On the Supposed Abridged Redaction of Anthony of Novgorod's *Kniga Palomnik*

К предполагаемой сокращенной редакции «Книги паломник» Антония Новгородского

Anna Jouravel

The Institute for Byzantine Studies of the
Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts,
Belgrade, Serbia

Анна Журавель

Институт византологии
Сербской академии наук и искусств,
Белград, Сербия

Abstract

This paper is focused on one of ten extant copies, which, to varying degrees, transmit Anthony of Novgorod's thirteenth-century travel account, *Kniga palomnik*. This copy was previously thought to have been an otherwise unknown redaction of the work, owing to the copyist's supposed intention to compile a list of sacred sites devoid of narrative flair. By examining the textual transmission, with reference to three specific examples, this article reveals the abridgement to be mechanical rather than deliberate, rendering a damaged version of the original which cannot be considered an intentional redaction.

Keywords

Early Rus, medieval Constantinople, travel accounts, pilgrim tales, sacred topography, sanctuaries, relics, textual criticism, text redactions

Резюме

Статья посвящена одному из десяти известных списков «Книги паломник» — путевых заметок Антония Новгородского, созданных на рубеже XIII века. Данный список раннее считался представителем нигде более не сохранившейся редакции этого произведения, целью которой являлось устранение повествовательных элементов текста и составление перечня константинопольских реалий. На трех примерах будет, однако, показано, что сокращения исключительно механические, и данный список не является умышленной редакцией текста.

Ключевые слова

Паломничество на Руси, хождения, средневековый Константинополь, сакральная топография, святыни, реликвии, текстология, редакция текста

The *Kniga palomnik* is as well known in Byzantine studies as it is in Christian archaeology because it provides one of the most detailed, albeit oftentimes confusing description of Constantinople on the eve of its sack in 1204. The text is an Old Russian pilgrimage account, written by the Novgorodian traveller Dobrynja Jadrejkovič in 1200. Though he later became the Archbishop of Novgorod, he was still a layman when he travelled to the Emperor's City and composed the *Kniga palomnik*—The Pilgrim's Book. The text was discovered in Russia in the first half of the 19th century [Строев 1834: 155], and its first critical edition was published by the Russian Byzantinist Chr. M. Loparev [Лопарев 1899]. To Western readers it had only been available in Sofia de Khitrowo's [1889] defective translation into French, which was completed a few years before the first critical edition was released, and was based on the publication of the only manuscript known at the time [Савваитов 1872]).[1] Since then, Anthony's account has often been consulted, especially for the reconstruction of medieval Constantinople's sacred topography [Janin 1969; Majeska 1984; Berger 1988; Mango 1998; Effenberger 2015]. The text has more recently also been referenced in works pertaining to ecclesiastical architecture [Лидов 2009 or Marinis, Ousterhout 2015], different cultural-historical questions [Garzaniti 2013; Vukovic 2015], art history [Конявская 2011; Kriza 2018], and to Constantinople's mediaeval soundscape [Torres 2020]. When cited in these various contexts, however, the reliability of Anthony's account is questioned due to the text's ambiguous construction. Instead of introducing the individual edifices one after another in a consistent

---

[1] Recent works, however, referred to a later, slightly more accurate translation by Ehrhard (1932), which is based on Loparev's edition. Other translations, like the excellent one by [Müller 1986], or those which are based on Khitrowo's translation, like [Lethaby, Swainson 1894; Richter 1897] or, more recently, [Márquez Gémar 2014], have received little attention. I am grateful to César Barta for pointing the latter work out to me.

topographical order, the text seems to adhere to a confused presentation. Previous research has thus suggested that the extant description is based on a later transcript of the text, and the failure to locate similarly named churches and monasteries arises from the author's fading memory. Both the examination of unpublished material and the discovery of a new text fragment has allowed for a more precise reading of some of the text's passages, which has resulted in a different interpretation of the text (see a new critical edition in: [Jouravel 2019]). This article, however, is solely concerned with its textual transmission, particularly, with scrutinising the claim of a "third", "second-hand" or "abbreviated" redaction.[2]

