Nazarii Nazarov
Paris, Fondation Maison des sciences de l'homme, invited researcher

PRINCESS OLGA'S WARS WITH THE DEREVLYANS. PUBLICATION OF THE FRAGMENT ACCORDING TO THE OSTROH (KHLEBNIKOVSKI) COPY WITH A POETOLOGICAL COMMENTARY

Войны княгини Ольги с деревлянами. Публикация фрагмента по Острожскому (Хлебниковскому) списку с поэтологическим комментарием

АБСТРАКТ: Цель статьи – хотя бы частично заполнить некоторые пробелы в изучении литературного наследия Киевской Руси. Во-первых, автор предлагает рассматривать фрагменты *Повести временных лет* как самостоятельные литературные произведения, которые заслуживают отдельного исследования. Эти произведения могут иметь свою текстуальную историю и выразительный индивидуальный стиль. Для выяснения текстуальной истории произведения используются свидетельства как прямые (списки *ПВЛ*), так и опосредованные, в частности пересказы у Яна Длугоша, Матвея Стрыйковского, а также староукраинских авторов 17 века. Во-вторых, впервые осуществлена публикация сплошного фрагмента *ПВЛ* только по Острожскому (Хлебниковскому) списку, включая акцентуацию, что имеет большое значение для изучения текстуальной истории и литературной формы *ПВЛ*. В-третьих, осуществлен подробный поэтологический анализ *Повести о войнах Ольги с древлянами*, показано его композиционную завершенность и независимость от дальнейших рассказов об Ольге, помещенных в *ПВЛ*, и их прихотливую поэтическую форму, построенную на риторических повторах серий лексики, а также на счету слогов и ударений.

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА: Древняя Русь, летопись, поэтика, акцентология, метрика, поэзия

ABSTRACT: The purpose of the article is to at least partially fill in some gaps in the study of the Kyivan Rus' literary heritage. Firstly, the author proposes to consider fragments of the *Tale of Bygone Years* (*PVL*) as independent literary works that deserve a separate study. These works may have their own textual history and distinct individual style. In order to clarify the textual history of the work, we use both direct evidence (manuscripts of the *Tale of Bygone Years*) and indirect evidence, in particular, the paraphrase-translations of Jan Długosz, Maciej Stryjkovskш, and seventeenth-century Old Ukrainian authors. Secondly, the article makes accessible for the first time a complete fragment of the *PVL* published from the Ostroh (Khlebnikovsky) manuscript only, including the accentuation, which is of great importance for the study of the textual history and literary formation of the *PVL*. Thirdly, the article provides a detailed poetologic analysis of the *Tale of Olga's Wars with the Derevlyans*, shows its compositional independence from the subsequent stories about Olga, and explores its complex poetic form, built on rhetorical repetitions of the series of vocabulary, as well as on the counting of syllables and accents.

KEYWORDS: Old Rus' chronicle, poetics, accentology, metric, poetry

Introduction

The earliest original narrative texts originating from the realm of Kievan Rus' have been conserved within the corpus referred to as *Повість врем'яних літ* (*Tale of Bygone Years*). This work has endured through time as an integral component of subsequent chronicle compilations. These compilations exhibit a degree of concurrence until approximately 1110, after which they diverge to recount their respective local narratives. The PVL has undergone extensive revisions[1], while an alternative, more concise, and earlier rendition than the Υ, Λ, Ω, and P versions has survived within the Novgorod chronicle. This variant is known as the Novgorod First Chronicle (N1)[2]. Notably, this compilation also encompasses the narrative detailing Olga's retribution. Despite minor discrepancies, N1's account of Olga's revenge closely parallels the text presented below; in certain instances, the alignment extends to orthographic particulars. This convergence underscores that both strands of the tradition have independently safeguarded a shared, relatively archaic form of the text.

Since the 19th century, scholars have devoted substantial efforts to the investigation of the *Tale of Igor's Campaign*, a prominent literary work of Kievan Rus'. Regrettably, most of these studies have analyzed this piece in isolation, neglecting its interconnectedness with other secular texts of the era, particularly the chronicles. Only a few endeavors have been made to bridge this gap[3]. This article represents another stride towards reinterpreting the textual heritage of Kievan Rus', which encompasses a multitude of intricately crafted literary texts beyond the "Slovo" alone. Notably, our approach emphasizes an intense focus on manuscript transmission and the formal structure of the text, an approach viable solely for texts with well-documented history of written tradition.

---

[1] *Повість врем'яних літ*: *Літопис (за Іпатським списком)*, Київ 1990. In the following text, the manuscripts of PVL are quoted like this: **Υ** – *Повесть временных лет по Ипатскому списку*, Санкт-Петербург 1871. **Ω** – *The Old Rus' Kievan and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles The Ostroz'kyj (Hlebnikov) and Cetvertyns'ky (Pogodin) Codices*, Harvard 1991, 761 p. **P** – *Радзивилловская или Кенигсбергская летопись*, Общество любителей древней письменности, Санкт-Петербург 1902, т. 1, 504 с. **Λ** – *Летопись по Лаврентьевскому списку*, Издание Археографической комиссии, Санкт-Петербург 1872, 512 с. Present-day state of the art Kyiv Rus' chronicle textology is outlined in: D. Ostrowski, *Introduction*, [in:] *Povest' vremennykh let. An Interlinear collation and Paradosis. Compiled and edited by Donald Ostrowski*, Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute 2004, pp. XVII-LXXIII. For a general overview of the Ostrog copy see: *Kronika halicko-wołyńska. Kronika Romanowiczów*, ed. D. Dąbrowski, A. Jusupović, Kraków – Warszawa 2017, s. XIV-XXX.

[2] *Новгородская первая летопись старшего и младшего изводов*, под ред. А.Н. Насонова, Москва, Ленинград: Издательство АН СССР 1950.

[3] R. Picchio, *On the Prosodic Structure of the Igor Tale*, "The Slavic and East European Journal" 1972, № 16 (2), p. 147-162; В. Франчук, *Літописні оповіді про похід князя Ігоря. Упорядкування. Текстологічне дослідження та переклади*, Київ 1988, 191 с.; В. Франчук, *Киевская летопись. Состав и источники в лингвистическом освещении*, Київ 1986, 182 с.; Н. Назаров, *Незамеченная эпика: метрическая (пере)оценка „Повести временных лет" и „Слова о полку Игореве"*, „Slavia Orientalis" 2019, nr 2, s. 241-260.

Ivan Franko undertook an initial analysis of the *Tale of Bygone Years* (*Повесть временных лет*), further referred to as PVL) as a literary work. His ideas were further developed in subsequent works[4]. In modern translations into Slavic languages, translators have intuitively sought to identify and emphasize "poetic fragments"[5]. Nevertheless, it was only through meticulous manuscript examination that substantial enhancements to prior findings were achieved. This progress culminated in an attempt to publish the first compositional part of the PVL, based on the Ipatski manuscript, and provisionally titled "the story of the origin of Rus'" by the publisher[6]. However, the publisher used only the Hypatian manuscript for this publication, which regrettably lacks crucial information, such as accentuation, indispensable for the stylistic and poetic analysis of ancient texts (let us imagine for a moment that accentuation were absent from the texts of Homer or Pindar). As a remedy, our current approach turns to the sole accented manuscript of the PVL, the Ostroh (Khlebnikovsky) copy, to address this issue[7].

Textual History of the *Tale of Olga's Wars with the Derevlyans*

According to our conception, PVL should be regarded more as an anthology of individual text that a unified text. Of course, any anthology could have its complex composition conceived by the compiler. Neverthells, it does not undermine the necessity to delve into the textual history of each of the individual works that constitute PVL.

While we have direct access to only one version of the story about Olga in Old Rus' sources, we can reconstruct a more detailed history of the text's formation through indirect evidence provided by "text witnesses". These text witnesses include Ruthenian and foreign language retellings or even translations.

Chronicle of Jan Długosz (1415-1480) is a particularly significant source in this regard. In the section dedicated to Olga's wars with the Derevlyans, it offers valuable insights into the narrative and helps shed light on the evolution of the text over time.

To be precise. in the chapter *Quomodo res Ruthenorum creverint, et a quibus principaliores civitates et castra aedificata sint*[8] (1, 121-123) the Polish historiographer writes:

> Dum enim populos, qui Drewlyanyes [vocabantur], Ruthenici generis ducem proprium
> Niszkinam habentes, ad tributum fretus potencia cogeret et prima solucione, de qua inter

---

[4] І. Франко, *Студії над найдавнішим київським літописом (частина перша)*, [в:] І. Франко, *Зібрання творів у пятдесяти томах*, т. 6, *Поезія*, Київ 1976, с. 10-11.

[5] *Повість врем'яних літ: Літопис (за Іпатським списком)*, Київ 1990.

