



<https://doi.org/10.15407/uhj2025.01.141>  
UDC [930.2:222.6](477)“12”

**Tetiana VILKUL**

Doctor of Historical Sciences (Dr. Hab. in History), Leading Research Fellow,  
Institute of History of Ukraine of the NAS of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine)

[tvilkul@gmail.com](mailto:tvilkul@gmail.com)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2737-8372>

## THE PRIMARY CHRONICLE IN THE JUDEAN CHRONOGRAPH (1262)

Recently, the time of the completion of the *Judean Chronograph*, which is the only definitely dated historical collection in Old Rus'ian literature, has been reconsidered based on a number of textual arguments. **The purpose** of this paper is to answer the question of whether the proposed revision is reasonable. It is also necessary to determine whether the compiler of the *Chronograph* was familiar with the *Primary Chronicle* since the dating of the *Chronograph* depends on the answer to this question. Textual criticism **methods** are applied here to address the problems of textual relationship. **Scientific novelty.** In the pages that follow, I offer a detailed analysis of quotations from the *Primary Chronicle* in the *Judean Chronograph* conducted for the first time. **Conclusions.** The author of the *Chronograph* knew the *Chronicle* well and quoted it both verbatim and in microcitations. The textual evidence does lead to the year 1262, so we have no reason to revise the traditional date of the compilation of the *Chronograph*.

**Keywords:** *medieval chronicles, Old Rus', textual criticism, translations from Greek into Old Church Slavonic.*

The *Judean Chronograph* (other names of this compilation in scholarly literature are the *Jewish Chronicle*, the *Chronograph of 1262*, and the *Archivsky Chronograph*) [1, 649; 2; 3, LXIX, LXXXVII] is one of the important witnesses of the Old Rus'ian literature. While

Цитування: Vilkul T. The *Primary Chronicle* in the *Judean Chronograph* (1262). *Український історичний журнал*. 2025. № 1 (580). С. 141—158. <https://doi.org/10.15407/uhj2025.01.141>

© Видавець ВД «Академперіодика» НАН України, 2025. Стаття опублікована на умовах відкритого доступу за ліцензією CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

ISSN 0130-5247. Український історичний журнал. 2025. № 1 (580)

the text of the *Chronograph* is preserved in the 15<sup>th</sup>- and 16<sup>th</sup>-centuries Archival, Vilnius, and Warsaw copies [4; 5; 6],<sup>1</sup> its common archetype attributed to a much earlier time. Some of its sources belong to the oldest translations from Greek into Old Church Slavonic, so it is important both for pre-Mongol and post-Mongol studies. What is especially valuable for Ukrainian scholars is that the *Chronograph* impacted the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, so the problems of the history of these texts are interrelated. It is generally considered that the compilation was created in Halych, although this is not the only possible provenance of the text proposed in the scholarly literature [7, 24—27, 30—32; 8, 95—96; 9, 14—15, 17, 50; 10, 4; 11; 12; 13, 26; 14; 15; 16, 67—68, 82; 17, 75].<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For the digital text of the Archival manuscript, see the Cyrillo-Methodianum website, created under the supervision of Anna-Maria Totomanova: <http://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/chronograph/clist>. Bulgarian colleagues prefer the name *Archiivskii Chronograph*, and unfortunately, the text of the Vilnius copy is neglected.

Ukrainian «літопис» (“litopys”) as well as «хронограф» (“chronograph”) translates into English as “chronicle”, but both types of writing were distinguished in the Old Rus’ian literature. The genre of “chronograph” implies a compilation of fragments or collections of fragments of various biblical books, apocrypha, and some Byzantine chronicles translated into Old Church Slavonic. In turn, “litopys”-chronicles represented a form of original historical narrative written in Old Rus’ian with elements of Old Church Slavonic.

<sup>2</sup> The assumption is hindered by some manuscript evidence. In the Old Halych and Old Volhynia dialects, like in Modern Ukrainian, /o/ and /a/ were strictly distinguished, whereas in the *Chronograph*, at least in its biblical part, regular examples of <o> changing into <a> and vice versa are found (in all 3 manuscripts). Earlier, the author of this paper qualified the phenomenon as “akanye” (аканье), sometimes with hypercorrect <o>^ [18, 27]. However, this definition appears to be incorrect, while the examples under question are in a stressed position: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Akanye>. As noted by Sergei Nikolaev, the features of the text have a crucial bearing on the history of the creation of the *Judean Chronograph*. He wrote to me: “In East Slavic languages, we rarely find [o] in place of the etymological \*a in stressed position. The two areas which do demonstrate such a development are Central and Northern Belarus. The change of [a] into [o] before [w] has been recorded in a number of dialects around Polatsk, as well as in a wide area in Central and Northern Belarus between Hrodna and Mahilyow. See: [19], map 28 «Halosnyia na mescy nacisknoha “a” u pazicii perad [w] — d[o]w, kaz[o]w, pr[o]wda and so on» («Галосныя на месцы націсканога “а” у пазіцыі перад [w] — d[o]ў, каз[o]ў, пр[o]ўда і інш.»). It can be assumed that originally any stressed /a/ was pronounced in these dialects as a weakly labialized (“слабоогубленны”) sound like English (RP) [ɒ] (spelled as <o>). While this sound regularly changed into [o] before [w], in other positions, it was restored into the usual [a]. In all probability, it is this phonetic pattern which is reflected in the above-mentioned “errors” in the copies of the *Chronograph*. See the only example where we find a change of O to A in an unstressed position: Ex.39.10 вблАженітє / вблОженітє. Also, in post-tonic position (A to O): Ex.5.23 вьлОжю / вьлАжю, Ex.16.21 растОаше сѧ / растАаше сѧ, Ex.30.35 вОращєго / вАращєго, Ex.33.9 стОнаше / стАнаше, Ex.40.5 кОжєніє / кАжєніє. Thus, it is most suitable to locate the protograph of the *Judean Chronograph* in modern Central (between Hrodna and Mahilyow) or Northern (around Polatsk) Belarus”. Also, «akanye» is typical for the North Belarusian dialects (Polatsk in the Great Duchy of Lithuania, etc.), whereas in the South Belarusian lands, some of which were part of medieval Volhynia, this phenomenon is absent. On the South Belarusian features on the example of the Moscow-Academic Chronicle, see: [20, 205].

It is believed that the *Judean Chronograph* was compiled in the 13<sup>th</sup> century. Usually, scholars date it to 1262 [2; 21, XVII—LVI, LXI—LXIX; 22, 124—125], but the date depends on how one reads the famous “Legend of Sovij” and the “Lithuanian” fragment which follows. This fragment evokes some episodes of Lithuanian history, including a description of pagan gods and lamentation over the customs of burning the dead and sacrifices. Of particular interest are the chronological calculations at the end of the fragment, where the scribe reports the number of years that elapsed between the founders of «елминских» (pagan) times — the “accursed Sovij” and Abimelech — and the time of the completion of the *Chronograph*.

The scholarly discussion concerning the dating of the *Judean Chronograph* began with Mikhael Obolensky’s “Preface” to the *Chronicle of Pereyaslavl-Suzdal* (1851) and continues to this day with, among others, the papers by the staff of Oleksiy Tolochko’s department at the Institute of History of Ukraine (2014—2024).<sup>3</sup> It seems that all possible arguments were already exhausted by those put forward by Obolensky and those proposed by his critics, especially Francis Thomson [1] and Tolochko [24].

