

A SECOND GREEK ACCOUNT OF THE REVOLUTION  
OF A) PSEUDO-DMITRIY (RUSSIA, 1605-1606):  
Codex Iviron 710, ff. 100<sup>rv</sup>.

In 1962 the Swedish hellenist B. Knös republished<sup>1</sup> an old Greek account of the revolution of a) Pseudo-Dmitriy that had been printed originally in 1612 by the archimandrite M. Kolutzidis<sup>2</sup>. The only other written Greek account of the events in question that I have come across in studying this period of Russian history is that found in Codex 710, ff. 100<sup>rv</sup>, of the Monastery of Iviron, Mt. Athos. Before presenting the relevant passage of the manuscript, however, a brief glance at the historical background would not seem out of place. A summary of the main events should suffice, since the tragic adventure of a) Pseudo-Dmitriy and the so-called «Time of Troubles» in general, has been adequately studied by both Russian<sup>3</sup> and non-Russian historians in

1. B. Knös, «Une version grecque de l'histoire de faux Démétrius, tzar de la Russie», *Δελτίον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* 16 (1962), 223-266.

2. Cf. *Βίος Δημητρίου Βασιλέως Μοσχοβίας, Σαντομίρου Βοιβόντου καὶ ἀρχόντων τῆς Λεχίας*, Ἐνετίησιν, παρὰ Ἀντωνίῳ τῷ Πινέλλῳ, ἀχιβ (Life of Dmitriy, king of Moscow, the voevoda of Santomira and of the Princes of Poland [by the monk Matthew Kolutzidis, archimandrite of Prikonisos], Venice, at the press of Anton de Pinelli, 1612). Cf. also G. J. Zaviras, *Νέα Ἑλλάς ἢ Ἑλληνικὸν Θέατρον* (Modern Greece or the Greek Theatre), Athens 1872, (photofacsimile re-edition by the Ἑταιρεία Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν, Athens 1972), p. 433; E. Legrand, *Bibliographie Hellénique du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Vol. I, Paris 1894, pp. 90-91.

3. The chronicles of the era have been collected in «Pamjatniki drevnej russkoj pis'mennosti odnosjaščiesja k Smutnomu Vremeni», *Russkaja Istoričeskaja Biblioteka*, Vol. III, izd. vtoroe, St. Petersburg 1909.

For the historiography of the era see principally: V. S. Ikonokov, *opyt russkoj istoriografij*, Vol. II, (photofacsimile re-edition of the years 1891-1908), Osnabrück, Otto Zeller, 1966, pp. 1830-1859; E. N. Kuševa, *Iz istorii publicistiki Smutnogo vremeni*, Saratov, 1926; J. J. Gapanovitch, *Historiographie russe hors de la Russie*, Paris, Payot, 1946; V. P. Adrianova-Perec, «Literatura 1580h-1610h godov», in the joint work *Istorija Russkoj Literatury*, Vol. I, Moskva, Leningrad, AN. SSSR, 1958, pp. 257-279.

For monographs, collections of texts and relevant articles, see principally the following (which contain further related bibliographies): *Skazanija sovremennikov o Dimitrii Samozvance*, izd. N. Ustrjalov, St. Petersburg 1832; *Zapiski getmana Žolkevskogo o Moskv. bojne*, izd. S. Muhanov, St. Petereburg 1871, *Smutnoe vremja moskovsk gosudarstva (1604-1613g.)*, Mater'jaly, vol. I-II, Moskva 1915; S. F. Platonov, *Drevnerusskije skanzanija i povesti o smutnom vremeni XVIII veka kak istoričeskij istočnik*, St. Petersburg <sup>1</sup>1888, <sup>2</sup>1913; *idem*, *Očerki po istorii Smuty v Moskovskom gosudarstve XVI-XVII vv.*, St. Petersburg <sup>1</sup>1899, <sup>2</sup>1910;

