

HARVARD UKRAINIAN STUDIES

EUCHARISTERION:

Essays presented to
OMELJAN PRITSAK
on his Sixtieth Birthday
by his Colleagues and Students

Edited by
IHOR ŠEVČENKO and FRANK E. SYSYN
with the assistance of
Uliana M. Pasicznyk

Volume III/IV 1979-1980

Part 2



Ukrainian Research Institute, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Ioannikii Galiatovs'kyi's Polemics against Islam and Their Muscovite Translations

DANIEL CLARKE WAUGH

The career and writings of Ioannikii Galiatovs'kyi (d. 1688) provide abundant material for ongoing scholarly investigation. A leading Ukrainian Orthodox churchman during the second half of the seventeenth century, Galiatovs'kyi has been considered the best educated and most capable of his Ukrainian contemporaries.¹ Evidence of his erudition is to be found in the religious polemics that form by far the largest part of his oeuvre. Understandably, he was most concerned with Catholics and Uniates, but he also wrote against Protestants, Muslims, and Jews. His polemics against Islam have received little scholarly attention, even though their content and history provide interesting material concerning the cultural history of the Ukraine and Muscovy in the second half of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. This essay will examine the content and sources of Galiatovs'kyi's two major anti-Muslim polemics, *Łabędź* (The Swan) and *Alkoran*, and then focus on their previously unstudied Muscovite translations.²

¹ Such is the assessment of the author of his standard (but now outdated) biography. N. F. Sumtsov, "Ioannikii Galiatovskii (K istorii iuzhnorusskoi literatury XVII veka)." *Kievskaiia starina* 8 (1884):1-20, 183-204, 371-90, 565-88. For a bibliography of his writings and the literature on him (somewhat in need of supplement), see L. E. Makhnovets', comp., *Ukrains'ki pys'mennyky: Bio-bibliografichni slovnyk*, vol. 1 (Kiev, 1960), pp. 278-86.

² *Łabędź z piorami swemi z darami Boskiemi Chrystus . . .* (Novhorod-Sivers'kyi, 1679); *Alkoran Machometów Naukę heretycką y żydowską y poganską napelniony, od Koheletha Chrystusowego rosproszony . . .* (Chernihiv, 1683). I do not discuss here the short sections on Mohammed and Islam in Galiatovs'kyi's *Alphabetum rozmaitym heretykom niewiernym dlia ich nauczenia y nawrocenia do Wiary Katholickiey . . .* (Chernihiv, 1681), and his *Stary Kościół Zachodni . . .* (Novhorod-Sivers'kyi, 1678). For a recent summary of *Alkoran* (inexplicably, *Łabędź* is omitted) and the sections on Islam in these last two books, see Ks. Jerzy Nosowski, *Polska literatura polemiczno-antyislamiczna XVI, XVII i XVIII w.*, vol. 2 (Warsaw, 1974), pp. 8-15, 146-81. The most extensive treatments of *Łabędź* are in A. S. Orlov, *Skazochnye povesti ob Azove. "Istoriia" 7135 goda: Issledovanie i tekst* (Warsaw, 1906), pp. 163-69; and P. M. Popov, *Albania v rossiiskii ta ukrains'kii literaturakh XV-XX st.* (Kiev, 1959), chap. 14. Galiatovs'kyi's Polish works (including *Łabędź* and *Alkoran*)

Labędź appeared in Novhorod-Sivers'kyi in 1679 and, fittingly, was dedicated to Hetman Ivan Samoilovych, one of the military leaders in the war against the Turks and Tatars and a patron of the Ielets' Monastery near Chernihiv, of which Galiatov's'kyi had been archimandrite since 1669. As the author explains in his dedication (p. [iv]), the book was intended to "arouse Christians to war against Muslims and show the devices and means whereby Christians might defeat Muslims in war and erase the foul Muslim name from the earth." The swan is the protecting Christ, under whose wings success against the infidels can be expected. The book is divided into five parts, or "feathers" of the swan, the first of which concerns the question of why Islam had lasted so long and concludes with the citation of various prophecies concerning the fall of the Ottomans and their faith. The second part deals specifically with reasons why Islam had attracted so many converts. The third part contains a discussion of Turkish successes against Christians. Galiatov's'kyi makes special note, though, of Christian victories over the Turks, providing evidence that the Turks are not invincible if Christians can unite against them. The fourth part deals with the ways in which the Muslim faithful was aroused against Christians. Here we find some of the standard Christian perceptions (and distortions) of Islam that can be traced back through the Middle Ages. The longest section of the book is the final one, which offers more than forty examples of military ruses through the ages which might be used to defeat the current foe. This "textbook of military science," to use A. S. Orlov's phrase, includes the tale of the Trojan horse, the Biblical Shibboleth, one of Princess Olga's revenges against the Derevljanians, and several examples of Scanderbeg's successes against Sultan Mehmed II. Galiatov's'kyi thus seems to have been concerned principally with proving the vulnerability of the Turks and demonstrating that a Christian victory was feasible. In the circumstances following the Turkish capture and destruction of Chyhyryn in 1678, such optimism was undoubtedly considered essential to reinforce the will to continue the war.

