The Institute of Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences

as a manuscript

Daria Glebova

NARRATIVE MODE IN THE HISTORICAL WRITING OF EARLY RUS' AND MEDIEVAL SCANDINAVIA

Dissertation Summary
for the purpose of obtaining
academic degree Doctor of Philosophy in Philology and Linguistics

Academic Supervisor:
F.B. Uspenskij
Doctor of Science

Moscow 2021

SUMMARY

General characteristics of the study

This research is dedicated to the forms of transmission of historical writing in Old Rus' and medieval Scandinavia. The two traditions are considered from a typological perspective suggested by two reasons. One of them is the necessity to understand specific generic features of the early chronicle writing of Old Rus' (*nachal'noe letopisanie*). The comparative perspective has already enabled scholars to put compositional features of the Old Russian early chronicle writing in the broader context of medieval book culture: over the last decades it has been shown that the open composition and year-by-year structure along with long narrative accounts of the events from different years put *letopisanie* close to both the annalistic and chronicle writing of Western and Central Europe (Ranchin 1999, Gippius 2003, Guimon 2012, etc.).

However, specific features of *letopisanie* are not limited to composition as it has also a distinctive form of transmission: *nachal'noe letopisanie* does not exist in a separate manuscript tradition. On the contrary, it always dissolves within the next compendium (*letopisnyj svod*) being perpetually continued and transmitted exclusively as an opening part of Old Russian chronicles. The great differences between the versions of this text – namely the main copies of *Poverst' vremennykh let* (PVL) and the Younger Recension of *The First Novgorod Chronicle* (Novg. I (young)) – suggest that the transmission process could be very open and free. To understand these features of the *nachal'noe letopisanie* transmission, it must be juxtaposed to the other medieval traditions of historical writing.

In its ability to exist without a separate manuscript tradition the Old Russian early chronicle writing seems to be unique among European medieval histories that can be transmitted as separate works, cf., for instance, cases of *Chronica Boemorum* by Cosmas of Prague (Komendova 2017), *Historia Francorum* by Gregory of Tours (Reimitz 2016: 526-527), *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* by Venerable Bede

(Guimon 2012: 213). The open transmission, on the other hand, is a shared trait found both in Old Russian and Western European historical writing where the compilers strive to *use* the predecessor's text rather than to *preserve* it.[1] Indeed, in the following centuries the texts of Gregory of Tours, Venerable Bede, and other early historians are significantly modified over transmission (Fisher 2012, Reimitz 2016, Sidorov 2015). The main questions are how exactly these historical traditions are changing over the transmission and whether the transmission form of the Old Russian early historical writing differs from them in any way? What forms of transmission are possible within the transmission of historical writing in general? In which pragmatical conditions do these forms develop? Do they change from tradition to tradition or are they universal? And, finally, can the forms of transmission change within one manuscript tradition?

The questions listed above introduce the other reason to study *nachal'noe letopisanie* from a typological perspective. While the fixed text was an innovation introduced by the invention of the printing press, the manuscript transmission was always a subject to variation. The variation is never homogeneous within one book culture as some texts are copied almost without any change (closed recensions) and others, alternatively, with significant modifications (open recensions in the broader sense of this term).[2] Although this division into two types of transmission, closed or open, is useful, it does not take into consideration the variety of the transmission forms within an open tradition.[3] The study of these forms as well as the features accompanying them (text genre, particularities of the manuscript tradition, function of the transmitted text) would help to devise a set of objective parameters for comparative transmission studies that could reach across the borders of national

---

[1] This view of a text as material for a new composition is intrinsic to the so-called "functional literature" like medical codices, apocrypha, lexicons, etc. (Baun 2007: 35, Zhivov 2017: 217).

[2] The distinction between open and closed recensions was first made in Pasquali 1952 and developed mainly in connection to the traditions that either show variants from other recensions or do not; in the Old Russian studies, however, the terms are used in the broader sense, i.e. transmission with significant changes or without them (Bulanin 2014: 28).

[3] For example, the research in the field of *Überlieferungsgeschichte* by scholars of Würzburg school shows that functional texts of different genres have different forms of transmission which correlate with their generic nature (Williams-Krapp 2000: 4-8).

manuscript traditions. This dissertation aspires to initiate this process with a typological study of the transmission forms found in Old Russian early historical writing and Old Norse-Icelandic tradition of *konugasögur* (Kings' sagas).

