

Slavic Review

33/4 (1974): 769-71

THE GALICIAN-VOLYNIAN CHRONICLE: AN ANNOTATED TRANSLATION. By *George A. Perfecky*. With an editor's preface. Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies, vol. 16, II: THE HYPATIAN CODEX, part 2. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1973. 159 pp. Genealogical table. DM 38, paper.

The translation and annotation of old Rus'ian texts is an unenviable task, owing to their complexity and obscurity. This is indeed true of the Galician-Volynian Chronicle (covering the years 1201-92), which has received insufficient attention and has never been rendered in a proper scholarly translation, much less one in English. Professor Perfecky offers a "free (but faithful) rather than a literal interpretation of the chronicle." He has "found it necessary to substitute indirect

for direct discourse" in certain instances and "for the sake of clarity to identify princes, substitute nouns for pronouns (and vice versa), translate participles by verbs and add words within the text itself," being careful to set off all such additions and substitutions by brackets (p. 15). These guidelines provide a great deal of leeway indeed for "interpretation" and create certain problems.

In those portions of the text which I have checked, Perfecky has been quite scrupulous, with the result that in many respects his translation is much more accurate than the Cross version of the *Povest' vremennykh let* and is free from the occasional blunders of Panov's 1936 modern Russian translation of portions of the Galician-Volynian Chronicle (to which Perfecky curiously does not refer). Perfecky does make a few mistakes (such as rendering *o reku Seret'* as "for the possession of the Seret," and *po ottsi svoem* as "while his father was still alive"). More serious, it seems to me, is the potential inherent in the "free interpretation" and extensive bracketing of Perfecky's translation for misleading the reader about what the text actually contains. A few of the more extreme examples will illustrate the point. I see no reason for the inclusion of clauses such as "[But they persistently hacked away at them]" (p. 19) or the awkward "[to come to (1206) rule and reign over them]" (p. 18) when these words are not in the text and are not necessary to clarify it. Providing historical identification and interpretation is extremely dangerous, especially when the translator tries to persuade us that as a nonhistorian he cannot "assume any responsibility for the correctness of the historical information" in his annotation (p. 15). Not uncommon are passages such as "[Prince] Oleksander [Vsevolodovič of Belz] came with his allies [the Polish Princes] Lestko [of Cracow] and Kondrat [of Mazowie]" (p. 19; for "*Vozvede Oleksandr Lest'ka i Kon'drata*"), and "[they were led by the Galician boyars] Jurij Domamerič and . . ." (p. 29; for "*Be bo s nimi Domamerich' Iur'gii i . . .*"). Distortion of the text can result from overly free interpretation, as one sees in the rendering of "*vidish' moiu nemoshch' ozhe nemogu a ni u mene detii*" as "Behold my illness [and] that I am not able [to beget. Therefore since] I have no children . . ." (p. 99). The *nemogu* needs no explanation and can be translated simply as "I am ill."

Perfecky is often insensitive to the literary devices of the text, not only in a number of instances where he has eliminated parallelism but in countless cases where without good reason he has changed direct into indirect discourse. While I recognize the difficulty of comparing an English translation of an old Slavic text with a modern Slavic translation, I venture to suggest that Teofil Kostruba's 1936 translation of this chronicle into modern Ukrainian for popular consumption is more faithful to the original than Perfecky's.

Although no textual commentary can be entirely satisfactory, there are aspects of Perfecky's admittedly nonexhaustive annotation about which the reader should be warned. He states no criteria for deciding what deserved comment and what did not, with the result that he passes over in silence many obscurities in the text or important names, while in other cases he provides superfluous commentary. The historical information in the notes (and often in brackets in the text) derives almost entirely from the secondary works of Hrushevsky and Pashuto, whose source in some cases was none other than this same chronicle.

Providing adequate commentary for this difficult text is obviously a task for a team of specialists, such as the one now preparing comprehensive editions and annotation of all the old Rus'ian chronicles under the guidance of Professor Pritsak,

the editor of the volume under review. Although offered as the first installment of that important project, Perfecky's volume was in fact prepared originally under different auspices as a doctoral dissertation. Therefore, the reader would be wise to heed the editor's warning that the Perfecky volume "shows the present state of research" (p. 7) and will need revision. As indicated by my critical comments, there is some justification for going one step further and suggesting that its publication was a bit premature.

DANIEL CLARKE WAUGH
University of Washington