101  
γ:  
100

Πατριάρχης τῆς ἀνατολῆς ἕως τοῦ ἡνναθ:  
ζυρίων τῶν ἁγιωτάτων τῶν ἱερῶν ἑπισκόπων ἀ:  
νατολῆς ἀπὸ θεοδώρου ἑπισκόπου ἀνατολῆς· οὐ:  
θεώσαντες τὴν οὐρανὴν τῶν ἀνατολῆς, οὐρα:  
συναγῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπιτομῆς ἡμετέρας,  
ἢ προσέφυγαντες ἡμετέρας τῶν ἀνατολῆς ἡννα:  
θῶν τῆς ἐπιτομῆς ἀνατολῆς, ὁμοιοῦσθε δὲ  
ταῖς ἐπιτομῆς, ἢ τῶν ἁγιωτάτων τῶν ἡνναθ:  
σχοδίων ἐπιτομῆς ἀνατολῆς ἀνατολῆς ἀπὸ τῆς  
ἐπιτομῆς ἀνατολῆς, ἀνατολῆς· ὁμοιο:  
ῦντες τῶν ἀνατολῆς, ἢ ἡμετέρας ἢ  
τῶν ἀνατολῆς ἀνατολῆς ἀνατολῆς τῆς  
ἐπιτομῆς ἀνατολῆς· ἀνατολῆς ἀνατολῆς:  
σας τῆς ἀνατολῆς ἡμετέρας ἀνατολῆς· ὁμο:  
ιοῦσθε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνατολῆς ἀνατολῆς, ἢ οὐ:  
ρατολῆς τῆς ἀνατολῆς ἀνατολῆς ἀνατολῆς, ἢ  
ἀνατολῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνατολῆς ἀνατολῆς ἀνατολῆς·  
ἀνατολῆς ἀνατολῆς· ἢ ἀνατολῆς ἀνατολῆς ἀνατολῆς:  
ἀνατολῆς ἀνατολῆς· ἢ ἀνατολῆς ἀνατολῆς ἀνατολῆς:  
ἀνατολῆς ἀνατολῆς ἡνναθ ἡμετέρας ἀνατολῆς τῶν

Codex Iviron, 710, f. 100r (copy).

Ἰβανοειτὸν ἰκτυερίον . βασιλεὺς ἤσθῃ αὐτῶν  
ἀνηγορεύθη . ἀναχθῆς ἢ ἡδὲ ἔδασχῃ καὶ θρο-  
νῶν . ἀναχθῆσα βίς αὐτῶν . γὰρ θαρρὴ ἀγχορὴ εὐφ-  
δοχῆ δὲν ῥηθῆθα θάσσωρεν ὑποροισοειθῆν , ἢ  
δὲν ἀδυσφῆν αὐτῶν θάσχῃσταν . ὁ ὑπὸ γονεὶν  
ἡδὲ ἔδασχῃ καὶ ἔδασχῃ αὐτῶν .  
Ἰβανοειτὸν ἰκτυερίον ὑποροισοειθῆν ἢ  
θάσθ βίς γὰρ θαρρὴ . ἢ δὲ ἔδασχῃσταν αὐτῶν  
ὑποροισοειθῆν . ὑποροισοειθῆν ἀγχορὴ .  
ἀγχορὴσταν αὐτῶν . ἢ δὲ θροισοειθῆν ἢ δὲ  
ὑποροισοειθῆν αὐτῶν . ἢ δὲ θροισοειθῆν  
ἡδὲ ἔδασχῃσταν ἀνηγορεύθη δὲν εὐφδοχῆ  
συναγοισοειθῆν αὐτῶν βασιλεὺς ἰβανοειτὸν δὲν  
ἰκτυερίον . ὁ ὑποροισοειθῆν χεῖρον ὑποροισοειθῆν  
θαρρὴ δὲν ἀνηγορεύθη ἀνηγορεύθησταν θροισοειθῆν  
εὐφδοχῆ . ἢ δὲ θροισοειθῆν δὲν χεῖροις συναγοισοειθῆν  
εὐφδοχῆ θροισοειθῆν καὶ δὲν ὑποροισοειθῆν ὑποροισοειθῆν  
γάμων , ὡς ἀνὲρ δὲν ἀγχορὴ γαμῆσταν δὲ .  
ἢ δὲ θροισοειθῆν . ἢ δὲ θροισοειθῆσταν ::

special monographs<sup>1</sup> as well as in more wide-ranging histories of Russia<sup>2</sup>.

