

[The Knowledge Bank at The Ohio State University](#)

Feature Title: Лѣтопись Lietopis' Chronicle

Article Title: 22 November 1980, Oxford: Meeting of the Slavic and East European
Medieval Study Group

Part 1: Simeon Polockii's Library by Anthony Hoppisley (51-52)

Part 2: Problems of Transmission in Judging Linguistic Development
by Veronica Du Feu (52-54)

Part 3: The 'Zakonik' of Tsar Dušan: A Socio-Political Study
by Muriel Heppell (55)

Article Authors: Anthony Hoppisley, Veronica Du Feu, and Muriel Heppell

Journal Title: Polata Knigopisnaia

Issue Date: December 1982

Publisher: William R. Veder, Vakgroep Slavistiek, Katholieke Universiteit, Postbus
9103, 6500 HD Nijmegen (Holland)

Citation: *Polata Knigopisnaia: an Information Bulletin Devoted to the Study of Early
Slavic Books, Texts and Literatures* 6 (December 1982): 51-55.

Appears in:

Community: [Hilandar Research Library](#)

Sub-Community: [Polata Knigopisnaia](#)

Collection: [Polata Knigopisnaia: Volume 6 \(December 1982\)](#)

ЛѢТОПИСЬ

22 NOVEMBER 1980, OXFORD:

MEETING OF THE SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN MEDIEVAL STUDY GROUP

SIMEON POLOCKIJ'S LIBRARY

ANTHONY HIPPISEY

A fascinating insight into the erudition of Simeon Polockij, the Byelorussian monk and poet who flourished in Moscow from about 1663 to 1680, is afforded by an examination of the library which he amassed during those years and which he left to his disciple Silvestr Medvedev. The inventory that was drawn up in 1689 (published by I.E. Zabelin in 1853) comprises 539 items, and by comparing it with the catalogue of the *Sinodal'naja tipografija* collection (CGADA fond 381) of which it subsequently became part, it is possible to identify a good proportion of the original library. Most of the books were Latin or Polish, almost none were Greek or Slavonic. Among non-religious works, Polockij possessed half a dozen books on astronomy and astrology (by Leowitz, Dee, Argolus, Sacrobosco, Hyginus, Alchabitius, and Albumasar), about a dozen on medicine, chemistry, and mineralogy (by Geber, Galen, Paulus Aegineta, Mercurialis, Argenterius, Lessius, Loesel, Fontanus, Sennertus, de Boodt, and Rueus), seven emblem-books (by Alciati, Camerarius, Drexelius, Neugebauer, David, Treterus, and Caussin), a dozen historical works (by Baronius, Josephus, Opmeer, Briet, Severus, Trogus, Dempster, Rolewinck, Bielski, Kromer, and Strykowski), four or five encyclopaedic works (*Polyanthea*, *Speculum quadruplex*, *Florilegium*, *Apophthegmata*, and Beyerlinck's *Theatrum vitae humanae*), and a good selection of classics, all in Latin (Aristotle, Cicero, Cato, Ovid, Plautus, Pliny the Younger, Plutarch, Seneca, Terence, Virgil, Statius, Livy, Sallust, etc.). Somewhat over half of Polockij's original library seems to have survived and is preserved in CGADA.

Bibliography: Primary texts

Knigi perepisnye knigam, kotorye po ukazu svjatejšago patriarcha v nynešnem vo 198 godu sentjabrja v den' perepisany v spasskom monastyre, za ikonnym rjadom, podle cerkvi v verchnej kladovoj polatke. Edited by I.E. ZABELIN, "Vremennik Imp. Mosk. obščestva istorii i drevnostej rossijskich", bk. 16, M., 1853, "Smes". pp. 53-67.

