

Kronika halicko-wołyńska: (Kronika Romanowiczów) / Chronica Galiciano-Voliniana: (Chronica Romanoviciana), edited, introduced and annotated by Dariusz Dąbrowski, Adrian Jusupović, in collaboration with Irina Juriewa, Aleksander Majorow and Tatiana Wiłkuł, Cracow and Warsaw: Polska Akademia Umiejętności; Instytut Historii PAN, 2017, CXXVII + 709 pp. + 16 colour copies of pages from the manuscript, Pomniki Dziejowe Polski, Seria 2 / Monumenta Poloniae Historica, Series nova, vol. 16

Kronika halicko-wołyńska: Kronika Romanowiczów [The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle: The Dynasty Chronicle of the Romanovichi], translation, introduction and commentary Dariusz Dąbrowski and Adrian Jusupović, Cracow: Avalon; Warsaw: Instytut Historii PAN, 2017, 327 pp. (text of the manuscript pp. 91–272)

Over 150 years after August Bielowski's call in the inaugural volume of the Monumenta Poloniae Historica series to publish the original text of the *Volhynian Chronicle* with a Polish translation and commentary, the Polish humanities have now received — thanks to a grant from the National Science Centre — two separate volumes, issued by two different publishers and featuring a critical scholarly edition and a translation of this historic work. The task of editing the work was taken on by two eminent experts on medieval Rus': Dariusz Dąbrowski, professor of the Casimir the Great University of Bydgoszcz, author of over 100 studies, including four books, mostly devoted to Galician-Volhynian Rus',¹ and the initiator and author of the edition, Adrian Jusupović from the Tadeusz Manteuffel Institute of History of the Polish Academy of Sciences, a scholar with many outstanding achievements to his credit.² The two editors invited Irina Iur'eva from the Russian Language Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Aleksandr V. Maiorov from Saint Petersburg University, and Tetiana Vilkuł from the Institute of Archaeography of the National Academy of Sciences, Ukraine, to collaborate with them on the project and support them with their specialist knowledge in the study of the manuscripts and preparation of detailed interpretations of many aspects debated in the literature on the subject.

¹ Dariusz Dąbrowski, *Rodowód Romanowiczów, książąt halicko-wołyńskich*, Poznań and Wrocław, 2002; idem, *Genealogia Mściśławowiczów: Pierwsze pokolenia (do początku XIV wieku)*, Cracow, 2008; idem, *Daniel Romanowicz król Rusi (ok. 1201–1264): Biografia polityczna*, Cracow, 2012; idem, *Król Rusi Daniel Romanowicz: O ruskiej rodzinie książęcej, społeczeństwie i kulturze w XIII w.*, Cracow, 2016 <<https://ukw.academia.edu/DariuszDąbrowski>> [accessed 8 May 2018].

² The bibliography of Adrian Jusupović until 2015 comprises forty studies, mostly devoted to Rus' in the Middle Ages, including the book *Elity ziemi halickiej i wołyńskiej w czasach Romanowiczów (1205–1269): Studium prozopograficzne*, Cracow, 2013 <<https://ihpan.academia.edu/AdrianJusupović>> [accessed 8 May 2018].

The *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, subtitled by Dąbrowski and Jusupović *The Dynasty Chronicle of the Romanovichi*, is well-known to specialists and occupies an important place in historical literature. It is a fragment of a number of surviving manuscript compilations from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries, comprising *The Tale of Bygone Years* (also known as the *Primary Chronicle* or *Nestor's Chronicle*), the most famous historic piece of Old Russian writing, covering the period until 1111 (6618 of the Russian era); its chronological continuation, the *Kievan Chronicle*, ending in 1198 (6706 or 6708); and the chronicle of the present edition, covering events from the thirteenth century, beginning with the death of Roman Mstislavovich in 1205 and ending in 1298. Among the compilations in question the oldest is the so-called *Hypatian/Ipatievski Codex*, a manuscript from the early 1420s, published since 1843 in several editions widely used by scholars. They include two editions of the second volume in the series *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei* (Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles — PSRL), from 1843 and Aleksei A. Shakhmatov's 1908 critical edition, reissued three times in 1962, 1998 and 2001, as well as a separate 1871 edition of the entire codex, reissued in 2001. Versions of the text of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* differing from the *Hypatian Codex* present in scholarly circulation are less popular. There is also the 1990 Harvard University phototypal edition, published together with the *Kievan Chronicle*, from poor quality microfilms of the Khlebnikov-Ostrogski Manuscript and the Pogodinskii Manuscript, and Mykola F. Kotliar's 2002 edition based on the Harvard edition. What undoubtedly justifies the need for a new critical edition of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* is not only the fact that Shakhmatov's 1908 edition, although valuable, does not meet modern scholarly requirements, but above all a significant defect in the manuscript on which the edition is based. As early as in 1901 Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi concluded that all studies should be based not on the chronologized *Hypatian Codex* but on other texts (Khlebnikov, Pogodinskii), which, although originating centuries later, are closer to the archetype (p. VIII). As it turns out, the text of the *Chronicle* lacks a chronological continuation of the narrative, which, according to Dąbrowski and Jusupović, was the reason why the copyist making the Hypatian Manuscript in the fifteenth century introduced a division into years, because a 'formula without a division into years was alien and unacceptable to him' (p. XLIX).