[6] Н. Назаров, *Просодика києворуських літописів: строфічна будова старо київської поезії*, «Мовознавство» 2023, № 1, с. 52-79.

[7] The history of textological research into PVL is recapitulated in T.V. Guimon, *Historical Writing of Early Rus (c. 1000 – c. 1400) in a Comparative Perspective*, Leiden – Boston 2021, p. 91-144.

[8] Joannis Dlugossii, *Annales seu Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, L. 1-2, Varsaviae 1964, p. 121-123.

eos convenerat, non contentus secundam in eodem anno exigeret, a Drewlyanis iniuriam non ferentibus nepharie occisus interiit. Qui missis ad suam relictam Olham nunciis, quatenus ducem eorum Nyszkinam virum acciperet et principatus uniret, summopere suadebant: illa muliebri dolo usa, primis et alteris Drewlyanorum nunciis benigne appellatis et aput se retentis, Drewlyanos cum duce eorum Nyszkina ad se venire, quasi coniugium sociatura et principatus unitura, iubet. Quibus iussa implentibus, legatis eorum, quos domi retinebat, per varios cruciatus clandestine primum onecatis, in occursum Drewlyanis procedit et ad insidias locaque iniqua, in quibus fortem exercitum collacaverat, perductos, omnem eorum exercitum ad quinque milia virorum se extendentem, occisioni mariti sui Jior parentando, delevit. Susceperat autem dux Jior ex Olha consorte sua filium unicum nomine Swyanthoslaum, qui annos viriles attingens, vir bellicosus et in armis strenuus esse ceperat; patris autern sui Jhior ulturus, primam expedicionem in Drewlanos egit, et gravi cede domitos sub iugum mittit tributumque imponit.

We can observe that the presented version of the *Tale* differs from the one that has survived. Not only is the prince's name different, but Olga also extends an invitation to him to come to Kyiv. Conversely, in the version that has been preserved, Prince Mal is mentioned only at the beginning of the narrative, and subsequently, there is no further mention of him, except for an ironic hint from Olga, employing the word "malo" (a little), which sounds similar to his name. It is plausible that the version that has reached us is a revision of the original, in which Prince Mal also came to Kyiv.

Additionally, Maciej Stryjkowski (1547-1593) presents a story about Olga, and while the sequence of episodes and details fully align with the Hypatian copy, it is essential to note that Stryjkowski might have had access to other versions as well. These versions may include references to Niskin (although he could have learned this name from Długosz[9]) or other variations not present in the surviving text:

> Tedy Drewlanie z xiążęciem swoim Niskinią, a wedlug niktórych Malditem nazwanym, poczęli myślić, coby około tych częstych poborów i wyderków, a jakoby się s tak cieszkiej niewolej wybić, i mówili między sobą: Kiedy się wilk wnęci w owce, tedy wszystko stado rosproszy[10].

Both variants of the name presumably refer to the short stature and young age of the prince – cf. Ukrainian **низький, мале дитя**. In the *Synopsis*[11], Inokentiy Gisel follows Stryjkovsky (he indicates the page of the first edition, 123).

---

[9] The indebtedness of Stryjkovski to Długosz was not once evoked in the literature, e.g.: S. Cynarski, *Uwagi nad problemem recepcji „Historii" Jana Długosza w Polsce XVI i XVII wieku*, [w:] *Dlugossiana. Studia historyczne w pięćsetlecie śmierci Jana Długosza*, Warszawa 1980, s. 281-290.

[10] *Kronika polska, litewska, zmódzka i wszystkiéj Rusi Macieja Stryjkowskiego*, Warszawa 1846, t. 1, s. 118.

[11] [И. Гизель] *Киевский синопсис*, Киев 1823, с. 23-25.

The surviving summary of an unknown chronicle, created in the 17th century by Binvilsky[12], does not include any mention of the episode concerning Olga's wars with the Drevlyans, nor does it reference other secular episodes. Instead, it provides detailed descriptions of all the religiously colored episodes in Olga's life. This observation strongly suggests that the two parts of the narrative, one with pagan and secular content and the other with Christian elements, were originally distinct and separate works.

However, both the Novgorod 1 Chronicle and the *Ipatski Chronicle* concur in their presentation of the episode recounting Olga's wars with the Drevlyans, which is followed by Stryjkowski.

In the 17th-century hagiographical work on Princess Olga published by Volodymyr Peretc, it is evident that the author used a version of the narrative slightly different from the Ipatsky copy but closely related to it: "Князь наш есть вельми молод и слычный"[13], that recalls "Malditem nazwanym" from Stryjkowski's chronicle. The hagiographic "life" attempts to modernize the story and highlights the political and ideological aspects of Olga's actions:

> Выгладте от землі сих всіх бунтовников и убийцов мужа моего, нехай не живут противляючися своїм паном, поднесли бо руки на своего пана, абы и иншии своевольники в Руси, учувши погибель их, боялися и не важилися панов своих губити[14].

Variations in wording and the absence of certain elements, such as dates, in the version used by the author indicate that a slightly different versions of the tale were circulating at that time. This hagiographical 'life' is close in its linguistic features to the chronicle text that was in use among Kyivan literati. Instead, the life of Olga from the *Степенная книга*[15], while fully consistent with the quoted Kyivan life in its presentation of episodes, is already a translation and retelling of the text for a different target audience.

The hagiography of the 18th century[16] is already completely dependent on the above sources in one way or another and have no independent significance as witnesses to the original ancient tradition of the text: in many details Dmytro Tuptalo follows Dlugosz and Stryjkowski (he gave the name Niskin and Maldit to the prince of the Derevlans) and a chronicle of the Y type ("Saint Nestor writes in his chronicle").

---

[12] Ю. Мицик, о., *Літопис Яна Бінвільського*, «Національний університет "Києво-Могилянська академія". Наукові записки. Історичні науки» 2002, № 20 (2), с. 60-77.

[13] В. Перетц, *Исследования и материалы по истории старинной украинской литературы XVI-XVIII веков*, Москва – Ленинград 1962, с. 69.

[14] Ibid., с. 70.

[15] *Книга Степенная царского родословия*, [в:] *Полное собрание русских летописей*, т. 21, ч. 1, Санкт-Петербург 1908, с. 6-38.

[16] [Туптало, Д.] *Книга житий святых*, т. 4, Киев 1764, folios 612-615 of cyrillic pagination.

Principles of Text Publication

From the Ω, Ostroh manuscript (also known as *The Khlebnikovskyi*), only the *Galician-Volyn Chronicle* and excerpts related to Ihor's campaign have been published in their entirety[17]. Subsequently, with the appearance of the facsimile edition of the text (Ω), a comprehensive analysis of the manuscript, encompassing all linguistic and content levels, became imperative.

For our comprehensive analysis, we have selected the account of Olga's war with the Drevlyanians. This narrative appears to be a distinct work that was part of the Old Rus' literary corpus. Although Shakhmatov identifies it as part of the so-called "original compilation" (свод), it is absent from other versions of the chronicle's composition as reflected in the list of episodes preserved by Binwilski and translated into Latin by Jan Długosz.

The Ostroh copy of the PVL stands out as the only accented version among the oldest manuscripts. Curiously, its accentuation has never been subjected to analysis, leaving uncertain the period of accentuation development it represents. Surprisingly, not a single passage from PVL has been published solely based on the Ostroh copy, despite numerous textual variants that have been published in volumes of the PSRL's variant of the Ipatian chronicle.

As demonstrated earlier[18], in Old Rus' chronicles, the fundamental unit of text division is the strophic period, comprising two symmetrical parts – the strophe and the antistrophe – each consisting of the same number of lines. The delineation of the strophe and antistrophe corresponds to the center of symmetry in the lexical series, which serves as an internal rhyme, and the center of the series of accents, while also accounting for the total length of the period, expressed in syllables. In cases where there is an odd number of lines in a strophic period, the central line encompasses all three centers of symmetry. This will be illustrated in the published text provided below.

Principles of Text Reproduction

Before embarking on a comprehensive analysis, our aim was to present the manuscript's text to the reader in a diplomatic edition, maintaining all its original features, such as spelling, diacritics, and the division into minimal text segments using periods and commas, as found in the original. The only significant change made was the division into words. However, we made an exception by choosing not to reproduce Greek-like aspirationsigns. Unlike acute and grave accents, aspitations do not possess accentual significance as will be shown further. Although they appear almost identically in the Ipatski, Radzivilovski, and Ostroh copy of the PVL, they are situated between two vowels (even if one of them is ь/ъ or the vowels belong to the end and beginning of different words). Moreover, their reproduction would be problematic due to the presence of numerous other signs in our text. Also we have retained the

---

[17] *Галицько-Волинський літопис. Текст. Коментар*, Київ 2002, 400 с.; В. Франчук, *Літописні…*

[18] Н. Назаров, *Просодика…*, с. 57-62.

periods and commas of the original text without alteration, and the punctuation remains unmodernized. For convenience, the *titlo* above a word is represented by a ~ within the word. Acute is denoted by ´, gravis by ` , double gravis by `` . All graphic variants of the original are preserved in the reproduction. Letters above the line are rendered as superscript .