The Tsar of Russia, Ivan the Terrible (Ivan IV, 1534-1584), died leaving two sons, Theodore (Fedor) and Dmitriy. Theodore ruled between the years

*idem*, *Social'nyj krizis Smutnogo vremeni*, Leningrad 1924; *idem*, *Smutnoe vremja*, Prague 1924, (photographic re-edition by Europe Printing, The Hague, 1965); *idem*, *Moskva i Zapad v XVI-XVII v.* Leningrad 1925; N. I. Kostomarov, *Smutnoe vremja moskovskogo gosudarstva v načale XVII g.*, St. Petersburg 1904; P. Ivanov, *Cerkov v epohu smutnogo vremeni*, Ekaterinoslav 1906; D. Cvetaev, *Car Vasilij Šujskij*, Vol. I-II, Varšava 1901-1910; V. N. Latkin, *Zemskie sobory drevnej Rusi, ih istorija i organizacija*, St. Petersburg 1885; B. Grekov, *Krest'jane na Rusi s drevnejših vremen do XVII v.*, kn. I-II, Moskva 1952-1954; V. O. Ključevskij, *Bojarsk. Duma Dr. Rusi*, St. Petersburg <sup>6</sup>1909; L. V. Cerepin, «Zemskie Sobory i utverždenie absoljutizma v Rossii»; in the joint work *Absoljutizm v Rossii XVII-XVIII vv.* Moskva 1964; *Vosstanie I. Bolotnikova, Dokumenty i Materialy*, sost. A. I. Kopanev & A. G. Man'kov, Moskva 1959; I. I. Smirnov, *Vosstanie Bolotnikova 1606-1607 gg.*, Moskva 1951; I. S. Šepelev, *Osvoboditel'naja i klassovaja bor'ba v Russkom gosudarstve v 1608-1610 gg.*, Pjatigorstk 1957; I. P. Šaskol'skij, *Švedskaja intervencija v Karelii v načale XVIII v.*, Petrozavodsk 1950; P. G. Ljubomirov, *Očerki istorii Nižeporodskogo opolčeniija 1611-1613 gg.*, Moskva 1939; I. E. Zabelin, *Minin i Požarskij*, Moskva 1896; S. M. Troitsky, «Samozvancy v Rossii XVII-XVIII vekov», *Voprosy Istorii* (1969), No. 3, pp. 134-146.

1. See principally: *Histoire des guerres de la Moscovie (1601-1610) par Isaak Massa de Haarlem*, publié par M. Obolenski et A. van den Linde, Vol. I-II, Brussels 1866; A. Theiner, *Monuments hist. relat. aux règnes d'Alexei Mich. Feodor III et Pierre le Grand, czars de Russie, Rome et Demetrius*, Paris 1878; *idem*, *La Russie et le Saint-Siège*, Vol. III, *La fin d'un dynastie; la légende d'un Empereur; l'apogée et la catastrophe; les Polonais au Krimlin*, Paris, Plon, 1901, translated into Russian; O. Pirling, *Dmitrij Samozvanec, polnyj perevod s francuzskogo* by V. P. Potemkin, Moskva, Sfinks, 1912; *idem*, *Iz smutnogo vremeni*, St. Petersburg 1902; K. Waliszewski, *Ivan le Terrible*, Paris, Payot, 1904; *idem*, *Les premiers Romanoff (1613-1683)*, Paris 1909; S. Platonov, *Boris Godunov*, Paris, Payot, 1904; V. Funk and B. Nazarevski, *Histoire des Romanov*, Paris, Payot, 1930; St. Graham, *Ivan le Terrible*, Paris, Payot, 1933; H. Fleischhacher, *Russland Zwischen zwei Dynastien (1598-1613)*, Baden bei Wien 1933; H. Valloton, *Ivan le Terrible*, Paris 1959; K. Waliszewski, *La crise révolutionnaire (1584-1614)*, Paris, Plon, <sup>3</sup>1906, which offers a comprehensive early bibliography at pp. 463-483.

2. Apart from the basic works mentioned in notes 3 and 4 above, and the chronicle *Mazurinskij letopiseč (Polnoe Sobranie russkikh letopisej)*, Vol. XXXI, Moskva, AN. SSSR, 1968, pp. 149-156) cf. the following works of more general interest: S. F. Platonov, *Lekcii po russkoj istorii*, St. Petersburg 1901, p. 175 ff.; V. O. Ključevskij, *Kurs Russkoj Istorii*, čast 3, Moskva 1957, pp. 5-99; S. M. Solov'ev, *Istorija Rossii s drevnejših vremen*, kniga IV, Vol. 7-8, Moskva 1960; N. M. Karamzin, *Istorija Gosudarstva Rossijskogo*, izd. Ejnerlinga, Vol. X, St. Petersburg 1842; A. Rambaud, *Histoire de la Russie*, Paris, Hachette, <sup>4</sup>1893, pp. 272-299; P. Milioukov, Ch. Seignobos, L. Eisemann, *Histoire de Russie*, Vol. I, *Des origines à la mort de Pierre le Grand*, Paris, Leroux, 1932, pp. 163-176; B. Nicolsky, *Le peuple russe; sa carrière historique (862-1945)*, Paris 1945, pp. 950-1100; P. Kovalevsky, *Manuel d'Histoire Russe*, Paris, Payot, 1948, pp. 122-155; P. Pascal, *Histoire de la Russie des origines à 1917*, Paris, PUF, 1949, pp. 44-51; G. Welter, *Histoire de Russie*, Paris, Payot, 1963, pp. 122-131; *Medieval Russia; A Source Book, 900-1700*, ed. by B. Dmytryshyn, New York 1967,

