

political scientists also argued that the institutionalization of the Chinese system was quite limited in the 1980s, and tradition of “guerrilla style-politics” remained important.

Torigian believes that the “Gang of Four” lacked their own coherent political platform during the late Cultural Revolution. He argues that there were “no real political differences separating Hua and Deng” (138), but they would have been divided by their generations and differing roles during the Cultural Revolution as benefiter and victim. According to my view, these arguments are not fully convincing. One could argue that Shanghai was the only provincial jurisdiction in China, where the Cultural Revolutionary Left remained in power until the coup led by Hua. For example, in the Shanghai, the radical leadership built a workers’ militia beyond the control of the People’s Liberation Army. At the level of the central leadership, the “Gang” and conservative “old cadres” were forced to cooperate by Mao. Under these circumstances, both sides had to pay lip-service to party unity, some would “wait and see” and political differences could not be openly expressed. After Mao died, the “Gang” was immediately arrested. During the criminal investigation to prepare their trial, the members of the “Gang” had good reasons to downplay their past ambitions for power and desire to purge “old cadres.” During the power struggle with Hua, Deng would not outline his own political agenda too openly. After he became the de-facto supreme leader of the CCP, however, Deng supported market, enterprise, price and labor reforms in the 1980s that went far beyond Hua’s agenda of 1977. Furthermore, in 1981 the Central Committee of the CCP passed a resolution that fully denied the Cultural Revolution. My impression is that Torigian sometimes takes statements of actors in the power struggle or in memoirs too literally without out critical contextualization. Furthermore, one might ask whether or not the upgrading of Hua and downgrading of Deng in the Chinese literature is somehow related to Xi Jinping’s effort to rewrite the history of “Reform and Opening” in recent years.

Prestige, Manipulation, and Coercion is interesting to read for scholars and students of Soviet and Chinese politics and history. Comparison based on original language material for both cases is rare and therefore highly welcomed.

FELIX WEMHEUER
University of Cologne

The Chronicle of Halych-Volhynia and Historical Collections in Medieval Rus’.

By Adrian Jusupović. Trans. Miłka Stępień. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2022. xxiv, 244 pp. Plates. Chronological Table. Bibliography. Indexes. \$131.00, hard bound. doi: 10.1017/slr.2024.31

The *Halych-Volynian Chronicle (HVL)*, covering the years 1201–1292 and subject to extensive analysis for well over a century, has recently undergone republication in a magnificent critical edition employing all known manuscripts, appending A. A. Shakhmatov’s 1909 reconstruction of the original conclusion, plus a brief continuation from 1651 edited by Dariusz Dąbrowski and Adrian Jusupović, *Chronica Galiciana-Voliniana (Chronica Romanoviciana)*, Monumenta Historiae Polonica, New Series 16 (Cracow-Warsaw, 2017). Enriched with copious notes and a detailed introduction, this edition, fronted also with Ukrainian and Polish title pages, now constitutes a must-consult gold standard.

Jusupović followed with a splendid gap-filling monograph—*Kronika halicko-wołynska (Kronika Romanowiczow) w latopisarskiej kolekcji historycznej* (Warsaw-Cracow: Avalon, 2019)—on *HVL*’s sources, construction, chronological, and narrative

strategies, *cui bono* authorship location and patronage of various passages, and precise or likely historical evidence therein, all capped with a detailed compositional chronological chart and an extensive bibliography. Under review here is a translation, supplemented by a foreword containing an abridgment of the 2017 Introduction concerning the chronicle's name (preferred: *Romanovichi*), annalistic genre (preferred: "collection"), and manuscript stemma, plus a new footnote questioning Christian Raffensperger's use of "king" for the Rus' *kniaz'* (VIIIⁿ3). The English version adds translations from *HVL* (92–93, 95/83–84) with both text and explanatory notes taken from the 2017 publication (69n244, 107–8n335, 84n31, 157n452, 85nn35, 37/159nn456–57, 86n47, 166n468), and, as if aware of North American readership, a long footnote dialoguing with Charles Halperin regarding the Mongol period Rus' chronicles (119n74) plus new material concerning *HVL*'s Lithuanian prince—monk Vaišvilka (137–43), referencing, among others, this reviewer.

An informed reading is an unmitigated delight as Jusupović takes us step by step through all of *HVL* and elucidates how its authors retained chronological continuity centered on a given ruler, yet included pertinent inserts, especially concerning neighboring lands. Scrupulously crediting other scholars, he carefully advances his own hypotheses, whether micro concerning individual passages, events, and loci of scriptoria and chanceries, or complex—that the later *Hypatian Chronicle* redactor did not understand *HVL*'s approach to chronology. Viewing a hypothetical *Danilo*'s, (Romanovich, d. 1264) *Chronicle* (Pol. *zwód*), first undertaken in 1246–47, as the initial phase of *HVL* composition, Jusupović sees it commencing with an encomium to Danilo's father Roman Mstislavich (d. 1205). This stretches from 1201, when he briefly occupied Kiev, until his death, and replaces text from what Jusupović calls the (now lost) *Kievan Chronicle* (Pol. *Latopis*) of the (Smolensk-based) *Rostislavichi*. Since (Rostislavich) Mstislav Mstislavich ruled in Halych during much of 1215–28, that lost chronicle continued as a substratum of *Danilo*'s, which comes into its own as fully Romanovichi-oriented as of 1229. The period 1244–59 within *HVL* appears as a focused "dynastic chronicle devoid of an annalistic layout, consisting of various types of stories gathered under various themes" (129). Finally, in the last, Volynian-centered phase of composition, likely very early 1300s, the 1259–60 response of Danilo's brother Vasil'ko of Volodimir (d. 1269) to Mongol demands that local fortresses be razed prompted self-serving editing of the foregoing concerning Danilo by the chronicler of the latter's relatively erudite nephew Volodimer Vasil'kovich (d. 1289).