The Russian philologist O. A. Belobrova initially proposed the idea in the 1970s that the text was edited at some later date by another scribe [Белоброва 1974: 182, 185; Eadem 1977: 227]. The basis for her hypothesis was a complete, but highly condensed copy of the text[3] which, having been uncovered in the 1920s [Сперанский 1926: 16], was unknown to Loparev. This manuscript, which shall henceforth be referred to as copy *3* (*Забелинский список*), can be dated to the 16th century [Jouravel 2019: 50–54], meaning that it is significantly older than the two fragments dated to the 17th and 18th centuries that arguably rendered the "first-hand" redaction. Belobrova concluded that as copy *3* rendered the same text as found in the earlier surviving copy *Я* (*Яцимирский список*),[4] albeit in an abridged form, this copy must be the work of a younger scribe who intended to create a simple list of sanctuaries and relics, and therefore omitted all narrative elements from the text. This approach to redaction can be seen in the following passage from the text:

	Я	*3*
1, 2)	а ѿтолѣ с҃го агафоника цр҃кѣь . и моци	а ѿтолѣ с҃тго а҃гафоника цр҃кѣь
3)	его тоӳ . блиz же плакоты̋ цр҃кѣь в манасты́ри . с҃тго п҃ррка илы̋и . в тойже	велико̋аго а̋какïа . ю̋же постави̋ костанти̋ цр҃ь . тж и мо̋ци его
4)	цр҃кѣи множество моцей ст҃ы̋ . по всей цр҃кви . ѻ̋коло поставлаю̋ть столы̋ . на праz̋никъ полны̋ моцей ст҃хъ . разѣѣе во	za п̑ороӳе̋мъ же цр҃кви ст҃ы̋. сергïа и ва̋кха . и гла̋вы и тж лѣжа̋ . и роӳка сергïа и ва̋кха . и кр̑о с҃тго
5)	троандофилицѣ манастыри тако̋ много	е̋пима̋ха . тж za̋ п̑ороӳе̋мъ цр҃кѣь
6)	и е̋ же цр҃кѣь велика с҃тго акакиӓ . ю̋ поставилъ костатинъ цр҃ь . тоӳже соӳть	ст҃ой е̋оӳфïмьи . тоӳ и гробъ е̋и то̋ць сребр̑о ѻ̋кова̋ . в той цр҃кви ст҃ы̋ ѻ̋ц҃ь

---

[2] For the discussion on the so-called "first-hand" or "extended" redaction assumed by Loparev see: [Jouravel 2019: 106–117], and, more detailed: [Журавель 2021].

[3] Belobrova published the text in [1977: 228–235], it was recently reproduced by [Лидов 2006: 197–205].

[4] On the manuscript descriptions, the *stemma codicum* and the examination of the whole textual transmission see: [Jouravel 2019]. I sincerely apologise for the error in stating the signature (p. XVI). The correct signature is "RGB, Muzejn. sobr., f. 178, Nr. 10261"!

Я

7)	й моцꙑ єго . й за ѡлтаремъ той цр҃кви
8)	ст҃го митрофана гробъ . перваго патриарха
9)	цр҃егородⷭкаго и тоⷹ патрахиль єго . й
10, 11)	глава а тѣла єго бивъ батоги . й сжеглъ коуⷭпронимъ поганꙑй цр҃ь . За пⷪромиⷷ же
12, 13)	цр҃кѣь . ст҃го серьгиꙗ . й йвахꙑⷬ . й главꙑ тоꙑⷤ
14)	тою тꙋ лежата . й роука сергиⷷва й кровь .
15)	й ст҃го єпимаха кровь тоже в раⷰцѣ . оⷹ
16)	подромиꙗⷩ же цр҃кѣь ст҃ꙑⷨ єоуⷣфимꙑꙗ .
17)	тоⷹ й гробъ єꙗ́ тоⷰпь сребромъ ѡⷦкованъ .
18)	в тойже цр҃кѣи ст҃ꙑй геⷯѡгрий лежить .
19)	сторонь же ѿ безькоⷩимитами . ст҃а мⷱнⷰа
20)	йоуⷧлꙑꙗ́на в тѣлѣ лежить . Въ бозⷩици же ст҃го самсона [...] (*Я* 179r 2 — 179v 11)

З

геѡⷬргїи в тѣлⷮ лежⷯй . вⷬ цр҃кви ст҃го самсона [...] (*З* 443r 18 — 443v 11)