The historical writing of Medieval Scandinavia has not been chosen as a comparative material by accident. The Old Russian *nachal'noe letopisanie*, known by the PVL and a similar text found in the Novg. I (young), is a prose work written in vernacular. Since most of the European historical writing of the 12-14th c. was in Latin, the choice for the comparison is limited to the Old English and Old Norse-Icelandic historical traditions. While the former has already been partly considered by T.V. Guimon (Guimon 2012) – albeit from a different perspective –, the Old Norse-Icelandic tradition has never been compared to the Old Russian historical writing in terms of transmission.[4]

Thus, the transmission forms of historical writing in medieval manuscript traditions constitute the main **subject of this study**. The Old Russian early chronicle writing and the Old Norse-Icelandic tradition of *konungasögur* work as **its object**. The **novelty of this research** is determined by its unprecedented focus on transmission forms of historical writing and typological perspective.

The **research goals** are to devise a comprehensive typology of transmission forms found in the Old Russian *nachal'noe letopisanie* and in the Old Norse-Icelandic *konungasögur* traditions as well as to describe similarities and differences of transmission between them. Accordingly, the main **objective** is to answer the following questions: 1) How do the scribes of Old Rus' and Medieval Iceland copy their sources? 2) How are the variants distributed across the copied text? 3) What triggers scribal emendations? To answer these questions, it is required to:

1. choose examples for the comparison;
2. develop a method for the comparative analysis of transmission;
3. indicate main transmission forms found in the given versions and elicit pragmatics behind choosing one form over another;

---

[4] Although there were attempts to compare these historical traditions in terms of their poetics (Melnikova 2003, Aliutina 2006).

4. juxtapose the forms of transmission in the Old Russian *nachal'noe letopisanie* to the Old Norse-Icelandic *konungasögur*.

The main **material for the study** of the Old Russian early chronicle writing is provided by the regional versions of the PVL (the copies of Laurentian and Hypatian groups) and a similar text found in the chief copies of the Novg. I (young). The study of the *konungasögur* transmission is based on two examples originating from different periods of the same tradition – the rise of the kings' sagas compendia in the 13th c. and the advent of compilations in the 14th c. In the dissertation, the former is represented by the use of *Ágrip af nóregskonungasögum* (*c.*1190) within *Heimskringla* (*c.*1220-1230). The latter – by the use of an *Íslendingasaga* (saga of Icelanders) within a compilation based on one of the *konungasögur*: *Bjarnar saga hítdælakappa* in a compilation known as *Bæjarbók á Rauðasandi* (AM 73 b, fol.; *c.*1370-1390).

The **methodology of this research** is informed both by the traditional methods of textual criticism and existing approaches within the Western textual criticism and the Russian text history (*textologia*) which tend to see the medieval work as a perpetually changing rather than fixed text (for example, Cerquiglini 1999, Nichols 1990, Likhachev 2001; in saga studies: Driscoll 2010, Lethbridge 2012, etc.). Therefore, although inspired by the "new philological" and textological focus on variation rather than on the original, this dissertation concentrates primarily on the variation between the versions preserved in several manuscripts rather than on an individual manuscript. In order to track this kind of variation this research implements traditional methods of textual criticism: the copies are chosen according to the existing stemmas of the versions and then juxtaposed to indicate agreed readings.[5] As a result, only the readings that do not have any agreement in the parallel version (AB≠CD) are considered as a version variant. This process facilitates the distinction between individual readings of a copy and variants that

---

[5] The method of agreement is described in, for example, Ostrowski 2003: xliii.

were introduced at the previous stages of transmission.

To study the transmission forms, identified variants are marked and then considered together within a fragment with a particular focus on the density of their distribution. This approach allows the research to track the switching of scribes between the different *modes of transmission*.

The following propositions are to be presented at the thesis defence:

1. The Old Russian *nachal'noe letopisanie* and the Old Norse-Icelandic *konungasögur* display similarities in their transmission, which is open in both cases: although *konungasögur* can exist in the separate manuscript traditions, they tend to be used in the new historical compendia and rewritten repeatedly.

2. Both traditions implement three basic types of transmission: a *close copy* (I), *similarity without identical text* (II), and *dense variation* (III). These forms are distinguished by the density of variant distribution and their qualitative traits. The transmission forms manifest the modes of interaction with a text available to the scribes.

3. The *dense variation* mode is characterised by, first, a considerable number of densely distributed synonymous variants and, second, parallel lexico-grammatical and rhetorical constructions shared between the versions. Most of these variants are not connected to the ideological changes (narrative strategy, changes in factual information) and cannot be fully explained by such major types of stylistic emendation as compression or amplification, modernisation or archaization, etc. These variants are more likely to reflect linguistic and narrative preferences of the scribe and to be profusely introduced to a copied text as a result of a change in scribe's comprehension and general perception of the text. The *dense variation* mode of transmission can originate from the function of *letopisanie* and *konungasögur* as history.

4. Both the *konungasögur* and the *nachal'noe letopisanie* scribes could

switch between the different modes of transmission.

