

## Nazarii NAZAROV

CNRS / Musée de l'Homme, Paris  
17 Pl. du Trocadéro et du 11 Novembre, 75116 Paris  
E-mail: nazamia@gmail.com  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9051-7382>

### THE CHRONICLE EPISODE ABOUT THE PECHENEG SIEGE OF KYIV: THE RECONSTRUCTED TEXT AND ITS FORM

The article shows the complex connections that exist between the history of a text and its poetics, as well as other levels of linguistic organisation, in particular, syntax. One fragment from the Tale of Bygone Years demonstrates the possibilities of textual reconstruction and its implications for understanding the poetic form of texts that were previously considered purely prose. However, the series of lexical repetitions, the parallelism between the lengths of prosodic segments, and the use of focalisation particles indicate that the analysed fragment is written in a complex poetic and rhetorical form. For the reconstruction of the original textual state, the following text witnesses were involved: the Laurentian, Hypatian, Radziwiłł, and Ostroh manuscripts of the Tale of Bygone Years, as well as the Commission and Trinity manuscripts of the First Novgorod Chronicle. As a result of comparing the two branches of the text transmission tradition, we found out what the text of the fragment looked like at the time of their divergence. Consistently following the elementary rules of textology (choose the shorter or the more difficult of the two alternative readings), we obtained noteworthy results. Thus, it turned out that the particle *že* is used only in the case of a change in the spatial or psychological focus of the narrative. Instead, the conjunction *i* is employed much less often than in later states of the text. It turned out that it appears almost always between sentences with the aorist and other verb tenses. This means that it was a contrastive conjunction rather than cumulative. Thus, the idea previously expressed in the author's publications that individual completed episodes of the most ancient chronicle should be studied as separate, completed works with their own textual history and their own unique poetics is confirmed.

Keywords: Kyiv Rus, chronicle, poetics, history of the text, stylistics, syntax

The chronicle complex of Kievan Rus was compiled over a period of time and acquired its modern form around the beginning of the 12th century [Shakhmatov 2003; Tvorogov 1976]. It consists of texts of very different themes, relating to church history, military events, the life of the princely court, echoes of the pagan past, and numerous narrative episodes in novelistic form, cf. the list of episodes in [Nazarov 2023a]. This article is dedicated to such an episode under year 968. This is an episode that relates about a brave lad who saved Kyiv during the Pecheneg

Цитування: Nazarov N. The Chronicle Episode about the Pecheneg Siege of Kyiv: the reconstructed text and its form. *Мовознавство*. 2024. № 6. С. 59–75. <https://doi.org/10.33190/0027-2833-339-2024-6-003>

Citation: Nazarov N. (2024). The Chronicle Episode about the Pecheneg Siege of Kyiv: reconstructed text and its form. *Movoznavstvo*, (6), 59–75. [In Ukrainian]. <https://doi.org/10.33190/0027-2833-339-2024-6-003>



Стаття опублікована за ліцензією CC BY-SA 4.0 (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

siege by swimming across the Dnipro and informing the prince's soldiers that the besieged people were ready to surrender. The voivode approaches the walls of Kyiv, and the Pechenegs think that it is Prince Sviatoslav and his army, and retreat. The people of Kyiv inform the prince about what has happened, and the prince returns and drives the enemies away.

The state in which the chronicle complex of texts was before the beginning of the 12th century is reconstructed by comparing the Kyivan chronicle tradition, preserved as part of the chronicle complex of the Galicia-Volhynia principality, with the Novgorodian chronicle tradition and other branches of the chronicle of Kievan Rus. After all, all the principalities of Kievan Rus began their chronicles with the complex that took shape in Kyiv in the early 12th century, continuing it with their local chronicles.

This is the reason why we have numerous textual witnesses for the selected fragment.

The question of restoring the original, or as close to the original form of the text as possible, is not only a problem of textual history. It is an extremely important procedure, only after which we can proceed to the study of all language levels, comprising metrics. It is especially important when we have relatively independent branches of a tradition, the date of divergence of which we can have an idea. In this case, the comparison of the two branches of the tradition is an imitation of a «time machine», thanks to which we can have not only a relative but also a close to absolute chronology of linguistic phenomena.

In order to test the principles of textual reconstruction that we propose to apply to the reconstruction of the state of the PVL text at the time of the original Kyivan compilation, we conducted a textual and then a linguistic study of a semantically complete episode. This example will also show how the reconstruction of the original state of the text affects the understanding of its poetic nature.

According to the conception of Shakhmatov and his successors, the Tale of Bygone Years has undergone many stages of additions. The most recent compilation is available as part of the northern (Laurentian) and southern (Hypatian) chronicle compilations. However, Novgorod chronicling as part of the Novgorod 1st Chronicle until 1016 preserved the state of the PVL that preceded the two known later compilations.

Therefore, the following system of text reconstruction seems quite logical, which can be algorithmically formulated as follows.

In order to reconstruct the linguistic form rather than the overall composition of the text, it makes sense to compare those compilations that preserve different states of the same text, rather than later translations and paraphrases into Latin, Old Ukrainian (Ruthenian), Old Russian, or Old Polish. Therefore, we limited ourselves to variants that are close to each other.

The main principle of the work is to use *only manuscripts available in photocopies*, since almost all editions of chronicles tend to simplify graphics and introduce modern punctuation, which has very little in common with the original division into minimal prosodic and syntactic segments.

This also determines the selection of sources,  
for PVL: **Λ** Lavrentian (19v–20r), **Υ** Hypatian (26r–26v), **Ρ** Radziwiłł (34v–36v) та **Ω** Ostroh (26r–27r = pp. 49–51) copies;

for N1L: Nк Commissionary (37r–38v) and Nт Troicki (14r–15v) copies (accessible online<sup>1</sup>).

The best reading is the one presented by at least one source in each of the two branches. If the majority of readings provide a longer reading, but there is one shorter one, then choose the shorter one. If the majority of sources give a grammatically and lexically simpler reading, but there is one more complex one, then choose the more complex one. Among the spelling variants, we choose the one that more fully conveys the reduced vowels, nasals and the vowel denoted with *yat'* (ѣ).

In cases where Y and Ω completely coincide, we present only the text of Ω; where Nк and Nт completely coincide, we present only the text of Nт. The italicised words are used to reconstruct the original state of the text, before the split of the two branches of textual transmission, cf. [Ostrowski 2004 Introduction; Tov 1992; Tvorogov 1976; Wachtel 2011].