Galiatov's'kyi dedicated his *Alkoran* (Chernihiv, 1683) to the co-tsars Petr and Ivan Alekseevich; the dedicatory verses express the wish that they be successful in waging war against the Ottomans. Two presentation

may soon be the subject of further study; see F. Ia. Sholom and I. P. Chepiga, "Proizvedeniia Ioannikiia Galiatovskogo na pol'skom iazyke," *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoi literatury* 25 (1970):321-24. For additional detail about some of the material discussed here, see my "Seventeenth-Century Muscovite Pamphlets with Turkish Themes: Toward a Study of Muscovite Literary Culture in Its European Setting" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1972), pp. 157-82.

copies of the book were delivered to the tsars in August of the same year.³ While some scholars have mistakenly assumed from the title that *Alkora*n is a version of the Koran,⁴ it is, rather, a dialogue between a proponent of Islam, whom the author portrays as a woman (Alkora)n riding an apocryphal beast (the law of Islam), and a proponent of Christianity (Koheleth Chrystusów). Galiatovs'kyi's aim was that "Christians reading my arguments written against Mohammed's Koran might reply to inquiring Muslims concerning the Christian faith and teach them the truth," in the manner in which Christ answered the learned doctors in the temple (pp. [v]–[vi]). It is not clear whether a real demand existed for such a manual, although one can assume that the wars against the Turks and Tatars had provided opportunities for conversion that previously had not been available. The book devotes considerable space to exposing the falsehood of various Muslim assertions concerning Islam and the Prophet. As in the case of *Łabędź*, here one finds traditional Christian half-truths and distortions about Muslim beliefs and practices. There is also occasional authentic descriptive material, notably in a section concerning dervish orders. The final chapters discuss doctrinal matters, such as the nature of the Trinity and Christian beliefs concerning heaven and hell.

It is of particular interest to examine what sources Galiatovs'kyi used in these two books, since we can thereby obtain some idea of the variety of reading available to an educated Ukrainian cleric during his time and, in particular, see what the sources of information concerning the Turks then were. A close study of Galiatovs'kyi's use of these sources remains to be done, but some preliminary observations can be made, relying in part simply on the author's marginal references.

Understandably, scriptural quotations are by far the most numerous of all citations; they are to be found in the mouths of the defenders of Islam as well as of their opponents. Like many Ukrainian Orthodox clerics, Galiatovs'kyi appears to have used a Latin Bible. He also cites saints' lives, the Prologue, and an account about the miracles of the icon of the Vladimir (Vyshhorod) Mother of God.

Most prominent among the secular materials cited by the author are certain cosmographies or world histories. He turns frequently to Cesare Baronius's monumental history of the church in its Polish abridgment by

³ See K. V. Kharlampovich, *Malorossiiskoe vliianie na velikorusskuiu tserkovnuiu zhizn'* (Kazan, 1914), p. 452, and the indication of the heading in the manuscript of the Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library, Leningrad (hereafter GPB), Collection of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy No. 186, fol. 1^r.

⁴ E.g., S. P. Luppov, *Kniga v Rossii v XVII veke* (Leningrad, 1970), pp. 110, 125.

