

Slavic Review
34/2 (1975): 453-56

TO THE EDITOR:

As an interested party, I would like to be permitted to use the pages of your prestigious journal to comment on certain statements made by Professor Waugh in his review of *The Galician-Volynian Chronicle: An Annotated Translation* (December 1974, pp. 769-71) and to add certain observations of my own concerning the translation of the chronicle itself.

1. It is a well-known truism that there is no such thing as a perfect book, whether it be a scientific inquiry, a literary work, or, as in this case, a translation.

Furthermore, every author and translator—with very few exceptions—is conscious of the defects of his own work, which occur despite countless hours of arduous labor. I am no exception.

2. I have no doubt that in the translation of the GVC certain things could have been done differently. Every translation can be done in different ways, depending on the aims of the translator. And herein lies the misunderstanding between the reviewer and myself, as translator of this medieval chronicle. The reviewer would have liked to see a literal translation of the GVC, a mirrorlike reflection of the Slavic document with a running commentary on the literary devices found in the text. According to his review, such a translation would meet the needs of historians of the Slavic Middle Ages. But is such a translation really feasible without losing something in English? Having tried it at first, I think the answer is "NO"! For example, the reviewer suggested that I translate "nemogu" by "I am ill," but what happens to this translation in the context of the entire sentence? What kind of English is "Behold my illness that I am ill" for "vidish' moi nemoshch' ozhe nemogu"? Consequently, I preferred to understand "nemogu" as "I am feeble, lacking in strength," from which I went one step further, as noted by the reviewer. My addition, however, was enclosed in brackets to warn the reader what was and what was not in the Slavic text. Occasionally, an entire clause was reworked to break up the monotony of direct speech constructions, and this was placed in brackets. In such cases, however, there was never any drastic departure from the meaning of the Slavic text. In fact in many instances the *literal* meaning of the reworked passage, together with the Slavic text in transliteration, was given in a section called "Commentary to Translation" (pp. 119–26), which apparently was missed by the reviewer. In other instances, the editor, Professor Pritsak, felt that the information would be repetitious and it was not included in the present edition of the book. Hence, my aim—to concentrate on a fluid reading in English—determined the form of the translation.

More serious, however, seems to be the reviewer's reproach that the Slavic literary devices were lost in the English translation. Unfortunately, that is the fate of every translation from a medieval Slavic medium to modern English. Nevertheless, the reproach is not 100 percent valid. Pages 106–10, dealing with the death of Prince Volodimer Vasilkovich, have retained the parallelisms of the Slavic text wherever possible. Finally, a literary study of the GVC—which is a book in itself—was not the intent of my work. Literary aspects of the GVC have been treated already by Hens'ors'kyi, Czyzhevs'kyi, Worth, and other investigators—all cited in my bibliography.

The reviewer also made certain observations about my historical notes which may mislead the reader of the review. Hrushevs'kyi and Pashuto were not used in the notes merely by chance. It is exactly because both authors used the GVC in their respective studies more than other historians that their textual commentaries deserve special attention. Furthermore, persons interested in reading my translation will immediately see that I did not limit myself to these two authors, but used many others—Cherepnin, Dashkevych, Hens'ors'kyi, Orlov, Petrushevych, Pritsak, Sharanevych, to mention just a few—whenever their works dealt with questions not covered by Hrushevs'kyi or Pashuto.

Mr. Waugh also reproaches me for not using Panov's 1936 modern Russian translation of portions of the GVC. The answer to this he provides himself. Panov's translation deals only with portions of the text and not the entire text.

3. The reviewer is also not without sin, which simply confirms the truism I stated at the beginning. In citing my translation of a phrase dealing with the battle on the Seret River, which he considered a mistake, Waugh omitted the verb which helped to determine the meaning of the entire phrase and without which both Slavic and English texts are meaningless. Consequently, "bivshimasia . . . o reku Seret' . . ." is indeed "fought . . . for the river Seret," or one step further, "fought . . . for the possession of the river Seret," as I had stated in my translation, and not a mistake as stated by the reviewer.

In looking over the translation once again and comparing it with the Hypatian text, I could find no omissions—especially of important names—which the reviewer accused me of passing over in silence, but actually never named. If this and similar generalizations made by the reviewer were supported by concrete examples, both I and future investigators would profit greatly, since this would have been an original contribution to a better understanding of the chronicle. Unfortunately, this was never done.

