѣсакъ 32 ж низокъ, мѣло накланяше 33, 34 разбѣгши же ся 34 сдари || печенъга главою в толстое брюхо близ лона 35 под 36 пѣнном даже сдате. войска 37 ж с 38 обоих странь стояха 39 тихо, и яреще на борбу малого мужичка со исполном, потомъ вставъ печенъгъ с великимъ стидомъ хотѣл переславления 39 сдари т крѣпко кулаком, он же скоро оборачъ от печенъга отбѣже, печенъгъ же члѣвкъ тяжелой от крѣпкаго 31 сдарения кулакова уже минѣло 42 рѣсина 43 погинѣвъ 44 сдате на землю, рѣсина же не даде емѣ встать всѣд на него и нача бити по щекам, что збылъ его ного с кровию 45 выпадали, и за горло его ѣхвати 46 даже ѣшу на томъ мѣстѣ выломилъ, видѣв же сие Владимиръ с войскомъ вскорѣ на печенъги наступи. печенъги ж видя 46 безсилие и бесчасть 48 свое разбѣгощася по полям. Рус же 8тѣкающихъ 49 били съкили, кололи, ловили, иных в Трубеже рекъ потопили, и множество полону и добычи в

1 В Владимиров 2, [Phrase untranslatable] 3 BGN смѣшил 4 GRN богатырем 5 E рюче 6 Е преславны 7, 8 G образъ 9 GRN богатырем 9, 10 G видѣ 11 BGERN Владимиръ 12 N велику 13-14 G ad. parentheses signs 14 BRN переславления 15 G переславлій 16 ER сомяшесъ 16-16 ER in marg. 17 E одноко ж 18 N вонокомъ 19 G 8готованемъ 20 BN Голяндъ Б Галланду 21-21 ER гордостью 22 R скорыя 23 В и 24 N русского 25 ER переславления 26 ER посмѣла 27 R Енесовы 28 ER бурыды 29 В suprascr. G om. 30 ER рєсина аnte сорт. рєсакъ R рєсина 31, 32 R высокъ 32 R рєсина аnte сорт. рєсакъ R рєсина 33, 34, 35 ER накланяющемся 34, 35 ER разбѣгися 35 ER луна 36 G пот 37 G валаска R волско 38 G со 39 В переславлій 39 ER переславлій 40 ER тѣхолои 41 ER крёпкова 42 ER миная 42 G рєсини на 44 N подкнува 45 ER кровью 46 [Phrase untranslatable, cf. example (76)] 47 ER виде 48 GERN безчастию 49 N утекающихъ
печенъжскомь обоє || набрали, славнію побдє едіннымь переяславлениномь2 (не інако яко евреян3 от Давида4 нат5 оилистимы6,2 воосприяша. сотвори7 ж Владимир на том брода, идже8 бъ побдё дрґїїї Переясловль8, на памят семъ яко переясления9 над богатырем9 побдё одержа11,12 переяславленина13 ж славнымь богатырем14, а отца ево15 чстнымь члвкомъ 8чыни16;

Бысть Владимиръ17 велийъ18 и слвнымь во всем свтє монархомъ, или самодержцем всѣх земель росйскихъ, живе беззаконно кмры хвать, прийдоша ж к нему от роных королей20 и князей21 и народъ8вчительных21 връ и законовъ, в начале21 махметянъ22 татары египтяне23 и арапленъ24, с прцями25 цары арагенскими, шестввя его да их връ и законъ приймет его Владимир пренебрежъ, || являше бо ся емѣ бити скаредень и мерзокъ, потом прийдоша послы от папы кесарей и къ връ римскихъ или латынскихъ26 и немецкихъ, просящъ27 ево дабы връ и законъ хрзянские28 приялъ29, Владимиръ30 ж и на сие не изволи, яко дѣствие латинское31 мало блгочтно, и костелы ихъ недобръ вкрашены являусяся посемъ же і от евреев32 вшцевань33, да приймет законъ Моисея34, от же и того не всохотъ, понеж изъ Моисеевъ35 законовъ36 тяжки суть, и не имающе у него никоторой връ и закона послы мста токмо греческихъ37 кесареи и патриарховъ38 послы нкое мство имаяще, обаче видя различие39 различныхъ връ и закооновъ не всохотъ никои прияти;

