

In sum, the article's claim that the "Hungarian prototype" of "Peter I's Testament" was the product of consistent Hungarian maneuvering between 1706 and 1710 is false. At best, Dr. Subtelny could make a case for the "individual creativeness" of such an adventurer as Talaba, a possibility he nevertheless rejects in the conclusion of his essay.

PETER PASTOR  
*Montclair State College*

PROFESSOR SUBTELNY REPLIES:

Although Professor Pastor's remarks are quite informative, they do not come to grips with two basic, well-documented, and incontestable facts: (1) In 1706, Ferenc Rákóczi himself ordered two of his diplomats, János Pápai and Ferenc Horváth, to spread anti-Muscovite propaganda. (2) In 1710, another Hungarian diplomat, Máté Talaba, probably on his own initiative, not only continued to spread such propaganda but even implicated Peter I in it. My goal was to present these little-known facts in connection with the growth of the myth of Peter I's "testament"; it was not my purpose to analyze Habsburg-Russian-Hungarian relations in the early eighteenth century. If these facts do not sit well with "standard interpretations," it is no fault of mine.

Furthermore, had Dr. Pastor read my article more carefully, he would have noticed that I did not say that Hungarian-Russian relations had been initiated by Rákóczi in 1708; rather, that in that year, Rákóczi, in order to improve his relations with Peter I, sent Talaba as his resident to the tsar's court. Nor did I say that in 1710 relations between Peter I and Rákóczi "cracked," but rather, that they had cooled. (For copious archival citations to this effect see A. V. Florovsky, *Ot Poltavu do Pruta*, Prague, 1971, pp. 55–57.) Incidentally, Rákóczi did not accept the Ukrainian lands that were offered to him and his followers, because, "not trusting the tsar all too much," he feared that this would "entice" him too deeply into Peter I's territory and that his men would be enserfed ("Sclaven würden sein") by the Russians (Imre Lukinich, ed., *A Szatmári béke története és okirat-tára*, Budapest, 1925, p. 495).

In conclusion, it would be worthwhile to recall how Józef Feldman, an outstanding Polish historian of the eighteenth century, characterized the leading East European political figures of the period: "They and their actions were blurred by a reluctance to follow a consistent political path and by a more or less general recourse to the mask of hypocrisy and intrigue."

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, Czyzhevskiy, 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. Hrushevskiy 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 Hrushevskiy 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