



Memory and Memoirs: The Past as a Foreign Country

Daniel C. Waugh

University of Washington,
Seattle, USA

Память и мемуары: прошлое как чужая страна

Даниэль Кларк Уо

Университет Вашингтона,
Сиэтл, США

Abstract

The posthumous publication of Iurii Dmitrievich Rykov's most important contributions to the study of the writings of Prince Andrei Kurbskii (including for the first time his kandidat dissertation) has inspired this essay as a tribute to Rykov, one of the leading specialists on early Russian manuscripts. Rather than focus on the substance of the Kurbskii material, the emphasis is on Rykov's own memoir in the book and more generally on memoirs as historical sources, among them ones written by the noted scholars S. V. Zhitomirskaiia and A. A. Zimin. Appended to the essay are a number of letters which Rykov wrote to his American colleagues.

Keywords

Iu. D. Rykov, A. A. Zimin, S. V. Zhitomirskaiia, E. L. Keenan, Prince A. M. Kurbskii, memoir, historiography, source study

Резюме

Посмертное издание важнейших исследований Ю. Д. Рыкова (включая и его неопубликованную кандидатскую диссертацию) о сочинениях кн. А. М. Курбского послужило поводом писать в память выдающегося специалиста в изучении древнерусских рукописей. Статья сосредоточится не на сложных вопросах о Курбском, а на анализе воспоминания Рыкова и источниковедческих

Citation: Waugh Daniel C. (2022) Memory and Memoirs: The Past as a Foreign Country. *Slověne*, vol. 11, № 1, p. 397–434.

Цитирование: Уо Д. К. Память и мемуары: прошлое как чужая страна // *Slověne*. 2021. Vol. 11, № 1. С. 397–434.

DOI: 10.31168/2305-6754.2021.11.1.18



This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

2022 №1 *Slověne*

вопросов о мемуарах, включая и воспоминания известных ученых С. В. Житомирской и А. А. Зиминой. В приложении опубликованы письма Рыкова американским коллегам.

Ключевые слова

Ю. Д. Рыков, А. А. Зимин, С. В. Житомирская, Э. Л. Кинан, кн. А. М. Курбский, воспоминания, историография, источниковедение

*to the memory of Iurii Dmitrievich Rykov
памяти Юрия Дмитриевича Рыкова*

The recent posthumous publication of Iurii Dmitrievich Rykov's *Kniaz' Kurbskii i oprichnina Ivana Groznoho* [Рыков 2021] underscores the importance of his early scholarship and serves as a stimulus to think about issues of memory and memoirs. In what follows, I will begin with some summary comments about the book and its author, but then transition to what really concerns me here: questions about how and how well we remember the past. I leave it to others to critique his work on Kurbskii, but I hope that this reflective essay will be an appropriate tribute to a respected colleague whose loss is deeply mourned. Had I not been inspired by this new book, I might not have gone into my personal archive, where, as I then discovered, there are a number of letters he wrote and which I append here. They illustrate his characteristic openness and generosity to colleagues and are connected in subject matter to his work on Kurbskii.

The news of Iurii Dmitrievich's death (an early victim of COVID-19, on 22 April 2020) indeed was a shock.¹ We had not stayed in touch over the last quarter century, and in that curious compression of time and memory, I had somehow imagined him as a still young scholar, one of whose publications I had in fact recently been using. Yet we were almost age-mates: by some curious coincidence, IuD and I were at formative stages in our education and careers at the same moment. I was born in 1941, he in 1946. When we met, but briefly, ere long ago in Moscow, he was working on his *kandidat* dissertation; I was completing my PhD. Neither of us had yet made much of a mark in the world of scholarship. We had a shared interest in the main subject of his book: the Muscovy of the 16th and 17th centuries, and more specifically, the writings generally attributed to Prince Andrei Kurbskii.²

¹ See the appreciative obituaries: [Дедук 2020, Филюшкин 2020]. They include references to a good many of his publications which I am not attempting to discuss here. I have not yet seen the Festschrift for Rykov published in 2021 [Сборник...Рыкову 2021].

² While working on my own dissertation, at the time I was also helping Edward L. Keenan (referred to here as ELK) with information about manuscripts which he could not

As he explains in his introductory memoir to this volume, “My Path to Prince Andrei Kurbskii” / «Мой путь к князю Андрею Курбскому» [Рыков 2021: 11–47], IuD’s first serious acquaintance with the subject came from reading Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Zimin’s *Oprichnina Ivana Groznogo*, a book that Sigurd Ottovich Shmidt had recommended to students in his introductory course at the Historical-Archival Institute (MGIAI, Московский государственный историко-архивный институт, now the Russian State University for the Humanities / Российский государственный гуманитарный университет). IuD describes his first meeting with AAZ at the latter’s apartment, a kind of “interview/exam” which would determine whether AAZ would agree to direct the aspiring scholar’s senior thesis and potentially the further study leading to the *kandidat* degree. In developing such an integrated program of training over several years, AAZ was hoping to prepare individuals who would have a solid basis for future careers as scholars. Not surprisingly, in suggesting topics to his potential students, he was choosing subjects about which he was particularly interested, a typical pattern in the way many dissertation advisers shape the work of their charges. The possible topics related to “source study” (*istochnikovedenie*), which was a long-standing concern of AAZ, at that moment engaged in defending his “heretical” views about the dating and authorship of the “Igor Tale” (Слово о полку Игореве). What we might assume hardly needs to be singled out as a “discipline” in itself (after all, don’t we all engage in source study as part of our work?), was treated as such in the curriculum of MGIAI. One of the topics he proposed was to study the manuscripts containing Kurbskii’s “History”, a project that in fact had never been thoroughly done despite the obvious interest in the text. This then became the focus of IuD’s dissertation work. The topic could combine the archaeological work, essential for establishing the “text”, with a particular focus on the *oprichnina*, about which the Kurbskii “History” contained important information.

Having finished his undergraduate degree, IuD began working in the manuscript division of the Lenin Library (GBL, Государственная библиотека имени В. И. Ленина, now RGB, Российская государственная библиотека); so he simultaneously embarked on his graduate studies in the “correspondence” (*zaochnyi*) division of MGIAI. He finished and defended his

examine personally as he was writing his controversial *The Kurbskii-Groznyi Apocrypha* [Keenan 1971]. I have no interest now in being drawn into the debates, especially since the scholarly consensus has rejected ELK’s hypotheses. I do refer to some of the more recent publications, in particular the work of K. Iu. Erusalimskii, who studied carefully Rykov’s work in the process of preparing his own publications of the Kurbskii material. However, for me to write in depth about this material would require a substantial investment of time and a degree of expertise on the textual issues which I never did have when involved in helping ELK.

dissertation on 27 May 1972.³ He was able to publish several articles from the study, reprinted in this book along with the complete, and previously unpublished dissertation. As Professor Vasiliĭ Vasil'evich Kalugin emphasizes in his introduction to this posthumous volume of IuD's work on Kurbskii, despite the substantial amount of subsequent research on the subject, that work of half a century ago "not only has not become obsolete but remains as some of the best in the field, in its study of the sources, the methodology, and in the depth of the scholarly analysis. The basic conclusions, observations and textological hypotheses of Iu. D. Rykov are as yet foundational" [Рыков 2021: 9].⁴

Over the years, the obligations of the work in GBL would hinder IuD in the pursuit of his personal scholarly interests. This obviously opened the way for others to produce some of the studies and publication of the Kurbskii oeuvre that, perhaps, he would have undertaken and for which he had laid the foundation. Clearly IuD's work established him as an expert on the material, which then opened the door for him to be invited to join the distinguished scholar Iakov Solomonovich Lur'e in producing a new edition (in 1979) of the Kurbskii-Ivan Groznyi "correspondence" in the venerable series *Literaturnye pamiatniki* [Переписка 1979].⁵ The volume contained the contributions of a pleiad of important scholars: Zimin, V. B. Kobrin, O. V. Tvorogov and D. S. Likhachev. IuD's dissertation work had prepared him to produce the critical texts of several of Kurbskii's letters and, with substantial revisions and updating, write the detailed archaeological descriptions of their manuscripts.

³ I had the opportunity to read IuD's senior thesis and later the *kandidat* dissertation summary (*avtoreferat*), a copy of which he signed on 6 June 1972 and gave me [Рыков 1972a]. However, I had not attended the defense. While in a letter to ELK dated 18 December 1971 I noted that "I have Rykov's dissertation in hand and will try to go through it by the beginning of next week" [Waugh 1995: 53], in retrospect I wonder whether that might not have been a reference to his *diplomnaia rabota*, not the *kandidat* dissertation, even though the latter presumably was already in a nearly completed draft by then. There is no reason to think that ELK ever saw more than the *avtoreferat*, my cryptic summaries of IuD's work, and the articles IuD eventually published. However, it appears that IuD sent ELK directly much more detailed information, if not the dissertation itself. They did correspond (see letter No. 3 below in my appendix). Cf. the contradictory statements by Erusalimskii [2009, 1, 313 n 362; 317 n 374 and esp. 328 n 427]. At one, he indicates it is not clear whether ELK ever saw (and in any event did not engage in) a discussion of IuD's textual arguments, but then he suggests that ELK and I had seen the full argumentation by IuD (including his dissertation), not just some condensed summary. In a letter to me dated 11 April 1972 [Waugh 1995: 58], ELK noted that he had recently read IuD's article on the redactions of the "History" [Рыков 1971].

⁴ «Она не только не устарела, но продолжает оставаться одной из лучших в данной области и по источниковедческой базе, и по методам исследования, и по глубине научного анализа. Основные выводы, наблюдения и текстологические построения Ю. Д. Рыкова до сих пор являются основополагающими».

⁵ There were subsequent, somewhat revised editions in 1981 (see № 15 in the appendix below) and 1993. The texts were also published, based on this edition, in [601]. IuD was invited to write the article on Kurbskii for the currently authoritative multi-volume Russian encyclopedia [Рыков 2016a].

When the same series (in 2015) produced what has to be considered for now the authoritative edition of the Kurbskii “History”, IuD was the “responsible editor” and wrote the introduction [Курбский 2015]. But the main work was that of Konstantin Iur’evich Erusalimskii, based on his own massive (two-volume) study of the “Kurbskii collections” that contained a new edition of their texts and archaeographic descriptions of the manuscripts whose detail went far beyond what IuD or anyone else was producing back in the 1970s [Ерусалимский 2009].⁶ Erusalimskii’s purview included not only the “History” but also the appended letters that form a part of the corpus known to us only from the late Muscovite manuscripts. While IuD had done textual analysis to support his classification of the manuscripts, Erusalimskii took that analysis farther, in addition to examining anew the manuscripts themselves. The result then was a refinement of IuD’s classification while still within the basic framework he had established. Whether this indeed is the last word on some of the textual issues is still an open question, as, in his memoir, while reviewing the publications on the Kurbskii material since his own dissertation work, IuD takes issue with some of Erusalimskii’s methodology [Рыков 2021: 42–44]. I am aware from private communications that even now there is some ongoing research which may result in publications defending some of Keenan’s hypotheses about the “History”.

This summary of IuD’s path to becoming a “Kurbskii expert” demonstrates that his mentor’s goals in preparing his students for successful careers were in this case very successfully met. In one of my precious and few meetings with AAZ, he pointed to various folders in which he accumulated writings and notes (his and others’) on subjects about which he had studied often long ago. His point was that scholarship is an ongoing process, constantly challenging us to consider new evidence and interpretations; so there is an obligation to keep track of what is new on the subjects about which one has written. Professor Kalugin’s encomium notwithstanding, it probably would be a fair judgment that much of what is in this posthumous volume of IuD’s early work has now been

⁶ Note his discussion [Ерусалимский 2009, 1: 350–354] of the methodological principles for proper codicological study, in which he devotes particular attention to the study of watermarks. One has to be impressed by attention he has given to even the smallest details in what ELK (and I) wrote as he engages the arguments while disagreeing with the main conclusions. None of the other critiques of ELK (least of all the numerous reviews published outside of Russia) show such attention to detail combined with equally impressive attention to the primary sources. This does not mean he has settled many of the key issues once and for all, and in fact he admits that some of the interesting questions, such as how the Kurbskii “collections” arrived in Russia, are still open. Erusalimskii has since published another massive contribution to kurbskiana [Ерусалимский 2018]. The book is part of a larger project on Russian elite emigres, thus providing a broader context for understanding Kurbskii’s own life than is found in most other studies. Erusalimskii provides his own detailed interpretations of evidence which contradicts ELK’s hypotheses. One of the volume’s distinctions is its substantial documentary appendices that make available new source material.

superseded. The publications for *Literaturnye pamiatniki* and Erusalimskii's recent studies, which carefully take into account IuD's contributions, certainly demonstrate that. In saying this, I am not questioning the importance of what IuD wrote. However, what we have here in this posthumous volume asks us to look backward, not ahead. It is first and foremost striking evidence about his development as a scholar, where the work he did at the start of his career was indeed groundbreaking. It is the evidence which gives substance to his introductory memoir. His career also then would include other significant contributions that have nothing to do with the Kurbskii material but were the product of the careful methodological training and on-the-job apprenticeship which IuD was fortunate to have.

