



The President and Fellows of Harvard College

On "Nestor the Chronicler"

Author(s): Oleksiy Tolochko

Source: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 1/4, UKRAINIAN PHILOLOGY AND LINGUISTICS IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY (2007), pp. 31-59

Published by: [Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41304501>

Accessed: 29/09/2014 16:27

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and *The President and Fellows of Harvard College* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

On “Nestor the Chronicler”

OLEKSIY TOLOCHKO

BY THE TURN OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, the name of “Nestor the Chronicler” was already firmly established in the scholarship of the Russian Empire among those of Herodotus, Thucydides, and other “fathers of history.” Only a privileged few who could enjoy the luxury of independent thinking dared to challenge the received wisdom. Among the dissident minority was Count Sergei Rumiantsev, who in January of 1814 remarked to Konstantin Kalaidovich that he, the count, “does not believe in Nestor, assuming all these chronicles to be cloister records and Nestor himself a creation of Petro Mohyla” (также не верит Нестору, почитая сии летописи монастырскими записками, а самого Нестора Петра Могилы фабрикою).¹ Oddly enough, this brilliant intuition was expressed by an outsider (in contrast to his famous elder brother Nikolai, Sergei was a man not burdened by a profound education),² and his interlocutor, one of the few professional historians of the time, treated this remark as the excusable extravagance of a dilettante grandee. What Count Rumiantsev really meant was that the only source on which his contemporaries based their knowledge of Nestor’s biography was the *Paterik* of the Kyivan Caves Monastery published in 1661. Throughout the entire eighteenth century the *Paterik* was erroneously considered to be a Mohyla-sponsored publication. Therefore, the count reasoned that chronicles attributed in this source to Nestor’s authorship must, in fact, have been monastery records and not the Primary Chronicle; and furthermore, that Nestor himself as the author of chronicles was nothing more than a fabrication (фабрика) originating in the seventeenth century. This surprisingly striking insight enjoyed neither publicity nor followers at the time. Kalaidovich noted it as an oddity in his diary, which was published half a century later. Even had this insight been made public in due time, it would have been considered too amateurish and out of vogue to be taken seriously. The mainstream historians went in the opposite direction, trying to uncover proof that Nestor did write the Primary Chronicle sometime in the early twelfth century. Even those who opposed that idea never considered

Mohyla's times as the possible age when the notion of Nestor as the author of certain chronicles originated.

There are reasons to take Sergei Rumiantsev's conjecture seriously. What once sounded naive might well have been a profound idea.³ Ironically, his famous brother Nikolai—the chancellor, a man of broad historical interests, a patron of scholars and collector of antiquities—was instrumental in introducing to Russian scholarship the so-called fragments of “Toparcha Gothicus,” a forgery by Karl Benedikt Hase.⁴ The insight of the other Rumiantsev, unbiased by good education, may finally expiate the family sin.

*

The dictum about Nestor was formulated by Nikolai Karamzin:

Nestor, who is to be called the father of Russian history, lived in the eleventh century; he was gifted by a curious mind, he listened with attention to the oral legends of ancient times, to the popular historical tales; he saw the monuments, he saw the graves of the princes; he conversed with patricians, with the elders of Kyiv, with travelers, with dwellers of different Rus' regions; he read Byzantine chronicles, church notes and thus became the first chronicler of our motherland.⁵

In a way, Karamzin revealed the manner by which antiquarians of his own generation went about reconstructing the Kyivan past. As the sole product of Karamzin, this portrait belongs to the domain of belles lettres; it is not the assessment of a textual scholar. The rhetoric is worth noting as well. Nestor's place in public perception was not only that of the first Rus' writer; his very name became a synonym and symbol of Russian history. For those writing at the turn of the nineteenth century, it was a foregone conclusion that the earliest chronicle text came to be known as “Nestor's chronicle” or, even more casually, “the Nestor.” The first attempts to challenge the idea of Nestor's authorship showed how the very possibility of his dethroning scandalized the public. Those who dared were plainly accused of being unpatriotic and almost anti-Russian (fortunately, no Germans took part in the controversy, and the “Nestor question” was never transformed into something analogous to the “Varangian question” in Russian cultural discourse).

The skeptics raised their voices rather early, in the 1830s and 1840s. They sparked a short-lived but very intense discussion, academic in nature but with an overtone of public polemics. The two sides of the controversy exhausted their respective arguments very soon and the following century saw only the repetition of the same pros and cons. Nobody was convinced and the controversy died peacefully at the turn of the twentieth century. What survived,

however, was a firm and persistent belief that Nestor did indeed author the Primary Chronicle; the lack of discussion only reinforced its general acceptance. Although neither details nor the very philosophy of this discussion are relevant for my topic, it is useful nevertheless to recall its major points.⁶

As is well known, three pieces traditionally ascribed to Nestor have survived to our time: the so-called *Lectio* (*Chtenie*) on Boris and Gleb, the Life of St. Feodosii of the Caves Monastery, and the Primary Chronicle. It was established, by almost the first students of the problem, that if we agree to accept the idea that the first two were works by Nestor, a certain monk of the Kyivan Caves Monastery, then we must rule out the possibility that the chronicle could have been written by the same person. A number of factual contradictions between the undisputed pieces by Nestor and the chronicle were found.⁷ Many scholars have noted that the first two works differ considerably from the chronicle in terms of stylistics. The notion of a single author was most damaged, however, by the discovery that Nestor, the author of the *vitae*, and Nestor, the alleged author of the chronicle, presented totally different biographical information. In the entry for 1051 from the Primary Chronicle, the author insists that he came to the Caves Monastery while St. Feodosii was its father superior and was admitted by him at the age of seventeen. Similarly, in the entry of 1091, while telling the story of transferring St. Feodosii's relics, the author states that he was the saint's disciple. Nestor the author of the Life of St. Feodosii, however, tells us that he did not see the saint while he was alive, that he came to the monastery later and was made a monk by Stefan, the then father superior of the Caves Monastery. Unlike the author of the chronicle, who was rather critical of Stefan, Nestor the author of the *vitae* had a very high opinion of him.

The defenders of Nestor's authorship of the chronicle were apparently unable to overcome these difficulties. Their attempts follow several rather simple tracks: (1) there were two Nestors in the Caves Monastery at the same time, one of them the author of the *vitae*, the other the author of the chronicle; (2) the autobiographical details in the chronicle do not belong to Nestor the author of the entire Primary Chronicle; and (3) Nestor the author of the *vitae* must be sacrificed to maintain his authorship of the chronicle. The second approach proved to be the most popular, especially after Aleksei Shakhmatov began to dissect the once monolithic text into a series of "pre-Nestor" stages.⁸ The Primary Chronicle now came to be viewed as a fusion of chronologically divergent layers of text penned by various authors, a work to which Nestor gave final shape and grandeur. This analysis offered what appeared to be a textologically sound basis for the idea that the "autobiographical" sections might have been either interpolations into Nestor's original text or some unacknowledged contributions by previous authors "inherited" by Nestor's work. The major and most obvious defect of all the discussions was that the scholars involved, regardless of their actual position, viewed the issue in the context

of the eleventh and the twelfth centuries, whereas the “Nestor question” does not belong there. The idea that a certain monk of the Caves Monastery called Nestor was the author of the Primary Chronicle originated several centuries later, and the discussion should be moved to that time. Once set in its proper literary and intellectual milieu, the origins and true meaning of the Nestor myth are revealed.

It remains a firm fact that not a single text dating from the eleventh through the fourteenth century discusses Nestor’s activity as a chronicle writer. Not a single copy of a chronicle (with one notable exception) bears his name, whether in a title, in a colophon, or in the text itself. On the contrary, we know perfectly well the name of the man who signed the text of the Primary Chronicle, and it is not Nestor. The only person to have claimed the authorship of the Primary Chronicle was Sil’vestr, the father superior of the Kyivan St. Michael’s Vydubychi Monastery. In a colophon, Sil’vestr declared that he “wrote” the chronicle in 1116 while Volodimer Monomakh was the grand prince of Kyiv.⁹ Ironically, most scholars tend to regard Sil’vestr as an impostor who hijacked Nestor’s work. There is something very odd in this willingness to reject direct source evidence in favor of mere conjecture, as scholars had no special reasons for it then as now.¹⁰ With such evidence, the burden of proof was patently on Nestor’s supporters. Yet it was always the skeptics’ position that was presented as revisionist and iconoclastic. One must ask instead why Nestor’s name came to be attached to the Primary Chronicle at all?

It seems that nobody who has studied Nestor’s problematic authorship of the chronicle has raised the question of how the tradition of “Nestor the Chronicler” penetrated the scholarly discourse. He was already in the textbooks long before any of us ever started to learn our first history, apparently from time immemorial. But how did Nestor get there? Until the late 1730s nobody in Russia knew about a chronicler Nestor. The first to “discover” him was Vasilii Tatishchev. As late as 1735 he himself still thought that the Primary Chronicle was written by a certain monk named Feodosii and asked the Academy to send him “старого Киевского летописца, именуемого Феодосиева.”¹¹ This was a widespread view, based on a misunderstanding of the chronicle’s title (Feodosii became the author because “Феодосьева” was viewed to be the genitive of the author’s name [черноризца Феодосьева] and not the name of the monastery [Феодосьева монастыря]).¹² But Tatishchev eventually changed his mind. As the somewhat mystifying story goes, sometime in 1720 or 1721 he obtained in Siberia from an unspecified Old Believer a copy of a chronicle with Nestor’s name in the title (which Tatishchev called the Raskol’nik copy). Tatishchev found a second copy of a chronicle with Nestor’s name in the library of Prince Dimitrii Golitsyn (the so-called Golitsyn copy). Tatishchev knew the Kyivan *Synopsis* (the first book on history ever to be printed in Slavonic), which contains quite a number of references to “Nestor the Chronicler,” and in

addition he knew the 1661 edition of the Kyivan Caves *Paterik*, where Nestor's vita appeared for the first time. Consequently, Tatishchev was able to write a special chapter for his *Russian History*, "On Nestor and His Chronicle."¹³ In this chapter Tatishchev tried to sketch Nestor's biography and to establish the range of his literary works, chronicle writing first of all. Even before his *Russian History* came out, Tatishchev's copies of the chronicle were thought to have perished in a fire. These enigmatic copies, which no one was able to examine, introduced Nestor to national fame.