Piotr Skarga, which was widely known in the Ukraine and Muscovy.⁵ The *Kronika of Maciej Strykowski* is another frequently-cited work, one that appears to have provided such material as the account about Princess Olga's revenge (derived ultimately from the *Pověst' vremennykh lēt*).⁶ Galiatov's'kyi's contemporary in Muscovy, Andrei Lyzlov, was translating Strykowski and using him around this same time for information about the Turks and Tatars while writing his "History of the Scythians" (*Skifskaia istoriia*).⁷ Among other historical works available in Polish to Galiatov's'kyi were Marcin Bielski's *Kronika świata*, Giovanni Botero's *Relatiae powszechnie*, and Alessandro Guagnini's *Kronika Sarmacyey Europskiej*.⁸ Bielski was of particular interest because of his long section on Scanderberg (based on the popular book by Marino Barlezio).⁹ Botero included one of the best short descriptions of the history and institutions of the Ottoman Empire; Guagnini had a chapter on the Tatars and, in the Polish edition of 1611, a very informative concluding section on the Turks. Galiatov's'kyi used Bielski and Botero only in *Łabędź* and cited Guagnini but a single time, in *Alkoran*. In contrast, Galiatov's'kyi's contemporary Feodosii Safonovych appears to have borrowed heavily from Guagnini;¹⁰ and the sections in Guagnini on the Turks and Tatars became rather widely known in late Muscovy, among other places, in manuscripts containing the first Russian translation of Galiatov's'kyi's *Łabędź* (see below).

Aside from these general works, Galiatov's'kyi had at his disposal some of the best sources containing detailed firsthand information about the

⁵ Cesare Baronius, *Rocznedzieie kościelne . . .*, trans. and ed. by P. Skarga (Cracow, 1603), contains the first ten books; the second edition, 1607, contains all twelve.

⁶ Maciej Strykowski, *Kronika Polska, Litewska, Żmodska, y wszystkiey Rusi Kijowskiej, Moskiewskiej, Siewierskiej . . .* (Königsberg, 1582); reprinted without change as vol. 2 of *Zbiór Dziejopisów polskich*, ed. by Fr. Bohomolec (Warsaw, 1766).

⁷ See Waugh, "Seventeenth-Century Muscovite Pamphlets," pp. 209–220.

⁸ Marcin Bielski, *Kronika, tho iesth Historya świata*, 3rd ed. (Cracow, 1564; 1st ed., 1551, and 2nd ed., 1554); Giovanni Botero, *Relatiae powszechnie: Abo Nowiny pospolite . . .* (Cracow, 1609; also later eds.); Alessandro Guagnini (Gwagnin), *Kronika Sarmacyey Europskiej . . .*, trans. and ed. by M. Paszkowski (Cracow, 1611 — a considerable expansion of the Latin original, 1st ed., Cracow, 1578; reprinted without change as vol. 4 of *Zbiór Dziejopisów polskich*, ed. by Fr. Bohomolec [Warsaw, 1768]).

⁹ It appears that some material taken from Bielski (including part of the discussion of Scanderbeg) may have been wrongly attributed by Galiatov's'kyi to Johann Sleidan (d. 1556), whose popular histories of the four great empires of antiquity and of the time of Emperor Charles V contain little on the Turks. See e.g., *Łabędź*, pp. [v], 49; *Alkoran*, pp. 73, 83. Without further study, it is not clear to me which of Sleidan's works, in which editions, might have been used by Galiatov's'kyi.

¹⁰ See Waugh, "Seventeenth-Century Muscovite Pamphlets," pp. 192–95.

Turks available in Europe. He cites the chronicle of Laonikos Chalcondylas (d. 1490), which told of the end of the Byzantine Empire and the establishment of Ottoman rule.¹¹ There are several references to Johann Lewenklaue's collected translations of Turkish historians, which appeared in various editions and versions in the second half of the sixteenth century.¹² Galiatovs'kyi cites in *Alkoran* what some consider to be the crowning achievement of seventeenth-century descriptions of the Ottoman Empire, Paul Rycaut's *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire* (its Polish translation appeared in 1678).¹³ In particular, Galiatovs'kyi drew extensively on Rycaut's description of dervish orders.

Galiatovs'kyi also seems to have been well read in works of belles lettres. He occasionally refers to the *Aeneid* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*; he seems to have found Tasso's *Jerusalem Delivered* (in the popular Polish translation of Piotr Kochanowski) appropriate because of its themes of struggle against the infidel.

