

Alexander V. Maiorov

Schlözer and Karamzin. Struggle for Priority in Studying Russian Chronicles*

The outstanding German historian August L. Schlözer (1735-1809), who intermittently lived and worked in St. Petersburg in 1761-1767 (see Peters 2005: 55-132; Lauer 2009: 272-281), played an important role in the development of historical studies in Russia. He was one of the most prominent historians and publicists of his time, who can rightly be called the "Mediator of the World" (Muhlack 2012: 7 ff.).

Assessing the professional level of Russian historians of the eighteenth century, Hans Rogger rightly wrote: "It is true that there was no scholar in Russia during the entire century who could measure himself with Schlözer in terms of achievement or expertness. His knowledge of history, of ancient and modern languages, his mastery of the methods of textual criticism, of historical geography and linguistics, gave him an undoubted advantage over his Russian colleagues" (Rogger 1960: 222).

At the same time, the major Russian historian and source-study expert Michail N. Tichomirov noted: "The first attempt to publish chronicles, made under Schlözer's supervision, was not successful, which did not prevent the aristocratic-bourgeois historiography from proclaiming him the pioneer in the Russian source study, deliberately ignoring Tatiščev's activity. The failure of the publication was to a large extent explained by Schlözer's excessive self-confidence, who at that time had a bad command of the Russian language" (Tichomirov 1955: 220). These words naturally show the influence of the Stalin era's historiographical stereotypes. However, as we will show further, such accusations against Schlözer were already expressed by Karamzin, who went a difficult path from admiration for Schlözer to understanding his flaws and realizing that his own vision of Russian history was deeper and more comprehensive, and would surpass that of Schlözer.

Like Schlözer, Nikolaj M. Karamzin (1766-1826) considered Russian chronicles to be the main source of historical information about Ancient Rus'. Following his German predecessor, Karamzin believed that the *Nestor Chronicle* was the most important among them. "Like Schlözer, he praised the *Primary Chronicle (Nestor)* by extolling it as a 'treasure of our history' and by maintaining that it was superior to those of other ancient peoples",

* The study was carried out with the financial support of the Russian Science Foundation (*Rossijskij naučnyj fond*), Project 16-18-10137. I express my sincere thanks to Brian Boeck for his help in preparing this article for publication.

wrote Joseph Laurence Black (Black 1975a: 38)¹. In order to surpass Schlözer's academic achievements, Karamzin begins searching for new ancient copies of Russian chronicles, especially of the *Primary Chronicle*, and introducing them into academic circulation.

In this article we will try to show the role of Schlözer and Karamzin in the search for and the study of the oldest copies of the Russian chronicles and, above all, of the most important among them – the *Hypatian (Ipat'ev) Chronicle*.

Both Schlözer and Karamzin became acquainted with the *Hypatian Chronicle* long before it was first published. Both scholars rated high the manuscript significance for the Russian history. Both of them used the information from this chronicle widely in their works. Nevertheless, the opinion about Karamzin's primary role in the study of the *Hypatian Chronicle* prevails in modern historical literature, while Schlözer's name is hardly ever mentioned in this context.

Why so many twentieth-century historians preferred to ignore Schlözer's primary role? Undoubtedly, when answering this question, we need to take into account the Stalin era prescription to give Russia priority in all sorts of discoveries. An objective assessment of Schlözer's achievements in the development of historical studies in Russia was hampered by his non-Russian background. His disagreements with Michail Lomonosov, who personally disliked Schlözer, also played a very negative role, especially because during the Soviet era Lomonosov became in many ways a propaganda symbol of the triumph of the Russian science in the fight against hostile foreign influences (see more Usitalo 2013). It is only through the prism of a skewed view of the eighteenth-century history in the Soviet period that Karamzin's 'priority' becomes a priority.

1. "What Do We Need this German Scholarship with Its Pedantic Requirements for?"

Priority of Schlözer and his students in the discovery and study of the *Hypatian Chronicle* is undoubtedly stated in the main work of the German professor in Russian history, published in five volumes under the general title *Nestor* (Schlözer 1802: 11). The German edition of *Nestor* (1802-1809) was constantly used by Karamzin in his work on the first volumes of his *History of the Russian State*. After the publication of the Russian translation (1809-1819), Schlözer's work gained wide popularity in Russia.

As Schlözer had left Russia, he certainly did not have access to the original *Hypatian Codex*. However, he was able to use an exact transcript of the Academy Library copy of the chronicle, prepared especially for him by his students Semën S. Bašilov and Aleksej Ja. Polenov. The historian defined its significance as the most important source of historical knowledge about Ancient Rus'. At the initiative and under the direction of Schlözer, the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences even began preparing the Chronicle for publication, which, however, did not take place (see Majorov 2017: 166-183).

¹ On Schlözer's study of the *Nestor Chronicle*, the importance that the historian attached to this written monument, the advantages and disadvantages of his research method, see Müller 1962: 138-149; Zimin 1962: 132-137; Henkel 2006: 101-117.

Karamzin undoubtedly knew about the precedence of Schlözer and his students in the discovery and the study of the *Hypatian Chronicle*. Nevertheless, he did not say a word about it. It seems that the historiographer deliberately kept silent about the role of his predecessors. To this end he apparently abandoned the name given to the chronicle by Schlözer – the *Hypatian Chronicle* – and instead used the names of its separate parts – the *Kievan* and the *Volhynian Chronicles*.

This situation requires an explanation. Undoubtedly, the national feelings and patriotic moods of Russian historians played an important part in reassessing the contribution of foreigners to the study of the ancient history of Russia, especially after the success of Catherine II's foreign policy and the victory of Russia in the Patriotic War of 1812. Karamzin actively expressed such moods himself. Let us dwell on this point.

The national feelings of Russians were offended by Schlözer's conclusions regarding the initial period of Russian history. The German historian defined the social development level of the ancient Slavs at the level of primitive savagery, comparing them with American Indians before the coming of the white man. "Like the Iroquois or Algonquins", Schlözer wrote, "the peoples of the Baltic shores had neither the goods, nor the money, nor the literacy which would have enabled them to trade" (Schlözer 1809: 388-390). All across Russian North, up to the middle of the ninth century, there was not a single settlement that could justly be called a town. "Savage, coarse, and dispersed, the Slavs began to form themselves into communities under the influence of the Germans, who had been appointed by destiny to sow the first seeds of civilization in the North-Western and North-Eastern Worlds" (Schlözer 1816: 178-180).

No matter how great Schlözer's devotion to historical truth was, it is only natural that Russians would consider such language condescending and intemperate, a sign of German haughtiness. In addition, Schlözer thought of Russian historians as lesser examples of the species. His condemnation of their provincialism and backwardness appeared to them to have grown out of a general theory of Russian backwardness. "What kind of people were those", he exclaimed, "who prided themselves on their knowledge of Russian history?" "People without any formal training, people who read only their chronicles, not knowing that there was history outside Russia, people who knew no language but their own". "I was at least a scholarly critic [...] I was in this respect the only one in Russia" (Schlözer 1768a: 70).

Apart from a higher professional skill level, Schlözer differed from Russian historians in his understanding of the essence of the historian's work. According to Schlözer, history was not history if its inspiration was anything but the impartial search for truth. "Love for the fatherland, wrongly understood, makes impossible the critical and dispassionate treatment of history... and becomes ridiculous." Lomonosov thought otherwise. "If literature can move the hearts of men, should not true history have power to inspire us for praiseworthy deeds, especially the history that relates the feats of our ancestors?" (quoted by Rogger 1960: 221-222).