When compared with the full text of the oldest copy *Я*, copy *З* does seem, at first glance, to be an abridgement of the text, in which descriptive or explanatory elements have been omitted. A closer examination of excerpts which appear in both copy *Я* and copy *З* reveals that the scribe did not copy all the lemmas consecutively but did so selectively. This style of abridgement is found throughout the entire text. The previously cited passage opens with a description of the church of St Agathonikos (1), which is also present in copy *З*. Copy *Я* then continues by describing the relics of St. Agathonikos (2), the "Plakota,"[5] "near which—in a monastery—a church was located, dedicated to St. Prophet Elijah" (3), in which such an amazing number of relics (4) were stored, that "tables full of relics of saints were placed throughout the church on the occasion of a holiday. Such a number of relics," Anthony adds, "is only to be found in the Triantaphyllos monastery"[6] (5). None of this information appears in copy *З* until the next sacred site, the "big church of St. Akakios" (6), is introduced, "which was erected by emperor Constantine", and "in which the relics of this saint are stored (7)". The scribe of *З* considered that this church was worth mentioning, but again failed to include the following information, featured in copy *Я*: "Behind the altar of this church the coffin of St. Metrophanes (8), the first patriarch of Constantinople, is stored, and there is also his stole (9) and his head (10). But his body the heathen emperor Kopronymos (i.e. Constantine V, A. J.) ordered to beat with lashes and to burn" (11). Copy *З* again

---

5   This is to be read as "Platea", a district of mediaeval Constantinople. See the explanation in: [Ibid.: 157–159].

6   I.e. the Peribleptos monastery, dedicated to the Theotokos and located in the southwestern part of the city, see: [Özgümüş 2000].

directly resembles copy Я when it is mentioned that "behind the Hippodrome the church of St. Sergius and Bacchus (12)" is located, and that this is where the heads of the two saints are kept (13), as well as "St. Sergius' hand and blood" (14), and "St. Epimachos' blood, stored in a shrine" (15). Copy З also includes the details that "at the Hippodrome, however, there is a church dedicated to St. Euthymia (16), in which her empty coffin is stored, forged in silver (17), and in which also lies St. George" (18), before omitting that "beside" or "opposite" an unclear entity (there seems to be a small lacuna), and "above" or "behind" "the вєзкоимиты[7] lies the holy martyr Iuliana, unscathed" (19). Copy З re-joins copy Я when it is mentioned that "in the church dedicated to St. Samson" (20) various other noteworthy things can be found.

Based on an initial reading, it is difficult to understand why the scribe of copy З decides to include some elements while omitting others. According to Belobrova, he is accurately copying all the churches and relics to compile an "outline of entities" (конспект реалий), and therefore omits any additional information regarding these entities and their associated legends. This claim, however, does not withstand criticism, when the elements are categorised as follows:

1) church	11) legend/add. inform.
2) relics	**12) church**
3) church	**13) relics**
4) relics	**14) relics**
5) legend/add. inform.	**15) relics**
6) church	**16) church**
7) legend/add. inform.	**17) relics**
8) relics	**18) relics**
9) relics	19) relics
10) relics	**20) church**

If the scribe's true intention was to concentrate on "entities" alone, then presumably he would have also included numbers 2–4, 8–10 and 19, which contain only basic information about churches and relics; however, he does not. Only the numbers 5, 7, and 11 contain additional information, but the scribe, nevertheless, has only copied out the items marked bold in the list above (i.e., numbers 1, 6–7, 12–18 and 20, incidentally including the additional information in number 7). In the fist two cases (numbers 2–4 and 8–10), the omission may have been motivated by the subsequent information (numbers 5 and 11), but in the third case the decision to leave out St. Juliana (number 19) is entirely incomprehensible, even if the scribe's omission of the вєскоимиты is explained by the failure to understand this part of the text. After a preliminary examination

---

[7] See Gr. ἀκοίμητοι 'the sleepless', i.e. "behind the monastery of the sleepless monks".

of this short passage, it therefore becomes obvious that the scribe's suggested *modus operandi* is inaccurate.

In order to understand why the text has been treated in this way, scribal craft must be considered rather than a wilful interpretation of the *vorlage*. By considering the process of copying it becomes clear that the reason for the selection is not the scribe's bias for key information over supplementary clarification, but merely trivial leaps *du même au même*. In the text passage cited above, these leaps from one lexeme to the exact same lexeme later in the text pertain to the words црквь in line 1 and 7, за in l. 9 and 13, and лежить in l. 18 and 20, which are marked in bold below and are made additionally visible by splitting *З*'s text according to *Я*:

Я	*З*
а̀ ѿтолѣ ст҃го а́гафо́ника **црквь** . и́ мо́щи его	а̀ ѿто́лѣ ст҃го а́гафо́ника **црквь**
то̀у̑ . близъ же пла́коты̀ црквь в манасты́ри .	
ст҃го пр̑рка и́льѝ . в то́иже цркви мно́жество	
мо́щей ст̑ы̀ . по все́й цркви . ѡколо поставля́ю́ть	
5 столь̀ы̀ . на пра́здникъ полны̀и мо́щей ст҃хъ . разве́е	
во троандофили́цѣ манасты́ри тако̀ мно́го ѝ е̑	
же **црквь** вели́ка ст҃го ака́кина̀ . ю̀ поставилъ	вели́каго а́ка́кїа . ю́же поставѝ
костати́нъ цр̑ь . то̀у̑же со̀у̑ть ѝ мо́щи его .	конста́нтѝ цр̑ь . тж ѝ мо́щи его
ѝ **за** ѡ̀лтаремъ той цркви ст҃го митрофана	
10 гробъ . пе́рваго патриа́рха цр̑его́рѡдскаго ѝ то̀у̑	
патрахиль его . и́ глава а тѣла его бивъ	
батоги . и́ сжеглъ ко̀у̑проним̑ пога́ны̀й цр̑ь .	
За пѡ̀ромие̑ же црквь . ст҃го серьги́на̀ . и́ и́вахка̀ .	**за** пѡ̀ро̀у̑е́м̑ же цркви ст̑ы̀ . сергїа ѝ
и́ главы̀ тою̀ тꙋ̀ лежа́та . и́ ро̀у̑ка сергие́ва ѝ	ва́кха . ѝ гла́вы ѝ тж лѣ́жа̀ . и́ ро̀у̑ка
15 кровь . и́ ст҃го е́пима́ха кровь тоже в ра́цѣ . о̀у̑	се́ргїа ѝ ва́кха . ѝ крѡ̀ ст҃го е́пима́ха .
подроми́на̀я̀ же црквь ст̑ы̀й ѐо̀у̑фи́мьй . то̀у̑ ѝ	тж за́ пѡ̀ро̀у̑ем̑ цркви ст̑оѝ ѐо̀у̑фѝмьи .
гро́бъ е́ѝ то́ць сребро́мъ ѿко́ванъ . в то́йже	то̀у̑ ѝ гро́бъ е́и то́ць сребрѡ̀ ѿкова̀ . в той
цркви ст̑ы̀й геѡ̀ргий **лежить** . сто́ронь же ѿ	цркви ст̑ы̀ ѿц҃ь геѡ̀ргїи в тѣлѣ̀ лѣ́жѝ .
безькойми́тами . ст҃а мꙋ̀нц̀а йо̀у̑льꙗ̀на в тѣлѣ̀	
20 **лежить** . Въ бознйци же ст҃го самсона [...]	в̑ цркви ст҃го самсона [...]
(*Я* 179r 2 — 179v 11)	(*З* 443r 18 — 443v 11)

This mechanical practice results in the omission not only of legends but also of a significant number of relics in copy *З*. For example, in the following passage from copy *Я*, which is also incompletely rendered in copy *З*, no legends or additional information are mentioned. Instead, the relics which were stored "in a side chapel, behind the great altar of the Hagia Sophia" are

listed consecutively. Anthony describes how "embedded in the wall" were "the cover plate of the Lord's coffin (1), the iron staff (2), the drills and the saws, with which the Lord's cross has been manufactured (3), the iron chain on Petrus' prison doors (4) and the wood which was on the Lord's neck under the iron and which was embedded into an icon", namely, "in the shape of a cross" (5):

<div style="text-align:center">

Я

З

</div>

[...] й горѣ на полатахъ стойть патриархъ . коли слоужать во притворѣ же za великимъ

1) ѡлтаремъ . въинеѣı во стенѣ . гроба гⷩа

2) верхнаıа доска . й посохъ желѣzенъ тоⷤже . й

3) свердьлъı й пилъı . ймиже ѱиненъ крⷭтъ гⷩь . й

4) оуже желѣzно во двѣрѣхъ петровъı темница .

5) й древо йже на ши оу хⷭа поⷣ желѣzомъ бъıло . тоⷤже въинено во йконıоу крⷭтомъ . в томⷤже притворѣ наⷣ дверьми горѣ . написанъ стефанъ первомуⷱкⷩъ [...] (*Я* 165v 17 — 166r 10)

[...] й горѣ на полатаⷮ стоⷨ патрїархъ коли слоужⷨ . в тоⷤже притворе наⷣ двѣрми горѣ . написаⷩ стефаⷩ муⷱкъ [...] (*З* 436v 12–15)

This passage clearly lists only relics, which, according to Belobrova's hypothesis, the scribe of copy *З* should have replicated given their importance to pilgrims, especially as some of them are associated with the Lord. But, as was the case in the previous example, the decision to omit these details was not dependent on content but was rather the result of a mechanical lapse. In this case, the clue to this lies in the word притворъ (l. 2 and 8, marked bold) from which and to which the scribe's eye appears to have leapt:

<div style="text-align:center">

Я　　　　　　　*З*

</div>

[...] й горѣ на полатахъ стойть патриархъ . коли слоужать во **притворѣ** же za великимъ ѡлтаремъ . въинеѣı во стенѣ . гроба гⷩа верхнаıа доска . й посохъ желѣzенъ тоⷤже . й

5 свердьлъı й пилъı . ймиже ѱиненъ крⷭтъ гⷩь . й оуже желѣzно во двѣрѣхъ петровъı темница . й древо йже на ши оу хⷭа поⷣ желѣzомъ бъıло . тоⷤже въинено во йконıоу крⷭтомъ . в томⷤже **притворѣ** наⷣ дверьми горѣ . написанъ

10 стефанъ первомуⷱкⷩъ [...]

(*Я* 165v 17 — 166r 10)

[...] й горѣ на полатаⷮ стоⷨ патрїархъ коли слоужⷨ .

в тоⷤже **притворе** наⷣ двѣрми горѣ . написаⷩ стефаⷩ муⷱкъ [...]

(*З* 436v 12–15)

These two examples sufficiently demonstrate that copy *3* is not an intentional redaction but rather the work of either an incompetent or perhaps inexperienced copyist. This means that copy *3* renders essentially the same text found in all extant copies.

It is worth asking, however, why the impression remains that the scribe of copy *3* is adhering to a secret method that determines which passages he includes and which he omits, especially when, despite the radical abridgement, his text does not appear to be at all incomplete. It, after all, displays no sign of textual damage. It is legible and it is expressed in complete and mostly consistent sentences. When examining the more elaborate passage, quoted above (on p. 219 sq and 222), it seems as though he intentionally copied five out of seven churches mentioned in copy *Я*, while omitting additional information about when churches were built or about the saint whose relics were stored there.

In our opinion, the reason for this approach lies in the monotony of the text. Since most sequences, excluding narrative elements, start with the words а оттолѣ 'and from there' or other prepositions of place like стоpoнъ же (...) 'beside/opposite the (...)', and end with the phrase свѧтыи (...) лежитъ 'saint (...) lies here' or и моци его ту(же), 'and his relics (also) lie here' (see, for instance, the first two lines of the above-cited text on p. 219/222), the leap *du même au même* implicitly means a leap from one (geographical) sequence to another. Therefore, it seems that a text that is abridged exclusively mechanically lacks entire lemmas. It was apparently this observation that gave rise to the impression that this text was abridged intentionally.

Yet, passages such as the following one remain that "unmask" the copyist's practice:

<table>
<tr><td align="center">*Я*</td><td align="center">*3*</td></tr>
<tr><td>

[...] й ѿтолѣ е҃ цр҃квь ст҃ыꙗ̀ йрины велика тоуже й моци еꙗ̀ лежать . а ѿтолѣ же в женскомъ манастырѣ . йриньйна глава . а̀ во троу́доватицѣ ꙁа йспигасомъ на горѣ . ст҃ый ꙃотикъ лежить . 5 томоу́ бо ꙃотикоу повелѣлъ цр҃ь полаты ꙁдати . и ѿ же воꙁма ꙁлато . й раꙁдалъ и҃ ницемъ . цр҃ь же повелѣлъ е привꙗꙁати ко хвостомъ двѣма конема да его раꙁнесоу́ть . ѻна же раꙁомьꙗвша по полю . й пришѐше стаста на единомъ мѣстѣ в лѣсѣ . тоу́же 10 й положенъ бы̀ . й цр҃квь оу́чиниша троу́доватымъ й хромымъ . тоу́же й храмы поставиша даютъ млт҃ню хрⷭ҇тꙗне й цр҃вѣ . ѿ негоже лаꙁарь писець йконный [...] (*Я* 181r 20 — 181v 20)

</td><td>

[...] а̀ ѿтолѣ ст҃ой ѻрины цр҃квь . й мо́цї ѐѐ тоу́ лѣжа̀ . ѿтолѣ в жеⷭ҇ко манастыри ѻрины голова *лежй.*

ѿ не́го лаꙁа́рь писець й йконⷩ҇ный лѣжй̀ [...] (*3* 444r 14–19)

</td></tr>
</table>

In this passage, the scribe fails to mention the legend behind why "the relics of St. Zotikos" are stored "in a hospital on a hill behind Ispigas" (l. 3sq.). The legend tells of how St. Zotikos was "instructed by the Tsar to build a palace" (l. 5), but instead of spending the money he was given for the intended purpose, "he spread it among the poor" (l. 5sq), and for this was publicly punished (l. 6–8). The reason behind the church's location is also missing, namely, that the two horses to whose tails the saint was then bound "stood still in a certain place in the forest, where he was buried afterwards (l. 8–10). And here the church was built for the sick and the weak. And there were also constructed accommodations"—which became places for "charity for Christians and emperors" (l. 10–12).