By his own reckoning, his bibliography of scholarly publications numbered 227 items [Рыков 2013, Idem 2015]. Indeed, a good many of his most important publications relate to the Kurbskii material. But there is much else that he contributed, as he became (in AAZ's estimate), "the solid pillar which supported the group of early [book] specialists in the manuscript division of the Lenin Library" [Зимин 2015: 288].⁷ Much of his work there was devoted to the cataloging and description of manuscript collections, one of the priorities for Sarra Vladimirovna Zhitomirskaia, the long-time head of the manuscript division. The results for the substantial number of new acquisitions during her tenure appeared on a regular basis in the annual volumes of the *Zapiski Otdela rukopisei GBL* and in the three parts of the first of a planned five-volume guide to the manuscript collections which he helped compile and for which he was the responsible editor [Рукописные собрания ГБЛ 1983–1996].⁸ These volumes were never intended as full, scholarly descriptions but rather were conceived as urgently needed guides which could make the material accessible to scholars sooner than would otherwise have been the case. Presumably the same principles were involved in the planned description of the important manuscript collection of the Old Believer Egor Egorovich Egorov to which IuD. contributed.⁹ By his own reckoning, he described more than 1000 of the Egorov manuscripts. Very briefly in the mid-1990s, he served as the temporary head of the Manuscript Division of GBL [Рыков 2016a].

⁷ «Он [...] фактически является основным столпом, на котором держится группа древников в ОРГБЛ».

⁸ This project, along with most of the other important initiatives of Zhitomirskaia, was not continued after her forced retirement (on which, see below), even though the actual publication of the books post-dated her departure.

⁹ See [Анисимова 2017: 8–9], regarding the previous efforts to describe the collection, which proved problematic, prior to her compilation of a complete scholarly description of the first 300 numbers. Her three volumes have now been published, but it is not clear when or whether we might expect a completion of the project, given the fact that the collection contains 2073 volumes. For details about Egorov and his collection, she cites [Ibid.: 7], [Рыков 1986, Idem 2008].

To produce so many manuscript descriptions over a wide range of material required a mastery of all the “auxiliary disciplines” for early book codicology to which IuD had been introduced during his program at MGIAI. At the time he began work on his Kurbskii project and then was hired in GBL, the staff of the manuscript division still included senior specialists from whom he could acquire or polish the necessary skills. As his many contributions to the study of individual manuscript sources reveal, he became a recognized master in his profession, those skills contributing to important source publications of monastery archives, chronicles and other primary sources.

Memories and Memoirs

For outsiders such as this writer, memoirs by Russian colleagues are of special interest in helping us enter a world that we ourselves never experienced in our formative years. Moreover, the research and publication that many of us do benefits from knowing the challenges that our colleagues have faced in their own careers, a fact which often, I think, is insufficiently appreciated by my colleagues outside of Russia. It is all too easy to criticize published work without appreciating the difficult conditions in which it was written. When we read these memoirs, we are looking in a mirror that reflects much that is familiar in our personal and professional experience. Memoirs may reveal the role played by personal relations (good or bad) or institutional constraints which help us to appreciate the work that was printed and what was not, whether careers blossomed or withered, whether objective scholarship was possible. In this regard, it is instructive to read the comments in Marietta Chudakova’s introduction to her publication of the important memoir by S. V. Zhitomirskaiia [Чудакова 2006]. Chudakova emphasizes how important for the history of Russian culture in the Soviet period were individuals who managed somehow to preserve pre-revolutionary values of humanistic scholarship and objectivity in the face of the socialist homogenization being imposed by the new regime. Clearly these considerations are very relevant to our appreciation of Iurii Dmitrievich and Aleksandr Zimin.

Memoirs are to be savored, at the same time that they need to be subjected to the same kind of critical assessment (*istochnikovedcheskii analiz*) we insist is necessary for any historical source. We must try to understand why they were written at a particular time and with a particular purpose, why their author chose to include certain things but perhaps consciously omitted others. However much we may admire the author, can we trust what he or she says? In my teaching years ago, I would give my graduate students an exercise to read and evaluate memoirs, in order that they learn how some cannot be trusted, having been written with, say, a particular political purpose. Memoirs present a particular point of view, in some cases patently biased. But even if they are written

with honest intent to be objective, they may be as flawed as memory tends to be. After all, in many ways, “the past is a foreign country” which we can but imperfectly retrieve through the fogged lens of the present.¹⁰

Iuriii Dmitrievich planned this volume as a tribute to his mentor, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Zimin. IuD’s introductory memoir begins with family history, a subject whose importance for him is clear from his on-line blog in his last years, with its treasure trove of family photos. He recounts how he managed to overcome many obstacles in order, finally, to gain admission to MGIAI, the experience of studying there and finally becoming one of AAZ’s “Musketees”, as he dubbed his closest students. The memoir is colored with the rosy glow of nostalgia that is common when we think back on our earlier lives and how we arrived at where we are today. In many ways, his story surely is not atypical for those who have gained a higher education and entered intellectual circles at a remove from those of their early years. Even if growing up in the relative comfort of post-World War II America cannot be compared with growing up the post-war years in the USSR, in retrospect it is something of a miracle (to my mind), that a small-town boy being brought up by a single mother who worked part-time as a shop-clerk could go on to the educational institutions that I did. IuD suggests he was precocious at a young age (an early reader who would amaze the workers in the local dairy combine by reading to them from the newspapers). I may have been an early reader but have no memory of such an accomplishment. Unlike IuD though, I never had to enroll as an apprentice to become a metal worker after completing middle school, nor did I have to go out to a *sovkhos* to dig potatoes with other freshmen once in college. Granted, I relied on scholarship money in school, and to supplement it I had brief stints on a garbage truck and as a short-order cook and lifeguard at a hotel.... As IuD put it, on completing his senior thesis at MGIAI, “I myself had not expected that I, once a metal worker, might create a serious study which would receive high marks and subsequently become the foundation for a dissertation” [Рыков 2021: 27].¹¹

One relives in his memoir the exhilaration of having excelled in a difficult entrance exam to gain admission to MGIAI and the intellectual stimulation of the early course work. At the same time though, and this is something we shared, there were moments of self-doubt when thrown into the competitive environment of a rigorous institution of higher education. How much do I really know, is it enough, do I really belong here? For me, despite doing well in secondary school, it was something of a shock to discover in college that I was a very small fish in a large pond. I struggled, and in many ways I still

¹⁰ Here I would recommend the stimulating book by David Lowenthal [1985].

¹¹ «Я сам не ожидал, что я, вчерашний слесарь, могу создать серьезное исследование, которое будет высоко оценено и ляжет впоследствии в основу диссертации».

question whether I belong in the same company as my distinguished peers. For IuD, the important step in his becoming the scholar who produced the work in this book was his being able to study under the guidance of AAZ, but for that to happen required passing another kind of “exam”. With trepidation, IuD and his peers arrived at AAZ’s apartment on ul. Dmitriia Ul’ianova. The “test” they were given was to return a week later with a report on their reading of [Рыбаков 1964], presumably a book about which AAZ was very critical.¹² We never learn here his opinion or what the aspiring students said about the book, but obviously their reports received a passing grade. Did they anticipate what they thought AAZ wanted to hear? One really would like to know more about the very good relationship AAZ had with his students, although it is possible to read about it in various other memoirs that have appeared since his death in 1980.¹³

Once IuD had settled on his main subject for his undergraduate thesis (*diplomnaia rabota*) which he then would expand into his *kandidat* dissertation, even from the start he was sent to the manuscript division of the Lenin Library to begin describing and classifying the manuscripts. IuD notes that he had particular difficulty at first in analyzing the watermark evidence, and was helped by Valentina Grigor’ievna Zimina (AAZ’s wife), one of the senior scholars there, and by his fellow student at MGIAI, Evgeniia Platonovna Mamatova, who would also complete her degree under AAZ and then had a career in the library [Рыков 2021: 22].¹⁴ In reading this, I think of my own experience, never having had a course on palaeography (even though I had worked through I. D. Beliaev’s old manual) and knowing nothing much about watermarks when I first arrived in Leningrad in 1968. To my horror, I could hardly make out the quite regular 17th-century cursive in my first manuscript, GPB/RNB, Pogodin № 1558. As AAZ appreciated, one has to learn these essential skills by hands-on experience, which IuD began to acquire early in his professional education.

As a kind of amusing anecdotal aside here, I would note another of IuD’s memories which rang a bell with my experience [Рыков 2021: 24–25]. He emphasized how, once he had started to work on the manuscripts, he would spend every possible waking hour in the library. Later, when he went off to Lenin-

¹² For AAZ’s opinion of Rybakov, see [Зимин 2015: 193–205].

¹³ Note, for example, a good many of the essays in the volume published to commemorate AAZ’s 90th birthday [Историк 2012].

¹⁴ While this is hearsay, I also am indebted to Mamatova, who, I was told, translated an article I wrote in English about Soviet watermark study [Waugh 1970] so that it would be accessible to the scholars in GBL. Obviously it has had some impact in subsequent approaches to the study of watermarks for the codicological analysis of, e.g., the Kurbskii manuscripts [Ерусалимский 2009, 1: 351–352]. For AAZ’s warm appreciation of Mamatova, one of his students, see [Зимин 2015: 279; Федосеева 2012].

grad to work in the archives, every minute with the manuscripts was precious. At the Publichka (GPB/RNB), he encountered the obstacle of the limited size of its cloakroom. One could not work in the library without first hanging up one's overcoat at the entrance. So, to avoid having to wait in line, even in very cold weather IuD would make his way to the library with no coat, arriving there early and not having to wait in line so he could get to the manuscripts right away. I recall doing exactly the same thing in 1968–1969 and again in 1971–1972, spending long days with the manuscripts from the moment the library opened until I was thrown out at closing time in the evening.

At this point the memoir arrives at a more sensitive topic, the relationship between IuD's work on the Kurbskii material and that by Konstantin Andreevich Uvarov, who was writing on the same subject under the guidance of Andrei Nikolaevich Robinson in the Gor'kii Institute of World Literature / Институт мировой литературы имени А. М. Горького. My own observations at the time when working on the same manuscripts confirm the accuracy of what IuD tells us [Рыков 2021: 29–31].¹⁵ Uvarov would make claims about “discoveries” which in fact others had made or which he imagined without looking closely at the manuscripts. While I cannot confirm this by a comparison of texts, he also plagiarized much of his work from IuD's senior thesis. Such theses in Russia are serious scholarly work, in many cases really the equivalent of an MA thesis in the U.S.¹⁶ After IuD confronted Uvarov with the evidence and reported the situation to AAZ, the latter's response reveals how personal interactions and private negotiation are very much a part of the history about how scholarship is produced and published. In this case, AAZ had his student's best interests in mind, even if it may have meant accelerating the schedule for completion at some cost to the content of the work. AAZ negotiated a “compromise” with Robinson, whereby Uvarov withdrew his planned publication about the man-

¹⁵ IuD [Рыков 2021: 30] cites my correspondence with Keenan [Waugh 1995: 51, 53, 57, 63] in support of his case about Uvarov's failure to do any independent work on the manuscripts [Ерусалимский, 1: 303–304]. Erusalimskii [Ibid., 337, n. 18] indicates that the harsh criticism of Uvarov by IuD (and in what I wrote) is only partially justified, since Uvarov did develop some independent ideas about the Kurbskii corpus. Note though (letter № 4 in the appendix) that IuD recognized the importance of his reading carefully Uvarov's work beyond just the latter's manuscript descriptions. It is somewhat curious that evidence about what Uvarov did or got wrong in some cases comes from the comments he wrote on the lists of those who used the manuscripts, placed inside the covers by the archivists. In one case, my “counter-comment” to what Uvarov had written on such a sheet is cited as evidence [Курбский 2015, 298, n 47].

¹⁶ A seemingly minor point perhaps, but who first re-discovered in LOII/SPbII RAN the proof pages of what G. Z. Kuntsevich planned to publish as a second volume of his edition of the Kurbskii materials? The proofs include his manuscript descriptions and their classification, work that anticipated what IuD would then refine. Having learned of the proofs from AAZ (not S. O. Shmidt, as Uvarov claimed), IuD then was able to use them in his senior thesis in 1969 [Рыков 2021: 25]. See the careful note about this matter in Erusalimskii's commentary [Курбский 2015: 294–295, n 42].

uscripts, in order that IuD publish first and be the first to defend the dissertation. As it turned out, Uvarov violated the agreement, so that his article on the manuscripts appeared first [Уваров 1971]. IuD did defend first but subsequently never had any serious interaction with Uvarov [Рыков 2021: 36].¹⁷ Would IuD have written an *even better* dissertation, had *l'affaire* Uvarov not happened? We cannot know.

