THE MARGIN IS THE MESSAGE: ANDREJ LYZLOV'S TRANSLATION OF STRYJKOWSKI'S KRONIKA

DAVID H. DAS

A hitherto neglected source for the study of Muscovite historical thought is the corpus of translations of the European historical works which entered Muscovy in the second half of the seventeenth century. These translated works offer an insight into late seventeenth century Muscovite historiographical concerns: the choice of the work to be translated is of course in itself one indicator of these concerns; even more revealing are the changes that the originals underwent in the process of translation. This short paper will focus upon one of these late seventeenth century translations: Andrej Lyzlov's translation in 1682 of sections of Maciej Stryjkowski's *Kronika polska, litewska, żmódzka i wszystkiej Rusi*[1].

Lyzlov's translation was not groundbreaking as prior to 1682 Stryjkowski's *Kronika* had been translated twice, once fully in 1679 and once partially in 1668-1670[2]. Lyzlov completed his own translation because he had a specific agenda in mind: he states in the introduction that his goal is to present "a history of the beginnings and origins of all the peoples of the world" with special reference to "the origins and beginnings of the numerous Slavic peoples..." (l. 307)[3]. As during the course of the seventeenth century Muscovy came into increasingly regular contact with various European states — states that were very aware of their origins and early history — Muscovites became concerned with discovering their own past and with establishing a pedigree equal to that of any other people.

Lyzlov's reworking of Stryjkowski was one response to this need and he chose his material carefully. In order to appreciate Lyzlov's choices it is necessary to realize what Stryjkowski offered. In Stryjkowski's *Kronika*

[1] Lyzlov used the first edition of STRYJKOWSKI'S *Kronika,* Könisberg, 1582.
[2] A. I. ROGOV, *Russko-pol'skie svjazi epochi Vozroždenija*, Moscow, 1966, pp. 271ff.
[3] All citations are from GPB POGODIN 1494 and STRYJKOWSKI 1582.

Book I, Chapter 1 presents history from Creation to the death of Noah; I, 2 discusses the Tower of Babel and the division of humanity into various peoples; II, 1 treats the origins and the early settlements of the Lithuanians; II, 2-7 presents further Lithuanian history; Book III is devoted fully to Lithuanian history; IV, 1 discusses the early settlements of the Slavic peoples; IV, 2 treats the origins of the Rus' and IV, 3 discusses the early history of the Rus' down to Rjurik. The balance of the *Kronika* treats the history of Lithuania-Rus' into the sixteenth century.

Lyzlov's translation starts with the straightforward choice of I, 2 which he translates in its entirety. He then jumps to the middle of II, 1 without any warning or marker (he leaves it all under the heading I, 2). The omitted part of II, 1 discusses what the classical historians wrote about Lithuania. Lyzlov's lack of interest in Lithuania cannot be attributed to an anti-Lithuanian bias since the translated section of II, 1 discusses Lithuania at great length. Rather his editing is a testament to his concern with giving a coherent account. The translation picks up just at the point in II, 1 where Stryjkowski starts to discuss Togormah, the third son of Gomer. Stryjkowski has discussed the first two sons in the final pages of I, 2. Lyzlov thus edits Stryjkowski in order to present a well-ordered and complete narrative of the descendants of Noah. At the end of II, 1 Lyzlov has a short statement in which the balance of Book II and all of Book III are summarized and in which he recapitulates the information taken from II, 1 and creates a transition to the translation of the first three chapters of Book IV. The choice of these chapters requires no explanation. At the end of the IV 3, with Rjurik's succession to his brothers' holdings, Lyzlov claims that he needs go no further and refers the interested reader to the *Stepennaja kniga* (l. 359). Lyzlov consciously filled in a gap by providing information not contained in the traditional Muscovite chronicles, thereby creating a "prehistory" for these chronicles.