Katalog staropečatnym i novym knigam, nachodjaščimsja v Biblioteke Moskovskoj sinodal'noj tipografii, 1888 (MS., no shelf-mark, preserved in CGADA)

Secondary literature

- V. POGORELOV, *Biblioteka Moskovskoj sinodal'noj tipografii, čast' 2, Pečatnye knigi, vyp. 1, Inostrannye knigi XV i XVI vv. (1485-1538), M., 1903.*
- A. POKROVSKIJ, *Biblioteka Moskovskoj sinodal'noj tipografii, cast 2, Pečatnye knigi, vyp. 2, Inostrannye knigi XVI v. (1539-1570), M., 1912.*
- SAVVA (I.M. TICHOMIROV), *Ukazatel' dlja obozrenija moskovskoj patriaršej (nyne sinodal'noj) riznicy i biblioteki, M., 1855.*
- M. POLUDENSKIJ, *Opisanie patriaršej biblioteki 1718 goda, "Russkij archiv", 1864.*
- S. BELOKUROV, *O biblioteke moskovskich gosudarej v XVI stoletii, M., 1898.*
- S.P. LUPPOV, *Kniga v Rossii v XVII veke, L., 1970.*

PROBLEMS OF TRANSMISSION IN JUDGING LINGUISTIC DEVELOPMENT
VERONICA DU FEU

The discontinuity in time and space of sources from which historians of culture and language build up their picture of the past results in a distortion of view. In the absence of precise historical facts, historians impose a contemporary view of data, accepting, implicitly if not explicitly, the notions of standard language and clear political boundaries as universally applicable. A simple example: the Common Slavonic **se* (the accusative of the reflexive pronoun) > *sie* in modern Polish. No problem? But the real history of *sie*, even in the fragmentary form in which we have access to it, is much more convoluted: by the 16th century there is no evidence of nasality in the Wielkopolski dialects; in the dialects of Małopolska nasality is erratic; there is nasality, but the other nasal *a*, in Mazowsza. The reason for *sie*, according to Kuraszkiwicz, was archaising by early printers in Kraków. Once established there, it stayed in the literary language. Our picture therefore is not *se* > *sie*, but *se* → *s'e* WP

s'e/se MP > *sie* lit. Pol.

s'a M

Another example of distortion by simplification is Zaimov's monograph on Ivan Vladislav's inscription in Bitolj. This is a 12-line inscription dating from 1015/16 announcing the building of a fortress. From the paleographic and linguistic point of view it shows consistency in the use of the nasals and inconsistency in the use of the *yers*. In the case of the *yers* there are many more soft for hard than the other way round. Zaimov points to other MSS

that have similar hesitation between hard and soft *jers* and quotes Seliščev who says that this was simply orthographic. But this does not answer the question why are there more soft than hard *jers*? He does not seem to be willing to admit that this can be explained by geography. In 1015, at Bitolj, Ivan Vladislav was over 500 kilometers as the crow flies from the ancient capital of Preslav he was in the heartland of quite a different tradition, in St Clement's area. Macedonian-Serbian characteristics, therefore, are liable to be found in this inscription. With geography in mind we do not need to explain the regular distinction between ѣ and њ as due to an adherence to an earlier tradition, because it is only in the Eastern Bulgarian tradition that they were confused. This would also eliminate the need for an opposing view which sees features such as ѡ for ѡи, and В 2 as 'progressive'

Another feature that distinguishes this text is the lack of jotation the strokes before *e* and *a* following another vowel. Judging from other available inscriptions, this seems one of the clear distinctions between the Bulgarian and Macedonian-Serbian traditions of the late 10th and early 11th centuries: for instance, the 972 fragment from Preslav has дѣлаѣ whereas the Samuel inscription of 993 from Macedonian has полагаѣ. The linguistic evidence is clear and is not contradicted by the contents of the inscription which announces that the fortress at Bitolj was built ... [На оубѣ] ѡжише и на ѡпсении и на жнзнь вьгаромь. This, says the editor, proves that the population of Bitolj and its surroundings was Bulgarian. In fact, all it implies is that the Bulgarians were in need of protection (they were fleeing the Byzantines). The local population was not necessarily involved, and to draw ethnographic conclusions about such a population from the ethnic origins of its rulers is hardly a yardstick of objective analysis.