While the information in IuD's memoir would hardly surprise readers in Russia, for us outsiders, his account of the process by which the dissertation was approved for the defense to proceed is even somewhat amusing [Ibid.: 33]. It is colored with some choice adjectives (not repeated here) describing M. S. Seleznev, the deputy rector of MGIAI for scholarly work, a specialist on the Soviet period who was supposed to read and approve the completed dissertation in order for the defense to be scheduled. The conversation went as follows. S.: "Are Marx and Lenin there?" R.: "They are". S.: "Where? Show me." So IuD did. Then, S.: "Have you checked all the citations from Marx and Engels?" R.: "Yes". S.: "Here is some paper. Write an attestation that all the citations from the classics of Marxism-Leninism have been checked according to the second edition of the 'Works' of K. Marx and F. Engels and the fifth edition of the 'Complete Works' of V. I. Lenin". And so, IuD concludes "With this the interest in the dissertation's author was exhausted".¹⁸

What better to illustrate the realities whereby institutions were placed under the control of individuals who seem to have had no concern for the integrity of scholarship and whose primary function was to ensure at least the appearance of ideological conformity. Yes, one might cite the classics out of necessity, but that did not, of course, mean abandoning scholarly standards. After all, AAZ had to cite the classics too. I recall he even said to me once, undoubtedly with a certain amount of irony, that he was a Marxist historian. That he and his serious colleagues would cite the classics too often was highlighted in critical reviews of their work in the West as a substitute for any kind of serious analysis of how the authors had used their sources. At one's place of employment—this was the case with IuD—a scholar might have to be a member of the Communist Party. However, of itself that may tell us nothing about what a person actually believed, any more than attending Easter Sunday service is evidence that an individual is a good Christian.

¹⁷ For IuD's comments based on his first acquaintance with the avtoreferat of Uvarov's dissertation, see letter No. 4 in the appendix below.

¹⁸ «Он без обиняков задал вопрос: «Маркс, Ленин есть?». «Есть», — ответил я. «Где? Покажите!» Я открыл раздел библиографии со списком работ классиков марксизма. «Все цитаты из произведений Маркса и Энгельса сверены?», — опять строго спросил Селезнев. «Да», — подтвердил я. «Вот Вам бумага. Пишите расписку в том, что все цитаты из классиков марксизма-ленинизма сверены по второму изданию «Сочинений» К. Маркса и Ф. Энгельса и по пятому «Полного собрания сочинений» В. И. Ленина [...]. Этим интерес к диссертанту был исчерпан».

IuD recalls [Ibid.: 34] being very nervous during the defense, since the rector of MGIAI, S. I. Murashov, who was presiding, asked a loaded question, but one to which IuD did manage to answer satisfactorily. From there on, it was smooth sailing. In my personal experience (Harvard was an exception in this), I never had to defend my dissertation once it had been approved by my adviser—just hand in the finished copy by the deadline. However, I remember the absolute terror of the oral qualifying exams that were required in order to proceed to dissertation writing. I was in the presence of some of the most distinguished professors and felt I had done miserably. That I passed was a surprise and a huge relief.

Most of the rest of IuD's memoir is a review and critique of the publications on the Kurbskii material that appeared either just before or following his dissertation defense. Naturally one of the first which he discusses is Edward Keenan's heretical book and subsequent articles [Ibid.: 37–39]. IuD offers a summary defense of his scheme about the text genealogy of the Kurbskii "History", refuting Keenan's effort to "turn it upside down". In this discussion, curiously, IuD is silent about aspects of his personal connection with some of the first debates over the book and his own correspondence with ELK himself.

IuD surely would first have learned about the book from AAZ, to whom, at ELK's request, I had brought a copy of the page proofs in late 1971. Knowing AAZ's well documented critical approach to source study and aware of the controversy over the Igor' Tale, ELK hoped for a more sympathetic reading than he would get from other scholars. Keenan had been in correspondence with AAZ, who informed him in a letter, sent via another of the American graduate students in Moscow, not to expect a published review of the book but promised a detailed *otzyv* [Waugh 1995: 46]. A week after I had delivered the proofs to AAZ (in a very enjoyable long evening in his apartment when the discussion even touched on IuD's work) I then was invited to return on 18 December 1971 and instructed to take careful notes that would constitute that review, which I then dutifully sent on to Keenan [Ibid.: 47–51].¹⁹ Had I not written a long and detailed letter to Keenan immediately after the meeting, kept a copy, and subsequently published most of it, I would be hard pressed to

¹⁹ The American exchange students were allowed to use the U.S. embassy's secure mail service to send letters home, although I know from personal experience that, even if such letters escaped the eyes of Soviet censors, they were being read by the American officials before the envelopes were sealed and dispatched. Erusalimskii [2009, 1, 313, n 362], expresses surprise at the correspondence between Keenan and his Russian colleagues, including IuD, at a time when letters presumably were all being read by the censors and Keenan was a *persona non grata* in the eyes of the Soviet authorities. Yet a lot of open correspondence through the regular mails was going on, with no overt signs that it was being interdicted. Perhaps discussions of old Russian manuscripts and texts were not perceived as endangering national security, or perhaps it was useful to be able to monitor such contacts, just in case the evidence could have served some purpose in the future.

reconstruct the events from memory today. That meeting, at which IuD had been invited to be present, surely would have left him a vivid memory, since the subject being discussed was so central to his own work. In fact in 1981, IuD did recall how AAZ had greeted me [see letter № 15 in the appendix below]. Yet there is no mention of the event in this current memoir of IuD's path to Kurbskii.

When I wrote ELK, apart from transmitting (I hope accurately) AAZ's critique, I also devoted some space to commenting on IuD and his work, with, to my embarrassment today, a passing comment suggesting I was dubious of its quality. (I was very opinionated, it seems.) Yet, until the stimulus of receiving [РЫКОВ 2021], I had totally forgotten how much interaction we seem to have had apart from that one encounter. I cannot document specific meetings, but it came as a surprise to find in my personal archive the letters and cards which he sent me over roughly the next decade and which I had not looked at in all the years since.²⁰ So memory is a fragile thing. An omission in a memoir may be unconscious or deliberate. In this case, IuD's silence about that personal experience and the fact of his correspondence with me and Keenan likely was deliberate. Even in the more open times of the early 21st century, it may have made sense to put some distance between him and Keenan's heresy. That he generously shared information with us was characteristic for who he was: all who interacted with him over the years were impressed by his lack of pretense and willingness to help others with what he knew.

It is easy to understand why this particular memoir by IuD, part of a tribute to AAZ, focuses rather narrowly on the author's education to become a Kurbskii expert. However, there is precious little here to tell us about IuD's long and productive career. He worked for close to four decades in the Lenin Library, in the process becoming a senior expert there on early manuscript holdings. In his few letters to me he mentions but in passing how his obligations at work were preventing him from pursuing his own scholarly interests. Would it not be nice to know more about that employment? In fact, he does tell us more in what I would term "memoir-like" writings not included in this book, and provides leads to others' memoirs which help us to understand the

²⁰ I must have talked with him during the Zimin memorial readings in Moscow in May 1990, since we were both on the program, but again I have no recollection of such a conversation. That was my first visit to the hallowed halls of MGIAI, about which IuD so warmly writes. Never comfortable in crowds, I do remember feeling quite nervous, intimidated in the presence of so many important Russian scholars, and trying to remember the *imia i ochestvo* of those whom I had never met and with whose work, they might have assumed, I should have been familiar. IuD's paper at the conference [summarized as РЫКОВ 1990] would seem to suggest that in the reconstruction of the contents of the Stroganovs' library in [Мудрова 2015], he deserves explicit credit for identifying some of the Stroganovs' books. She fails to mention him by name and does not cite that paper.

context in which he tried to balance work and other obligations.²¹ This part of his story is worth exploring here, even if it takes us beyond the bounds of his Kurbskii book.

When IuD first was employed in the manuscript division of GBL, it was still directed by a remarkable scholar, Sarra Vladimirovna Zhitomirskaia, who in her early education had studied the Italian Renaissance but then in the early 1950s was hired to work in the GBL manuscript division, at the time headed by the accomplished historian Petr Andreevich Zaionchnovskii.²² He soon moved on to another job, and, to her surprise, she succeeded him. She continued as head of the division until forced to resign in late 1976. During her tenure, she was instrumental in making the holdings more accessible to users through the retrospective publication of collection descriptions, and she did a great deal to expand acquisitions, with members of her staff even beginning archaeographic expeditions to collect old manuscripts in remote villages. To accomplish all this placed a huge burden on her professional staff, as there was barely enough time to record new acquisitions, much less catch up on the backlog of describing and organizing what was already in the collection. It was to assist in this work that IuD was hired. I can attest from personal experience that in the late 1960s and beginning of the 1970s, the manuscript division of GBL was one of the best places to do research, attentive to the needs of its patrons.

However, all this was about to change in the political and ideological environment of the 1970s, as one can learn in sometimes excruciating detail from Zhitomirskaia's posthumously published memoir.²³ To put it in simple terms, ideologically inspired careerists, some apparently animated in part by antisemitism (Zhitomirskaia was from a Jewish family), managed to oust her, with the result being, in her terms, the "destruction" of the manuscript division as she had known and directed it. Over several years, she and others of the old, well-trained professional staff were shown the door. Political directives about restricting access to archives and manuscripts were reinforced by the newly appointed administrators, and already by 1977 (as I know from what one of Keenan's graduate students reported from Moscow), it had become difficult to obtain access to manuscript material or expect to obtain copies of it.²⁴

²¹ For his own story, see [Рыков 2016a], much of which is developed further in his memoir about his road to Kurbskii, and [Рыков 2016b].

²² In what follows here, I am relying on [Житомирская 2006].

²³ See the long section [Ibid.: 383f], entitled «История гибели отдела рукописей». I would stress that her memoir is not just focused narrowly on the issues at work, but contains a lot of compelling personal stories, including how she was so thrilled, when, as a mature scholar, she finally made it to Italy in 1964 for a conference and the opportunity to visit Florence, which had been the focus of her very early academic work [Ibid.: 318].

²⁴ Unpublished letter of ELK to DCW, 7 May 1977, Waugh archive [Житомирская 2006: 424].

In retrospect, I had been blessed during my research there only a few years earlier. Among the trumped-up accusations against Zhitomirskaja and her closest colleagues was the claim that they had given foreign scholars access to unpublished material that then was printed in the west to discredit the USSR.

One might argue that Zhitomirskaja's memoir about all this is one-sided and self-serving. It is certainly an *apologia pro vita sua*, but one that is extensively documented and persuasive, in part because as a good scholar, she is also very careful to note the limits of what she knew and how she knew it. Our purpose here is not to plumb the depths of what happened but rather to try to understand how the events might have affected IuD's career. Those who knew him well admired the fact that he was self-effacing, never one to push himself in the limelight, easy to like. Certainly the few letters I have from him reinforce that characterization. So one can imagine he would have kept his head low as the saga with Zhitomirskaja unfolded and would have focused just on doing his work well, even if acutely aware of what was going on. After all, one of his senior colleagues on the staff of the manuscript division was none other than Valentina Grigor'evna Zimina, and IuD remained close to AAZ even well after his mentor had ceased to spend any significant time himself on the manuscripts. There were already indications Zimina would be targeted for dismissal. IuD's name first comes up in Zhitomirskaja's memoir only in passing comments about his as yet being too junior to be considered for the leadership of the early manuscript group within the department [Житомирская 2006: 408, 425]. When writing me, IuD avoided even hinting at problems at work (other than the fact there was too much of it), and after July 1976, some months before Zhitomirskaja was replaced, he had ceased to send me specific information about manuscripts. One explanation could be that he sensed I had moved on to other subjects, but it is reasonable to hypothesize that the threats to those who might assist foreign researchers were a good reason to cease doing so.

The situation in the manuscript division in the 1980s continued to deteriorate. We learn from Zhitomirskaja that in the spring of 1987, IuD had managed to block a planned appointment of an unqualified individual to work on the old manuscript collections [Ibid.: 483]. Later in the year presumably he was one of the staff members who wrote to those in authority protesting the firing of some of their colleagues. The response was a sharply worded denunciation that began: "We are tired of the anarchism and demagoguery of Iu. D. Rykov, N. B. Tikhomirov [...]" and others, and demanded that "strong measures be undertaken to stop the antisocial activity of the abovementioned group" [Ibid.: 492].²⁵ In mid-January 1988, 23 of the staff members, IuD among them and

²⁵ «Нам надоели анархизм и демагогия Ю. Д. Рыкова, Н. Б. Тихомирова [...] Наша убедительная просьба: принять строгие меры по пресечению антиобщественной деятельности упомянутой группы [...]».

including some of the more recently appointed ones, sent a protest letter to the local Communist Party cell in the library and copied it to a deputy minister of the interior, the complaint regarding the secrecy in the selection process that was underway to appoint a new head of the manuscript division. The fires were further inflamed by publication of letters signed by distinguished scholars that supported the concerned staff. In May, the targets of the protest demanded that Rykov and several of his like-minded colleagues be fired. The outcome merely awaited a recommendation by the Party organization, which came on 10 June: “For slanderous accusations addressed at comrades at work and for ignoring the decisions of the Party organization [...] the Communist Iu. D. Rykov is to be given a stern reprimand” [Ibid.: 506].²⁶ That recommendation passed with a majority vote, whereas the committee was evenly split on the recommendation that 6 of his colleagues be summarily dismissed.