1584 and 1598; Dmitriy was born in 1583, and in 1591, was either murdered by Boris Godunov or else died from injuries received as the result of an epileptic stroke. Theodore married Godunov's sister, Irene, in 1580. In 1598, Godunov contrived to succeed his brother-in-law, and having thus attained the throne of Russia somewhat irregularly<sup>1</sup>, he occupied it until 1605; he had already been regent and effective head of state since 1587. His ways were autocratic, however, and when in the years 1601-1603, meager harvests led to severe famine throughout the country, the resentment of the *boyars* and the people was roused against him.

In the region of Kiev, in 1601, a young monk came forward and disclosed that the son of Ivan the Terrible had managed to survive in 1591: Dmitriy had not been murdered, nor was he dead, because he was none other than the monk himself! In 1603, a) Pseudo-Dmitriy made the acquaintance of the Poles C. Ostrogoski and A. Wyznyowyeski, who brought him before the *voevoda* of Santomiria, G. Mniszek. He had already fallen in love with the *voevoda's* daughter, Maria or Marina, to whom he had given a promise of marriage if he were helped to obtain the throne of Moscow; the *voevoda* accordingly took an interest in the case, foreseeing that he might become father-in-law of the future Tsar of Russia. In the following year, Mniszek presented «Dmitriy» to the king of Poland, Sigismund III (1587-1632) through the Papal Nuncio to Poland, Rongani; whether or not he believed what a) Pseudo-Dmitriy said about his rights to the Moscow throne, the king agreed to assist his attempt to gain it on the understanding that the province of Smolensk would be ceded to Poland and that Roman Catholics would be permitted freedom of action within Russia. a) Pseudo-Dmitriy agreed to these conditions, and thus with financial backing from the Polish court, he set out in the same year for Moscow at the head of a rather diversely-composed force, consisting mainly of approximately two thousand discontented Kossacks and about three thousand Poles. In January 1605, they were defeated in their first engagement with the Russian army.

In the following April, the son of Boris Godunov, Theodore (Fedor) II, ascended to the throne of Moscow. The *boyars* had become disaffected with his father and refused to accept the heir; with P. Basmanov at their head, they

pp. 224-234; J. D. Clarkson, *A History of Russia from the ninth Century*, London, Longmans, 1961, pp. 142-166; N. V. Riasanovsky, *A History of Russia*, New York, OUP, 1963, pp. 170-193; Fr. Dvornik, *The Slavs in European History and Civilization*, New Jersey, R.U.P., 1962, pp. 466-475, 486-488, 623-629;

1. See the chronicle «Povest, kako voshiti nepravdoju na Moskve carskij prestol Boris Godunov» *Russkaja Istoričeskaja Biblioteka*, Vol. XIII, izd. vtoroe, St. Petersburg 1909' coll. 147-176.

declared the throne of Moscow vacant and slew Theodore II, along with his mother, in June. It has been maintained that a) Pseudo-Dmitriy was not uninvolved in either the death of Boris Godunov or the murder of Theodore. At any rate, it was in June of the year 1605 that he marched on Moscow and entered the city in triumph. The Patriarch of Moscow, Job, failed to recognize a) Pseudo-Dmitriy as the son of Ivan the Terrible, and was deposed. The Greek metropolitan of the city, Rjazan Ignatius, did recognize him, and became patriarch of Moscow (1605-6, 1611)<sup>1</sup>. The eighth wife of Ivan the Terrible, and mother of Dmitriy, Nagaia—she had in the meantime become a nun—also recognized a) Pseudo-Dmitriy as the son of Ivan, and on July 30, the Patriarch Ignatius crowned him Tsar of Russia. He also blessed his marriage with Maria, or Marina Mniszek, on May 8, 1606.

What was the real identity of the new Tsar of Russia? Was it really Dmitriy or a) Pseudo-Dmitriy? Many have concerned themselves with the problem, advancing quite a number of interpretations and supporting them with various arguments, but as yet no definitive solution has been reached. Most discount the possibility that it could really have been the son of Ivan the Terrible, identifying him instead as the monk G. Otrep'ev<sup>2</sup>. It is the opinion of a contemporary Russian historian that the problem will never be solved<sup>3</sup>.