Following this train of thought and thanks to their in-depth knowledge of the literature on the subject as well as previous editions of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, Dąbrowski and Jusupović have established that the text of the *Chronicle* has survived in seven paper manuscript compilations from the fifteenth to the nineteenth centuries. Three of them also feature, in addition to the chronicles in question, other works: *The Tale of St Peter Metropolitan of Kiev*, fragments of *The Book of Esther* and *The Tale of the Mamay Battlefield*. The traditional, often strange-sounding names of the manuscripts come either from the names of the owners or places where they were discovered or kept. The manuscripts studied for the present edition are: (1) the afore-mentioned Hypatian Manuscript (*Ipat'evskii spisok*, kept in the Library of the Russian

Academy of Sciences in Saint Petersburg, no. 16.4.4), made at the beginning of the 1420s; (2) the Khlebnikov-Ostrogski Manuscript (*Khlebnikovskii-Ostrozhs-kii spisok*, kept in Saint Petersburg, in the Russian National Library — RNL, no. F.IV.230) made in the late 1550s and early 1560s, and supplemented in 1637; (3) the Pogodinskii-Czetwertyński manuscript (*Pogodinskii spisok*, also from the RNL, no. Flor. 1401) completed in 1621, which is a copy of the Khlebnikov Manuscript; (4) the Bundur/Jarocki Manuscript (*Spisok Ia. V. Iarotskogo*, kept in the Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Saint Petersburg, no. 21.3.14) written down in 1651 by Marko Bundur, a monk from the Monastery of St Nicholas in Kiev; (5) the Ermolaevskii Manuscript (*Ermolaevskii spisok*, kept in the RNL in Saint Petersburg, no. F.IV.231) made in 1711 in the Pechersk Lavra in Kiev; (6) the Cracow Manuscript, a copy of the Pogodinskii manuscript in the Latin alphabet from around 1782–92, commissioned by Adam Naruszewicz and kept in the Princes Czartoryski Library in Cracow (BC, no. 122); (7) the RGADA Manuscript (Russian State Archives of Historical Records, no. F.181.10), made by Petr Bol'shakov in 1814–16, a copy of the entire *Hypatian Chronicle*.

Dąbrowski and Jusupović carried out a detailed analysis of the first five manuscripts from the Southern Rus'ian collections, studying them directly in libraries and then continuing their research on modern electronic copies precisely reproducing the originals. On this basis they have formulated a hypothesis whereby the surviving historic works of Southern Rus'ian historiography are in their entirety (together with a list of Kievan princes until the capture by Kiev by Batu Khan, *The Tale of Bygone Years*, *Kievan Chronicle* and *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*) a product of the Romanovichi's scriptorium (p. LXXIV). The *stemma codicum* drawn up for the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* by the editors indicates that that a collection compiled in the Romanovichi's milieu or its copy gave rise to a manuscript (protograph), two separate versions of which became, respectively, the protograph of the Hypatian and Khlebnikov Manuscripts (and the latter's later copies, the Pogodinskii-Czetwertyński and Cracow Manuscripts), and the protograph of the Bundur/Jarocki and Ermolaevskii Manuscripts. Some other, now lost, copies were used in the seventeenth century — as is evidenced by the surviving fragments — by the Metropolitan of Kiev Iosif Tryzna and Hegumen of the Monastery of St Michael in Kiev, Feodosii Sofonovych.