So, what might we learn from this? By now IuD was a respected and senior specialist, possibly better liked personally than were some of his colleagues and not perceived as having been the instigator of the protests. Perhaps too, his “lighter sentence” was because his work was indispensable. The first volumes of the survey of the manuscript holdings, for which he had written much and was the editor, still had not all appeared [Рукописные собрания ГБЛ 1983–1996]. In 1990 he compiled a brief guide for non-experts to use in the evaluation and description of manuscripts [Рыков 1990a]. In his positive review of the book, A. A. Turilov [1992: 247] emphasized, “It is nice to note that the author of these recommendations is a person for whom the expertise and scholarly description of manuscript books has been a subject of daily work over many years. Behind these recommendations is clearly evident considerable practical experience.” He went on to praise the book for its “accessible language, lacking scholarly jargon which too often obscures the meaning of that which should be crystal clear (especially taking into account that the intended user as a rule is a person with limited practical experience in the subject)”.²⁷

So Rykov survived the purge of the late ‘80s. However, one of those in the hierarchy whom he had offended would later take his revenge. In his later account about how that happened, what we might call part 2 of his *apologia pro vita sua* (the first part being his road to Kurbskii), IuD pulled no punches

²⁶ «За клеветнические обвинения в адрес товарищей по работе, игнорирование решений парторганизации [...] коммунисту Ю. Д. Рыкову объявить строгий выговор».

²⁷ «Приятно отметить, что автором рекомендаций является человек, для которого экспертиза и научное описание рукописных книг — предмет каждодневной многолетней работы, за рекомендациями отчетливо виден большой практический опыт. Рекомендации [...] изложены доступным языком без излишнего наукообразия, нередко затемняющего смысл того, что должно быть предельно ясным (особенно учитывая, что адресат, как правило, человек с небольшим практическим опытом в данной области)».

[Рыков 2016б]. However, he did not dwell on the events of the late 1970s and 1980s; rather, he sent readers to Zhitomirskaiia's memoir for the details. What mattered in 2016 was to write in his blog about how, after nearly four decades in the service of the library, he was pushed out the door, just as Zhitomirskaiia had been, if for perhaps slightly different reasons. One of the issues that continued to affect the manuscript division was re-structuring of functions and departments within the library. IuD had moved from the manuscript division into a new department that focused on research, which seems to have been satisfactory until the decision was made to abolish it, supposedly in the interest of "optimization" of RGB, whatever that obfuscation is supposed to mean. His application then for an opening to return to the manuscript division, was rejected by its then head, one of the bureaucrats whom he had managed to offend back in the 1980s. Fortunately for IuD, he was able to finish his professional career in a position at RGADA.

In reflecting on the above, I keep wondering how much I can trust any memoirs, when my own memory regarding IuD is so flawed.²⁸ What I can reconstruct about him, a tribute that is not exactly a memoir, relies for the most part on his and others' memoirs and a few letters written long ago. Closer as they are to the events, the letters are probably the most reliable witnesses, but even they, like memoirs, may provide only a one-dimensional picture of something much more complex. After all, I brought to my work in Russia more than half a century ago the biases of my own education. In letters to my mentor then presumably I was writing what he might most want to hear. In his letters to me, as in the account of his path to Kurbskii, IuD never engages in discussion of controversial issues, the one exception being the affair with Uvarov. However objective, immediate impressions that say little and are silent about much may, of course, be no better witnesses than reflections written down after some lapse of time. Understandably a passionate memoir may be more suspect than a dispassionate letter. Yet the "washing of dirty linen" in public, which often is decried, may be justified and trusted to reveal facts about situations and people that can be confirmed from other evidence.

To remember Iurii Dmitrievich is also to remember his mentor, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Zimin, for in a way, IuD's book is also his mentor's book. IuD only occasionally cites AAZ's own memoir, *Khram nauki* [Зимин 2015], mainly for some positive sentiment about his students, whom AAS tended to remember much more warmly than he did many of his colleagues.²⁹ Yet to read it

²⁸ It is not as though I have no memories about my experiences when studying in Russia back then. On the contrary, but what I think I remember well is very selective, in particular focusing naturally on events that directly affected me [Waugh 2014].

²⁹ In his conscious effort to emphasize the positive and honor his mentor, IuD even seems in one case to have deliberately mis-read [Зимин 2015]. AAZ, as was his wont, took great relish in cutting Vladimir Terent'evich Pashuto down to size and

inescapably deepens our appreciation of the circumstances within which IuD was able to achieve his educational goals and embark on a career embodying the values of an older generation of distinguished scholars. A proper discussion of AAZ's memoir may have to await a future generation, given the controversy that arose at its publication. But a few comments here are appropriate in my conclusion. AAZ is passionate in his judgments. He paints his portraits of colleagues in evocative word-pictures that are almost too cleverly contrived, probably reflecting the influence of his reading of the great historian Vasilii Osipovich Kliuchevskii, who was famous for his verbal portraits of the heroes of Russian history and for his aphorisms, which AAZ helped compile and publish [Ключевский 1968]. Arguably *Khram nauki* represents not only a general reflection late in life about many of the worst aspects of how the Soviet historical profession suffered but more specifically is a deliberate indictment at least in part aimed at those who either actively attacked AAZ or failed to support him during the controversy over the Igor' Tale. He never hesitated to use that criterion as a standard for determining who wore the white hats and who did not. If there are heroes here, it is those who fought to maintain the scholarly standards of an earlier era and did not simply succumb to the temptations of compromise and careerism.

Can we trust such a memoir any more than we can trust S. V. Zhitomirskaia's or Iurii Dmitrievich's rather bitter accounts, less clothed in literary artifice, of how they were unfairly treated and their life's work relegated, at least in the minds of the regime's officials, to the dustbin of history? At this distance, I cannot be scandalized in the way some might still be when AAZ's dart hits closer to their home. However, if I were confronted with a choice, I would prefer to read his yet unpublished correspondence with his dear colleague Iakov Solomonovich Lur'e to learn more about the Russian historical profession in the middle of the 20th century. Alas I never expect to see it: prepared for publication, those letters must languish inaccessible in the archives, lacking permission from his heirs that they become public.³⁰ Even were we to

only somewhat grudgingly manages to say something positive about his colleague's work. In conclusion he states: "Our relations with Pashuto on the surface were always friendly" ('Sasha, you devil', 'Volodka'). Brothers at arms" / «Наши отношения с Пашуто внешне всегда были приятельскими («Сашка черт», «Володька»). Братья по оружию» [Ibid.: 231, emphasis mine]. But IuD chooses to ignore the pages of sarcastic and damning comment, and when writing about the Zimin Festschrift which, as eventually published, omitted any indication it was honoring AAZ [Россия 1982], merely notes: "The collection of essays was prepared by a group of historians headed by V. T. Pashuto, whom A. A. Zimin deemed his long-time friend and 'brother at arms'" / «Сборник готовился группой историков во главе с В. Т. Пашуто, которого А. А. Зимин считал своим давним приятелем и «братом по оружию»» [Рыков 2021: 45].

³⁰ Since his death, a good many of AAZ's letters to colleagues and former students of his have been published or summarized, e.g., in several of the essays in [Историк 2012].

have them, as vivid testimony to their time in the way that a memoir, written with hindsight, cannot be, of course we might still be wanting for a guide to the foreign country of the past.

With *Khram nauki*, I find myself nodding with approval when I read passages that seem to confirm my opinion of someone, at the same time that I know, at least in some of AAZ's comments on colleagues outside of Russia (his knowledge there obviously was limited), that he makes mistakes in details. I am glad we have the book, which draws me into trusting his perceptions about people.³¹ His characterization of IuD seems remarkably accurate: "He has no love for wild fantasies, he is a down-to-earth person, who loves the substantial quality of concrete sources. At least on the surface, he [...] keeps his composure in difficult situations in life [...] He is a modest man, yet maintains a sense of self-respect" [Зимин 2015: 288].³²

Appendix: Letters of Iu. D. Rykov

Iurii Dmitrievich and I corresponded for at least a decade beginning soon after I had returned from the USSR in 1972 and started teaching at the University of Washington. Generally we exchanged New Year's wishes, his messages in few cases being merely cards with a brief handwritten greeting for the year ahead (I have not copied those here). Sometimes there would be an added sentence or two. However, in most cases when he wrote, the letters contained some real substance about the scholarly material on which we both worked. The letters indicate that we exchanged publications, and he generously went out of his way to obtain for me books I requested or which otherwise he assumed would interest me. In some cases, he sent information on topics that he knew were of particular interest to me even if I had not asked about them. I have

He was very careful to guard his correspondence with Iakov Solomonovich, much of it written in the kind of "Aesopian language" that Russian intellectuals historically used to confound the censors, in this case the functionaries who might open the letters. In a discussion of ELK's book, AAZ showed me one of his exchanges with Lur'e but would not let me copy the letters.

³¹ Regarding AAZ's ability quickly to size up individuals, Zhitomirskaja recounts, how he but passed Liudmila Vladimirovna Tiganova in the hall of the manuscript division and then posed the question to Valentina Grigor'evna: "What sort of a beast with the eyes of a murderer has appeared here among you?" / «Что это за красота с глазами убищи появилась у вас?» [Житомирская 2006: 406]. Zhitomirskaja's point was that he sensed immediately how dangerous Tiganova might be, as then proved to be the case when she emerged as the evil genius stepping on the bodies of her rivals to gain control of the manuscript division.

³² «В нем нет любви к пламенным фантазиям, он земной человек, любящий добротный материал конкретных памятников. Он [...] во всяком случае внешне сохраняет спокойствие в сложных житейских ситуациях [...] Человек он скромный, но сохраняющий чувство собственно достоинства».

no copies of the letters I wrote him, but presumably they may be found in his personal archive. It is clear from what he wrote me and from references in ELK's published work, that IuD corresponded with him. I include below the one letter of his to ELK, which I happen to have, since ELK copied it to me, wondering what I made of the information in it.

Even though there is a certain level of formality, the warm and generous spirit with which Iurii Dmitrievich wrote comes out very clearly. That he was willing to provide information about manuscripts and, according to ELK, copy some portions of texts for him, in no way indicates IuD subscribed to the American professor's skepticism about the Kurbskii material. This clearly was a correspondence in the best spirit of collegial relations, where there was trust in the exchange of information, not any kind of rivalry or one-upmanship. That the correspondents might disagree in their conclusions was no obstacle to such exchange. ELK made it clear that he was very much indebted to Iurii Dmitrievich for the information and text excerpts which the latter had provided.

After the last of his New Year's greetings in 1982, I have no more letters from IuD, though in 1985 he sent me a copy of *ZOR* containing one of his articles [see below n. 69]. One can but guess why my correspondence with IuD did not continue. Of course by the 1980s I had long ago moved away from any involvement with Kurbskii (my editing of my correspondence with Keenan is an exception [Waugh 1995], but that did not involve new research). IuD himself had for a long time been unable to work further on the material; in a sense, his contribution to the publication of the Kurbskii-Groznyi letters in 1979 marked kind of a high water in what he would himself write on the subject. We both were preoccupied other priorities, though we obviously still shared a strong interest in the codicology of manuscripts. As suggested already, it is possible that the difficult situation in GBL, where there were politically inspired accusations about too much openness concerning the use of collections in the manuscript division, and, worse, the sharing of manuscript material with foreigners, made it somewhat risky for him to continue to write.

* * *

№ 1

Москва, 6 ноября 1972 г.

Любезный Даниель!

Получил с оказией книгу Э. Кинена, за что спешу принести Вам искреннюю глубокую признательность³³.

³³ Keenan 1971 was in page proof at the time I returned to the USSR in September 1971; I had a copy of the proofs with me to circulate to Russian specialists for their comments. When the book actually appeared in print, Keenan sent numerous copies directly and

Коротко о своем житье-бытье.

По-прежнему тружусь в отделе рукописей ГБЛ, где занимаюсь описанием рукописных книг из собрания Е. Е. Егорова³⁴. Написал статью для «Исторических записок» о степени достоверности известий А. М. Курбского о событиях «великого гонения» в России³⁵. В свободное от службы и личных дел время начал заниматься подготовкой текста компиляции к изданию³⁶. Дело идет очень медленно. Впрочем, не исключено, что данный текст, подготовленный уже К. А. Уваровым к печати, лежит в каком-нибудь издательстве и ждет своего выхода в свет.

Желаю Вам, дорогой коллега, больших успехов в научной и преподавательской деятельности.