One comes away from Galiatovs'kyi's works impressed by the author's learning, but a bit disappointed that he used so sparingly some of the rich material available to him. His arguments against Islam, as most of his oeuvre, are basically in the spirit of medieval religious polemic.¹⁴ There is only the stark contrast of evil and good; in between, there are no shades of gray. The emphasis is on discrediting the opponent with any kind of slander and on rather bald reiteration of the cardinal points of Christian belief. Characteristically, for material about Mohammed and the origins of Islam, he relies most heavily on one brief section of Baronius under the year 630. Baronius's information derived ultimately from the work of the

¹¹ Galiatovs'kyi probably used J. B. Brumbach's 1615 Geneva edition of Chalcondylas (*Historiae Byzantinae scriptores tres*), which also contained Nicephoras Gregoras's *Istoria Romaike*, cited in *Alkoran*. This was the first edition of Chalcondylas and the only seventeenth-century edition of Gregoras. See Gy. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, vol. 1, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1958), pp. 391-97, 450-53.

¹² Lewenklaue's work is *Annales sultanorum Othmanidarum, a turcis sua lingua scripti . . .* (Frankfurt, 1588), with various subsequent editions (listed by C. Göllner, *Turcica: Die europäischen Türkendrucke des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, vols. 1-2 [Bucharest, etc., 1961-68], nos. 1828, 1867, 1868, 1876, 1956, 2044, 2045, 2203). The work cited by Galiatovs'kyi as "Ian Gaudier w Kronikach Tureckich" (*Łabędź*, pp. 22, 41, 51) is also Lewenklaue's (Gaudier was his translator).

¹³ Paul Rycaut, *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire . . .*, 1st ed. (London, 1668). The Polish edition used by Galiatovs'kyi was *Monarchia Turecka, opisana przez Ricota Sekretarza Posła Angielskiego u Porty Ottomanskiej residuiącego: Z francuskiego języka na Polski przetłumaczona . . .* (Słuck?, 1678).

¹⁴ One of the foremost authorities on Galiatovs'kyi's works, Professor Constantine Bida, made this general assessment of them; see the summary of his seminar presentation on "The Works of I. Galjatovs'kyj," in *Minutes of the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies Held at Harvard University* 3 (1972-73): 12.

Byzantine chronicler Theophanes (ca. 752–818), whose account was very influential in forming the warped medieval Christian view of Islam.¹⁵ When dealing with historical information about the Ottomans and their institutions, Galiatovskiy seems content to cite repeatedly a few small sections in world histories. Some accounts which contained a reasonable amount of detail, such as Guagnini's, or a book devoted entirely to the Turks, such as Rycaut's, received scant attention. This picture is rather similar to what we find in Galiatovskiy's long polemic against the Jews, *Mesia pravdyvyi*, which he produced in the late 1660s, apparently in response to Jewish agitation over the false messiah, Sabbetai Zevi.¹⁶ Given the genre of his writings, it is, of course, unreasonable to expect of Galiatovskiy a much different approach. Even if they wished, it was not all that easy for Christians of the seventeenth century to obtain genuinely unbiased information about Islam. Most of those who produced anti-Islamic polemics in Europe during the frequent Habsburg wars with the Ottomans seem to have been no more concerned than Galiatovskiy with establishing the facts about Mohammed and his faith. Whatever their limitations, Galiatovskiy's works were among the first (if not the first) efforts by an Orthodox cleric in Eastern Europe to write "scholarly" polemic against Islam that would be more than a translation of one or two traditional sources.

The events that led Galiatovskiy to write his polemics involved Muscovy, as well. This fact and the close cultural ties between the Ukraine and Muscovy in the late seventeenth century ensured that his works would find an audience in Muscovy. The history of the Muscovite translations, to which we now turn, suggests that the books were valued not only as religious polemic, but as Turcica which might serve as a source of information for those curious about Ottoman beliefs and customs. The Russian translations have not previously been studied; what follows must be considered a preliminary report on them.¹⁷ Critical editions will be required

¹⁵ See Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 1: 531–37; Adel-Theodore Khoury, *Les Théologiens byzantins et l'Islam: Textes et auteurs (VIII^e-XIII^e s.)* (Louvain and Paris, 1969), pp. 106–109.