5. Over the time the general mode of the Old Norse-Icelandic *konungasögur* transmission evolved from the active revision of the kings' sagas in compendia (13th c.) to their preservation in the large compilations that revised only the additional texts, *þættir* (end of 14th- beginning of the 15th c.). The same model is applicable to the Old Russian chronicle writing that was shifting from active revision of historical writing to the text stabilisation in the 14-15th c. (cf. the PVL in the chronicles of the Laurentian and Hypatian groups).

Conference presentations and public demonstrations of the results and materials of the dissertation

The main materials and conclusions of the dissertation have been presented in 2017–2021 in oral and poster presentations at 11 conferences, 10 of which were international:

«Ancient Rus' and Germanic World in Historico-Philological Perspective» (9-10.06.2021, 10-11.06.2020, 6-7.06.2018, 7-8.06.2017, Institute for Slavic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences/ HSE, Moscow);

1st Symposium «The Formula in Oral Poetry and Prose. New Approaches, Models and Interpretations» (5-7.12.2019, University of Tartu, Tartu);

«11th Meletinsky Readings. In Medias Res: The Narrative Strategies» (8-9.10.2019, RSUH, Moscow);

«The 54th International Congress on Medieval Studies» (9-12.05.2019, University of Western Michigan, Kalamazoo);

7th Annual Conference for Emerging Scholars «Text – commentary – interpretation» (13.04.2019, HSE, Moscow);

5th International conference for young researchers «Folkloristics and Cultural Anthropology Today» (7.03.2019, RSUH, Moscow);

7th International conference «Textologia and Historico-Literary Process» (15-17.03.2018, MSU, Moscow);

3[d] International conference «Digital Humanities in Nordic Countries» (7-9.03.2018, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland).

The papers on the dissertation topic have also been presented at the research seminars of Institute of Polish Language of Polish Academy of Sciences (*DH Lunch*, supervisors M. Eder, J. Rybicki), *Varangian Club*, (supervisor F.B. Uspenskij) as well as the meetings of the Department of Typology and Comparative Linguistics at the Institute of Slavic Studies (Russian Academy of Sciences).

The overview of the research

Structure. This dissertation contains an introduction, three chapters, an excursus, conclusions, a bibliography, and two appendices.

The **first chapter** provides the general comparison of the Old Russian early chronicle writing and the Old Norse-Icelandic *konungasögur* traditions. It begins with an overview of various approaches to the Old Russian chronicles: from A. Schloezer to A.A. Shakhmatov's theory of *letopisnyj svod* (chronicle compilation) and the early chronicle writing evolution followed by the debate between his followers and critics. According to Shakhmatov and his followers, who have contributed significantly to his theory in the second part of the 20th – beginning of the 21th c. (Tvorogov 1976; Gippius 1997, 2006b, 2014; Guimon 2012; Mikheev 2012, 2020, etc.), the PVL (12th c., the first quarter) is not the beginning of the Old Russian chronicle writing but just one of the stages in its development. The theory is built on the premise that the previous stage of the Old Russian chronicle writing (the version of 1090s, *Nachal'nyj svod* ('Beginning Compilation')) is preserved in the Novg. I (young). Thus, to compare the PVL and the Novg. I (young) means to compare the two stages of the Old Russian early chronicle writing rooted in the 11th c. Alternatively, the critics of Shakhmatov's theory regard the text of the Novg. I (young) as a revision of the PVL (earlier (Ostrowski 2007: 302-304) or later (Vilkul 2003)). Although this debate is still ongoing, both sides agree that the tradition of the Old Russian early chronicle writing was open to significant changes over the

transmission: according to the *Nachal'nyj svod* theory, the general revision stopped at the PVL composition; according to the critics it continued further.

The development stages of the *konungasögur* tradition are less hypothetical and therefore can be used to provide a possible model for the development of the Old Russian chronicle tradition. The second part of the chapter describes the traditional 6-stages model devised by Theodore M. Andersson (Andersson 1985). This part of the chapter focuses on evolution of *konungasögur* tradition from the Norwegian synopses (12th c.) and separate sagas about Norwegian kings (13th c.) to compendia (13th c.), i.e., collections of long kings' sagas that included various texts from synopses, separate sagas, and other compendia in a revised form. Same as synopses, the compendia are confined by the period from the beginning of kingship until 1177. During the 14-15th c. the form of the *konungasögur* tradition was changing as the transmission of the main texts of the kings' sagas became more stabilised. However, while the main text was transmitted without significant changes, the additional narratives (*þættir*) were actively revised.

The general overview shows that both traditions are open and are characterised by constant revision of the existing historical tradition. The evolution of the *konungasögur* tradition correlates with the reconstructed process of the Old Russian *nachal'noe letopisanie* transmission, progressing from its active revision in the early compendia (*svody* of 11-12th c.) to the stabilisation of the transmitted text in the later compilations.