4. As far as Waugh's remark that Teofil Kostruba's Ukrainian translation was more faithful to the original than my own is concerned, I would like to make the following observations: (a) Kostruba and I worked on two different variants of the GVC, of which neither is the original (despite the reviewer's statement to the contrary), since the thirteenth-century protograph never reached us. Kostruba based his translation primarily on the sixteenth-century Khlebnikovsky text of the GVC, while I used the fifteenth-century Hypatian text. (b) The translation of any text from Church Slavonic into another Slavic language is by nature a different process than that involving a translation into English. In the first case, both the vocabulary and syntactic constructions are often so similar that one can do without changes of grammatical constructions and consequently without brackets. I think that the reviewer will agree with me on this point.

And as far as the reviewer's remark that the publication of the translation was a bit premature is concerned, I agree with him only inasmuch as I believe that he is entitled to his own opinion in this as in all other matters.

GEORGE A. PERFECKY
La Salle College

PROFESSOR WAUGH REPLIES:

Yes, most books are imperfect. While it is the purpose of a review to indicate, as mine did, what is good about a book, the review should also point out imperfections. The reviewer should not, of course, criticize the author for what he did not intend, but neither should the author attribute to the reviewer statements he did not make.

I nowhere indicated that I wished "to see a literal translation of the GVC" or any kind of "running commentary on the literary devices found in the text." You have not answered the objection regarding your extreme use of bracketed expressions; the examples I cited speak for themselves. I am well aware of the section "Commentary to Translation" (in which, incidentally, you should have inserted some of the "Notes" that follow it—for example, nos. 130, 135, 146); I did not object specifically to any of the passages explained in that commentary. Regarding literary devices, it is true that parallelisms may be difficult to reflect

in translation; the choice of indirect over direct discourse is quite another matter. Regarding Kostruba's translation, I should, of course, have written "his original," since I am well aware that we do not have "the original." However, the point is that a reader wishing to consult a translation of the GVC into a modern language, in which the literary sense of the text comes across (here variant readings are not entirely to the point), would do well to consult Kostruba. I did, of course, state that I recognize the difficulty in comparing English and Slavic translations of a Slavic text. I referred to Panov's translation first of all by way of compliment rather than reproach. My pointing out your failure to mention it was for two reasons: (1) apparently you were trying to provide references to the various editions and translations of GVC; (2) although incomplete and in places unsatisfactory, the Panov translation nevertheless includes very large portions of the text.

Regarding specific examples of translation, you have not answered my objection to your rendering of "nemogu." In the sentence dealing with the Seret, I did not "omit" the verb. One can take the phrase in isolation and translate it as you do, but to me that was incorrect for several reasons: (1) the campaign was against Halych, to which the army marched after the battle on the Seret; (2) the word *bitisia* does not take an object, nor does it normally occur in conjunction with *o* in the meaning you supplied; (3) there are many examples in old Rus'ian texts of the use of *o* with the accusative meaning "near, on"—examples which often occur precisely in such a context, where an army is engaged in some activity near a river; and (4) the chronicler, who had just used "na rettse Serete," presumably, like you, wished to vary his language while saying the same thing.

You apparently did not read carefully my remarks concerning the "Notes" to the text. I did not, as you suggest, accuse you of omitting names in your translation. What I did say is that you comment on some figures and fail to comment on others, but do not indicate why you chose those you did. For example, one wonders why you expand at length on some of the Rus'ian princes but see no need whatsoever to comment on Mongols and Tatars mentioned in the text. Had you sought to provide even rudimentary information on them, presumably you would not have identified Nogai as "[Khan]" in the text of your translation (an identification, one suggests, that probably was lacking in *the* original, since the chronicler knew better) and again in your index as "Tatar khan" (pp. 95, 154), when in fact Nogai was not and could not be khan of the Golden Horde. Yet you chose at random to gloss the chronicler's references to a thousand boats or a hundred thousand dead as an "obvious exaggeration" (notes 47, 143); you inform us that the chronicler's "by God's will Danilo's retinue took flight because of their sins" "quite obviously cannot be taken seriously" (p. 41 and note 67).

As far as Hrushevs'kyi and Pashuto are concerned, the problem is not so much in citing them—indeed, more than others they have commented on the text—but rather in presenting their *commentaries* in places as though they were independent *sources* or based on such sources, even though often that is not the case.

Finally, regarding my opinion that your translation was premature (or better, to use Ingrid Bergman's line, "born backwards"), I might merely suggest that one would expect a translation to be made not before, but after, completion of the critical text in the project of which the translation is to be a part. However, I am aware of the considerations which governed the decision to do otherwise.