Be that as it may, *Russian History* remained unpublished until later in the century and thus for some time the Russian public still cherished the notion of Feodosii the Chronicler. This myth was finally destroyed by Fedor Miller (Gerhard Friedrich Müller). In the April 1755 issue of his periodical *Ezhe-mesiachnye sochineniia, k pol'ze i uveseleniiu sluzhashchie*, Müller published a special article "O rossiiskom letopisatele prepodobnom Nestore." As editor of Tatishchev's *Russian History*, Müller knew his papers intimately and simply reproduced Tatishchev's earlier observations. Later Prince Mikhail Shcherbatov and Major Ivan Boltin would base their assessments of Nestor the Chronicler on Müller's and Tatishchev's works. However, the monument to Nestor was erected by August Ludwig von Schlözer. In spite of the fact that both of Tatishchev's chronicle copies with Nestor's name were believed to have been lost and similar ones not yet discovered, Schlözer called his famous book "Nestor."¹⁴ Schlözer was viewed as an indisputable authority on everything concerned with the Primary Chronicle: his study made a revolution in Russian scholarship, and his verdict was taken as final for many years to come.

It is easy to surmise that everything that Russian scholars knew about Nestor came through a single medium—Tatishchev, and that he himself learned it only thanks to his acquaintance with Ruthenian, or more precisely, Kyivan texts of the seventeenth century. Alongside the *Synopsis* and *Paterik* this provenance should be suggested for both of Tatishchev's chronicles. The Golitsyn copy is the well-known Ermolaev copy of the Hypatian Chronicle, and the Raskol'nik copy can be identified as a descendant of the Khlebnikov copy of the same chronicle.¹⁵ In other words, the origin of the tradition of Nestor the Chronicler is *traditional*; that is, the academic community (and even such a sophisticated textual critic of his time as Schlözer) assumed without any verification a rather local Kyivan tradition, one that was unknown elsewhere before the second quarter of the eighteenth century. Thus we are led to look to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as the time of Nestor's "birth" and to Kyiv as a possible place of that birth.¹⁶

It would be useful for the purposes of this study to pretend that we know nothing about the iconic "Old Rus' chronicle writer Nestor" and that the vast body of literature on him was never written. My suggestion is to try to trace when, where, and in which texts his name first appears as a chronicle writer,

what kinds of texts were ascribed to Nestor, and how the idea of “the first Rus’ chronicle writer” developed.

One general observation should be made before I proceed. Traditionally chronicle writing has been studied as a more or less uninterrupted process commencing in the eleventh and ending in the early eighteenth century, with the chain of replication never seriously broken. This imagined chronicle-writing activity is supposed to cover, more or less uniformly, all the lands of a more or less precisely imagined “Old Rus’”—that is, essentially pre-Mongol Kyivan space—which somehow survived all the calamities of subsequent history. Set in a fanciful common cultural space,¹⁷ history writing in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and later in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth is viewed not as a separate textual tradition but a mere extension of “all-Russian chronicle writing,” not much different either in nature or appearance from, say, Muscovite chronicles of the same period. In fact, Ruthenian chronicle writing witnessed a very different development from that of Muscovy. Not only did the compilation of new texts not occur for almost three centuries,¹⁸ the reproduction of old texts stopped as well. For the entire period from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century only two copies of Old Rus’ chronicles were made: the Radziwiłł copy and the Pereiaslavl-Suzdal Chronicle (*Letopisets Pereiaslavl’ia Suzdal’skogo*), both from the fifteenth century and both copied in Lithuania from Great Russian originals.

Thus, in terms of Muscovite and Ruthenian chronicle writing, no common space existed from the fourteenth century on, and both traditions evolved separately with very little interaction if any. Each one developed its own set of ideas and concerns; each one drew on its own models and sources. No significant exchange of chronicle texts occurred before the early seventeenth century. Therefore, “Nestor” could not have possibly lived in both worlds. Whereas his tradition is prominent in Ruthenian space, it simply does not exist in the Muscovite context.

Muscovy witnessed an impressive surge in chronicle writing activity in the fifteenth century. With the growth of political and military power, previously inaccessible chronicle copies became available in Moscow, and central authorities took advantage of the opportunity to gain access to local tradition, Novgorod being the principal source. Some major compilations were produced at that time and they were replicated in a great many copies. It was at this time that the whole industry of chronicle writing in Moscow was launched, generating hundreds and hundreds of copies from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries. During the fifteenth century the Hypatian-type chronicle (whose late copies have Nestor’s name in the title) was used several times, serving as an important source for the Sophia I Chronicle, the Moscow Compilation of the late fifteenth century, and others. Amazingly, none of them shows any traces of knowledge of Nestor. For all their differences, history

writing in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania shares this feature with Muscovite records. The Lithuanian Chronicles, their copies largely from the sixteenth century, know no Nestor either (including the somewhat spurious Bykhovets Chronicle, which is based on the Hypatian-type chronicle). It is believed that across the border, Renaissance Polish historians utilized ancient Ruthenian or Muscovite chronicles, some of them apparently since lost. In the 1570s Maciej Strykowski even undertook a special inquiry into existing chronicle copies available in the Grand Duchy, having amassed the largest collection of his time. It is remarkable that no Polish author, from Jan Długosz to Marcin Kromer to Marcin Bielski to Strykowski, knew anything about Nestor the Chronicler. This, of course, is the argument of silence, but it shows exactly what such arguments are expected to show: in the successor traditions to pre-Mongol Kyivan chronicle writing, there was no notion of any monk Nestor authoring or even simply copying a chronicle.

Nestor's name appears for the first time in the title of the so-called Khlebnikov copy of the Hypatian Chronicle: "Пѡвѣсти вѣременъны(х) лѣт(т). нестера черъноризца. ѿеу(до)сіева манастира пе(ч)рскаго. ѿкоудоу е(с) пошла роу(с)каа зе(м)ла. и кто в неи поча(л) первое княжѣ(ти). и ѿкоудоу роу(с)каа земля стала е(с)." The codex in question is from the late sixteenth century.¹⁹ Judging from the fact that in an older copy of the same chronicle, in the Hypatian itself (1430s), Nestor's name is not to be found, we can safely assume that Nestor was not named as the author in their common ancestor.²⁰ All other copies of the Hypatian group that do contain Nestor's name are in fact the descendants of a single Khlebnikov copy. Thus, Nestor's name is unmistakably an interpolation introduced by the editor or the scribe of the Khlebnikov codex and belongs to the end of the sixteenth century. Additional support for the suggestion that even within this textual tradition the chronicle was not yet connected with Nestor's authorship comes from Grand Prince Vytautas's Circular Epistle of 1415. It deals with the consecration of Metropolitan Gregory Tsamblak and justifies this act by referring to the precedent of Klim Smoliatich: "А то нашли есмо написано стоитъ в летописцех русских, в киевском и в володимерском и в иных" (Which we had found written in Ruthenian chronicles, in the Kyiv and Volodymyr Chronicle, and in others).²¹ The "Kyiv and Volodymyr Chronicle" is undoubtedly a chronicle of the Hypatian type, and the absence of Nestor's name in referring to it is noteworthy. It is also important that the episode took place in 1415, very close to the date of the Hypatian copy, which, as it happens, does not mention Nestor.²² Thus, the earliest actual codex of Nestor's "authorship" appeared at the very end of the sixteenth century.

If not from a previous protograph, however, from where did Nestor's name find its way into the title of the Khlebnikov copy? It is true that during the fifteenth century some texts do mention chronicle-writing activity by Nestor.

These references, however, are confined to a single tradition, namely, that of the Kyivan Caves *Paterik*. In the so-called Arsenii version, preserved in a copy from 1406 (which is considered to be the original), in a story about Nikita the Hermit, there is mentioned “Нестеръ, иже написа Лѣтописецъ” (Nester who wrote the chronicle).²³ It seems that this casual remark made in passing (Nestor is mentioned here in a list of other early Caves fathers)²⁴ gave rise to further development of the Nestor theme in subsequent versions of the *Paterik*. In 1460 and 1462 two new versions of the *Paterik* were produced in Kyiv, commissioned by the choirmaster and later service supervisor Kasiian, hence the First and the Second Kasiian redactions. The two Kasiian redactions (but especially the Second) stand out for their unprecedented expansion of the *Paterik* with excerpts borrowed from a chronicle. Following the hint of the Arsenii redaction, Kasiian apparently assumed that the author of a chronicle at his disposal must have been Nestor, the monk of the Caves Monastery. In a story about Agapit the Physician, Kasiian makes a reference to a source not to be found in any previous redaction of the *Paterik*: “якоже блаженный Нестеръ въ Лѣтописци написа о блаженныхъ отцѣхъ, о Даміане, Іереміи, и Матѣи, и Исакии” (as the blessed Nester wrote about the blessed fathers Damian, Jeremiah, and Matthew, and Isaac in the chronicle).²⁵