А. А. Зимин наказал кланяться Вам.

С глубоким уважением

Ю. Рыков

№ 2

Москва, 24.11.1972 г.

Многоуважаемый Даниель!

Александр Александрович сообщил мне, что проф. Э. Кинен работает в настоящее время над новой книгой, в которой соотношение Полной и Компилятивной редакций «Истории» рассматривает иначе, чем я³⁷.

В этой связи считаю своим прямым долгом сообщить Вам об ошибках, допущенных в моих рукописных заметках, касающихся сборника № 42 из собрания К. И. Невоструева (эти заметки я показывал Вам в ГБЛ)³⁸.

via me to give to scholars and libraries, though our correspondence suggests that many of them never arrived. I sent Iu.D, a copy after returning to the U.S. at the end of spring 1972.

³⁴ On his work with the Egorov collection, see above n. 9.

³⁵ [Рыков 1974], an offprint of which he later sent me (see № 7).

³⁶ This reference is unclear. If he was in fact preparing the text of what he termed the *Kompilativnaia redaksiia* of the Kurbskii "History", to the best of my knowledge, he never did publish it, nor did Uvarov. However, he may have sent a copy of the text to ELK. See n. 38.

³⁷ While ELK was working on the Kurbskii material, he had a rather extensive correspondence with AAZ and Ia. S. Lur'e. ELK indeed was planning to write a book on the Kurbskii "History" and did a considerable amount of work on the texts and what he argued were their sources. However, he never completed a book-length manuscript, since his many obligations at work and other matters occupied much of his time. His most substantial published work on the "History" is Keenan 1978.

³⁸ Having learned from AAZ about ELK's work on the "History", Iu.D then began to correspond with ELK directly (see № 3). However, it is not clear he ever attempted to argue with ELK about the latter's hypotheses; rather, he seems to have been satisfied to provide information on manuscripts and copy some portions of unpublished texts. His focus on issues of dating and watermarks in writing me presumably was a reflection of the fact that my main contribution to Keenan 1971 had been about the manuscripts, not any of the textual analysis. This letter assumes I would pass the information along to ELK.

На лл. 141–147 находится Соборное деяние патриарха Адриана по поводу священнодействий новгородского дьячка Юшки Микляева (Михеева), а не послание с увещаниями.

Послание патриарха Никона 7074 г. адресовано константинопольскому патриарху Дионисию, а не иерусалимскому (ошибка составителя оглавления сборника).

На листах невоструевского списка компиляции помещены филигранные гербы двух типов: герб 7 провинций (малый) с контрамаркой IG неустановленного типа и герб 7 провинций (малый) с курсивными литерами AI под кругом и контрамаркой CDG (Клепиков, № 943 = 1691, 1711 гг.). В заметках моих (и в статье) водяной знак указан по ошибке как № 941 по справочнику Клепикова.

Сообщаю Вам также другие филигранные невоструевского сборника, помимо указанных выше: Клепиков — Амстердам, № 129 = 1670–1720 гг., № 143 = 1675–1693 гг.; № 252 = 1669–1740 гг.; Клепиков — Голова шута, № 93А — 1698 г.; герб Амстердама с контрамаркой IVI, герб Амстердама с курсивными литерами IB под щитом и контрамаркой PDB и др.

Советую Вам, Даниель, обратить внимание Кинена на завещательную запись в сборнике. Не по распоряжению ли патриарха Адриана сделана эта запись (в марте 1697 г. он составил духовное завещание, а в 1686–1690 гг. был митрополитом казанским и свияжским)? О завещании его см. работу Г. А. Скворцова «Патриарх Адриан, его жизнь и труды в связи с состоянием русской церкви в последнее десятилетие XVII века», изданную в 1913 г. в Казани (стр. 330–332, 356).

С лучшими пожеланиями

Ю. РЫКОВ

№ 3³⁹

Москва, 20 янв. 1973 г.

Уважаемый г-н Кинан!

Спешу принести Вам признательность за сообщение в основных чертах Вашей концепции о происхождении текста «Истории» кн. Курбского.

³⁹ ELK wrote me a long letter on 15 February 1973 in which he devoted only a single paragraph to the “History”, beginning by saying “I rarely get time now to do anything with the Istoriia [...] [T]hings did not really fall into place until Rykov came up with that “kompilativnaia redaktsiia” for which eternal thanks to him – and to you” [ELK to DCW, unpublished, Waugh archive]. He appended some of his textual comparisons and several pages in Russian from a letter he had written to Ia. S. Lur’e. In addition, he sent me a copy of this letter from IuD, merely characterizing it as “odd” and wondering what I thought about it. IuD’s letter indicates he had seen a copy of ELK’s detailed letter to Lur’e that laid out some of the main arguments Keenan was developing about the textual relationships of the various versions of the history. Yet apart from sending ELK small corrections, IuD deliberately avoided arguing here about the really important issues.

Вы пишете (в письме к Я. С. Лурье), что пространный текст «И» Курбского «покрывается» 4-мя основными источниками: 1) Комп. ред., 2) Скиф. историей А. Лызлова, 3) «Нов. Маргаритом», 4) Летописным текстом, близким к Лебедевской летописи, т. е. Вы признаете первичность Комп. ред. по сравнению с Полной. Согласно Вашей рабочей гипотезе, автор Комп. ред. надо искать «в группе «литераторов» Чудова мон. 1670-х гг. (а м. б. и Типографии?)». Стало быть (я домысливаю), Комп. ред. появилась не позднее 1677 г., когда сб. соч. Курбского (или сб-ки?) писался в дому кн. В. В. Голицына.

Мне также теперь кажется, что списки Син. 483 и Нев. 42 вышли из среды духовенства из кругов близких к справщикам Печатного двора. Об этом однажды вскользь я говорил Даниелю в бытность его в Москве. Помимо литературного окружения комп. списков в составе сб-ков (произведения и переводы Евфимия Чудовского, церковные сочинения, греч. тексты в Сб. Син. 483 и пр.), за это, вероятно, говорят употребление греч. слова «βαπτειον» в тексте компиляции (Син. 483, л. 820об.; Нев. 42, л. 225), транслитерация слова «проклят» лат. буквами (Син. 483, л. 223об.; Нев. 42, л. 227 об.). В списке F.XVII.11 все это устранено. Возможно, наличие этих слов в ранних списках есть рез-т «баловства» справщиков, знавших греч. и лат. языки. В списках Пол. ред., обследованных мною, подобных вещей не имеется.

Соборное деяние насчет священнодействий Юшки Микляева (Михеева) было, по данным иеромон. Амвросия, ок. 1698 г. (Ист. рос. иерархии, т. 1. М., 1807, стр. 272).

Сб. Син. 483 писан разными почерками и вообще представляет собой составную ркп. Кстати, сб. Нев. 42 — тоже.

Я не знаю, какие у Вас есть основания считать, что один из списков Комп. ред. писан рукой самого Евфимия.

В лит-ре есть указание на то, что большую часть ркп. Син. 483 занимает автограф Евфимия (См. И. Н. Лебедева. Поздние греч. хроники и их рус. и вост. переводы — Палестинский сб., вып. 18 (81). Л., 1968, стр. 109), но не всю.

М.б., над идентификацией почерков работал спец-но Даниель?

Что касается меня, то я не занимался сличением почерков комп. списков с автографами Евфимия. Всем этим, конечно, надо заняться в будущем. К сожалению, у меня теперь мало возможностей: служба есть служба, а ГИМ раотает до 16 часов.

Хочу заметить, что моск. список «Нов. Маргирита» в переводе Курбского находится не в собр. Уварова — как Вы указываете в письме к Я. С. Лурье — а в собр. Ундольского.

Заключая письмо, сердечно Вас благодарю, г-н Кинан, за высказанные по моему адресу добрые пожелания в новом 1973 г. Я также Вам желаю всего лучшего.

С московским приветом

Ю. Рыков

№ 4

8 марта 1973 г.
Москва.

Достоуважаемый коллега Даниель!

Получил от Вас письмо и, не откладывая дела в долгий ящик, отвечаю.

Ваши просьбы по мере своих возможностей и сил постараюсь выполнить⁴⁰.

В ГИМ мне выбраться не так просто: связан службой, а ГИМ работает до 16 часов. Но «лазейку» найду.

20 и 26 выпуски «Записок отдела рукописей», 1 том описания Муз. соб. и книга Клепикова по филиграням и штемпелям давно уже стали библиографической редкостью. Вы правильно пишете о том, что эти старые издания маловероятно обнаружить у букинистов. Кстати, я справлялся уже в ряде магазинов, и ответ был везде неутешительный: нет и не было.

Думаю, что есть другой путь, более надежный. Вам нужно написать в отдел международного книгообмена Б. П. Наневскому. Этот отдел имеется в ГБЛ. Полагаю, что здесь больше возможностей.

Что же касается 2 дополнительной части к описанию Синод. соб., то как только она выйдет в свет, я ее приобрету для Вас.

С. В. Житомирской я передал Ваше намерение писать ей в ближайшее время⁴¹. Она сказала, что так и думала, что дело будет значительно дороже, чем Вы ей говорили.

Хочу сообщить Вам новость: 20 числа в ИМЛИ состоится защита диссертации К. А. Уварова на тему: «Князь А. М. Курбский — писатель». С авторефератом диссертации я ознакомился в ГБЛ⁴².

С сущностью взглядов Уварова Вы имели возможность познакомиться через его тезисы, как я Вам показывал.

Уваров считает, что сборник соч. Курбского был «построен» в Посол. приказе, а сама «И.»⁴³ появилась в связи с интересом к ней (!) ц. Алексея Михайловича. Основанием для такого суждения служит один дипломатический документ, находящийся в Стокгольмском гос. архиве в Швеции. В нем сказано, что ц. Алексей находит особый интерес для чтения в Истории Ивана Грозного, в рассказах о его жестокостях. Слово история передается Уваро-

⁴⁰ The first part of this letter concerns various requests I had made of IuD regarding books that I hoped to receive.

⁴¹ The short comment about S. V. Zhitomirskaja may concern negotiation regarding my obtaining certain desiderata for the reference library in the manuscript division of GBL in exchange for the receipt of microfilms I had requested. I had been able to do this successfully to obtain microfilms of manuscripts from GIM and GPB.

⁴² The *avtoreferat* is [Уваров 1973]. While IuD seemed uncertain as to whether he would be able to see the entire dissertation, he was nonetheless willing to answer questions if Keenan had them regarding it. I do not recall when IuD would have acquainted me with Uvarov's *tezisy* and in what form that might have been.

⁴³ История. — DW.

вым с большой буквы. Не знаю, как следует писать первую букву в этом слове (нужно видеть текст шведского оригинала), но, даже если слово пишется с большой буквы, это ровным счетом ничего не доказывает. Почему бы под этой «Историей» не видеть Хронику А. Гваньини, к-рая, как мы знаем, была уже в это время в России? И т. п.?

Уваров, в отличие от меня, выделяет 7 ред. текста «И.»

Каковы же три ред. из числа дополнительных?

В одну из ред. «И» Уваров выделяет литер. перевод «Истории» на русский язык, сделанный в 1760 г. студентом АН Семеном Девовичем и поднесенный члену Военной коллегии, обершталмейстеру Петру Спиридоновичу Сумарокову. Сей перевод находится в собр. акад. М. Н. Тихомирова. Кстати, как указывает Тихомиров, в рукописи, помимо «И.», имеется перевод «двух» писем Курб. к Ив. IV и первого письма Ив. IV к Курб. (См. М. Н. Тихомиров. Описание Тихомровского собрания рукописей. М., 1968, стр. 44).

Другой ред. Уваров считает списки ГБЛ, собр. ОИДР, № 255; ГПБ, Эрмитаж. собр. № 458 и ЦГАДА, Кабинет Екат. II, № 365. Эти списки Уваров выделяет в т.н. Екатеринбургскую ред., но на самом деле это отрывки из пространного текста.

В ред. Тимковского Уваров выделяет цитатный текст в труде этого исследователя. По моим наблюдениям, в 2 цитатах текст «И» Курб. дан в переводе на рус. яз., но это явление свойственно историографии того времени, и говорить о какой-то ред. текста для гр. Н. П. Румянцева, вестимо, не следует.

Интересно, что создание Комп. ред. Уваров связывает с Евфимием Чудовским и патриархом Адрианом и относит к 90-м годам.

Словом, Даниель, с диссертацией этой мне хотелось бы ознакомиться. У меня как это получится, не знаю.

Диссертация Уварова в текстолого-археографической части, на мой взгляд, содержит ряд сомнительных и спорных положений, но тем не менее представляет интерес для курбсковеда.

Полагаю, что Э. Кинену, Вашему учителю, небезынтересно было бы знать эту работу. Если его она заинтересует, я мог бы, наверное, ему написать ответы на интересующие его вопросы.

К настоящему письму прилагаю машинописную копию одной из работ К. А. Уварова. Оно интересно в том плане, что Уваров считает ркп. Унд. № 720 списком втор. пол. XVI в. (!) и с помощью его «разбивает» концепцию Кинена⁴⁴.