Following Hrushevs'kii's old suggestion, Dąbrowski and Jusupović have chosen the Khlebnikov Manuscript as the basis of their edition. The manuscript must have originated in Prince Konstantyn Ostrogski's circle, on the basis of a protograph kept in the Monastery of the Dormition of the Mother of God in Leshch near Pinsk from where it found its way to Kiev and in early 1621 to Zhyvotov, the estate of Prince Stefan Czetwertyński, where a copy subsequently known as the Pogodinskii-Czetwertyński Manuscript was made. Next it must have found its way to Pechersk Lavra, where it was used by Petro Mohyla and Sylvester Kossov, as is evidenced by their notes. The choice of the Khlebnikov Manuscript was preceded by thorough studies of the content and form of the surviving manuscripts, from which the editors concluded that the protograph

was a historiographic collection referred to in the Middle Ages as the *Rus'ian Chronicle*. Its third part is the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*.

The editors' next task was to establish the genre of the work, above all to determine whether we are dealing with a classic old Rus'ian chronicle (*letopis'*). To this end Dąbrowski and Jusupović used the latest model developed by Timofei V. Gimon as well as studies by Aleksei A. Gippius, Tat'iana A. Kruglova and Gelian M. Prokhorov, which show that the content of a *letopis'* is divided by year, and that within a given year there is no single core of the narrative. In addition, a *letopis'* is open to transformations and additions (compilations), and individual authorship is not expressed (p. XLIX). In this light the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* is not a *letopis'*, because its text is not divided by year. It is composed of separate modules, often constituting self-contained wholes. In addition, the narrative often recurs to specific threads, which creates a complex structure of cause-and-effect determinants. Therefore, Dąbrowski and Jusupović have concluded, drawing on Elisabeth Van Houts' findings, that its genre is that of a court (dynastic) chronicle focusing on one princely family.

The chronicle describes the history of five generations of the family, beginning with its progenitor, Roman Mstislavovich. Its protagonists are Feodora, Helena, Daniil and Vasyl'ko Romanovich, Iraklii, Lev, Roman, Mstislav (I), Shvarno and Mstislav (II) Danilovich, Ol'ga and Vladimir Vasyl'kovich, in the fourth generation Iurii L'vovich and Daniil Mstislavovich and in the fifth — Mikhail Iur'evich. Further detailed reflection on the authorship of the *Chronicle* and place of Galician chronicles in Southern Rus'ian historiography is based on an impressive overview of the literature on the subject. It has proved impossible to name the copyists and authors of the analysed work, but the editors have come up with their own interpretation of the structure of its content. In their opinion the *Chronicle* consists of two basic parts: 1) *Court Chronicle of Daniil Romanovich*, with two editions: the first originating around 1246–47, and the second covering the following period until 1258, with a continuation until the second half of 1264; 2) *Volhynian Chronicle*, covering the period from 1258 to around 1298, edited two or three times, as Dąbrowski and Jusupović have managed to establish. The first edition must have originated in Vasyl'ko Romanovich's milieu in the late 1260s, the second at the court of his son, Vladimir Vasyl'kovich, covering the period until early 1289, and the third, a continuation, may have been linked to the milieu of Mstislav (II). As a dynastic chronicle, the *Chronicle* lists many names of people serving the Romanovichs; it also presents the history of the neighbouring countries: Lithuania, the Polish principalities, Hungary, Austria and the Horde.

The present editors have decided to leave the commonly used derivative 'Galician-Volhynian' in the title, noting, however, that the term can be used, contrary to tradition, only in the sense that it is a court chronicle linked to the Romanovichs' state — Galician-Volhynian Rus'. That is why Dąbrowski and Jusupović have proposed their own original name for the publication, *The Dynasty Chronicle of the Romanovichs*. However, to avoid the chaos resulting from a rejection of traditional

names and their replacement with new ones, they have decided to use the term only as a subtitle. Agreeing with the editors, I hope that the name will nevertheless come to be appreciated in historiography.

The editors' ambition was to provide a critical edition preserving the specificity of the medieval text, which, with the help of modern technology and procedures, has made it possible to render the original in print as faithfully as possible. The text of the present edition is based on the Khlebnikov Manuscript, which the editors believe best conveys the nature of the chronicle, written at the court of the Romanovichs in the thirteenth century. The entire codex, written in half-uncial script, comprises 386 paginated + 9 unpaginated folios, with the *Chronicle* to be found on folios 303–384v. That the manuscript attracted much interest is evidenced by numerous comments, including those by five authors from 'Latin circles', people writing in Polish and Latin from the seventeenth-eighteenth centuries, and at least four persons using Cyrillic script from between the sixteenth and second half of the eighteenth century. Colour scans of the manuscript, made to reproduce the manuscript as faithfully as possible, have made it possible to precisely read all marginal notes and emphases.

