#### 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 "чьрноризьца Феодосиева манастыря печерьскаго" in the title is "impossible" ("Принять предложение Д. Островского, однако, нельзя"). Tolochko argued that this phrase appears in the Hypatian (M), Khlebnikov (X), and Radziwiłł (P) copies because the Hypatian branch contaminated the Radziwiłł copy. 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 "Феодосиевъ монастырь" with one exception does not appear in the pre-Mongol period. Instead, the term "Печерьскый монастырь" is used. That single exception is the Hypatian branch where, s.a. 1182, one finds the phrases "дерноризнць [X: черноризець] Федосьева  $[X: \Theta_{\text{еостева}}^{\text{до}}]$  манастъра Печерьского" and "чернуьцемь [X: чернорние] Федосьева [X:  $\Theta$ еосіева] манастура". 4 Не 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 "Таким Tolochko concluded: образом традиционно полагают заглавием «третьей» редакции *ПВЛ* 1117 г., на самом деле возникло на столетие позже и представляет собой заглавие Киевского свода начала XIII в."

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>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Толочко Алексей О заглавии Повести временных лет, Ruthenica (2006, 5), 248-250.

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> ПСРЛ 2: 627.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> ПСРЛ 2: 628.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Толочко, О заглавии, 250.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Толочко, О заглавии, 251.

<sup>&</sup>lt;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 Ukrainain Literature. Texts: Volume X, part I] (Cambridge, MA, 2003) [hereafter:

One should not reglect to take into consideration the Academy cupy ( $\lambda$ ) of the PVL. It along with the Radziwill copy testiles to the readings of their common example.

```
0.1:
H(z) . Genorise the repertion \operatorname{Kin}_{X}^{X} \wedge \overline{\mathbb{Q}}
Т. : постоя вели времени и указатани
        PRIOR BIRPOROSNA A VIA
                                       - поряжуннуца, филогрофика
A :
        Павьето временкаї хість.
                                        - порморт құзатфовадорысқ 🖘
       авже в кременникум кай-
И:
                                       - подрвор кура фодостивка
    — Прикласти првые на а лисетора угрнории AI объеть а
X :
                      0,2:
/L :
                             авуду останошил
т:
                             оттакучу остално иче
Р : в опастира поселивато, биода в опаж I
А С в дим гларм по-прискать, Фибда б попрад
И : э хвай гири поверескаго, беород се го топ ха
XIII в днагтира поръкато, бекордоу бивника
                      0.3:
Л. С. рускам уржал не отех к отка ката первые ки «🛠 🏲
Т с пруская земью выстрыней поча герере князыти
Р : раубкава çor a v н в отлиси пообпорыю к жети. І
А. : - <sub>(</sub>-8 4сав> I дом до наток моннобаторное кылыкиган
И : функциория «Пи длок ин полуж и фикс ком Б
X : раубал убла - вто в исп пога присс визжа.
                      0,4:
Л. С. н. Биорду рускава кожили стада сотте-с-
Т 1 - и от вкуду русках асточи страв жего
P: omitted
A : contitod
                              CRAMA DO D
Ν τ. η δικογιλής ροψικάς και αλικά απαλα ότ
```

Next, let us lunk at how editens of the PVL have rendered the title. $^{\parallel}$ 

BURN 2005L L

I have taken the makings from the following collisions (1) Here are recommended dome in 1; Besidence research Terrain, Hypercontent, Pea, A, A, Hermander, Herperball, 1916, C, 1, (2) Bytechnologist, C, A, Hypercontents, c, experimentally, C, A, Lypperballytin,

#### **0.1**:

Block Compositions approximate separations

 $E_{\rm MSC}$  повысть верменьных лист энспоризына ободосуща

Элик: ОВ ПОВЧИСУ ВРЕЖЛІВИНЫХ ЛЬТЬ.:

### Milk: Die Brzihlung von den Anfangsjahren, von «Nester» einem Mürch des

Повібшть зременьнікть дії, в чьоперионіє Феоу осменні.