## 1

Λ Придоша печенѣзи *на руску зємлю первое* .  
Y придоша печенизи пѣрвое *на рускую зємлю* .  
P придоша *печенѣзи* *на роускоюю зємлю . первое* .  
Ω *прідоша печенѣси* второе *на роускоую зємлю* .  
Nт *прідоша печенеѣзи* , *на роускоюю зємлю* .  
Nк придоша *печенѣзѣ* *на роускоюю зємлю прѣвѣе*

## 2

Λ а Ст~ославъ бѣше *Переѣславци* . И затворися Волга въ градѣ со унуки своими  
Y в городѣ  
P а ст~ославъ бѣше в *переѣславци* . и затвориса *влга* въ граде со вноуки своими.  
Ω а ст~ославъ бѣше в *переѣславци* . и затвориса *влга* съ вноуки своими .  
Nт ст~ославъ бѣше в *переѣславци* . затвориса *влга* въ градѣ съ вноуки своими  
Nк а ст~ославъ

## 3

Λ *ѡрополкомъ* . и *ольгомъ* . и *Володимеромъ* . въ градѣ киевѣ .  
P съ *ѡрополкомі* и *влгомъ* и *володимеромъ* . в граде въ киевѣ .  
Ω съ *ѡрополкѡмъ* , и *влго* , *владимеромъ* . в городѣ киевѣ ,  
Nт *ѡрополкѡ* . и *влгомъ* . и *володимеромъ* . въ граде в киеве .  
Nк съ *ѡрополкомъ* и съ *володимиромъ* въ градѣ киевѣ

## 4

Λ и *встоупиша градъ в силѣ* велице . бещислено множество ѡколо града .  
и не бѣ лѣзѣ изъ гра да вылѣсти .  
Y в силѣ *тажъѣ* . бещисленное множество *ѡколо горо*<sup>o</sup>  
P и *встоупиша печенѣзи гра*<sup>o</sup> . в силе велицѣ . бещислено множество *ѡколо гра*<sup>oa</sup> .  
и не бѣ лѣзѣ изъ града вылѣсти .

<sup>1</sup> <https://chronicles.website/scans/> , [https://rusneb.ru/catalog/000199\\_000009\\_004979549/](https://rusneb.ru/catalog/000199_000009_004979549/)

Ω и вступишиа печенѣси горw<sup>o</sup> . и не бѣ л<sup>o</sup>зѣ вылезѣти из града .  
Nт и остоупишиа печенеѣзи . в силѣ та<sup>o</sup>це бесчилѣное множество иколь града .  
и не бѣ лѣзѣ изъ града вылѣсѣти .

Nк и остжишиа градъ въ силѣ тажѣѣѣ

5

Λ ни вести послати . изнемогаху же людѣе гладомъ и водою .  
P ни вѣсти послати . изнемогахоу лю<sup>o</sup>мѣ гла<sup>o</sup>мѣ . и водою .  
Ω ни вѣсти послати . изнемогах лю<sup>o</sup>ѣе гладw<sup>o</sup>мѣ и водою .  
Nт ни вѣсти послати . изнемогахоу людѣе гладw<sup>o</sup>мѣ . и жажею .

6

Λ собравшесѣ людѣе оно<sup>o</sup>а страны днѣпра в лодѣихъ . ѡб ону стра ну столаху .  
Y днѣпра  
P собравшесѣ<sup>ca</sup> лю<sup>o</sup>ѣе оно<sup>o</sup>а страны днѣпра . в лодѣихъ оноу столаху страну  
Ω и събравшесѣ лю<sup>o</sup>ѣе оно<sup>o</sup>а страны днѣпра . в лодѣихъ ѡб оноу страну столахъ .  
Nт и брашесѣ людѣе , оно<sup>o</sup>а страны днѣпра . в лодѣихъ столаху ѡб оноу страну .

7

Λ и не бѣ лѣзѣ внити в киевъ . и ни є диному ихъ . ни изъ града к онѣмъ .  
Y же ихъ . ни изъ  
P и не бѣ лѣзѣ внити в киевъ . ни единому и<sup>o</sup> . ни из гра<sup>o</sup>а ко нѣ<sup>o</sup> .  
Ω и не бѣ л<sup>o</sup>зѣ внити<sup>o</sup> в киевъ ни единому<sup>o</sup> ихъ . ни из города къ и<sup>o</sup>нѣм<sup>o</sup> .  
Nт не бѣ л<sup>o</sup>зѣ внити . в<sup>o</sup> киевъ . ни единому ихъ . из града к<sup>o</sup> нимъ .

8

Λ Вѣстужи ша людѣе въ градѣ  
P и вѣстоужишиа лю<sup>o</sup>ѣе въ гра<sup>o</sup>е .  
Ω и вѣстоужишиа людѣе в городѣ .  
Nт и стоужишиа людѣе въ гра<sup>o</sup>е .  
Nк вѣстоужишиа

9

Λ и рѣша . не ли кого иже бы могль на ону страну дойти .  
P и рѣша а нѣ<sup>o</sup> ли кого иже бы могль на ону страну дойти .  
Ω и рекоша нѣ<sup>o</sup> ли кого иже бы могль на оноу страну дойти .  
Nт и рѣша нѣ<sup>o</sup> ли кого иже бѣ могль на оноу страну дойти .

10

Λ и ре(че) имъ . аще кто не приступитъ с утра . предатися имамъ печенѣгомъ .  
Y подѣ городѣ имамъ  
P и ре<sup>o</sup> имъ аще не подстоупите заоутра . предати<sup>o</sup> има<sup>o</sup> печенѣго<sup>o</sup> .  
Ω аще не пристоупите оутро пw<sup>o</sup> горw<sup>o</sup> . предатисѣ има<sup>o</sup> печенѣго<sup>o</sup> .  
Nт аще не пристоупите оутро по<sup>o</sup> гра<sup>o</sup> . предатесѣ имамъ печенеѣгw<sup>o</sup>мъ .  
Nк имоу<sup>o</sup>

**11**

Λ и рє(че) единъ отрокъ . азъ преиду .

Р и рє<sup>ч</sup> единъ отрокъ азъ преиду <...>

Ω и рє<sup>ч</sup> единъ отрокъ , азъ могу преити , ~горожане же ра<sup>д</sup> быв<sup>ш</sup>е . ~

Нт и рече имъ . единъ отрокъ . азъ преиду .

**12**

Λ И рєша <...>

Иди .

Ү

ити

Р и рѣша <...>

иди

Ω и рекоша ~отрокоу . аще можєши како и ты~ иди .

Нт <...>

Нк <...>

**13**

Λ он же изиде изъ града с уздою .

Р внъ изиде из гра<sup>д</sup>а со уздою .

Ω вн<sup>ѣ</sup> же изиде из града съ оуздою .

Нт он же изиде изъ града . съ оуз<sup>ѣ</sup>дою .

**14**

Λ и ристаша сквозѣ печенѣги . глаголя . Не видѣ ли коня никтоже .

Р и рѣсташа же сквозѣ печенѣгы гл~а . не видали коня никтоже

Ω и хож<sup>ѣ</sup>аше сквозѣ печенѣги гл~а , не виде ли коня никто<sup>ж</sup> .

Нт рѣста сквозѣ печенези гл~а . не видесте ли коня . никтоже

Нк рысташе

**15**

Λ Бѣ бо уме<sup>ѣ</sup>а печенѣжьски . и мняхуть и своего .

Ү

своихъ

Р бѣ бо оумѣа печенѣжьскы . и мнахоуть своего .

Ω бѣ бо оумѣа печенѣ<sup>ж</sup>скы , и мнах<sup>ѣ</sup>т и свои<sup>ѣ</sup> .

Нт бѣ бо оумѣа печенес<sup>ѣ</sup>кы . и мнахоу свои .

**16**

Λ **ѣ**ако приближися к рѣцѣ . сверга порты .