Kasiian was guided by a belief that the chronicle he used was the same one mentioned in the *Paterik*. So in the First Kasiian redaction, the story about the beginnings of the Caves Monastery, borrowed from a chronicle entry of 1051, was given the title “Нестора, мниха обители монастыря Печерьскаго, Сказаніе что ради прозвася Печерьскый монастырь” (By Nestor, a monk of the Caves Monastery, a narration on how the Caves Monastery got its name).²⁶ In the Second Kasiian version, a chapter on the translation of St. Feodosii's relics (borrowed from the chronicle entry of 1091) is ascribed to Nestor as well: “Нестора, мниха монастыря Печерьскаго, о пренесеніи мощемъ святаго преподобнаго отца нашего Феодосіа Печерьскаго” (A discourse by Nestor, a monk of the Caves Monastery, about the translation of the relics of our most venerable father, Feodosii of the Caves Monastery).²⁷ Kasiian went so far as to insert Nestor's name into those places in the text where the narration was in the first person. His confidence in Nestor's authorship grew from version to version. Thus, at the end of a chapter on the founding of the Caves Monastery, instead of the words of the first redaction, which accurately follow the chronicle text (without the name) we read: “приидох же и азъ к нему, худый и недостойный азъ рабъ Несторъ, и приять мя, тогда лѣтъ ми сущу 17 от рождения моего” (I, the wretched and unworthy servant Nestor came to him, and he accepted me. I was then in my seventeenth year).²⁸ Kasiian apparently was not embarrassed by the fact that later, in the Life of St. Feodosii, he himself put down on paper the actual words spoken by Nestor: “тожде исписахъ азъ грѣшный Несторъ, мній всѣхъ въ монастыри преподобнаго отца нашего

Θεодосία Πριάτѣ же быхъ въ нь преподобнымъ игуменомъ Стефаномъ и якоже отъ того пострыжень быхъ и мнишескыя одежда сподобленъ" (This I, the sinful Nestor, the least of all the monks in the monastery of our venerable father Feodosii, have written down. I myself was received into the monastery by the venerable superior Stefan and was tonsured and invested with the monastic habit by him).²⁹

The above evidence was reviewed by specialists several times in the past with varying results. The majority of scholars tended to reject the idea that Kasiian had a chronicle copy with the name of Nestor: all the interpolations were seen as the result of Kasiian's own guesswork. Shakhmatov, too, agreed that Kasiian did not possess "some old chronicle text with the name of Nestor" and invented it by deduction; yet by some strange twist of thought, in the next sentence Shakhmatov insisted that it was "most likely that Kasiian came into possession of a *PVL* copy in whose title there was an indication that the *PVL* was composed by Nestor."³⁰

Kasiian was the first to deduce that Nestor wrote the chronicle. If, indeed, he did not possess some chronicle "with the name of Nestor," then how could he arrive at his surmise? In fact, it was hard for him to reach any other conclusion. Up until the 1630s there was only one chronicle text available in Kyiv—the Khlebnikov-type chronicle, and Kasiian had no knowledge about the dozens more abroad, in Muscovy. A single remark in the *Paterik* matched a single copy. Kasiian must have worked on the assumption that there existed an "Old Chronicle," which, naturally, could not be any other than the one referred to in the *Paterik* (the Arsenii version, as it happens, noted only one person involved in chronicle writing—the monk Nestor). Kasiian could not have avoided his "discovery," and, one should note, his discovery could only have happened in a Ruthenian setting. It would have been impossible in Muscovy, where the choice of chronicles would have been too great to guarantee one right selection. Kasiian's ignorance, fortunately, spared him this anxiety.

Towards the end of the fifteenth century writers in Muscovy also began to suspect that the author who wrote the chronicle entry of 1091 about the translation of St. Feodosii's relics and the author of the chronicle was one and the same person. The Moscow Compilation of the late fifteenth century contains the phrase "азъ же грѣшныи вземъ мотыку" (and I, sinful one, took a spade), into which its editor inserted the addition "иже и лѣтописание се в то время писахъ" (who was also writing this chronicle at that time).³¹ A Muscovite scribe had taken this first step, but proceeded no further: he lacked a name.

Kasiian was more fortunate, since he came to possess two texts simultaneously: the chronicle telling the story of St. Feodosii under the year 1091 (a rare passage written in the first person) and the *Paterik*, which included the Life of St. Feodosii signed by Nestor. He assumed them to be two pieces by the same author. In addition, Kasiian had the benefit of the *Paterik*'s hint about Nestor

writing some unspecified chronicle. It was only logical for him to assume that the entry of 1091, and, by extension, the whole of the chronicle, must be Nestor's work too.

Kasiian made his discovery in 1460 and confirmed it in 1462. Either date can serve as the birth date of Nestor the Chronicler. That would explain, among other things, just why no Khlebnikov-type copy written before that date could supply the name of Nestor. By the end of the fifteenth century, however, some Ruthenian booklovers started to make note of Kasiian's discovery. The reader of the so-called Pereiaslavl-Suzdal Chronicle identified, in the entry of 1051, a passage that he had spotted before in the Second Kasiian redaction and corrected the text so that it would agree with the latter's reading: "вънжи и азъ Нестер приидохъ 17 лѣтъ сушу и пріять мя, сеи же и написахъ."³²

During the fifteenth century, however, Kasiian's proposal did not enjoy popularity. It was only the following century that saw the first success of his conjecture. When it was decided to create a new copy of the chronicle in Kyiv in the 1560s (most probably, in the Caves Monastery, where the Kasiian versions had been produced a century earlier), the Nestor tradition was already well established locally. The manuscript produced is known now as the Khlebnikov copy. The editor entrusted with the task knew his *Paterik* and consulted its text while copying the chronicle, sometimes even having original readings amended according to the *Paterik* text.³³ For someone well versed in the *Paterik*, it was quite easy to recognize identical passages while copying the chronicle text and to note that they had been attributed there to Nestor. We know that the scribe recognized at least one, the entry for 1051. Opposite the words "къ нѣмоу же и азъ приидѡ(х) хоудыи. и недостоинныи рабъ" on the margin he added "нестѣ(р) мни(х)."³⁴ The scribe of the Khlebnikov copy was atypical. He was not a classically trained philologist, yet his interventions into the text were generally those of a learned man. He did not copy the original slavishly, but improved it if he saw fit: he unified the orthography to conform with the then fashionable Balkan models, identified and corrected some scripture quotations, and offered conjectures, some of them quite reasonable.

The situation of the Khlebnikov editor mirrored that of Kasiian a century earlier. He, too, was under the impression that the chronicle he was working on was the only one that had ever existed, and he, too, had both the chronicle and the *Paterik* on his writing desk. The anonymous "monk of the Feodosii's monastery" in the chronicle's title cried out to be named, and the only candidate for the job was Nestor of the Caves Monastery. The interpolation of his name in the Khlebnikov title made it the first chronicle ever written by Nestor.

The last decades of the sixteenth century were marked by a general decline in literary activity, and so the discovery of the ancient chronicle written by the Caves monk Nestor went virtually unnoticed at the time.³⁵ Besides, at a certain

point the Khlebnikov copy left Kyiv³⁶ to resurface there only in the early 1620s.³⁷ This second coming of Nestor was sensational.

In 1620 the Ruthenian Orthodox were visited by Theophanes, the patriarch of Jerusalem. Leaders of the community convinced him to consecrate a new Orthodox hierarchy, which he did in several stages. The restoration of the Orthodox hierarchy by an Eastern patriarch under the military protection of the Cossacks was a major event in the life of the Kyivan metropolitanate.³⁸ The last event of this many-staged process took place in February 1621, in Zhyvotiv, a town that belonged to Prince Stefan Sviatopolk-Chetvertyns'kyi, an Orthodox and a descendant of "old Kyivan princes." The importance of the moment was apparently recognized by many. To mark the solemnities, the old Rus' annals were brought on stage. It was in Zhyvotiv that the Khlebnikov copy made its dramatic entry. To commemorate the patriarch's visit, Prince Sviatopolk-Chetvertyns'kyi commissioned a copy of "Nestor's chronicle," which was completed in March 1621. This is the manuscript known today as the Pogodin copy.³⁹

With the patriarch departed to Moldavia and the Pogodin copy made, its original, the Khlebnikov copy, disappeared again (probably sent back to the Movilas who had apparently supplied it for the occasion). But not for long. The circumstances of its arrival had attracted attention to such a rarity. The Khlebnikov entered the scene at a very peculiar moment in Ruthenian intellectual life. With their hierarchy restored, though illegal, the very legitimacy of the Orthodox lay in their being successors to a millennium-long tradition. Shortly before the "rediscovery," Zakhariia Kopystens'kyi had transformed his anti-Uniate polemics so they would incorporate historically based arguments. This strategy, which presented the Uniate Church as a novelty and a break with Ruthenian tradition, proved very effective. Yet Zakhariia, as all Orthodox polemicists of the time, lacked domestic documents that would support such claims. He himself had to resort to Polish chronicles for information on Ruthenian history. The Orthodox desperately needed something that would unambiguously and decisively underscore their authenticity and, by extension, expose the fraudulent claims of their opponents. Here was the market for "Nestor's chronicle."

Zakhariia Kopystens'kyi made the note "Nestor's chronicle" in the margin of his *Palinodia* ca. 1621–1623. Yet for the next decade it seemed to be simply an inconsequential episode for the Kyivan literati. Things changed dramatically when Petro Mohyla became metropolitan of Kyiv in late 1632. Adopting certain practices from the post-Tridentine Counter-Reformation, the new metropolitan launched an impressive campaign aimed at restoring the Orthodox Church to the standing it rightly deserved. The restitution of historical memory was among the principal means to that end. Mohyla sponsored the

renovation of ancient sites that witnessed, as he believed, the moment when Rus' was baptized; he encouraged investigations into Rus' history; and he promoted the results of these studies in a series of publications issued by the Caves Monastery printing shop.

Bearing in mind the past links of the Mohylas (Movilas) to the Khlebnikov manuscript (see note 36), it is no wonder that we find it in the custody of Petro Mohyla in the 1630s. Mohyla appears to be its first modern student. The metropolitan collated the text with that of another chronicle,⁴⁰ and he marked some passages for Syl'vestr Kosov's attention. By the time the Khlebnikov came into Mohyla's possession, the book was in a deplorable state with its pages out of order and some even lost. The codex was restored in the 1630s and new copies produced.

In its new form it served as the principal source for the so-called Hustynia Chronicle produced in the mid-1630s in the circle of Mohyla's associates. "Nestor the Chronicler" is presented here as the major authority and referred to on numerous occasions.