In this respect, Karamzin's views were undoubtedly close to those of Lomonosov. As a patriot and a staunch supporter of autocratic monarchy, Karamzin emphasized in the Russian history the progress achieved in creating a powerful state. Only the strong

state led by the absolute monarch, in his opinion, could ensure historical progress and prosperity of the Russian people. Karamzin's starting point was the statement that Russia possessed a highly developed material and spiritual culture at the very beginning of its existence as a state. Neither internal dissension nor foreign invasion were able to destroy the creative ability of the national character that had shaped at the very early stage, and together with the wise policy of Russian rulers and the institution of autocracy could create a new empire that integrated the best features of the Slavic, Germanic, Mongolian, and Byzantine life (Karamzin 1991b: 23).

The aforesaid explains the general hostility of Karamzin to Schlözer and his scholarly work. At the very beginning of his studies in Russian history, Karamzin sought to overcome the dependence on Schlözer's methods and conclusions. Having finished the draft version of the first two volumes of his *History*, in a letter dated 6 March 1806, Karamzin wrote to his patron, Vice Minister of Education Michail N. Murav'ev (1757-1807), "Now I can catch my breath and I'm not afraid of Schlözer's ferule" (Karamzin 1998: 291). This meant that from then on Karamzin no longer considered himself, as he had used to, Schlözer's pupil, afraid of punishment from a strict teacher.

With time, Karamzin's criticism of Schlözer became stronger. The famous historian Michail T. Kačenovskij in a letter to the poet Vasilij A. Žukovskij on 15 December 1810 quoted Karamzin's public statements about the Göttingen professor, which he had recently heard: "Schlözer is a charlatan, he is a foreigner; Russian history is for him absolutely alien; he does not know anything about it and talks idly, he shows off in front of the ignorant" (Iezuitova 1981: 105).

In a letter to Aleksandr I. Turgenev on 3 April 1810, Karamzin, referring to the German edition of Schlözer's *Nestor*, wondered for whom that work was written. He answered himself: "For seven or eight inquisitive people. It is not much use. The explanation and the translation of the text are very bad and often ridiculous. The old man did not know well both the language of the chronicles and their content after Nestor" (Saitov 1899: 231).

This harsh tone of the assessment given to Schlözer may have surprised and disappointed Turgenev. After all, he knew that a few years ago Karamzin and Murav'ev were going to visit Schlözer in Göttingen in order to get his advice on Russian history (the letter from Turgenev to his parents dated 28 December 1803/9 January 1804) (Istrin 1911: 135). Turgenev, who was a student at the University of Göttingen in 1802-1804, assumed the role of an intermediary between Schlözer and Karamzin's (see more Lehmann-Carli 1997: 539-554).

Even an enthusiastic admirer of the historiographer Michail P. Pogodin was indignant at the unfair evaluation of Schlözer's scholarly merit. : "Those are the few words", wrote Pogodin about the above quotation, "that I would not like to hear from Karamzin! They show that working to the letter of Schlözer's instructions and being partially indebted to Schlözer for his method [...] he did not quite understand that and did not realize that he was among those seven or eight readers of Schlözer's work, and therefore Schlözer's writings were not only useful, but also necessary for historical studies, that without Schlözer our history would not have been able to appear in its present form" (Pogodin 1866: 54).

The negative attitude of Karamzin to Schlözer is confirmed by Archbishop (later the Metropolitan) Evgenij (Bolchovitinov), who also disapproved of the Russian historiographer on that ground. In a letter to Vasilij G. Anastasevič, dated 13 January 1819, Evgenij wrote, "...let the magpies chatter at him [Schlözer], like at a bear in the forest, but at its lair it is important. Karamzin also sometimes pinches him like a flea; he lives on Schlözer's comments in his *History* but does not say whose blood he has been drinking" (Bolchovitinov 1889: 165).

Subsequent researchers repeatedly confirmed that Karamzin built his method of source critical analysis based on the model developed by Schlözer. This can be undoubtedly concluded from the analysis of the *Notes* compiled by Karamzin for his *History* (see more Black 1975b: 127-147; Bächtold 1946).

"It seems, that the first thing to do for Karamzin", argued Pogodin, "was to write a letter to his teacher, to the master, i.e. to Schlözer, who discovered the world of Russian annals to Europe, showed their significance, and taught how to use them [...] But no, Karamzin did not write a letter to Schlözer. He must have been afraid to tell him about the intention to write the *History*, because he realized the level of Schlözer's requirements..." Karamzin "must have been scared at first. However, his ardent desire to write the *History* and his first hope, based on superficial knowledge, to overcome difficulties soon naturally put a different perspective on the matter. What do we need this German scholarship with its pedantic requirements for? Is it worth the trouble to sweat over letters and to write dissertations about a certain word? Russians need a book of a different kind. They need the *History* that is understandable to all. With Schlözer, it should be expected in about a hundred years..." (Pogodin 1866: 20-21).

Pogodin undoubtedly had in mind the situation described in the book about Schlözer by his son Christian, who in 1801 became a professor at Moscow University and lived in Russia for many years (see more Kaplunovskij 2014). Soon after Karamzin was appointed imperial historiographer, Christian Schlözer wrote to his father from Moscow to Göttingen (late 1803), "I saw him [Karamzin] recently. He assured me many times of his respect for you and by the way said that before starting his work he would write to you and ask for instructions" (Schlözer 1828: 418-419). The Russian historian did not fulfill that intention. The hypothesis that Karamzin might have corresponded with Schlözer, but the letters burnt in the Moscow fire of 1812, has not been proved (Lehmann-Carli *et al.* 2008: 69, note 217). We know only one letter from Karamzin to Schlözer where he thanked the latter for volumes III and IV of *Nestor*, delivered by Turgenev in 1805 (Istrin 1911: 229).

It can be assumed that Karamzin's refusal to cooperate with Schlözer was caused by the rumors that the latter expressed doubts about the creative abilities of Karamzin as a historian. In January 1805 Turgenev wrote to Andrej S. Kajsarov that Karamzin wanted to send Schlözer the first pages of his *History*. Then Turgenev asked Kajsarov if it was true that Schlözer had written to Petersburg that Karamzin could not write the history of Russia (Istrin 1911: 327). Schlözer considered it necessary to clear himself of all the charges. In a letter to Turgenev on 26 March/7 April 1805 he emphatically declared: "If someone

tells you that I wrote anything against Karamzin, Thun you can on my behalf show these lines and call that person a liar and a scoundrel!" Nevertheless Schlözer further admitted that he had written a letter to the President of the Imperial Academy of Sciences Nikolaj N. Novosil'cev, where he expressed doubts about the prospects of the academic history of Russia being written in the near future, but in that letter he did not mention Karamzin's name (Istrin 1911: 307).

In any event, the relationship between two historians was poisoned. Karamzin refused to go to Schlözer for advice and preferred to play a lone hand. Perhaps this explains the harsh tone of Karamzin's statements about Schlözer cited above and his desire to belittle Schlözer's contribution to the study of the Russian history in general and the Russian chronicles in particular.

To Schlözer's German scholarship and pedantry in his slow and laborious search for the initial versions of *Nestor* by means of comparing and critically examining a large number of chronicle copies, mostly late ones, Karamzin could oppose only one reliable remedy: the use of the oldest surviving Russian chronicles, especially those that had not been previously known and involved in the historical study.