By omitting this legend, the scribe of copy *3* also removes any reference to Zotikos' relics, as well as their location, giving the impression that he considered this information superfluous. However, the reason for leaving out all of these details seems obscure, especially when equally important information is included, namely the "big church of St. Irene", in which "her relics lie" (l. 1sq.) and the "female monastery", in which, "on the contrary, her head is stored" (l. 2sq.). The mechanical nature of the work is revealed in this case by the incongruent use of the masculine personal pronoun него in copy *3*, (l. 12), which refers to Zotikos rather than Irene('s head), despite the latter directly preceding the pronoun. The appearance of this pronoun clearly demonstrates that the scribe of copy *3* originally intended to mention the relics of Zotikos, perhaps hearing about them in his inner dictation. His inattentiveness or carelessness, however, resulted in him mechanically completing the sequence а ѿтолѣ же в женскомъ манастырѣ . ирѝньйна глава with the otherwise frequently used verb лежи̑. When he returned to his work, he found the last word лежи̑ within the Zotikos sequence а̀ во троу̑доватицѣ za йспигасомъ на горѣ . ст҃ый zотикъ лежить and realised that he had already copied it out. Whether the scribe intended to exclude the legend, or he simply believed that he had already copied it, is unclear. However, the incongruity of the masculine personal pronoun reveals that he proceeded to the next textual sequence with Zotikos in mind. This is unlikely to have occurred if the scribe had intended to omit all the information regarding this saint. It can therefore be concluded that if the copyist had only meant to compile a list of sanctuaries, he would have done it correctly, at least as regards the grammar. And thus, it is more than likely that the so-called third "abridged" redaction, as well as the second "extended" one, never existed.

This evidence clarifies the textual transmission both disproving the conventional assumptions and allowing for the account to be reliably dated. As all additional elements, like the mention of the Sack of Constantinople in a seventeenth-century copy as well as all omissions like those in copy *3*, can be dated to a later time (in the case of *3*, to the 16th century), the original text of the

Kniga palomnik was unequivocally written before the Sack of Constantinople in 1204, an assessment which corresponds well with Anthony's silence about this event.

This article has shown that the text in copy *3* has not been purposefully edited, and that there is no evidence to substantiate the claim that the author or a later scribe glossed or abridged the text to preserve the memory of Constantinople's treasures, or even to stake the city's claim to potentially stolen or destroyed relics. Moreover, by identifying all possible interpolations and lacunae, a text can be delineated which henceforth should serve as the basis for future examination—it is, in topographical terms, the more accurate localisation of sanctuaries; and in philological terms, the text's context within the Rus-Byzantine medieval literary tradition.

Bibliography

Sources

Ms. *Я*
РГБ, ф.178 (Музейное собрание), № 10261, л. 156–185, XVI в.

Ms. *3*
ГИМ, ОПИ, ф. 440 (Собр. И. Е. Забелина), № 416, л. 434об.–445об., сер. XVI в.

Literature

Berger 1988
Berger A., *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos* (= Poikila Byzantina, 8), Bonn, 1988.

Effenberger 2015
Effenberger A., Zur „Reliquientopographie" von Konstantinopel in mittelbyzantinischer Zeit, *Millennium*, 12/1, 2015, 265–327.

Ehrhard 1932
Ehrhard M., Le livre du Pèlerin d'Antoine de Novgorod. *Romania*, 58, 1932, 44–65.

Garzaniti 2013
Garzaniti M., Le Livre du Pèlerin d'Antoine de Novgorod: Constantinople dans le premier témoignage d'un récit de voyage russe, *Slavica Occitania*, 36, 2013, 25–45.

Janin 1969
Janin R., La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin. 1: Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat œcuménique. 3: Les églises et les monastères, Paris, 1969.

Jouravel 2019
Jouravel A., *Die ‚Kniga palomnik' des Antonij von Novgorod. Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (= Imagines Medii Aevi. Interdisziplinäre Beiträge zur Mittelalterforschung, 47), Wiesbaden, 2019.

de Khitrowo 1889
Khitrowo S., de, Antoine, archevêque de Novgorod. Description des lieux-saints de Constantinople (1200), Idem, ed., *Itinéraires russes en Orient* (= Publications de la Société de l'Orient Latin. Itinéraires1), Genève, 85–111.