¹⁶ See my "News of the False Messiah: Reports on Shabbetai Zevi in Ukraine and Muscovy," *Jewish Social Studies* 41 (1979): 301–322.

¹⁷ The manuscripts known to me are the following (asterisked ones have not been examined de visu; descriptions of all but these may be found in Waugh, "Seventeenth-Century Muscovite Pamphlets," Bibliography):

(1) The translation of *Łabędź* — State Lenin Library of the USSR (hereafter GBL), Collection of N. S. Tikhonravov No. 391, Collection of the Rogozhskii Cemetery Nos. 62* and 384; State Historical Museum, Moscow (hereafter GIM), Collection of A. S. Uvarov Nos. 491 (68) and 492 (855); GPB, Collection of the Solovki Monastery No.

before firm conclusions can be reached regarding the accuracy of the translations, editorial changes subsequent to translation, and so on.

Apparently, *Łabędź* was translated twice in Muscovy, the first time "from the Polish tongue and alphabet in the year 1683. The first name and remaining names of the translator begin with 'B' and total the number 1503."¹⁸ The same individual produced, in 1671, a translation from the Polish of a collection of amusing anecdotes (*facecye*). The interest in such anecdotes may explain in part why he undertook to translate *Łabędź*, the last and longest section of which is merely a collection of anecdotes, albeit with a rather different tone and focus than those in the *facecye*. The translator was familiar with Bielski's *Kronika świata*, and he also translated from the chronicles of Guagnini and Botero (see below). He made an effort to render the Polish verse of his originals in verse of his own, but his failure to follow the rules for syllabic poetry and his ignorance of Latin suggest that he had limited formal schooling.

The translation of *Łabędź* is uneven and often far from literal. Purely historical portions of the original tend to be rendered quite faithfully, while portions dealing directly with religious questions are less so. Words and phrases are omitted;¹⁹ epithets and synonyms are added wherever possible, with the result that this version of Galiatovs'kyi's work acquires

322 (490), Q.I. 244 (formerly Collection of F. A. Tolstoi, II, 26); Library of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Leningrad (BAN), 17.6.18*; Institute of Russian Literature of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Leningrad (IRLI), r.IV, op. 7, Karel'skoe Collection No. 36*, and r.IV, op. 19, Prichudskoe Collection No. 2*.

(2) The translation of *Alkoran* — Västerås (Sweden), Stifts- och Lands-Biblioteket, Codex ad 10; GIM, Collection of A. S. Uvarov No. 490 (307); Central State Archive of Ancient Arts, Moscow (TsGADA), f. 181, Collection of MGAMID No. 756 (1286); GPB, Collection of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy No. 186, F.XVII.19 (formerly Collection of F. A. Tolstoi, I, 236).

¹⁸ This translation is found in all the copies I have examined. BAN 17.6.18 contains what appears to be a different translation (see below); the version found in the fragmentary copies I have not examined must still be determined. A. M. Panchenko identifies the translator as one Bogdan or Boris Sekiotov; see A. M. Panchenko, *Cheshskorusskie literaturnye sviazi XVII veka* (Leningrad, 1969), pp. 42, 59–60, fn. 37. Panchenko suggests that the same translator may have been responsible for the translation from Guagnini of the "Short History of Bohemia." This seems unlikely; cf. Waugh, "Seventeenth-Century Muscovite Pamphlets," pp. 397–98, fn. 69.

¹⁹ The translation is complete, however, in the sense that it encompasses the entire book. S. A. Klepikov had expressed some doubts as to whether the edition of *Łabędź* with the text ending on p. 66 is complete ("Izdaniia novgorod-severskoi tipografii i lozhnochernigovskie izdaniia 1674–1679 godov," *Kniga: Issledovaniia i materialy* 8 [1963]: especially 266). At least two of the known copies of the book (including the one I have used on film from the Academy of Sciences Library in Kiev) end with p. 66; the translation ends in the same place, suggesting that Klepikov's doubts were without foundation.

a polemical tone even stronger than that of the original. The "Mohammedan sect" becomes a "heresy," and an "accursed" one, at that. Its inflictions on Christians are "merciless," even though in Galiatovskiy's original they are not. The translator seems to have referred to the Bible (or possibly cited it from memory), since he expands some of Galiatovskiy's scriptural citations. While the language of the translation needs close analysis, we can characterize it as a mixture of Slavonic and plain style. As a whole, the features of the translation provide some support for A. M. Panchenko's contention that the translator was a monk.