Each line in the text contains the following elements, positioned above and below the line:

Line number
Compositional part
Number of stresses in the line
Text of the line
Letter entry of the lexical series

In compositional notation, $_S$ stands for stanza, $_A$ for antistanza, or $_C$ for the central line of the period.

Distinguishing a strophic period is based on some key criteria, including its syntactic and semantic completeness, along with a symmetrical series of repeated vocabulary. The elements of the lexical series are marked in **bold** for clarity. The principles of line delimitation include an approximate equality of syllables and, most importantly, the presence of punctuation in the manuscript.

We mark the centers of symmetry of a stanza according to the number of accents ||, the number of syllables ^, and the lexical series *. If the series has an odd number of elements, the central element is highlighted with the appropriate sign on both sides. [38] indicates the beginning of a new page of the manuscript (according to the numbering at the top of the pages, without counting recto/verso). After each stanza, the quantitative parameters of all levels of symmetry (accentuation *Akc*, number of syllables *Syl*, lexical series *Lex*) are indicated. `<...>` indicates the omission of the passages of a manuscript that do not enter into poetic form (the number of years).

The Tale of Olga's Wars with the Derevlyans[19]

P1

$^1_{S1}$ 3 (38) <...> *р*єко´ша дроу´жина **игорєва** . отро´ци свєн^ьдѣжи изьодѣлися сж^{т20}   α

$^2_{S2}$ 5 (39) *w*роу´жиє^м и пор^ьты . а мы на´зи . да **пои´ди** с на´ми **кня´жє** в да^н .   β γ δ

^3_C 4 *∂*а и ты добж´дєшь || и мы . ^ и послоу´ша и^х **игорь** * идє * в дєрє´ва в **да´нь** .   α β δ

$^4_{A1}$ 5 *и* примышля´шє къ´ пръво´и дани . и наси´ляшє и^м и мж´жи єго .   δ

$^5_{A2}$ 2 и възь^ьмя **да^н по´идє** въ сво´и гра^д .**идоущж** ж̑ ємоу въспя^т ,   δ β β

Akc 9 || 1 || 9 *Syl* 55^56 *Lex* α β γ δ α * **β** * δ δ δ β β

P2

^6_S 3 *р*а´змысливь рє^ч **дроу´жинѣ** своєи . идѣ´тє вы з данїю` **домовь** .   α β

^7_C 4 *а* азб възвра´щоуся || и похо´жю єщє . ^ и поу´сти * **дроу´жиноу** * свою` **домовь** .   α β

^8_A 2 *с* малою жє **дроу´жиною**` възь<sup>ь</sup>вра´тися жєлаа` боль^ьша имѣнїа` .   α

Akc 4 || 1 || 4 *Syl* 33^34 *Lex* α β * **α** * β α

---

[19] See English translation: https://www.mgh-bibliothek.de/dokumente/a/a011458.pdf, pp. 78-80.

[20] Here, the Y copy has " . "

P3

$^9_{S1}$ **⁵ слы́шав҄ше** ж **дерє́влѧнє** ꙗко ѡпѧ́ᵀ идє́ᵀ .

издоу́мавше **дерє́влѧне** съ кнѧ́sє́ᴹ свои́ᴹ **малѡ́ᴹ**   α β γ δ β ε

$^{10}_{S2}$ ⁴ **и** рєко́ша , аще сѧ вна́диᵀ волкъ въ ов҄ци . то ѡᵀноси́ᵀ по єдино́и всє́ ста́до .

$^{11}_{C}$ ³ *а*ще нє **оубїю́ᵀ** єго̀ . та́ко и сє́и ‖ ^ * аще нє **оубїє́мь** єго̀ . то всѧ̀ ны погоу́биᵀ .   η η

$^{12}_{A1}$ ⁵ **и** посла́ша к нє́моу гл~ще , по́что идє́ши ѡпѧ́ᵀ . поималь єси всю̀ да́нь .   α δ γ ε

$^{13}_{A2}$ ⁵ и нє **послоу́ша** иˣ игорь и и́зшє́ᵈше изъ гра́да изь коростѣ́нѧ противоу **дерєвлѧ́нє** .   α β

Akc 11 ‖ 11 *Syl* 70^69 *Lex* α β γ δ β ε **η** * **η** α δ γ ε α β

P4 |...|

$^{14}_{S1}$ ² **и оубиша игора** . и дроу́жиноу єго̀ . бѣ̀ бо̀ иˣ **ма́ло** . и погрєбєнь быˢ **игорь** .   α β γ δ

$^{15}_{S2}$ ³ и єˢ могила єго̀ ^ оу иско́ростѣнѧ гра́да в **дерє́вѣˣ** .   ε

$^{16}_{S3}$ ⁴ и до́ сєго дн~є . **ѡлга** ж бѧшє въ кы́євѣ . съ сн~ѡᴹ свои́ᴹ дѣ́ᵀскѡᴹ , **ст~ослаᵛвѡᴹ** .   * η ζ

$^{17}_{A1}$ ² и кор҄милєць єго̀ бѣ̀̀ асмоуадь . и воєвода бѣ̀̀ свин҇дєл҄дъ , то́жє ѡц~ь мьсти́шиᴴ .   ‖

$^{18}_{A2}$ ⁴ рєко́ша жє **дерєвлѧ́нє** .^ сє кнѧ́sѧ роуˢкаго **оуби́хо́ᴹ** .   ε ι α

$^{19}_{A3}$ ⁷ поимє́ᴹ жєноу єго̀ **ѡлᵇгоу** за́ **кнѧˢ** сво́и **ма́ль** . и **ст~ослава** сътвори́ᴹ ємоу ꙗко ж хо́щєᴹ η ι β ζ

Akc 2+3+4+2‖4+7 *Syl* 34^36, 39^41 *Lex* α β γ δ ε η ζ * ε ι α η ι β ζ

P5

$^{20}_{S1}$ ⁴ посла́ша дерєвлѧ́нє лоу́чшїи мꙗ́жи сво́и , числѡ́ᴹ . к~ . в **лѡ́ᵈѝ** къ **ѡлᵇsѣ** .   α

$^{21}_{S2}$ ³ и приста́ша пѡд боричєвы́ᴹ в **лѡдїи** .

бѣ̀̀ бо тог҇ла во́да тєкоущи възлє̀ ⁽⁴⁰⁾ **го́ры** кыєвˢкыа̀,   α β

$^{22}_{C}$ ² и на подолѣ ^ ‖ нє сѣ́дѧхж ‖ **людїи** но на́ **горѣ** .   * α β

$^{23}_{A1}$ ³ **(го)рѡд** жє бѧшє кыєвь идє́жє єˢ нн~ѣ двѡ́рь **гор҄дѧтинь** . и микифо́рѡᵛ .   γ ε

$^{24}_{A2}$ а двѡ́рь кнѧ́ж бѧшє в **го́родѣ** . идєжє єˢ нн~ѣ двѡ́рь воро́тиславь и **чю́диᴴ** .   γ ε α

Akc 8 ‖ 1 ‖ 8 *Syl* 59^62 *Lex* α α γ α γ * δ ε δ ε α

P6

$^{25}_{S}$ ⁵ а пєрєвѣ́сиштѡ̀ бѣ̀̀ внѣ́ **города** . и бѣ̀̀ внѣ́ горо́да двѡ́рь * **тєрє́мны̀̀** .   α α β γ

$^{26}_{C}$ ⁴ дроу́гыи идє́жє ‖ єˢ **двѡ́рь** ‖ дємєстни́ковь .^ за ст~ою̀ бц~єю̀ наᵈ горою̀ .   δ

$^{27}_{A}$ ⁴ бѣ̀̀ бо̀ тоу **тєрє́ᴹ** ка́мєнь . и повѣ́даша ѡˡsѣ ꙗко дєврѧ́нє прїидо́ша .   γ

Akc 6 ‖ 1 ‖ 6 *Syl* 36^35 *Lex* α α β * γ δ γ

P7

$^{28}_{S1}$ ⁵ и възва́ **ѡˡга** к сє́бѣ и **рєᶜ** им . добрѣ́ гостїє **прїидоша** . и рєко́ша **дерєвлѧ́нє** , α β γ δ β ε

$^{29}_{S2}$ ² **прїидохѡ́ᴹ кнѧ́гинє** . и **рєᶜ** имь **ѡлга** . да гл~єтє что раᵈи **прїидостє** * сѣ́мо .   δ η β α δ