In 1635 the Caves Monastery printing shop produced a Polish translation of the *Paterik*. *Paterikon abo Zywoty SS. oycow pieczarskich* was authored by Syl'vestr Kosov, who had been directed to the Khlebnikov by Mohyla. Kosov mentions Nestor in a list of his sources as "Śwety Nestor Zakonnik Pieczarski," and refers to his chronicle eleven more times.⁴¹

Three years later Afanasii Kal'nofois'kyi published *Teratourgēma or the Miracles...*, a treatise on miracles performed by the Caves Monastery saints. The book was intended as a supplement to Kosov's *Paterikon*. It also mentions Nestor among its major sources: "Śwety Nestor, Monach Pieczarski y Kronikarz Ruski." The appearance of Nestor's name in the *Paterikon* and *Teratourgēma* indicates that by this time the formula "Nestor the Chronicler" had already been coined. Kal'nofois'kyi further increased Nestor's citation index: all in all he refers to "Nestor's chronicle" nearly twenty times.

Having been introduced in Kyiv in the early 1630s, Nestor became an instant celebrity. No wonder. At a time when the Kyiv intellectuals grouped around the Caves Monastery were struggling to revive Ruthenian tradition and historical memory, the chronicle by Nestor, a monk of the Caves Monastery, was a discovery of tremendous importance. The Orthodox at last could appeal to a domestic and, more importantly, ancient source, composed within the very walls of the monastery. As the major defender of Orthodoxy, the Caves Monastery was eager to use this opportunity to promote itself as a place where one of its own monks had given birth to its oldest historical tradition. It thus would become not only the hub of the sacral tradition of Rus', but also the principal guardian of its historical memory about "the glorious times of princely rule." Kosov made this clear in his dedication to Adam Kysil', reminding his benefactor that the

Lavra is the "treasury of Rus' history, the nest of the holy fathers, where God preserved the ancient annals."⁴²

Nestor's reputation in the seventeenth century was also supported by the new fashion of attributing to him the entire Caves *Paterik*, as evidenced by the title of Kosov's *Paterikon* (*słowińskim ięzykiem przez świętego Nestora Zakonnika y Latopisca Ruskiego przed tym napisany*). It is difficult to determine what made Kosov arrive at such a conclusion (chances are, it was a result of mere misunderstanding: the scribe of a copy used by Kosov was a certain "Дьячок Нестрепц").⁴³ From this time on, each subsequent manuscript version of the *Paterik* and printed editions of the text would have Nestor's name in the title. And it is important that the alleged author of all these *Pateriks* was not simply Nestor, but *Nestor the Chronicler*.⁴⁴ Ironically, Nestor's chronicle-writing activity for the *Pateriks* became more important than his authorship of several *vitas*.

One might form an opinion that for Kyivan intellectuals of the seventeenth century "Nestor" may have become synonymous with a certain type of chronicle—the Khlebnikov or a similar one—which bears Nestor's name in the title. To some extent this is true. But more often than not, the actual texts cited under this label are not those of the "genuine" Nestor. Though we may rightfully suspect that the Khlebnikov copy was not Nestor's work, the seventeenth-century writers had no doubts that it was genuine Nestor. The Nestor myth, however, would generate a series of further fakes, texts ascribed to Nestor that have nothing to do with the Khlebnikov copy. "Nestor" became an alias for any chronicle-like text at all and virtually any chronicle could be called "Nestor" and be quoted under his name.

Such a custom, it seems, was inaugurated by the very first promoters of Nestor. Kosov, who had definitely read the Khlebnikov, glossed different materials as Nestor's work—for example, those borrowed from the Second Kasiian redaction of the *Paterik* (the narration on the beginnings of the Caves Monastery) and from the Hustynia Chronicle (the passage on the five baptisms of Rus'). Kal'nofois'kyi followed his example in *Teratourgēma*. Although some of the quotations under Nestor's name there were clearly borrowed from the Khlebnikov, others are obvious quotations from the Hustynia Chronicle (the account about the renovation of the Church of the Dormition by Symeon Olel'kovych in 1470 or the legend of Batu's death in Hungary in 1247) and still others are borrowings from the Second Kasiian redaction of the *Paterik*. In one instance, a reference to Nestor masks a borrowing from Kopystens'kyi's foreword to the Lavra edition of the *Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on Fourteen Epistles by St. Paul* (the legend on the origins of the "gifts of Monomakh," in its turn borrowed by Kopystens'kyi, most probably, from the Sophia I or a similar chronicle).⁴⁵

From the very beginnings of the Nestor myth no particular chronicle was understood as a work by Nestor, but rather the chronicle as a genre, or more broadly, any text on history. One important thing should be mentioned in this connection. All the copies of the older version of the Hustynia Chronicle (five out of eight) attribute it to Nestor (“лѣтописецъ творение Прп(д)бнаго ѿца нашего Нестора монаха мона(с)тира Печерскаго, ꙗже ѡ нашем Россійскомъ”), and some of them even provide the exact date of composition, 1073. The date, of course, is a late invention: 1073 was the year when the Dormition Cathedral of the Caves Monastery was founded, a date of special symbolism for the monastery. The title with Nestor’s name was not part of the original design, of course, but it was added to the Hustynia Chronicle rather soon. Apparently, for many contemporaries this adaptation of “Nestor’s chronicle” seemed a better Nestor than the Khlebnikov itself. It was equipped with all the necessary embellishments of the time (footnotes, references to Polish historians, etc.)

From the 1630s on, the Nestor myth would be disseminated through various agencies: by filiation of the Khlebnikov copies, by the spread of the Hustynia Chronicle copies, and, most important, by the printing press of the Caves Monastery, which produced hundreds and hundreds of *Pateriks*.

Thus, the so-called Ukrainian Chronograph (composed in the second quarter of the seventeenth century), citing Nestor, the Caves chronicler, quotes, in fact, a corresponding passage from the Hustynia Chronicle on the renovation of the Dormition Cathedral by Prince Symeon Olel’kovich in 1470. In another instance it is the Life of Princess Ol’ha in the version of the *Stepennaia kniga* that is quoted while referencing Nestor the Chronicler. And on two occasions it is the *Kronika Polska* by Maciej Strykowski that pretends here to be “Nestor’s chronicle.”⁴⁶ Chances are, the author of the Chronograph never even saw the Khlebnikov copy, the bona fide Nestor. All he knew was the prestige and authority associated with Nestor’s name and that to quote him was the fashion of the time.

Sometimes it was even not a history text at all that was presented as Nestor’s chronicle: in the polemical treatise *Indicium* (composed in 1638 by an anonymous monk of the Vinnytsia Monastery), its author quotes *Supplementum Sinopsis* (a polemical treatise of 1632) but justifies his point by remarking, “Toż właśnie nasz historik ruski Nestor ś. [on the margin: Nestor, historyk ruski], posłusznik ś. Theodozego, archimandryty Pieczarskiego, w Kronice dzieiow ruskich pisze.”⁴⁷ The author of *Indicium*, probably close to the Vinnytsia school (and thus to Kal’nofois’kyi and Kosov), knew about the recent Kyivan vogue and wanted to reflect it, but had no chronicle text and tried to do his best with whatever limited resources he possessed.

Such things happened not only to provincials. Even in the Lavra itself, where the myth originated, there was an inclination to do the same. The famous *Synopsis*, a historical text of paramount importance, is full of quotations from

Nestor. Yet those citations of source are in the same category as the mythical "numerous Rus' chronicles," "ancient Rus' chronicles," and even "vellum chronicles" that the *Synopsis* marshals in its support. All these references were aimed at producing an image of a very solid piece of scholarship, but in fact the tools of the author of *Synopsis* (whoever he might be) were very limited: besides *Kronika Polska* by Maciej Strykowski (and even this not in the original, but rather in a translated and abridged form) and the Hustynia Chronicle, he used no other historical sources.⁴⁸ The *Synopsis* was very important in spreading the Nestor myth. First published in 1674 and reissued in 1678, with three more editions dated to 1680 (but in fact printed up to the 1690s), it was the first history bestseller in Eastern Europe. The actual print runs are unknown, yet there is little doubt that for the next century the *Synopsis* remained the most popular work on Rus' history. For many Ukrainians and Russians it was the first and the last book on history they ever read, sometimes at a fairly young age, and with it Nestor's name was firmly imprinted in memory.

Attempts to adapt Nestor for educational purposes were made rather early. Virtually all the Kyivans associated with the Nestor myth (Syl'vestr Kosov, Afanasii Kal'nofois'kyi, Innokentii Gizel', Feodosii Sofonovych) were teaching in the Kyiv Collegium at some point in their careers. As the last will and the testament (1646) of Afanasii Kal'nofois'kyi reveals, one of Nestor's first aficionados put together a "paperback" edition of Nestor's chronicle, which is registered among his books as "Епитоми chronologiae sancti patri nostri Nestoris pro recompositione pueris danda, ut sciant gentis sua acta" (Synopsis of our father Saint Nestor's chronicle composed for the young, so they can learn the deeds of their history).⁴⁹ This work is apparently lost, and it remains to speculate whether it was indeed an abridgment of the Khlebnikov-type chronicle, or a book similar to the later *Synopsis*. Another attempt was more fortunate. In the 1690s Lev Kyshka, the future Uniate metropolitan of Kyiv, prepared an abridged Polish translation of a Khlebnikov-type chronicle, which he called *Annales sancti Nestoris* and apparently used while teaching in a Volodymyr school. Nestor, of course, never wrote in Polish and could not have known *Annales ecclesiastici* by Caesar Baronius (which serves here as the source of the chronological grid), yet unlike Kal'nofois'kyi, Kyshka never even hinted that his work was not what the Caves monk had written six hundred years earlier.