Obolensky’s main points are sound. The compiler of the *Judean Chronograph* gives only the number of years from Abimelech and Sovij to the time when «сздаша ся кѣнигы сиаѣ» (“these books — i.e. *Chronograph* — were written”). But it is possible to fill the gap in the calculations if we keep in mind that the most famous Abimelech is associated with the patriarch Abraham.<sup>4</sup> The interval «отъ адама» (“from Adam”) «до авимелеха» (“to Abimelech” = “to Abraham”) can be supplemented according to the chronology of the *Primary Chronicle*, where “from Adam to the Flood — 2,242 years” and “from the Flood to Abraham — 1,082 years”, which is 3,324 years. Add to this the “3,446 years” from “the accursed Sovij” and Abimelech (= Abraham) to the completion of the *Chronograph* — and this gives us the date: 6770 years from the Creation of the world, or 1262 A.D. The only thing that Obolensky did not bother to do is to prove that the compiler of the *Judean Chronograph* really **knew** the *Primary Chronicle*. However, the knowledge of the “*Nestor Chronicle*” by every Old Rus’ian author was assumed by default by the 19<sup>th</sup> century scholar.<sup>5</sup>

Modern researchers have directed their criticism precisely at this weak point. Thomson pointed out that our knowledge of the sources of the *Judean Chronograph* is far from perfect. At the same time, the chronicles available to the Old Rus’ian authors (e.g., *Hamar-tolos*, *Malalas*, etc.) give very different data on the life span of the biblical characters. Thus, the calculations may lead not to the “1262” year but to a broad period from the mid-12<sup>th</sup> to the late 13<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>6</sup> Tolochko emphasized that 1) the compiler of the *Judean Chronograph* did not rely on “Nestor’s chronology” and might not have known the *Primary Chronicle* at all; and 2) since according to the Bible and the Greek chronicles Abraham

<sup>3</sup> See the yearbook *Ruthenica* (Kyiv) since 2014; and [13]. Review on the latter: [23].

<sup>4</sup> Although, it should be taken into account that the “Legend of Sovij” mentions “Abimelech” without further clarification, while there are several biblical characters with this name.

<sup>5</sup> Other names of the Old Rus’ian *Primary Chronicle* are the *Tale of Bygone Year* and the *Nestor Chronicle*. Obolensky used the latter.

<sup>6</sup> According to his meticulous calculations, from 1144/45 to 1299/1300 [1, 649].

met Abimelech only in the land of Canaan, it is necessary to add about 75 years from the day of his birth to his arrival in Canaan, which is “3224 + 75 = 3299”. Consequently, the creation of the *Judean Chronograph* to be moved to the 14<sup>th</sup> century [24].<sup>7</sup>

Even though the sources of the “Legend of Sovij” and the “Lithuanian” fragment have been repeatedly discussed in the scholarly literature,<sup>8</sup> the relationship of the *Judean Chronograph* with the *Primary Chronicle* is still obscure, which means that Obolensky’s arguments remained by and large unproven. Only recently, a textual study of the “Lithuanian fragment” and some other has revealed borrowings from the *Primary Chronicle* into the *Chronograph* [26],<sup>9</sup> completely unnoticed by previous researchers.

<sup>7</sup> The same opinion was expressed by Tolochko in [13, 22]. Quite contrary, other section of this book (by Tolochko and Kyrychenko) states: «до Хронографа 1262 р. увійшли лише перші 10 книг хроніки Малали. Проте в ГВл містяться цитати... з XVII... та XVIII книг... Отже... автор ГВл мав і повний текст Малали... автор ГВл працював не власне з текстом хронографа 1262 р. (italics mine — Т.В.), а з тими матеріалами, які ввійшли до складу його. Іншими словами, він мав доступ до скрипторію, де виготовляли хронограф. Ця обставина лише стверджує нас у припущенні, що над ГВл працювала та сама група людей (чи особа, що паралельно (або дещо раніше) уклала Іудейський хронограф» [13, 79]. ‘The *Chronograph of 1262* includes only the first ten books of the *Chronicle of Malalas*. However, the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* contains quotations... from the 17<sup>th</sup>... and 18<sup>th</sup> books of *Malalas*... Thus... the author of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* had the unabridged text of *Malalas* at his disposal... the author worked *not with* the text of the *Chronograph of 1262*, but with the materials prepared for it. In other words, he had access to the scriptorium where the *Chronograph* was produced. These circumstances only confirm our assumption *that the same group of people (or one person) worked on the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle and the Chronograph at more or less the same time*’. Here, we are talking about the 1260<sup>s</sup>, not the 1330<sup>s</sup>. Tolochko and his colleagues fail to explain the inconsistencies in their book [13]. However, the last thought is consonant with the words published a dozen years earlier: «Правда, автор Галицко-Волынской летописи работал не только с *Ид.* /= *Judean Chronograph* — Т.В.: в его тексте прослеживаются заимствования из опущенных в *Ид.* последних книг Хроники Малалы. Не исключено, что над текстом Галицко-Волынской летописи и над текстом *Ид.* работал один и тот же человек или одна и та же «команда»» [16: 83]. ‘However, the author of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* worked not only with the *Judean Chronograph*. Its text reveals borrowings from the last books of the *Chronicle of Malalas* omitted in the *Chronograph*. It is possible that one person or “team” worked on both the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* and the *Chronograph*.’

<sup>8</sup> For example, Ilya Lemeshkin [2] scrutinized the text relations of the *Judean Chronograph* and the *Chronicle of George Hamartolos* and suggested that the “Legend of Sovij” was bound up with the *Hamartolos* narration about Farah and Abraham. Sergej Ivanov [25] revealed that the “Legend” was placed in the part of the *Chronograph*, which included the fragments of the *Chronicle of John Malalas*, accompanied by the Commentary of Nicetas of Heraclea on the Sermons of Gregory of Nazianzus.

<sup>9</sup> The compiler included the composition of the “Legend of Sovij” with the “Lithuanian fragment” in the 18<sup>th</sup> Sermon of the *Chronograph* (Cyrillic numeral .иї.: «СЛОВО .иї.») [5, 27v-28r; 4, 26d-27a; 6, 56-57]. The insertion from *Hamartolos* connected with it follows closely behind after a brief biblical quotation [5, 28r; 4, 27a-b; 6, 58].