In this respect, Karamzin made a remarkable progress. On 12 September 1804, in a letter to Murav'ev, Karamzin wrote: "I have found two really good parchment chronicles: one of the 14th century, at Count Puškin's (the *Laurentian Chronicle* of 1377, preserved until our time) (RNB OR, f. IV. 2), which I have already copied, and the other in the *Troitsky Library*, just as ancient (the *Troitsky / Troickaja Chronicle* burnt in the Moscow fire of 1812). Neither Tatiščev nor Ščerbatov had such precious copies of Nestor. Every day I find new gross mistakes of Tatiščev and Boltin. I remark on them in the notes, in no way offending the memory of the dead" (Karamzin 1998: 285).

Given by the Emperor Alexander I the right of unimpeded access to all the archives of Russia, Karamzin, of course, had an indisputable advantage over Schlözer, who lived in Germany and, apart from a few printed publications, possessed only his old extracts from and copies of chronicles made during his stay in Petersburg in the 1760s.

As noted by Pavel N. Miljukov, Schlözer surpassed Karamzin "with his materials and critical techniques". The range of issues raised by Karamzin was "essentially conditioned by the matters considered by Schlözer. Even where Karamzin does not agree with him, he always operates with the help of Schlözer's data". Karamzin frees himself from Schlözer only where he "has to choose between various versions of chronicles: having such good texts of the chronicles as represented by the *Laurentian* and *Troitsky Manuscripts*, Karamzin could resolve such issues without any academic reasoning – simply by virtue of the best manuscript. In the terminology of Schlözer, it meant that Karamzin possessed a 'pure' *Nestor* and, therefore, did not need to 'restore' it" (Miljukov 1898: 158-159).

To what has been said by Miljukov, we can only add that the *Hypatian Chronicle*, by its historical significance, is not inferior to the *Laurentian* and *Troitsky Chronicles*, and perhaps even surpasses them. In the first place, the *Hypatian* contains another ancient version of the *Tale of Bygone Years*, that is, the 'pure' *Nestor*, and offers many advantages, including

the extension of the *Tale* to 1117, and in many cases provides a very useful corrective to the *Laurentian* (Ostrowski 2003: xxiv; see more Šachmatov 2003: 528ff.). In addition, only the *Hypatian* retained two other most important Rus' chronicles of the 12th-13th centuries – the *Kievan* and *Galician-Volhynian*². Getting hold of such valuable sources and appreciating them as “treasures”, Karamzin felt his complete superiority over Schlözer and no longer wanted to share the priority in studying the annals.

2. *Discovery of the Chlebnikov Copy*

The information about how and when Karamzin found the manuscripts of the *Hypatian Chronicle* is extremely contradictory. For example, Jurij M. Lotman believed that the historian got hold of two important copies of the annals in the summer of 1808 (Lotman 1998: 319, 379). It is often stated that Karamzin found the oldest copy of the chronicle in 1814 when he visited the Ipat'ev Monastery (Brjusova 1982: 64; Agapov *et al.* 2003: 97). Some authors specify that until 1814 the chronicle had been kept in the sacristy of the main monastery church – the Holy Trinity Cathedral (Gluchov 2008: 70). In the newest biography of Karamzin we find contradictory information. In one place it is said that the historian found the chronicle in 1808, in the other – the middle of 1809 is pointed out (Murav'ev 2014: 313, 476).

However, according to Karamzin himself, his acquaintance with the chronicle began not with the *Hypatian*, but with the *Chlebnikov Copy*. “In 1809”, the historian wrote, “while examining the ancient manuscripts of the late Peter Kirillovič Chlebnikov, I found two treasures in one book: the *Kievan Chronicle*, known only to Tatišev, and the *Volhynian Chronicle*, previously known to nobody. A few months later I found another copy of them. Once it had resided with the Ipat'ev Monastery and later got lost among the Defects in the library of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences” (Karamzin 1989: 25).

Contemporary researchers are critical of Karamzin's information about the circumstances of his acquaintance with the *Hypatian Chronicle*. Among others, the commentators of the latest academic edition of *The History of the Russian State* refute this information. The *Hypatian (Academic) Copy* “was discovered by A.I. Turgenev in the Library of the Academy of Sciences around 1807, who told the historiographer about it” (Afanas'eva *et al.* 1989: 333). Or: Karamzin had the *Academic Copy* of the *Hypatian Chronicle* that had been “discovered by A.I. Turgenev in the Library of the Academy of Sciences around 1807” (Afanas'eva *et al.* 1991: 660). The same comment is repeated with an addition: “A copy [from the *Academic Chronicle*] belonging to A.F. Malinovskij is known [...] which Karamzin could use while working on the *History* in Moscow” (Afanas'eva *et al.* 1992: 351). However, no grounds are given for this assumption.

Meanwhile, the circumstances of Karamzin's discovery of the *Hypatian Chronicle* are well known from the surviving correspondence, including the letters to A.I. Turgenev: “What a discovery I made!” wrote Karamzin, “The *Volhynian Chronicle*, complete, up to

² On the historical significance of these chronicles, see Pritsak 1990: xxiii-xxxii.

1297, abundant in details, absolutely unknown. What will Engel say? I have not been sleeping several nights for joy. The copy is beautiful, of the fourteenth century. An interesting item for connoisseurs. In a word, it is a treasure; God sent it from heaven” (Pogodin 1855: 80–81).

In the first publication (1855), that letter was dated 23 August 1807. This date is sometimes accepted in the academic literature (Prijma 1980: 60). However, a few years later, M.P. Pogodin dated the letter 1809, finding the previous dating erroneous (Pogodin 1866: 49). Among other events, the letter mentioned the wedding of Princess Ekaterina A. Vjazemskaja and Prince Aleksej G. Ščerbatov (“...we gave our former princess to Prince Ščerbatov”), held in April 1809 (Obolenskij 1876: 98). Hence, the document could not be written before that time.

An error in the dating was probably made when copying Karamzin’s letters in the course of their preparation for publication on Turgenev’s initiative in 1836. At that time the publication was rejected by the censorship committee. Two decades later, Pogodin used the copy, which has survived to our time in the Manuscript Division collection of the Institute of Russian Literature (the Puškin House) of the Russian Academy of Sciences. The last number in the letter date indicating the year is illegible, and this letter was placed among letters dated 1806 and 1808 (IRL RO, no. 15976, l. 5).

In the original, which was kept in the Turgenevs’ family archive and published in 1899, the document in question is dated 23 August 1809 (Saitov 1899: 226). The original of the letter has also been preserved until our time in the Turgenevs’ fund at the Manuscript Division of the Puškin House. Written by Karamzin’s hand, the date thereon is quite legible – 23 August 1809 (IRL RO, f. 309, no. 125, ll. 17–18).

This date is confirmed by another document, i.e. Karamzin’s letter to Novosil’cev, dated 23 August 1809. In that letter the historian also mentioned his recent discovery of the *Volhynian Chronicle*. “Having described the rule of Donskoi, I had to return to the 12th and 13th centuries, in order to add a lot from the comprehensive *Volhynian Chronicle* that I have found recently. It has been unknown until now and is very precious. This find is the most important among those at which I have rejoiced in six years” (Pogodin 1866: 50).

Turgenev was the first to ask Karamzin about the origin of the manuscript. On 17 September 1809, he received an answer. “I got the *Volhynian Chronicle* not from Russov, but from the library of a certain Kolomna merchant. This find spared me shame, but cost six months work. The gods do not give, but sell living pleasures, as the ancients used to say” (Saitov 1899: 228).