In a word, Nestor became a sensation of the early seventeenth century and maintained that status throughout the rest of the century. And as is often the case with a celebrity, his name must have been well known, but his works were hardly read.⁵⁰ His reputation was spread and supported by a kind of propaganda campaign launched, controlled, and sustained by the Caves Monastery. In most cases it was enough only to mention his name or to make a reference to his work to prove one's point. By mid-century Nestor had already become such a powerful authority that his chronicle was even used in legal disputes

and proved to be superior to any legal document. When in 1656 the Lavra filed suit against the Vydubychi Monastery to gain control over the ferryboat route across the Dnieper River, Vydubychi hegumen Ihnatii Starushych called on Nestor as his principal witness. He presented the chronicle entry of 1097 (it mentions that Prince Vasil'ko Rostislavich crossed the Dnieper on his way to Vydubychi), “беручи довод Нестором, кройникаром або лятописцом Печарским киевским за фундамент sprawy своея.” Ironically, the Lavra, Nestor’s “birthplace,” lost the case and commissioners Anton Zhdanovych and Fedor Vyhovs'kyi, appointed by the hetman Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi, ruled in favor of Vydubychi Monastery.⁵¹

By the second half of the century, Nestor was ranked among the most important ancient authors. The prestige of his name turned him into an author of *vitas* for the second time in his career. The so-called Ukrainian Life of Prince Volodymyr (starting with the printed edition of 1670) bears Nestor’s name in its title: “выбрано з лѣтописца Руского, преподобнаго Нестора Печерского.” (Its major sources, however, were the *Paterikon* of 1635, the *Hustynia Chronicle*, and the *Kronika Polska* by Maciej Strykowski.)⁵² Somewhat later, in his famous “Books of Saints’ Lives,” Dymytrii Tuptalo coauthored with Nestor the Life of St. Volodymyr (“сія історія житія его собрана изъ Лѣтописца Руского преподобнаго Нестора Печерскаго”), the Life of Theodore and John the Varangians (“отъ преподобнаго Нестора Лѣтописца Печерскаго”), and some others.

The “real” Nestor—that is, the Khlebnikov-type chronicles—had to compete with these simulations. Shortly before the *Synopsis* was published by the Lavra, Feodosii Sofonovych, father superior of St. Michael’s “Golden-Domed” Monastery in Kyiv produced his *Chronicle Taken from Ancient Annalists* (1672). Its title recommended the work as the fusion of two Ruthenian classic authors: Nestor and Strykowski (“Кроиника з лѣтописцо(в) стародавних, з святого Нестора пече(р)ского киевского, а также зъ кроиник полскихъ”).⁵³ In terms of content, it was indeed very close to the Khlebnikov-type text (although Nestor here spoke in a heavily Polonized Ruthenian), yet it proved far less successful than the *Synopsis*.

With the number of Nestor-based compilations pretending to be originals growing, it was hard to tell real from fake. Even experienced writers like Dymytrii Tuptalo sometimes had difficulty discerning which was which. As early as the 1690s he knew both “Nestors,” the Khlebnikov and the *Hustynia* chronicles, yet the way he quoted Nestor in “The Catalog of the Metropolitans of Kyiv with a Brief Chronicle Appended” (1691) and in his famous “Books of Saints’ Lives” proves that he hardly distinguished between them.

For all his fame, Nestor remained a rather mythical figure. Nobody knew exactly when he lived or exactly what he wrote. Any chronicle could be presented as written by Nestor and everything that was known about ancient times

was presented as if read from "Nestor's chronicle." Before the 1660s there was considerable uncertainty about the biographical details of Nestor's life: the author of the Chronograph was certain that Nestor was a near contemporary of St. Ol'ha (the tradition of the *Paterik*); that he was a disciple of St. Antonii; that he was accepted into the monastery by St. Feodosii but at the same time also by Stefan. The titles of the Hustynia Chronicle insisted that Nestor wrote the chronicle in 1073. Oddly enough, nobody in the seventeenth century seemed to notice that the chronicle Nestor was credited with writing continues through the twelfth and closes at the very end of the thirteenth century. The Primary Chronicle, the Kyivan Chronicle, and even the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle of the thirteenth century (all three are Hypatian-type manuscripts) were attributed to "Nestor." One of the seventeenth-century students of the Khlebnikov codex, having reached the end of the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle, noted in the margin: "Здѣ є(ст) конецъ Кро(й)ники Несторовы."⁵⁴

Although Nestor is referred to as a saint from the very start (and as early as 1638 Kal'nofois'kyi was able to show Nestor's relics in the caves), the exact moment of his canonization is not known. Nestor's first vita appears only in the *Paterik* of 1661 (reissued by Dymytrii Tuptalo under 27 October)⁵⁵ and is clearly composed of biographical data already found in the Second Kasiian redaction.⁵⁶ The date of Nestor's commemoration also reveals its late origin: 27 October is the feast day of martyr Nestor of Thessaloniki. Services for Nestor are known only from the beginning of the eighteenth century.

All this inconsistency, uncertainty, and lack of precise knowledge is not surprising. With an explosive growth in popularity, that is what one would expect. His became a brand name. Various people go on record trying to claim familiarity with Nestor's name, if not his works. Any text even remotely concerned with history asserted that it had Nestor among its sources. Any text on history was believed to be Nestor's work. It mattered not that people had a very vague notion of when Nestor lived or what he authored. The picture, then, is of an expanding myth. The cumulative effect of these rather chaotic efforts was that Nestor came to be viewed as the most important writer of Kyivan times, with the Rus' Chronicle being his major achievement.

The overview of what happened to Nestor during the seventeenth century allows several observations: (1) Nestor's rise to prominence was made possible by the specific conditions in which post-Union Ruthenian intellectual life developed; (2) there was no tradition regarding Nestor independent of the Second Kasiian version of the Kyiv *Paterik*; (3) Nestor's fame was spread either by erroneously attributed texts or through Khlebnikov-type copies of the chronicle; (4) no chronicle with Nestor's name in its title ever existed before the Khlebnikov and its descendants; and (5) Nestor's name in the latter is an interpolation made in the late sixteenth century under the influence of the Kasiian redaction of the *Paterik*. To sum up: despite the unwavering belief

in the early modern period that the tradition regarding Nestor was based on sources now lost, all we have is the sole spurious evidence of the Khlebnikov copy. Nestor may have written the Primary Chronicle, but there is no way of knowing it.

For a long time Nestor's myth remained a local Ruthenian tradition unknown elsewhere. Even in the first decades of the eighteenth century, in all of Russia only former students of the Kyiv Collegium such as Feofan Prokopovych, Stefan Iavors'kyi, or Dymytrii Tuptalo knew that there was a major Rus' historian Nestor the Chronicler, whereas their younger contemporary Vasiliï Tatishchev twenty years later would still look for the "chronicle of Feodosii." Among foreigners only Johannes Herbinus knew about Nestor (he called him "Ruthenorum historicus chronologus Nestor"), and that was simply because he had visited Kyiv and the Caves Monastery, was told about Nestor, and was shown his grave in the crypts. Herbinus's guide happened to be Innokentii Gizel'.

Still, there remain in Tatishchev's works two enigmatic chronicles with Nestor's name in their titles, also believed to have been lost after the historian had died. They are supposedly witnesses of a tradition independent from the Khlebnikov copy. The first of these chronicles, known as the Golitsyn copy, is certainly of Ukrainian origin. After all, Prince Dimitrii Golitsyn was the voivode of Kyiv and many of the manuscripts in his vast collection came from Kyiv. Contrary to popular belief, the Golitsyn copy has survived. It is well known and was published several times as the Ermolaev copy.⁵⁷ For many a scholar the Golitsyn copy seemed ancient (supposedly, a copy of a pre-Mongol manuscript), since Tatishchev had reported that it lacked a Galician-Volhynian portion. Yet Tatishchev also noted that the manuscript was written in a "White Russian hand," the standard description of Ukrainian hands throughout the eighteenth century. Some peculiarities of the codex as described by Tatishchev lead to copies of the Khlebnikov group: "В нем многое разтеряно, знатно, с чего оной списыван, тот поврежден был, ибо на полях того же писца рукою приписывано тако: 'зде нечто проронено.' Он кончится в 1198-м году, но окончание его утрачено: а потом 19 лет спустя нечто непорядочно новейшее выписано."⁵⁸ One can recognize here a similar gloss in the Khlebnikov ("тѣ(т) много чого(с) нема(ш)")⁵⁹ and an identical one in the Iarots'kyi (1651) and Ermolaev (1710s) copies ("Тѣтъ перестѣплено лѣтъ ѿ").⁶⁰

Why did Tatishchev decide that the Ermolaev copy lacked a Galician-Volhynian portion? The person who produced the Ermolaev clearly discriminated between the Kyivan Chronicle and its Galician-Volhynian sequel: between the two parts two blank folios (four and a half pages) were inserted; the Kyivan part has the old Cyrillic foliation, while the Galician-Volhynian portion has a newer Arabic one. It was this codicological seam that probably

caused Tatishchev's mistake: he (or the scribe he had hired) did not realize that what followed after the blank pages was also a chronicle text.

The second chronicle Tatishchev mentions, the Raskol'nik copy, was very similar to the Golitsyn: it, too, bore Nestor's name in the title and its text ended at about the same point, in 1197. Tatishchev claimed that it was on vellum, "of an old tongue and script," with *iusy*. "Vellum" is quite puzzling, but the *iusy* are normal in the Balkanized orthography of Ukrainian manuscripts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Tatishchev reported that the chronicle's title was "Повести временных дей Нестора, черноризца Феодосиева Печерского монастыря," which unmistakably identifies the Raskol'nik copy as belonging to the same family as the Khlebnikov.⁶¹

Finally, the puzzling absence of the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle in one or both copies (if indeed they lacked it) finds its parallel in *Annales sancti Nestoris*, mentioned earlier. This Polish translation was made from a Khlebnikov-type original that apparently lacked the Galician-Volhynian portion.⁶²

We have thus come full circle and it is time to conclude. We have every reason to assume that Nestor did not compose the Primary Chronicle at the beginning of the twelfth century. He may have done so, but not a single piece of current evidence can document it. The idea of ascribing priority in the writing of the Rus' Chronicle to Nestor first occurred to Kasiian in the mid-fifteenth century. The first chronicle "written" by Nestor was the Khlebnikov copy of the late sixteenth century. This made Nestor the ultimate Methuselah. He was born in the fifteenth century, spent his early years in the sixteenth, and become a celebrity author in the seventeenth. Nestor's "birthplace" was the Caves Monastery, where he became an adopted child of the brethren.

