

From: Daniel Waugh <dwaugh@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>

Author's Subject: new text edition: Latukhinskaia stepennaia kniga

Date Written: Sun, 28 Jul 2013 13:27:54 -0700

Date Posted: Mon, 28 Jul 2013 16:27:54 -0400

<<http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=H-EarlySlavic&month=1307&week=e&msg=X9FKw8COwgf0yCIZjby2dQ&user=&pw=>>

Latukhinskaia stepennaia kniga 1676 goda. Izdanie podgotovili N. N. Pokrovskii, A. V. Sirenov. Otvetstvennyi redaktor N. N. Pokrovskii. Moskva: Iazyki slavianskoi kul'tury. 880 pp. ISBN 978-5-9551-0567-3.

The long-overdue revival of interest in the Muscovite "Book of Royal Degrees" (*Stepennaia kniga*, for convenience below abbreviated SK) has brought us a new edition of that important text, a substantial revision in our understanding of its origins and much additional scholarship about its contents. The book reviewed here may be seen as another product of this welcome attention to SK, in that the editors had a major role in the recent work on the 16th century text. One might (perversely?) argue that it is even more important that we have proper editions of the later versions/continuations of the SK such as this one, since they were the ones that tended to be mined by historians such as Karamzin, who have shaped (distorted?) our understanding of early Russian history and whose influence has been so hard to shake off. Indeed, it was Karamzin who acquired the eponymous copy of the "Latukhin" text, so dubbed for the Balakhna merchant from whom he bought it.

The edition here is based on what has to be close to the authorial copy (Nizhnii Novgorod Regional Library, Ts-2658/2, dated 1679) of the "extended" version of the *Latukhinskaia stepennaia kniga*, a copy first brought to scholarly attention by L. L. Murav'eva in the 1960s. The final section (missing in that manuscript) has been supplied from RNB, F.IV.249, a "Chronographic Miscellany" of approximately the same date, and a few other lacunae filled from GIM, Sinodal'noe sobranie No. 293. N. N. Pokrovskii contributed an introductory essay reviewing various aspects of the text's history and its contents, although not really attempting to clarify its relationship to its sources. A. V. Sirenov's archaeological survey incorporates some of the material he has published elsewhere on the text and the manuscripts. There are indexes of personal and geographic names and a concordance table for the authorial and archival numbering of the folios in the Nizhnii Novgorod manuscript.

The Latukhin *Stepennaia kniga* has long been of interest for its sometimes unique information on the Muscovite Time of Troubles. Other important features of the text are its substantial attention to the Muscovite acquisition of Siberia and its inclusion even if largely in capsule summary, of information about a huge number of Russian saints. During the middle part of the 17th century, the original SK appears to have been little used: indicative is the history of the short-lived *Zapisnoi prikaz* of the late 1650s, where a copy of it could not be obtained by those assigned by Aleksei Mikhailovich to write a continuation. While M. D. Kagan-Tarkovskaia suggested that the SK was an important source for the compilation of the *Tituliarnik* late in Aleksei Mikhailovich's reign, Sirenov has shown that this was not the

case, and that, apparently, no copy of SK was then available in the library of the Posol'skii prikaz where the work was done. Tikhon Makare'vskii's attention to the text then came at the moment when SK in a sense was born again and began to be drawn upon by various late Muscovite bookmen, in no little part thanks to him. The fact that his version of the text, brought down to his own time, presented a coherent (if somewhat awkwardly assembled) idea of the development of the Muscovite tsardom was clearly significant for the writing of history in the Petrine era and beyond.

Indeed, as Sirenov argues, it was the first more or less successful attempt by a Muscovite writer to come up with a history that successfully united the histories of the Riurikid and Romanov dynasties, bridging the gap created by the end of the former. The consensus seems to be that the author/compiler of this history was Tikhon of the Makar'ev-Zhel'tovodskii Monastery, where he was but briefly archimandrite in 1675-1677 before going on to occupy other important positions in the Orthodox hierarchy (he later became the Patriarch's treasurer). While the text comes down to the end of the reign of Aleksei Mikhailovich, if Sirenov is right, it could not have been completed before 1678, since one important source was Innokentii Gizel's *Sinopsis*, in the edition of that year. Thus, of course, the designation of 1676 in the title of this new edition may seem a bit odd, since the editors do seem to agree that the work was finished in 1678, and the dedicatory verses in the manuscript bear a date of 1679. In his separate monograph, *Stepennaia kniga i russkaia istoricheskaia mysl' XVI-XVIII vv.* (M., 2010), Sirenov ventures in a footnote (p. 318) to question whether the Tikhon who was the Makar'ev archimandrite associated with the text is in fact the same Tikhon who occupied the later positions in church administration and is known, *inter alia*, as a writer on Muscovite music. Moreover, Sirenov notes that the apparent existence of two layers in the text may indicate a second, anonymous author/compiler did much of the work, with Tikhon's providing merely the final touches. These questions about possible multiple Tikhons do not loom large though in most of what Sirenov has written on the text and its fate, as the same Tikhon arguably was responsible for the influential so-called "Chronographic" version of the text that was produced between 1702 and 1705 in Moscow, and which seems clearly to have relied on the earlier version that is represented in the Nizhnii Novgorod manuscript Tikhon donated to his original monastic home.

Those who would use this new edition will want to have in hand as well not only Sirenov's valuable monograph (2010) mentioned above but his *Stepennaia kniga. Istoriia teksta* (M. 2007). The 2010 book provides a sweeping overview of the relationship between the *Stepennaia kniga* and the development of Russian historiography in the 16th-18th centuries. The sections devoted to the Latukhin text (ep. pp. 306-318, 347-360) distill for the reader what is important to know about its history and highlight its relationship to key sources, only one of which was the 16th-century SK. Interestingly, Tikhon substantially edited what he took from the 16th-century text at the same time that he cut and pasted virtually without change, material from the *Sinopsis*, the *Kievo-Pecherskii paterik*, the *Kazanskaia istoriia*, and other sources. In fact, where there were discrepancies, he preferred those other sources to what was in the original SK. Moving on to the various Petrine historiographic projects, Sirenov then shows how the Latukhin *Stepennaia kniga* figured in a good many of them.

For details regarding the redactions of the Latukhin text, one must consult the relevant Chapter 7 (pp. 315-370) in Sirenov's 2007 book, as that material is largely not repeated in the new edition. While the editors readily acknowledge a debt to P. G. Vasenko's still valuable study of the text and its sources published in 1902 (where one finds, *inter alia*, a careful determination of which passages are based on the 16th-century SK), the more recent manuscript discoveries have shown that Vasenko's scheme of the main redactions is much in need of revision. Part of Sirenov's study in 2007 focused on the marginalia in the Nizhnii Novgorod manuscript, which he included as an appendix (in the present edition, they are all in the text, with notes indicating their placement in the margins of the manuscript). For the later history of the text, these marginalia are important, as they were incorporated without break in subsequent copies.

As the editors admit, the study of the Latukhin *Stepennaia kniga* has by no means been exhausted, as there is still much to learn about its relationship to other historical works. We can be grateful to have now the basis on which to pursue such study and can only hope that this edition will inspire the publication of other late Muscovite histories that are essential if we are ever fully to understand the emergence of "modern" historical writing in Russia and to clear away the cobwebs that the late Muscovite texts have draped over the realities of Muscovite history.