$^{30}_{C}$ ³ и рєкоша **дерєвлѧ́нє** .^ посла наˢ **дерєв҄скаꙗ зємлѧ̀ рєкоу́щи** ‖ си́цє .   β ε ε θ β

$^{31}_{A1}$ ⁵ **мꙗ́жа** твоєго̀ оубихѡᴹ . бѧ́шєᵀ бо тво́и мꙗж ꙗко вол҄кь . въсхы́щаа̀ и гра́бѧ .   ζ ζ

$^{32}_{A2}$ ⁴ а на́ши **кнѧ́sи** до́бри сꙗᵀ . ижє роспа́сли суᵀ **дерєв҄скоую̀ зємлю̀** .   η β ε θ

Akc 9 ‖ 1 ‖ 9 *Syl* 61^63 *Lex* α β γ δ β ε δ η β α δ * β ε ε θ β ζ ζ η β ε θ

P8

$^{33}_{S1}$ ⁴ да **пои̇ди** за́ нашь **кнѧ́зь** , за **ма́ль** . бѣ̀̀ бо имѧ **маль кнѧ́sю** дерєв҄скомоу̀ . | * α β γ γ β

$^{34}_{S2}$ ² **рєᶜ** жє иᴹ ѡˡлга . лю́ба ми єˢ **рѣ́ᶜ** ва́ша . оужє мнѣ́ своє́ᴦ мꙗжа нє крє́сити .   ‖ ^ δ δ

$^{35}_{A1}$ ³ но хо́щоу вы почти́ти . наоу́ᵀрїа прєᵈ лю́дьми сво́ими . а нн~ѣ **идѣтє** в лѡᵈю̀ свою̀ . | α ε

$^{36}_{A2}$ ³ и лѧзѣтє в **лѡᵈѝ** вєли́чающєсѧ . азь оутрѣ́ послю̀ по ваˢ . вы жє рᵇцѣ́тє .   ε

Akc 4 ‖ 4, 3 ‖ 3 *Syl* 49^53 *Lex* α β γ γ β * δ δ α ε ε

P9

³⁷_{S1} ² нє єдє^м ни на конє^х , ни`` пѣ́ши идє^м . но понєсє́тє ны в лw^ди` . и въз^ьнєсоу^т α

³⁸_C ⁰ ‖ вы`` в * лw^ди` * .^ и w<sup>т</sup>поусті я в лw<sup>д</sup>ю` . ‖ α

³⁹_{A2} ² wлѣ́га жє повєлѣ и́скопати ꙗмоу вєли́коу и глоубокоу на дворѣ тєрєм^ьскw^м , α

Akc 2 ‖ 0 ‖ 2 *Syl* 28^34 *Lex* α α α

P10

⁴⁰_{S1} ⁴ внѣ́ града . и заоу^тра w^лга сѣдꙗ́щи в тєрє́мѣ посла` по го́стѣ . α

⁴¹_{S2} ³ прїи́доша къ ̀ ни^м гл~щє . зовє^т вы wлѣга на ч^сть вєли́коу . wни[`] ж **рє^кша** , ⁽⁴¹⁾ β α γ

⁴²_C ¹ нє єдє^м ни`` на конє<sup>х</sup> . ни`` на возѣ^х .^ ни`` пѣ́ши **идємь** , β

⁴³_{A1} ⁶ но **понєсє́тє** ‖ * на^с в лw^ди` * . рєко́ша жє кы́янє . на^м нєво́ля . **кнꙗ́sь** на́шь оуби^т .^β
ε β η

⁴⁴_{A2} ⁴ а **кнꙗ́гини** на́ша хочє^т за ва́шь **кнꙗ́sь** . и **понєсоша** я` в лw<sup>д</sup>и` . η η δ ε

Akc 9 ‖ 9 *Syl* 54^54 *Lex* α β α β β β δ * ε * β η η η δ ε

P11

⁴⁵_{S1} ⁴ они ж сѣдꙗ́хж в пєрє́гбє^х **вєли́чаю`щєсꙗ** и **вєли́кы^х** соустога^х горѣдꙗщєсꙗ . α α

⁴⁶_{S2} ² и **принєсо́ша** я` на дво́рь къ wлѣзѣ . * β γ

⁴⁷_C ¹ ‖ и **нєс^ьшє** я` врꙗ́ноуша въ ꙗмоу ^ ис лw^дєю . и приник^ьши wлѣга и рє^ч и^м . ‖ β γ

⁴⁸_{A1} ² добра́ ли ва^м ч^сть . wни ж рєко́ша ,

⁴⁹_{A2} ⁴ поу́щє на^м иго́рєвы см~рти . повє́лѣ **засы́пати** нꙗ` живы . и **посыпаша** я` . δ δ

Akc 6 ‖ 1 ‖ 6 *Syl* 50^50 *Lex* α α **β** γ * **β** γ δ δ

⁴⁹ᵃ > и посла́в^вши wлѣга к дєрє́вляно^м рє^ч .

P12

⁵⁰_{S1} ³ да ащє мꙗ пра́во проситє то **пришлѣтє** къ́ мнѣ **мж́жи** нарочитыа̀ . α β

⁵¹_{S2} ³ да въ вєли́цєи ч^сти **по́идоу** за ва́шь кнꙗ^s . γ

⁵²_{S3} ⁴ єг^да нє поустꙗ^т мє́нє людїє києв^ьстїи . сє́ жє слы́шав^ьшє **дєрєвля́нє** . δ

⁵³_{C1} ⁴ избра́ша лоу́чшаꙗ` **моу́жа** ижє дє́рж̇а^т **дєрєв^ьскоую** зємлю̀ . и **посла́ша** по́ ню .^^β δ α

⁵⁴_{C2} ⁴ **дєрє́вляно^м** ‖ жє пришє^дши^м . **повє́лѣ** wлѣга **мов^ьницоу** съ́твори^{ти} . рє́коущє си́цє . * δ ε η

⁵⁵_{A1} ³ **измы́вшєсꙗ прїидѣтє** къ́ мнѣ . wни жє **пєрєж^ьгоша** мо́вницоу . η γ θ η

⁵⁶_{A2} ⁴ и влѣ́зоша **дєрєвл́нє** и нача́ша **мытисꙗ** . и запро́ша **мов^ьницоу** w ни^х . δ η η

⁵⁷_{A3} ⁴ и повєлѣ за́жєчї я` w<sup>т</sup> двєрє́и . и тоу **изго́рє́ша** вси` . ε θ θ

Akc 14 ‖ 1 ‖ 14 *Syl* 88^92 *Lex* α β γ δ β δ α δ η **θ** * **θ** γ ζ θ δ θ θ η ζ ζ

P13

⁵⁸_{S1} ³ И посла̀ к^ъ дєрє́вляно^м рєкоу́щи си́цє . сє оу^{жє} идоу к ва^м , |

⁵⁹_{S2} ³ да пристрои́тє **мєды мнwгы** оу гра́да , идєжє оубистє **мж́жа моєго`** , ‖ ^ * α β

⁶⁰_{A1} ⁴ да попла́чюсꙗ на^д гро́бw^м єго` . и сътво́рю тризноу **мж́жоу моємоу** . | β

⁶¹_{A2} ⁴ wни́ жє слы́шав^ьшє свєзо́ша **мєды мнwгы** sѣ́лw ‖ α

Akc 3 + 3, 4 + 4 *Syl* 80=42+38 *Lex* α β * β α

P14

⁶²_{S1} ³ wлѣга жє поє^мши ма́ло дроужины . и лєг^ько **идоу́щи** ⁽⁴`⁾ **прїидє** на гро́бь єго` . α α

⁶³_{S2} ² и плака́сꙗ по мж́жи **своємь** . β

⁶⁴_C ³ и **повєлѣ** лю́дє^м * **насыпати** ‖ ^ * мо́гылоу вєли́коу , и ꙗко **ис^ьсыпаша** . γ δ δ

$^{65}_{A1}$ ^{1} **повєлѣ** три``зноу тво́рити .   γ

$^{66}_{A2}$ ^{3} по сє́ᵐ сѣ́дша дєрє́влянє пити . и **повєлѣ** отро́коᵐ **своиᵐ** слоу́жи́ти прєд ними .   γ β

Akc 6 + 6 *Syl* 94=47+47 *Lex* α α **β** γ * **δ** * **δ** γ γ **β**

Р15

$^{67}_{S1}$ ^{5} и рєко́ша **дєревля́нє** къ **wˡsѣ** . гдє`` соу́ᵗ **дроу́sи** на́ши . и\ˣ жє посла́хо́ᵐ по тя .   α β γ

$^{68}_{S2}$ ^{2} wна ж рє\ч , **идоу́ᵗ** по мнѣ съ **дроу́жиною** мж́жа моєго` .   δ γ

$^{69}_{C}$ ^{5} и ꙗко оупиша\с **дєрє́влянє** . **повє́лѣ** || ^ * **отро́коᵐ** своиᵐ пи́ти на ня . а са́ма **wᵗидє про\ч** ε η θ δ β

$^{70}_{A1}$ ^{2} и пото́ᵐ **повє́лѣ wтро́кwᵐ сѣчї я**` .   η θ ι

$^{71}_{A2}$ ^{5} и **съсѣ́коша** их . є~ . а **wл�҄га** възъвра́тися къ` кїєвоу . и пристро́и воя на про́къ и\ˣ .   ι **β** β

Akc 9 + 1 + 9 *Syl* 115=56+59 *Lex* α **β** γ δ γ α η θ * **δ** ζ η θ ι ι **β** ζ

^{71a} > НАЧА́ЛО КНЯ́ЖЄНЇА СТ~ОСЛА́ВЛЯ .