Nestor the Chronicler proved a very apropos figure for Kyivan literati of the seventeenth century. He allowed Western educated intelligentsia with a modern sense of authorship to relate to an otherwise anonymous and faceless medieval chronicle tradition and to accept it as their own. His very name—Nestor—that so agreeably reminded those schooled in classical literature (former students of Zamojski Academy or the Kyiv Collegium) of the image of Homer, provided Nestor the Chronicler with some noble connotations.

Nestor the Chronicler is the result of "archeological research" carried out by intellectuals grouped around the Lavra and the Collegium. The real Nestor, a monk of the Caves Monastery, authored two very important lives but hardly contributed to the chronicle writing. He was an excellent writer in his own right, but he should be denied the honor of composing the Primary Chronicle. If we still sympathize with his plight, we may console ourselves with the idea that losing an irrelevant name, we acquire one more first-rate writer of the early twelfth century.

NOTES

1. "Zapiski vazhnye i melochnye K. F. Kalaidovicha," in *Letopisi russkoi literatury i drevnosti*, ed. Nikolai Tikhonravov, vol. 3 (Moscow, 1861), pt. 2, "Materialy," 82.
2. A general belief, which was unfair to Sergei Rumiantsev. In the 1770s the Rumiantsev brothers became acquainted with Baron Grimm, who later became their tutor. Grimm took the Rumiantsevs to the Netherlands, where they studied at the University of Leiden, then to Paris and Switzerland (in Geneva the Rumiantsevs met Voltaire), and finally to Italy (V. S. Ikonnikov, *Opyt russkoi istoriografii*, vol. 1, bk. 1 [Kyiv, 1891], 136). The brothers thus were probably the first Russians to have conducted the so-called Grand Tour.
3. An 1815 letter from Nikolai Rumiantsev to Kyivan scholar of antiquities Maksym Berlyns'kyi gives us an insight into what was considered to be serious research at that time. The count urged him to look more closely into local antiquities, hoping that he would find the originals of the *Pravda ruskaia*, the Kyivan Caves *Paterik*, and, most precious of all, the parchment original of Nestor's chronicle. "Perepiska gosudarstvennogo kantslera grafa N. P. Rumiantseva s moskovskimi uchenymi," in *Chteniia v Imperatorskom Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei Rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete*, 1882, bk. 1 (Moscow, 1882), 191–92.
4. As we now know, thanks to the brilliant study by Ihor Ševčenko; see his "The Date and the Author of the So-Called Fragments of Toparcha Gothicus," in *Byzantium and the Slavs: In Letters and Culture* (Cambridge, Mass., 1991), 353–478.
5. N. M. Karamzin, "Ob istochnikakh Rossiiskoi istorii do XVII veka," in *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo*, 5th ed., bk. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1842; repr., Moscow, 1988), xv.
6. Two rather old surveys of the literature still remain very useful today: Ikonnikov, *Opyt russkoi istoriografii*, vol. 2, bk. 1 (Kyiv, 1908), 334–417; P. Klepats'kyi, *Ohliad dzherel do istorii Ukraïny*, pt. 1 (Kamianets, 1920). A review of more recent studies can be found in A. G. Kuz'min, *Nachal'nye etapy drevnerusskogo letopisaniia* (Moscow, 1977); and in *Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti Drevnei Rusi: XI–pervaia pol. XIV v.* (Leningrad, 1987), 276–78. In English a very good review of the debate on the authorship is the respective section in Samuel H. Cross's introduction to his translation of the Primary Chronicle; see "The Russian Primary Chronicle," *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature* 12 (1930): 80–86.
7. These are catalogued in Cross, "Russian Primary Chronicle," 81–85.
8. Shakhmatov summarized what he believed to be the evidence for Nestor's authorship in a special essay "Nestor the Chronicler," first published in a Festschrift for Ivan Franko; see his "Nestor Letopisets," *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka* (Lviv) 117–18 (1914): 31–53; repr. in A. A. Shakhmatov, *Istoriia russkogo letopisaniia*, vol. 1, *Povest' vremennykh let i drevneishie russkie svody*, bk. 2, *Rannee russkoe letopisanie XI–XII vv.* (St. Petersburg, 2003), 413–28. He described "die Nestor Frage" as a problem especially dear to his heart. Perhaps this emotional

state of mind is responsible for the statement that "the most solid and authentic proof" of Nestor's authorship is the absence (in the past) of a chronicle copy with his name in the title (p. 424).

9. For our purposes it does not matter what the proper translation of "напис(а)х" might be: it could stand for "composed," "sponsored," or even simply "commissioned" (all three would cover the medieval notion of authorship). It is important that Sil'vestr claimed the authorship of the chronicle at about the same time when it is believed that Nestor also must have been active in chronicle writing.
10. The reasons are emotional, not factual. It is well known that Shakhmatov, a firm believer in Nestor, was willing to revise his general schema of chronicle writing several times in order to accommodate Nestor's activity. Shakhmatov finally came up with the idea of three versions of the Primary Chronicle: the first was composed around 1110 by Nestor with his name in the title but did not survive; the second was sponsored in 1116 by Sil'vestr (survived in the Laurentian, Trinity, Radziwiłł, and Academy copies), and the third was written in 1118 (now to be found in the copies of the Hypatian type). Shakhmatov's stemma may well be accurate and a first version of the Primary Chronicle or *Pověst' vremennykh lēt* (hereafter *PVL*) may well have existed. Still, it does not explain why Nestor should be considered its author. Shakhmatov's stemma may do just as well without Nestor, and his insistence on Nestor's authorship is shown to be purely ideological, not textual. Shakhmatov's constructions are too well known to be discussed here at any length. Of greater interest is the further development of his ideas by some of his students, who betray an emotional component in their argumentation. Evhen Perfets'kyi, Shakhmatov's pupil and a devoted follower of his ideas, also distinguished three versions of the *PVL*. The oldest one, by Nestor, did not survive in its original form but is witnessed by the texts of the Sophia I and Novgorod IV chronicles. The second (as in the Laurentian, Trinity, and Radziwiłł copies) was commissioned by Sil'vestr. Finally, the third version (as in the Hypatian-type chronicles) must have been a contaminated one based on the first two. It is here that Nestor's name survived. Why it does not appear in the second version is obvious: having plagiarized Nestor's work, Sil'vestr must have substituted his own name for Nestor's. "In so doing," suggests Perfets'kyi, "Sil'vestr not only deprived Nestor of his distinguished place as the first Rus' chronicler and historiographer, but he also tried to seize this place for himself" (Evhen Perfets'kyi, "Peremyshl's'kyj litopysnyi kodeks pershoi redaktsii v skladi khroniky Iana Dlugosha," *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka* 147 [1927]: 36–42). Such an emotional attack on a seemingly innocent Sil'vestr may suggest that the whole schema was constructed with the intent of rescuing Nestor for the pantheon of Rus' historians. This is further supported by the scholar's final ruling: "It is clear that my thorough discrimination among the extant texts from different compilations and the three versions of the *PVL* completely solves the problem of Nestor's authorship." Yet Perfets'kyi was not able to resolve some major problems. Sil'vestr's crime may have accounted for the absence of Nestor's

name in the second version of the *PVL*. But why is it absent in the first version as well (Sophia I and Novgorod IV chronicles are also silent on Nestor)? His name surfaces only in the latest copies of the latest, third version. And from where would this last version have recovered Nestor's name, since both of its sources (i.e., the first and second versions) were unable to supply it? Shakhmatov put it vaguely: "The Nestor tradition in the *PVL* influenced that ancient compilation that served as the source for some corrections in the Khlebnikov copy of the sixteenth century" (Shakhmatov, "Nestor Letopisets," 427).

11. S. L. Peshtich, *Russkaia istoriografiia XVIII veka*, pt. 2 (Leningrad, 1965), 137; A. I. Andreev, "Trudy V. N. Tatishcheva po istorii Rossii," in V. N. Tatishchev, *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 1 (Moscow, 1994), 16.
12. The title of the Radziwiłł copy reads: "Повесть временны(х) лѣтъ. черноризца Февдосьева монастыра Печерьскаго, ѿкоуда є(с) пошла роу(с)ская земля. и кто в ней поча(л) первое кнѣжити." *Radzivilovskaia letopis'*, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1994) (facsimile reproduction); *Polnoe Sobranie Russkikh Letopisei* (hereafter *PSRL*), vol. 38 (St. Petersburg, 1989), 11 (normalized transcription). Other copies of the Primary Chronicle with a similar title had not yet been discovered at the time.
13. Tatishchev, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 1:119–21. For an earlier (but identical) version, see *ibid.*, vol. 4 (1995), 44–46. *Istoriia Rossiiskaia* was originally published in 1767.
14. August Ludwig von Schlözer, *Nestor: Ruskiia letopisi na drevle-slavenskom iazyke*, 3 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1809–1819). Several important textual critics of their generations (Mikhail Pogodin, Aleksei Shakhmatov, Mikhail Priselkov) followed suit by giving similar titles to their studies. Shakhmatov entitled his 1890 inaugural lecture at Saint Petersburg University "On Compositions by St. Nestor" and later taught the course "Nestor's Chronicle."
15. For more details, see my *"Istoriia Rossiiskaia" Vasiliia Tatishcheva: Istochniki i izvestiia* (Moscow, 2005), 102–69.
16. Oddly enough, the only study that clearly, if inadequately, implied the possibility of a late origin for the tradition of Nestor as the author of a chronicle was a short article by the same Evhen Perfets'kyi, who in less than ten years would switch to the opposite view; see his "Do pytannia pro Nestora Pechers'koho," *Ukraina: Naukovyi tr'oxmisiachnyk ukraïnoznavstva* (Kyiv), no. 1–2 (1918): 11–20.
17. See some very insightful remarks by Edward Keenan, who argues that a common Rus' space never existed, or if it once did, it was history by the turn of the seventeenth century. Edward L. Keenan, "Muscovite Perception of Other East Slavs before 1654—An Agenda for Historians," in *Ukraine and Russia in Their Historical Encounter*, ed. Peter J. Potichnyj et al. (Edmonton, 1992), 20–38.
18. The one notable exception is the so-called Lithuanian Chronicles, a local event that did not affect the lands of future Ukraine.
19. Until recently, the Khlebnikov copy was traditionally dated to the very end of the sixteenth century; see, for example, A. A. Shakhmatov, "Predislovie," in *PSRL*, vol.