The edition uses the Litopys New Roman font, which is a version, prepared by Ukrainian IT specialists, of the Times New Roman typeface commonly used in the humanities. The Ukrainian font makes it possible to edit the text both in Cyrillic and Latin scripts. An advantage of the font is a possibility of printing all Cyrillic letters found in the analysed manuscripts with the exception of the letter 'shta', differing from the modern Russian letter 'щ' in that the descender, instead of being found at the end of the letter, is in all manuscripts an extension of the middle leg below the base line 'и'. It has been replaced with 'щ'. Another exception is the letter 'z', not available in the Litopys New Roman font, but editable in Times New Roman, which causes no complications because of the presence of the font in all basic versions of Word. Here the editors have replaced 'z' with 'z', also present in the published manuscripts. As a reviewer and drawing on my own experience I must note the editors' veritably Benedictine meticulousness. Contrary to what they claim, the Litopys New Roman font is by no means stable and additional characters, like 'iotated a' and the ligature '8', turn into 'æ' and 'γ' when the text is transferred to another file or another computer. As we read the critical edition in question we find practically no such errors, which cannot, unfortunately, be said about the translation published by Avalon, in which sloppy proofreading detracts from the work of the editors.

The critical edition is additionally supported by a grammatical description as well as lexical and syntactical specification of the work (pp. XCVII–CXVII) by Irina Iur'eva translated by Jusupović. As research into the language of the *Chronicle* is by no means advanced, this extremely important article provides considerable philological help to scholars without such competence. Linguistically, Iur'eva distinguishes two different works in the text, which is why the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* cannot be viewed as one source. The 'Galician' part, written in Daniil Romanovich's circle, bears a similarity to the archaic *Tale of*

Bygone Years with its literary (Church Slavonic) forms and structures, while the 'Volhynian' part is full of manifestations of the vivid language of the *Kievan Chronicle*.

Thus when working on the critical edition, its authors had to prepare the text of the Khlebnikov-Ostrogski Manuscript, marking a divisions into folios/pages and within them into lines of the original. The editors have also preserved the emphases and notes found in the manuscript. In their publication they have striven to observe the editing instructions of Adam Wolff and follow the guidelines of Dmitrii S. Likhachev and Oleg V. Tvorogov. In addition, they have taken into account the practice recently followed by the editors of new volumes in the series *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, *Monumenta Poloniae Historica* and *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. However, they have also drawn on their own experiences stemming from the specificity of the manuscripts. This is especially valuable, because the rapid development of information technologies makes it possible to avoid any modernization of the script, which frees scholars from the need to refer to the manuscript. What does arouse some doubts, however, is the modernization of the punctuation and spelling, in accordance with the rules of modern Russian. The editors note that in the case of the Hypatian, Khlebnikov and Pogodinskii Manuscripts the method is not objectionable. In their view it can be debatable in the case of the Bundur/Jarocki and Ermolaevskii Manuscripts, whose authors were influenced by the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Polish and Ukrainian spelling. If we follow Dąbrowski's and Jusupović's arguments that in all cases we are dealing with medieval Southern Rus'ian writings, we can speak only of an editorial tradition developed in Russia in connection with the editions of *The Tale of Bygone Years* and other historic examples of Church Slavonic writings from Rus'. On the other hand, when it comes to the question of the local language, what I find more convincing is the view that already in the Late Middle Ages there existed a clear division into the Great Russian and Western Russian language areas.³ Southern Rus'ian writings undoubtedly belong to the Western language area, which is by no means uniform in linguistic and literary terms. I agree with Iur'eva that the text of the *Chronicle* belongs to that area as well. That is why I find the introduction of yers in square brackets in place of *paerki* and after overridden consonants, in accordance with the Russian spelling, objectionable. Taking into account the phonetic differences between modern Ukrainian and Russian, I am not sure which yer should be placed after a overridden letter. This is debatable, but it seems that instead of adding yers it is better to write the overridden letters in italics. The editors have also explained all conventional abbreviations and at the same time have trusted the reader's competence regarding numerals written in short as letters under the titlo. While in the introduction numerals are given in full, in the edited text of the manuscript and references (philological footnotes) they are not.

