

Donald Ostrowski

## The Title of the *Povest' vremennykh let* Redux

In a recent issue of this journal, Aleksei Tolochko discussed the title of the *Povest' vremennykh let* (PVL). In his discussion, Tolochko asserted that accepting my inclusion of the phrase “чѣрноризьца Феодосіева манастиря печерьскаго” in the title is “impossible” (“Принять предложение Д. Островского, однако, нельзя”). Tolochko argued that this phrase appears in the Нуратіан (И), Khlebnikov (X), and Radziwiłł (P) copies because the Нуратіан branch contaminated the Radziwiłł copy.<sup>1</sup> In this claim of a particular type of contamination among the PVL copies he accepted the theoretical formulation of Aleksei Gippius.<sup>2</sup> Tolochko also argued that the term “Феодосіевъ манастирь” with one exception does not appear in the pre-Mongol period. Instead, the term “Печерьскыи манастирь” is used. That single exception is the Нуратіан branch where, s.a. 1182, one finds the phrases “чѣрноризецъ [X: чѣрноризецъ] Федосіева [X: Феодосіева] манастиря Петерьскаго”<sup>3</sup> and “чѣризьцель [X: чѣрноризецъ] Федосіева [X: Феодосіева] манастиря”.<sup>4</sup> He also argued that the appearance of this phrase in the middle of the title instead of at the beginning or end is an awkward placement and an indication that it is an interpolation.<sup>5</sup> Tolochko concluded: “Таким образом, то, что традиционно полагают заглавием «третьей» редакции ПВЛ 1117 г., на самом деле возникло на столетие позже и представляет собой заглавие *Киевского свода* начала XIII в.”<sup>6</sup>

While Tolochko’s article is logically argued, I find that I do not accept the premises on which he bases his argument and, therefore, am unable to accept his conclusion. First, let us look at the textual evidence for the title, which consists of six manuscript witnesses. I present that evidence according to the interlinear collation edited by me for the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute in 2003.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Толочко Алексей О заглавии *Повести временных лет*, *Ruthenica* (2006, 5), 248–250.

<sup>2</sup> Ги́ппіус А. А. О критике текста и новом переводе-реконструкции «Повести временных лет», *Russian Linguistics* (2002, 26), 63–126.

<sup>3</sup> *ПСРЛ* 2: 627.

<sup>4</sup> *ПСРЛ* 2: 628.

<sup>5</sup> Толочко, О заглавии, 250.

<sup>6</sup> Толочко, О заглавии, 251.

<sup>7</sup> *The Povest' vremennykh let: An Interlinear Collation and Paradosis*, comp. and ed. by Donald Ostrowski; associate editor David J. Birnbaum, senior consultant Horace G. Lunt [= *Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. Texts: Volume X, part I*] (Cambridge, MA, 2003) [hereafter:

**One should not neglect to take into consideration the Academy copy (A) of the PVL. It along with the Radziwiłł copy testifies to the readings of their common exemplar.**

## 01:

D :	Се повѣсть е в рече а ннѣ <sup>X</sup> а <sup>1</sup>	
T :	се повѣсть е в рече а ннѣ а ннѣ	
P :	вѣст в рече ннѣ <sup>X</sup> а <sup>1</sup> а	терновнѣа фелдѣнѣа
A :	Повѣсть в рече ннѣ <sup>X</sup> а <sup>1</sup> а	терновнѣа фелдѣнѣа <X>
H :	вѣст в рече ннѣ а <sup>T</sup>	терновнѣа фелдѣнѣа
X :	Повѣсти в рече ннѣ <sup>X</sup> а <sup>1</sup> а ннѣа	терновнѣа фелдѣнѣа

## 02:

D :		ѡвѣдѣ а ннѣ а ннѣа
T :		ѡвѣдѣ а ннѣ а ннѣ а ннѣ
P :	ѡвѣдѣа ннѣа ннѣа ѡвѣдѣа <sup>X</sup> ѡвѣа I	
A :	ѡвѣдѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ѡвѣа I ннѣа	
H :	ѡвѣдѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ѡвѣдѣа ннѣа	
X :	ѡвѣдѣа ннѣа ннѣа ѡвѣдѣа ѡвѣа	