Р и ко же приближиса к рецѣ . и сверга порты

Ω и **ѣ**ако приближиса к рецѣ . с<sup>ѣ</sup>вер<sup>ѣ</sup>гъ пор<sup>ѣ</sup>ты с<sup>ѣ</sup> себе .

Нт **ѣ**ако приближишиса к реце . сверга порты .

Нк

свергъ

съ себе

**17**

Λ сунуся въ днѣпръ . и побреде .

Ү

и побрѣде

Р и соуноу<sup>ѣ</sup> в днѣпръ . и побреде .

Ω соуноуса въ днѣпръ и побрыде .

Нт соуноувса в д<sup>н</sup>епрѣ . и попереди же .

Нк

и побреде

**18**

Λ видевше же печенѣзи устремишася на нь , стрѣляюще его,

Υ *оустрѣмишася*

Р видѣвши<sup>жс</sup> печенѣзи оустремиша<sup>с</sup> на нь . стрелляючи его .

Ω и видѣвше печенѣси оустремиша<sup>с</sup> на нь стрѣляюще его .

Нт видѣвши<sup>ше</sup> же печенѣзи . стремииша<sup>с</sup> на нь стрелаше его .

Нк *стрелляюще*

**19**

Λ и не могоша ему ничтоже створити . они же, видѣвше с оноѣ страны ,

Υ *же*

Р и не могоша емоу ничто<sup>жс</sup> створити . они же видѣвши со оноѣ страны .

Ω и не могоша емоу ничто<sup>жс</sup> створити . они же видѣвше съ оноѣ страны .

Нт не могоша емоу нич<sup>то</sup> же зла створити . они же видѣша . со оноѣ страны .

**20**

Λ и приѣхаша в лодыи противу ему , и взяша и в лодью

Υ *приѣхавше*

Р приѣхавша в лод<sup>и</sup> ~ противу емоу . и взяша в лод<sup>ю</sup> ~

Ω приѣхавше в лод<sup>и</sup> ~ противу емоу . и взяша и в лод<sup>ю</sup> ~

Нт прихажаше в лодыи .

Нк *преихавше*

**21**

Λ и привезоша и къ дружинѣ . и рече имъ .

Р и привезоша ко дружинѣ . и рече имъ

Ω и привезоша къ дружинѣ . и рече имъ .

Нт и привезоша къ дружинѣ . и рече имъ

Нк *привезоша и*

**22**

Λ *аще не путе (sic!) заутра къ городу , предатися хотятъ людѣе печенѣгомъ .*

Υ *подъступите заутра рано*

Р *аще не подступите заутра к городуу . предати<sup>с</sup> хотять людѣе печенѣгомъ .*

Ω *аще не подступите заутра пв<sup>д</sup> горв<sup>д</sup> рано . предатися имоу<sup>м</sup> людѣе печенѣгомъ .*

Нт *аще не постоупите заутра къ градуу . предатися людѣе имоу<sup>м</sup> печенѣгомъ .*

**23**

Λ *Рече же воєвода ихъ , имянемъ Прѣтичь . Подъступимъ заутра в лодь .*

Υ *же имъ воєвода ихъ*

Р *рече же воєвода ихъ , именемъ прети<sup>ч</sup> . по<sup>д</sup>ступи<sup>м</sup> заутра в лод<sup>ях</sup> .*

Ω *рече воєвода ихъ именемъ прети<sup>ч</sup> . пв<sup>д</sup>ступи<sup>м</sup> заутра в лод<sup>ях</sup> .*

Нт *рече же воєвода ихъ именемъ притичь . постоупимъ заутра в лодяхъ .*

**24**

Λ и попадше княгиню и княжичѣ . умчимъ на сю страну .

Υ *и попадше*

Р по<sup>а</sup>па<sup>а</sup>ше кн~гню . и княжичи оумчи<sup>а</sup> на сю сторонуу .

Ω и пв<sup>а</sup>па<sup>а</sup>ше княгиню и княжичи оумчи<sup>а</sup> на сю стра<sup>а</sup>у и лю<sup>а</sup> .

Нт и попа<sup>а</sup> же кн~гню . и княжичи оум<sup>а</sup>чимъ на сю странуу людеи .

## 25

Λ *аще ли сего не створимъ , погубити ны иматъ Святославъ .*

Υ *ны иматъ*

Р *аще сего не сотвори<sup>а</sup> . погубити ны иматъ ст~ославъ .*

Ω *аще ли сего не сътвори<sup>а</sup> , погубити нас има<sup>а</sup> ст~ославъ .*

Нт *аще ли того не створимъ . погубит<sup>а</sup> ны има<sup>а</sup> ст~ославъ*

## 26

Λ *яко бы(сть) завтра . всѣдъше в лодью*

Р *яко бы<sup>с</sup> заутра всѣдъши в лодьи*

Ω и бы<sup>с</sup> *яко* заутра , и всѣдоша в лв<sup>а</sup> .

Нт и *яко бы<sup>с</sup> заутра все<sup>а</sup>ше в<sup>а</sup> лодьи .*

## 27

Λ *протиу свѣту и въстроубиша вельми . и людье въ граде кликнуша .*

Υ *трубами*

Р *противоу свѣтоу . и въстроубиша . и биша вельми . и лю<sup>а</sup> въ гра<sup>а</sup> кликнуша .*

Ω *противоу свѣтоу въстроубиша вельми . и людїе въ градѣ кликоша .*

Нт *противоу в лодь<sup>а</sup> въстроубиша вельми трубами . людїе въ гра<sup>а</sup> кликнуу .*

Нк *противоу свѣтоу* *кликноуша*

## 28

Λ *Печенѣзи же мнѣша князя пришедша , побѣгоша разнo от града .*

Υ *печенѣзѣ*

Р *печенѣги мнѣша кн~за пришедша . побегоша разнo w<sup>а</sup> гра<sup>а</sup> .*

Ω *печенѣзи же мнѣша князя пришедша . побѣгоша разнo w<sup>а</sup> града .*

Нт *печенѣзи же . м<sup>а</sup>ниша . кн~за прише<sup>а</sup>ша . побѣгоша раз<sup>а</sup>но w<sup>а</sup> града .*

Нк *мнѣша*

## 29

Λ *И изиде ольга со унуки и с людми к лодьѣ . Видевъ же се . князь печенѣжъскїи .*

Υ *съ*

Р *изыде вла со вноуки . и с лю<sup>а</sup>ми к лодьѣ . и видѣв же кн~зъ печенѣ<sup>ж</sup>скїи*

Ω *изыде вла съ в<sup>а</sup>ноуки и с лю<sup>а</sup>ми к лодьѣ . видѣв же княз печенѣз<sup>ж</sup>скїи .*

Нт *изыде вла съ в<sup>а</sup>ноуки и с людми . видѣвше се кн~зъ печенѣжескѣ*

Нк *своими и с людьми к лодьѣ . же се*

## 30

Λ *възратися единъ къ воеводѣ Прѣтичю . и рече Кто се приде .*

Υ *притичю*

Р *възратис<sup>а</sup> еди<sup>а</sup> ко претичю воеводе . и рече кто се прииде .*

Ω *въз<sup>а</sup>вратиса единъ къ воеводѣ претичю и рече . кто се прииде .*

Нт и *въз<sup>а</sup>вратис<sup>а</sup> единъ къ воеводѣ . притичю .*

Нк *рече кто се прииде*

**31**

Λ И рє(чє) єму . Лодьѧ оноѧ страны . И рє(чє) князь печенежський . А ты князь ли еси .