Tab. 1

<p>the <i>Judean Chronograph</i> [5, 28r-v; 4, 27a-b; 6, 57-58]</p> <p>И по тѡ<sup>м</sup> жит<sup>ѣ</sup> Фара лѣ<sup>т</sup>.р.и .л.и ѿи оумре<sup>1</sup>. живѣ<sup>2</sup> же всѣ<sup>х</sup> лѣ<sup>т</sup>.с.и ѿ. бѣ<sup>ѣ</sup> же и тѣ<sup>м</sup> куміротворецѣ ѿ каменія . и древа , твора , и продаа .</p> <p>ростоеше* тако время въ .л. ро<sup>а</sup> даже и дотолѣ лѣ<sup>т</sup> .ѿ.и .л.и <b>к.и д.</b>лѣ<sup>т</sup> ѿ Адама до Авраама ,</p> <p>в' та лѣта никто* прѣ<sup>ж</sup>рожены<sup>х</sup> члѣ<sup>к</sup>ъ , аѡвлаетса прѣ<sup>ж</sup>е оумретіа вѣ<sup>ч</sup>а . но вѣ<sup>ч</sup>ь прѣ<sup>ж</sup> члѣ<sup>к</sup>ъ снѣ<sup>в</sup> свои<sup>х</sup> . наслѣ<sup>д</sup>ники имѣ<sup>н</sup>іи<sup>9</sup> свои<sup>х</sup> вставляюще .</p> <p>а никто* [не]<sup>11</sup> глѣ<sup>т</sup> в Авелѣ . ибонесвоею смѣ<sup>р</sup>тію оумреть . но неволею . ѿ негож Фара . противуобразна бѣ<sup>и</sup> прежпостави<sup>12</sup> своею хитростію . сѣ<sup>д</sup>ѣла идола подобія и<sup>х</sup> же сѣ<sup>т</sup>вори<sup>а</sup> . испытаніе<sup>м</sup> пріа<sup>т</sup> . и тѣ<sup>м</sup> изовобразивѣ ѿ свое<sup>г</sup> чада .</p> <p>оумре бо Аранѣ<sup>14</sup> пожаро<sup>м</sup> . егѡ<sup>ж</sup> зажеже Авраамѣ . пожещи хотя идолы вѣ<sup>ч</sup>а своего . вше<sup>а</sup> же Аранѣ<sup>15</sup> изнести ае хотя , <b>и самѣ<sup>ж</sup> сѣ<sup>г</sup>орѣ</b> . сего ра<sup>а</sup> чю<sup>а</sup>в са бжю исписанію . назнамена глѣ<sup>ц</sup>и...</p>	<p>the <i>Chronicle of Hamartolos</i> [27, 81 and 58]</p> <p>[27, 81] и по томъ житѣ Фара лѣ<sup>т</sup>.р.л.ѿ.и оумре живѣ<sup>ѣ</sup> всѣ<sup>х</sup> лѣ<sup>т</sup>.с.ѿ. бѣ<sup>ѣ</sup> же и тѣ<sup>м</sup> коуміротворецѣ ѿ каменіе<sup>ѣ</sup> и древа твора и продаае .</p> <p>[27, 58] соу<sup>м</sup> ѡбо ѿ Адама доже и до потопа лѣ<sup>т</sup> .ѿ.с.ѿ. а ѿ потопа доже и до размѣ<sup>ш</sup>еніе<sup>ѣ</sup> столпотвореніе<sup>ѣ</sup> и до оумертвие<sup>ѣ</sup> Фалекова...</p> <p>[27, 81] растоеше же тако время въ .л. родѣ . доже и дотолѣ<sup>6</sup> лѣ<sup>т</sup> .ѿ.л.ѿ.и</p> <p>и никто же когда же прѣ<sup>ж</sup>ероженныхъ члѣ<sup>к</sup>въ аѡвлаетса снѣ<sup>в</sup> преже оумертвие<sup>ѣ</sup> Оча . но Оцѣ<sup>и</sup> преже чаде снѣ<sup>в</sup> своихъ<sup>10</sup> наслѣ<sup>д</sup>ники имѣ<sup>н</sup>іи<sup>и</sup> своихъ вставляюще .</p> <p>а никто же да не глѣ<sup>т</sup> в Авелѣ ибо не своею смѣ<sup>р</sup>тью оумре но невольною<sup>13</sup> . ѿ него же Фара противуобразна бѣ<sup>и</sup> прежепостави<sup>ѣ</sup> своею хытростію сѣ<sup>д</sup>ѣлавъ идола подобьяе . ихъ же створи испытаніемѣ пріа<sup>т</sup> . и тѣ<sup>м</sup> извобразивѣ ѿ своего чада .</p> <p>оумре бо Аранѣ<sup>ж</sup> пожаромѣ него же зажеже<sup>16</sup> Аврамѣ<sup>ж</sup> пожещи хотя идолы Оца свое<sup>г</sup> . вшеде<sup>ѣ</sup> же Аранѣ<sup>ж</sup> изнести ае хотя<sup>18</sup> сего ради чюдивѣ са бжю исписанію назнамена глѣ<sup>ц</sup>и...</p>	<p>the collated text of the <i>Primary Chronicle</i></p> <p>[29, 91.29-92.2] <i>се же Серухъ роди Фару</i><sup>3</sup> . Фара же <i>роди .ѿ. снѣ<sup>в</sup> . Аврама и Нахора . и Арана</i><sup>4</sup> . Фара же <i>творше</i><sup>5</sup> кумиры . <i>навыкъ оу вѣ<sup>ч</sup>а свое<sup>ѣ</sup> .</i></p> <p>[29, 18.1-3] <i>секо ѿ Адама до потопа . лѣ<sup>т</sup> .ѿ.в.с.м.в.</i><sup>7</sup> а ѿ потопа <b>до Аврама</b><sup>8</sup> . лѣ<sup>т</sup> .ѿ.л.ѿ.и (= .ѿ.л.ѿ.и .л.ѿ.и .л.ѿ.и .л.ѿ.и )...</p> <p><i>see below</i> [29, 92.13-15]</p> <p>[29, 92.10-15] <i>примѣ<sup>ѣ</sup> Аврамѣ<sup>ж</sup> вѣ<sup>ч</sup>нь . зажеже идолы въ храминѣ<sup>ѣ</sup> [ѿ] [ѿ]</i><sup>19</sup> . <i>видѣ<sup>ѣ</sup> же се</i><sup>20</sup> Аранѣ<sup>ж</sup> <i>братѣ<sup>ѣ</sup> Аврамѣ<sup>ж</sup> . рѣ<sup>ч</sup>е<sup>ѣ</sup> по идо<sup>л</sup>ѣ<sup>ѣ</sup> . хотѣ<sup>ѣ</sup></i><sup>22</sup> {оумчати идо<sup>л</sup>ѣ<sup>ѣ</sup>} [вѣ<sup>ч</sup>мчати идо<sup>л</sup>ѣ<sup>ѣ</sup>]<sup>23</sup>. [и] <b>самѣ<sup>ж</sup></b> {з} [сѣ<sup>г</sup>горѣ<sup>ѣ</sup>]<sup>24</sup> <i>ту Аранѣ<sup>ж</sup></i><sup>25</sup> . и оумре прѣ<sup>ж</sup> <i>вѣ<sup>ч</sup>мѣ<sup>ѣ</sup> . прѣ<sup>ж</sup> сѣ<sup>г</sup>мѣ<sup>ѣ</sup> бо не [бѣ<sup>ѣ</sup>]</i><sup>26</sup> <i>оумиралѣ снѣ<sup>в</sup> прѣ<sup>ж</sup> вѣ<sup>ч</sup>мѣ<sup>ѣ</sup> . но вѣ<sup>ч</sup>ь прѣ<sup>ж</sup> снѣ<sup>в</sup>мѣ<sup>ѣ</sup> .</i></p>
---	--	--

Notes: <sup>1</sup> Istrin erroneously attributes this fragment to Gen.11.27 and 11.32 instead of Am.81.5-6 [22, 329]. Two words (“и оумре”) might be inserted from Gen. (cf. Gen.11.32 “быша же вси днѣ фары в харавнѣ лѣт .с.ѿ.и оумре ту фара въ харавнѣ» [38, 155]), but the whole phrase still belongs to *Hamartolos*; <sup>2</sup> sic Arkh Wars; Vil жи; <sup>3</sup> L фара; <sup>4</sup> L R A S1 *err.*: арона; T(N1) арама; N4 арала; <sup>5</sup> L твори; <sup>6</sup> sic Am.tr; Am.s до; <sup>7</sup> L *err.*: лѣ<sup>т</sup> .л.ѿ.и .л.ѿ.и; <sup>8</sup> L вбрама; <sup>9</sup> sic Arkh Wars; Vil имѣ<sup>н</sup>ію; <sup>10</sup> sic Am.s; Am.tr снѣ<sup>в</sup> своимѣ<sup>ѣ</sup>;

End of Tab. 1

<sup>11</sup> sic Arkh Wars; Vil om; <sup>12</sup> sic Arkh Wars; Vil прѣж<sup>а</sup>епостави<sup>а</sup>; <sup>13</sup> sic Am.tr; Ам.с неволею; <sup>14</sup> sic Arkh Wars; Vil аронъ; <sup>15</sup> sic Arkh; Wars аррана; Vil аронъ; <sup>16</sup> sic Am.s; Ам.тр поже; <sup>17</sup> sic Ам.с; Ам.тр ара; <sup>18</sup> sic Ам.с; Ам.тр om; <sup>19</sup> Н храмины; *all other copies* храминѣ; <sup>20</sup> L R A NK S1 N4 om; <sup>21</sup> L R A S1 N4 err.: аронъ; <sup>22</sup> L хотѣвъ; Chl N4 хотѣ; <sup>23</sup> Н Chl оумьчати; L R A S1 N4 вымчати; N1 вымычати; NK вынести; Chl *and other copies* идолы; <sup>24</sup> Н S1 N4 згорѣ; Chl изгорѣ; L съгорѣ; R A N1 NK сгорѣ; <sup>25</sup> L R A S1 N4 аронъ; <sup>26</sup> Н om; sic Chl L R A T(N1) NK N4; K(N1) бы; S1 не умираше бо

Let us refer to Table 1. The first column presents the text of the *Judean Chronograph*, the second one displays parallel fragments of *Hamartolos*,<sup>10</sup> and the third one shows excerpts from the *Primary Chronicle*.<sup>11</sup> The convergences of the *Chronograph* and *Hamartolos* are underlined; italics are used when the text of the *Chronicle* differs from both the *Chronograph* and *Hamartolos*; bold type is used where the text of the *Chronograph* coincides with the *Chronicle*.

As we can see, this passage is distinguished by microcitations from the *Primary Chronicle*. Also, there are larger borrowed words from the same source (about 420 characters long) in another part of the *Chronograph* (see Tab. 2 in the Appendix). Textual criticism helps here to answer questions raised by scholars. In particular, Tolochko pointed out that the figure "3324" does not match the original number of the years "from Adam to Abraham" in *Hamartolos*: "3332". However, it is very probable that "3324" was calculated by the compiler of the *Chronograph* from the *Primary Chronicle* ( $2242 + 1082 = 3324$ ).<sup>12</sup> Such an assumption is supported by the presence of several quotes from the *Chronicle* (see bold expressions in Table 1 and fragments β, δ, ε in

<sup>10</sup> The *Chronicle of George Hamartolos* was published by Istrin [27, 81, 58] and Matvienko, Shchegoleva [28, 181—182, 154]. Scholars distinguish its two main editions: the Trinity or First Edition (Am.tr) and the Second one (Am.s).