The Muscovite manuscripts containing *Łabędź* include another work by the same translator entitled, "In Brief About the Turks, from whence they came, and about their accursed false teacher Mohammed, from whence this liar, and how he lived and how many peoples he seduced, and concerning the customs and rites, and concerning Turkish judges." This is a compilation, introduced by a line from Guagnini's chronicle, and continuing with Baronius's account for the year 630 concerning Mohammed and the origins of Islam. Following Baronius, the translator returns to Guagnini, where he uses portions of book 10, part 3, with the subtitles "On Asia Minor" and "On the Turkish Military." The Guagnini provides material on the origins of Islam, the nature of Muslim rituals, Ottoman justice, and the ranks and organization of the Ottoman army. His final section, which provides the conclusion for the Muscovite compilation, includes a short history of the Ottomans and their military successes and the well-known "Prophecy of the Red Apple" portending the fall of the Ottoman Empire. Among the sources which Guagnini used, and which thereby reached Muscovy indirectly through the translation, were the well-known sixteenth-century account about the Ottomans by Bartholomew Georgijević and the verses on the Turks by the prolific Polish polemicist against Islam, Krzysztof Warszawicki.²⁰ Since the translations from Guagnini and Baronius were completed in 1682, it is likely that the translation of *Łabędź* in the next year was seen to be a necessary supplement to the largely historical "In Brief About the Turks."

There is a second translation of *Łabędź*, with which I am acquainted only from a description of its manuscript, that is, the work of a monk, Avraamii Karamyshev, who dedicated his translation to Tsar Peter I.²¹ In

²⁰ For a bibliography of their works, see Göllner, *Turcica*.

²¹ The manuscript is BAN 17.6.18. See *Istoricheskii ocherk i obzor fondov Rukopisnogo otdela Biblioteki Akademii nauk*, vol. 1 (Moscow and Leningrad, 1956), pp. 116, 420. A later copyist added a title page on which he referred erroneously to the translation's original as an edition published in Chernihiv (!) by Lazar Baranovych in 1709 (!).

his dedication he praises Peter for his victories over the Turks and Swedes and compares the monarch with the swan, who was willing to sacrifice its own life. Following the dedication, the manuscript includes Simeon Polotskii's verses on the birth of Peter in 1672, in which the poet had glorified Peter as a future conqueror of the Turks. Presumably, the translation dates to the time before Peter's disastrous defeat on the Pruth at the hands of the Turks in 1711; it may be that the reference to victory over the Swedes is an indication that the *terminus a quo* for the translation is the Battle of Poltava (1709).

While there was a delay of a few years between the appearance of *Labędz* and its first Muscovite translation, Galiatovs'kyi's *Alkoran* was probably translated in Muscovy soon after it was received there in August 1683. We have two translations of the work, or, at least, what we must consider to be a rough translation and an extended reworking and improvement of it. There is good reason to believe that the translations were done in the Muscovite Diplomatic Chancellery. What appears to be the earlier of the versions follows the Polish text very closely, preserving the word order of the original and containing many calques. One of the three known copies of this translation is found in convoy with a number of documents deriving from government chancelleries; this fact points to the official milieu as the possible place of origin or at least of the circulation of the work.²² The second translation is a polished work by a man with considerable education and literary talent, a translator for the Diplomatic Chancellery, Stakhii Ivanovich Gadzelovskii. A noble from Vilnius, where he probably received a Jesuit education, Gadzelovskii began his long career in the Diplomatic Chancellery in 1667.²³ He is known to have translated a "chronicle" from Polish in the 1670s while on assignment in the Ukraine; he may have written a collection of heraldic *virshi* in Muscovy in the 1680s. While he seems to have used the first translation of *Alkoran*, he nonetheless referred as well to the original book. He attempts to avoid calques and Polish syntax. Unlike the author of the first transla-

²² The manuscripts containing the first translation are GPB, St. Petersburg Theological Academy No. 186; GIM, Uvarov No. 490 (307); and TsGADA, f. 181, No. 756 (1286). Kharlampovich (*Malorossiiskoe vliianie*, pp. 431, 452) cites the TsGADA manuscript as though it is the second translation by Gadzelovskii. Manuscript 186 contains, in addition, a series of decrees issued between 1681 and 1700, although it should be noted that they are written in a different hand and on different paper from the translation of *Alkoran* and thus may have been joined to it only long after copying.