Р и рє<sup>чє</sup> ємоу лю<sup>пб</sup>є вноѧ страны . и рє<sup>чє</sup> князь печенѣ<sup>жс</sup>скѣи . а ты князь ли еси

Ω и рє<sup>ч</sup> ємоу лю<sup>дг</sup>є вноѧ страны . и рє<sup>ч</sup> князь печенѣ<sup>жс</sup>скы . а ты князь ли еси .

№т рєчє сємоу людїє вноѧ страны . и рєчє кн~сь печене<sup>жс</sup>скїи . а ты кн~сь ли еси .

№к и рє<sup>ч</sup> ємоу печенѣ<sup>жс</sup>скѣи

**32**

Λ онъ же рє(чє) . Азъ єсмь мужь єго . и пришель єсмь въ сторожѣ(х),

Ү пришель сторожєхъ

Р w<sup>ч</sup> же рє<sup>чє</sup> азъ єсмь моужь є<sup>г</sup> . пришє<sup>г</sup> єсми въ сторожє<sup>х</sup> .

Ω w<sup>ч</sup> же рє<sup>ч</sup> , азъ єсмь мж<sup>жс</sup> єго и пришолъ єсмь въ съторожє<sup>х</sup> .

№т онъ же рєчє азъ єсмь моужь єго . пришолъ єсмь въ стражахъ .

№к онъ пришель сторожєхъ

**33**

Λ по мнѣ идетъ полкъ со княземъ, бєцїсла множество . Сє же рєчє грозя имъ .

Ү идетъ множество . сє же рєчє грозя имъ

Р и по мнѣ идоу<sup>м</sup> вои многы со кн~змь мой<sup>м</sup> бєс числа мно<sup>жс</sup>ство . сє <sup>жс</sup> рє<sup>чє</sup> грозя и<sup>м</sup> .

Ω а по мнѣ иде<sup>м</sup> вои бєсчисленое мнв<sup>жс</sup>ство . сє <sup>жс</sup> рє<sup>ч</sup> грозя и<sup>м</sup> .

№т а по мнѣ идоу<sup>м</sup> вои . с кн~сємъ бєсчисла множєство . сє же рєчє грозя имъ .

**34**

Λ Рє(чє) же князь печенежський къ Прѣтичю . Буди ми другъ .

Ү князь печенѣ<sup>жс</sup>скѣи

Р рє<sup>чє</sup> же кн~зь пє<sup>ч</sup>нѣ<sup>жс</sup>скы ко прєти<sup>чю</sup> боудї ми другъ .

Ω и рє<sup>ч</sup> князь печенѣ<sup>жс</sup>скы прєтичю . бж<sup>дг</sup> ми другъ ,

№т рєчє кн~сь печенєскїи . ко притичю . боуди ми ты другъ .

№к печенѣ<sup>жс</sup>скѣи

**35**

Λ Онъ же рєчє . тако створю . И подаста руку межю собою ,

Ү боудї . и подаста руку

Р w<sup>ч</sup> же рє<sup>ч</sup> та<sup>ко</sup> сотворю . подаста роу<sup>кы</sup> межю собою .

Ω w<sup>ч</sup> же рє<sup>ч</sup> тако бжди , и подаста ржкы межю собою .

№т w<sup>ч</sup> же рє<sup>ч</sup> . тако боуди . и пода роукоу межю собою .

**36**

Λ и вѣдасть печенѣ<sup>жс</sup>скїи князь Прѣтичю конь , саблю , стрѣлы .

Ү печенѣ<sup>жс</sup>скѣи князь прєтичу конь саблю стрѣлы

Р и дасть пє<sup>ч</sup>нѣ<sup>жс</sup>скы кн~зь прєти<sup>чю</sup> ко<sup>н</sup> . саблю . стрылы .

Ω и вѣдасть пє<sup>ч</sup>нѣ<sup>жс</sup>скы князь прєтичю . ко<sup>м</sup> саблю стрѣлы .

№т и вѣда печенєскїи князь . притичю . конь . саблю .

№к стрѣлы

37

Λ онъ же дастъ ему бронѣ , щитъ , мечъ . отступища печенѣзи от града ,

Υ дастъ емоу брони . щитъ . мечъ

Р w<sup>и</sup> же дастъ емоу . брони . щит<sup>и</sup> . меч<sup>и</sup> . и w<sup>и</sup>стоупиша печенѣзи w<sup>и</sup> града<sup>и</sup>

Ω w<sup>и</sup> же вда<sup>и</sup> емоу брони , щит<sup>и</sup> меч<sup>и</sup> . и w<sup>и</sup>стоупиша печенѣзи w<sup>и</sup> града .

Нт w<sup>и</sup> же дастъ емоу щит<sup>и</sup> . і м~чь . и w<sup>и</sup>стоупиша печенѣзи w<sup>и</sup> града .

Нк брони , щитъ . мечъ

38

Λ и не бѣше лъзѣ коня напоити . на Лыбеди печенѣзи .

Р и не бѣше коня напоити на лыбе<sup>и</sup> печенѣ<sup>и</sup> .

Ω и не бѣше лъзѣ коня напоити на лыбе<sup>и</sup> печенѣ<sup>и</sup> .

Нт не бѣше лъзѣ коня напоити . на лыбеди , печенѣзи .

Нк . печенѣзи

39

Λ И послаша кыѣны къ Святославу , гл(аголю)ще:

Ты княже , чюжеѣ земли ищещи и блюдеши ,

Υ чюжеѣ

Р и послаша кыѣны . ко ст~ославоу гл~ще ты княже чюжеѣ земли ищещи .

Ω и послаша кыѣны къ ст~ославоу гл~ще , ты княже чюжеѣ земли ищещи и блюдеши .

Нт и послаша кыѣны , къ ст~ославу , послы гл~ще .

ты кн~же чюжеѣ земли ищещи . и блюдиши .

40

Λ а своѣѣ ся охабивъ . малы бо насъ не взяша печенѣзи , м(а)т(е)рь твою и дѣти твои .

Υ малѣ дѣти твоихъ

Р своѣѣ ся охабивъ . малы<sup>и</sup> бо на<sup>и</sup> не взяли печенѣзи . и мт~рь твою . и дѣти твои<sup>и</sup> .

Ω а своѣѣ ся лишивъ . мало бо на<sup>и</sup> не взяша печенѣзи . и мт~рь твою и дѣти твои .

Нт своѣѣ ся охабивъ . мало бо на<sup>и</sup> не взяше печенѣзи . и мт~ри твоѣѣ . и дѣти твоихъ .

Нк взяша

41

Λ Аще не поидеши ни обраниши насъ , да пакы ны возмутъ .

Р аще не поидеши ни обраниши на<sup>и</sup> . да пакы ны возмутъ .

Ω аще не прїидеши ни вборониши на<sup>и</sup> . да пакы на<sup>и</sup> възмоу<sup>и</sup> .