The **second chapter** describes modes of transmission of the Old Russian early chronicle writing on the material of its two main versions: the PVL (according to the copies of Laurentian and Hypatian groups) is compared to the Novg. I (young; main copies) up to the year of 6524 (1015-1016).

The **section 2.1** deals with the methodology used for the comparative study of variation between these versions. Two stages of the analysis are conducted: 1) distinguishing the individual readings of the copies from the variants of PVL and Novg. I (young); 2) tracking the lexico-grammatical and syntactical variants and

analysing their distribution in a fragment. The aim of the first stage is to find such readings when **all** of the chief PVL copies are not in agreement with **all** chief copies of Novg. I (young). The variant readings that do not have agreed readings in the parallel version are then marked; the ones that do have agreed readings are regarded as identical text. At the second stage the marked variants are further analysed within a text fragment (a year entry or an episode). The density and qualitative traits of the variant distribution work together as means to distinguish the transmission forms. Overall there have been identified three forms of transmission: 1) *a close copy* (type I; > 6 identical words between the variants); 2) *similarity without identical text* (type II; almost no identical text); 3) *dense variation* (type III; < 4-6 identical words between the variants). The marked text of the *nachal'noe letopisanie* accompanied by a critical apparatus is presented in the Appendix 1.

Moreover, the correlation between the forms of transmission and compositional changes is also considered: the fragment with a particular form of transmission can be either left at the same place or moved. The **section 2.2.1** presents the table with all compositional alterations. The Tab. 1 below demonstrates its shorter version and includes compositional changes, assigned types of transmission, and the number of words participating in variation.

Tab.1. Distribution of the transmission forms in the PVL (up to 945).

№ in Appendix 1	№ in Tab. 1, section 2.2.1 (Placement in the composition of Novg.I (young)/PVL)	Type	PVL	Novg.I (young)
1	2 8 (Kij's past)	II	100%	100%
2	3,5 17 (Beginning of annals with Byzantine emperors)	II	100%	100%
3	7 (Kij, Tscheck, Horiv)	I	10%	25%
4	13 15 (1st Rus' campaign against Greeks)	II	100%	100%
5	13 28 (1st Rus' campaign against Greeks)	III	59%	46%
6	14 (Tribute to the Khazars)	I	17%	16%
7	20 26 (Askold and Dir in Kiev)	II	100%	100%
8	21 (Tribute to the Varangians)	II	100%	100%

9	23	(Banishment of the Varangians)	III	67%	76%
10	23	(Invitation of the Varangians)	I	51%	15%
11	24	(Rurick, Sineus, Truvor)	I	12%	39%
12	33	(Igor/Oleg's rule)	II	100%	100%
13	35	(Oleg takes Smolensk)	II	100%	100%
14	36	(Oleg and Igor take Kiev)	III	51%	42%
15	38	38, 51 (Igor and Olga)	II	100%	100%
16	50	(Igor's campaign against Greeks)	III	86%	66%
17	53	(Gathering the army for a new campaign)	III	65%	24%
18a	55	40 (1) (Oleg's campaign against Greeks)	I	62%	7%
18b	55	40 (2)	III	64%	69%
18c	55	40 (3)	I	4%	4%
18d	55	44	I	19%	18%
18e	55	48	II	100%	100%

The identified transmission forms are further described in the next sections of the second chapter. The *close copy* transmission form (Type I) is covered in the **section 2.2.2**. This form is characterized by the sparsely distributed variants (single lexical or morphological synonyms; rarely appearing synonymous syntactic constructions; occasional additions of conjunctions and single lexemes) – usually there are *more than 5-6 identical words* between the variants. Although it is the most typical form of transmission for the text covering the time period from 945 and to 1015, it is also found in the fragments before 945, usually in those that retained their compositional place. The only case of *a close copy* mode pertaining to the dislocated fragment is the tale of Oleg's campaign against Greeks.

The *similarity without identical text* mode (Type II) is discussed in the **section 2.2.3**. In this type of transmission episodes correspond to each other only at the level of content and have either only one short phrase in common or none lexical correspondence at all (for this reason in the Tab. 1 the variation in these fragments is marked 100%). All episodes transmitted in this mode are found before 945, both in the parallel and compositionally moved episodes. All instances of *similarity without identical text* demonstrate either a significant alteration in the narrative strategy of the fragment.