#### 0.2:

Шаж отпакулу сеть пошьля

 $E_{\mathrm{SYS}}$  mahas then heneflokalo, otkyay egyl holluga

Дож Сели да ЕСТЬ ИСШЛА.

## Mill: Hilblerkhaters des Peodosij, water das Russische Land

🖿 т. реалиот шря присрыжкию, отпасуму ость пошьяю

### 0.3:

Піст. Рустаков домов, как отва. К ав та предстаръто попажния,

 $E_{ABC}$  гом восум элемия, и кто пълим почуль пытова киристу.

Jaac - 1990 КАС ЗОКОС КТО ВЪ КИСВЪ ИАЧА ПЕРВЫЕ КИЛЖИТИ,

### Milk: gehammen ist und wer in him zuerst begennen kat, als Pürst zu beurschen,

1 рустывающество в вайте почены почены провей кактура, предоставляющественных применентах применента

#### 0.4:

BDыт, а отпакуду рукьякая замия стала, отть,

 $E_{\rm SMS}$  is otherwise evolutional beams of analytical.

 $\sqrt{I}$ egy (II) OTK $\sigma$ ely (VCKA) (SESSO  $\sigma$  CTA/IA/ECCE)

Milk: und woher das Rossinche Land entstanden ist.

📠 с., и отникуду Русьякая замля стана, осты

One notices that, whereas Shahlmatov and Likhachev are in agreement that the phases "responsion a decrement is searce cupes merepairs are" does not belong in the title, Buguslavskii 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>rd</sup> reductions. Müller believed that the phase belongs in the exitiest reduction of the PVL, but

Tracers over Species Spec, 1. It Tracers are against as a, Cort., 10, A, Approximate, 3. (a), 2006. C, 31 (31), Beginnetiff's editor was proposed for publication in 1999, but did not see the light of day until Astonomy found the lost typeset copy in the archives and published it in 2006.

(5) Heaveness species was 2004, 2 mm, Fron, F. C. Tracerson, N.J., 1980, 1; 9. (4) Dis obtainable Chemit, superchisten den 180mb der River Hilberthistens Notes, in der Reduktion des Abter 18 vests our den Arbeit 1116, relevantaiert nach den kondulerführ Levens verlagt, Reduktionslagts, Abedentsbestagts, Buddelpis, Jost verlagts und Chiefentswage, tenn. Levelf 1400cs. Bundlech zur Neutreitswallt, incompagnism von Ledelf 1400cs. Bundlech 2001. 1, 1 include 1400cs inmulation because he translated from a vistual Review tent that he constanted conceptually using a stransministration from any published celline. (5) BURI 2005, 1 (so represented by the sightsmish.)

I suspect he has charged his mind since the publication of his translation as the most of Gippins' lengthy review. In creating his virtual text, Miller had based his decisions on a stemma that insolved only the six main manuscript witnesses. to the PVL and not any of the manuscript copies of the Younger Reduction of the Novemod I Chamiele (hematiter  $1111H_{201}$ ) unto that wove of the extent text of the Older Reduction coincides with any part of the PVL). Gippius argued that and including consideration of  $HHH \otimes a$  was an oversight, for the text in it that corresponds to the PVL provides us evidence about the relationship of the PVL. to the Narkal'mi swed thereafter NSv). Purthermore, he around that this relationship and the agreement of readings between P and A, on one band, and Mand X, on the other, can best be explained by contamination of MX on PA. In 2006, in the journal Russian Linguistics, Müller accepted Gignins' argument. about the contamination of XX on PX and draw up a stemma to represent the relationship of the 1111/1 on and the NSv to the PVL copies and reductions.\* Although wither Gippins nor Miller directly addressed the application of this contamination to the title of the PVL as Tolochko has done, it appears that dropping the phrase "von «Nestor.» einem Mörch des Höhlenklestens des Fernhaif". would be consistent with the views Müller expressed in his 2006 response to Ginning review.