Kriza 2018

Kriza Á., *Depicting orthodoxy. The Novgorod Sophia icon reconsidered* (Doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge), 2018.

Lethaby, Swainson 1894

Lethaby W. R., Swainson H., The Church of Sancta Sophia Constantinople. A study of Byzantine building, London, 1894.

Majeska 1984

Majeska G. P., *Russian travelers to Constantinople in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries* (= Dumbarton Oaks studies, 19), Washington DC, 1984.

Mango 1998

Mango C. A., Where at Constantinople was the Monastery of Christos Pantepoptes? *Δελτίον ΧΑΕ, Περίοδος Δʹ. Στη μνήμη του Δημητρίου Ι. Πάλλα (1907–1995)*, 20, 1998, 87–88.

Marinis, Ousterhout 2015

Marinis V., Ousterhout R. 'Grant Us to Share a Place and Lot with Them.' Relics and the Byzantine Church Building, C. J. Hahn, H. A. Klein, eds., *Saints and sacred matter* (= Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine symposia and colloquia), Washington D.C., 153–172.

Márquez Gémar 2014

Márquez Gémar J., *Peregrinos Rusos en los siglos XII–XVI*, Málaga, 2014.

Müller 1986

Müller K., Die Pilgerreise des Dobrynja Jadrejkovič, *Itineraria rossica. Altrussische Wallfahrtsliteratur*, Leipzig, 100–124.

Özgümüş 2000

Özgümüş F., Peribleptos ('Sulu') monastery in Istanbul, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 93, 2000, 508–520.

Richter 1897

Richter J. P., ed., *Quellen der byzantinischen Kunstgeschichte. Ausgewählte Texte über die Kirchen, Klöster, Paläste, Staatsgebäude und andere Bauten von Konstantinopel* (= Quellenschriften für Kunstgeschichte und Kunsttechnik des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit N.F., 8), Wien, 1897.

Torres 2020

Torres M.-E., Echoes of Constantinople: Rewriting the Byzantine Soundscape in Travel Accounts, B. Stojkovski, ed., *Voyages and Travel Accounts in Historiography and Literature. Voyages and Travelogues from Antiquity to the Late Middle Ages*, Budapest, 2020, 193–213.

Vukovic 2015

Vukovic A., The Ritualisation of Political Power in Early Rus' (10th–12th centuries) (PhD thesis, Cambridge, 2015).

Белоброва 1974

Белоброва О. А., «Книга паломник» Антония Новгородского (К изучению текста), *Труды отдела древнерусской литературы*, 29, Ленинград, 1974, 178–185.

——— 1977

Белоброва О. А., О «Книге паломник» Антония Новгородского, З. В. Удальцова, отв. ред., *Византийские очерки. Труды советских ученых к XV Международному Конгрессу Византинистов*, Москва, 1977, 225–235.

Журавель 2021

Журавель А. Р., Кем и когда редактировался текст «Книги Паломник» Антония Новгородского? *Лингвистическое источниковедение и история русского языка. Труды Института русского языка им. В. В. Виноградова РАН*, 2021, 1, 116–141.

Конявская 2011

Конявская Е. Л., Византийская живопись и живописцы в «Паломнике» Антония Новгородского, П. А. Смирнов, А. А. Пауткин и др., отв. ред., *Литература древней Руси*, Москва, 2011, 44–57.

Лидов 2006

Лидов А. М., Антоний Новгородский. Описание святынь Константинополя, Idem, отв. ред., *Реликвии Византии и Древней Руси. Письменные источники*, Москва, 2006, 197–205.

———— 2009

Лидов А. М., Катапетасма Софии Константинопольской, Idem, *Иеротопия. Пространственые иконы и образы парадигмы в византийской культуре*, Москва, 2009, 209–223.

Лопарев 1899

Лопарев Хр. М., *Книга Паломник. Сказание мест святых во Цареграде Антония, архиепископа Новгородского в 1200 году* (= Православный Палестинский сборник, 17/3 (51)), С.-Петербург, 1899.

Савваитов 1872

Савваитов П. И., *Путешествие Новгородскаго архиепископа Антония в Царьград в конце 12-го столетия. С предисловием и примечаниями*, С.-Петербург, 1872.