## 03:

D :	рѣкаа ѡвѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа <X>
T :	рѣкаа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа
P :	рѣкаа ѡвѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа I
A :	рѣкаа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа I
H :	рѣкаа ѡвѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа I
X :	рѣкаа ѡвѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа

## 04:

D :	н ѡвѣдѣа рѣкаа ѡвѣа ннѣа ннѣа
T :	н ѡвѣдѣа рѣкаа ннѣа ннѣа ннѣа
P :	<i>omitted</i>
A :	<i>omitted</i>
H :	н ѡвѣдѣа рѣкаа ннѣа ннѣа
X :	н ѡвѣдѣа рѣкаа ѡвѣа ннѣа ннѣа

**Next, let us look at how editors of the PVL have rendered the title.<sup>10</sup>**

## EUNJ 2009], 1.

<sup>10</sup> I have taken the readings from the following editions: (1) *Древняя русская литература*, т. 1: *Восточная часть*, Тарнов, Издательство, Гед, А. А. Шахматов, Петроград, 1916, С. 1. (2) Булгарский, С. А. *Словарь древнерусского языка*, т. 1, С. А. Липовицкий, 1916, С. 1.

## 0,1:

*Миле*: От повести временных лет о немъ,

*Бугай*: ПОВЕСТЬ ВРЕМЕННЫХ ЛЕТЪ ИЛИ ПОСЛОВЕЦА СВОДОУСТВА

*Лазе*: ОТ ПОВЕСТИ ВРЕМЕННЫХ ЛЕТЪ,

**Müller**: Die Erzählung von den Anfangsjahren, von <Nestor> einem Mönch des

■ : Повести временных лет, или летописи св. Феофана

## 0,2:

*Миле*: отъкрыту отъ польца

*Бугай*: МАНАСТИРИ ПЕЧЕРСКАГО, ОТКРЫВЪ БУДЬ ПОШЛА

*Лазе*: ОТКРЫВЪ БУДЬ ПОШЛА

**Müller**: Hölleklösters des Pecherskij, wobei das Russische Land

■ : манастиря печерскаго, отъкрыту отъ польца

## 0,3:

*Миле*: Русская земля, которую Казьмъ великий князь венжань,

*Бугай*: РУССКАЯ ЗЕМЛЯ, И КТО ПЯНЕР ПОПАЛЪ ПЕРВЪ КНЯЗЮ

*Лазе*: РУССКАЯ ЗЕМЛЯ КТО ПЯНЕРЪ НАЧА ПЕРВЪ КНЯЗЮ

**Müller**: gekommen ist und war in ihm zuerst bezwungen hat, als Fürst zu herrschen,

■ : русская земля, а кто пянеръ началъ правити княземъ,

## 0,4:

*Миле*: а отъкрыту русская земля отъ польца

*Бугай*: а отъкрыту русская земля стала быть,

*Лазе*: а отъкрыту русская земля стала быть

**Müller**: und wobei das Russische Land entstanden ist.

■ : а отъкрыту Русская земля отъ польца

One notices that, whereas Shakhmatov and Likhachev are in agreement that the phrase “летописи св. Феофана” does not belong in the title, Bugajzavskii and I are in agreement that it does belong. Shakhmatov places it in the title of the 3<sup>rd</sup> but not the 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> redactions. Müller believed that the phrase belongs in the earliest redaction of the PVL, but

Татьяна Мюллер, *Временные летописи*, т. 1: *Летопись св. Феофана*, СПб., 2006, 10, 4, Appendix, 31, 2006, 31 (31). Bugajzavskii's edition was prepared for publication in 1999, but did not see the light of day until Antonov found the lost typeset copy in the archives and published it in 2006. (3) *Повесть временных лет*, 2 тт. Ред., Л., У., Пискарев, А.В., 1990, 1: 2. (4) *Die alt-russische Chronik, zugeschrieben dem Mönch des Klosters Hölleklösters Nestor, in der Redaction des Abtes Ill'jar' aus dem Jahre 1116, rekonstruiert nach den Handschriften Laurent'skaja, Andrej-Borovickaja, Akademicheskaja, Petroskaja, Zvezdinskaja und Chetovskaja*, trans. Ludolf Müllers. *Handbuch zur Nestorchronik*. Herausgegeben von Ludolf Müllers. Band 4. Posen Slavica. 36 Q-Stachen. 2001). I. I include Müller's translation because he translated from a vital Russian text that he constructed conceptually using a streamer rather than from any published edition. (5) EURI 2008, 1 (as represented by the sign ■).