In an article published in 1941, S. A. Bugoslavskii described the edition of the PVL that he had prepared using a stemma. In that article he discussed the inlationship of the HH //Am to the PVL. While mentioning the phase "or repare content Pychoses a conserv, in which are religiously the phase "or repare content Pychoses a conserve content,", he does not discuss any of the first part of the title. \*\*In 1981, I described the principles of using a stemma to edit the PVL and proposed the reading with "repropersion the experience expressions in the title. \*\*In the title. \*\*Union the phase in his 1941 article. \*\*When Artamanov's publication of Bugoslavskii ton thought that phase belongs in the title. \*\*But then, Bugoslavskii, Müller, and I were all using a similar stemma to reconstruct the archetype of the PVL (hereafter, PVLn), which does not involve contamination of HX on PA. In 1997 and 2000, respectively, Herace G. Laut and

Miller, Luibil; К. притите текета, п. текету и переволу. Пла пою грежесками мене, Russian Education (2006, 50), 401–456.

Бутостивенну, С. А. "Геологи времититу деть (Списки, ределции, первототе гланы телет). Соверения уровен комстол, Совност, состабления, Ред. П. К. Тудона, М.Я., 1941. С. 21.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Textual Criticism and the Present remnancyth lett Some Theoretical Committeentions, Harrand Ultradates Studies (1981, 5), 11–31.

Aleksai. Gippins proposed the encendation "replaced to a start," for "options of a control of the Introduction to the HURI 2003 edition, I recapitalized my argument for the title that I had proposed in 1981 (pp. 23–29) and explained why I was not accepting the encendation." publication of a term," to the title, "P Basically, I prefer the reading "resilient software outlands of the main manuscript witnesses do. They seem to have no problem with it since was of them tries to "connect" it. For us to do so would be to engage, in my opinion, in hyperconnection.

Recently I wrote an evaluation of Miller's acceptance of Gippins' argument and concluded that an alternative way for viewing the possible relationship of  $HH/I \ll n$ , NSv, and the PVL exists that is better than seeing contamination of  $HX \ll PA$ . If That alternative way posits contamination of the HH/I line on /IT. I had proposed in my introduction to HURI 2003 (1: XLIV—XLV) in a more indimensary masses that each a contamination exists. I will not inheares my settin argument hum, but I will outline the basics of it.

Editors and investigators of the PVL such as Skaldenatov, Rogadayskii, Miller, Percell, and Libbarhey have agreed that the manuscript copies mans or less directly attesting to PVL:s can be arranged in those groups (I use here the siels that Miller proposed in 2006): PA (the common exampler of the Radziwill and Academy copies); #17 (the common exemplar of the Lamestian and Trivity) copiech and MX (the common manufact of the Hypatian and Khlebulkov copied). In other words, the readings of P and A are generally closer to each other than they are to HT or HX. Libewise, the madings of H and T are generally closer to each other than they are to  $P \wedge \text{ and } M \times_{\mathbb{R}}$  and so forth. In addition, PA is closer to HT than it is to XX. On these points, the principle insestigators are in accord. Thus, when all copies agree on a marking that marking has the highest probability of having been in PVLcs. When //T agrees with UN against. PA, or when PA agencs with MX against JTT, then that reading of MX loss at high probability of leaving been in PVLs. When AT agrees with PA against. MX, then the mading either of MT+PA or of AX could have been in PVLo. The sterrors indicates no preference in that case.

Gippins claims (and his claims have been accepted by Miller and Tolorkho among others) that MX contaminated PA. The key concept have is "contamination" for if PA was genealogically closer to FX, then the agreements

Lint. Burner G. 1997. Почесть превидення ужите од Почесть премета премета и кето. Радинални (1997. St. 317-326. Потторе А. А. . Повесть преметних лит се верхностом тренежаждения и информация положина. Из намере о другие и други други. Т. 1: Другие за Трен. В., 2000. С. 440-460.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> Introduction, HURI 2008, I: LX-LXIII.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> The Nuclear and Seed Theory and the Present arrange of the P