Stryjkowski's version of early Slavic history was popular in Muscovy due to his claims for the primacy of Moscow and its founder in the early Slavic world[4]. However Lyzlov was not content with simply transmitting Stryjkowski's account. Rather he rewrote the account from a specifically Muscovite point of view. The subtle changes and additions that Lyzlov introduced into the text by means of margin notes are revealing both of the way in which the Muscovite ordered the past and of the Muscovite self-image in the late seventeenth century[5].

Stryjkowski's main means of presenting the origins of the various European peoples was to place them within the genealogical scheme of des-

---

[4] ROGOV, cit., pp. 266-267.

[5] Lyzlov appears to have been aware of the impact of the margin note — both in engaging the reader's attention and in leaving a lasting impression. He plays the elegant game of reproducing Stryjkowski's text (for the most part completely faithfully) while insinuating his own concerns by means of the notes. The relationship between text and margin note and the question of how a text was read in late seventeenth century Muscovy remain to be studied.

cent from Noah. Lyzlov reproduces in full Stryjkowski's genealogical account (as shown above he attempted to make it clearer) and he also amplifies upon Stryjkowski's account and corrects errors in his presentation. Lyzlov makes a number of simple additions in the margin. Next to the account of the geographical disposition of the descendants of Noah's sons Lyzlov adds respectively: "Shem's descendants"; "Cham's descendants"; "Japhet's descendants" (l. 314, p. 12; l. 314^v, p. 13; l. 315, p. 13). Lyzlov ties specific peoples to the descendants of Noah: where Stryjkowski has the note "German peoples", Lyzlov reads "German peoples from Gomer" (l. 322^v, p. 19); Lyzlov adds, next to an account of the Venety and Sarmatians, "Venety and Sarmatians from Riphat, the son of Japhet" (l. 324^v, p. 23); next to an account of Gomer's descendants, Lyzlov has the note "the people from Gomer, the son of Japhet" (l. 315^v, p. 13); similarly Lyzlov adds, in the appropriate place, the note "the people from Togormah, the son of Japhet" (l. 327^v, p. 26)[6].

Lyzlov also attempts in the margin notes to correct Stryjkowski's mistakes in genealogy — mistakes which in his view threatened to disrupt the orderly scheme. Where Stryjkowski states that Phut and Canaan were sons of Mesraim, Lyzlov places in the margin: "Phut and Canaan according to the Bible were sons of Cham and not Mesraim. *Genesis* Chapter 10" (l. 312, p. 11). When Stryjkowski again claims that Phut was a son of Mesraim, Lyzlov puts in the margin: "Phut according to the Bible was the third son of Cham and not of Mesraim" (l. 312, p. 11). In the final entry in this series, where Stryjkowski states that Canaan was the fifth son of Cham, Lyzlov places in the margin: "Canaan according to the Bible was the fourth son of Cham. *Genesis* Chapter 10" (l. 313^v, p. 12). Clearly this genealogical structuring of history was still viable in late seventeenth century Muscovy. Even more pronounced evidence of its continued viability is Lyzlov's emphasis upon Mosoch and Asarmot.

Mosoch, the sixth son of Japhet and, in Stryjkowski's account, the founder of Moscow and patriarch of all Slavic peoples, received special attention from Lyzlov. As the eponymous forbear of Moscow and the Muscovites, Mosoch provided the clear link between Noah and seventeenth century Muscovy. Lyzlov does his best to emphasize that link through his use of margin notes. Lyzlov adds notes: "people propagating from Mosoch" (l. 331, p. 89); "Mosoch's settlements" (l. 332, p. 90); "Moscow from Mosoch" (l. 333^v, p. 92); "Mosoch's peoples lived on one side of the Black Sea" (l. 333^v, p. 92); "the Slavic peoples from Mosoch" (319^v, p. 17). Lyzlov also changes Stryjkowski's margin notes. Where Stryjkowski has the note "where the Slavs settled on the Volga and Don", Lyzlov substitutes "the second settlements of Mosoch's peoples" (l. 334, p. 92). Where Stryjkowski has "Japhet means expansion", Lyzlov has "explanation of the

---

[6] Lyzlov's changes in the final three notes might be partially explained by an interest in Japhet, the father of Mosoch.

names Japhet and Mosoch" (l. 334, p. 92). Lyzlov also provides cross-references to Mosoch. On l. 319ᵛ (p. 17), next to an explanation of Mosoch's name, Lyzlov puts in the margin: "below p. 92⁷". At this point on p. 92 (l. 334ᵛ), next to yet another explanation of Mosoch's name, Lyzlov has: "above p. 17".