The **section 2.2.4** deals with the *dense variation* mode characterised by densely dispersed variants within the framework of the identical text – such fragments usually contain *less than 4 identical words* shared between the variants. The *dense variation* mode appears several times before 945 and also in the articles of 1015-1016 (the episode describing the conflict between prince Yaroslav and Novgorodians). In this mode the density of variant readings is accompanied by the parallelism of different kinds. At the clause level the versions can correspond as lexico-grammatical parallel chains that consist of morphological, lexical, syntactical, and contextual synonyms, e.g.: «₁и ₂нача пущати ₃огнь трубами ₂на ₄лодья ₅рускыя» (ПВЛ) / «₁и ₃огненымъ строемъ ₂пожьже ₄корабля ₅рускыя» (НПЛмл) = ₁and ₂started to burn/burned ₃with the chains/arrays of fire ₄the boats/ships ₅of Rus'. At the periodical level the parallelism manifests as inverted clause sequences (individual clauses correspond as lexico-grammatical parallel chains too): 1) *И въсташа сами на ся воеватъ, 2) и бысть межи ими рать велика и усобица, 3) и въсташа град на град, 4) и не бѣше в нихъ правды* (НПЛмл) / 4) *И не бѣ в нихъ правды, 3) и восташа родъ на род, 2) и быша в них усобицѣ, 1) и воевати сами на ся почаша* (ПВЛ) (1-2-3-4 / 4-3-2-1). Moreover, the parallelism can also emerge at the rhetorical level when, for instance, both versions provide a special expression as a point at the end of the character's speech but the expression is different (see the analysis of the conflict between prince Yaroslav and Novgorodians episode in the **section 2.2.4.3**).

The main feature of *dense variation* mode resides in the fact that although it usually appears side by side with changes in the narrative strategy (e.g., the case of difference in Oleg's status in the PVL and in the Novg. I (young)), most of the variants are not linked to the main narrative or stylistic change. Alternatively, the behaviour of variants in this mode seems to be a side effect of such a change: usually the variant types are so diverse that it is impossible to explain them by one particular narrative or stylistic reason.

The *dense variation* mode stands against the other modes as it contains both identical text (as in Type I) and a dramatic change in the scribe's narrative strategy

(as in Type II). The main difference lies in the mode of scribe's work: seeing the episode in a new light the scribe does not change the text completely (as it is done in the Type II mode) but *improvises* on the protograph material – changes bits and pieces of the copied text but preserves its structure on every level from a clause to the rhetorical organisation of discourse. This mode of written improvisation frees the scribe to introduce any of their linguistic or narrative preferences (possibly unconsciously) and this process results in the diversity of variants that do not connect directly to the main narrative change. The examples of the dense variation mode found in a long fragment are given in the **section 2.2.4.3** (the conflict of Yaroslav and Novgorodians) and in the **Excursus 1** (the story of Vladimir and Rogneda in the articles of 980 and 1128 in the Laurentian chronicle – a case when the text changes its function).

The **third chapter** discusses the forms of transmission in the Old Norse-Icelandic *konungasögur* tradition. The chapter features two examples belonging to the different stages of this tradition – **section 3.1** traces the usage of a synopsis within a compendium (*Ágrip af nóregskonungasögum*, *c*.1190 within *Heimskringla*, *c*.1220-1230); **section 3.2** – the case of an *Íslendingasaga* transmission when it is included in the *konungasögur* 14th c. compilation (*Bjarnar saga hítdælakappa* in the *Bæjarbók á Rauðasandi*, AM 73 b, fol., *c*.1370-1390).

The transmission of *Ágrip* in *Heimskringla* is studied on the fragment from the beginning until *Óláfs saga Tryggvassonar*. This fragment shows the traces of the same modes that were previously discussed in Chapter 2. The *close copy* mode (Type I) can be seen over the transmission of the famous legend about Haraldr hárfagri who becomes enchanted by the Lapp princess Snæfriðr – this fragment was copied in *Heimskringla* in an almost identical way (**section 3.1.1**). The *similarity without identical text* mode (Type II) is, however, more common for the transmission of *Ágrip* in *Heimskringla*. The **section 3.1.2** discusses two such examples from the battle at Fitjar in *Hákonar saga góða* – in both cases the only correspondence is found in the common content and a short speech line. Finally, **section 3.1.3** considers

the *dense variation* mode (Type III) found in the transmission of jarl Hákon Sigurðarson's death story.

The last section of the dissertation is dedicated to the transmission of *Bjarnar saga hítdœlakappa* within the *Separate saga of St. Óláfr* in the *Bæjarbók á Rauðasandi* (AM 73 b fol., *c.*1370-1390) compilation. *Bæjarbók* differs from other compilations of the same type as it features two fragments from the *Íslendingasögur* that do not appear anywhere else in *konungasögur* – fragments from *Bjarnar saga* and *Laxdœla saga*. The analysis of variation mostly focuses on the fragment from *Bjarnar saga* as it is transmitted in the *dense variation* mode and stands in contrast to the *close copy* mode general transmission of the *Separate saga of St. Óláfr*.