<sup>11</sup> On the manuscripts of the *Primary Chronicle* and early Novgorod chronicles, see [30, XX—XXI; 31]. The principal manuscript here is Hypatian since Laurentian contains many errors. The quotations from the *Primary Chronicle* are labeled with column and line numbers (after the edition of the Laurentian copy [29]), as done by Donald Ostrowski in [30]. As for collated text, see [32] for some examples; we have brought together readings from the Laurentian and Hypatian branches of the *Primary Chronicle*, the *Novgorod First Chronicle* of the *Younger Edition*, and the Novgorod-Sofian group (*Novgorod-Karamzin*, *Sofian First* and *Novgorod Forth* chronicles). Many manuscripts have been published [29, 18, 91-92; 33, 13, 79; 34, 137; 35, 46-47; 36, 78-79; 37, 66]. For manuscript acronyms, see the List of Abbreviations.

<sup>12</sup> Unlike Obolensky, Tolochko noticed that the insertion from the *Chronicle of Hamartolos* in the *Chronograph* contains the number "3324", which differs from the original "3332" in *Hamartolos*. However, he refuses to admit the influence of the *Primary Chronicle*, where exactly this sum occurs:  $2242 + 1082 = 3324$ . He attempted to solve the problem by hypothesizing an «Antiochian era» in the *Chronograph* (minus 5500 years instead of 5508 according to standard recalculation dates from C.M. to A.D.) [24, 281]. But, as our sources show, it is not the case since the figure "3324" is by no means the only borrowing from the *Primary Chronicle* into the *Chronograph*.

Table 2).<sup>13</sup> As the *Primary Chronicle* appears to be one of the additional sources of the *Judean Chronograph*,<sup>14</sup> Obolensky's argument, in spite of having been questioned by Thomson and Tolochko, still stands.

<sup>13</sup> As for second (in fact, first) borrowing, see the 15<sup>th</sup> Sermon (Table 2). Istrin considered the *Judean Chronograph* placed here as "an apocryphon, printed in the *Palaeas*" [22, 328], but in fact, it is an exact quotation from the "Introduction" of the *Primary Chronicle*. The loan from *Palaeas* is excluded since the author of the *Judean Chronograph* deals with the text of his source much more accurately than *Palaeas*'s compiler. Cf. the *Chronicle* and the *Chronograph* «зѣдѣша / вижѣша столпъ за .м. лѣтъ» versus *Palaeas* and the Introductory Part of the *Ellinsky Letopisets* «бысть оубо дѣлаему столпу .м. лѣтъ»; «по размѣшеннѣ же ѣзыкѣ» — «по раздѣленнѣ оубо ѣзыкѣ», and so on. Besides, while the compilation in the *Chronograph* is simple (Gen.11.5-9 — borrowing from the "Introduction" of the *Primary Chronicle* — Gen.11.10-), *Palaeas* have a very complex composition, with inserts from the "Philosopher's Speech" and the "Introduction" of the *Chronicle* (in this order) mixed in with other sources.

Tatiana Anisimova recently sought to prove the thesis that the texts of all medieval Old Rus'ian chronographs and chronicles, including the *Judean Chronograph*, the *Primary Chronicle*, *Palaeas*, and *Ellinsky Letopisets* go back to some oldest proto-chronograph [44]. Unfortunately, her comparison of the texts is not valid. For example, she cites the text of Cosmas from the manuscript with text omissions [44, 185], although the edition of Cosmas came out long ago (1997). As a consequence, it seems to the reader that the Introductory part of the *Ellinsky Letopisets* and the *Short Chronographic Palaeas* reflect a partial convergence with the *Palaeas Interpretata*, while we observe another partial correspondence in Cosmas. In fact, the *Palaeas Interpretata* borrows from Cosmas more or less precisely, two *Chronographic Palaeas* closely follow the *Palaeas Interpretata*, and the *Ellinsky Letopisets* does so in heavy abbreviation. The *Judean Chronograph* appears to be separate from *Palaeas*: for example, it has quite a different set of lexical substitutions in Cosmas. Because of partial comparisons, Anisimova fails to notice that the boundaries of the insertions, as well as the way of borrowing, do not coincide in the *Judean Chronograph* and *Palaeas*. In particular, the texts of the *Chronograph* and "Introduction" to the *Primary Chronicle* correspond to each other verbatim, whereas *Palaeas* are characterized by lexical substitutions and a number of abbreviations and duplications. I write at length about the texts in the story of the pandemonium [in process]. For now, it should be noted that the very nature of the compilations favored to supplement them with new sources. And if *Palaeas* have additional texts by Cosmas, Hippolytus of Rome, «The Philosopher's Speech», and the manner of compilation is different — texts of sources are broken into smaller fragments, which increased the number of duplications and other inconsistencies — then *Palaeas* and the *Ellinsky Letopisets* belong to a later stage of the existence of this plot in Old Rus'ian literature. In any case, compilations were not created in one center.

<sup>14</sup> Where Tolochko writes that "...нет причин считать, что компилятор хронографа мог принимать во внимание или даже знать этот совершенно посторонний для него текст" ("...there is no reason to believe that the compiler of the *Chronograph* could have taken into account or even known this completely extraneous text — i.e. the *Primary Chronicle* — T.V."). "Тораздо естественнее предполагать, что в своих подсчетах он исходил бы из тех хронологических выкладок, которые уже содержались в текстах, составивших хронограф"<sup>5</sup>

As for the next questionable point (that Abraham could not meet Abimelech **immediately** after Abraham's birth, and we must add 75 years till their meeting in Canaan, cf. Gen.20.1-26), the matter is that authors of the biblical books and chronicles count ages from birth to death, and not from intermediate events. Besides, in general, medieval historians have a very complicated relationship with counting years. Let us illustrate it with the story of the Patriarch himself.

While Abraham's legitimate wife Sarah was for a long time barren, his slave Hagar bore him a son (Gen.16). After God commanded circumcision, the patriarch did his bidding along with his entire household, including his son Ishmael, who was at the time 14 years old (and Abraham was 98, Gen.17.23-25). Later, a son by his wife Sarah, Isaac, was born (Gen.21.1-3). Seeing Ishmael hurting young Isaac, Sarah demanded the slave girl and her child to be thrown out. The next day, Abraham sent Hagar and Ishmael into a desert. In the Old Church Slavonic translation: «задѣ за плещи еи (to her, i.e. Hagar) вѣтрокъ . и поусти ю» (Gen.21.18). This implies that Hagar carried Ishmael on her shoulders although he was already more than 14 years old (in fact, 17-18).<sup>15</sup> Especially impressive is the scene when the mother suffered so much from the lack of water that she put her child far away from herself, "lest she should not see her son die", and the abandoned child wept (Gen.21.14-16): «отроча въскрича въсплака са». On the whole, Ishmael is depicted as a toddler who can not yet properly walk. Noteworthy is that all these contradictions came within the frame of a coherent narrative (Gen.16-21), and neither authors, editors, nor readers were concerned about such a "minor" detail as Ishmael's age.

To summarize, our textual study shows that the author of the *Judean Chronograph* included the *Primary Chronicle* in his extensive range of sources. What is important for us, he used the figures from the *Primary Chronicle* in his chronological calculations. Thus, we must return to the traditional date of the *Chronograph* (the 1260<sup>s</sup>) and rule out the skepticism expressed by Thomson and Tolochko. This conclusion is extremely important because it confirms one of the few accurate dates in the history of Old Rus'ian chronographic literature.

---

(‘It is much more natural to assume that in his calculations he would have proceeded from those chronological calculations which were already contained in the sources of the *Chronograph*<sup>5</sup>; and in note 5, he points of the various numbers in the chronicles, as Thomson had done before him’) — he is mistaken. Quite contrary to Tolochko's opinion, the compiler of the *Chronograph* valued the *Primary Chronicle* so highly that he used it even though he had more detailed accounts of biblical history to work with and quoted it verbatim and in microcitations.