Посла же Владимировъ40 в роные гдєрства пословъ41 своих увдать о чинѣ връ ё дѣствах вских народовъ прильжно, в началъ ж повеле хатъ в болгарскую землю, ё свидтелствовать41 връ их иных посл в Рим вных в нмцы, во Аорико, во Египет, и в Скио42, иже присмотривъ43 в различних народъ въ различным връмъ и дѣствамъ, прийдаше же потомъ во Црґгородъ44 возвестища ж сие кесарем Константину47 и Василію, яко от Владимирова монарха


a G in marg. градь Переяславль во нрамение побдъ | b G in marg. посльство дл размнѣл връ
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российского проводати въры прийдоща послы. кесари ж слышав сие радостны бъх, повелѣша ж ихъ пряти чност, показаша ж посломъ и чинъ црковныя по уставѣ греческомъ, и одарив ихъ отпѣстища къ Владимерѣ въ Киевѣ, и да тѣсно своемѣ о греческомъ върѣ, лѣтчи возвестит, послѣ съ ними къ Владимиру патриархъ и кесарь Константинъ грека Кирила, и еписофа мѣжа ученъ, сей Кирилъ пришо къ Владимиру, о върѣ хрѣниѧнскомъ много бесѣдова съ нимъ, владѣ же емѣ отъ патриарха и отъ кесарей вмѣсто поминокъ запону златую на неяже вырезано и зрядно страшный судъ Бѣкѣ къ семуж присмотрясь Владимиръ, моли еписофа, да повѣдает ему написанняя || на запонѣ, кѣи одеслѣвъ сѣдѣнъ и кѣи ошѣю отъ стоять, повѣдѣ яко емѣ еписофа яко одесную стояти бѣдѣт вѣрѣюща въ гѣда йщего Иисуса Хреста, и творящи дѣла блѣгая, за сие по смерти вѣчныи живот и ществъ нѣбѣное восприимутъ, ошѣю въ жива Бѣа не вѣрующій разных безъ закона и безъ вѣрѣ живуще, дела слѣве творящихъ, тѣи во огнѣ адскомъ вѣчно осѣщенъ бѣдѣтъ. Владимиръ ж слышав сія вѣдою и рече, блѣгословенный сіи иже одесную стануть, горе же тѣмъ иже ошѣю, еписофа [sic] же отвѣща, аще крѣстились, и ты будещи одесную, аще ж во идолопоклоніи жити бѣдеше, мѣсто твоо со всѣми людми земель твоихъ ошѣюю, а потомъ въ вѣчномъ осѣщеніи, Владимиръ же обеща крѣтиться, и одаря вѣлиосоѳа отпусти.

Призва Владимиръ близшихъ своихъ бояръ и дѣмныхъ людей во градѣ Владимиръ иже надъ Клязмою. || къ немѣж и престоль сой иѣсѣ Киевъ пренесе. тамь возвести имѣ бесѣдѣ о вѣрѣ хрѣниѧнскѣ Иисуса Кирила, еписофа, аще кто крѣтится вѣдою и дѢмъ во імѣ огѣ и сѣна и сѣтаго дѣча, умеры имать востати, и ществовати во вѣкѣ, невернымъ же и некрещенымъ по смерти мѣка и осѣщенъ вѣчное, тако Владимиру отъ изображенія послѣдняго суда Бѣка на запонѣ, вѣра хрѣниѧнскѣ въ срѣды утвердиась, но не имѣ блѣгословѣыхъ

---

1 В российского GER российского | 2 BGN бѣхъ | 3 R показа Н показавша | 4 N посламъ | 5 N лутчъ | 6 В Владимиру | 7 БGER Костянтинъ | 8 R Кирила | 9 ER Кирилъ | 10 GERN Владимѣръ | 11 Р хрѣниѧнскѣ | 12 Е жа | 13 R патриарха | 14 G сапанъ | 15 GER Владимѣръ | 16 M моля | 17 ER судъ | 18 GERN ошую | 19 BN еписофа | 20 ER вѣрующій | 21 BG Иисуса ER Иисуса Н Иисуса | 22 E творяще | 23 E вѣчны | 24 ERN ошую | 25 N омъ | 26 G стоять | 27-27 E беззаконна Р беззаконо | 28 G живѣще Е живѣюще | 29 R слѣя | 30 EР творяще | 31 BG осѣщеніи | 32 GERM Владимѣръ | 33 R ошѣю | 34 R блѣгословѣнію | 35 G сие | 36 ER ошую | 37 GE еписофа | 38-38 N не крѣстишись и тако | 39 ER омпъ | 40 RN Владимѣръ | 41 ER одари | 42 BER Владимѣръ | 43 N близинахъ | 44 BEN хрѣниѧнскѣ | 45 В Кирилъ Р Кирилъ | 46 GR хрѣщенна | 47 E има | 48 BGER некрещенымъ Н некрещеннымъ | 49 G Владимѣръ ER Владимѣръ | 50 G послѣднаго | 51 Р хрѣниѧнскѣ