Р16

$^{72}_{S1}$ ^{4} wлˠга съ́ сыно́ᵐ свои́ᵐ **ст~осла́воᵐ** . събра́ вои мнωгы и хра́бры .   α

$^{73}_{S2}$ ^{3} и и́дє на **дєрєвсᵺкоую**` зємлю . и и́зыдоша **дєрєвля́нє** противоу .   β β

$^{74}_{S3}$ ^{2} снє́мшися wбѣ́ма по́лкома накоу́пь .

$^{75}_{C}$ ^{6} соу́ноу **ко́пїєᵐ** || **ст~осла́вь** ^ * на **дєрє́вляны** . и **копїє** лєтѣ ско́зѣ оуши **ко́нєви** *.ᵞ α β γ δ

$^{76}_{A1}$ ^{3} оуда́ри в но́гы **ко́нєви** .   δ

$^{77}_{A2}$ ^{2} бѣ`` бо вєлᵺми дѣ́тєскь . и рє\ч свє́нгєлᵺд , и асмоуд . **княз** оужє поча́ль .   ε

$^{78}_{A3}$ ^{3} потя́гнє́ᵐ дроу́жино по **князи** . и побѣ́диша **дєрє́вляны** .   ε β

Akc 11 + 1 + 11 *Syl* 132 = 65 + 67 *Lex* α **β** β γ δ δ * α β γ ε ε β

Р17

$^{79}_{S1}$ ^{4} **дєрєвля́нє** жє побѣ́гоша и **затво́риша**\с въ **гра́дє**\ˣ **свои**\ˣ .   α β γ δ

$^{80}_{S2}$ ^{5} **ẃльга** ж оустрє́мися съ **сы́ноᵐ свои́ᵐ** на иско́ростѣ́нь **град** .   ε η δ γ

$^{81}_{C1}$ ^{4} ꙗко тїи бяхж **оубили** мж́жа єꙗ . и ста́ около * **гра́да** * съ **сы́ноᵐ свои́ᵐ** . || ^ θ γ η δ

$^{82}_{C2}$ ^{5} а **дєрєвля́нє затво́риша**\с въ **гра́дѣ** , и боря́хж крѣпᵺко из **гра́да** .   α β γ γ

$^{83}_{A1}$ ^{3} **вѣдя́**шє бо ꙗко са́ми **оубили** князя . и на что ся прєда́ти .   θ

$^{84}_{A2}$ ^{6} и стоя́ **wлˠга** лѣ́то цѣ́ло . и нє можа́шє взя́ти **гра́да** .   (43) ε γ

Akc 13 || 1 || 13 *Syl* 63^62 *Lex* α β γ δ ε η δ γ θ * γ * η δ α β γ γ θ ε γ

Р18

$^{85}_{S1}$ ^{6} и оумы́сли си́цє посла` къ **горо́доу** , **рєкоу́щє** , чє́го **хочєтє** досѣ́дѣти .   α β γ

$^{86}_{S2}$ ^{2} а вси` ваши **горо́ды** прєда́шя\с мнѣ и **яша**\с **по да**\ⁿ .   α δ

$^{87}_{C1}$ ^{3} || и дѣ́лаю\ᵗ ни вы **своа**` и зємли` * **своя**` *. а вы **хочєтє** голо́дwᵐ измє́рєти . || ^ ε ε γ

$^{88}_{C2}$ ^{2} нє **имж́щи**\с **по да**\ⁿ . дєрєвлянє жє **рєко́ша** , ра́ди быхо́ᵐ ся ꙗли **по да**\ⁿ .   δ β δ

$^{89}_{A1}$ ^{3} но хо́щєши **мьсти́ти мж́жа своєго** . рє\ч жє и́ᵐ wлˠга .   η

$^{90}_{A2}$ ^{3} ꙗко азь оужє **мьсти́ла** єсмь **мж́жа своє́ᵍ** . кж́гда прїидоша къ кы́євоу .   η

Akc 8 || 3 || 8 *Syl* 65^66 *Lex* α β γ α δ ε * ε * γ δ β δ η η

Р19

$^{91}_{S1}$ ^{3} и второє` и трєтїє , єжє къѓда **тво́ря**\ˣ три́зноу моу́жоу моємоу .   α

$^{92}_{S2}$ ^{3} а оу́жє нє **хо́щоу** wᵗмᵺщєнїа **тво́рити** . но **хо́щоу да**\ⁿ имѣ́ти пома́лоу .   β α β γ

$^{93}_{C}$ ^{3} и смири́вᵺшєся || ^ с **ва́ми** пои́доу опять . ᵛ

$^{94}_{A1}$ ^{2} * **рєкоша** * жє дєрєвля́нє чє́го **хощєши** оу на\с . ра́ди дає́ᵐ мєдwᵐ и скорою` .   δ β γ ε

$^{95}_{A2}$ ^{3} **и**на ^ж **речє** и^м , нн~ѣ оу ва^с нѣ́тоу **ни**`` **мєдоу ни**`` **ско́ры** .   ^{δ υ ε}

Akc 8 || 8 *Syl* 50^50 *Lex* α β α β γ υ * **δ** * **β** ε δ υ ε

P20

$^{96}_{S1}$ ^{5} но **ма́ла оу** ва^с **про́шоу** , **да́итє** ми ѿ **двора́** по **три**`` **голоу́би** ,   ^{α β γ δ ε η}

$^{97}_{S2}$ ^{4} **д**а по **три** ^ж **воро́бѣи**` , азь бо нє хощоу тя^жкы **да́ни** възло́жити на́ **вас**ⷠ ,   ^{ε θ}

$^{98}_{C}$ $^?$ ꙗко ^ж мꙗ́жь мо́и . но сє́го || [^] * **оу** вас **про́шоу** * **ма́ла** .   ^{β α}

$^{99}_{A1}$ ^{5} **и**знємогли бо́ ся вєстє въ ѡса́дѣ . да **в**ⷠ**да́итє** сє **ма́лоє**` , **дерє́вляне** жє ра^{дї} быша .   ^{γ α}

$^{100}_{A2}$ ^{3} **събра́ша** ѿ **двора́** по **три**`` **голоу́би**, и по **три**`` **воробьи**` .   ^{δ ε η ε θ}

Akc 12 || 12 *Syl* 52^54 *Lex* α β γ **δ ε η ε θ** * **β** * **α** γ **α δ ε η ε θ**

P21

$^{101}_{S1}$ ^{3} **и** посла́ша къ **ѡл**ⷠ**зѣ** с покло́но^м . **ѡ́лга** ^ж **рє**^ч имь .   ^{α α}

$^{102}_{S2}$ ^{3} сє оужє покорилися єстє` мнѣ и моємоу дѣ́тяти . а **и́дѣ́тє** въ гра^д .   ^β

$^{103}_{C}$ ^{5} **а** я заоу^тра [^] ѿстоу́плю ѿ **гра́да** || и **пои́доу** в **го́рѡ**^д **сво́и** .   ^{γ β γ}

$^{104}_{A1}$ ^{2} **дєрєвлянє** жє **ра**^{дї} быша **вни́доша** в **го́рѡ**^д .   ^{δ β γ}

$^{105}_{A2}$ ^{3} **и** повѣда^ш **лю́дємь** и **ѡбра́доваша**^с **людї** в **горо́дѣ** .   ^{ε δ ε γ}

Akc 8 + 8 *Syl* 91=45+46 *Lex* α α β γ β γ * **δ** * **β** γ ε δ ε γ

P22

$^{106}_{S}$ ^{2} **ѡлга** ^ж **ра́здаа**` **воє**^м **кож**^д**омоу** по **голоу́би** , а **дроугым** по **воробьєви** , [^] *

$^{107}_{A}$ ^{5} и по́вєлѣ || къ **кож**^д**омоу голоу́бєви** || и **въро́бьєви** привяза́ти ⁽⁴⁴⁾ **чи́пь** .