<sup>15</sup> It took two years before Isaac was born (and Abraham was 100 years old) and at least another year or two for him to become capable of playing with children. All of this makes 17—18 years old Ishmael at the time of the expulsion.

## Appendix

Bold type indicates correspondences between the texts of the *Judean Chronograph* and *Palaeas*<sup>16</sup> and the “Introduction” of the *Primary Chronicle*.<sup>17</sup> We use underlining when the texts of *Palaeas* coincide with the “Philosopher Speech” and italics when the texts of the *Chronograph* and *Palaeas* differ from the *Primary Chronicle*.

As we see, Table 2 is much more complicated than Table 1. First of all, the *Primary Chronicle* is represented here by two fragments, from the «Introduction» and from the «Philosopher’s Speech», which occupy the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> columns.<sup>18</sup> Naturally, the *Chronograph* and *Palaeas* used sources beyond the *Primary Chronicle*.

All versions of the story of pandemonium ultimately go back to Genesis 11, but this episode is retold in a mass of texts. Old Rus’ian scribes had access to the Slavonic Genesis, the *Chronicles of Hamartolos* and *Malalas*, the *Christian Topography* by Cosmas Indikopleustes, and the *Book of Jubilees* (or the *Little Genesis*).<sup>19</sup> Authors working later than the beginning of the 12<sup>th</sup> century included ready-made compilations, among them fragments of the *Primary Chronicle* and the *Palaea Interpretata*. Sometimes scribes re-checked compilations against their sources, which led, among other things, to numerous duplicates that were not systematically eliminated by compilers.

For better understanding, the texts in Table 2 are divided into segments. The fragments of the *Primary Chronicle* are labeled with letters and numbers of the Greek alphabet ( $\alpha_{1,2}$ ,  $\beta_2$ ,  $\delta$ ), the non-annalistic sources of the *Judean Chronograph* are denoted as  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ , and the non-annalistic sources of *Palaeas* — as  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n$ . The *Chronograph* took from the *Chronicle* only a fragment of the “Introduction”, while the compiler of the *Palaea Interpretata* first turned his attention to the «Philosopher’s Speech», and then proceeded to the text of the “Introduction”. The sequence of the fragments taken from the *Chronicle* in the *Chronograph* is as follows:  $\beta \delta \varepsilon$ . It is noteworthy that the passage from the “Introduction” is surrounded by quotations from Gen. 11, with  $x_3$  ending Gen. 11.9 and  $x_4$  beginning Gen. 11.10. In turns, all *Palaeas* have the sequence of fragments borrowed from the *Chronicle* as:  $\alpha \beta \delta$ . The short fragment  $\gamma$ , with the account of

<sup>16</sup> The principal copy here is Kolom, but since Kolom has many errors, the edition (1892) is useful for comparing the *Palaea Interpretata* versions [42, 230—231, 243—244]. The collation here was made on the basis of such manuscripts: A — Aleksandro-Nevsky mid-14<sup>th</sup> cent.; K — Kirillo-Belozersky no.68/1145 15<sup>th</sup> cent., W — Wien no.12 15<sup>th</sup> cent., U — Uvarov no.85/286 16<sup>th</sup> cent.; T2 — Tikhonravov 1576; Ja — Jakushkin 17<sup>th</sup> cent.; S — Silinsky 17<sup>th</sup> cent.; T — Tikhonravov 17<sup>th</sup> cent.

<sup>17</sup> The principal copy here is H. I’ve put some erroneous readings H in curly brackets.

<sup>18</sup> The “Introduction” and the “Philosopher’s Speech” in the *Primary Chronicle* are separated by dozens of folia, so it is not surprising that scribes treated them as independent texts.

<sup>19</sup> The *Jubilees* was available to the author of the *Primary Chronicle*. The story about pandemonium compiles here from Gen. 10 and 11, *Hamartolos* [27, 57-58], and the *Book of Jubilees*. In turn, the 13<sup>th</sup>—15<sup>th</sup> Sermons of the *Judean Chronograph* contain Gen. 9.19-11.4 — Cosmas [45, 23r-v] — Gen. 11.5-9 — the fragment of the “Introduction” of the *Primary Chronicle* — Gen. 11.10-. The composition of *Palaeas* is much more complex but also includes fragments of the *Primary Chronicle* and Cosmas and, additionally, some text going back to Hippolytus of Rome [46].

Tab. 2

<p>the <i>Judean Chronograph</i></p> <p>[5, 24r; 4, 24c; 6, 48b] <math>x_1</math> Gen.11.1-4 и бѣ вса земла оуста одина... гра<sup>а</sup> . и сынъ . емоу<sup>ж</sup> бѹдетъ вер'хъ до нбсе . и сътвори<sup>м</sup> собѣ имл . прѣж<sup>е</sup> даж<sup>е</sup> не разыдемса по лицу всеа зе<sup>м</sup>ла:</p> <p><math>x_2</math> Cosmas [45, 23r-v]</p> <p>[5, 24v; 4, 25a; 6, 50a] <math>x_3</math> Gen.11.5-9 <b>И</b> снидѣ гѣ бѣ видѣти града и стлѣпа... и ѡтудѣ разсѣа их гѣ бѣ по лицу всеа земла.</p>	<p>the collated text of the <i>Primary Chronicle</i>, the "Introduction"</p> <p>[33, 4.19-23; 29, 5.2-6] <math>a_{1,1}</math> и бы<sup>с</sup> азыкъ единъ . и оумноживши<sup>в</sup>пирмса<sup>1</sup> члѣвко<sup>м</sup> на земли . и помыслиша создати столпъ до нбси . <b>въ дни Нектана . и Фалека .</b> и събравшеса на мѣстѣ Сенаръ поле.</p> <p>[33, 4.23-24; 29, 5.6-7] <math>a_{2,1}</math> здати {сти}<sup>5</sup> столпъ до нбсе и {городъ} [градъ]<sup>6</sup> вколо его Вавилонъ .</p>	<p>the collated text of the <i>Primary Chronicle</i>, the "Philosopher's Speech"</p> <p>[33, 78.6; 29, 91.2-3] <math>a_{1,2}</math> и быша члѣвци мнози . и единоголасни . [и]<sup>2</sup> рѣша другъ къ другу . [сѣ]зижемъ<sup>3</sup> столпъ до нбсе .</p> <p>[33, 78.7-10; 29, 91.4-5] <math>a_{2,2}</math> и начаша здати . и бѣ старѣшина имъ Невролъ<sup>7</sup> и реч бѣ се<sup>8</sup> оумножишаса члѣвци и помысли их суетны<sup>9</sup> .</p> <p>[33, 78.10-11; 29, 91.6-7] <math>a_{2,3}</math> и сниде бѣ и размѣси азыки . на .о. и два азыка .</p> <p>[33, 78.11-17; 29, 91.7-8] <math>a_{2,4}</math> Адамовъ же азыкъ бы<sup>с</sup> не втатъ оу Авера. [33, 78.12-13; 29, 91.8-12] <math>a_{2,5}</math> то бо едінъ не приложи<sup>с</sup> къ безумью ихъ . рѣкъ сиче аще бы члѣвко<sup>м</sup> бѣ реклѣ на нбо столпъ дѣлати . то повелѣлъ бы самъ бѣ слово<sup>м</sup> . аeko же створи нбса и землю . и море . и вса видимае и невидимае .</p>	<p>the <i>Palaea Interpretata</i> and the <i>Complete Chronographic Palaea</i></p> <p><math>y_1, y_2</math> Cosmas [45, 23r-v] with annalistic microcitations<sup>4</sup></p> <p>[39, 58a.9-13; 40, 55v.22-24; 41, 65b.9-13; 43, 57d.8-11] <math>a_{2,2}</math> и начаша здати столпъ . и бѣ старѣшина ихъ и началникъ соуетьному ихъ помыслаоу именовъ Неврогъ</p> <p>[39, 58a.13-25; 40, 55v.24-56r.1; 41, 65b.16-с.2; 43, 57d.13-25] <math>a_{2,5}</math> Аверъ же юдинъ [тог'а]<sup>10</sup> не предложис<sup>11</sup> к безумью ихъ . но рече сиче . аще бы члѣвомъ бѣ реклѣ столпъ на нбо дѣлати то повелѣлъ бѣ самъ бѣ слово<sup>м</sup> . аeko же створи нбо и землю . и вса видимае и невидимае .</p> <p><math>y_3</math> бѣсть же всѣхъ лѣтъ Аверовъ {ф.} [с. и м. быс же Аверъ .ѣи]<sup>12</sup> по Нои .</p>
---	--	---	--