Karamzin received the copy of the *Hypatian Chronicle* that came from the library of a Kolomna merchant and industrialist Pëtr K. Chlebnikov (1734–1777) from his good friend Dmitriij Poltorackij (1761–1818), married to Chlebnikov’s daughter Anna. This was evidenced by Michail P. Pogodin, who wrote down his conversation with Karamzin when they first met in December 1825 (Barsukov 1888: 231).

Until the summer of 1809 the chronicle was kept in Moscow, in Chlebnikov’s old estate on Všivaja Gorka on the other side of the Jauza. There it was found by Karamzin, who was invited to sort out the books in the deceased merchant’s library. Obviously having

heard about it from the historiographer, Konstantin F. Kalajdovič described that event in 1813: "...the *Volhynian Chronicle* was accidentally found among the heaps of thick but unimportant books, which were absolutely disappointing" (Kalajdovič 1813: 210).

The date of the discovery of the manuscript can be determined more accurately. On June 25 that year, the Poltorackij's purchased a house on the Bolšaja Kalužskaja street from duchess A.A. Orlova-Česmenskaja (Ivanov 2006). It is quite possible that, preparing to move to a new house, the owners invited an expert to sort out the old library they had inherited.

Karamzin's letter to his brother dated 21 June 1809 confirms this assumption. In it the historian told about the unexpected need to rewrite many of the earlier chapters of his *History*: "I am working as usual, and I have finished describing the time of Donskoj, but now I have to correct a lot in what was written earlier" (Pogodin 1866: 48).

The above facts lead to the conclusion that Karamzin most likely discovered the *Hypatian Chronicle* in June 1809. However it was only two months later that the historian fully appreciated the significance of the discovery he had made.

As a result of the manuscript examination, the historian discovered numerous unique reports related to the history of Rus' of the 12th-13th centuries that no historian had previously known. This unexpected discovery, as if sent from heaven, inspired Karamzin and made him believe in himself as a pioneer. From then on he knew and could tell to the whole world as many new historical facts about Ancient Rus' as none of his most knowledgeable predecessors, including Schlözer, could.

The amount and importance of the new historical knowledge learnt from the *Hypatian Chronicle* forced Karamzin to stop working on the *History* and to make numerous additions and amendments to the already written volumes. Particularly significant were the borrowings from the *Volhynian Chronicle*, which had previously been unknown to scholars. The historian decided to place lengthy extracts from it in the notes, as he notified Turgenev on 3 April 1810. "The amendments are already finished; now I am writing out the most important passages from the *Volhynian Chronicle* for the notes, and then I will proceed with God's help" (Saitov 1899: 231).

3. Search for Hypatian Copy

Only after Karamzin had encountered the *Chlebnikov Copy* of the *Hypatian Chronicle* and appreciated its significance did he show interest in the *Hypatian Copy* that resided with the Academy of Sciences.

In the letter to Novosil'cev cited above, Karamzin wrote, "The Academic Library possesses the manuscript in folio, which has not been printed before. It is written in two columns and called *Chronograph* or *Vremennik Russkii*; the first white sheet states *Chronograph* or *Vremennik Kievskij*; and further *kniga Ipat'eva monastyrja služki Tichona* (the book of the Ipat'ev Monastery acolyte Tichon) and *kniga Ipat'eva monastyrja starca Tarasija* (the book of the Ipat'ev Monastery monk Tarasij). I need to see that record. Be so kind, lend it to me for a month..." (Pogodin 1866: 50).

Worried about the long absence of response from Novosil'cev, Karamzin turned to Turgenev for help on 17 September 1809. "For God's sake, my dear friend, persuade Nikolaj Nikolaevič Novosil'cov to send me for a while the *Academic Codex*, about which I asked him. I need it. It has the following features: 1) written in folio in two columns; 2) on the first white sheet it is stated that it belonged to a monk and an acolyte of the Ipatov or Ipat'ev Monastery; 3) called *Chronograph* or *Vremennik* and continues up to about 6780. You will do a great service to a zealous historiographer" (Saitov 1899: 228).

Apparently, the *Hypatian Codex* was delivered to Karamzin in early October. It took long to fulfill the historiographer's request because the information about the manuscript in the catalogue of the Library of the Academy of Sciences was missing, and therefore it was difficult to find it. This can be inferred from the explanations given in the letter to Turgenev on October 15. Thanking him for the delivery of the *Hypatian Chronicle*, Karamzin apologized for failing to do so earlier because of his "twelve-day illness". Besides, the historian complained about the neglect of the academic librarian. "I hope that Mr. Librarian will now include the *Hypatian Chronicle* in the catalogue" (Saitov 1899: 228-229).

How did Karamzin learn about the existence of the *Hypatian Codex*, which was not included in the catalogue of the Library of the Academy of Sciences of the time?

Of course, the historian was aware of the brief information about this codex, quoted by Schlözer in the second part of his *Nestor*, the German edition of which Karamzin had used (see Afanas'eva *et al.* 1989: 377-378). Schlözer named the *Hypatian* or *Academic Codex* among the earliest and the most important copies of the oldest Russian Chronicle (see Schlözer 1802: 11). However, Schlözer did not mention the *Kievan* and the *Volhynian Chronicles* included in the *Hypatian Codex*. Besides, Schlözer, who had not seen the manuscript with his own eyes and judged it solely based on what he had heard from the others, did not provide any of the paleographic information about the codex that we find in Karamzin's letters cited above.

Karamzin, who was mostly engaged in literary work, rarely went to archives and libraries himself. He did not go to St. Petersburg to visit the Academic Library in the spring and the summer of 1809. After the imperial decree on appointing Karamzin to the post of historiographer (31 October 1803) and until Napoleon's invasion, the historian spent winters in Moscow, while in summer he lived in Ostafyev, the estate of the Princes Vjazemskij, whose relative, Ekaterina A. Kolyvanova (the illegitimate daughter of Prince Andrej I. Vjazemskij) Karamzin married in January 1804. However, throughout his work on the *History of The Russian State*, he regularly employed his volunteer assistants from among the leading Russian archaeographers and archivists.

Karamzin's letters and other documents known today provide no information on the issue in question. Who exactly told the historiographer about the existing in the Academic Library in St. Petersburg another ancient copy of the *Volhynian Chronicle* and provided its exact description, can be inferred only from indirect data. One can only say with certainty that Karamzin could not get this information from Turgenev or from the staff of the Academic Library, since the manuscript, according to the correspondence with Turgenev,

was not even included in the library catalog. Moreover, there was no information about it in the printed catalogue of the library published by P.I. Sokolov in 1818. They were added later, by hand, on the margins of one of the surviving copies (Petrov 1956: 234).

No mention of the *Hypatian Copy* in Karamzin's correspondence suggests that he could obtain information about this manuscript from available printed publications or when meeting in person one of his Moscow assistants.

Let us consider both possibilities.

For many years the historiographer was assisted by the staff of the Moscow archive of the College of Foreign Affairs, headed by the archive manager, outstanding historian, archaeographer and archivist Nikolaj N. Bantyš-Kamenskij (1737-1814). Karamzin constantly used his works and the ancient manuscripts he had found (see Bantyš-Kamenskij 1818). The Moscow house of Bantyš-Kamenskij, together with his personal archive, burned down in 1812. However, it is clear from the surviving Karamzin's letter to him, dated 27 September 1813, (where Karamzin expressed his critical opinion about the *Cyprian Book of Degrees*) that the scholars exchanged information about the Old Russian chronicles (ОИРБ91: 23-24).