Mosoch as the link between Biblical past and seventeenth century present is further accentuated by Lyzlov's focus on Mosoch's namesakes, Muscovy and Moscow. Lyzlov adds margin notes: "Moscow" (l. 314ᵛ, p. 13); "name of the people of Moscow" (l. 332, p. 90); "about the city of Moscow" (l. 332, p. 90); "the ancient Muscovite kingdoms [were] first in Asia" (l. 335ᵛ, p. 94); "Muscovite is the pure Slavic language" (l. 350ᵛ, p. 110). Lyzlov changes a margin note: where Stryjkowski has "whence came the Slavic peoples", Lyzlov substitutes "many peoples came from the Muscovite lands" (l. 339ᵛ, p. 96).

Asarmot, in Stryjkowski's account Mosoch's companion in the settlement of Northern and Eastern Europe, is the only other individual to be cross-referenced in Lyzlov's translation. On p. 13 (l. 314ᵛ) Stryjkowski gives Asarmot's genealogy: "the son of Ektan, grandson of Evor, greatgrandson of Salin, greatgreatgrandson of Arfaksad who was the son of Shem". In the margin Lyzlov has the note: "see below p. 92". On p. 92 (l. 334ᵛ) Stryjkowski again provides a genealogy for Asarmot: "son of Ektan, grandson of Shem, greatgrandson of Patriarch Noah". Stryjkowski then proceeds to describe his adventures with his "granduncle" Mosoch. Here, in the margin, Lyzlov adds an extensive note: "Asarmot, the son of Ektan, grandson of Salin, greatgrandson of Canaan, greatgreatgrandson of Arfiksad who was the son of Shem. *Genesis* Chapter 10. According to this Asarmot should be the greatgreatgrandson of Mosoch and not the grandson. See above p. 13". The significance of Lyzlov's rewriting of Asarmot's genealogy goes beyond any concern with correction.

In Stryjkowski's *Kronika* Asarmot gave his name to the Sarmatians who, in Stryjkowski and in much of sixteenth century Polish history writing, are virtually synonymous with the "Slavs"[8]. In the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, however, Polish historians limited the term "Sarmatian" exclusively to the Polish nobility. In this view the Sarmatians were a heroic warrior race superior to all other peoples and a Catholic bulwark against Orthodoxy and Islam. In correcting Asarmot's genealogy, Lyzlov is calling attention to Asarmot's subordinate status vis à vis Mosoch and thereby he deflates the seventeenth century Polish assertions of Sarmatian superiority[9].

---

[7] Lyzlov is himself referring to the pagination of the 1582 edition of Stryjkowski — a pagination which he faithfully reproduces in the margin throughout the translation.

[8] On Sarmatianism, see: T. ULEWICZ, *Sarmacja; studium z problematyki słowiańskiej XV i XVI w.*, Kraków, 1950.

[9] Lyzlov might be confusing grandnephew and grandson. However he might deliberately be substituting "son" for "nephew" in the margin in order to show Asarmot's *direct* subordination to Mosoch.