8 G in marg. возвращеніе пословъ изъ Гречи съ еписофонъ Кириломъ | b U in marg. Cyrillic | l G in marg. бесѣда его | e G in marg. отпѣтскѣ | e G in marg. звѣщеніе
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людей намерения его к совершению вскоре привести, сего ради в заключение положи;
Собра же великое войско от великого Новагорода, а новгородцев и киевлян, пойдя в Таврику южнее Перекопью зовем, взя Кавб или Теодосию град славный у гreckов, потом и столицы всеа Таврики град Корсунь. (его же Савелли в книгах вторых Херсоном а Меховий Корсийм нарицать) у преславного пристанища моря понтийскаго, особое сокровище кесарей греческих осады и вскрыми силами многое время добываше его бъ бо труден к немъ присть к томъ ж и гречестви воини добре храню ихъ, Владимиров ж с осадными людми нача договариваться здатися им, глаголя аще добрываемо не поддадьтесь стоя́ть бдеть еще до трех льть, и доколе их достанать, чего потом себя жалѣ́ть бдуть, греши ж грозд его не слуша́хъ, и стоя́ подъ Корсунем еще с. мсповь градыки сидѣ́лцы хотя принудит, и нужда, однако в своем упорствѣ пребывашу, не единъ из нихъ протопоп Анастасий написа на стрель словеса свои ци́е, црь Владимиру, бдь хощеши град вскорь добы́ти, въ ждь яко́ тробы есть подземные к востоку слйца ими́ жь идет в Корсунь пръсная вода, ты же прекопав она́ турубы, водѣ оти́мешь корсунимъ, и здаться тебь, с тьмъ письмомъ стрель выстрели прямо шагра, Владимира ж повел стрель принести пред себя и письм чрез преводника, прочь тробы под землѣ́ повелъ прекопати. корсуния видя отя́ние воды на млдрдие его з градом и нарядом морскимъ и градскимъ и сокровищи кесарски здаться,
В йнших древних роси́ских лгописцах написано, и Енимомъ, и Гербештейн в книгах своих о Москвѣ на листу. б. м. свидѣ́тельстввію т., новгородцы едва чрезъ. з. лть были со Владимировъ под Корсунем, жены ж их истосковався природно свербою от много го ждания мужен своих, съмневаухся о их возвращеніи, мнѣше яко на войнах мж их погибоща рабовъ своих и плѣ́нников в мж е мѣ́сто себѣ прийша, по взятии ж

---


a G in marg. воюеть на Грецию | b G in marg. облже́ние Корсѣ́на | c G in marg. имѣ́на протопопа Анастасіи | d G in marg. зда́ча Корсѣ́на | e ER in marg. зри о ново[го]родцахъ
Корсуня новгородцы 1, возвратившись в велики Новгород2, града Корсуня врата м感动ные, и колокол звои велички (яже и до днеся 8 соборные3 церкви в Новгороде4 есть) с собою привезоша на знамя побъды5; | рабы ж и пльвники которые жены за себя побрали господ своих во град пустить не хотехь, и воставъ противъ6 господ своих со оружием отбити их хотыху. венега ж с ними господа воинскими оружием бой сотвориша, влечиша над ними побъды пленники, по совтву ж пъваго7 старвьшаго воискового8 оружие сабли мечи отложше, и вземше дреколъ и плъти тьмъ их наказаху, ихже рабы 8страшишася помянувъ яко прежде господие такими палками 9 и плетми их наказывающи же10 а не саблиями, и тако из града бежаша11 вонь, и прийдоша на мьсто болотное прилежашее12 над рькою Мологою13 от Углача 14 версть, и тамо сьдоща в 14 осаде и кръпость построиша хотя от господъ15 своих оборонитися16 но господа их иных повища иных четвертоваша и достоинными казниымъ противъ их дьль казища,