The closest assistant and friend of Karamzin was Aleksej F. Malinovskij (1762-1840), the most prominent expert of the time in Russian antiquities. Since 1803 he was Assistant Administrator of the Moscow Archive of the College of Foreign Affairs. He headed the Archive from 1814 until his death (see Dolgova 1992: 176-229; Beljakova 2010: 125-144). Malinovskij regularly supplied Karamzin with historical information and archival materials, which is evident from the correspondence between them. Only Karamzin's letters to Malinovskij have survived that were written between 1813-1826, when the historian lived outside Moscow – in Nižnij Novgorod, St. Petersburg and Carskoe Selo. However, it is clear from the correspondence that cooperation and friendship between the scholars began much earlier. Karamzin wrote to Malinovskij very sincerely on October 10, 1818: "For two decades I have seen from you only the evidence of true friendship" (Longinov 1860: 35).

As we know, Bantyš-Kamenskij and Malinovskij together with Count Aleksej I. Musin-Puškin studied the manuscript of *The Lay of Igor's Campaign* and prepared the first edition of the manuscript (1800) (see Dmitriev 1976: 97-103). Malinovskij wrote the foreword and the comments, and translated *The Lay* into the contemporary Russian language. The historian continued to be actively interested in this record later on and was looking for chronicle records concerning Prince Igor and his campaign against the Polovtsians (see Speranskij 1920: 1-24).

The interest in *The Lay* and the need to explain the information contained in it could put the Moscow archivists on the trail of the *Academic Copy* of the *Hypatian Chronicle*, which had retained the most complete story about Igor's Campaign in year 1185. It is possible that Karamzin could participate in that pursuit himself. He was among those few who read the manuscript of *The Lay* before its publication and made several reports about it in the press (see Dmitriev 1962: 38-49).

A hand written copy of the chronicle story about Prince Igor's campaign on the sheets that, according to the water-marks, are dated 1814 was found in Malinovskij's papers. This

proves that Malinovskij was undoubtedly acquainted with the *Hypatian (Volhynian) Chronicle* at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The copy is performed with an expressed stylization of the handwriting of the 17th century (sheets 9-12a). Michail N. Speranskij and Lev A. Dmitriev concluded that the copy was made from the now unknown copy of the *Hypatian Chronicle* (Dmitriev 1960: 193 f.).

In addition, at Malinovskij's initiative, at about the same time, the complete copy of the *Hypatian Codex* was prepared (RGADA, F. 181, n° 10). It is the manuscript in folio, on 11 + 346 sheets, written in one handwriting, on blue paper, dated 1814. On sheet 346 there is the copyist's note: "From the chronicle original was copied by collegiate registrar Petr Bol'sakov. The copy was verified against the original by the collegiate counsellor and chevalier Ivan Ždanovskij". At the beginning of the manuscript, on sheet 1, one more entry can be read: "This chronicle, named Volhynian, was donated to the Archive Library in 1816. A. Malinovskij" (see Kloss 1998: F-G).

4. *A Manuscript "Recovered from Dust"*

Be that as it may, Karamzin adhered to the version that he found both copies of the *Hypatian Chronicle* – the *Chlebnikov* and the *Academic* – independently and without participation of anyone else.

The historian and his friends made sure that as many people interested in Russian antiquities as possible would become aware of the discovery of the new chronicle.

First of all, the news about the find reached Germany. In the letter dated 29 September 1809, A.I. Turgenev asked his brother Nikolaj, who was a student at the University of Göttingen, to tell about Karamzin's new discovery to Schlözer, the professor of that university. "Tell Schlözer that Karamzin has found a new complete *Volhynian Chronicle*, up to year 1297 (?), abundant in details, which has been absolutely unknown. The copy is beautiful, of the 14th century; the style is interesting for experts, in a word, it is a treasure, as Karamzin has written to me. He has not been sleeping for several nights for joy" (Tarasov 1911: 398). Unfortunately, the news was late: Schlözer had died on 9 September 1809.

Death did not let Schlözer comment on Karamzin's discovery. One can only assume that he would not have been delighted about it, for he would have remembered (or realized after further clarification) that he had been aware of that chronicle almost half a century before Karamzin discovered it. As we will show further, in 1767 Schlözer received a message from his student Semen Bašilov about the delivery to the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences of a newly discovered chronicle from the Ipat'ev Monastery. The chronicle "begins in exactly the same way as all Nestor's codices and ends in year 6800 (i.e. 1292 A.D.)" (the date specified in Turgenev's letter – 1297 – is an error).

Schlözer's Russian students, who copied the *Hypatian Chronicle* in the late 1760s, could not comment on Karamzin's find either. Bašilov died in 1770, while Aleksej Polenov, who had helped him, had long since been dismissed from the Academy of Sciences and completely stopped his studies in history.

Meanwhile, the largest experts in Russian antiquities of the time – Aleksej N. Olenin and Aleksandr I. Ermolaev – were immediately notified about Karamzin’s discovery of a previously unknown chronicle. Both of them were obviously told about the contents of the newly discovered manuscript. It is known that on 18 August 1810, while in Černihiv on his archaeographic tour of Russia, Ermolaev informed Olenin: “In the Lubensk Mhar monastery we found a record [...] I think it is the same chronicle that Karamzin calls the Volhynian. We have this interesting chronicle now and intend to have it copied in Kiev” (quoted by Prijma 1980: 76). In fact, Ermolaev found and copied one of the copies of the so-called *Hustynian Chronicle*.

Among the first to learn about the *Volhynian Chronicle* was Duke Tadeusz Čackij (Czacki) (1765-1813), the general visitor (inspector of educational institutions) in the Kievan, the Podol’sk and the Volhynian provinces, a historian and a collector of ancient manuscripts. In 1816, Karamzin’s letter to him, translated into Polish and dated 4 August 1810, was published. In the letter the historian briefly described the manuscripts he had found (Melamed 1976: 54).

Karamzin often spoke about his discovery of the *Hypatian Chronicle* with young historians who were eager to help in his work in the archives and libraries. The first press report about this discovery was probably made by K.F. Kalajdovič (1813). He mentioned only the copy found by Karamzin among the manuscripts of merchant Chlebnikov. Kalajdovič also published the first brief description of the chronicle in Russian (Kalajdovič 1813: 210).

Several months later, Kalajdovič in a letter to academician Filip I. Krug (dated 15 January 1814) informed his addressee about Karamzin’s discovery of the *Hypatian Copy* that had fallen into oblivion in the Academic library. The message contains a veiled rebuke of a young historian to the entire academy: “Do you really know that a treasure resides with the academy – the *Volhynian Chronicle*, buried among defects and not included in the catalog – that N.M. Karamzin recovered from dust? I would like to know who will have the honor to publish these manuscripts” (quoted by Bessonov 1862: 126).

In the last year of his life, in conversation with M.P. Pogodin, Karamzin recalled both copies of the *Hypatian Chronicle* as his most important academic findings: “...one is mine, presented to me by the late Poltorackij, the other, also almost mine, I found in the academic defects” (Barsukov 1888: 331).

Apparently, Karamzin concluded independently that the *Hypatian (Academic) Codex* should include the *Kievan* and the *Volhynian Chronicles* and thus be similar to the *Chlebnikov Copy*. It seems possible to restore in general outline the path of the historian’s research.

5. *Schlözer or Karamzin*

Karamzin, undoubtedly, made the most important discovery on the first acquaintance with the text of the *Chlebnikov Copy*. In its title he must have found the name of the compiler of the chronicle that is absent in all other copies – *The Tale of the Bygone Years by Nestor, the monk of the Feodosiev Pečerskij Monastery* (Pritsak 1990: 3).