The compiler of *Bæjarbók* does not compress or amplify significantly the *Bjarnar saga* fragment: the *Bjarnar saga* versions contain almost the same amount of words on the parallel fragment (*Bæjarbók* – around 3050 words, the separate saga – around 2955). However, the general level of variation is very high (30-50% from chapter to chapter). It does not mean that the compiler transmits the saga in a homogeneous way: the microanalysis of variation in each chapter shows that there are fragments both with a sparse variation (Type I) and with a very dense variation (Type III), i.e. the compiler could switch between the modes of transmission. The *similarity without identical text* mode (Type II), however, is not found in this case.

The **section 3.2.1.2** lists the examples of variants found in the *Bjarnar saga* transmission: syntactic (periodical structure, types of anaphora, direct/indirect speech), morphological (presens/preterite and the change of modality of verbs, articles, the usage of pleonastic constructions like 'þeir Þórðr'), and semantical (single synonyms, groups of synonyms, lexico-grammatical parallel chains). While usual for any kind of transmission, these variants are distributed very closely manifesting the *dense variation* mode.

As in the other examples, the main change triggering the *dense variation* mode in case of *Bæjarbók* is a change in the narrative strategy of the compiler. It becomes clearer if the fragment from *Bjarnar saga* is read in pair with the fragment from *Laxdœla saga* – another unusual choice for the *Separate saga of St. Óláfr*

13

compilations (**section 3.2.2**). These fragments are linked not only by the same characters (Þórðr Kolbeinsson, Þorkell Eyjólfsson) but also by the same theme: both *þættir* describe a sinful behaviour of two respectful men (a famous *höfðingi* and a famous poet and *bóndi*) that leads to their downfall. The fragment from *Bjarnar saga* is edited accordingly: the compiler introduces several major changes in the image of Þórðr – for example, in the *Bæjarbók* version he does not have the ability to contact St. Óláfr directly when he first meets him. The narrative changes notwithstanding, the fragments around the changes (and beyond) are transmitted in the *dense variation* mode: most of the variants are situated closely and do not result from the narrative change itself.

Apart from the fragments showing the *dense variation* mode, there are also chunks of *Bjarnar saga* that are transmitted within *Bæjarbók* in a very close way, almost without any variants at all (**section 3.2.3**). All these fragments (except for one which was found near a *vísa*) fit perfectly either in the general devotional pragmatics of the compilation about St. Óláfr or the narrative strategy of the Þórðr's and Þorkell's stories. Moreover, *Bæjarbók* preserves other important features of the *Bjarnar saga* composition and narrative. For example, the compositional structure is left untouched; in both versions the narrative of the Norwegian part is rich with the cause-and-effect connections and there is no sight of Þórðr's thoughts, feelings, or motivations (unlike in the Icelandic part in *Bjarnar saga* that was not included in *Bæjarbók*). The preservation of these features shows that they did not trigger the compiler's improvisation. The reason for the dense variation mode lies primarily in the change of the fragment's function – while in the saga it was a part of the bigger story, in *Bæjarbók* it was used as an *exemplum* (a similar change in the text function accompanied by the *dense variation* mode happens in the Vladimir and Rogneda story, discussed in the Excursus 1).

The final **section 3.2.4** is dedicated to the comparison of the transmission forms of *Bjarnar saga* and *Laxdæla saga* in *Bæjarbók*. The analysis shows that although the fragment about Þorkell Eyjólfsson also differs in the amount of variation from the *Separate saga of St. Óláfr* and even has several short fragments

copied in the *dense variation* mode, most of the variants are distributed sparsely. This kind of transmission allows one to argue that the fragment was not percieved by the compiler as different from the their strategy as *Bjarnar saga*.

The chapters are followed by conclusions, bibliography, and two appendixes. The comparison of the *nachal'noye letopisanie* versions is given in the Appendix 1 while the comparison of the *Bjarnar saga* versions is presented in Appendix 2.

The list of publications on the dissertation topic

– in the high-quality journals approved by HSE:

1. *Glebova, D.S.* Neuklyuzhaya saga: Povtory i neodnorodnaya kompoziciya v «sagah ob islandcah» [Clumsy Sagas: Repetitions and Loose Structure in the Sagas of Icelanders] // Vestnik RGGU. Literaturovedenie. YAzykoznanie. Kul'turologiya [RSUH/RGGU Bulletin: "Literary Teory. Linguistics. Cultural Studies"]. 2021. № 1. S. 58-72.

2. *Glebova, D.S.* Rukopisnaya variaciya mezhdu originalom i issledovatelem (esse otvetstvennogo redaktora) [Manuscript Variation between the Original and the Researcher (Editor's Foreword)] // Vox medii aevi. Vol 1-2 (6-7). 2020. C. 14-27.