Milka Stępień's translation is eminently readable and sometimes eloquent but allows several unfortunate aspects for the neophyte. With Jusupović's employing cognate Polish words, *gród* (for *HVL*'s elastic term городъ), for example, becomes "grod" (65), but never so explained in text or note. Captured Polish *czeladzi* (челѣди) are "serfs" (157: that early?) or "servants" (189: all of them?), as can be substantial *ludzie* (153, referencing *HVL*: съ людьми з добрыми), while a "knight" (*ryceri*: best term here for an undifferentiated swordsman?) can also be a prince's "servant" (85: *sluga*/слуга). *HVL*'s office of соцкый (centurian, hundredman) remains the Polish "setnik" (85), and where *włość* (волость) is a prince's domain it becomes "estate" (21). The rendering of place and personal names is inconsistent: Russian forms of Ukraine's Volodimir and Belarus's Navahrudak, while Ukrainian Halych, Belarusian Vawkavysk, and Polish for formerly Rus' Przemyśl, Chełm, and Bełż; also Lithuanian names for native princes except two in mixed *HVL*/Russian form with Polish orthography: Budykid, Budywid. Among the few outright mistakes: inland Poland's *wielkim morze* from *HVL*'s "моръ великъ," becomes "great sea" not pestilence (161); *pascha* is both "Easter" and "Passover" (187); twice *Nicea* is "Nice" (76, 113); thrice "Romanovichi" is plural (107, 110, 112) where the Polish singular denotes

one prince; and *HVL*'s землю ракоушкоу as *ziemię rakuszka* becomes "Land of Rakushkaia" (never identified), not Austria (117). Do such minor defects negate the book's overall value for researchers? Hardly. But pedagogues need such alerting if advising students who may consult this most excellent contribution to our scholarship on medieval Rus'.

DAVID GOLDFRANK
Georgetown University

Prague: Belonging in the Modern City. By Chad Bryant. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2021. 332 pp. Notes. Index. Photographs. Maps. \$29.95, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2024.32

In this creative, lively history of Prague accessible to non-specialists, Chad Bryant walks in the shoes of five historical actors who called it home over the course of two centuries. Each of the Pragues that emerges—German City, Czech City, Revolution City, Communist City, and Global City—makes up a distinct chapter. Unlike a traditional academic monograph, the book invites the reader to reminisce on the experiences of travel, belonging, alienation, politicking and people-watching, while simultaneously touching on key themes in modern Czech history. Its hybrid qualities call to mind the works of historian and travel writer Jan Morris (writing on Trieste) and Claudio Magris' classic *Danube*.

Each chapter comprises a sort of historical walking tour. The first follows the life of Karel Zap, who published the first tour guide of Prague written in Czech (rather than German) in 1847. In it, Prague becomes "a Slavic city, a Czech city" (38). Zap waxed that, "Prague is the fruit of Czech history, the fruit of the thousand-year spiritual and bodily activities of the whole nation," and his primary bodily activity of interest was *strolling*. Throughout the century, leisure walking became a form of sociability that the middle classes were borrowing and adapting from the nobility. Bryant notes that seeing the city "while on foot . . . was crucial to imagining Prague as the capital, sanctum, and mecca of the nation" (44). In turn, Zap cautioned his upstanding readers on the dangers of visiting the industrial districts, and barely mentioned the Jewish Town; Jews and Germans brought an unwelcome "cosmopolitanism," he asserted, that detracted from the city's "purely Slavic essence" (54).

Half a century later, the German-speaking Jewish Prager Egon Erwin Kisch offered vignettes from a very different side of Czech Prague. The city had undergone a Czechification, with the erection of the National Museum, establishment of Czech-owned businesses and banks, and the disappearance of German-speakers from the city council. The old Jewish Town was subjected to "slum clearance" in the name of scientific and technological progress. But Kisch was less drawn to modern, shiny Prague; in his popular weekly column "Prague Forays" in the newspaper *Bohemia*, he sought out the marginalized in late night visits to dive pubs and seedy locales. He explored soup kitchens, prisons, homeless shelters; he wrote on panhandlers and on the local dogcatcher. To do so, Kisch "learned the Czech slang on the street" (78). Bryant posits that as the German identity of Prague diminished, Kisch's focus on these marginalized characters revealed "a struggle to forge a sense of place in a city increasingly imagined as 'golden, Slavic Prague'" (104). Wandering and writing, his encounters allowed him to form an "alternative way of belonging," to create relationships, however fleeting, among himself, his subjects and his readers.