Симъ льтописыам на подобие описуемъ17 18 19. Сетни у Строга и у Помпия18 книгъ в. || и Геродот у Мелпомена, о татаръ илил скивъ також слгъи и пльвники поемъше жены хозяевъ своих 19 возвращающи яко Корсунь славный 20 ихъ 30 град пристанищий31 со всею Таврикою взя, ѳ слышахъ яко имыт сестру, и да 32 дадыт ему в жену, аще не дадыт 33 сотворю такожде, и Константинополю 34, и противъ35 греческим градом якож и Корсунь.37 кесари ж отвъщаша не достоитъ намъ хръстянским монархом за иновъргого княя родныя сестры дати, а егда отстъния болвановъ, ко истииному Христу Бгъ 38 шему приступиши, 38 и в ѣйд хръстянскую39 въру приступиши 38 и крестишися, тогда сестры ѣйце тьбъ во святый бракъ возвращати не будемъ, слышавъ же сие рече 40 прежде послахъ к вамъ послы ѣже
возвестишиа ми изрядно подробну вся о йшем законе, его ж возлюбих, въра ж и дѣства йшн углодни мнѣ суть, и тако пришлите епікпа изъ меня  
крѣтіт, сами ж с сестрою своею вскоре ко мнѣ приѣзжаніте или 
пришлете ко мнѣ в супрыжество, аз же Корсунъ, і всю таврицку и 
понтскую страну вамь возвращаю. сышавъ Константинъ 6 Василий 
кесари блгдарное 7 Владимировъ отвѣть возрадовася 8 велию 
радостию и начаю молити Анну сестру свою, да издёт за Владимера 
в супружество 10, она же отрицаешь сѣло. братія же ея рекоша, аще не 
pойдешь что корсуникомь и таврикомь Владимара содѣлъ, то сотворит 
и греюк, къ тому ж и горши безчесть 12 на насъ мститъ бѣдают, аще 13 ж 
Бѣ́ться россіскую землю. { сѣ́тьмъ крещениемъ просвѣти́ть, а 15 
греческую землю бракомь твоимъ отъ пленения свободить вѣ́чную славу и 
безсмртное блгословеніе отсель возрастет на тебя, 
Алѣна цѣ́саревна, братьи со схезамь ответца да буді воля гдѣ́дня, и 
всѣдъ в корабли поиде къ Корсуну, брати 17 ж ея кесари 
провождаху 18, яко 19 Длугош 20 и Меховиі піпютъ, съ веліим 21 
множествомъ кѣ́зе грецескихъ и женска 22 и дѣ́ча полу 23 иде, ихже 
блгоприятні 24 Владиміръ прия, и како скоро кесаревну во градъ и в 
полаты корсуникя 25 вводиша, абие везапу найде на неѣ́ слепота по 
изволеніо Бжю. нача же Владери сомнѣвается креститься 25 
ему 26 или ни 27 мнѣше 26, 28 бо яко бооз 29 его для его намѣреніе что 
похоть 30 креститься наказаша. кесаревна ж послалъ ко Владимиру, 
аще не крестися не избудешь слѣ́поты, сышавъ 31 ся Владиміръ 
Святославичъ внукъ Игоревъ и Ольгина правнукъ Рюриковъ, крестися 
в Корсунъ | въ вѣру греческую христианскую во имя отцѧ́ и сна и 
сѣтаго дѣ́ва въ лѣ́то отъ сотворенія мира „сѣ́ч.“ а отъ Хрста по Длугошѣ́ и 
Меховию „дѣ́ч.“ 33 34 а Кромеръ полагаетъ въ книгахъ 35 т. х. „сѣ́ч.“ 34 а от 
Хрста „дѣ́ч.“ 36 едѣа ж архипелкѣ́т 37 корсуникѣ́ возложи руку на 
Владимира 38 и блгослови его да прийметъ дѣ́ва сѣ́тѣ́ и тогда 39 отъ 30 очию 
еї отпаде яко чешѣ́я. тогда абие прорѣ́бъ хвалу гдѣ́дъ Бѣ 40 возздаде 
глѧя, иѣ́е полнахъ истиныга 41 Бѣгъ, 42 крѣ́щина же ся 42 съ нимъ всѣ́ 43