Нт аще не прїидеши не вборониши на<sup>и</sup> . да пакѣ ны възмоу<sup>и</sup> .

Нк прїидеши ни вборонѣши насъ ны

42

Λ Аще ти не жалъ очины своѣѣ , ни м(а)т(е)ре стары суща . и дѣти своихъ .

Υ и дѣти свои<sup>и</sup>

Р аще ли ти не жа<sup>и</sup> w<sup>и</sup>чины своѣѣ . и мт~ри стары соущи . и дѣти свои<sup>и</sup> .

Ω аще ти не жа<sup>и</sup> w<sup>и</sup>чины своѣѣ . и мт~ри стары сѣща . и дѣти твои<sup>и</sup> .

Нт аще ли ти не жалъ w<sup>и</sup>чины своѣѣ . и матери стары соущи . и дѣтеи соущи своихъ .

Нк аще тѣ не жалъ и дѣти свои<sup>и</sup>

43

Λ *То слышавъ С(вя)тославъ . вборзѣ въсѣде на конѣ съ дружиною своєю*

Υ *въсѣдѣ*

Р *и то слышавъ ст~ославъ в борзѣ всѣ<sup>9</sup> на кони . со дру<sup>жс</sup>ною своєю*

Ω *то слышавъ ст~ославъ , в борзѣ всѣ<sup>9</sup> на кони из дружиною своєю ,*

Ντ *то слышавъ ст~ославъ , в<sup>9</sup> борзѣ соуши в<sup>9</sup>сѣде на коня с дружиною своєю .*

Νκ *в борзѣ сѣ<sup>9</sup>ши съ*

44

Λ *и приде Києву, цѣлова м(а)т(е)рь свою и дѣти своа,*

Р *пріиде к киевоу . и цѣлова мт~рь свою и дѣти своа .*

Ω *и пріиде къ кыевоу . и цѣлова мт~рь свою и дѣти своа .*

Ντ *пріиде к<sup>9</sup> кіевоу . и цѣлова матерь свою . и дѣти своа .*

Νκ *пріиде кыевоу*

45

Λ *и съжалися ѿ бывшемъ от печенѣгъ . И собра вои и прогна печенѣги в поли ,*

Υ *съжали си*

Р *и сожалиса ѿ бывше<sup>м</sup> ѿ<sup>т</sup> печенѣгъ . собра вои и прогна пе<sup>чс</sup>нѣги в поле*

Ω *съжали си ѿ бывше<sup>м</sup> ѿ<sup>т</sup> печенѣгъ . и събра воа и прогна печенѣги в<sup>9</sup> поле .*

Ντ *сжали са ѿ бывше<sup>м</sup> . ѿ<sup>т</sup> печенсгъ . из<sup>9</sup>бра вои . и прог<sup>9</sup>на печенсги . во плъ .*

Νκ *съІжалиса и собра воа*

46

Λ *и бысть миръ.*

Р *И бы<sup>с</sup> миръ .*

Ω *и бы<sup>с</sup> мир<sup>9</sup>но .*

Ντ *и бы<sup>с</sup> миръ*

Νκ *и бы<sup>с</sup> мир<sup>9</sup>но .*

The reconstructed text thus obtained almost coincides with D. Ostrowski's *paradosis* text, however, there are several significant differences: we consider the fragments explaining the words *полк* and *в силе тяжѣѣ* to be interpolations. Moreover, in the Kyivan Chronicle we find the use of *в силе тяжѣѣ* without any additional explanation by a periphrase. Another seemingly unimportant, but in fact very significant, discrepancy is that we accepted the shorter reading wherever at least one witness to the text cited it, and this also applies to the conjunction *и* «and». The superscript number at the beginning of a line indicates the line number, the subscript number before the beginning of a sentence indicates the sentence number. In the following text, the subscript numbers at the end of the line indicates the number of syllables in the line.

In the version of the text that we have obtained as a result of textual comparison, the prosodic features of the original are much more clearly visible. Thus, it becomes noticeable that shorter segments, which can be called *cola*, are combined into longer segments — poetic lines. The lines are combined into a strophic period, which is characterised by the alternation of shorter and longer lines. Each strophic period starts and ends with a line of similar length, thus creating a symmetrical succession of lines. At the lexical level, the unity of each

strophic period is emphasised by symmetrical series of repeated vocabulary (see below). <sub>n</sub> marks the beginning of each independent sentence.

SPI

- <sup>1</sup> <sub>1</sub> | прїйдоша **печен҃зи** . первое . на роускоую землю . | 17  
<sup>2</sup> <sub>2</sub> | а ст~ославъ баше переславци . <sub>3</sub> | и затвориса вльга въ **градѣ** съ вноуки своими . 29  
<sup>3</sup> <sub>3</sub> | рополкомъ . и вльгомъ . и владимеромъ . въ **градѣ** кыевѣ . | 22  
<sup>4</sup> <sub>4</sub> | и ост҃жиша **печен҃зи** **градѣ** в силѣ тажыцѣ<sup>2</sup> . <sub>5</sub> | и не бѣ лъзѣ вылезѣти из **града** . 28  
<sup>5</sup> <sub>5</sub> | ни вѣсти послати . <sub>6</sub> | изнемогах҃ людїе гладѣм и жажею<sup>3</sup> . | 20

SPII

- <sup>6</sup> <sub>7</sub> | и<sup>4</sup> събравъшесѧ **людїе** **вноа** **страны** днѣпра . в лѣдїахъ вб **оноу** **страноу** стоах҃х҃ . | 28  
<sup>7</sup> <sub>8</sub> | не бѣ лъзѣ внити . въ киевѣ . ни єдиномоу ихъ .<sup>5</sup> ни из **города** къ нимъ . | 25  
<sup>8</sup> <sub>9</sub> | и вѣстоужиша **людїе** в **городѣ** . 7  
<sup>9</sup> <sub>10</sub> | и рекоша <sub>10</sub> | нѣсть ли кого иже бы могъ на **оноу** **страноу** доити . | 22  
<sup>10</sup> <sub>11</sub> | аще не пристоупите оутро под **город**<sup>6</sup> . предатисѧ имамъ печен҃гомъ . | 24

SPIII

- <sup>11</sup> <sub>12</sub> | и **рече** єдинъ втрокъ <sub>13</sub> | азъ **прєидоу** . | 14  
<sup>12</sup> <sub>14</sub> | и **рекоша** <sub>15</sub> | **иди** . <sub>16</sub> | внѣ же **изыде** изъ града . съ оуздою . 21  
<sup>13</sup> <sub>17</sub> | рѣста сквозѣ **печен҃гы** гл~а . <sub>17</sub> | не видѣ ли коня никтоже . | 20  
<sup>14</sup> <sub>18</sub> | бѣ бо оумѣа **печен҃жьски** . <sub>19</sub> | и мнах҃х҃ свои . | 15  
<sup>15</sup> <sub>20</sub> | ко приближисѧ к рѣцѣ . съверьгъ порьты съ себе . 20  
<sup>16</sup> <sub>20</sub> | соуноуса въ днѣпрѣ . и побрѣде . | 10