The short period during which a) Pseudo-Dmitriy reigned (June 1605-1606) proved that he would have been a capable ruler. He introduced various reforms, but the Russians did not take to his inclinations towards «Europeanization», «the Polish way of life», as several chronicles characterized it. The *boyars* were also ill-disposed towards his marriage with Maria, or Marina, Mniszek, and the installation of Poles at the Russian court. On May 16-17, 1606, they rose in revolt with Vasiliy Shuyskiy at their head and slew a) Pseudo-Dmitriy in the Kremlin. Two days later, Vasiliy Shuyskiy was proclaimed Tsar, with the name of Vasiliy V, and he reigned until June 19, 1610. The so-called «Time of Troubles» did not end, as is known, until the enthronement of the founder of Romanov royal dynasty, Michael, IV (1613-1645), who was a relative of Ivan the Terrible.

Codex Iviron 710, paper, 16<sup>o</sup>, ff. 144<sup>r</sup>v, appears in Sp. Lambros' *Cata-*

1. See principally N. Levitskij, «Ignatij patriarh moskovskoj» *Hristianskoe Čtenie* (1886), Nos. 11-12, pp. 549-590 and (1887), Nos. 1-2, pp. 20-53.

2. See the Chronicle «Skazanie o Griške Otrep'eve», *Russkaja Istoričeskaja Biblioteka*, Vol XIII, izd. vtoroe, St. Petersburg 1909, coll. 713-754.

3. «Le problème de faux Dimitry est un des plus obscurs de l'histoire russe et il existe bien peu de chances de le voir résolu un jour»: P. Kovalevski, *Manuel d'histoire russe*, Paris, Payot, 1948, p. 141.

logue as Athos no. 4830, where he dates it to the eighteenth century<sup>1</sup>. The passage that interests us is contained in ff. 100<sup>r</sup>-102<sup>v</sup>; being without a title, Lambros headed it «Διήγησις περί τῆς ἐν Ῥωσίᾳ ἐπαναστάσεως τοῦ ψευδο-Δημητρίου (ἀ ν ε π ί γ ρ α φ ο ς) καὶ ἄλλαι βραχεῖαι εἰδήσεις περί τῆς ρωσικῆς ἱστορίας κατὰ τὸν Σ' αἰῶνα». (An account of the revolution of Pseudo-Dmitriy in Russia (untitled), and other short passages on seventeenth-century Russian history).

The first section of the passage, the «Account of the revolution of Pseudo-Dmitriy in Russia», is contained in ff. 100<sup>rv</sup>. From a photograph of the manuscript<sup>2</sup>, one sees that the text is very legible, and quite accurate in its orthography. As for the date of the manuscript, the formal hand writing suggests that it is not of the eighteenth century, as Lambros estimated<sup>3</sup>, but belongs, at the latest, to the end of the seventeenth. The short passages on seventeenth century Russian history are contained in the remainder of the text (ff. 101<sup>r</sup>-102<sup>v</sup>). Since this latter section offers no new historical data—it is extremely summary in form, and the events related in it are today widely known, even to non-specialists—we shall confine ourselves here to an examination of only the first section of the text. The substance of ff. 101<sup>r</sup>-102<sup>v</sup> is therefore presented in summary form without further comment: (f. 101<sup>r</sup>). In 1613, Michael Feodorovic, a kinsman of Ivan the Terrible, ascended to the throne of Moscow, and Philaretos (Filaret) the father of the King, gained the patriarchal throne. Michael restored order to the State and died in 1645 (f. 101<sup>v</sup>). His son, Alexius, succeeded him. He fought the Swedes, the Poles and the Turks, and took many cities. Alexius died in 1674, and his son Theodore (Fedor) succeeded him. Theodore was weak in character and inexperienced in war. In 1678, however, the Muscovites defeated the Turks and in 1682, Theodore died («poisoned») eating an apple. Discord ensued, and two kings ascended to the throne, John and Peter Alexeyevich. Of these, John was the brother of Theodore (f. 102<sup>v</sup>) from the same mother, while Peter was from a different mother, Natalia Kyrilovna. At that time a new heresy appeared in Moscow, called the «phillipic» heresy.