- 2, 2nd ed. (St. Petersburg, 1908; repr. Moscow, 1998), viii. In his preface to the 1998 reprint edition, Boris Kloss suggests, on the basis of watermarks, that the codex must have been copied in the late 1550s–early 1560s; see B. M. Kloss, "Predislovie k izdaniiu 1998 g.," in *PSRL*, 2:G.
20. The title is well known, but it is useful to repeat it here: "Повѣсть временныхъ лѣт(т). черноризца Феодосѣева монастыра Печерьскаго. ѿкуда есть пошла Руская земля и кто в ней почаль прѣвѣе княжи(т). стала есть." We may assume that this is the title of the third redaction of the *PVL* (after Shakhmatov). The authorship here is already attributed to an anonymous monk of "Feodosii's monastery." True, some copies of the second redaction (Radziwiłł and Academy), too, have a very similar title naming "a monk of Feodosii's monastery" as the author. It is best explained as a contamination by a copy of the Hypatian type. The older copies of the second redaction (Laurentian and Trinity) did not yet attribute authorship to any specific person: "Се повѣсти времяньны(х) лѣт(т). ѿкуда есть пошла руская земля. кто въ киевѣ [Trinity: неи] нача прѣвѣе княжи(т) и ѿкуда руская земля стала есть" (*PSRL*, vol. 1, pt. 1, 2nd ed. [Leningrad, 1926], cols. 1–2); this is supported by the title of Sophia I: "Повѣсти времяньныхъ лѣт: откуда пошла Русская земля и кто в ней перво почя княжити и откуда Руская земля стала есть" (*PSRL*, vol. 6, pt. 1, 2nd ed. [Moscow, 2000], 1), Novgorod IV: "Повѣсти временныхъ лѣтъ, откоуду пошла Руская земля, и кто почя въ ней княжити первое, и откоуду Роуская земля стала есть" (*PSRL*, vol. 4, pt. 1, 2nd ed. [Petrograd, 1915], 1), and the Novgorod Karamzin chronicles: "Повѣсти временныхъ лѣт, откоуду пошла Руская земля и кто в ней почя первое княжити и откуда Руская земля стала есть" (*PSRL*, vol. 42 [St. Petersburg, 2002], 21). The title of the first redaction is a matter of speculation, of course, since it did not survive, if it ever existed. In this regard, see Donald Ostrowski's remarks, in which he, on the basis of the tally of the majority of witnesses, rules in favor of a composite title that draws from both the second and third redactions, as closest to the original ("Introduction," in *The "Pověst' vremennykh lét": An Interlinear Collation and Paradosis*, ed. Donald Ostrowski, *Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature*, Texts 10, pt. 1 [Cambridge, Mass., 2003], lx–lxi).

The problem of the "original" title of the *PVL* is of marginal interest for this study. Of much greater weight is the difference in the title among the copies of the second redaction. It may serve as yet another argument against Nestor's authorship. Recently, Aleksei Gippius suggested that the contamination of the Radziwiłł and Academy copies by a Hypatian-type text affected the entire initial portion of the *PVL*, including the title. In other words, the scribe of the Radziwiłł-Academy protograph began copying the third redaction and only later switched to his second-redaction source (Aleksei A. Gippius, "O kritike teksta i novom perevode-rekonstruktsii *Povesti vremennykh let*," *Russian Linguistics* 26, no. 1 [2002], 85–87). This means that the allusion to "the monk of Feodosii's monastery" in the title of Radziwiłł-Academy copies made its way there from the Hypatian-

type text. Gippius does not hint at the time when such a contamination could have occurred. Although any time between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries is possible, the later period seems more likely. It would mean for us that until the end of the fifteenth century, the titles of the third redaction (as in the Hypatian-Khlebnikov-type copies) had not yet identified the anonymous “monk of Feodosii’s monastery” as Nestor.

In spite of Gippius’s insistence that the allusion to the “monk of Feodosii’s monastery” must have stood in the original title (Gippius, “O kritike,” 121n13), it is clearly an innovation of the third redaction, and an awkward one at that. One would have expected a different word order, with the name of the author either at the beginning—“Черноризца Феодосьева монастыра Печерьскаго повѣсти временныхъ лѣтъ. ѿкуда есть пошла...”—or at the end—“Се повѣсти...ѿкуда руская земля стала есть. черноризца Феодосьева монастыра Печерьскаго.” Yet we find it in a very unusual position in the middle of the sentence. The insertion cut the title in two, having severed the part that explains the content of the work from its name. Uninterrupted, the title reads perfectly well. One may guess that the interpolation was made in imitation of the Chronicle of George Hamartolos (“книгы временныя и вбразныя Геургия мниха”), but the editor got it wrong: here the name of the author comes at the end of the title. In fact, as I have shown elsewhere, the gloss referring to the “monk of Feodosii’s monastery” was inserted into the title not earlier than the first decades of the thirteenth century; see A. Tolochko, “O zaglavii *Povesti vremennykh let*,” *Ruthenica* 5 (2006): 248–51.

One cannot but note the obvious development of the “author theme” in the titles of the *PVL*: from no author at all in the second redaction, to the anonymous monk of the Caves Monastery in the third, to Nestor the monk in the Khlebnikov.

21. *Akty otnosiashchiesia k istorii Zapadnoi Rossii*, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1846), 36.
22. One more contemporaneous reference to the Hypatian-type chronicle can be cited. In 1419, Zosima, the deacon of the Trinity Monastery, spent six months in Kyiv during his pilgrimage. He calls the city “мати и глава всеѣ градовомъ рускимъ” (*Kniga khozhdenii: Zapiski russkikh putishestvennikov XI–XV vv.*, ed. N. I. Prokof’ev [Moscow, 1984], 120). The form “градовомъ” is the idiosyncratic reading found in the Khlebnikov, vs. “градамъ” in the Hypatian and “градомъ” in the Laurentian, Radziwiłł, and Academy copies. It suggests that in the early fifteenth century in the Grand Duchy there were Khlebnikov-type texts in circulation, but without Nestor’s name in the title.
23. Dmytro Abramovych, *Kyievo-Pechers’kyi Pateryk: Vstup, tekst, prymitky* (Kyiv, 1930), 126. For an English translation, see *The Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, trans. Muriel Heppell, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, English Translations 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 1989), 145.
24. For each one a specific attribute is noted: Pimin was the faster; Matfei was the percipient; Grigorii, the miracle-worker; Agapit, the physician, and so on. Literary

activity is mentioned only for two: "Nestor who wrote the chronicle" and "Grigorii the creator of canons."

25. Abramovych, *Kyievo-Pechers'kyi Pateryk*, 133. Shakhmatov suggested that the passage is not an addition of the Kasiian redaction, but was "omitted" in the Arsenii redaction and thus may reflect the original words of Polikarp (Shakhmatov, "Nestor Letopisets," 421).
26. Abramovych, *Kyievo-Pechers'kyi Pateryk*, 16.
27. Ibid., 78.
28. Slavonic: Ibid., 20. English translation: *Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, 23.
29. Slavonic: Abramovych, *Kyievo-Pechers'kyi Pateryk*, 78. English translation: *Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, 88.
30. Shakhmatov, "Nestor Letopisets," 421.
31. *PSRL*, vol. 25 (Moscow and Leningrad, 1949), 14. This reading was inherited by the Voskresenskaia Chronicle, the Tver Miscellany, and some others.
32. In spite of its erroneous name, given by its first editor, the Pereiaslavl-Suzdal Chronicle is of Ruthenian origin.
33. A few examples: in the entry for 1130, which tells the story of the decoration of St. Feodosii's tomb by the boyar Georgii, the scribe of the Khlebnikov adds his patronymic—"Shimonovich," known only from the *Paterik*; in the entry for 1091 about transferring the relics of St. Feodosii, the name of the then father superior of the Caves Monastery was added, a name that the scribe could have borrowed only from the list in the *Paterik*.
34. See the photo reproduction of the Khlebnikov: *The Old Rus' Kievan and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles: The Ostroz'kyj (Xlebnikov) and Četvertyns'kyj (Pogodin) Codices*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Texts 8 (Cambridge, Mass., 1990), 70. The gloss was further expanded in later replicas of Khlebnikov, namely, the Bundur of 1651 and the Ermolaev of 1700: "святыи Несторъ, писаръ патерика Печерскаго и сее Кроиники приходъ свой именить" (*PSRL*, vol. 2, appendix, 81).
35. It was, however, used by the authors of the well-known forged charter to the Caves Monastery recorded in 1581 by Meletii Khrebtovych in the Lutsk provincial books. Kyiv here was called "мати градовом руское земли," which, as we know, is an individual reading of the Khlebnikov; see *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii*, pt. 1, vol. 1 (Kyiv, 1859), 2.
36. Various conjectures about the fate of the manuscript have been proposed, almost all of them purely hypothetical. For example, Omeljan Pritsak suggested that the manuscript was produced in the circle of the Ostrih Academy sometime ca. 1575. It was then transferred to Kyiv by Zakhariia Kopystens'kyi in 1616 (Omeljan Pritsak, "Introduction," in *Old Rus' Kievan and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles*, xxxiii–xxxiv).

Some stages of the manuscript's history can be reconstructed on the basis of

notes at the end of the codex. One of them states that the book belongs to Vitold Maroc (Romanian: Vitolt Mărățeanul), the logothete of Moldavia; the next one declares that Vitold the logothete had stolen the book in the town of Krosnyk from a certain “father governor of Ustia.” Vitold Maroc started his career as a client of Moldavian hospodar Constantine Movila; then served his brother Jeremiah. In 1615 he is mentioned as one of the boyars of Jeremiah’s widow, Elizabeth, in Ustia, the Movilas’ Podillia estate. Vitold Maroc is also known to have been secretary to Domna, Constantine Movila’s widow, who lived in Ustia.