На этом писать кончаю. Желаю Вам свободы и больших творческих успехов. Мой поклон Вашему учителю.

Ю. РЫКОВ

⁴⁴ It is not clear what work by Uvarov IuD copied and sent in typescript. I had earlier been able to examine the Undol'skii manuscript referred to and had determined it best be dated to ca. 1630, certainly not the 16th century. Presumably I had told IuD of this observation well prior to the appearance of [Waugh 1977: 223, 232–234].

№ 5

Москва, 09.10.1973.

Уважаемый коллега, совсем недавно вышел в свет 34 выпуск «З.О.Р.», который уже стал библиографической редкостью⁴⁵. Я купил всего лишь 2 экз., как автор. Один из них я высылаю Вам на добрую память по почте. «В недостатках или в погрешенных молимся простити», — повторяю я вслед за Курбским (См. РИБ, т. XXXI, стб. 310, строки 5–7).

Дела у меня сейчас приостановились. Заедает текущая работа в отделе. Времени для «досуга», во время коего можно заняться творениями князя Андрея, практически мало. Хочется верить в лучшее будущее.

Как у Вас дела? Что нового? Написали ли Вы рецензию на «Вести-Куранты»? Читали ли Вы книгу Р. Г. Скрынникова?⁴⁶

На этом кончаю.

Ю. Рыков

№ 6⁴⁷

Уважаемый Даниель!

Поздравляю Вас с Новым годом. Желаю Вам здоровья, счастья и больших творческих успехов на службе у Клио.

Очень благодарен Вам за присылку Вашей публикации в АЕ⁴⁸ и Ваших рецензий на «Очерки» С. М. Каштанова⁴⁹ и на «Вести-Куранты».⁵⁰ (В будущем мечтаю устроить себе «ликбез»). Также благодарен Вам и за лучшие пожелания по моему адресу. К сожалению, мои дела сейчас приостановились. Надеюсь, что в новом году они придут в движение. Дай-то бог...

Интересно, собирается ли г-н Кинан давать «отповедь» Скрынникову? С московским приветом

Ю. Рыков

№ 7⁵¹

Многоуважаемый Даниэль!

Поздравляю Вас и Вашу супругу с Новым 1975 годом! Желаю Вам всех благ в жизни и новых научных успехов.

⁴⁵ [Рыков 1972a].

⁴⁶ [Скрынников 1973].

⁴⁷ Presumably this note on a New Year greeting card cannot be earlier than end of 1973 or beginning of 1974.

⁴⁸ Уо [Waugh] 1972.

⁴⁹ [Waugh 1973a].

⁵⁰ [Waugh 1973b].

⁵¹ The date presumably is that on the offprint of [Рыков 1974], which arrived with this card: 28 December 1974.

Пользуюсь случаем, отправляю Вам оттиск своей работы. Я написал статью для ТОДРЛ об источниках 1 послания Курбского к царю⁵². Жду решения редколлегии.

С симпатией к Вам

Ю. Рыков

№ 8

11.05.76

Глубокоуважаемый коллега Даниэль Кларк Уо!

С большим интересом я ознакомился с Вашей работой о собрании рукописей графа Ф. А. Толстого⁵³.

Я хотел только дать Вам некоторые дополнительные сведения, которые следовало бы включить в Вашу работу.

Рукопись № 124 из V отделения собрания (с. 114 Вашей работы) находится в наст. вр. в Гос. биб-ке СССР им. В. И. Ленина под шифром Муз. собр. № 9021. Это сборник исторический сер. XVIII в. на 206 лл. (II + 204), в 4°.

Приметы принадлежности рукописи к толстовскому собранию следующие. На нижней части корешка печатная наклейка со вписанными от руки цифрами: «Отдел. V, № 1[24]». На об. верхней крышки печатный экслибрис: «Из библиотеки графа Ф. А. Толстова. Отдел. V, № 124» (цифры вписаны от руки). На л. I: «Отд.V, n = 124» (чернилами). Почерк П. М. Строева.

Еще сообщу Вам о рукописи Гос. биб-ки им. М. Е. Салтыкова-Щедрина, к-рая, очевидно, также принадлежит к собранию Толстого. Это Евангелие-тетр, писанное в 1527 г. под Вязьмой писцом Сидором Григорьевым сыном. Его шифр — Q.I, № 21. На корешке этой рукописи имеются две старые бумажные наклейки. На одной из них (верхней) писан номер «23», на другой (нижней) — название и бывший шифр: «Отд. II, № 529. Евангелие, писанн[ое] на бумаге. 1527». Название писано почерком, подражающим полууставу, а шифр надписан над названием позднее гражданским почерком. В «Третьем прибавлении» П. М. Строева последний номер II отделения — 522 (стр. 108 Вашей работы), а номер рукописи (современный) Q.I.21 пропущен Вами во 2 таблице (стр. 53 Вашей работы).

Вот пока всё, что я могу Вам сообщить.

С лучшими пожеланиями Вам и Вашей семье

Ю. Рыков

⁵² [Рыков 1976].

⁵³ The subject here is my guide to the manuscripts that once belonged to Count F. A. Tolstoi, a little book I compiled from material gathered during a brief visit to Leningrad in 1995 [Waugh 1977/1980]. I sent photocopies of the typescript to colleagues prior to its publication; it is probably one of those to which IuD refers. The book was first published in a microfiche edition in 1977 and then in a minimally revised hard copy in 1980. On the circumstances connected with the appearance of that book, see [Waugh 2014, 2: 33–34].

№ 9

Москва, 23.05.1976 г.

Глубокоуважаемый коллега Даниэль Кларк Уо!

Я сделал запрос в Ленинград по поводу объяснения старого шифра рукописи Q.I. № 21 из Основного собрания рукописей Библиотеки им. Салтыкова-Щедрина: не толстовская ли эта рукопись. Ответ был написан сотрудницей отдела Брониславой Александровной Градовой⁵⁴. По ее данным, рукопись Q.I. № 21 «не имеет отношения к собранию Толстого. Старый шифр на корешке этой рукописи (Отд. II, № 529) соответствует рукописному каталогу А. Х. Востокова, который принял систему Строева для описаний рукописей, получивших в Публичную библиотеку из других собраний. Этот каталог как бы продолжает 2-е прибавление Строева, поэтому и появились шифры, подбные толстовским рукописям...

Время поступления рукописи в библиотеку пока установить не удалось».

Не удовлетворившись таким ответом, я сделал еще один запрос: действительно ли Востоков подшифровывал к толстовскому собранию рукописи других собраний или он подключал к нему рукописи толстовские, каков объем этого каталога Востокова, с какого и по какой № он содержит названия рукописей и т. п.

Известно ли Вам он том, что Востоков принял систему П. М. Строева и как бы продолжил 2 прибавление последнего? (Я что-то сомневаюсь).

Завтра я уезжаю в археографическую экспедицию и буду в Москве токмо через месяц.

Шлю Вам и всей Вашей семье добрые пожелания.

Ю. Рыков.

№№ 10, 11 (sent in the same envelope)

№ 10

Москва, 2.7.1976

Глубокоуважаемый коллега!

Сердечно поздравляю Вас и Вашу супругу с рождением наследника!⁵⁵ Об этом я узнал от А. А. Зимина и заочно, так сказать, познакомился с Вашей супругой и сыном через посредство фотографии, которую Вы ему прислали. Ваша радость мне близка и понятна, ибо у меня также родился сын 17 февра-

⁵⁴ B. A. Gradova of the Manuscript Division of GPB was an expert on the Tolstoi collection. After the publication of my book, she co-authored with B. M. Kloss and V. I. Koretskii an important two-part article on the manuscripts in the collection of D. M. Golitsyn, many of whose books then were acquired by Tolstoi [the first part is Градова, Клосс, Корецкий 1979]. My book had provided a preliminary list of them, which that study extended and corrected.

⁵⁵ My son is Maximilian Daniel Waugh, born on 6 April 1976; his mother is Marina Aleksandrovna Tolmacheva.

ля сего года. Его мы нарекли Павлом. Он растёт здоровым и весёлым. Когда он улыбается, нас невольно охватывает неописуемый восторг... И мать, и сын находятся в настоящее время в городе Тамбове у бабушки. Я их посещаю наездами. Через неделю думаю взять отпуск и погостить в Тамбове.

Я вернулся из археографической экспедиции. Привез 26 рукописей. Одна из них — Звезда пресветлая — XVII в., 5 других — XVIII в. Остальные датируются XIX и XX вв.⁵⁶

Получил письмо от Б. А. Градовой, которая подтверждает, что рукописный каталог А. Х. Востокова является как бы продолжением 2-го «Прибавления» П. М. Строева и включает в себя рукописи, поступившие в Публичную библиотеку «с начала ее основания в том числе и собрание Дубровского!» В этом каталоге записано, например, Остромирово Евангелие (Отд. 1, № 462), которое находится в библиотеке с 1806 г. Всем этим и вызвано появление шифров, подобных толстовским. Т. о., Евангелие 1527 г. следует считать рукописью, не входившей в состав толстовского собрания. Между прочим, Градова пишет, что «все шесть р-сей, взятых Востоковым дополнительно (из числа книг, описанных в «Третьем прибавлении» Строева, — Ю. Р.), также вошли в его каталог, но уже под другими номерами».

На этом я кончаю свое письмо.

Желаю Вам и всему Вашему семейству жизненного благополучия и счастья!

Ю. Рыков.

№ 11

Москва, 3.7.1976

Глубокоуважаемый Даниэль!

Сегодня утром получил от Вас письмо от 16.06.

Я не нашел никаких сведений в отношении того, как сборник № 9021 из Муз. собрания попал в нашу библиотеку. В машинописном т. V «Описания» рукописей этого собрания № 9021 помещен среди рукописей, поступивших в Муз. собрание, согласно колонтитулам, в 1936–1940 гг. (с. 311–312). В книге предложенный за указанные годы я не нашел этой рукописи.

Очередные тома «Описания» Муз. собрания будут издаваться, но это будет нескоро⁵⁷. Сначала должна будет выйти серия томов каталога-справочника

⁵⁶ The archaeological expedition which IuD led worked in Iaroslavl' oblast' 24 May–22 June 1976. For the published description of the books, see [Рыков 1979].

⁵⁷ Indeed it was not “soon”; the second volume, not the work of IuD, is Музейное собрание 1997, about which S. V. Zhitomirskaja [2006: 536] caustically remarked that the meticulous earlier senior scholar for early manuscripts, “I. M. Kudraivtsev would have turned in his grave, if he could have seen this volume—a crude reprinting of a typescript full of mistakes and imprecision!” / «И. М. Кудрявцев перевернулся бы в гробу, если бы увидел этот том — примитивную перепечатку машинописного текста с массой ошибок и неточностей!»

по всем собраниям, а эта работа затягивается примерно лет на семь. В конце этого года предполагается сдача в издательство только 1 части 1 тома, которая будет посвящена истории дореволюционных собраний библиотеки⁵⁸.

Жаль, конечно, что Ваш приезд в Москву и Ленинград отложен, но может быть в след. году Вам удастся приехать. Без рукописной базы работать очень трудно.

К юбилею Д. С. Лихачева должен выйти Т. XXXI «Трудов отдела древнерусской литературы». В нем помещены очень интересные работы о переписке Ивана IV и Курбского Я. С. Лурье⁵⁹ и А. А. Зимина.⁶⁰ Включена в этот том и моя заметка, посвященная проблеме источников 1 послания Курбского.⁶¹ Я обязательно пришлю Вам отпечаток этой работы.

Ю. Рыков

№ 12⁶²

Глубокоуважаемый Даниэль! Поздравляю Вас и всех Ваших близких с замечательным праздником — Новым годом. Желаю Вам всем большого счастья, крепкого здоровья и других жизненных благ.

У меня особых новостей нет. Единственное, что радует, — это то, что в этом новом году должна выйти в свет «Переписка Ивана Грозного с Курбским», в подготовке которой есть и мой труд.⁶³ Впрочем, предстоит еще немало хлопот.

Всего доброго Вам.

Мой новогодний привет Э. Кинану.

Ю. Рыков.

№ 13⁶⁴

Глубокоуважаемый Даниэль!

Поздравляю Вас, Вашу супругу Марину и малышку Макса с Новым годом! Желаю Вам здоровья, счастья и всех других жизненных благ!

Как Вы поживаете? Что новенького? Последнее, что я видел у Вас, — это вторая часть Вашего исследования о собрании П. М. Строева в т. 32 «Трудов отдела древнерусской литературы»⁶⁵.

⁵⁸ In fact only the first three parts of vol. 1 (out of a planned five volumes) appeared, the last in 1996 [Рукописные собрания ГБЛ 1983–1996].

⁵⁹ [Лурье 1976].

⁶⁰ [Зимин 1976].

⁶¹ [Рыков 1976].