Being familiar with the works of V.N. Tatiščev and Schlözer, Karamzin knew that Nestor's name could not be a mistake or a later addition, since it was present in two other ancient copies containing *The Tale of the Bygone Years* that were available to Tatiščev, but already unavailable to Schlözer.

This, as well as other original versions of the *Hypatian Codex* mentioned by Schlözer, likened it to the lost *Raskol'ničij* and *Golicyn Copies*, from which Tatiščev learned much about the history of Southern Rus' in the 12th-early 13th centuries. That information was absent in the chronicles initially available to Karamzin, however, much of it was found in the *Chlebnikov Copy*, which he discovered in the summer of 1809. The new discoveries made by the historiographer must have prompted him to try to find the *Hypatian Copy*.

When Karamzin was starting the search, he only knew that the manuscript was once kept in the Library of the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg. This was evident from Schlözer's description of the known to him copies of *Nestor's Chronicle* where it was stated under number 11: "The *Hypatian*, in folio, Old style (Fraktur), continues until 1292; the analogue (Seitenstück) of the above *Radz[iwil]* [described under number 1], with which it coincides considerably. This codex [Hypatian] arrived at the Academy after me (i.e., after Schlözer had left Russia). That same Bašilov sent me its skillfully performed copy (Abschrift) from the beginning to the death of Rurik, along with the description of this important old codex, which I published in *Universal. hist. Bibl. Gatterer. T. VI. S. 304*" (Schlözer 1802: 11).

There is no doubt that Karamzin availed himself of Schlözer's reference to his description of the *Hypatian Copy* in the *Allgemeine Historische Bibliothek* published by J.Ch. Gatterer (Johann Christoph Gatterer, 1727-1799) in Göttingen. Nevertheless, in the notes to *The History of the Russian State* Karamzin made no reference to this publication, while he used and repeatedly referred to other Gatterer's publications (see Afanaš'eva *et al.* 1989: 358-359).

Volume 6 of the *Bibliothek* published in 1768, contained "An Abstract from a Report from St. Petersburg dated 16/27 December 1767". The editorial introduction explained that it was about the delivery to St. Petersburg of "a very valuable codex of the Annals, the second oldest after the Radziwil codex, of which the Academy of Sciences had previously had certain information; it is likely to be from the 13th century. Mr. Bašilov wrote the following preliminary report to Mr. Prof. Schlözer about the codex and other news concerning Russian literature" (Schlözer 1768b: 303).

From the description of the codex that followed, Karamzin was to find not only an indication that the record continued up to 6800 (1292), but also that it concerned the Volhynian princes. The historiographer found there all the paleographic features of the manuscript that he listed later in the letters to Novosił'cev and Turgenev³. Karamzin undoubtedly used the description published in Göttingen (referred to by Schlözer) in his search for the *Volhynian Chronicle*.

³ The text of Bašilov's message, together with Gatterer's editorial explanations and Schlözer's comments to him in our translation from Latin and German, see MAIOROV 2017.

After Schlözer and his students, at least one more prominent Slavic scholar became acquainted with the ancient copy of the *Hypatian Chronicle*. It was an outstanding Czech scholar Josef Dobrovský. From August 15 to October 15 in 1792, he worked in the Library of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences and saw the *Hypatian Chronicle* among other annals. This is directly evidenced in his notes to *The History of the Russian State* by Karamzin, “Ipat. academičn. codex Bombicina, ut vidi etc.” (The Hypatian academic codex. Paper, as I saw it, and so on) (see Moiseeva *et al.* 1990: 51). This fact became for Edward Keenan one of the most important reasons to suspect Dobrovský as a possible author of the *Igor’ Tale* (see Keenan 2003).

Being the first to get acquainted with the *Chlebnikov Copy* of the *Hypatian Chronicle*, Karamzin did not want to give up his priority and recognize the right of precedence for Schlözer, who had found and published a description of its more ancient *Hypatian Copy* forty years earlier. As far as we know, Karamzin did not explain to any of his correspondents or interlocutors, how, without leaving Moscow, he was able to learn about the forgotten ancient manuscript in the Library of the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg, which was not even listed in the library catalogs.

Under the influence of Karamzin, the new name of the *Hypatian Chronicle* – the *Volhynian Chronicle* – for some time replaced the former one. The imperial chancellor Count Nikolaj P. Rumjancev planned to print the record under this new name. In the letter to the Minister of the Internal Affairs, Osip P. Kozodavlev, dated 18 January 1818, Rumjancev expressed his wish that the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences should begin printing the second part of the Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles, published at his expense, “assigning therefor the so-called Volhynian Chronicle” (SPbF ARAN, f. 2, op. 1, n° 2, ll. 33-33v).

The name “Volhynian Chronicle” was used because the information about it was received directly from Karamzin. This name should be evidence of the recognition of his priority as the discoverer. It was Rumjancev’s informed choice. It is clear from the letter to Archbishop Evgenij (Bolchovitinov), dated 7 August 1820, that the Chancellor preferred the new name of the chronicle given by Karamzin, knowing about Schlözer’s priority in studying the manuscript. “Nikolaj Michajlovič [Karamzin] named [the chronicle] the Volhynian, which is nothing else but the chronicle that had already been known to Schlözer under the name of the Ipat’ev” (Bolchovitinov 1868: 34).

Rumjancev’s efforts failed (see Majorov *et al.* 2018: 5-34). Fifteen years later, the Imperial Archaeographic Commission began publishing the Complete Collection of the Russian Chronicles. The question of choosing the name for the *Hypatian Chronicle* arose again. As far as we can judge, the initial intention was to use the name “Volhynian Chronicle.” (Zamyslovskij 1885: 106, 263-264). The name “Hypatian Chronicle”, given by Schlözer and his students, became the name of the codex only at the last stage of its preparation for publication. The chronicle was published under this name in 1843, 1871 and 1908. Since then it has been a rightful part of the academic circulation.

Abbreviations

IRL RO	Rukopisnyj Otdel Instituta Russkoj Literatury (Puškinskij Dom) Rossijskoj Akademii nauk.
OIPB91	<i>Otčet Imperatorskoj Publičnoj Biblioteki za 1888 god</i> , Sankt-Peterburg 1891.
RNB OR	Otdel Rukopisej Rossijskoj Nacional'noj Biblioteki.
SPBF ARAN	Sankt-Peterburgskij Filial Archiva Rossijskoj Akademii nauk.