3. *Glebova, D.S.* Perepisat' ili pereskazat'? O pereskaze i variacii v rukopisnoj tradicii *Bjarnar saga Hítdœlakappa* [To copy or to tell? On retelling and variation in the manuscript tradition of *Bjarnar saga Hítdœlakappa*] // Vestnik RGGU. Literaturovedenie. YAzykoznanie. Kul'turologiya [RSUH/RGGU Bulletin: "Literary Teory. Linguistics. Cultural Studies"]. 2020. № 4. C. 28-44.

4. *Glebova, D.S.* Pereskaz kak iskusstvo istorika: k voprosu o rukopisnoj transmissii istoriopisaniya v Drevnej Rusi i Drevnej Skandinavii [Retelling as the historian's art: Approaching the forms of transmission in historical writing of Old Rus' and Scandinavia] // Slavyanovedenie. № 4. 2020. C. 30-49.

– other publications:

5. *Glebova, D.S.* Perepischik ili pereskazchik? O pereskaze v drevneislandskoj i drevnerusskoj rukopisnyh tradiciyah [A Scribe or A Reteller? On the Retelling in the Manuscript Traditions of Medieval Scandinavia and Medieval Russia] // Fol'kloristika i kul'turnaya antropologiya segodnya: Materialy Vserossijskoj nauchnoj konferencii molodyh uchenyh [Folkloristics and Cultural Anthropology Today: The Materials of the International conference for young researchers] / Ed. by N.S. Petrova, N.N. Rychkova. Moscow, 2019. S. 13.

6.	*Glebova, D.S.* K poetike dvuhchastnoj sagi: tochka zreniya i kompoziciya v "Bjarnar saga Hítdælakappa" [To The Poetics of The Bipartite Saga: Point of View and Composition of *Bjarnar saga hítdælakappa*] // Drevnejshie gosudarstva Vostochnoj Evropy. 2016 god: Pamyati G.V. Glazyrinoj [The Earliest States of Eastern Europe. 2016: In Memory of G.V. Glazyrina] / Ed. by T. V. Gimon, E. A. Mel'nikova, T. N. Dzhakson, A. S. Shchavelev. Moscow, 2018. S. 111-123.

Bibliography

1.	*Alyutina I.V.* Poetika syuzhetov v "Povesti vremennyh let" i skandinavskih sagah [The Poetics of the plots in the *Povest' vremennykh let* and Scandinavian Sagas]. Disser. kand. fil. nauk. [Unpublished PhD thesis]. Moscow: MGU, 2006.
2.	*Bulanin D. M.* Tekstologiya drevnerusskoj literatury: Retrospektivnye zametki po metodologii [Textologia of Old Russian Literature: Retrospective Notes on the Methodology]// Russkaya literatura [Russian Literature], 2014, №1. S. 18-51.
3.	*Vilkul T.L.* Novgorodskaya pervaya letopis' i Nachal'nyj svod [*Novgorodian I Chronicle* and *Nachal'nyj svod*] // Palaeoslavica. Cambridge (Mass.), 2003. [Vol.] XI. P. 5–35.
4.	*Gimon T.V.* Istoriopisanie rannesrednevekovoj Anglii i Drevnej Rusi: Sravnitel'noe issledovanie [Historical Writing of Early Medieval England and Early Rus]. Moscow: Universitet Dmitriya Pozharskogo, 2012.
5.	*Gippius A.A.* K istorii slozheniya teksta Novgorodskoj pervoj letopisi [To the History of Novgorod I Chronicle Text Development] // Novgorodskij istoricheskij sbornik [Novgorodian Historical Collection]. Vyp. 6 [16]. SPb., 1997. S. 3—72.
6.	*Gippius A.A.* U istokov drevnerusskoj istoricheskoj tradicii [At the Sources of the Old Russian Historical Tradition]// Slavyanskij al'manah [The Slavic Almanac], 2002. M., 2003. S. 25-43.
7.	*Gippius A.A.* Dva nachala Nachal'noj letopisi: k istorii kompozicii Povesti vremennyh let [Two Beginnings of the Initial Chronicle] // Verenica liter. To the 60th Anniversary of V. M. Zhivov. M., 2006. S. 57-96.
8.	*Zhivov V.M.* Istoriya yazyka russkoj pis'mennosti [The History of Russian Written Language]. M.: Universitet Dmitriya Pozharskogo, 2017. 2 Vols.
9.	*Komendova J.* «Letopis' Monaha Sazavskogo» i Kievskaya letopis': sravnenie metodov istoriopisaniya [*Letopis' of Sazavian Monk* and *Kievan letopis'*: A Comparison of Historiographical Methodologies]// Slověne = Slověne. International Journal of Slavic Studies. 2017. Vol. 6 (1). S. 256-272.
10.	*Lihachev D.S.* Tekstologiya: na materiale russkoj literatury X-XVII vv. [Textologia: On the Material of Russian Literature of the 9-17th c.]. Saint-Petersberg: Aletejya, 2001 (1st ed. 1962).
11.	*Mel'nikova E.A.* Istoricheskaya pamyat' v ustnoj i pis'mennoj tradiciyah (Povest' vremennyh let i «Saga ob Inglingah») [Historical Memory in Oral and Written Traditions (*Povest' Vremennykh Let* and *Inglinga Saga*)] // Drevnejshie gosudarstva Vostochnoj Evropy. 2001: Istoricheskaya pamyat' i formy eyo voploshcheniya [Ancient States of Eastern Europe. 2001: Historical Memory and Its Forms] / Ed. by E.A. Mel'nikova. Moscow: Vostochnaja Literatura, 2003. S. 48-92.
12.	*Miheev S.M.* Dve redakcii Nachal'nogo svoda v novgorodskih letopisyah XII i XV vv. (k istorii teksta Nachal'noj letopisi) [Two Redactions of *Nachal'nyj Svod* in Novgorodian Chornicles

