

tions of genre and structure. His title claims that the *Slovo* is a "tale" but also an "epic poem," and the reader is left puzzled because the translation and notes give him nothing to judge the "poetry" by, and the narrative offers precious little to relate to ordinary notions of a tale.

Howes has chosen to follow the example of Ivan Novikov, whose 1938 translation into Modern Russian divided the work into sections, each with an explanatory title. But Howes's real debt is to Vladimir Nabokov, as he states. He has followed Nabokov (who followed A. I. Sobolevsky and others) in transposing the account of the solar eclipse from its First Edition position preceding the apostrophe to Boian to a point following Igor's conversation with his brother Vsevolod. Unfortunately, Howes neglects to mention his transposition, which such modern commentators and translators as D. S. Likhachev, Zenkovsky, Obolensky, and Monas have rejected as unwarranted.

He also follows Nabokov in assuming that the first battle, won by Igor and his allies, was with the main Polovtsian forces led by Khans Gzak and Konchak, who then fled toward the Don. Most commentators and the majority of translators of the *Slovo* assume that Igor's initial encounter was with an advance party of the Polovtsians and that the main forces of Gzak and Konchak came up from beyond the Don to defeat Igor on the following day.

There are several other infelicities of translation: *pardus* is everywhere translated as leopard rather than cheetah, which the frescoes of the Saint Sofia Cathedral in Kiev indicate was kept as a hunting animal. Prince Iziaslav's retinue is covered by birds' feathers rather than their wings (*ptits' krily*), while Igor in his escape kills geese and swans "morning, noon, and night" rather than for "breakfast, dinner, and supper." Fortunately, we are spared many of the monstrosities of previous translations into English: Nabokov's "Bloody effulgences herald the light" becomes "The blood-red sky heralds the dawn," for instance. Certainly no one will agree with Howes's interpretations of all the *loci obscuri*, and he readily admits to uncertainty concerning some of them. In general, the translation reads well, if it may too often lack the inspiration of the original.

On balance, it still seems to this reader that Obolensky's translation remains the best in English. Published in the *Penguin Book of Russian Verse*, it has the great virtue of serving as an accompaniment to the original text. Despite the virtues of Howes's edition there is still room for an excellent, inspired translation of the *Slovo o polku Igoreve* with careful, scholarly annotation. Until that time, Howes's edition fills the need adequately.

JACK V. HANEY  
*University of Washington*

THE GALICIAN-VOLYNIAN CHRONICLE: AN ANNOTATED TRANSLATION. By *George A. Perfecty*. 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 Perfecty 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, Perfecty 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 Perfecty curiously does not refer). Perfecty 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 Perfecty'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' moiū nemoshch' ozhe nemogu a ni u mene detiū*" 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."

Perfecty 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 Perfecty's.

Although no textual commentary can be entirely satisfactory, there are aspects of Perfecty'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 Russian chronicles under the guidance of Professor Pritsak,

the editor of the volume under review. Although offered as the first installment of that important project, Perfeky'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 Perfeky 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*

THE SHAPING OF CZARDOM UNDER IVAN GROZNYJ. By *Bjarne Nørretranders*. Reprint of the 1964 Copenhagen edition, Variorum Reprint S4. London: Variorum Reprints, 1971. 188 pp. £6.

This book, a welcome and much-needed reprint of a work (first published in 1964) by a Danish scholar, is important to all those interested in the reign of Ivan IV, in the tsar's ideas, and in the relation between theory and practice in Ivan IV's statesmanship. Nørretranders's first work on Ivan IV, which appeared in Danish in 1956 under the title *Ivan den Skraekkelige i Russisk Tradition*, is far more informative than scholarly perhaps, but in 1959 he published his translation (into Danish) of Ivan's correspondence with Kurbsky, and in 1963 he wrote a most interesting article, "Ivan Groznyj's Conception of Tsarist Authority," *Scando-Slavica*, 9 (1963): 238-48.

The author fully appreciates the magnitude of the task he sets himself not only in trying to define the tsar's views but also in seeking out the logic of his actions in the light of his theories. In doing this he makes full use of current—especially Soviet—scholarship, and twice expresses regret that A. A. Zimin's *Oprichnina Ivana Groznogo* (1964) appeared just too late to take it into account in writing this book.

The analysis of Ivan's letters to Kurbsky (chapter 2) is masterly. The author points out the close interrelations between the various subjects mentioned in the tsar's epistles. Nørretranders rightly insists that Ivan is attempting a *scriptural*, *historical*, *political*, and *personal* justification of his actions and adds, "This personal justification is a long, connected argument in the form of a sort of autobiography, and occupies a good fifth of the total text of the message" (p. 28). The author is correct that Ivan's historical justification supports the political one. It would be difficult not to agree with him that Ivan introduced into Russian literature "propaganda not for the Faith, but [advocating] the supremacy of the Czar" (p. 33). This book contains many thought-provoking observations on the nature of the tsar's and Kurbsky's writings (for the latter, chapter 4 is especially fruitful). Consequently it is a most valuable contribution to the specialist literature on the theories that underlay the formation of the Muscovite state in the sixteenth century.

There are, however, a few inaccuracies that should not pass unnoticed. The author in outlining the tsar's views refers to them as Ivan's "programme." It would seem more correct to call it his "outlook" or *Weltanschauung*. Ivan certainly had a political program of action as a ruler, but it changed at least four times—even if the central point, the desire to retain complete power, remained unaltered.

Some bibliography is notable for its absence, such as S. V. Bakhrushin's works. After all, so many of the Soviet historians—including Zimin—base their interpre-