Inextricably linked with Stryjkowski's discussion of Noah's descendants is his presentation of the post-Babel division of humanity into the various peoples of the world. That Lyzlov found this to be a meaningful way to order history is evidenced by his use of margin notes. Lyzlov adds notes at the appropriate moments: Cymbrians (l. 315^v, p. 13); Median people (l. 316^v, p. 14); Macedonians (l. 317, p. 15); French (l. 318^v, p. 16); German peoples (l. 320^v, p. 17); Saxons (l. 322, p. 19); Vandals (l. 323, p. 19). Lyzlov also replaces Stryjkowski's notes with his own. Where Stryjkowski has a margin note identifying his sources for the text's discussion of the Scythians, Turks, and Tatars (*Genesis* 10. *Beros. lib.* 5. *Apocal.* 20), Lyzlov has "Scythians, Tatars, Turks" (l. 315^v, p. 14). Next to an account of how the Greeks and Latins perceived Janus, Stryjkowski has in the margin "Janus" while Lyzlov has the replacement notes "Greki" and "Latinniki" (l. 316^v, p. 24).

Lyzlov also uses margin notes to highlight the role of the "Russian" people. Lyzlov adds a series of notes: "under which [astrological] signs are the Russian lands" (l. 329, p. 85); "the origins of the Russian peoples" (l. 333^v, p. 92); "ancient battles of the Russians" (l. 352, p. 111); "Russian settlements" (l. 352, p. 111); "why the Russians are so named" (l. 354^v, p. 113); "various names of the Russians" (l. 355^v, p. 114). By these notes Lyzlov draws attention to the role of the "Russians" — the ancestors of the inhabitants of seventeenth century Muscovy — in early Slavic history. Yet, in so doing, he significantly rewrites that history.

For Stryjkowski, Rus' was a specific geographic area centered upon Kiev, the *Russacy* (or some variation thereof) were the inhabitants of this area, and *ruski* was the appropriate adjective. Moscow was rendered by *Moskwa* and the appropriate adjective was *moskiewski*. In short, Rus' and Moscow were two distinct entities. Lyzlov, however, quite consciously conflates the two. Lyzlov renders without exception   *Russacy* as *Rossiane*, *ruskie* as *rossijskija*, *Rus'* as *Rossija*, *Rus' Biała* as *Belaja Rossija*, *ruskich y slawienskich* as *slavenorossijskich*. That this is more than a translating convention is evident when Lyzlov's translation is compared to the other Muscovite translations of Stryjkowski. With few exceptions these translations render *Russacy* as *Rusi* or *Russaki*; *ruskie* as *ruskie*, *Rus'* as *Rus'*, *Rus' Biała* as *Rus' Belaja*, and *ruskich y slawienskich* as *ruskich i slavenskich*[10]. All of the margin notes relating to the "Russians" mentioned in the previous paragraph accompany a text in which Stryjkowski is recounting the history of the Rus'. Thus Lyzlov coopts for Muscovy — which by the late seventeenth century was called "Russia" and was peopled by "Russians" —

---

[10] The 1668-70 translation was consulted in BAN 32.11.4. The 1679 translation was consulted in GPB F. IV. 103. Examination of other MSS. of the two translations shows no variation in translation.

the history of Rus' and thereby endows Muscovy with a significant role in early Slavic history[11].

Lyzlov's reworking of Stryjkowski is one example of the Muscovite reaction to the European histories that entered Muscovy in the second half of the seventeenth century[12]. This paper has attempted to demonstrate the value of a close textual comparison of the original and the translation. Such a comparison is a basic step in the reconstruction of Muscovite historical culture and in the elucidation of the process of cultural borrowing from Europe in pre-Petrine Muscovy.

---

[11] Further evidence of this cooptation: Stryjkowski recounts the contruction of Kiev and states in the text that Kiev was "the chief and glorious capital of the Rus' autocracy". In the margin he has "Kijow'". Lyzlov does not reproduce this margin note and replaces Stryjkowski's statement with:"Kij... founded...Kiev in 830 AD". Lyzlov's seeming lack of interest in the idea of *translatio imperii* from Kiev to Moscow requires further study (l. 356, p. 112). Another motive behind this cooptation of Rus' is, of course, Muscovite pretensions in the Ukraine.
[12] See: A. I. Sobolevskij, *Perevodnaja literatura Moskovskoj Rusi XIV-XVII vv.*, St. Petersburg, 1903.