Aleksii Gippius proposed the emendation "uplozhen v istinu" for "uplozhen v istinu i pravdu".<sup>13</sup> In the Introduction to the HURI 2003 edition, I recapitulated my argument for the title that I had proposed in 1981 (pp. 28–29) and explained why I was not accepting the emendation "uplozhen v istinu" to the title.<sup>14</sup> Basically, I prefer the reading "uplozhen v istinu i pravdu" because the scribal editors of the main manuscript witnesses do. They seem to have no problem with it since none of them tries to "correct" it. For us to do so would be to engage, in my opinion, in hypercorrection.

Recently I wrote an evaluation of Müller's acceptance of Gippius' argument and concluded that an alternative way for viewing the possible relationship of IIII/I on NSv, and the PVL, exists that is better than seeing contamination of IX on PA.<sup>15</sup> That alternative way posits contamination of the IIII/I line on JTT. I had proposed in my Introduction to HURI 2003 (I: XLIV–XLV) in a more rudimentary manner that such a contamination exists. I will not rehearse my entire argument here, but I will outline the basics of it.

Editors and investigators of the PVL, such as Shakhmatov, Bugoslavskii, Müller, Powell, and Libkarchev have agreed that the manuscript copies more or less directly attesting to PVLx can be arranged in three groups (I use here the sigla that Müller proposed in 2006): PA (the common exemplar of the Radziwiłł and Academy copies), JTT (the common exemplar of the Laurentian and Trinity copies), and IX (the common exemplar of the Hypatian and Khlebnikov copies). In other words, the readings of P and A are generally closer to each other than they are to JTT or IX. Likewise, the readings of J and T are generally closer to each other than they are to PA and IX, and so forth. In addition, PA is closer to JTT than it is to IX. On these points, the principle investigators are in accord. Thus, when all copies agree on a reading, that reading has the highest probability of having been in PVLx. When JTT agrees with IX against PA, or when PA agrees with IX against JTT, then that reading of IX has a high probability of having been in PVLx. When JTT agrees with PA against IX, then the reading either of JTT+PA or of IX could have been in PVLx. The schema indicates no preferences in that case.

Gippius claims (and his claims have been accepted by Müller and Tolochko among others) that IX contaminated PA. The key concept here is "contamination" for if PA was genealogically closer to IX, then the agreements

<sup>13</sup> Levst. Elena G. 1997. По поводу реконструкции текста *Повести временных лет*. *Philologica* (1997, 5), 317–326. Гиппиус А. А. По поводу реконструкции текста *Повести временных лет*. *Славянская филология*, Т. 2, № 3 (1997), 440–460.

<sup>14</sup> Introduction, HURI 2003, I: LX–LXII.

<sup>15</sup> The Nidderflut Speed Theory and the *Povest' vremennykh let*, *Russian Linguistics* (2007, 51).

of PA and BX would not be contamination, and the agreements of PA with JTT would be considered contamination, but that is not the case. Likewise, we can speak of the close proximity of FX and IIII)ca because there are at least 124 cases where BX agrees with IIII)ca against JTT and PA.<sup>13</sup> Thus far, however, I have been able to identify only 16 cases where JTT agrees with IIII)ca against PA and BX. So, we can speak of contamination in the case of IIII)ca on JTT when IIII)ca=JTT≠PA≠BX, but we cannot speak of contamination of IIII)ca on BX when IIII)ca=BX≠PA=JTT, because the number of cases of discrete agreement indicates a close genealogical proximity of IIII)ca with BX.