SPIV

- <sup>17</sup> <sub>21</sub> | видѣвъшыше же печен҃зи оустрѣмишасѧ на нь стрѣлающе его . | 22  
<sup>18</sup> <sub>7</sub> | не могоша ємоу ничтож сътворити . <sub>22</sub> | вни же видѣвъшыше съ вноа страны . 25  
<sup>19</sup> <sub>23</sub> | приѣхаша в **лѣди** и привезоша къ дружинѣ . <sub>23</sub> | и **рече** имъ . | 20  
<sup>20</sup> <sub>24</sub> | аще не постоупите **заоутра** къ градуу . предатисѧ имоут **людїе** печен҃гомъ . | 27  
<sup>21</sup> <sub>25</sub> | **рече** воевода их именем прѣтчїхъ . <sub>26</sub> | подѣстоупимъ **заоутра** въ **лодыахъ** . | 25

SPV

- <sup>22</sup> <sub>27</sub> | попадше **княгиню** и **княжичи** . оумьчимъ на сю страну **людєи** . | 21  
<sup>23</sup> <sub>28</sub> | аще ли того не сътворимъ . погоубити ны иматъ ст~ославъ . | 21

<sup>2</sup> Ostrowski adds *бецисльно мѣножьство около града*, but we think it is an interpolation. In the Kyiv Chronicle of 12 century *в силѣ тажыцѣ* is used without periphrastic explanations.

<sup>3</sup> Ostrowski: водою

<sup>4</sup> Ostrowski – и

<sup>5</sup> Ostrowski + ни

<sup>6</sup> Ostrowski – под град

<sup>7</sup> Ostrowski + и

24	29  ко бысть заоутра всѣдъши въ <b>люды</b> .	14
25	противоу свѣтоу <b>вѣстроубиша</b> вельми . <b>тробами</b> . 30  и <b>людіе</b> въ <b>градѣ</b> кликнуо .	24
26	31  печенѣси же мнѣша <b>кназа</b> пришедша . побѣгоша разнѡ <b>от града</b> .	21
SPVI		
27	32  <b>изыде</b> вльга съ вьноуки и съ <b>людьми лодыамъ</b> . 33  видѣв же <b>кназь</b> <b>печенѣжскыи</b> .	30
28	възвратисѡ единь къ воеводѣ прѣтичю и <b>рече</b> . 34  кто се <b>пріиде</b> .	24
29	35  <b>рече</b> емоу 36  <b>людіе</b> вно страны . 37  и <b>рече</b> <b>кназь печенѣжскыи</b> 38  а ты <b>кназь</b> ли еси .  30	
SPVII		
30	39  <b>внѣ рече</b> 40  азъ есмь мжжъ его . 41  <b>пришоль</b> есмь въ сторожѣхъ	21
31	41a  а по мнѣ идеть полкъ со <b>княземъ</b> . 42  се же <b>рече</b> гроза имь .	20
32	43  <b>рече</b> <b>кназь печенѣжскыи</b> прѣтичю . 44  <b>бжді</b> ми другъ .	17
33	45  Онъ же <b>рече</b> . 46  тако <b>бжди</b> , 47  и <b>подаста</b> ржку межи собою .	20
34	48  и <b>вда</b> <b>печенѣжскыи</b> <b>кназь</b> прѣтичю конь . саблю . стрѣлы .	18
SPVIII		
35	49  <b>внѣ</b> же дасть емоу бронѣ , щить , мечъ . 50  <b>отстоупиша</b> <b>печенѣси</b> <b>отъ града</b> .	24
36	51  не блше лзѣ <b>кона</b> напоити . на лыбеди <b>печенѣги</b> .	18
37	52  и <b>послаша</b> кыане къ <b>святославу</b> глаголюще . 53  ты <b>кнаже</b> чюжеи земли ищещи . и блудиши .	31
38	<b>своєа</b> сѡ <b>вхабивъ</b> . 54  малѣ бо <b>нась</b> не <b>взаша</b> <b>печенѣзи</b> . <b>матерь твою</b> и <b>дѣти твои</b> .	29
39	55  <b>аще</b> не <b>пріидеши</b> ни <b>вборониши</b> <b>нась</b> . да <b>паки ны</b> <b>възмоуть</b> .	22
40	56  <b>аще</b> ли ти не <b>жаль</b> <b>отчины</b> <b>своєа</b> . и <b>матери</b> стары <b>сжца</b> . и <b>дѣти</b> <b>своих</b> .	28
41	57  То слышавъ <b>святославъ</b> . въ борзѣ <b>всѣдъ</b> на <b>кони</b> . съ <b>дружиною</b> <b>своєю</b> .	25
42	<b>пріиде</b> кыєвою . <b>цѣлова</b> <b>матерь</b> <b>свою</b> . и <b>дѣти</b> <b>своа</b> .	19
43	<b>сжжали</b> сѡ <b>в</b> <b>бывшємъ</b> . <b>от печенѣгъ</b> . <b>собра</b> <b>вои</b> и <b>прогна</b> <b>печенѣги</b> <b>в</b> <b>поле</b> .	27
44	58  и <b>бысть</b> <b>миръ</b> .	5

English translation (Primary [1953]: 85–86):

... the Pechenegs invaded Rus' for the first time. So Olga shut herself up in the city of Kiev with her grandsons, Yaropolk, Oleg, and Vladimir. The nomads besieged the city with a great force. They surrounded it with an innumerable multitude, so that it was impossible to escape or send messages from the city, and the inhabitants were weak from hunger and thirst. Those who had gathered on the other side of the Dnieper in their boats remained on that side, and not one of them could enter Kiev, while no one could cross over to them from the city itself. The inhabitants of the city were afflicted, and lamented, «Is there no one that can reach the opposite shore and report to the other party that if we are not relieved on the morrow, we must perforce surrender to the Pechenegs?».

Then one youth volunteered to make the attempt, and the people begged him to try it. So he went out of the city with a bridle in his hand, and ran among the Pechenegs shouting out a question whether anyone had seen a horse. For he knew their language, and they thought he was one of themselves. When he approached the river, he threw off his clothes, jumped into the Dnieper, and swam out. As soon as the Pechenegs perceived his action, they hurried in pursuit, shooting at him the while, but they did not succeed in doing any harm. The party on the other shore caught sight of him, and rowed out in a boat to meet him. They then took him into their boat, and brought him to their company. He thus reported to them that if they could not relieve the city on the next day, the inhabitants would surrender to the Pechenegs. Then their general, Pretich by name, announced, «Tomorrow we shaii approach by boat, and after rescuing the Princess and the young Princes, we shaii fetch them over to this side. If we do not bring this to pass, Svyatoslav will put us to death». When it was morning, they embarked before dawn in their boats, and blew loudly on their trumpets. The people within the city raised a shout, so that the Pechenegs thought the Prince himself had returned, and accordingly fled from the city in various directions. Thus Olga went forth With her grandsons and her followers to the boats. When the Prince of the Pechenegs perceived their escape, he came alone to Pretich, the general, and inquired who had just arrived. Pretich replied that it was a boat from , the opposite bank. The Prince of the Pechenegs inquired whether Pretich was the Prince himself. The general then replied that he was the Prince's vassal, and that he had come as a vanguard, but that a countless force was on the way under the Prince's command. He made this statement simply to frighten the Pechenegs. So the Prince of the Pechenegs invited Pretich to become his friend, to which request Pretich assented. The two shook hands on it, and the Prince of the Pechenegs gave Pretich his spear, sabre, and arrows, while the latter gave his own breastplate, shield, and sword. The Pechenegs raised the siege, and for a time the inhabitants could no longer water their horses at the Lybed' on account of the retreating enemy. But the people of Kiev sent to Svyatoslav, saying, «Oh Prince, you visit and frequent foreign lands. But while you neglect your own country, the Pechenegs have all but taken us captive, along with your mother and your children as well. Unless you return to protect us, they will attack us again, if you have no pity on your native land, on your mother in her old age, and on your children». When Svyatoslav heard these words, he quickly bestrode his charger, and returned to Kiev with his retinue. He kissed his mother and his children, and regretted what they had suffered at the hands of the Pechenegs. He therefore collected an army, and drove the Pechenegs out into the steppes. Thus there was peace.