Tab. 2 Continued

<p>[5, 24v-25r; 4, 25a; 6, 50a-b] β <i>зж</i><sup>а</sup>аша<sup>14</sup> ж<sup>к</sup> столпъ за .м̄. лѣт<sup>т</sup> . и не свѣршенъ бы<sup>с</sup> . и сниде гѣбъ видѣти гра<sup>а</sup> и стѣпа . и ре<sup>ч</sup> гѣ . се ро<sup>а</sup> єдинъ . и ѣзы<sup>к</sup> єдинъ . и смѣси бѣ ѣзыки и раздѣли ѣ . на .о̄. и на два ѣзыка .</p>	<p>[33, 4.24-28; 29, 5.7-11] β и здаша<sup>15</sup> столпъ<sup>16</sup> . за .м̄. лѣт<sup>т</sup> . и не свѣршенъ бы<sup>с</sup> . и <sup>а</sup> сниде гѣбъ<sup>17</sup> видѣтъ {горо<sup>а</sup>} [градъ]<sup>18</sup> и столпа<sup>19</sup> . и ре<sup>ч</sup> гѣ се родъ єдинъ . и ѣзыкъ єдинъ . и смѣси бѣ ѣзыки . и раздѣли на .о̄. и на<sup>20</sup> два ѣзыка .</p> <p>[33, 4.28; 29, 5.11] γ (cf. Gen.11.8-9) и рассѣѣ по всеи земл<sup>а</sup> .</p>	<p>[33, 78.17-19; 29, 91.12-14] <i>а</i><sub>2.6</sub> {того ра<sup>а</sup> сего} [сего ради того]<sup>27</sup> ѣзыкъ не премѣниса . Ѱ сего су<sup>т</sup> <u>єврѣи</u> . на .о̄. и <u>єдинъ</u> ѣзыкъ раздѣлища<sup>с</sup> ...</p> <p>[33, 78.22-24; 29, 91.17-19] <i>а</i><sub>2.8</sub> <u>Є</u> Ада- ма же до потопа лѣт<sup>т</sup> ѣв̄.с̄.м̄.в̄. а Ѱ потопа до <u>раздѣленъѣ ѣзыкъ</u> . <u>лѣт. ф̄.к̄.ѣ</u></p>	<p><i>а</i><sub>2.2</sub> и <u>наченьшимъ</u> <u>оубо</u> {со}зда<sup>ти</sup><sup>13</sup> стольпъ . <u>безлѣпот-</u> <u>нымъ ихъ</u> помыш- леньємъ... <i>у</i><sub>4</sub>... [45] [39, 58b.11-18; 40, 56r.6-9; 41, 65c.17-d.5; 43, 58a.6- 12] β<sub>2</sub> и <u>бы</u> [оубо]<sup>21</sup> <u>дѣлаему</u> столпу .м̄. лѣтъ . и не свѣршенъ бы<sup>с</sup> . и сниде гѣ видѣтъ столпа и ре<sup>ч</sup> гѣ се родъ єдинъ<sup>22</sup> и ѣзыкъ <u>ихъ</u> єдинъ . и смѣси бѣ ѣзыки и раздѣли <u>ѣ</u> <i>а</i><sub>2.6</sub> на .о̄. и на <u>єдинъ</u> <u>ѣзыкъ</u> [39, 58b.18-23; 40, 56r.9-11; 41, 65d.6- 10; 43, 58a.12-17] <i>а</i><sub>2.4</sub> .в̄.<sup>23</sup> <u>ѣзыкъ Ада-</u> <u>мовъ</u> . <u>имже</u> {до- саду} [досю<sup>а</sup>]<sup>24</sup> глѣху . тогъ не <u>ѡѣтъ</u> бы<sup>с</sup> . {а} [оу]<sup>25</sup> <u>Фалека сн̄а</u> <u>Аверова</u> . <i>а</i><sub>2.5</sub> <u>зане</u> ту <u>бо</u> <u>Аверъ</u> не <u>преложиса</u><sup>26</sup> <u>к</u> <u>безаконью ихъ</u> . [39, 58b.23-25; 40, 56r.12-13; 41, 65d.10-12; 43, 58a.17-19] <i>а</i><sub>2.6</sub> сего ради того ѣзык не <u>премѣниса</u> . <u>тѣмже</u> <u>оубо</u> [<u>єврѣи</u>]<sup>28</sup> <u>про-</u> <u>зваша</u><sup>с</sup> : + <i>у</i><sub>3</sub>, <i>у</i><sub>6</sub>... [45] [39, 58c.8-15; 40, 56r.17-21; 41, 66a.3-11; 43, 58a.28-b.4] = <i>а</i><sub>2.5</sub> <u>Въ</u> <u>лѣт<sup>м</sup> . глѣ тысуци</u><sup>29</sup> <u>въ</u> <u>лѣтѣи . о̄.нонѣ . глѣ</u> = <i>а</i><sub>1.1</sub> <u>во днѣ Нектана</u><sup>30</sup> . и <u>Фалека</u> раздѣли</p>
---	--	---	--



the scattering of the people, is omitted in both texts. In all probability, the *Chronograph* did not preserve it because the dispersion of people was already covered according to Gen.11.8-9, and the *Palaea Interpretata* and *Chronographic Palaeas* because of Cosmas and Hippolytus of Rome [46].

It should be emphasized that the moving of the annalistic fragments from *Palaeas* into the *Judean Chronograph* is impossible since the compiler of the *Chronograph* makes more extensive and precise use of the text of the "Introduction" of the *Primary Chronicle*. Cf., in particular,  $\epsilon$ , absent in *Palaeas*, as well as  $\beta$  and  $\delta$  versus  $\beta_2$  and  $\delta_2$ .

It is particularly significant for us that the author of the *Chronograph* quotes from the *Chronicle* literally, not limiting himself to microcitations, as he did in his chronological calculations (Table 1). The way the scribe handled the insertions leaves no room for doubt that the compiler of the *Judean Chronograph* was perfectly familiar with the *Primary Chronicle*.

## Abbreviations

- A** — Moscow-Academy copy of the *Primary Chronicle*  
**Ak** — Academy copy of the *Novgorod First Chronicle*  
**Am.tr** — *Hamartolos*, First or Trinity redaction  
**Am.s** — *Hamartolos*, Second redaction  
**Arkh** — Arkhival copy of the *Judean Chronograph*  
**Chl** — Chlebnikov copy of the *Primary Chronicle*  
**H** — Hypatian copy of the *Primary Chronicle*  
**K** — Comission copy of the *Novgorod First Chronicle*  
**Kolom** — Kolomensky copy of the *Palaea Interpretata*  
**L** — Laurentian copy of the *Primary Chronicle*  
**N1** — *Novgorod First Chronicle*  
**N4** — *Novgorod Forth Chronicle*  
**NK** — *Novgorod-Karamzin Chronicle*  
**Pog** — Pogodin copy of the *Complete Chronographic Palaea*  
**R** — Radziwill copy of the *Primary Chronicle*  
**Rum** — Rumiantsev copy of the *Complete Chronographic Palaea*  
**S1** — *Sofian First Chronicle*  
**Syn** — Synodal copy of the *Complete Chronographic Palaea*  
**T** — Tolstoi copy of the *Novgorod First Chronicle*  
**Vil** — Vilnius copy of the *Judean Chronograph*  
**Wars** — Warsawian copy of the *Judean Chronograph*