One could, of course, criticize much of the information given in ff. 101<sup>r</sup>-102<sup>v</sup>, but this would be beyond our present scope. One nevertheless notes that in two and a half pages, the compiler of the chronicle covers at least sixty-

1. S. P. Lambros, *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos*, Vol. II, Cambridge 1900, p. 210.

2. I would like here to thank Mr. I. A. Missios of Thessaloniki and the reverend fathers of the monastery of Iviron, Mt. Athos, for their assistance in photographing the manuscript.

3. S. P. Lambros, *op. cit.*, p. 210.

nine years, from Michael Feodorovich's ascent to the throne (1613) until the coronation of Ivan V and Peter the Great in 1682.

From the «Time of Troubles» (1584-1613) that is, from the succession of Ivan the Terrible, until Michael IV's ascent to the throne of Moscow, the manuscript refers only to the Pseudo-Dmitriy incident (1601-1606), and the accessions of Vasiliy Shuyskiy (1606-1610) and finally of Vasiliy V (1613). This entire span of twenty nine years is all included in f. 101<sup>r</sup>. The period of anarchy is dealt with in a single phrase: «ἐν τούτοις δὲ τοῖς χρόνοις συνεκροτήθησαν πόλεμοι κατὰ τῶν Μοσχοβιτῶν ὑπὸ τῶν Λέχων, ὡς ἐν οὐδενὶ ἄλλοτε. λεηλασία τε καὶ ἀρπαγαὶ καὶ τὰ παραπλήσια» (during these years unprecedented wars were waged against the Muscovites by the Poles, with plundering and abductions, and the like).

It is difficult to ascertain the source of the compiler's (or copyist's) information. As we mentioned earlier, the sole printed Greek version known to us today is that of the archimandrite Matthew Kolutzidis<sup>1</sup>; there naturally arises the question, therefore, of whether the writer of Cod. Iviron 710 (ff. 100<sup>r</sup>-100<sup>v</sup>) took Kolutzidis' version into account. I think not, as there is no comparison between the two texts. Kolutzidis has given us a literary-poetic text, based on historical information that was still fresh at the time of composition, whereas the author of our manuscript achieves nothing more than a prosaic, hackneyed summary of an historical event that had already received considerable scholarly attention. The author of Cod. Iviron 710 ff. 100<sup>v</sup>-100<sup>r</sup> must have taken the information he records from somewhere, and his source was obviously concerned with Russia. The note «γ<sup>ο</sup>» (3<sup>rd</sup>.) on the upper lefthand side of f. 100<sup>r</sup>, probably had some reference to this source. The question of the manuscript's origins—is it from Mt. Athos? is it from the Trans-Danube region?—is unanswered, and by now probably unanswerable.

Let us therefore look at the two texts side by side: A, the account by archimandrite M. Kolutzidis, which we know was printed in 1612, and B, the account by the author of Cod. Iviron 710, ff. 100-100<sup>r</sup>, about which we can only say that its source was consulted after 1682.

1. A, after the dedications and invocations in the first 108 lines of the poem, refers.

2. To a)Pseudo-Dmitriy, who went to the king of Poland and declared that Boris Godunov had expelled him (11. 109-224).

B relates that someone (who?) came forward and claimed to be the son of Ivan the Terrible (1. 1-4). Those who believed him took him to the *voevoda* of Santomiria (1. 5-6).

1. See p. 288, note 2.



3. An agreement is reached between a)Pseudo-Dmitriy and the king of Poland (11. 225-258).

4. a) Pseudo-Dmitriy marches against Moscow. Boris Godunov commits suicide, drinking «poison» (lines 259-278).

5. Conduct of a)Pseudo-Dmitriy towards the Muscovites. He favours the Poles to the disadvantage of the Russians (11. 279-302).

6. The Muscovites want to kill a)Pseudo-Dmitriy. In an attempt against his life he is saved by P. Basmanov, who warns him in time (11. 303-374).

7. «Dmitriy», continues to favour the Poles, who enrich themselves by taking the property of orthodox monasteries (1. 357-398).

8. Maryna Mnizsek goes to Smolensk and Moscow. Her marriage to a) Pseudo Dmitriy (lines 399-548).

9. The Muscovites finally rise in revolt against «Dmitriy» and slay him (1. 549-720).

10. A, rejoices that God has saved the orthodox. He also rejoices that, in May 1606, Vasiliy ascended to the throne of Moscow. At that time the author was an archimandrite in the monastery of the Saviour, Smolensk (lines 721-750).

11.

An agreement was reached between a)Pseudo-Dmitriy and the *voevoda* (1. 6-15).