Literature

- Afanaševa et al. 1989: M.I. Afanaševa, V.Ju. Afiani, V.P. Kozlov, G.A. Kosmolinskaja, *Kommentirovannyj spisok istočnikov i literatury, ispol'zovannyh N. M. Karamzinym v "Primečanijach"*, in: N.M. Karamzin, *Istorija Gosudarstva Rossijskogo*, I, Moskva 1989, pp. 330-382.
- Afanaševa et al. 1991: M.I. Afanaševa, V.Ju. Afiani, V.P. Kozlov, G.A. Kosmolinskaja, *Kommentirovannyj spisok istočnikov i literatury, ispol'zovannyh N. M. Karamzinym v "Primečanijach"*, in: N.M. Karamzin, *Istorija Gosudarstva Rossijskogo*, II-III, Moskva 1991, pp. 658-705.
- Afanaševa et al. 1992: M.I. Afanaševa, V.Ju. Afiani, V.P. Kozlov, G.A. Kosmolinskaja, *Kommentirovannyj spisok istočnikov i literatury, ispol'zovannyh N. M. Karamzinym v "Primečanijach"*, in: N.M. Karamzin, *Istorija Gosudarstva Rossijskogo*, IV, Moskva 1992, pp. 344-377.
- Agapov et al. 2003: A.A. Agapov, S.B. Bachmustov, A.K. Boev et al., *Russkie monastyri: Povolž'e*, I, Tula 2003.
- Bächtold 1946: R. Bächtold, *Karamzins Weg zur Geschichte*, Basel 1946.
- Bantyš-Kamenskij 1818: D.N. Bantyš-Kamenskij, *Žizn' Nikolaja Nikolaeviča Bantyš-Kamenskogo*, Moskva 1818.
- Barsukov 1888: N.P. Barsukov, *Žizn' i trudy M. P. Pogodina*, I, Sankt-Peterburg 1888.
- Beljakova 2010: G.S. Beljakova, *Aleksej Fedorovič Malinovskij – archeograf, izdatel', redaktor "Slova o polku Igoreve"*, in: G.S. Beljakova et al. (eds.), *Bojan: Materialy obščestvennogo muzeja "Slova o polku Igoreve"*, I, Moskva 2010, pp. 125-144.
- Bessonov 1862: P.A. Bessonov, *Konstantin Fedorovič Kalajdovič. Biografičeskij očerk*, Moskva 1862.
- Black 1975a: J.L. Black, *Nicholas Karamzin and Russian Society in the Nineteenth Century: A Study in Russian Political and Historical Thought*, Toronto 1975.

- Black 1975b: J.L. Black, *The Primečanija: Karamzin as a 'Scientific' Historian of Russia*, in: J.L. Black (ed.), *Essays on Karamzin: Russian Man-of-Letters, Political Thinker, Historian, 1766-1826*, The Hague-Paris 1975, pp. 127-147.
- Bolchovitinov 1868: *Perepiska mitropolita Kievskogo Evgenija s gosudarstvennym kanclerom grafom Nikolaem Petrovičem Rumjancevym i s nekotorymi drugimi sovremennikami s 1813 g. po 1825 vključitel'no*, I, Voronež 1868.
- Bolchovitinov 1889: *Pis'ma mitropolita Kievskogo Evgenija Bolchovitinova k V.G. Anastaseviču*, "Russkij Archiv", 1889, 6, pp. 161-236.
- Brjusova 1982: V.G. Brjusova, *Ipat'evskij monastyr'*, Moskva 1982.
- Dmitriev 1960: L.A. Dmitriev, *Istorija pervogo izdanija "Slova o polku Igoreve": Materialy i issledovanija*, Moskva-Leningrad 1960.
- Dmitriev 1962: L.A. Dmitriev, N.M. Karamzin i "Slovo o polku Igoreve", "Trudy Otdela Drevnerusskoj Literatury", XVIII, 1962, pp. 38-49.
- Dmitriev 1976: L.A. Dmitriev, *Pervye izdateli "Slova"*, "Vestnik Akademii Nauk SSSR", 1976, 4, pp. 97-103.
- Dolgova 1992: S.R. Dolgova, *Aleksej Fedorovič Malinovskij: Očerki*, in: A.F. Malinovskij, *Obozrenie Moskvy*, Moskva 1992, pp. 176-229.
- Gluchov 2008: A.G. Gluchov, *Drevnie knigi Ipat'evskogo monastyrja*, "Universitetskaja Kniga", III, 2008, pp. 68-71.
- Henkel 2006: T. Henkel, *Die Funktion der Nestorchronik für August Ludwig von Schlözers Selbstverständnis*, "Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft", LIV, 2006, pp. 101-117.
- Iezuitova 1981: R.V. Iezuitova, *Iz neizdannoj perepiski V.A. Žukovskogo*, "Ežegodnik Rukopisnogo Otdela Puškinskogo Doma na 1979 god", 1981, pp. 80-112.
- Istrin 1911: V.M. Istrin (red.), *Pis'ma i dnevnik Aleksandra Ivanoviča Turgeneva gettingenskogo perioda*, Sankt-Peterburg 1911 (= Archiv brat'ev Turgenevych, 2).
- Ivanov 2006: O. Ivanov, *Vажnejšaja nachodka: Čto N.M. Karamzin obnaručil v Chlebnikovskoj biblioteke*, "Istorija: elektronnyj žurnal", XXI, 2006, <<http://his.1september.ru/article.php?ID=200602106>>; last accessed on November 15, 2017).
- Kalajdovič 1813: K.F. Kalajdovič, *Ob učenych trudach mitropolita Kipriana i o tom, spravедливо li pripisyvaetsja emu i mitropolitu Makariju sočinenie knigi Stepennoj*, "Vestnik Evropy", LII, 1813, 23-24, pp. 207-224.
- Kaplunovskij 2014: A. Kaplunovskij (Hrsg.), *Auch in Moskwa habe ich Ursache zufrieden zu sein": Christian von Schlözers Privatkorrespondenz mit der Familie. Akademische Lebenswelten, Wissens- und Kulturtransfer in Russland am Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 2014.

- Karamzin 1989: N.M. Karamzin, *Istorija Gosudarstva Rossijskogo*, I, Moskva 1989.
- Karamzin 1991a: N.M. Karamzin, *Istorija Gosudarstva Rossijskogo*, II-III, Moskva 1991.
- Karamzin 1991b: N.M. Karamzin, *Zapiska o drevnej i novoj Rossii*, Moskva 1991.
- Karamzin 1992: N.M. Karamzin, *Istorija Gosudarstva Rossijskogo*, IV, Moskva 1992.
- Karamzin 1998: N.M. Karamzin, *Polnoe Sobranie Sočinenij*, XVIII, Moskva 1998.
- Keenan 2003: E. Keenan, *Josef Dobrovský and the origins of the Igor' tale*, Cambridge (MA) 2003.
- Kloss 1998: B.M. Kloss, *Predislovie k izdaniju 1998 g.*, in: *Polnoe Sobranie Russkich Letopisej*, II, Moskva 1998, pp. A-H.
- Lauer 2009: R. Lauer, *August Ludwig Schlözer zwischen Petersburg und Göttingen*, "Jahrbuch der Gottinger Akademie der Wissenschaften", 2009, pp. 272-281.
- Lehmann-Carli 1997: G. Lehmann-Carli, *A.L. Schlözer als Rußland-Historiker, sein Göttinger Studiosus A.I. Turgenew und der russische 'Reichshistoriograph' N.M. Karamzin*, in: E. Donnert (Hrsg.), *Europa in der Frühen Neuzeit, Festschrift für G. Mühlpfordt zum 75. Geburtstag*, II, Weimar-Köln-Wien 1997, pp. 539-554.
- Lehmann-Carli et al. 2008: G. Lehmann-Carli, S. Brohm, H. Preuß, *Göttinger und Moskauer Gelehrte und Publizisten im Spannungsfeld von russischer Historie, Reformimpulsen der Aufklärung und Petersburger Kulturpolitik*, Berlin 2008.
- Longinov 1860: M.N. Longinov (ed.), *Pis'ma Karamzina k Alekseju Fedoroviču Malinovskomu i pis'ma Griboedova k Stepanu Nikitiču Begičevu*, Moskva 1860.
- Lotman 1998: Ju.M. Lotman, *Sotvorenje Karamzina*, Moskva 1998.
- Majorov 2017: A.V. Majorov, *Iz istorii otkrytija Ipat'evskoj letopisi*, "Rossijskaja istorija", 2017, 6, pp. 166-183.
- Majorov et al. 2018: A.V. Majorov, A.E. Kotov, *Iz istorii izdanija russkich letopisej: poslednee načinanie grafa N.P. Rumjanceva*, "Russkaja Literatura", 2018, 1, pp. 5-34.
- Melamed 1976: E.I. Melamed, *Zabytoe pis'mo Karamzina*, "Russkaja Literatura", 1976, 3, pp. 54-56.
- Miljukov 1898: P.N. Miljukov, *Glavnye tečenija russkoj istoričeskoj mysli*, I, Moscow 1898.
- Moiseeva et al. 1990: G.N. Moiseeva, M.M. Krbec, *Jozef Dobrovskij i Rossija: pamjatniki russkoj kul'tury XI-XVIII vv. v izučenii češskogo slavista*, Leningrad 1990.
- Muhlack 2012: U. Muhlack, *Der Vermittler der Welt. Ein Zugang zum Verständnis des 'ganzen' Schlözer*, in: H. Duchhardt, M. Espenhorst (Hrsg.), *August Ludwig (von) Schlözer in Europa*, Göttingen 2012 (= Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz. Abteilung für Universalgeschichte, 86), pp. 7-20.