## REFERENCES

1. Thomson, F. The Slavonic Translation of the Old Testament. *Interpretation of the Bible*. Ljubljana and Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998, 607-918.
2. Lemeshkin, I. Sovijaus sakmė ir 1262 metų Chronographas (pagal Archyvinį, Varšuvos, Vilniaus ir I. J. Zabelino nuorašus). Vilnius: LLTI, 2009 [in Lithuanian].
3. Chronica Galiciano-Voliniana (Chronica Romanoviciana), Dąbrowski, D., Jusupović, A., Juriewa, I., Majorow, A., Wiłkuł, T. (Eds.). *Monumenta Poloniae historica. Nova series. XVI*. Kraków; Warszawa: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 2017 [in Polish, in Old Church Slavonic].
4. Arkhival copy of the *Judean Chronograph*. RGADA, collection MGAMID. № 279/658 [in Old Church Slavonic].
5. Vilnius copy of the *Judean Chronograph*. Lietuvos mokslų akademijos Vrubleskių biblioteka (The Wroblewski library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences). № 109/147 [in Old Church Slavonic].
6. Warsaw copy of the *Judean Chronograph*. Biblioteka Narodowa. Dział zbiorów specjalnych. BOZ cim.83 [in Old Church Slavonic].
7. Orlov, A. O galicko-volynskom letopisanii. *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury*. 5. 1947, 15-35 [in Russian].  
[Орлов А. О галицко-волинском летописании. *Труды Отдела древнерусской литературы*. 5. 1947. С. 15—35].
8. Orlov, A. K voprosu ob Ipatievskoj letopisi. *Izvestiia Otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti*. 31. 1926, 93-126 [in Russian].  
[Орлов А. К вопросу об Ипатьевской летописи. *Известия Отделения русского языка и литературы*. 31. 1926. С. 93—126].
9. Hensiors'kyi, A. Halytsko-Volynskiy litopys (protses skladannia; redaktsii i redaktory). Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo AN URSSR, 1958 [in Ukrainian].  
[Генсьорський А. Галицько-Волинський літопис (процес складання; редакції і редактори) Київ: Вид-во АН УРСР, 1958].
10. Hensiorskyi, A. Halytsko-Volynskiy litopys (leksychni, frazeolohichni ta stylistychni osoblyvosti). Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo AN URSSR, 1961 [in Ukrainian].  
[Генсьорський А. Галицько-Волинський літопис (лексичні, фразеологічні та стилістичні особливості). Київ: Вид-во АН УРСР, 1961].
11. Tolochko, A. O galickom boiarine Zhiroslave, ego ventse i ubozhestve. *Ruthenica*. 5. 2006. 252-256 [in Russian].  
[Толочко А. О галицком боярине Жирославе, его венце и убожестве. *Ruthenica*. 5. 2006. С. 252—256].
12. Tolochko, A. Odnа zaimstvovannaia formula v Galicko-Volynskoj letopisi. *Ruthenica*. 5. 2006. 256-257 [in Russian].  
[Толочко А. Одна заимствованная формула в Галицко-Волинской летописи. *Ruthenica*. 5. 2006. С. 256—257].
13. Halytsko-Volynskiy litopys. Tekstolohiia. Ed. by Oleksiy Tolochko. Kyiv: Akademperiodyka, 2020 [in Ukrainian].  
[Галицько-Волинський літопис. Текстологія. Під ред. О. Толочко. Київ: Академперіодика, 2020].
14. Lemeshkin, I. Ioann Malala i folklornoe skazanie o Sovii v sostave Chronographa 1262 g.: perevodnaia vizantijskaia chronika i drevniaia litovskaia literatura. *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*. Vilnius, 2006, 229-275 [in Russian].

- [Лемешкин И. Иоанн Малала и фольклорное сказание о Совии в составе Хронографа 1262 г.: переводная византийская хроника и древняя литовская литература. *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*. Vilnius, 2006. С. 229—275].
15. Vilkul, T. O nekotorykh istochnikakh litovskikh izvestij Galicko-Volynskoj letopisi. *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės istorijos šaltiniai. Faktas. Kontekstas. Interpretacija*. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2007, 17–28 [in Russian].  
[Вилкула Т. О некоторых источниках литовских известий Галицко-Волынской летописи. *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės istorijos šaltiniai. Faktas. Kontekstas. Interpretacija*. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2007. Р. 17—28].
  16. Vilkul, T. Iudeiskij i Sofijskij chronography v istorii drevnerusskoi chronographii. *Palaeoslavica. T. XVIII, № 2*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2009, 65–86 [in Russian].  
[Вилкула Т. Иудейский и Софийский хронографы в истории древнерусской хронографии. *Palaeoslavica. T. XVIII, № 2*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2009. Р. 65—86].
  17. Vilkul, T. Litopys i chronograph. Studii z domongols'koho kyivs'koho litopysannia. Kyiv: Institut istorii Ukrainy NANU, 2015 [in Ukrainian].  
[Вилкула Т. Літопис і хронограф. Студії з домонгольського київського літописання. К.: Інститут історії України НАНУ, 2015].
  18. Knyga Iskhod. Drevneslavianskij polnyj (chetij) text po spiskam 14–16 vekov. Ed. by T. Vilkul. Moskva: Kvadriga, 2015 [in Russian, in Old Church Slavonic].  
[Книга Исход. Древнеславянский полный (четий) текст по спискам XIV—XVI веков. Сост. Т. Вилкул. Москва: «Квадрига», 2015].
  19. Dyaialektalahichny atlas belaruskaj movy. Minsk, 1963 [in Belarussian].  
[Дыялекталагічны атлас беларускай мовы. Мінськ, 1963].
  20. Nikolaev, S. Novye dannye po istoricheskoi fonetike vostochnoslavianskikh iazykov. *Slavianskoe i balkanskoe iazykoznanie. 23. Balto-slavianskaia komparativistika. Aktsentologija. Dalnee rodstvo iazykov. Pamiati Vladimira Antonovicha Dybo*. Moskva: Institut slaviano-vedeniia RAN, 2023, 179–247 [in Russian].  
[Николаев С. Новые данные по исторической фонетике восточнославянских языков. *Славянское и балканское языкознание. Вып. 23. Балто-славянская компаративистика. Акцентология. Дальнее родство языков. Памяти Владимира Антоновича Дыбо*. Москва: Институт славяноведения РАН, 2023. С. 179—247].
  21. Obolenskij, M. Predislovie. *Letopisets Pereiaslavlia-Suzdalskogo, sostavlenyj v nachale 13 veka (mezhdy 1214 i 1219 gg.)*. Moskva, 1851, I–LX [in Russian].  
[Оболенский М. Предисловие. *Летописец Переяславля-Суздальского, составленный в начале XIII в. (между 1214 и 1219 гг.)*. Москва, 1851. С. I—LX].
  22. Istrin, V. Aleksandriia russkikh chronographov. Issledovanie i text. Moskva: Universitetskaia tipografiia, 1893 [in Russian, in Old Church Slavonic].  
[Истрин В. Александрия русских хронографов. Исследование и текст. Москва: Университетская типография, 1893].
  23. Dąbrowsky, D. Badając Kronikę Halicko-Wołyńską (Kronikę Romanowiczów). Rozważania na marginesie opracowania Oleksija Tołoczki, *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 2023. CXXX, 2, 379–397 [in Polish].
  24. Tolochko, A. O date tak nazyvaemogo Iudeiskogo chronographa. *Ruthenica*. 15. 2019, 279–282 [in Russian].  
[Толочко А. О дате так называемого Иудейского хронографа. *Ruthenica*. 15. 2019. С. 279—282].
  25. Ivanov, S. Mifologicheskij konvoj “basni o Sovii” v sostave Iudeiskogo chronografa. *Slaviano-vedenie*. 2010. 2, 63–71 [in Russian].