Akc 3 || 1 || 3 *Syl* 23^24 *Lex* α β γ * α β γ

P23

$^{108}_{S1}$ ^{4} и **ѡбєр**ⷠ**тиваючи** въ **пла́ткы** ма́лы **нит**ⷠ**коюⷯ повєр**ⷠ**заючи**.

къ всѣ́^м **голоу́бє**^м , и **въро́бїє**^м .   ^{α β}

$^{109}_{S2}$ ^{4} и **повє́лѣ ѡл**ⷠ**га** ꙗко **смєр**ⷠ**чєся** поу́стити **голоу́би** и **воро́бьи** ,   ^{γ δ α β}

$^{110}_{S3}$ ^{4} **воє**^м **своим**^м . **голоу́би**ж^ж и * **въро́бьи** * **полєтѣша** въ **гнѣ́зда своа**`

ѡвїи в **голоу́бники своя**` . || [^]   ^{ε α β ε α ε}

$^{111}_{A1}$ ^{3} **воробїєвє** ^ж **пѡ**^д **застрѣ́хы** . и та́ко **загарахꙗся голоуб**ⷠ**ница** .

и ѡ ни^х **клѣти** и **ѡдри́ны** .   ^{η α}

$^{112}_{A2}$ ^{4} и нє бѣ **двора́ идє́жє** нє **горя́шє** , и нє бѣ`` **л**ⷠ**зѣ гаси́ти** .   ^{θ η}

$^{113}_{A3}$ ^{5} всѣ **двор́и за́горѣша**^с . и **побѣ́гоша** лю**дї**є из^ь **гра́да** .

и **повєлѣ ѡл**ⷠ**га воє**^м **своим**^м **има́ти** и^х   ^{θ η γ δ ε}

Akc 12 || 12 *Syl* 87^85 *Lex* α **β** γ δ α **β** ε α **β** ε * **α** * ε η α θ η θ η γ δ ε

P24

$^{114}_{S}$ ^{2} и ꙗко взя **горѡ**^д и **пож**ⷠ**жє** , и **старѣ́ишины** ^ж **гра́да ижьꙗжє** ,   ^{α α}

$^{115}_{C}$ ^{4} и **прочаа**` * **лю́ди** , ѡвѣ<sup>х</sup> **изби**́ . <sup>^</sup> а **дроугыа**` **рабо́тѣ прєда** мꙗ́**жє**^м **своим** . || ^β

$^{116}_{A}$ ^{6} а **прѡ**^к о́**ста́ви** и^х **пла́тити да**^н . и **възло́жи** на́ ня **да́нь тяжкоу** .   ^{β γ γ}

Akc 6 || 6 *Syl* 31^33 *Lex* α α β * **β** γ γ

P25

$^{117}_{S1}$ ^{5} и **двѣ**`` **ча́сти идєта** къ **кы́євоу** . а **трє́тїа** к **вы́шєгоро́доу** къ **ѡл**ⷠ**зѣ** .   ^{α β γ δ}

$^{118}_{S2}$ ^{2} **бѣ**`` бо **вы́шєгоро**^д **ѡлжи**^н **гра**^д . и **и́дє ѡл**ⷠ**га** по **дєрєв**ⷠ**скои зємли**   ^{γ δ α δ ε}

$^{119}_{S3}$ ^{5} съ **сы́нѡ**^м **своим** и съ **дроу́жиною**` **своєю оуста́вляющи оуста́вы** и **оуро́кы** .   ^{η θ θ ζ ζ ι}

$^{120}_{S4}$ ^{3} и **соу**^т **ста́новища єя** и **ловища єя** , и **прїи́дє** || в **горѡ**^д * **сво́и** * **кы́євь** . || ^{ζ α γ θ β}

¹²¹_{C1} ⁴ съ **сы́но^м свои^м** ст~ослаⷡвⷤⷨ . и пребывъши лѣ́то єди́но . ^{<...>}   η θ

¹²²_{C2} ⁴ идє wⷧга к но́воугоро́доу . ‸ **оуста́ви** по мьстѣ **пого́сты** и **да^н** .   α δ γ ζ κ λ

¹²³_{A1} ⁶ и по лоу́сѣ **пого́сты́** и **да^н** и **wбро́кы** . и ло́вища єя по все́и **зе^мли** .   κ λ ι ε

¹²⁴_{A2} ⁴ и знамєнїа и мѣсты и **пого́сты** . и са́ни єя стоꙗ^т въ плєско́вѣ **и до сє́го д~нє .**   μ

¹²⁵_{A3} ⁵ и по днѣ́проу перевѣ́сища и по дє́снѣ . и є^с сє́ло єя **wлъжичи и до сє́го д~нє .**   δ μ

¹²⁶_{A4} ⁴ изрядⷰвши възвра́тися къ **сы́ноу своєму** в кыєвь , и пребыва́шє с ним въ лю́бъви .   η θ β

Akc 18 ‖ 1 ‖ 18 *Syl* 126^121 40 *Lex* α β γ δ γ δ γ α δ ε η θ θ ζ ζ ι ζ α γ * θ * β η θ α δ γ ζ κ λ κ λ ι ε μ δ μ η θ β

Comment. In fact, it would be possible to present this text in a "short" representation:

P14

wⷧга жє поє^мши ма́ло дроужины .

и лєгъко **идоу́щи прїидє** на гро́бь єго̀ .   α α

и плака́ся по мⷤжи **своємь** .   β

и **повєлѣ** лю́дє^м * **насыпати** ‖   ‸ *

мо́гылоу вєли́коу , и ꙗко **исъсыпаша** .   γ δ δ

повєлѣ три̏зноу тво́рити .   γ

по сє^м сѣⷣша дєрє́влянє пити .

и **повєлѣ** отро́ко^м **свои^м** слоу́жи^{ти} прєд ними .   γ β

For further exploration on representing an ancient poetic text in a "long" and "short" layout, refer to[21].

The Composition of the Text

We will divide the entire story into compositional episodes and present them in a synoptic table. The episodes are evidently grouped around at least three main themes (see Table 1): tribute to the prince, funeral rites and buring in soil, and burning or the funeral pyre.

Episodes 1-6, 2-4, and 3-5 can be considered as variants of the same semantic complex. Their content helps to understand Olga's revenge more deeply, as she imitates funeral rites through burning and burying, adding ironic complexity to her vengeful acts. The ritual content of Olga's actions has already been analyzed in detail before[22]. However, the authors of the cited articles do not mention that the right to blood revenge was a commonplace of medieval law, mentioned in the *Русская Прав-*

---

[21] Н. Назаров, *Просодика…*, с. 61-62.

[22] A.V. Koptev, *Reconstructing the Funeral Ritual of the Kievan Prince Igor (Primary Chronicie, sub Anno 945)*, SML 13, 2010, s. 87-106. A.V. Koptev, *Ritual and History. Pagan Rites in the Story of the Princess' Revenge (the Russian Primary Chronicle, under 945-946)*, „Mirator" 2010, № 11, p. 1-54. F. Butler, *A Woman of Words. Pagan Ol'ga in the Mirror of Germanic Europe*, „Slavic Review" 2004, vol. 63, p. 771-793.

Table 1

Tribute to the Prince	burying in the ground	funeral pyre
1) 1-16 Igor goes to take tribute from the Derevlyans and they kill him		
	2) 16-49 the Derevlyans asked Olga to marry their prince Mal. She kills them by throwing their boat into a pit	**3)** 49a-57 Derevlyans envoys come for the second time, Olga orders them to be burnt when they are in the bathhouse
	4) 58-71 the first Campaign of Olga. She orders a burial mound to be constructed and to kill 5000 Derevlyans	**5)** 72-78, 79-116 the second campaign of Olga. The fire of Korosten, the main city of the Derevlyans
6) Olga makes the Derevlyans to pay a big tribute. 117-126 She returns to Kyiv, than goes to Novgorod establishing the level of tribute from different tribes		

да, and even earlier in Oleg's treaty with the Greeks of 912: "if anyone commits a murder – a Christian to Rusyn or a Rusyn to Christian – let him die at the place of murder". This is exactly what happens to the Derevlyans whom Olga kills at the scene of her husband's murder (episode 4). The method of Ihor's murder, known from the tradition of Lev Dyakon, is silenced in the text of the Kyiv scribe: either out of respect for the prince or because the method of execution does not fit into the ritual parallelism of the episodes. Probably much closer in interpreting the semantics of Olga's actions was the researcher Iliana Chekova[23], who pointed out the role of Olga's tasks as motifs common to folk tales and wedding rituals.

Lexical series

In the analyzed text, there are 26 strophic periods, each with a corresponding lexical series, totaling 26 lexical series. The presence of a lexical series as a compositional device is undeniably evident in the text itself. The series includes both identical words and words with common roots. The center of symmetry closely aligns with or coincides with other centers of symmetry, such as accentuation and syllabic sequences. By identifying this center, we gain insights into the composition of a strophic period: coincidence of the three ceters means that a strophic period is not a fiction, but a textual reality consciously employed by the anonymous author.