He marches against Russia. Boris Godunov dies as word arrives of «Dmitriy's» approach (1. 16-19).

As soon as «Dmitriy» gains the throne, he orders his men to kill the king Fedor and his sister. Further, he favours the Poles and the Roman Catholics (20-28).

Observing that «Dmitriy», favours the Poles and Roman Catholics, the Muscovites slay him (1.29-30).

Immediately thereafter they install Vasiliy Shuyskiy on the throne. Later they depose him and confine him to a monastery (1.31-35).

Wars ensue between the Russians and the Poles, with plundering, abductions, and many other consequences.

We have said that A gives a literary-poetic version while that of B is more prosaic and trite. Side by side, a step by step comparison of the two texts clearly demonstrates that B is far more summary in its account of the events than is A. A is unmistakably close to the events (it was written in 1606, in the monastery of the Saviour, Smolensk, and the work was printed in 1612); B is quite remote from them, for the final item referred to in the manuscript is the existence of two kings in Russia, Ivan V, and Peter the Great, whose coronation took place in 1682. The omissions of B, moreover, make us think that he did not have A as his source, and it was this which prompted our earlier statement that these two versions are the sole (known) written Greek references to the events of the revolution of a)Pseudo-Dmitriy.

The text of the manuscript follows; orthography and punctuation have been corrected:

*Παραγενόμενος τις ἐκήρυξεν ἑαυτὸν εἶναι Δημήτριον, τὸν ἐλάσσονα υἱὸν Ἰβάνου τοῦ Τυράννου, ἀναιρεθέντα ὑπὸ Θεοδώρου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ. Πιστεύσαντες οὖν οἱ Λέχοι ταῖς αὐτοῦ ἀπάταις, προσήνεγκον αὐτὸν τῷ τῆς Σαντομηρίας ἡγεμόνι καὶ προτρέφαντες ἐξομόσασθαι μὲν τὰ τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας δόγματα, ὁμολογήσαι δὲ τὰ τῶν παπιστῶν, εἰ θέλει ἐγκρατῆς τῆς τῶν Μοσχοβιτῶν βασιλείας διὰ τῆς ἐπικουρίας αὐτῶν καὶ συμμαχίας γενέσθαι, κατέπεισαν. Ὁμολογήσας τούτων τὸν παπισμὸν, καὶ ὑποσχεθεὶς, εἰ τῇ τῶν Λεχῶν βοηθείᾳ ἐγκρατῆς γένοιτο τῆς τῶν Μοσχοβιτῶν βασιλείας, βασίλισσαν ἀναγορεύσαι τὴν τοῦ ῥηθέντος ἡγεμόνος θυγατέρα. Ὅθεν δυνάμεις αὐτῶν στρατιωτικὰς εἰληφώς, οὐκ ὀλίγον μέρος τῆς Ῥωσίας ἑαυτῷ ὑπέταξε καὶ δολοφονηθῆναι τῷ φόβῳ αὐτοῦ τὸν Μπορίς Γουδενῶβ πεποίηκε καὶ τελευταῖον, πιστευθεὶς παρὰ τῶν Μοσχοβιτῶν εἶναι ἀληθῶς αὐτὸν τὸν Ἰβανοβίτζην Δημήτριον, βασιλεὺς καὶ παρ' αὐτῶν ἀνηγορεύθη. Ἀναχθεὶς οὖν ἐπὶ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ θρόνου ἐκέλευσε τοῖς αὐτοῦ λάθρα τῇ ἀγχόνῃ περιβαλεῖν τὸν ῥηθέντα Θεόδωρον Μπορισοβίτζην καὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ βασίλισσαν. Ὅ καὶ γέγονε τῇ κθ<sup>η</sup> τοῦ Ἰουλίου κατὰ τὸ ,αχε<sup>ον</sup> ἔτος. Ἰδόντες οὖν τοῦτον οἱ Μοσχοβίται προσκείμενον ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς Λέχοις καὶ τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ἐθίμοις τῶν παπιστῶν, συμφωνήσαντες ἀλλήλοις ἀπέκτειναν αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν τῇ ις<sup>η</sup> τοῦ Μαΐου κατὰ τὸ ,αχς<sup>ον</sup> ἔτος, καὶ παραχρῆμα ἐπὶ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ ἀνήνεγκον τὸν πρῶτον τῆς συνωμοσίας αὐτῶν Βασίλειον Ἰβανοβίτζην τὸν Ζούσκην, ὃν μετ' οὐ πολὸν χρόνον καταγαγόντες τῶν ἀνακτόρων ἐν μοναστηρίῳ περιώρισαν. Ἐν τούτοις δὲ τοῖς χρόνοις συνεκροτήθησαν πόλεμοι κατὰ τῶν Μοσχοβιτῶν ὑπὸ τῶν Λέχων, ὡς ἐν οὐδενὶ ἄλλοτε, λεηλασίαι τε καὶ ἀρπαγαὶ καὶ τὰ παραπλήσια.*

(100<sup>o</sup>) Someone came forward and declared himself to be Ivan the Terrible's younger son, Dmitriy, who had been killed by his brother Theodore (Fedor).