- [Иванов С. Мифологический конвой «басни о Совии» в составе Иудейского хронографа, *Славяноведение*. 2010: 2. С. 63—71].
26. Vilkul, T. The “Legend of Sovij”, Hamartolos, and the Primary Chronicle in the Judean Chronograph, Conference «*Francysk Skaryna and the Renaissance book culture. Skaryna’s Little Travel Book turns 500*». Vilnius, 22-23, September, 2022 [in English].
  27. Istrin, V. Knigy vremen’nyia i obraznyia Georgiia Mnikha. Chronika Georgiia Amartola v drevnem slaviano-russkom perevode. 1: Text. Petrograd: Rossiiskaia gosudarstvennaia Akademicheskaia tipografiia, 1920 [in Russian, in Old Church Slavonic].  
[Истрин В. Книги временныя и образныя Георгия Мниха. Хроника Георгия Амартола в древнем славяно-русском переводе. 1: Текст. Петроград: Российская государственная Академическая типография, 1920].
  28. Matveenko, V., Shchegoleva, L. Knigy vremen’nye i obraznye Georgiia Monakha. 1. Interpretirovannyj text Troitskoj rukopisi. Moskva: Nauka, 2006 [in Russian, in Old Church Slavonic].  
[Матвеев В., Щеголева Л. Книги временные и образные Георгия Монаха. 1. Интерпретированный текст Троицкой рукописи. Москва: Наука, 2006].
  29. Lavrentievskaja letopis’. In: *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisej. 1*. Moskva: Iazyki russkoj kultury, 1997 [in Old Church Slavonic].  
[Лаврентьевская летопись. *Полное собрание русских летописей. 1*. Москва: Языки русской культуры, 1997].
  30. The Povest’ vremennykh let: An Interlinear Collation and Paradosis. Ostrowski, D., Birnbaum, D., Lunt, H. (Eds.). I-III. Cambridge, Mass., 2003 [in English, in Old Church Slavonic].
  31. Guimont, T. Historical writing of Early Rus (c. 1000 — c. 1400) in a comparative perspective. Brill, 2021.
  32. Nikolaev, S., Vilkul, T. Variants Between the Novgorod First Chronicle and the Novgorodian-Sophian Group in Relation with the Primary Chronicle. *Revue des études Slaves*. Paris, 2023, 94. Fascicule 3 and 4, 319-338 and 607-622 [in Russian].  
[Вилкул Т.А., Николаев С.А. Расхождения Новгородской I летописи и Новгородско-Софийских сводов на материале «Повести временных лет». *Revue des études Slaves*. Париж, 2023. 94. 3—4. P. 319—338 and 607—622].
  33. Ipatievskaja letopis’. In: *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisej. 2*. Moskva: Iazyki slavianskoj kultury, 2001 [in Old Church Slavonic].  
[Ипатьевская летопись. *Полное собрание русских летописей. 2*. Москва: Языки славянской культуры, 2001].
  34. Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis’ starshego i mladshego izvodov. Ed. by A. Nasonov. Moskva; Leningrad: Izdatelstvo AN SSSR, 1950 [in Old Church Slavonic].  
[Новгородская первая летопись старшего и младшего изводов. Под ред. и с предисловием А. Н. Насонова. Москва; Ленинград: Изд. АН СССР, 1950].
  35. Novgorodskaja Karamzinskaia letopis’. In: *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisej. 42*. Sankt-Peterburg: Dmitrij Bulanin, 2002 [in Old Church Slavonic].  
[Новгородская Карамзинская летопись. *Полное собрание русских летописей. 42*. Санкт-Петербург: Дмитрий Буланин, 2002].
  36. Sofijskaia pervaja letopis’ starshego izvoda. In: *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisej. 6. 1*. Moskva: Iazyki slavianskoj kultury, 2000 [in Old Church Slavonic].  
[Софийская первая летопись старшего извода. *Полное собрание русских летописей. 6. 1*. Москва: Языки славянской культуры, 2000].
  37. Novgorodskaja Chetvertaja letopis’. In: *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisej. 4. 1*. Moskva: Iazyki slavianskoj kultury, 2000 [in Old Church Slavonic].

- [Новгородская Четвертая летопись. Полное собрание русских летописей. 4. 1. Москва: Языки славянской культуры, 2000].
38. Клуша Buttia. Davnioslov'ians'kyj chetij text za spyskamy 14-16 stolit', vstup ta uporiadkuvannia textu Vilkul, T., pokazhchyky sliv Nikolaev, S. *Kyivs'ke chrystyianstvo, XXII*. Lviv: Vydavnytstvo UKU, 2020 [in Ukrainian, in Old Church Slavonic].  
[Книга Буття. Давньослов'янський четій текст за списками XIV—XVI століть, вступ, упорядкування тексту Т. Вілкул, покажчики слів С. Ніколаєва. *Київське християнство. XXII*. Львів: Видавництво УКУ, 2020].
39. Kolomensky copy of the *Palaea Interpretata*. Moskva, Rossiiskaia Gosudarstvennaia Biblioteka. Otdel rukopisei, Troitsky, no. 38, 1406 [in Old Church Slavonic].  
[Коломенський список *Толкової Палеї*. Москва, Російська Державна Бібліотека. Відділ рукописів, збір. Троїцьке, № 38. 1406 р.].
40. Pogodin copy of the *Complete Chronographic Palaea*. Sankt-Peterburg. Rossiiskaia Natsionalnaia Biblioteka. Otdel rukopisei, Pogodin, no.1435, early 16th cent. [in Old Church Slavonic].  
[Погодинський список *Повної Хронографічної палеї*. Санкт-Петербург, Російська національна бібліотека. Відділ рукописів, збір. Погодинське, №1435, 1-а пол. XVI ст.].
41. Synodal copy of the *Complete Chronographic Palaea*. Moskva. Gosudarstvennyi Istoricheskii Muzei. Otdel rukopisei, Synodal, no.220, 1477 [in Old Church Slavonic].  
[Синодальний список *Повної Хронографічної палеї*. Москва. Державний Історичний музей. Відділ рукописів, збір. Синодальне, №220, 1477 р.].
42. *Paleia Tolkovaia po spisku sdellanomu v Kolomne v 1406 godu*. Trud uchenikov N. S. Tikhonravova. Moskva, 1892 [in Old Church Slavonic].  
[Палея Толковая по списку, сделанному в Коломне в 1406 году. Труд учеников Н. С. Тихонравова. Москва, 1892].
43. Rumiantsev copy of the *Complete Chronographic Palaea*. Moskva. Rossiiskaia Gosudarstvennaia Biblioteka. Otdel rukopisei, Rumiantsev, no.453, 1495 [in Old Church Slavonic].  
[Рум'янцевський список *Повної Хронографічної палеї*. Москва. Російська Державна Бібліотека. Відділ рукописів, збір. Рум'янцевське, №453, 1495 р.].
44. Anisimova, T. Proiskhozhdenie skhodnykh statej v bibleiskikh chastiakh drevnerusskikh chronographov: skazaniia o stolpotvorenii, Serukhe, Farre, Avraame i Isave, *Vestnik PSTGU. Seria III: Filologia*. Moskva, 2023, 74, 9-30 [in Russian].  
[Анисимова Т. Происхождение сходных статей в библейских частях древнерусских хронографов: сказания о столпотворении, Серухе, Фарре, Аврааме и Исаве, *Вестник ПСТГУ. Серия III: Филология*. Москва, 2023, 74. С. 9—30].
45. Golyshenko, V., Dubrovina, V. *Kniga naritsaema Kozma Indikoplov*. Moskva, 1997 [in Old Church Slavonic].  
[Книга нарицаема Козьма Индикоплов. Cosmas (Indicopleustes), В. С. Гольшенко, В. Ф. Дубровина. Москва: Индик, 1997]
46. Vilkul, T. *Tolkovaia Paleia i Povest' vremennykh let*. Siuzhet o "razdelenii jazyk". *Ruthenica, VI*. Kyiv, 2007, 37-85 [in Russian]  
[Вилкул Т. Толковая Палея и Повесть временных лет. Сюжет о «разделении язык» *Ruthenica. VI*. К., 2007. С. 37—85].

Received 18.11.2024

*Тетяна ВІЛКУЛ*

докторка історичних наук, провідна наукова співробітниця,  
Інститут історії України НАН України (Київ, Україна)  
tvilkul@gmail.com  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2737-8372>

ПОВІСТЬ ВРЕМЕННИХ ЛІТ  
В ІУДЕЙСЬКОМУ ХРОНОГРАФІ (1262)

Хронологію Іудейського хронографа, який є єдиною точно датованою в давньоруській літературі історичною компіляцією, останнім часом переглядали, спираючись на різноманітні текстологічні аргументи. **Мета** статті — з'ясувати, чи спроба ревізії правомірна. Також необхідно отримати відповідь на питання, чи знав укладач Іудейського хронографа Повість временних літ (Початковий літопис), адже ця відповідь обумовлює датування Хронографа. Для розв'язання проблем співвідношення текстів застосовуються **методи** текстуальної критики. **Наукова новизна.** Вперше детально проаналізовано цитати, запозичені у Хронограф із Початкового літопису. **Висновки.** Автор Іудейського хронографа був добре знайомий із Повістю временних літ, цитуючи її як дослівно, так і в мікроцитатах. Тож свідчення текстів дійсно ведуть до 1262 р. й підстав переглядати традиційну дату утворення Іудейського хронографа немає.

**Ключові слова:** середньовічні літописи та хронографи, Давня Русь, текстологія, переклади з грецької на давньослов'янську.