---

[23] И. Чекова, *Летописное повествование о княгине ольге под 6453 г. в свете русской народной сказки. Опыт определения жанровой природы*, «Старобългарска литература» 1990, кн. 23-24, с. 77-98.

The structural patterns in the lexical series suggest (see Table 2) that it could have served as a mnemonic or compositional device, presumably, the series itself was composed first, and then the strophic period was written based on it.

Table 2

	α	β	γ	δ	ε	η	ζ	θ	ι
1	игор-	ид-	княз-	дан-					
2	друж-	дом-							
3	слыш-	дерев-	опять	ид-	мал-	уб-			
4	уб-	игор-	мал-	дерев-					
5	лод-	гор-	город-	ныне двор					
6	бе вне города	двор-	терем-						
7	ольг-	реч-	добр-	-ид-	дерев-	княг-	земл-	муж-	
8	ид-	княз-	мал-	реч-	лод-				
9	лод-								
10	ольг-	-ид-	реч-	-нес-	лод-	княз-			
11	велик-	-нес-	ольг-	-сып-					
12	-сл-/-шл-	муж-	-ид-	дерев-	-вел-	мов- / мы-	-жеч-		
13	меды многы	мужа моего							
14	-ид-	сво-	повел-	-сып-					
15	дерев-	ольг-	дроуг-дроуж	ид-	прок-	повел-	отрок-	сек-	
16	ст-слав-	дерев-	копи-	кон-	княз-				
17	дерев-	затвор-	град-	свои-	ольг-	сын-	оуб-		
18	город-	рек-	хот-хоч-	яшася по дань	свои-	мьстити мужа своего			
19	твор-	хощ-	дан-	рек-	медом и скорою				
20	мал-	у вас прошу	да-	двор	голуб-	вороб-			
21	ольг-	ид-	град-	рад-	люд-				
22	кожд-	голуб-	вороб-						
23	голуб-	вороб-	повел-	ольг-	сво-	гор-гар-	двор-		
24	-жьж-	прок-	дань						
25	ид-	кыев-	-город-	ольг-	земл-	сын-	сво-	-ста-	-рок-
	погост-	дань	и до сего дне						

The length of the lexical series also serves a compositional function. The lengths alternate, but a noticeable tendency emerges (see Table 3): the series' lengths fluctuate between medium and short in the main part of the text, and the last stanza features the longest lexical series, thus creating a climax effect. This deliberate arrangement intensifies the narrative, leading to a powerful conclusion.

Table 3

α β γ δ α * β * δ δ δ β β

α β * α * β α

α β γ δ β ε η * η α δ γ ε α β

α β γ δ ε η ζ * ε ι α η ι β ζ

α α γ α γ * δ ε δ ε α

α α β * γ δ γ

α β γ δ β ε δ η β α δ * β ε ε θ β ζ ζ η β ε θ

α β γ γ β * δ δ α ε ε

α α α

α β α β β δ * ε * β η η η δ ε

α α β γ * β γ δ δ

α β γ δ β δ α δ η θ * θ γ ζ θ δ θ θ η ζ ζ

α β * β α

α α β γ * δ * δ γ γ β

α β γ δ γ α η θ * δ ζ η θ ι ι β ζ

α β β γ δ δ * α β γ ε ε β

α β γ δ ε η δ γ θ * γ * η δ α β γ γ θ ε γ

α β γ α δ ε * ε * γ δ β δ η η

α β α β γ υ * δ * β γ ε δ υ ε

α β γ δ ε η ε θ * β * α γ α δ ε η ε θ

α α β γ β γ * δ * β γ ε δ ε γ

α β γ δ α β ε α β ε * α * ε η α θ η θ η γ δ ε

α β γ δ γ δ γ α δ ε η θ θ ζ ζ ι ζ α γ * θ * β η θ α δ γ ζ κ λ κ λ ι ε μ δ μ η θ β

The elements of the lexical series (throughout the work) are connected by a number of phonetic similarities: *дерев-/терем-, добр-/двор-/твор-, гор-/город-, град-/рад-, повел-/велик-, лод-/люд-, прок-/-рок-, льзњ / *ользњ* etc.

However, there are lexical repetitions that permeate the entire text and are one of the central words-themes. Such a word is *mal*, the name of the prince of Derevlyans, which is then used in its original meaning ("a small, young one"). It is the ambiguity of the word *mal* within the text that creates the effect of irony, especially when it is used by Olha herself in conversations with the Derevlyans. Moreover, it is known that in other versions of the story, not preserved in the Old Rus' original, the prince had other names: Długosz knows him as Niskin (apparently, *short, not tall*), and Stryjkovsky knows him as Maldite (i.e., *a small child*). Both names are also ironic, but in the preserved version, the wordplay and the irony it creates are much more developed. Thus, when Olga tells the Derevlyans "ма́ла оу ва^c про́шоу" (l. 96), the phrase sounds deliberately ambiguous: does the princess want to get Prince *Mal* to take revenge for her husband's murder, or does she really want **little** tribute?

Also, the main characters of the story – the Derevlyans and Olga – are represented by almost the same number of word uses (*derev-* is used 32 times, and Olga's name is used 31 times). Another (probable) example of wordplay can be the use of the word *trizn-* and numeral *tri*, as it is used three times (lines 60, 65, 91), and is immediately followed by a series of numerals three.

The considerable formal work on lexical series and wordplay shows how poetry played a role of reflection on language, because to create such a complexly organized text, it was necessary to have an understanding of words that share the same root, different phonetic forms of the same root, an understanding of stress and syllable, etc. The sophisticated poetic form can be compared to the rhetorical devices of the Byzantine hymnography[24], but the latter has never been studied from the point of view of the repetitive lexical series.

Commentary on the accentology

We have fully reproduced all the accents of the original manuscript, written in the middle to second half of the 16th century, presumably somewhere in Volyn, possibly in Ostroh[25]. The first regularity that strikes one's eye is that the accents are not random, but reflect the internal structure of the poetic text, and even more so, they are organized into the same series, the center of which coincides with the centers of other levels of linguistic organization. In other words, the number of accents was a significant factor in the organization of the strophic period. However, it is noticeable that to preserve the regularities, only *acute* accents need to be counted. Instead, the *gravis* probably did not have the meaning of a tonic accent, but rather conveyed a change in intonation, since it cannot be taken into account when counting accents: all regularities disappear.

Since accents reflect the internal structure of the text itself, namely the coincidence of the centers of linear sequences of words, syllables, and syntactic periods, a logical question arises: to which era does the manuscript's accents belong?

---

[24] Н. Назаров, *Просодика…*, с. 72.

[25] О. Пріцак, *Чому катедри українознавства в Гарварді?*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, New York 1973.

We cannot know whether the accentuation was a result of the then-current tradition of performing, say, other ancient texts (such as the Psalter), or whether the scribe copied an older accented manuscript. Therefore, it remains to establish not an absolute, but a relative chronology of the system to which the accent system of the analyzed text belonged (a separate comprehensive study should be made for the entire manuscript). For the stress of the Slavic languages, a parameter indicating the stage of development is the preservation of enclinomen words that did not have their own stress[26]. Their peculiarity was that they did not have an independent stress, instead, they had a "mechanical", non-phonological stress (an increase in intonation) at the beginning and end. The same applies to enclinomena combined in a sequence.

Thus, in the text of the story about Olga, the accentuation features of the Early Old Rus' period are the following enclinomens (the number denotes the line in our publication):

> *град*: 25 *а пєрєвѣ́сишто` бѣ`` внѣ́ города . и бѣ`` внѣ горо́да дво́рь тєрє́мны`` .
> 40 *внѣ́ града . 80 иско́ростѣ́нь град 102 и́дѣ́тє въ град 79 въ гра́дєх свои 82*
> *боря́хж крѣпько из гра́да .*
> *князь*: 19 *за́ княс сво́и ма́ль . 24 дво́рь княж 77 княз оужє поча́ль*
> *гора*: 22 *на́ горѣ*
> *син*: 72 *вльга съ́ сыном своим ст~осла́вом .*
> *терем*: 27 *бѣ`` бо` тоу тєрєм ка́мєнь*
> *земля*: 30 *посла нас дєрєвьскаа зємля` 32 ижє роспа́сли сут дєрєвьскоую` зємлю` (+ 53)*
> 73 *и и́дє на дєрєвьскоую` зємлю 87 и зємли` своя`*
> *гость*: 28 *добрѣ́ гостїє прїидоша*

However, it is the poetic form that allows us to draw a very important conclusion: the ´ sign in the manuscript had a tonic force, because it is the counting of acutes that gives regular series, and the grapheme ` had only an intonational force and therefore was not taken into account in the counting of stresses, and if it is counted, the coincidences between the lexical, sylabic, and accentuation series disappear. It should also be noted that the title ~ in the syllable count has a value of 1, and this is sufficient to preserve the symmetry of the series.