The Poles believed his impostures, and brought him before the *voevoda* of Santomiria; they urged him to renounce the doctrines of the Eastern Church and confess those of the Papists, if he wished to become master of the Muscovite kingdom with their assistance and alliance. They succeeded in their persuasions; he embraced papism and promised that if, with the help of the Poles, he became master of the kingdom of the Muscovites, he would nominate the daughter of the above-mentioned *voevoda* as his queen. Thereupon he subjugated not a small portion of Russia with the military forces they gave him; he forced Boris Godunov to die in fear of him, and having persuaded the Muscovites that (100<sup>y</sup>) he really was Dmitriy Ivanovich, they proclaimed him king. Upon ascending to the royal throne, he commanded his men to hang, secretly, the above-mentioned Theodore (Fedor) Borisovich and his sister, the queen, which took place on the 29th of July, 1605. When the Muscovites saw that at every opportunity he advanced the Poles' interests, and papist ecclesiastical institutions, by common consent they slew him and his entourage on the 17th of May, 1606, and without delay, they installed the leader of their conspiracy, Vasilii Ivanovich Shuyskiy upon the throne; shortly thereafter, they removed him from the palace and confined him to a monastery. During these years, unprecedented wars were waged against the Muscovites by the Poles, as never before, with plunderings and abductions and the like.

### Commentary

1-5 : Ἀναιρεθέντα ὑπὸ Θεοδώρου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ (killed by his brother, Theodore). Not a single source on the «Time of Troubles» reports that Theodore (Fedor) I (1584-1598), the son of Ivan the Terrible, killed his brother, Dmitriy, in 1591. On the contrary, the chronicles of the era inform us that the murder was carried out by the agents of Boris Godunov<sup>1</sup>.

5-10: Σαντομυρία (Santomiria). Hellenized form of the name of the Polish city Sandowierz.

20-25: ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ βασίλισσαν (his sister, the queen). When Theodore (Fedor) was killed, his mother, Maljuta Skutarov, the wife of Boris Godunov, was slain, and not his sister, Xenia Godunov, who became a nun in 1606 and lived until 1622<sup>2</sup>.

1. «Oficial'naja letopis glasis, što careviča ubili agenty Godunova, a vse sledsvie o delebylo godunovskoj poddelkoj»; A. V. Kartašev, *Očerki po Istorii Russkoj Cerkvi*, Vol, II, Paris, YMCA Press, 1959, p. 50; see also K. Waliszewski, *La crise révolutionnaire 1584-1614*, Paris, Plon, 1906, pp. 39-41.

2. «Moskvici ubili caricu Mar'ju i Feodora a Kseniju otdali Samozvancu»: A. V. Kartašev, *op. cit.*, p. 52; cf. also Waliszewski, *op. cit.*, pp. 179-181; S. F. Platonov, *Smutnoe*

: τῆ κθ<sup>η</sup> τοῦ Ἰουλίου κατὰ τὸ ,αχε<sup>ον</sup> ἔτος (the 27th day July of 1605). The date is wrong. The murder of Theodore II and Maljuta Skutarov took place on June 10, 1605<sup>1</sup>. Theodore II was overthrown on June 1, 1605; a)Pseudo-Dmitriy entered Moscow in triumph on June 20, 1605, and the murder was carried out before his entry into Moscow<sup>2</sup>.

30-35: μετ' οὐ πολὺν χρόνον (shortly thereafter). In fact, a period of four years. Vasiliy Shuyskiy acceded to the throne of Moscow in May, 1606, and abdicated in June, 1610.

*Thessaloniki*  
*Institute for Balkan Studies*

*vremja*, p. 109; De Labarre de Raillicourt, «Tableaux Généalogiques», *Les cahiers de l'histoire* (1961) No. 7, pp. 136-145; (see Table VIII, p. 140).

1. See page 296, note 2.

2. See S. F. Platonov, *Smutnoe vremja*, pp. 109-112.