Сперанский 1926

Сперанский М. Н., *Собрание рукописей И. Е. Забелина, Старая традиция*, Отчет Государственного Исторического Музея за 1916–1926 гг.. Приложение 2, Москва, 1926, 1–27.

Строев 1834

Строев П. М., Хронологическое указание материалов отечественной истории, литературы, правоведения, до начала XVIII столетия, *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения*, 1/2, 1834, 152–188.

References

Belobrova O. A., "Kniga palomnik" Antoniia Novgorodskogo (K izucheniiu teksta), *Trudy Otdela Drevnerusskoi Literatury*, 29, Leningrad, 1974, 178–185.

Belobrova O. A., O "Knige palomnik" Antoniia Novgorodskogo, Z. V. Udal′tsova, ed., *Vizantiiskie ocherki. Trudy sovetskikh uchenykh k XV Mezhdunarodnomu Kongressu Vizantinistov*, Moscow, 1977, 225–235.

Berger A., *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos* (= Poikila Byzantina, 8), Bonn, 1988.

Effenberger A., Zur „Reliquientopographie" von Konstantinopel in mittelbyzantinischer Zeit, *Millennium*, 12/1, 2015, 265–327.

Ehrhard M., trans., Le livre du Pèlerin d'Antoine de Novgorod, *Romania*, 58, 1932, 44–65.

Garzaniti M., Le Livre du Pèlerin d'Antoine de Novgorod: Constantinople dans le premier témoignage d'un récit de voyage russe, *Slavica Occitania*, 36, 2013, 25–45.

Janin R., *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin*, 1/3: *Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat œcuménique. Les églises et les monastères*, Paris, 1969.

Jouravel A., *Die ‚Kniga palomnik' des Antonij von Novgorod. Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (= Imagines Medii Aevi. Interdisziplinäre Beiträge zur Mittelalterforschung, 47), Wiesbaden, 2019.

Konyavskaya E. L., Vizantiiskaia zhivopis′ i zhivopistsy v «Palomnike» Antoniia Novgorodskogo, P. A. Smirnov, A. A. Pautkin et al., eds., *The Literature of Medieval Russia: a collective monograph*, Moscow, 2011, 44–57.

Lidov A. M., Antonii Novgorodskii. Opisanie sviatyn′ Konstantinopolia, Idem, ed., *Relics in Byzantium and Medieval Russia. Written sources*, Moscow, 2006, 197–205.

Lidov A. M., The Catapetasma of Hagia Sophia. Byzantine Installationa and an Image-Paradigm of the Temple Veil, Idem, *Hierotopy. Spatial Icons and Image. Paradigms in Byzantine Culture*, Moscow, 2009, 209–223.

Majeska G. P., *Russian travelers to Constantinople in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries* (= Dumbarton Oaks studies, 19), Washington DC, 1984.

Mango C. A., Where at Constantinople was the Monastery of Christos Pantepoptes? *Deltion of the Christian Archaeological Society, Periodos Delta. Stē mnēmē tou Dēmētriou I. Palla (1907–1995)*, 20, 1998, 87–88.

Marinis V., Ousterhout R. 'Grant Us to Share a Place and Lot with Them.' Relics and the Byzantine Church Building, C. J. Hahn, H. A. Klein, eds., *Saints and sacred matter* (= Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine symposia and colloquia), Washington D.C., 153–172.

Márquez Gémar J., *Peregrinos Rusos en los siglos XII-XVI*, Málaga, 2014.

Müller K., Die Pilgerreise des Dobrynja Jadrejkovič, *Itineraria rossica. Altrussische Wallfahrtsliteratur*, Leipzig, 1986, 100−124.

Özgümüş F., Peribleptos ('Sulu') monastery in Istanbul, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 93, 2000, 508−520.

Speranskii M. N., *Sobranie rukopisei I. E. Zabelina. Staraia traditsiia*, Otchet Gosudarstvennogo Istoricheskogo Muzeia za 1916−1926 gg. Prilozhenie 2, Moscow, 1926, 1−27.

Torres M.-E., Echoes of Constantinople: Rewriting the Byzantine Soundscape in Travel Accounts, B. Stojkovski, ed., *Voyages and Travel Accounts in Historiography and Literature. Voyages and Travelogues from Antiquity to the Late Middle Ages*, Budapest, 2020, 193−213.

Анна Журавель, PhD,
стипендиста „Александар фон Хумболт" фондације
у оквиру постдокторског програма „Феодор Линен"
Византолошки Институт
Српске академије наука и уметности (САНУ)
11 000, Београд, Кнеза Михаила 35
Србија / Сербия
jouravel.anna@googlemail.com