Therefore, it should be recognized that the accentuation of the Ostroh copy is immanent in the text itself and reflects its internal structure. Another question is whether this connection was preserved by copying an older accented manuscript, or by the tradition of oral recitation of the chronicle that may have existed in princely and magnate courts, or by the peculiarities of the Western Ukrainian accent in the 16th century (which, by the way, have been hardly studied). The answer to this question requires a separate study, taking into account the accent system of the entire Ostroh manuscript of the PVL.

---

[26] В. Скляренко, *Праслов'янська акцентологія*, Київ 1998, 342 с.

Is there an acrostic in this poem?

In Byzantine ancient poetry, there were often acrostics that indicated the author or theme of the work. However, in the text under analysis, no unambiguous acrostic could be found. Nevertheless, there are certain coincidences that should be mentioned, although we are not sure that they are acrostics:

р - w - д - и - и | р - а - с | с - и - а - и - и | и - и - и - и - р - п | п - и - и - **р** - а | а - д - б |
    …

и - а - и - **р** - **w** | н - **д** - ꙗ - **и** - **с** | **и** - с - **а** - д - **и** |
    …

Maybe it was a word play on the roots *rod-* and *sija(t')*.

Conclusions. In general, the text reveals a clear composition aimed at a certain aesthetic, but mainly ideological effect. It was understood very straightforwardly by the author of the 17th-century Life of St. Olga, who, however, quite rightly conveyed the ideological thrust of the work. Undoubtedly, the main rhetorical device used by the author of the chronicle is irony, even political irony. After all, the Derevlyans are not just punished, they are punished by imitating a princely funeral rite. Obviously, this text can be a reflection of the centralization of the tribal union and its transformation into a proto-state institution centered in Kyiv, as evidenced by the lexeme *Kyiv* in the very last line, in a strong place. In the same way, the power of the Kyivan princely family over other lands is established. In this context, it seems legitimate to hypothesize that the acrostic **р - w - д ... р - w | н - д** may be a deliberate play with form by the author.

The Tale of Olga's Wars with the Derevlyans is a representative of Old Rus' rhythmic prose that can even be seen as a type of ancient literary epic poetry. It is similar to poetry through the strict laws of strophic period construction that regulate all the language levels. We should not be concerned with the exact definition of poetry or prose, because the distinction between these concepts is a inherent problem of terminology, not one that is immanent in the text itself or the epoch of its creation. The metrical organization is based on the coincidence of the boundaries and the center of the lexical series with the boundaries of and symmetrical series of accents and the linear length of the text fragment in syllables. The question of the origin of this form and its historical development is the subject of a separate study.

References

Chekova I., *Letopisnoe povestvovanie o knyagine Ol'ge pod 6453 g. v svete russkoj narodnoj skazki. Opyt opredeleniya zhanrovoj prirody*, «Starobŭlgarska literatura» 1990, kn 23-24.

Długosz J., *Joannis Dlugossii Annales seu Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae. 1-2*, Varsaviae 1964.

Franchuk V., *Litopysni opovidi pro pokhid knyazya Ihorya. Tekstolohichne doslidzhennya ta pereklady*, Kyiv 1988.

Franchuk V., *Kievskaya letopis'. Sostav i istochniki v linhvisticheskom osveshchenii*, Kyiv 1986.

Franko I., *Studii nad naidavnishym kyyivskym litopysom (chastyna persha)*, [in:] Ivan Franko, *Zibrannia tvoriv u 50-ty tomakh*, t. 6. *Poeziya*, Kyiv 1976.

[Gizel', I.], *Kievskij sinopsis*, Kiev 1823.

Guimon T.V., *Historical Writing of Early Rus (c. 1000 – c. 1400) in a Comparative Perspective.* Leiden – Boston 2021.

Halytsko-Volynskyy litopys. Tekst. Komentar, M.F. Kotliar (ed.), Kyiv 2002.

Butler F., *A Woman of Words. Pagan Ol'ga in the Mirror of Germanic Europe*, „Slavic Review" 2004, vol. 63.

Cynarski S., *Uwagi nad problemem recepcji „Historii" Jana Długosza w Polsce XVI i XVII wieku*, [w:] *Dlugossiana. Studia historyczne w pięćsetlecie śmierci Jana Długosza*, Warszawa 1980.

Kniga Stepennaya tsarskogo rodosloviya, [v:] *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisey*, t. 21, ch. 1, Sankt-Peterburg 1908.

Koptev A.V., *Reconstructing the Funeral Ritual of the Kievan Prince Igor (Primary Chronicie, sub Anno 945)*, „Studia Mythologica Slavica" 2010, vol. 13.

Koptev A.V., *Ritual and History. Pagan Rites in the Story of the Princess' Revenge (the Russian Primary Chronicle*, under 945-946), „Mirator" 2010, vol. 11.

Kronika halicko-wołyńska. Kronika Romanowiczów, ed. D. Dąbrowski, A. Jusupović, Kraków – Warszawa 2017.

Letopis' po Lavrent'evskomu spisku, Sankt-Petersburg 1872.

Mytsyk Yu., *Litopys Yana Binvilskogo*, «Nacional′nyi universytet 'Kyevo-Mohyljans′ka akademija'. Naukovi zapysky. Istorychni nauky» 2002, № 20 (2).

Nazarov N., *Prosodyka kyievoruskykh litopysiv: strofichna budova starokyivskoi poezii*, "Movoznavstvo" 2023, № 1.

Nazarov N., *Nezamechennaya epika: metricheskaya pereocenka «Povesti vremennyh let» i «Slovo o polku Igoreve»,* „Slavia Orientalis" 2019, nr 2.

The Old Rus Kievan and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles. The Ostroz'kyj (Hlebnikov) and Cetvertyns'kyj (Pogodin) Codices, Harvard 1991.

Ostrowski D., *Introduction*, [in:] *Povest' vremennykh let. An Interlinear collation and Paradosis. Compiled and edited by Donald Ostrowsk,* Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 2004.

Picchio R., *On the Prosodic Structure of the Igor Tale*, "The Slavic and East European Journal" 1972, nr 16 (2).

Peretts B., *Issledovaniya i materialy po istorii starinnoy ukrainskoy litetratury XVI-XVIII vekov*, Moskva – Leningrad 1962.

Pritsak O., *Chomu katedry ukrayinoznavstva v Harvardi*, Cambridge, Massachusets; New York 1973.

Povist vram'yanykh lit: Litopys (Za Ipatskym spyskom), Kyiv 1990.

Povest' vremennyh let po Ipatskomu spisku, Sankt-Petersburg 1871.

Radzivilovskaya ili Kenigsbergskaya letopis', Sankt-Petersburg 1902.

The Russian Primary Chronicle. Laurentian text, Cambridge [1953], [in:] https://www.mgh-bibliothek.de/dokumente/a/a011458.pdf.

Shakhmtov A.A., *Istoriya russkogo letopisaniya*, t. 1, kniga 2, *Rannee russkoe letopisanie XI-XII vv.*, Sankt-Peterburg 2003.

Skliarenko V., *Praslovyanska aktsentolohiya*, Kyiv 1998.

Stryjkowski M., *Kronika polska, litewska, zmódzka i wszystkiéj Rusi Macieja Stryjkowskiego*, t. 1, Warszawa 1846.

[Tuptalo, D.], *Kniga zhitij svyatykh*, t. 4, Kiev 1764.

NOTE ON THE AUTHOR

Nazarii Nazarov – PhD in Ukrainian language (кандидат філологічних наук), linguist, translator, and poet, currently Ukrainian refugee in France, invited researcher at Fondation Maison des sciences de l'homme, Paris. **Publications:** *A planar graph as a topological model of a traditional fairy tale*, „Semiotica" 2024. https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2023-0116; *Следы индоевропейского близнечного мифа в формулах балто- славянских песен*, „Scando-Slavica" 2017, vol. 62/2, с. 151-178; *Indo-European Musical Idiom and Indo-European Ethnogenesis*, „Folia Philologica" 2021, vol. 2, s. 42-60; *Бортний дуб на межі: релікти індоєвропейського звичаєвого права у давньоруських та староукраїнських пам'ятках XI-XVII ст.*, «Мовознавство» 2022, № 4, с. 55-70; *Витоки (а)симетрії нової української прози: моделі текстопородження Григорія Квітки-Основ'яненка*, „Slavia Orientalis" 2022, nr 1, s. 47-61.

ORCID: 0000-0002-9051-7382

Email: nazarmia@gmail.com