²³ On Gadzelovskii, see Kharlampovich, *Malorossiiskoe vliianie*, pp. 431, 452; S. A. Belokurov, *O Posol'skom prikaze* (Moscow, 1906), p. 132; Nils Åke Nilsson, *Russian Heraldic Virši from the 17th Century* (Stockholm, etc., 1964), especially pp. 68–69.

tion, who rendered the verse of the original in prose, Gadzelovskii used verse that preserved carefully the 13-syllable lines that were formally required in Polish Baroque poetry. Gadzelovskii must have completed his translation by 1687, since a copy of it was included in a manuscript miscellany taken to Sweden in that year by his acquaintance, the Swedish diplomat Sparwenfeld.²⁴

A few observations can be made about the spread of Galiatovskii's books and their translations in Russia. Aside from the fact that copies of the books were available to the translators (in the case of *Alkoran*, presumably one of the two presentation copies was used), we know that the library collected by Simeon Polotskii and his pupil Silvestr Medvedev contained both *Alkoran* and *Łabędź* (the former in two copies).²⁵ This library was confiscated when Medvedev fell from grace in 1689 and eventually became part of the library of the Moscow Printing House. The Polotskii-Medvedev library contained other works produced by Galiatovskii and his patron Baranovych, among them Galiatovskii's *Alfavyt* of heretics, a section of which is devoted to Mohammed. At least one other copy of *Alkoran* was owned by a Muscovite cleric in the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century.²⁶

The manuscript history of the Muscovite translations of Galiatovskii's works can be connected with two of the leading Russian "Westernizers" of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries: Vasilii Vasil'evich Golitsyn and his young third cousin, Dmitrii Mikhailovich Golitsyn. A copy of the translation of *Alkoran* was in the possession of the elder Golitsyn when he was disgraced and exiled in 1689.²⁷ As head of the Diplomatic Chancellery in the 1680s and as one actively involved in the renewed Muscovite commitment to fight the Ottomans, he may well have

²⁴ This is the fascinating Codex ad 10 now in Västerås, a manuscript that provides an excellent cross section of the literature which was *au courant* in chancellery circles in the mid-1680s in Muscovy. For a full description, see Staffan Dahl, *Codex ad 10 der Västeråser Gymnasial-Bibliothek* (Uppsala, 1949).

²⁵ See I. E. Zabelin, ed., "Knigi perepisnye knigam . . .," *Vremennik Obshchestva istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete*, bk. 16 (1853), sec. 3, pp. 58, 67 (items 164 — where the author is named Gratovskii — 510, and 517). Orlov (*Skazochnye povesti*, 164) notes the existence of a copy in the Synodal Typography library with Medvedev's inscription of ownership.

²⁶ The copy now in the Library of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR (formerly in the Moscow Synodal Library) has a late seventeenth- or early eighteenth-century inscription on the back end-paper: "Siia kniga glagolemaia Alkoran diiakona Pavla Vologzhanina."

²⁷ *Rozysknye dela o Fedore Shaklovitom i ego soobshchnikakh*, vol. 4 (St. Petersburg, 1893), col. 33. Golitsyn also owned works by Baranovych and a "Letopisets Kievskoi, pechatnoi" (Gizel's *Synopsys*?) (ibid., cols. 56-57).

had something to do with the translation of that work and the fact that a copy of it came into the possession of the Swedish diplomat Sparwenfeld sometime between 1684 and 1687. While governor of Kiev in the middle of the reign of Peter I, Dmitrii Mikhailovich Golitsyn commissioned translations and did much to enlarge what was the most remarkable Russian private library of his time. He seems to have had a particular interest in Turcica. Among his books was a copy of the translation of *Alkoran*, in a manuscript of the early eighteenth century that includes many of the works found in Sparwenfeld's manuscript with virtually no textual differences.²⁸ In other words, there would appear to have been a copy or protograph of the Sparwenfeld collection in the 1680s, from which the manuscript of D. M. Golitsyn was later copied. Golitsyn also owned a copy of the translation of *Łabędź*, a manuscript previously owned by one Fedor Kirilovich Gerasimov (possibly a government clerk).²⁹ This copy is of particular interest, because it shows evidence of some effort to edit and improve the translation with reference to the original book.