Apparently, this connection with the Moldavian hospodar family helped the manuscript to return to the Caves Monastery when Petro Mohyla became its archimandrite.

Shakhmatov suggested that one marginal gloss with a computation from the “start of the chronicle” was made in 1608 and that the manuscript was still in “Southwestern Russia” at that time. Shakhmatov misread the date (6370 instead of the correct 6360), so the gloss was actually made in 1598 (see the facsimile reproduction in *Old Rus’ Kievan and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles*, 386).

37. The Khlebnikov or a similar chronicle remained unknown in Kyiv until the early 1620s. “Nestor’s chronicle” is referred to for the first time by Kopystens’kyi in a marginal note in the fourth chapter of his *Palinodia*; see Lev Krevza’s “*Obrona iednosci cerkiewney*” and *Zaxarija Kopystens’kyj’s “Palinodija*,” Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Texts 3 (Cambridge, Mass., 1987), 560. This might indicate that Kopystens’kyi did know a chronicle with Nestor’s name. The passage itself indeed might have come from the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle account about the coronation of Prince Danylo Romanovych. It should be noted, however, that not all of *Palinodia*’s marginalia belong to Kopystens’kyi himself; a great deal of them are the additions of later readers and owners of manuscripts. But even if the reference in question does belong to Kopystens’kyi, it is probable that it emerged after 1621, when the first draft of *Palinodia* was finished. The allusion to Nestor appears in the fourth chapter—that is, towards the end of the work. It is well known that Kopystens’kyi continued to work on *Palinodia* after 1621. Otherwise, no passage or factual detail in *Palinodija* can be demonstrated as coming from the Khlebnikov copy, contrary to the opinion of the editors of its English translation; see Lev Krevza’s “*A Defense of Church Unity*” and *Zaxarija Kopystens’kyj’s “Palinodia”: Sources*, comp. Bohdan Strumiński and Igor Strumiński, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, English Translations 3, pt. 2 (Cambridge, Mass., 1995), 954–57). Kopystens’kyi’s sources on ancient Rus’ history were Polish authors.
38. For a survey of the events, see Serhii Plokhyy, *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine* (Oxford, 2001), 111–23.
39. A lengthy colophon in high style was composed describing the patriarch’s visit, his blessing to the prince and his family, and the patriarch’s departure to Moldavia. In its present state the Pogodin lacks the colophon, but it was still in place in the

- 1780s, when the copy was made for Adam Naruszewicz (the Cracow copy). The colophon shows that the standard manner of referring to the chronicle as "Nestor's annals" was not yet established. The scribe called it "Kniha rekomyia Letopisec, Ruskaja kronika kniaženija Rossyjskoho" (PSRL, 2:xiii).
40. Shakhmatov noted that someone writing in red ink tried to collate the text of the first six and a half folios with the so-called Tver Miscellany (PSRL, 2:x). Boris Kloss has identified the hand as that of Mohyla (PSRL, 2:N).
 41. For the facsimile reproduction of the *Paterikon*, see *Seventeenth-Century Writings on the Kievan Caves Monastery*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Texts 4 (Cambridge, Mass., 1987), 3–116; list of sources on p. 115.
 42. Ibid., 9.
 43. Abramovych, *Kyievo-Pechers'kyi Pateryk*, 193, 194.
 44. These were, for example, the version of 1658, composed in the town of Hadiach ("списанъ преподобнымъ Несторомъ лѣтописцемъ и черноризцемъ печерскимъ"); the version edited by the father superior of the Caves Monastery Iosyf Tryzna in the 1650s ("Списанъ трудолюбіемъ блаженнаго Нестора русскаго лѣтописца"); and all the printed Church Slavonic versions (1661, 1678, and 1702), whose editors were more to the point ("Составленъ тремя Печерскими святыми, Несторомъ лѣтописцемъ Россійскимъ, Симономъ епископомъ Владимирскимъ и Суждалскимъ и Поликарпомъ, архимандритомъ Печерскимъ").
 45. *Besiedy sv. Ioanna Zlatousto na 14 poslanii sv. apostola Pavla* (Kyiv, 1623).
 46. The Ukrainian Chronograph has not been published yet. I refer here to the manuscript of the 1680s, now in the Library of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kyiv (Natsional'na Biblioteka Ukraïny im. V. I. Vernads'koho, manuscript division, fond 1, no. 171).
 47. For the text, see *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii*, pt. 1, vol. 8 (1914), 776. On *Indicium*, see S. Golubev, *Kievskii mitropolit Petr Mogila i ego spodvizhniki*, vol. 2 (Kyiv, 1898), 310–20.
 48. On the sources of the *Synopsis*, see S. L. Peshtich, "Sinopsis kak istoricheskoe proizvedenie," *Trudy otdela drevnerusskoi literatury* (Leningrad) 15 (1958): 41; Hans Rothe, "Einleitung," in *Sinopsis, Kiev 1681: Facsimile mit einer Einleitung von Hans Rothe* (Cologne, 1983), 72–85; Oleksii Tolochko, "Ukraïns'kyi pereklad 'Khroniky' Matseia Strykovs'koho z kolektsii O. Lazarevs'koho ta istoriografichni pam'iatky XVII st. (Ukraïns'kyi khronohraf i Synopsys)," *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka* 231 (1996): 158–81.
 49. The testament was published by Volodymyr Aleksandrovych, "The Will and the Testament of Afanasij Kal'nofojs'kyi," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 15, no. 3–4 (1991): 415–28; see p. 423.
 50. While copying the Hustynia Chronicle, one scribe of the late seventeenth century even made Nestor the theme of his poetical exercise:

Несторъ преподобный лѣтписецъ зъ васа,
еже въ кънигахъ стихъ въсегда пользоваса

Лѣтописецъ книга нареченъ на,
 сиа Несторъ монахомъ естъ соложенъ на.
 Аще бы въ сего тла мой грѣшны ѹди
 готовъ есмъ писаты преподобнаго трѣды,
 кто оубо вбраше(т)са ѿ на земли сѣщихъ,
 ктѡ силенъ вѣзъ вѣсты писаніа чтѹщихъ.
 Благдатію твоею, Г(с)ди, грѣ(ш)ніи оукрипаемъ,
 молю биты тобою въ дѣлѣ наста(в)лаемъ,
 сотвори ма до(с)тойна писати се дѣлау,
 еже желаю азъ многгрѣшный зѣло.
 Помощи ми потѣща, помощниче скорый,
 оукрыпителю во тѣ рѣдехъ ѿ небесныхъ твори.
 Дѣлау сіе, словомъ къ тебѣ простираю,
 наченъши ѡ тебѣ, скончить ѹповаю.

Biblioteka Akademii nauk Rossii (BAN), call no. 24.4.35 (Srezn. no. 72), fol. 2–2v.
 The irony is that the author of this enthusiastic eulogy never saw a line by Nestor.
 He accepted the *Hustynia Chronicle* as the real Nestor's work.

51. O. L., "Kievo-Vydubitskii perevoz na Dnepre i ego nezhdannaia politicheskaia rol'," *Kievskaiia starina*, 1882, vol. 4 (November): 369.
52. For the facsimile reproduction of the text, see Feodosii Sofonovych, *Khronika z litopysystiv starodavnikh*, ed. Iu. Mytsyk (Kyiv, 1992), 278–80.
53. *Ibid.*, 56.
54. *Old Rus' Kievan and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles*, 391.
55. *Kniga zhitii sviatykh... na tri mesiatsy pervaiia: Septevrii, oktovrii i novemvrii...* (Kyiv, 1689), fol. 353–54. The vita elaborates the same theme suggested by Kal'nofois'kyi in 1635: the Caves Lavra is the birthplace and the guardian of Ruthenian historical tradition ("Въ последняя сіа лѣта яви Господь въ Россійской нашей земли, въ Печерскомъ святомъ Монастырѣ, пристнопамятнаго спасителя, Преподобнаго отца нашего Нестора, иже просвѣти наши очеса, въ ползу нас и благодареніе Богу приводя, егда написа нам о началѣ и первомъ строеніи Россійскаго нашего міра, не токмо внѣшняго, но найпаче внутреняго и духовнаго").
56. As a result, a discrepancy about the time when Nestor was admitted into the monastery was not reconciled and probably remained unacknowledged.
57. Manuscript held at the Rossiiskaia Natsional'naia Bibilioteka (RNB), call no. F.IV.231.
58. Tatishchev, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 4:48; 1:124.
59. *Old Rus' Kievan and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles*, 307. The note was made by the same reader who noted the ending of "Nestor's chronicle" in the Galician-Volhynian part.
60. *PSRL*, vol. 2, appendix, 83; Biblioteka Akademii nauk Rossii (BAN), call no. 21.3.14, fol. 174.

61. The only puzzling thing here is "деи" instead of the expected "лѣтъ," but this Polonism finds its explanation in the corrupted way the title appears in the Ermolaev ("Починаютьса повѣсти временныхъ: Нестера черноризца Θεοδοσiева монастыра Печарского ѿкъдѣсть пошла Рускаа земля") and Iarots'kyi copies ("Починаютъся повѣсти време(н)ныхъ: Нестора черноризца Θεοδοσiева монастыра Печерскаго ѿкъдоу ест пошла Рускаа земля и кто въ ней поча(л) перве(й) княжѣти и ѿкъдѣ Рускаа земля стала е(ст).") Apparently, the Raskol'nik copy had a similar gap after "временныхъ" and before "Нестера," which Tatishchev filled at his own discretion.
62. For a detailed discussion, see Oleksiy P. Tolochko, "Leo Kishka's *Annales sancti Nestoris* and Tatishchev's Chronicles," *Palaeoslavica* 10, no. 2 (2002): 257–70.