- Müller 1962: L. Müller, *Schlözer und die Nestor-Chronik*, in: E. Winter (Hrsg.), *Lomonosov – Schlözer – Pallas. Deutsch-russische Wissenschaftsbeziehungen im 18. Jahrhundert*, Berlin 1962 (= Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte Osteuropas, 12), pp. 138-149.
- Murav'ev 2014: V.B. Murav'ev, *Karamzin*, Moskva 2014.
- Obolenskij 1876: D.A. Obolenskij (red.), *Chronika nedavnej stariny: Iz archiva knjazja Obolenskogo-Neledinskogo-Meleckogo*, Sankt-Peterburg 1876.
- Ostrowski 2003: D. G. Ostrowski, *Introduction*, in: D.G. Ostrowski (ed.), *The "Pověst' Vremennykh Lět": An Interlinear Collation and Paradosis*, Cambridge (MA) 2003 (= Harvard Library of early Ukrainian literature, Texts, 10), pp xvii-lxxiii.
- Peters 2005: M. Peters, *Altes Reich und Europa: der Historiker, Statistiker und Publizist August Ludwig (v.) Schlözer (1735–1809)*, Münster 2005 (= Forschungen zur Geschichte der Neuzeit. Marburger Beiträge, 6).
- Petrov 1956: V.A. Petrov, *Istorija rukopisnych fondov Biblioteki Akademii Nauk s 1730 g. do konca XVIII v.*, in: V.P. Adrianova-Peretc (red.), *Istoričeskij očerk i opisanie fondov Rukopisnogo otdela Biblioteki Akademii Nauk*, 1, Moskva-Leningrad 1956, pp. 171-264.
- Pogodin 1855: M.P. Pogodin (red.), *Pis'ma N.M. Karamzina k A.I. Turgenevu*, "Morskvitjanin", 1, 1855, 1, pp. 77-106.
- Pogodin 1866: M.P. Pogodin, *Nikolaj Michailovič Karamzin po ego sočinenijam, pis'mam i otzyvam sovremennikov*, II, Moskva 1866.
- Prijma 1980: F.Ja. Prijma, "Slovo o polku Igoreve" v istoriko-literaturnom processe pervoj treti XIX veka, Leningrad 1980.
- Pritsak 1990: O. Pritsak (ed.), *The Old Rus' Kievan and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles: The Ostroz'kyj (Xlebnikov) and Četvertyns'kyj (Pogodin) Codices*, Cambridge (MA) 1990 (= Harvard Library of early Ukrainian literature, Texts, 8).
- Rogger 1960: H. Rogger, *National Consciousness in Eighteenth-Century Russia*, Cambridge (MA) 1960.
- Saitov 1899: V.I. Saitov (red.), *Pis'ma N.M. Karamzina k A.I. Turgenevu (1806-1826)*, "Russkaja Starina", xcvii, 1899, 1, pp. 211-238.
- Schlözer 1768a: A.L. Schlözer, *Probe russischer Annalen*, Bremen-Göttingen 1768.
- Schlözer 1768b: A.L. Schlözer, *Auszug eines Schreibens aus St. Petersburg, vom 16/27 Dcbr. 1767*, "Allgemeine Historische Bibliothek", vi, 1768, pp. 303-306.
- Schlözer 1802: A.L. Schlözer, *Nestor. Russische Annalen in ihrer slavonischen Grundsprache*, II, Göttingen 1802.
- Schlözer 1809: A.L. Schlözer, *Nestor. Russkie letopisi na drevle-slavianskom iazyke*, 1, Sankt-Peterburg 1809.
- Schlözer 1816: Schlözer, *Nestor. Russkie letopisi*, II, Sankt-Peterburg 1816.

- Schlözer 1828: Ch. von Schlözer, *August Ludwig von Schlözers öffentliches und Privatleben aus Originalurkunden*, 1, Leipzig 1828.
- Šachmatov 2003: A.A. Šachmatov, *Istorija ruskogo letopisanija*, 1/2, Sankt-Peterburg 2003.
- Speranskij 1920: M.N. Speranskij, *Pervoe izdanie "Slova o polku Igoreve" i bumagi A.F. Malinovskogo*, in: Id. (red.), *Slovo o polku Igoreve*, Moskva 1920, pp. 1-24.
- Tarasov 1911: E.I. Tarasov (red.), *Dnevnik i pis'ma Nikolaja Ivanoviča Turgeneva za 1806-1811*, Sankt-Peterburg 1911 (= Archiv brat'ev Turgenevych, 1).
- Tichomirov 1955: M.N. Tichomirov, *Pervye izdanija istočnikov*, in: Id. (ed.), *Očerki istorii istoričeskoj nauki v SSSR*, 1, Moskva 1955, pp. 220-223.
- Usitalo 2013: S. Usitalo, *Invention of Mikhail Lomonosov: a Russian National Myth*, Brighton (MA) 2013.
- Zamyslovskij 1885: E.E. Zamyslovskij (ed.), *Protokoly zasedanij Archeografičeskoj Komissii*, 1, Sankt-Peterburg 1885.
- Zimin 1962: A.A. Zimin, *Schlözer und die russische Chronistik*, in: E. Winter (Hrsg.), *Lomonosov, Schlözer, Pallas. Deutsch-russische Wissenschaftsbeziehungen im 18. Jahrhundert*, Berlin 1962 (= Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte Osteuropas, 12), pp. 132-137.

Abstract

Alexander V. Maiorov

Schlözer and Karamzin. Struggle for Priority in Studying Russian Chronicles

In the 18th and 19th centuries, new knowledge about the history of ancient Rus' was acquired by the introduction of new written sources, primarily narrative sources, into academic circulation. The ancient Russian chronicles were most significant in this respect. Each historian sought precedence for his own discovery and study of a previously unknown ancient record. This explains misconceptions about the role of some scholars as pioneers in studying Russian chronicles. In some cases, these misconceptions persist to our time.

The article studies the history of the discovery by Nikolaj M. Karamzin of the *Hypatian* (*Academic*) and the *Chlebnikov Copies* of the *Hypatian Chronicle*. It is established that Karamzin found the information about the *Hypatian Copy* in a little-known Latin description of the manuscript published in Göttingen in 1768. This description leads us to the conclusion that the first to discover the chronicle was not Karamzin (as it is still customarily thought) but August L. Schlözer and his students. Karamzin was the third to find the *Hypatian Codex* but the first to understand its true significance.

Keywords

Hypatian Chronicle; Nikolaj M. Karamzin; August L. Schlözer.