Other copies of the translation of *Łabędź* include one made in 1698 by a certain D. A. I., an early eighteenth-century manuscript purchased in Vologda in late 1720 by an Ivan Ivanovich Popov, and one belonging to Nikita Petrovich, a priest of the Cathedral of the Dormition in Vladimir in 1721.³⁰ The translation seems to have been popular in the Russian North, in part amongst the Old Believers. One of the manuscripts, which has come down to us in the collection of the Solovki Monastery, was the property of a deacon of that monastery in the eighteenth or the early nineteenth century.³¹ A full copy and a fragmentary copy of the work are in manuscripts that were in the library of the Moscow Old Believer Rogozhskii Cemetery, and other fragments appear in two eighteenth-century manuscripts discovered recently by the archaeographic expeditions that have so successfully mined the libraries of Old Believer villages in the North.³²

²⁸ The manuscript is GPB, F.XVII.19, which contains other works that may be classified as Turcica. On it and the related MS Codex ad 10, see my *The Great Turkes Defiance: On the History of the Apocryphal Correspondence of the Ottoman Sultan in Its Muscovite and Russian Variants* (Columbus, Ohio, 1978), pp. 161–62. On Golitsyn's library, see S. P. Luppov, *Kniga v Rossii v pervoi chetverti XVIII veka* (Leningrad, 1973), pp. 204–223. A listing of his manuscripts is in my book, *The F. A. Tolstoi Collection* (Zug, 1977), pp. 10–11, 69–71.

²⁹ MS GPB, Q.I.244.

³⁰ These are, respectively, GBL, Rogozh. 384; GIM, Uvarov 492 (855); and GBL, Tikhonravov 391.

³¹ GPB, Solovki 322 (490).

³² GBL, Rogozh. 384 and 62; IRLI, Prichudsk. 2 and Karel'sk. 36.

In conclusion, a few words should be said about the chronological distribution of the manuscripts containing the translations of Galiatov's'kyi's two works, since this evidence enables us to infer what may have attracted at least some Russian readers to them. I know of ten manuscripts containing *Łabędź* (three of them fragmentary copies) and five manuscripts containing *Alkoran*. Of the fifteen, one is from the 1680s (prior to 1687), one is dated 1698, eight additional copies appear to have been made in the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century during the reign of Peter I, and another toward the end of his reign or soon thereafter. We may posit with some assurance that at least one other copy existed in the 1680s. So the bulk of the manuscript tradition falls within the reign of Peter, which encompassed Vasili Vasil'evich Golitsyn's disastrous Crimean campaigns, the conquest of Azov, and the campaigns against the Turks that culminated in the treaties of Constantinople (1700) and Adrianople (1713). In Russia the Turkish wars of this period led to the production of new items of Turcica and the revival of earlier ones.³³ The manuscripts containing the first translation of *Łabędź* must have been of particular interest as Turcica, since all of the complete ones contain, as well, the compendium from Baronius and Guagnini on the Turks. Those manuscripts are thus similar to any number of polemical booklets produced in seventeenth-century Europe during the Habsburg wars against the Ottomans, in which the reader could expect to find some facts (and fancy) about the Ottomans and their faith, along with Christian prophecy and polemic about their fall.³⁴ Since not only *Łabędź* but also the Guagnini text included prophecies in which the Russians played the key role in the fall of the Turks, it is easy to understand how the books gained currency in the era when direct Russian involvement against the Ottoman Empire emerged as a leading element in European international relations.

University of Washington

³³ See Waugh, *The Great Turkes Defiance*, especially pp. 165–68.

³⁴ E.g., *Tuercken-Einfall, oder kurtzer jedoch scheinbarer Bericht von dem grausamen Einfall Gogs und Magogs . . .* (Stuttgart, 1664); *Reflexion politique sur les Grandeurs et Puissances de l'Empire Ottoman, avec les Moyens Asseurez de Ruiner cette grande & superbe Monarchie . . .* (Cologne, n.d. [1683 or 1684?]).