1 N пришлете | 2 N имѧ́ | 3 E Куръусъ | 4 R твердуикую | 5 ER пощуткую | 6 BERGER 
Коштнинъ | 7 E благороднъ R блгкодно | 8 N возрадовашся | 9 ER велию | 
10 BGN суправляю | 11 B Владмировъ | 12 GN бежесте | 13 B ante corr. {e} ще | 14 ERN 
росиискую | 15 ER omm. | 16 G бежестное | 17 B брата GN брата | 18 G провождаю 
19 G ad. do in ras. | 20 BN Длугожъ | 21 N великомъ | 22 ER ad. и фрацы миром 
23 BGN пола | 24 B блгоприятно | 25 ER omm. | 26-26 Е и мнѣше ante corr. или нинемъще 
27 R и | 28 N мнѣше | 29 Е болезнь ante corr. бози R больши | 30 BGN похотъ ER хотѣлъ 
31 E ad. же | 32 GR христианскъ | 33 ER „дѣ́ч.“ | 34-34 N om. | 35 BGN книг | 36 ER „дѣ́ч.“ 
37 E архипелкѣ́п | 38 BERN Владмирова | 39 ER ad. ж | 40 BGN гдѣ́дъ Бѣ́ хвалу | 
41 В истииномъ | 42-42 В ante corr. крѣ́циша же съ ER крещаюся | 43 E вси́

a G in marg. прибѣтъ царевыя Аны греческаго въ Корѣ́йнъ | b G in marg. слѣ́пота 
Владимира | c G in marg. крещеніе Владиміра | d G in marg. по рожъ дъ 988 годъ | 
е G in marg. Владимиров пропес
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бояря 1 его, и воинство 2 росийское, Владимиръ 3 жь во свтотм крещениї 4 има дано новое грееческое Василий, Венчая 5 же и свтным браком со 6, а. Апною кесаревною греческою, в велии радости всѣ народа, в Корсуни 7, б. ж на горѣ созда 8 храм во имя сѣтаго Василия тезоименника 9 своеи 30 на память свтаго крещения 10 корсунъ 12 ж 13 и Кау у и всю Таврику 14 отдаде | греческимъ кесаремъ 13, 15, самъ ж всѣ 16 в корабли 17 с новобрачною кесаревною, и получа с ними прощение возвратися 18 ко 8 сти ю Диѣпр я потом же свѣкм пт, прийде в Киє б в велию радостию 4 всего народа, принесе же с собою 19 и мощи сѣтаго 19 20, и иконы и книги и ризы и протчая 21 22, и протопопа Анастасия ис Корсёня иже 23 совѣтова чрез стрелу о трубах подземными, и прочи 24 попов дьяконоў пъвцовъ, монаховъ, и мастеровыхъ 25 людеи из грековъ с довольным платежем нанятых строенія ради црквей, Егда 26 ж прии в Киевъ свтъ по верволѣ разрушати и іскорениї 26 из основаніи 27 куміры, Харса 28, Стриба, Мокосса, и Волосса, балвава 29 [sic], иже б почитаем богъ скотій 30 и лсный, (яко б у аркадовъ Панъ 31) во изпрежнительное 32 всенародное мочно возврати 33, и в нечистотѣ 34 идола 35 х коневому хвосту привязати и влецы 36 | чрез град к Днепру, и назвавъ 37 камень идопита в Днепрѣ, Народи 38 ж неврін плахахуся по богах своихъ слезнымъ негодованіемъ, Повелъ Владимиръ 39 в гдѣстрѣ своеем росийском учинити заказ, да вси креститя 40, и нарече крещенiem всенародному днѣ, аще ж кто не креститя 41, наказание да восприиметь 42 сия слышавъ 43 народ с радостию идяѢ крѣтитис в Киевѣ, иинъ ж на вреченныя 45 мѣста (по нижь 46) грецески свяцицы для сѣтаго крещения поставленьы были) глоще другъ другу аще бы сие дѣло не было добро не крѣтися 47 т велікии кѣзъ и бояре ево 48, облече же с и ереи и

1 BG E 2 воистомъ 3 В Владимиру 4 BG E крѣн 5 ER венчаш 6 ER в 7 N Корсун 8 B ad, и в ras 9 B antе согр. тезоименника Н тезоименитства 10 B ad, a in ras, GN add. a 11 B suprascr. 12 ER Корсунъ 13-15 N кесаремъ отдад 14 G Таврикъ 15 Е кесерамъ 16 B всѣлѣ 17 B карабли 18 G возвратися 19-19 N in marg. 20 N Клиmente 21 R проптія 22 G црковные 23 B antе согр. якѣ GN же 24 ERN проптія 25 ER masterовъ 26 N искоренити 27 ER основаниї 28 ER Хорса 29 N балвана 30 ER скотія 31 G пропчи 32 G исправленное 33 Е вроврѣи 34 BGE начальаго N начальное 35 Е едапа 36 ER врещи 37 Е навеза 38 G народиї 39 BERN Владимиръ 40 BG крѣтится 41 BGN крѣтится 42 N восприиметь 43 E слъва 44 ER ии 45 ER уречениїя 46 B antе согр. низм 47 ER крѣтися 48 G его