I turn now to an example from the history of the Eastern Slavs. The strength of Russia's Church and the mobility of its secular rulers assured the relative unity of the old Russian literary language. Bulakhovsky, taking issue with both Istrin and Obnorsky, made it clear in the opening paragraphs of his *Kommentarii* that the relatively monolithic nature of the literary language does not alter the real differences between distances and periods. The early literary language of the Eastern Slavs is only occasionally useful as a clue to reality; the language and traditions found in the law codes give a truer image. The 1229 Smolensk treaty with Riga and Gotland and the 1262/63 agreement between Alexander Nevski and the Teutonic Order are in-

by the same spirit as that which is seen in the Vinodolski and Vrbanski statutes, by the same concern for trade and justice on the part of the elders as that expressed in the City states of Italy, and by the same notion of a collective effort of good people for the common weal. Both the *Nogorodskaya Sudnaya Gramota* (15th century MS) and the *Pskovskaya Sudnaya Gramota* of 1467 (16th century MSS), despite the fact that our late copies date from the period of centralization, reflect joint decisions by the people of these cities and preoccupation with trade, possessions and the rule of law. The editors of the *Pamyatniki Russkogo Prava* are quite happy to see these documents as evidence of a straight line of continuity from the *Russkaya Pravda* and yet the attitudes and societies reflected in them are quite different. The *Sudnyye Gramoty* are as different as chalk from cheese from such a jaundiced document as the *Russkaya Pravda*, which demands *wergeld* and blood revenge at every step. This difference cannot be explained just by time or evolution of society, for Kievan Russia was rich, and in many ways more powerful and sophisticated than the Northern cities. So we can only think that Scandinavians with a Byzantine veneer have to be held responsible. Smolensk, Novgorod and Pskov, described as 'feudal republics' in the *PRP*, possessed democratic traits in the Greek sense of the participation of a large percentage of the population in government. They were not feudal in the fief-owing sense. The Lithuanian Statute of 1529, on the other hand, directly related to the so-called 'Privileges' of the previous century, is certainly the product of King and State, concerned with loyalty and treachery and with the wheels of bureaucracy. The 1497 *Sudebnik* is equally concerned with administration and, though we know that a good many of its ideas were part of what Ivan III understood as the mantle of Byzantium, the models of Polish and Lithuanian Privileges would be near to hand to reinforce precise forms. The *Sudebnik* of 1550 is even more clearly in this feudal tradition. What I would like to emphasize is the '*razdroblennost*' in all this. Three distinct traditions exist in Poland and in Muscovy. As medievalists we need to keep a wary eye on 'convenient' lines of development which do no more than justify that which appears true today: we are in a position to see the discontinuity and fragmentation of the past and to use our knowledge for a better interpretation of the real present.

THE 'ZAKONIK' OF TSAR DUŠAN: A SOCIO-POLITICAL STUDY

MURIEL HEPPELL

The subject of this paper was the *Zakonik* or law code first promulgated by the Serbian Tsar Dušan in 1349, with an expanded version five years later.

After a brief sketch of the historical background, the transmission of the text and the legal documents and traditions which influenced the *Zakonik*, most of the paper was devoted to an analysis of its content and a discussion of the light it throws on the social and economic structure of medieval Serbia. The majority of the clauses of the *Zakonik* (which are not arranged in any logical order) deal with ecclesiastical affairs, property and land tenure, and crimes and their punishment. There are also a number of items relating to the administration of justice and court procedure. Particular stress is laid on the operation of the three-tier jury system (one of the most interesting aspects of the *Zakonik*), and the conception of law as the sovereign force in the state.

21-24 MARCH 1981, BIRMINGHAM:

FIFTEENTH SPRING SYMPOSIUM OF BYZANTINE STUDIES

BYZANTIUM AND THE SLAVS

HAGIOGRAPHICAL WRITING AMONG THE ORTHODOX SLAVS

FAITH C.M. WIGZELL (KITCH)

That hagiographical writing among the Orthodox Slavs was dependent on Byzantine models is not a matter of dispute: as is well known, the Slavs received Byzantine hagiography in its various forms (sub-genres) through translations, and imitated them according to their needs: the *vita* (both *synaxaria* and longer forms), the *encomium*, the *patericon*, the *martyrion* and subsidiary forms such as accounts of the translation of relics are all to be found in Slavonic. Similarly, the stylistic range of Byzantine hagiography, from high-style rhetorical to popular, was reproduced in Slavonic. Given widely differing dates and place of composition as well as stylistic and generic variety, it might be argued that it is not possible to determine any distinctive Slavonic features, especially since the relationship with Byzantine hagiography was a continuing one. Certainly the task presents con-