Each strophic period contains a series of repeated vocabulary that has signs of symmetrical organisation:

печенѣзи - градѣ - градѣ - печенѣси - градѣ - града

α β β α β β α β α β β

людіє - страны - оноу страну - города - людіє - городѣ - оноу страну - город

α β β γ α γ β γ α γ β γ

рече - преидоу - рекоша - иди - изыде - печенѣгы - печенѣжьски

α β α β β γ γ α β α β γ γ

луди - рече - заоутра - людіє - рече - заоутра - лодѣхъ

α β γ α γ γ α α β γ α γ α

княгиню - княжичи - людиє - лодыи - въстроубиша - трубами - людїє - градѣ  
 - княза -

α α β β γ γ β δ α  
 града  
 δ  
 α α β γ γ β δ α δ

изыде людѣми лодьѣмъ князь печенѣжскїи рече прїиде рече людїє рече князь  
 α β β γ δ ε α ε β ε γ  
 печенѣжскїи князь  
 δ γ  
 α β β γ δ ε α ε β ε γ δ γ

рече - княземъ - рече - рече - князь - печенѣжскыи - бждї - рече - бжди  
 - печенѣжскыи

α β α α β γ δ α δ γ  
 князь  
 β  
 α β α β γ δ α δ γ β

печенѣзи коня печенѣзи святославу своа насъ взлша печенѣзи . матеръ твою  
 дѣти

α β α γ δ η ζ α θ ι κ  
 твои насъ ны възмоутъ матери дѣтеи своихъ святославъ кони своєю ма-  
 теръ своєю .  
 ι η η ζ θ κ δ γ β δ θ δ  
 дѣти своа . печенѣгъ печенѣзи  
 α β α γ δ η ζ α θ ι κ ι η η ζ θ κ δ γ β δ θ δ

The following preliminary conclusions can be drawn from the reconstructed text. The conjunction *and* (и) is used much less frequently between parts of a complex sentence than in the surviving later versions of the text. Similarly, the aorist seems to have been used even more frequently in the prototype. The futurum and imperative were used only in the direct speech of characters. Sentences tend to be short and not extended.

Let's write down the syntactic structure of the sentences of the reconstructed fragment in conventional notation:

V — verb, S — subject, C — complement, O — object, DS — direct speech, aor — aorist, adv — adverb, d — direct, fut — futurum, impf — imperfect, imper — imperative, ind — indicative, inf — infinitive, n — noun, part — participle, pron — pronoun, pl — plural, s — singular.

In the end, it turned out that in the restored text, the conjunction *i* and *a* between parts of a complex sentence (and not within a sentence between homogeneous members) is used only 15 times. In all cases, *i* and *a* stand between clauses with an aorist, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the present tense/imperfect/imperative/future tense. The present tense can be expressed implicitly (omitted verb in a nominal sentence). The conjunctions can be used both immediately (/) between two clauses and in a distance (one clause before or after, //).

aor/impf	1 [Vaor + Spl + Cn + Cadv]	2 a [Ss + Vimpf + Cn]
aor/impf	2 a [Ss + Vimpf + Cn]	3 i [Vaor + Ss + Cn + Cn + Cn]
aor/impf	2 a [Ss + Vimpf + Cn]	... 4 i [Vaor + Spl + Od + Cn]
aor/impf	4 i [Vaor + Spl + Od + Cn]	5 i [Vimpf + (Vinf + Cn) + (Od + Vinf)]
aor/impf	8 [Vimpf + Vinf + Cn + Sn + Cn]	9 i [Vaor + Spl + Cn + Vaor]
fut/aor	11 аще [(Vpr + Ca + Cn) (Vfut + Oind)]	12 i [Vaor + Sn]
fut/aor	13 DS [Spron + Vfut]	14 i [Vaor]
aor/fut	22 [(Spron + Cpart + Cn + Vaor + Cn) i (Vaor + Cn)]	23 i ... 24 DS
аще [(Vfut + Cad + Cn) (Vfut + Sn + Oind)]		
aor/impf	29 jako [(Vimpf) (Cadv + Cv + Cn + Cn + Vaor + Oind)]	30 i [Spl + Cn + Vaor]
aor/pres	36 DS [Spl + ADJn]	37 i [Vaor + Sn]
aor/pres	37 i [Vaor + Sn]	38 DS a [Spron + Vn]
aor/pres	41 DS [Vpret + Cn]	41a DS a [Cpron + Vpres + Sn + Oind]
aor/imper	46 DS [Cpron + Vimper]	47 i [Vaor + Od + Cpron]
aor/imper	46 DS [Cpron + Vimper]	... 48 i [Vaor + Sn + Oind + Od + Od + Od]
aor/impf	51 [(Vimpf + Od + Vinf) (Cn + Spl)]	52 i [Vaor + Spl + Oind + Cn]

This forces us to 1) recognise our reconstruction of the text (with «minimal *i*») as correct, because we have unexpected patterns of usage in this reconstruction; 2) reconsider the syntactic function of conjunctions between parts of a complex sentence. It turns out that the ancient oppositional conjunction *i* was reinterpreted over time as a joining conjunction, and therefore its use has become more frequent in the analysed text. The use of the oppositional conjunctions *i* and *a*, namely in the position between the aorist and other forms of the tense and mood of the verb, indicates that there was a very clear opposition in the grammatical semantics of the aorist and other tenses or other finite verb forms. This is due to the function of the aorist as a narrative historical tense, and in this function it is opposed to all other forms of the verb. This opposition is explained by the two modes of writing discussed by Emile Benveniste: the modus of history and the modus of narration.