a G in marg. Владимиръ въчанъ со Анною  b G in marg. храмъ в Василия  c G in marg. возвратъ Корсёни, Кау и Таврыды грѣхомъ  d G in marg. прии в Киевъ и прінесе мощи сѣтаго Клиmente  e G in marg. разрѣшение кѣмиръ
диакони¹ в ризы стоях² на скамьях к тому ³строеныых на рекь Днепръ, і вхождах людие во Днепръ толпами²ўй по пояс ини ж по шею свѣценницы ж крестяще³ их во имя отца и сина и святаг даха, || и даваху имъ имена⁴, Василіян. Петръ, Иоанн⁵, Тимоѳей и Симеон⁶. и про⁷.
В то же время дванадесяти⁸ събо Владимировых имѣющих⁹ отъ жень и наложницъ, Вышеслава, Изаслава, Святополка, Ярослава, Всеволода, Святослава, Мстислава¹¹, Бориса¹². Глѣба, Станислава, Посвізда, Свдислава, особо крѣти¹³ епѣкѣ¹⁴ корсунскій, и вдаде ихъ по крещеніи, и съ нимъ¹⁵ колико сотъ детеи боярскихъ¹⁶ въ наѣчіе громоты, греческио¹⁷ и словенскомъ¹⁷, (которою¹⁸ мы и¹⁹ иѣше россіанемь²⁰, допотребляемъ) пристава къ нимъ 8чители добрýchъ и искучныхъ во всякъ ученіи, созда же въ Киевъ и²¹ цѣрковь во имя вседержителя сѣба изъ вѣлікаго²² каменія²³, а на мѣстѣ идѣж стоялъ идолъ. Перунъ да цѣрковь²⁴ во имя свѣтаго Василія тезоименіника²⁵ своеи и иныхъ множество цѣрковь на различныхъ мѣстахъ идѣж прежде различные кѣміры стояхъ, отъ многихъ сокровищъ кирпичный²⁶ || каменъ²⁷, и отъ древа, взя²⁸ же у патриарха костятыніопольскаго²⁹, б Киевь перваго³⁰ митрополита Оѳотія, Новгородскаго³¹ архіепископа³² Леонтия, Иоакима³³ корсунскаго³⁴ преведе³⁵, на архіепископство въ велики Новыгородъ³⁶, и прішед же³⁶ въ Новьгородъ³⁷ Иоакимъ вся³⁷ кѣміры и ідолы³⁸ срокуши, Перунъ же вверже въ реку Волѣховъ яче течѣть посредъ³⁹ града изъ озера Илмѣна, а егда Перуна тацці, ⁴¹ въ Воѣховъ⁴¹ и бали пайками по дѣтовъ тѣловщиц, въ то время въ немъ крича²⁴² бѣсъ, о беда⁴³ мнѣ впадох въ руцъ немѣтстви⁴⁴ и пливь противъ⁴⁵ воды подъ великия мосты, (яко о томъ лѣтописцы пыші рускіе и Герберштейн⁴⁶ на листѣ од.м въ⁴⁷ описаніи Москвы согласно свидѣтелствѣютъ) сиць Перунъ рече яко всѣмъ слышашимъ, се вамъ новгородцы⁴⁸ на память мою, симъ веселитесь воспоминая⁴⁹ мене, аби же рекъ си на выкнути, на мостъ межъ народа.

¹ BGN диакони | ² Н крестящее | ³ BGN имена | ⁴ GRN Іоанниъ | ⁵ Е Семеонъ | ⁶ R прочиъ | ⁷ BN то | ⁸ ER дванадесят | ⁹ B ante ccorr. имущихъ | ¹⁰ GN Изаслава ER Изослава | ¹¹ ER Мстислава | ¹² G ad. | ¹³ B in ras. GN omм. | ¹⁴ BGN add. крѣти | ¹⁵ ER нимъ | ¹⁶ Баярскіхъ | ¹⁷ BERN славенскогъ | ¹⁸-¹⁹ BG и Іѣше мы нынѣ мы | ²⁰ ER omм. | ²¹ ER росіане Н російне | ²² ER omм. | ²³ GERN великого | ²⁴ ER каменъ | ²⁵ Н церковь | ²⁶ B ante | ²⁷ G резонейниковъ R тесемеиника | ²⁸ G взятъ | ²⁹ Е костятыніопольскаго Н константинопольскаго | ³⁰ G первого | ³¹ ER новгороду | ³² G архіепископа | ³³ ER Иоанна | ³⁴ E корсунскаго | ³⁵ GN приведе | ³⁶-³⁶ Н пришедше | ³⁷ G Новъградъ | ³⁸ ER взя | ³⁹ BG ідоли | ⁴⁰ ER посредъ | ⁴¹ B ante | ⁴² BGN крича | ⁴³ Bѣда ante ccorr. беда | ⁴⁴ B ante ccorr. немѣтстви | ⁴⁵ Н немѣтвныя ER немѣтвныя | ⁴⁶ Н противъ | ⁴⁷ G въ | ⁴⁸ ER новгородцы | ⁴⁹ B волюминная