I have also found that the nature of the respective agreements is different, such that when J and T agree with the IIII)ca against a reading agreed to by P, A, H, and X, the nature of the difference in the readings is better explained by a deviation from PVLca in the text in IIII)ca=J=T than in P=A=H=X. For example, null readings in PA+BX are less apt to be the result of contamination of BX on PA than additions in JTT. More direct evidence of contamination of IIII)ca on J can be found, for example, in PVL 119,10, where J carries the reading "βαγαανια βαγαθη". This reading can best be explained by the scribe of JTT combining the "βαγαθη" reading of PVLca (as testified by P, A, H, and X) with the "βαγαθη" reading of the IIII)ca line (as testified by IIII)ca). We find that P, A, and T testify to "βαγαθη" only (X has a lacuna and J is not extant). To accept the reading of J as primary and to try to explain the dropping of "βαγαανια" in PA as the result of contamination from BX leaves unexplained how and why "βαγαανια" was dropped from IIII)ca. To be sure, all sorts of imaginative and convoluted scenarios could be created to describe why P, A, and H dropped "βαγαανια" whereas IIII)ca dropped "βαγαθη", but the most elegant explanation is that the scribe of JTT was confronted with "βαγαθη" in his direct exemplar and "βαγαανια" in his contaminating text. He could not or did not want to decide between them and included them both. Combining readings from two or more exemplars is a common scribal practice.

Now we can turn to Tolochko's argument. It has two parts. The first part deals with the contamination problem, the second part with linguistic usage of the phrase "φωδωρον χειρωγρα". As concerns the first part of Tolochko's argument—the contamination of the Hypatian branch on the common exemplar of the Raskinik and Academy copies—if one accepts Gippius' formulation that FX contaminated PA, then the agreement of P and A with H and X on the phrase "φωδωρον χειρωγρα χειρωγρα χειρωγρα" can be explained by that contamination. And one would, therefore, be justified in concluding, as Tolochko did, that the phrase "φωδωρον χειρωγρα"

<sup>13</sup> *Scribal Practices and Copying Probabilities in the Transmission of the Text of the First Homograph in Polycarpus* 19, no. 2 (2005), 50–56.

“свѣдѣнїи о вѣдѣнїи” does not belong in PVL<sub>11</sub>. Yet, if one accepts my argument—that contamination occurred on HT from the IIII/I line—then one must conclude that the phrase “свѣдѣнїи о вѣдѣнїи” actually does belong in PVL<sub>11</sub> because there is no reason to posit contamination of HX on PA.

As concerns the second part of Tolochko’s argument, the absence of the phrase “Федосеѣи о свѣдѣнїи о вѣдѣнїи” before the entry of 1182 in the Hypatian branch, one needs to point out that the lemma “Федосеѣи” does appear in combination with other lemmas elsewhere in the PVL (citations are from H only since the readings of P, A, H, and X are at issue here)—for example: PVL 187,5: *свѣдѣнїи о вѣдѣнїи* (s.a. 1074); PVL 189,13–19: *о вѣдѣнїи о вѣдѣнїи* (s.a. 1074); and PVL 284, 13: *на дѣ о вѣдѣнїи* (s.a. 1109). It also appears in conjunction with “Петроукии”—for example: PVL 160,15–16: *на дѣ о вѣдѣнїи о вѣдѣнїи* (s.a. 1051); and PVL 160,24–25: *свѣдѣнїи о вѣдѣнїи о вѣдѣнїи* (s.a. 1051). Finally, we find it with *свѣдѣнїи* alone: PVL 198,7–8: *свѣдѣнїи о вѣдѣнїи о вѣдѣнїи* (s.a. 1074). The lack of appearance of the specific phrase “свѣдѣнїи о вѣдѣнїи о вѣдѣнїи” in our sources between 1116 and ca. 1200 may be more a result of our scant source evidence than any prohibition against, or other hindrance to, the use of that phrase before ca. 1200. There does not appear to be any imperative against the phrases “Федосеѣи о вѣдѣнїи”, “Петроукии о вѣдѣнїи”, and “Федосеѣи о вѣдѣнїи о вѣдѣнїи” existing in time.

In the end, I must express my appreciation to Tolochko for his close reading of the source evidence, his attentiveness to recent developments in textual interpretations of the PVL, and his raising questions and challenges to the HURI 2003 edition. But I must also respectfully disagree that it is “impossible” to accept the reading “свѣдѣнїи о вѣдѣнїи о вѣдѣнїи” in the title of the PVL. Not only is it possible but it is the reading that most likely was in PVL<sub>11</sub>.