Similarly, the function of the particle *že* is much more consistent and natural only in the reconstructed text. The particle *že* signals a change of focus, psychological or spatial:

- inside/outside the city: <sup>16</sup> | *внѣ же изыде изъ града*
- river / riverbank: <sup>20</sup> | *яко приближиса к рѣцѣ . съверъгъ порѣты съ себе . соуноуса въ днѣврѣ . и побрѣде .* | <sup>21</sup> | *видѣвшіе же печенѣзи оустрѣмишася на нь стрѣляюще его .*
- river / riverbank: *не моглоша емоу ничтожъ сътворити .* | <sup>22</sup> | *вни же видѣвшіе съ вноа страны .* | <sup>19</sup> | *приѣхаша в луди и привезоша къ дружинѣ .* | <sup>23</sup> |
- inside/outside the city: <sup>30</sup> | *и людїе въ градѣ кликою .* | <sup>31</sup> | *печенѣзи же мнѣша князя пришедша . побѣгоша разнѣо вт града .*
- river / riverbank: <sup>32</sup> | *изыде влѣга съ вноуки и съ людѣми лодѣамъ .* | <sup>33</sup> | *видѣв же князь печенѣжскїи . възвратиса единъ къ воеводѣ прѣтичю*
- the prince is somewhere far away / the conversation is held now and here: <sup>41a</sup> | *а по мнѣ идетъ полкъ со княземъ .* | <sup>42</sup> | *се же рече грозда имъ .*
- pecheneg / vovoda: <sup>48</sup> | *и вда печенѣжскы князь прѣтичю конь . саблю . стрѣлы .* | <sup>49</sup> | *внѣ же дастъ емоу бронѣ , щитъ , мечь .*

These observations are confirmed by comparisons with a precisely dated monument of the Old Kyivan language, the Ostromyr Gospel of 1057, i.e. several decades before the creation of the probable common prototype of all chronicle branches:

Luke 23, 10

*и исповѣда тако нѣсмъ азъ хс + и въпросїша же и: кѣто оубо ты неси да отвѣтъ дамъ пославышимъ ны + чѣто глаголиши о тебѣ самомъ + рече же . азъ гласъ въпижцаго въ поустыни +*

Luke 24, 15

самъ ісъ приближьса . идише съ нима + очи же іею държастеса . да него не познаета + рече же къ нима +

In the Greek original, the particle *že* has no equivalent. Greek particles such as *oun* are rendered in the Slavic translation by another particle, *oubо*. That is, the use of the particle *že* is immanent to the Old Ruthenian language itself.

It is also noteworthy that *že* is located mostly in the first (lines 17, 27, 35), second (18, 31) or last line (26) of the strophic period, thus emphasising that the beginning of a new stanza implies a change in narrative focus. This also confirms the legitimacy of our division into strophic periods.

Poetical form that was found in the analysed fragment was also identified in other texts that are included into PVL, cf. [Nazarov 2023].

The discussion of its origin and common features with other medieval poetic traditions of the the Byzantine influenced cultural area is a topic of a separate study.

## REFERENCES

- Mink G. (S. a.). The Coherence-Based Genealogical Method — What is it about? URL: [https://www.uni-muenster.de/INTF/Genealogical\\_method.html](https://www.uni-muenster.de/INTF/Genealogical_method.html) (last accessed: 04.11.2024).
- Nazarov N. (2023). Prosodyka kyievoruskykh litopysiv: strofichna budova starokyivskoi poezii. *Movoznavstvo*, (1), 52–79. [In Ukrainian].
- Nazarov N. (2023a). *Pověst' vremennykh lět* as the literary corpus of Kyivan Rus'. *Movoznavstvo*, (5), 57–77.
- Ostrowski D. (2004). *Povest' vremennykh let*. An Interlinear collation and Paradosis. Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.
- Ostrowski D. (2004). Introduction. *Povest' vremennykh let. An Interlinear collation and Paradosis*. D. Ostrowski (Comp., Ed.). Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, XVII–LXXIII.
- Shahmatov A. A. (2003). *Istoriya russkogo letopisaniya*. Vol. 1. Book 2. Rannee russkoe letopisanie XI–XII vv. Saint Petersburg: Nauka. [In Russian].
- Tov E. (1992). *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress press; Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum.
- Tvorogov O. (1976). *Povest' vremennykh let i Nachal'nyj svod* (Tekstologicheskij kommentarij). *Trydy otдела drevnerusskoj literatury*. Vol. 30, 3–26. [In Russian].
- Wachtel K., Holmes W. (Eds.). (2011). *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research*. Society of Biblical Literature.

## SOURCES

- Λ Letopis' po Lavrent'evskomu spisku. (1872). Saint Petersburg. [photocopy of the manuscript]. [In Old Ruthenian].
- Ω The Old Rus Kievian and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles. The Ostroz'kyj (Hlebnikov) and Cetvertyns'kyj (Pogodin) Codices. (1991). Harvard. [photocopy of the manuscripts].
- Y *Povest' vremennykh let po Ipatskomu spisku*. (1871). Saint Petersburg. [photocopy of the manuscript]. [In Old Ruthenian].
- P *Radzivilovskaya ili Kenigsbergskaya letopis'*. (1902). Saint Petersburg. [photocopy of the manuscript]. [In Old Ruthenian].
- Primary *The Russian Primary Chronicle*. Laurentian text. Cambridge [1953]. <https://www.mgh-bibliothek.de/dokumente/a/a011458.pdf> (last accessed: 08.08.2024)

Дата надходження до редакції: 29.10.2024

Дата надходження після доопрацювання: 11.11.2024

Дата затвердження редакцією: 14.11.2024

Received: 29.10.2024

Received in revised form: 11.11.2024

Accepted: 14.11.2024

**Назарій НАЗАРОВ**

Національний центр наукових досліджень / Музей людини  
Площа Трокадеро і 11 листопада, 17, Париж 75116, Франція  
Електронна пошта: nazarmia@gmail.com  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9051-7382>

**ЛІТОПИСНИЙ ЕПІЗОД ПРО ПЕЧЕНІЗЬКУ ОБЛОГУ КИЄВА:  
РЕКОНСТРУЙОВАНИЙ ТЕКСТ ТА ЙОГО ФОРМА**

У статті показано складний зв'язок між історією тексту та його поетикою, а також іншими рівнями мовної організації, зокрема з синтаксисом. На прикладі одного епізоду Повісті минулих літ показано можливості текстуальної реконструкції та її вплив на розуміння поетичної форми тексту, який раніше вважався суто прозовим. Втім, серії лексичних повторів, а також паралелізм довжини просодичних сегментів, як і вживання фокалізаційних часток, вказують складну поетичну та риторичну форму аналізованого фрагмента. Для реконструкції вихідного текстуального стану були залучені такі свідки тексту: Лаврентіївський, Іпатський, Радзивіллівський та Острозький рукописи Повісті минулих літ, а також Комісійний та Троїцький рукописи Першого новгородського літопису. Внаслідок зіставлення двох гілок традиції передачі тексту ми з'ясували, як виглядав текст фрагмента на момент їхнього розходження. Послідовно додержуючи елементарних правил текстології (обирати з двох альтернативних читань коротше або ж складніше), ми отримали варті уваги результати. Так, виявилось, що частка *же* вживається лише у випадку зміни просторового чи психологічного фокусу нарації. Натомість сполучник *і* фігурує значно рідше, ніж у пізніших станах тексту. Виявилось, що він з'являється майже завжди між реченнями з аористом та іншими дієслівними часами. Таким чином, це не *i* сурядний, а давніший *i* – протиставний. Таким чином підтверджується раніше висловлена в публікаціях автора ідея про те, що окремі завершені епізоди найдавнішого літопису слід досліджувати як окремі, завершені твори зі своєю текстуальною історією та своєрідною поетикою.

Ключові слова: Київська Русь, літопис, поетика, історія тексту, стилістика, синтаксис