I have also found that the vature of the respective agreements is different, such that when H and T agree with the  $HHH_{\rm MC}$  against a reading agreed to by  $P_{\bullet}(\lambda, M_{\bullet})$  and  $X_{\bullet}$  the nature of the difference in the readings is better explained. by a deviation from PVLer in the tent in 1111/1 an=H=T than in P=A=H=X. For example, null readings in PA+MX are less apt to be the result of contamination of MX on PA than additions in HT. More direct evidence of contamination of 1111/1 on /1 can be found, for example, in PVL 119,19, where /1 carries the reading "RANGARANGA RANGATH". This mailing can heat he explained by the scribe of HT combining the "magazine" reading of PVLs (as testified by P. A. H. and X) with the "sense on or mailing of the HHD time (as testified by HHD but). We find that P, A, and A testify to "RAGAA H" only (N has a lacona and T is not. estant). To accept the reading of // as primary and to try to explain the dropping Of "RANAMINA" in PA as the result of contamination from MX leaves uncoplained how and why  $T_{0.00} \otimes_{A} \otimes_{B} T_{0.00}$  was dropped from  $HH/I_{AM}$ . To be sare, all state of imaginative and convoluted somation could be created to describe why P. A. and H dropped Toxyga a mail whereas HHJI and dropped Toxyga mil. but the most elegant explanation is that the scribe of  $H\Gamma$  was conficuted with "RANGERAL IN" in his direct exemples and "RANGERA ANDIA" in his contaminating test. He could not or did not want to decide between them and included them both. Combining readings from two or mean summplans is a common artibal practice.

Now we can turn to Tolochio's argument. It has two parts. The first part deals with the contamination problem, the second part with linguistic usage of the pluran "Orogeovers are recompet." As concerns the first part of Tolochio's argument—the contamination of the Hyperian branch on the common exemplar of the Radziwitt and Academy copies—if one accepts Gippins' formulation that AN contaminated PA, then the agreement of P and A with M and N on the phrase "neperopose or Orogeo, one recommend to proceed a position in conclusing, as Tolochio did, that the phrase "repropose or Orogeo, as Vergoe as Orogeo, as Tolochio did, that the phrase "repropose or Orogeomes.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Sorbal Practices and Capping Probabilities in the Transmission of the Test of the Press' arranged by Administration 19, pp. 2 (2005), 50–56.

ear admaps a empore scaro account belong in PVLs. Yet, if one accepts my argument—that contamination occurred on //T from the HH//I line—then one must conclude that the plurae acceptance as Φeo/property was a major to be renepaled to a first belong in PVLs: because there is no reason to posit contamination of MX on PA.

As concerns the second part of Thinrhim's argument, the absence of the phase "Peroposition : Search in the interpretation of history for 1182 in the Hypatian branch, one made to point out that the learner "Vecenomera". does agreed in combination with other learnes elambase in the PVL (citations are from H only since the readings of P,  $\lambda$ , H, and X are at issue here)—for manph: PVL 187,5; evinka prespondra (sa. 1074); PVL 189,18-19; ex. окруссь фолодоль lic. (sa. 1074); and PVL 284, 13; мады проболого occupations. (s.a. 1109). It also appears in conjunction with "Herrebreakun"—für mannhe PVL 160,15-16: manker zuen merebes resin е жува весто, осводай онги **(ка. 1051); and PVL 160,24-25**; уоваты ж nefronce was a A. 60 progeorou a merchi (s.a. 1051). Finally, we find it with өз гэс пыр т **жиж: РVL 198,7-8:** тернор один, отвежоваюм изивае этом (s.a. 1074). The lack of appearance of the specific pluras for proposed is Φρογραμοίκες για του τε μετ τις περισμέσευνα" **in our sources between 1116 and ra**. 1200 may be more a result of our seast annue evidence than any probabition against, or other kindrance to, the use of that plotae before ca. 1200. There does rest appear to be any impossive against the phases "Progodices only ев гостыр Л., "Петережия колласть рь?", **жи** Феодосиясы, холласть ры Heregory . " consisting in time.

In the end, I must express my appreciation to Tolochko for his close mading of the source evidence, his attentiveness to recent developments in testnal interpretations of the PVL, and his raising questions and challenges to the HURI 2003 edition. But I must also respectfully disagnee that it is "impossible" to accept the mading "reproperse at Pengagness are not upon the representation the title of the PVL. Not only is it possible but it is the making that most likely was in PVLs.

Harvard University