⁵ G in marg. храмъ во имѣ сѣба | ⁶ G in marg. первый митрополит Оѳотіи, архіепископ Леонтий и Іоакимъ | ⁷ G in marg. сокрѣдшение кумировъ въ Новъградѣ
из воды палку, и сказывает Москва || что и ніне единожды в год слѣчаются в Новѣгородѣ великим, и сен1 гласа2 слышан бывает, егоже усляшавъ абыне с великимъ швомъ стекаютца3 и палками4 другъ з другомъ буютца, и от того толоконестокий швомъ возрастает5 что едва ихъ начальные с великимъ трудомъ смирилъ могутъ; сице ж от того времени вес рускихъ бѣлыи и черныи восточныи полуночныи,6 и на полѣнь лежащихъ народы въ христианской7 вѣрѣ под властвомъ8 патриарха9 константинопольскаго10 и дѣствіями11 греческими твердо и непоколебимо пребываютъ, противъ рѣскихъ12 и греческихъ лѣтописцѣв от сотворенія мира. „свѣтъ въ томъ сочленійный лѣтъ Жигимонтъ13, и Герберштейнъ звело помышляли14, считая годъ о Владимирове крещеній на .з.м листу во описаніи Москвы „свѣтъ и противъ тѣхъ всѣхъ лѣтописцѣв русскихъ, издаетелей греческихъ и полскіхъ || яже азъ сие согласовѣхъ многажды16, у Мещови въ книге .ѣ.и въ главѣ .ѣ.и листъ .ѣ.и Ваповиѣ и Бѣлскіѣ изъ нихъ годъ отъ Христа полагаетъ быти .ѣ.17 отъ крещенія Владимера, а Кромерь въ книгахъ .ѣ. о вѣрѣ 18 дѣрейнихъ словья18,19 считаетъ, отъ сотворенія мира по греческомъ числахъ годъ сени „свѣтъ и а отъ Христа .ѣ.ъ и считая съ поѣзданнымъ лѣтомъ сѣднимъ „афебы.19 и того бѣреть, фѣо. лѣтъ, а Олга жена Игорева баба Владимерова крестится въ лѣтъ „свѣтъ, прежде Владимира за .ѣ.д. лѣта.,
Аще Зонарь21 греческихъ лѣтописецѣвъ въ лѣтописце книгъ22 .ѣ.23 || пiшеть яко напередъ сего отъ кесаря константинопольскаго24 Василия македонянин25 послан бысть въ Русь епископъ, (его же елень 86и рогами26,27). Рѣсь же тщаниемъ28 его вѣру христианскѣю29 прия, веняда молюко его о чудеси30, какова31 отъ вѣда Христа, сотворитъ. епископъ егліе32, или новыя завѣтъ вверхѣ во огнь, вѣлікѣй35, еже36 въ цѣлосты37 и невредимъ37 съ вѣліѣмъ бдивленіемъ всѣхъ россіянъ38 пребысть39, Но яко вскорѣ отъ приятя вѣры40 христианскія41 отстѣпіща, отздѣ
является, когда Ольга потомко Иоанна 1 Цымисхию, а Владимир 2 внёс её в Костянтину 3 и Василию 4, снамь Цымисхиевыем 5.
227v
цесарем греческим идоша прияти въру святую хрьстиянскую, о семь тойже Зонар въ тыхъ книгах пишет,
Воспоминаетъ Льмберть саэнабурскій иже прежде фѣлъ лѣть лѣтопис
немецкую писа лѣта от Хрѣтѧ 6 росйские 7 народы ко Антону 8 первому кесарю послы своя послаша, моля его да пошлетъ къ нимъ епископа учения ради въру хрьстиянскіх. кесар же посла къ нимъ епископъ Адалберта 10, онже отъ руку ихъ насили 8йде, хотяцымъ убить его, 11 но мнится 13, 14 истино бысть, яко Зонар, и іны лѣтописатели греческій и руский 15 лѣтописателя свидѣтелствуютъ, яко прежде Ольга, потомъ внукъ ея 16 Владимира 17 крѣстилися, і въ рускихъ земляхъ восприялъ 18 въру греческаго 19 закона, по чинамъ греческимъ въ Царьградѣ основаннено 20, руский 21, земли, въ познанье, истино 22 Бґа и Ісэа Хрѣтѧ 23 ея его единороднаго, 24 приведоша въ лѣто отъ Хрѣтѧ .йылъ, а полыки Ішѣ. при Мелеславе 24 Земомиславовиче 25 кйзѣ 26, 27 всѣ крѣтия амь одинъмѣшлень, вѣнгеръ 28, потому 29 жъ въ лѣто .йылъ, аще ихъ кйзѣ Генджка Свѣщана 30 сятого сятѣ 31 крещение 32 прия въ лѣто .йылъ въ то время когда и Владимиръ 33, а ченъ въ лѣто отъ Хрѣтѧ сѣнда .йѣ. при Бориевъ кйзѣ первомъ хрьстянскомъ 34, однако и до лѣтѧ .йѣ. году чернь вѣру крѣто егдѣ 35, прия,
Читателью любезный описанье 36 дѣствъ Владимиrowыхъ 37 немного оставить имамъ понеже вѣдать намъ потребно есть какими мерзкими 38 кѣмъ ироваленѣ дѣяволь 39 предстѣль было предковъ ихъ словуковъ русаковъ чечовь. || полаковъ, и прочъ 40: и Литвъ 41 ктолькою 42 поганской 43 дѣствова отъ насъ съ велимъ трудомъ собраны, и глубокимъ доводамъ достигнуть 43, і испытаны здѣ яки 44 въ зерцалѣ 45, і яки на древнѣй 46 вѣкъ предоковъ своихъ зрѣти имамы,
Illustration 2. Ms. U, Slav 26, fol. 2r.
ОТКРОЯЛИ ПРЕЖДЕ СЕГУ, СВЕТЫ НЕУКИМЫ.