of the 12th and 15th c.] // Novgorodskij istoricheskij sbornik [Novgorodian Historical Collection]. 2020. № 19 (29). S. 168-217.

13. *Miheev S.M.* Kto pisal «Povest' vremennyh let»? [Who Was Writing the *Povest Vremennykh let*?] Moscow: Indrik, 2011.

14. *Ranchin A.M.* Oppoziciya «priroda – kul'tura» v istoriosofii «Povesti vremennyh let» [The Opposition 'nature – culture' In Philosophy of History in the *Povest Vremennykh let*] // *A.M. Ranchin*. Stat'i o drevnerusskoj literature [Works on Old Russian Literature]. Moscow: Dialog-MGU, 1999. S. 105-115.

15. *Sidorov A.I.* Istoricheskaya kniga vo vremena Karolingov v kontekste knizhnoj kul'tury frankov (VIII-X vv.) [Historical Book at the Carolingian Era in the Context of Franks Book Culture (8th-10th c.)]. Saint-Petersberg: IC «Gumanitarnaya Akademiya», 2015.

16. *Tvorogov O.V.* Povest' vremennyh let i Nachal'nyj svod: (Tekstologicheskij kommentarij) [*Povest' Vremennykh Let* and *Nachal'nyj Svod*: A Textological Survey] // Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury [The Works of Old Russian Literature Department]. Leningrad: AN SSSR, 1976. T. 30. S. 3-26.

17. *Andersson, Theodore M.* Kings' Sagas (Konungasögur) // Old Norse-Icelandic Literature: A Critical Guide / Ed. by Carol J. Clover, J. Lindow. Ithaca, NY, and London, 1985. Pp. 197-238.

18. *Baun J.* Tales from Another Byzantium: Celestial Journey and Local Community in the Medieval Greek Apocrypha. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

19. *Cerquiglini, B.* In Praise of the Variant: A Critical History of Philology / Trans. by Betsy Wing. Baltimore, 1999 (*Cerquiglini, B.* Éloge de la variante. Histoire critique de la philology. Paris, 1989).

20. *Driscoll, M.* The Words on the Page: Thoughts on Philology, Old and New // Creating the Medieval Saga: Versions, Variability and Editorial Interpretations of Old Norse Saga Literature / Ed. by Emily Leithbridge, Judy Quinn. Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2010. Pp. 87–104.

21. *Fisher, M.* Scribal Authorship and the Writing of History in Medieval England. Columbus: Ohio State University, 2012.

22. *Gippius A.A.* Reconstructing the original of the Povest' vremennyx let: a contribution to the debate // Russian Linguistics. 2014. Vol. 38, № 3. Pp. 341-366.

23. *Lethbridge, E.* Authors and Anonymity, Texts and Their Contexts: The Case of Eggertsbók // Modes of Authorship in the Middle Ages / ed. by Slavica Rancović et al. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2012. Pp. 343-364.

24. *Nichols, S.G.* Introduction: Philology in a Manuscript Culture // Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies, 65, № 1 (1990). Pp. 1-10.

25. *Ostrowski, D.* Introduction // The Povest' vremennyx let: An Interlinear Collation and Paradosis / Compiled and ed. by Donald Ostrowski. Cambridge (Mass.), 2003. Pp. xvii-lxxiii.

26. *Pasquali, G.* Storia della tradizione e critica del testo, 2nd ed., Florence, 1952.

27. *Reimitz H.* The Early Medieval Editions of Gregory of Tours' *Histories* // A Companion to Gregory of Tours / ed. By A. C. Murray. Linden, Boston: Brill, 2016. Pp. 519-565.

28. *Williams-Krapp W.* Die überlieferungsgeschichtliche Methode. Rückblick und Ausblick // Internationales Archivfür Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur 25/2. 2000. S. 1-21.