⁶² Undated, but probably the end of 1978. On a card with a reproduction of V. M. Kustodiev's 1916 painting "Shrovetide"/ Масленница.

⁶³ [Переписка 1979].

⁶⁴ Note on New Year's card, sent after № 12.

⁶⁵ [Уо 1976, Idem 1977].

Я кое-что сделал в отношении «Переписки» Грозного с Курбским. Надеюсь, что в будущем 1979 году Вы это сможете увидеть.

Сейчас времени свободного у меня практически нет — после работы занимаюсь с сыном, помогаю жене по хозяйству. О научных занятиях пока приходится только мечтать.

Проф. Э. Кинан прислал мне оттиск своего исследования об «Истории»,⁶⁶ но я до сих пор с этим исследованием не познакомился дословно из-за незнания английского языка. Суть этого исследования я знаю со слов самого Э. Кинана: он мне писал. Надеюсь, что у меня со временем найдется возможность перевести этот текст.

Еще раз поздравляю с Новым годом!

С искренним уважением

Ю. Рыков
декабрь 1978 г.

№ 14

Москва, 27 марта 1979

Глубокоуважаемый коллега Даниэль!

Поздравляю Вас с выходом в свет Вашей ценной книги⁶⁷ и сердечно благодарю за неё.

Считаю своим долгом сообщить, что в Республиканской публичной библиотеке имени Алишера Навои в Ташкенте хранится рукопись XVIII в., содержащая апокрифическую переписку турецкого султана с польским королём, римским цесарем и чигиринскими казаками. Любопытно, что в составе окружения есть и подменная переписка Петра I с турецким султаном.⁶⁸ Это своего рода историческая параллель.

Полагаю, что Вам обязательно надо ознакомиться с текстами ташкентской рукописи.

Подробное описание этой рукописи см. в работе А. И. Мазунина «Славяно-русские рукописи Научной библиотеки Ташкентского университета и Республиканской библиотеки имени Алишера Навои» (Труды отдела древнерусской литературы, т. 32. Л., 1977, с. 380–382).

Желаю Вам новых творческих успехов на службе у Клио.

Ю. Рыков

⁶⁶ [Keenan 1978].

⁶⁷ [Waugh 1978].

⁶⁸ Obviously this would have attracted IuD's attention where he had just received my book about the apocryphal correspondence of with the Ottoman sultan. Since the book was now out, presumably I just filed away this information and forgot about it, until, in the 1990s, when planning a trip to Tashkent, I "re-discovered" Mazunin's description of the manuscript, which then proved to be incredibly interesting and would be the basis for an entire monograph [Waugh 2003]. In that book, I made no mention of this letter from IuD, which first brought the Tashkent manuscript to my attention.

№ 15

Москва, 22 февраля 1981 г.

Глубокоуважаемый Даниэль,
Рад был получить Ваше послание.

Несколько слов о своих делах. Я подготовил к публикации несколько новонайденных актов Сласо-Прилуцкого монастыря XV в.⁶⁹ В нынешнем году должна быть выпущена «Переписка Ивана Грозного с Андреем Курбским». Это будет 2-ой «завод», но исправленный по сравнению с 1ым. На титуле будет стоять: «Москва – 1981».

Мне было бы интересно знать Ваше мнение о «Переписке».

Получили ли Вы тот экземпляр, который мы Вам послали прежде?⁷⁰

Меня волнует судьба сборника, посвященного А. А. Зимину. Хотелось бы верить, что все будет благополучно с изданием; ну и, конечно же, хотелось бы ознакомиться с текстом⁷¹.

Помните ли Вы, как мы однажды встретились на квартире у А. А. Зимины? Как он дружески Вас похлопывал по плечу и попросту, по-русски, называл Вас Данилой...

Об А. А. всегда хочется думать, как о живом человеке, и просто не укладывается в мыслях, что 25 февраля с. г. исполняется год, как его нет в нами...

Посылаю Вам бандеролью «Описание рукописей Чудовского собрания» Т. Н. Протасьевой⁷². Я думаю, что оно для Вас интересно и нужно.

С лучшими пожеланиями
Вам и Вашим близким

Ю. РЫКОВ

⁶⁹ [Рыков 1982a]. In 1985 IuD sent me a copy of the volume with his article on which he wrote the following inscription: «Глубокоуважаемому коллеге Даниэлю Уо с лучшими пожеланиями и с московским приветом. Эту работу я мысленно посвятил светлой памяти незабвенного моего Учителя А. А. Зимины, и мне доставляет удовольствие вручить ее Вам как человеку, которого мой Учитель высоко ценил за вклад в науку. 22.V.1985 г. Москва».

⁷⁰ Indeed I had received the copy of the 1979 first edition, which I treasure, as it is inscribed by most of the scholars who produced it: «Дорогому Даниэлю Дональдовичу, во многом помогшему при написании этой книги — с приветом и благодарностью. Д. Лихачев, Я. Лурье, Ю. Рыков, В. Кобрин. 28.IX.79». While the signatures are all individual, the inscription is in Lur'e's hand and ink; he was the only one who insisted on using my patronymic, something I always avoided, given the fact that it sounds so odd in Russian (I use my middle name). I never reviewed [Переписка 1979] and probably did not send IuD any substantial comments about the book.

⁷¹ This may be a reference to [Россия 1982], the Festschrift prepared by AAZ's Russian colleagues but which was censored to exclude any indication of its dedication. IuD had an article in it [Рыков 1982b]. Alternatively, the reference could be to the Festschrift which I was preparing and about which I had informed AAZ on the eve of his death in 1980 [Waugh 1985]. That book, which was the first such commemorative volume openly to honor him, presumably was the main reason I was invited to sit at the podium when the first Zimin memorial readings took place in 1990.

⁷² [Протасьева 1980].

Bibliography

Анисимова 2017

Анисимова Т. В., *Каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг из собрания Е. Е. Егорова*, 1, 1–100, Ю. С. Белянкин, ред., Москва, 2017.

Библиотека 2001

Библиотека литературы Древней Руси, 11, С.-Петербург, 2001.

Градова, Клосс, Корецкий 1979

Градова Б. А., Клосс Б. М., Корецкий В. И., К истории Архангельской библиотеки Д. М. Голицына, *Археографический ежегодник за 1978 год*, Москва, 1979, 238–253.

Дедук 2020

Дедук А. В., Памяти Юрия Дмитриевича Рыкова, *Вестник церковной истории*, 2020, 1/2 (57/58), 388–392.

Ерусалимский 2009

Ерусалимский К. Ю., *Сборник Курбского. Исследование книжной культуры*, Москва, 2009.

——— 2018

Ерусалимский К. Ю., *На службе короля и Речи Посполитой*, Москва, С.-Петербург, 2018.

Житомирская 2006

Житомирская С. В., *Просто жизнь*, Москва, 2006 (<http://uni-persona.srcc.msu.ru/site/authors/zhitomirskaja/zhitomirskaja.htm>).

Зимин 1976

Зимин А. А., Первое послание Курбского Ивану Грозному (Текстологические проблемы), *ТОДРЛ*, 31, Ленинград, 1976, 176–201.

——— 2015

Зимин А. А., Храм науки (Размышления о пережитом), *Судьбы творческого наследия отечественных историков второй половины XX века*, А. Л. Хорошкевич, сост., Москва, 2015, 35–384.

Историк 2012

Историк в России между прошлым и будущим. Статьи и воспоминания, В. П. Козлов, ред., Москва, 2012

Ключевский 1968

Ключевский В. О., *Письма. Дневники. Афоризмы и мысли об истории*, Р. А. Киреева, А. А. Зимин, сост., М. В. Нечкина, ред., Москва, 1968.

Курбский 2015

Курбский А., *История о делах великого князя московского*, К. Ю. Ерусалимский, подг., А. А. Алексеев, перев., Ю. Д. Рыков, отв. ред., Москва, 2015.

Лурье 1976

Лурье Я. С., Первое послание Ивана Грозного Курбскому (Вопросы истории текста), *ТОДРЛ*, 31, Ленинград, 1976, 202–234.

Мудрова 2015

Мудрова Н. А., *Библиотека Строгановых (вторая половина XVI – начало XVIII в.)*, Екатеринбург, 2015.

Музейное собрание 1997

Музейное собрание. Описание, 2. № 3006 – № 4500, Т. А. Исаченко, подг., Москва, 1997.

Переписка 1979

Переписка Ивана Грозного с Андреем Курбским, Я. С. Лурье, Ю. Д. Рыков, подг., Ленинград, 1979.

Протасьева 1980

Протасьева Т. Н., сост., *Описание рукописей Чудовского собрания*, Новосибирск, 1980.

Рукописные собрания ГБЛ 1983–1996

Рукописные собрания Государственной библиотеки СССР имени В. И. Ленина. Указатель, 1, 1–3, Москва, 1983–1996.

Рыбаков 1964

Рыбаков Б. А., *Первые века русской истории*, Москва, 1964.

Рыков 1971

Рыков Ю. Д., Редакции «Истории» князя Курбского, *Археографический ежегодник за 1970 год*, Москва, 1971, 129–137 (переизд. в кн.: [Рыков 2021, 353–365]).

— 1972a

Рыков Ю. Д., «История о великом князе московском» А. М. Курбского как источник по истории опричнины. Автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени кандидата исторических наук, Москва, 1972.

— 1972a

Рыков Ю. Д., Списки «Истории о великом князе Московском» князя А. М. Курбского в фондах отдела рукописей, *ЗОР*, 34, 101–124 (переизд. в кн.: [Рыков 2021, 366–400]).

— 1974

Рыков Ю. Д., «История о великом князе Московском» А. М. Курбского и опричнина Ивана Грозного, *Исторические записки*, 93, 1974, 328–350 (переизд. в кн.: [Рыков 2021, 401–423]).

— 1976

Рыков Ю. Д., К вопросу об источниках Первого послания Курбского Ивану IV, *ТОДРЛ*, 31, Ленинград, 1976, 235–246.

— 1979

Рыков Ю. Д., сост., Ярославское собрание рукописных книг (ф. 739). Краткое описание, *ЗОР*, 40, Москва, 1979, 181–195.

— 1982a

Рыков Ю. Д., Новые акты Спасо-Прилуцкого монастыря XV в., *ЗОР*, 43, Москва, 1982, 85–105.

— 1982b

Рыков Ю. Д., Князь А. М. Курбский и его концепция государственной власти, *Россия на путях централизации: Сборник статей*, В. Т. Пашуто, ред., Москва, 1982, 193–198.

— 1986

Рыков Ю. Д., Собрание Е. Е. Егорова (ф. 98), *Рукописные собрания Государственной библиотеки СССР имени В. И. Ленина. Указатель*, 1, 2, Москва, 1986, 320–336.

— 1990a

Рыков Ю. Д., Строгановские рукописные и старопечатные книги в фондах Государственной библиотеки СССР имени В. И. Ленина, *Спорные вопросы отечественной истории XI – XVIII веков: Тез. докл. и сообщ. Первых чтений, посвященных памяти А. А. Зиминой*. Москва, 13 – 18 мая 1990 г. Москва, 1990, 238–241.

— 1990b

Рыков Ю. Д., сост., *Экспертиза и научно-техническая обработка рукописных книг: Методические рекомендации*, Москва, 1990.

— 2008

Рыков Ю. Д., Егоров Егор Егорович, *Православная энциклопедия*, 18, Москва, 2008, 32–35.

— 2013

Рыков Ю. Д., *Список печатных работ Ю. Д. Рыкова в XX в. (с 1970 г. по 2000 г.)* (<https://rkka1946.livejournal.com/850.html>).