КРИНИКА СИРМАТСКАЯ.

ПОЛСКАЯ ЛИТОВСКАЯ, ЖИДОЕСКАЯ, И БЕЛ РОСШИЯ КІ-тскон, Московской, Съверской, Полоценкой, Подемской, Поденской, Плюсской, и проч. и разные слушане кончение и домашние.

Псковку, Новгороды, Поморье, и ныны страни, Казо-

месцы Псковы, и Кийлову Книгу Литовскою приложает.

По истинным и основательным сочинением подлинных, дохо-

дных, и есть разныхъ. Историописцы и тьмоѣ, постоян-

ныхъ, и домашнихъ. Киевы, Московы, Свѣдскіе, Литовская,

Псковы, и въ среднихъ, доски времена закрыты.

Киевъ и Литовскіе, Слободы, и Донецъ Ос-

дская Псковы, ея зымы, съ величномъ приложані-

ыхъ, и умовычныхъ трудовъ. А особнѣ, съ разныхъ. Ли-

товскихъ, и Киевъ, мнѣ вновь прѣжнихъ неразъясня-

ныхъ.

ЧЕЗБ.

МЯТВѢ АОССѢКИѢСѢСѢСѢ.

СТѢКОВѢСѢ.

Досконо Полскому, свѣдскому написаны, сложны, и на ныны
светъ со нынѣшнимъ истинно доходной дѣлности, слѣпъ-
стремимъ, изобрѣтеймъ, великимъ основательнымъ и нынѣ-
освѣдомъ, Князъ Голицынъ разумъ всѣхъ дѣловъ, кѣмъ дѣлать, до настоящаго 1582. году.

КЪ ТОЛѢЖ.

Всѣхъ, сколько ихъ есть въ Светѣ, Народъ, основательным
докладь.

Съ книгѣ и поколѣніемъ ея Конос Бѣл.

Печатаны на Полскомъ языкѣ въ Кищкѣ, у Н. Матвеева, 1582. годѣ, а по

Славеноское переведены въ Московѣ.

Печатаны на Псковскомъ языке въ Кищкѣ, у Н. Матвеева, 1582. годѣ. а по

Славеноское переведены въ Московѣ.
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