³ Andrash Zoltan [András Zoltán], *Iz istorii russkoi leksiki*, Budapest, 1987, p. 13.

Despite this minor reservation, the present edition of the *Chronicle* should be regarded as a model example. Dąbrowski and Jusupović have added appropriate back matter to the literally published text of the Khlebnikov Manuscript. After the text of the *Chronicle* the reader will find all varieties of spelling from the other four manuscripts from the fifteenth-eighteenth centuries — Hypatian, Pogodinskii-Czetwertyński, Bundur/Jarocki and Ermolaevskii — which even include the spelling of words by means of other letters rendering the same sounds (doublets), for example oy–ŏ–y, ѣ–e and so on. as well as words or phrases missing from the Khlebnikov Manuscript, inversions and different versions of names of places and people. There are also dates introduced by the author of the Hypatian Manuscript. Below, usually at the bottom of the page, we will find footnotes marked with Arabic numerals and featuring comments explaining the text. They include information, if available, about the individuals appearing in the text, with references to the literature about them. The same applies to all geographical names and place names, with editors referring the reader to studies explaining their role in the period in question. Particularly valuable are explanations concerning the events described in the chronicle with attempts to establish their actual chronology, which in the light of the findings relating to the structure of the *Chronicle*, whose authors often return to matters described earlier, helps the reader to understand the text. In total, there are over 1600 footnotes, with the number of philological notes being certainly several times higher.

It is good that Dąbrowski and Jusupović have been able to provide their readers with a Polish translation of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* alongside its critical edition. The translation published by Avalon repeats the main part of the introduction to the critical edition with the exception, of course, of the philological commentary. The translation is directly from the Khlebnikov Manuscript collated with the above mentioned four manuscripts from the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries. However, unlike in the critical edition here it has proved necessary to choose a specific version of words and phrases regarded by the editors as correct or best conveying the meaning of the text. Every translation is an interpretation. However, the translators should be praised for the fact that they have marked the changes introduced in comparison with the Khlebnikov Manuscript in italics. This also applies to the use, also quoted in the introduction to the critical edition, of the name Dnieper (p. 108, fol. 315/645 of the Khlebnikov Manuscript), although the reference is clearly to the Dniester, written in the translation in italics (p. 130 and footnote 363). What facilitates reading for people having problems with reading the Cyrillic script or just beginning to study the script and the language of the sources is the preservation in the translation of the structure of the text, division into folios/pages and lines of the original, which makes it possible to read both volumes in parallel. The translation successfully attempts to remain as faithful as possible to the linguistic and literary specificity of the text. Its authors have decided not to modernize the language to make it more understandable to the Polish reader. Names of people and places have been Polonized, whenever traditional equivalents exist in Polish. I am also grateful to Dąbrowski and Jusupović for pre-

serving the Eastern Slavic ending of ‘-ич’ in the patronymics instead of the forgotten Polish ‘-ic’, even with reference to Western Slavs, which was and still is quite exotic, for example in studies by Jan Tęgowski devoted to the Gediminovich (Giedyminowicz) dynasty or studies by Dąbrowski himself, where the dynasty is referred to as the Romanovichs (Romanowicze), but in the text we find Roman Mstislavic (Mścisławic), Daniil Romanovic (Romanowic) and so on. in the light of the sources in which they appear. The footnotes to the Polish translation of the chronicle make up a separate study. They contain information about the dates found in the Hypatian Manuscript, explanations concerning the Biblical literature widely quoted in the *Chronicle*, documents of the names of places, people and events as well as fragments of the texts, terms used and so on, which Polish readers will find difficult to understand according to the translators. At the same time, in tracing literary references the two scholars do not go too far, as sometimes happens in the case of their too inquisitive colleagues. For example (p. 161, footnote 709), the phrase ‘lom’ kopeiny’, translated as ‘breaking of the spear’, regarded in the literature as a borrowing from the *Kievan Chronicle*, is, according to the translators, a description of concrete actions by means of similar sets of words.

Unfortunately, the translation of *The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle: The Dynasty Chronicle of the Romanovichi*, unlike the critical edition, is characterized by less meticulous proofreading (quite numerous examples of the ‘iotated a’ and the ligature ‘8’ are rendered by means of incorrect characters). Nevertheless, in both cases we are dealing with a perfect publication, deserving the highest praise as a publication of historiographic sources.

Krzysztof Pietkiewicz
(Poznań)

(Translated by Anna Kijak)