- 2015
Рыков Ю. Д., *Список печатных работ Ю. Д. Рыкова в XXI в. (с 2001 г. по 2015 г.)* (<https://rkka1946.livejournal.com/5282.html>).
- 2016a
Рыков Ю. Д., *Немного о себе* (<https://rkka1946.livejournal.com/5429.html>).
- 2016b
Рыков Ю. Д., *История увольнения Ю. Д. Рыкова из РГБ в январе 2016 г.* (<https://rkka1946.livejournal.com/4776.html>).
- 2016в
Рыков Ю. Д., Курбский Андрей Михайлович, *Большая Российская энциклопедия*, 16, Москва, 2016, 383–385.
- 2021
Рыков Ю. Д., *Князь Курбский и опричина Ивана Грозного*, Москва, 2021.
- Россия 1982
Россия на путях централизации: Сборник статей, В. Т. Пашто, отв. ред., Москва, 1982.
- Сборник ... Рыкову 2021
Сборник статей, посвященных Юрию Дмитриевичу Рыкову (1946–2020), А. В. Дедук, отв. ред.; А. В. Кузьмин, А. В. Дедук, сост. Москва, 2021.
- Скрынников 1973
Скрынников Р. Г., *Переписка Грозного и Курбского: Парадоксы Эдварда Кинана*, Ленинград, 1973.
- Турилов 1992
Турилов А. А., *Новые пособия по археографии, Археографический ежегодник за 1990 год*, Москва, 1992, 247–249.
- Уваров 1971
Уваров К. А., «История о великом князе Московском» А. М. Курбского в русской рукописной традиции XVII–XIX вв.: (Археографический обзор списка памятника), *Ученые записки Московского государственного педагогического института имени В. И. Ленина*, 455, *Вопросы русской литературы*, Москва, 1971, 61–78.
- 1973
Уваров К. А., Князь А. М. Курбский — писатель; («История о великом князе Московском»): Автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук, Москва, 1973.
- Уо 1972
Уо Д. К., *Неизвестный памятник древнерусской литературы: «Грамота государя царя и великого князя Ивана Васильевича всеа Руси к Степану, королю польскому»*, *Археографический ежегодник за 1971 год*, Москва, 1972, 357–361.
- 1976, 1977
Уо Д. К., К изучению истории рукописного собрания П. М. Строева, *ТОДРЛ*, 30, Ленинград, 1976, 184–203; 32, Ленинград 1977, 133–164.
- Уо 1977/1980
Уо Д. К., сост., *Славянские рукописи Собрания Ф. А. Толстого: Материалы к истории собрания и указатели старых и новых шифров*, Zug, 1977 (переизд., Ленинград, 1980).
- Уо 2003
Уо Д. К., *История одной книги: Вятка и «не-современность» в русской культуре Петровского времени*, С.-Петербург, 2003.
- Федосеева 2012
Федосеева А. И., А. А. Зимин и его ученица Е. П. Маматова, *Историк в России между прошлым и будущим. Статьи и воспоминания*, В. П. Козлов, ред., Москва, 2012, 661–670.

Филюшкин 2020

Филюшкин А. И., Юрий Дмитриевич Рыков (07.12.46 – 22.04.2020), *Петербургские славянские и балканские исследования / Studia Slavica et Balcanica Petropolitana*, 2020, № 1(27), 223–227.

Чудакова 2006

Чудакова М. О., *О роли личностей в истории России XX века* (<http://uni-persona.srcc.msu.su/site/authors/zhitomirskaja/predislov.htm>).

Keenan 1971

Keenan E. L., *The Kurbskii-Groznyi Apocrypha: The Seventeenth-Century Genesis of the "Correspondence" Attributed to Prince A. M. Kurbskii and Tsar Ivan IV*. With an appendix by Daniel C. Waugh, Cambridge, MA, 1971.

——— 1978

Keenan E. L., Putting Kurbskii in His Place, or: Observations and Suggestions Concerning the Place of the *History of the Grand Prince of Muscovy* in the History of Muscovite Literary Culture, *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte*, Bd. 24 (1978), 131–161.

Lowenthal 1985

Lowenthal D., *The Past is a Foreign Country*, Cambridge, etc., 1985.

Waugh 1970

Waugh D. C., Soviet Watermark Studies — Achievements and Prospects, *Kritika: A Review of Current Soviet Books on Russian History* 6/2 (1970), 78–111.

——— 1973a

Waugh D. C., rev. of: S. M. Kashtanov, *Ocherki russkoi diplomatiki* (M. 1970), *Slavic Review* 32/1 (1973), 158–160.

——— 1973b

Waugh D. C., The Publication of Muscovite Kuranty, *Kritika: A Review of Current Soviet Books on Russian History*, 9/3 (1973), 104–120.

——— 1977

Waugh D. C., The Lessons of the Kurbskii Controversy Regarding the Study and Dating of Old Russian Manuscripts, *Russian and Slavic History*, D. K. Rowney and G. E. Orchard, eds., Columbus O, 1977, 218–237.

——— 1978

Waugh D. C., *The Great Turkes Defiance: On the History of the Apocryphal Correspondence of the Ottoman Sultan in Its Muscovite and Russian Variants, with a foreword by Academician Dmitrii Sergeevich Likhachev*, Columbus O, 1978.

——— 1985

Waugh D. C., ed., *Essays in Honor of A. A. Zimin*, Columbus O, 1985.

——— 1995

Waugh D. C., Correspondence concerning the 'Correspondence', *Камень Краежгльнь. Rhetoric of the Medieval Slavic World. Essays presented to Edward L. Keenan on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students*, Nancy Shields Kollmann et al., et., Harvard Ukrainian Studies, XIX, Cambridge, MA, 1995, 23–65.

Waugh 2014

Waugh D. C., The Enthusiasms of Youth and Where They Led: A Memoir, *Quaestio Rossica* 2014, № 2, 19–62; № 3, 19–53.

References

- Deduk A. V., Pamiati Iurii Dmitrievicha Rykova, *Vestnik tserkovnoi istorii*, 2020, 1/2 (57/58), 388–392.
- Gradova B. A., Kloss B. M., Koretskii V. I., K istorii Arkhangel'skoi biblioteki D. M. Golitsyna, *Arkheograficheskii ezhegodnik za 1978 god*, Moscow, 1979, 238–253.
- Filyushkin A. I., Iurii Dmitrievich Rykov (07.12.46 – 22.04.2020), *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Petropolitana*, 2020, № 1(27), 223–227.
- Fedoseeva A. I., A. A. Zimin i ego uchenitsa E. P. Mamatova, *Istoriik v Rossii mezhdu proshlom i budushchem. Stat'i i vospominaniia*, V. P. Kozlov, ed., Moscow, 2012, 661–670.
- Jeruzalimski K. J., *At the service of the King and the Republic: Monography*, Moscow, St. Petersburg, 2018.
- Jeruzalimski K. J., *Kurbtsky Literary Collection: A Study of Russian Book Culture*, Moscow, 2009.
- Keenan E. L., Putting Kurbskii in His Place, or: Observations and Suggestions Concerning the Place of the History of the Grand Prince of Muscovy in the History of Muscovite Literary Culture, *Forschungen zur osteuropaischen Geschichte*, 24 (1978), 131–161.
- Keenan E. L., *The Kurbskii-Groznyi Apocrypha: The Seventeenth-Century Genesis of the "Correspondence" Attributed to Prince A. M. Kurbskii and Tsar Ivan IV*. With an appendix by Daniel C. Waugh, Cambridge, MA, 1971.
- Lure Ia. S., Pervoe poslanie Ivana Groznogo Kurbskomu (Voprosy istorii teksta), *TODRL*, 31, Leningrad, 1976, 202–234.
- Lowenthal D., *The Past is a Foreign Country*, Cambridge, etc., 1985.
- Mudrova N. A., *Biblioteka Stroganovykh (vtoraia polvina XVI – nachalo XVIII v.)*, Yekaterinburg, 2015.
- Protaseva T. N., comp., *Opisanie rukopisei Chudovskogo sobraniia*, Novosibirsk, 1980.
- Rybakov B. A., *Pervye veka russkoi istorii*, Moscow, 1964.
- Rykov Yu. D., comp., *Ekspertiza i nauchno-tehnicheskaiia obrabotka rukopisnykh knig: Metodicheskie rekomendatsii*, Moscow, 1990.
- Rykov Yu. D., comp., Iaroslavskoe sobranie rukopisnykh knig (f. 739). Kratkoe opisanie, *ZOR*, 40, Moscow, 1979, 181–195.
- Rykov Yu. D., "Istoriia o velikom kniaze Moskovskom" A. M. Kurbskogo i oprichnina Ivana Groznogo, *Istoriicheskie zapiski*, 93, 1974, 328–350.
- Rykov Yu. D., Kniaz' A. M. Kurbskii i ego kontseptsii gosudarstvennoi vlasti, *Rossii na putiakh tsentralizatsii: Sbornik statei*, V. T. Pashuto, ed., Moscow, 1982, 193–198.
- Rykov Yu. D., *Kniaz' Kurbskii i oprichnina Ivana Groznogo*, Moscow, 2021.
- Rykov Yu. D., K voprosu ob istochnikakh Pervogo poslaniia Kurbskogo Ivanu IV, *TODRL*, 31, Leningrad, 1976, 235–246.
- Rykov Yu. D., Novye akty Spaso-Prilutskogo monastyria XV v., *ZOR*, 43, Moscow, 1982, 85–105.
- Rykov Yu. D., *Redaktsii "Istorii" kniazia Kurbskogo, Arkheograficheskii ezhegodnik za 1970 god*, Moscow, 1971, 129–137.
- Rykov Yu. D., Sobranie E. E. Egorova (f. 98), *Rukopisnye sobraniia Gosudarstvennoi biblioteki SSSR imeni V. I. Lenina. Ukazatel'*, 1, 2, Moscow, 1986, 320–336.
- Rykov Yu. D., Spiski "Istorii o velikom kniaze Moskovskom" kniazia A. M. Kurbskogo v fondakh otdela rukopisei, *ZOR*, 34, 101–124.
- Rykov Yu. D., Stroganovskie rukopisnye i staropechatnye knigi v fondakh Gosudarstvennoi biblioteki SSSR imeni V. I. Lenina, *Spornye voprosy otechestvennoi istorii XI–XVIII vekov: Tez. dokl. i soobshch. Perykh chtenii, posviashchennykh pamiati A. A. Zimina*, Moscow, 13 – 18 maia 1990 g. Moscow, 1990, 238–241.
- Skrynnikov R. G., *Perpiska Groznogo i Kurbskogo: Paradoksy Edvarda Kinana*, Leningrad, 1973.
- Turilov A. A., *Novye posobiia po arkhografii, Arkheograficheskii ezhegodnik za 1990 god*, Moscow, 1992, 247–249.
- Uvarov K. A., "Istoriia o velikom kniaze Moskovskom" A. M. Kurbskogo v russkoi rukopisnoi traditsii XVII–XIX vv.: (Arkheograficheskii obzor spisokov pamiatnika), *Uchenye zapiski Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo instituta imeni V. I. Lenina*, 455, *Voprosy russkoi literatury*, Moscow, 1971, 61–78.
- Waugh D. C., Correspondence concerning the 'Correspondence', *Камень Краежгльнь. Rhetoric of the Medieval Slavic World. Essays presented to Edward L. Keenan on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students*, Nancy Shields Kollmann et al., et., Harvard Ukrainian Studies, XIX, Cambridge, MA, 1995, 23–65.
- Waugh D. C., ed., *Essays in Honor of A. A. Zimin*, Columbus O, 1985.
- Waugh D. C., K izucheniiu istorii rukopisnogo sobraniia P. M. Stroeva, *TODRL*, 30, Leningrad, 1976, 184–203; 32, Leningrad 1977, 133–164.
- Waugh D. C., *Istoriia odnoi knigi: Viatka i "ne-sovremennost'" v russkoi kul'ture Petrovskogo vremeni*, St. Petersburg, 2003.
- Waugh D. C., Neizvestnyi pamiatnik drevnerusskoi literatury: "Gramota gosudaria tsaria i velikogo kniazia Ivana Vasil'evicha vseia Rusii k Stepanu, koroliu pol'skomu", *Arkheograficheskii ezhegodnik za 1971 god*, Moscow, 1972, 357–361.
- Waugh D. C., comp., *Slavianskie rukopisi Sobraniia F. A. Tolstogo: Materialy k istorii sobraniia i ukazateli starykh i novykh shifrov*, Zug, 1977.

Waugh D. C., Soviet Watermark Studies — Achievements and Prospects, *Kritika: A Review of Current Soviet Books on Russian History* 6/2 (1970), 78–111.

Waugh D. C., The Enthusiasms of Youth and Where They Led: A Memoir, *Quaestio Rossica* 2014, № 2, 19–62; № 3, 19–53.

Waugh D. C., *The Great Turkes Defiance: On the History of the Apocryphal Correspondence of the Ottoman Sultan in Its Muscovite and Russian Variants*, with a foreword by Academician Dmitrii Sergeevich Likhachev, Columbus O, 1978.

Waugh D. C., The Lessons of the Kurbskii Controversy Regarding the Study and Dating of Old Russian Manuscripts”, *Russian and Slavic History*,

D. K. Rowney and G. E. Orchard, eds., Columbus O, 1977, 218–237.

Waugh D. C., The Publication of Muscovite Kuranty, *Kritika: A Review of Current Soviet Books on Russian History*, 9/3 (1973), 104–120.

Waugh D. C., rev. of: S. M. Kashtanov, *Ocherki russkoi diplomatiki* (M. 1970), *Slavic Review* 32/1 (1973), 158–160.

Zimin A. A., Khram nauki (Razmyshleniia o perezhitom), Sud'by tvorcheskogo naslediiia otechestvennykh istorikov vtoroi poloviny XX veka, A. L. Khoroshkevich, comp., Moscow, 2015, 35–384.

Zimin A. A., Pervoe poslanie Kurbskogo Ivanu Groznomu (Tekstologicheskie problemy), *TODRL*, 31, Leningrad, 1976, 176–201.

Daniel Clarke Waugh, Ph.D.,
 Department of History Box 353560
 University of Washington
 Seattle, Washington 98195
 USA / CIHA
 dwaugh@u.washington.edu

Received May 12, 2022