

BOOK REVIEWS

Akty, odnosiaschchiesia k istorii Zapadnoi Rossii, т. 1(6): *Sbornik dokumentov Kantseliarii velikogo kniazia litovskogo Aleksandra Iagellonchika (1494–1506 gg.)*. *Shestaia kniga zapisei Litovskoi metriki [Акты, относящиеся к истории Западной России, т. 1(6): Сборник документов канцелярии великого князя литовского Александра Ягеллончика (1494–1506 гг.). Шестая книга записей Литовской метрики]*, ed. M.T. Bychkova, O.I. Khoruzhenko, A.V. Vinogradov, Moscow–St Petersburg, 2012, 664 p. ISBN 978-5-90598-630-7

The reviewed publication announces the updated publication of the Lithuanian Metrica (LM) in Russia by the Russian Academy of Sciences Institute of Russian History¹. After the Bolshevik revolution in Russia in 1917, this scholarly activity was stopped. With the blessing of the academician Vladimir Pashuto and his ability to get permission ‘from the top’², there was an attempt to update LM research and publishing in 1978–1980³, when the ‘long’ decade was measured out for the Soviet Union to live. I stress the decade of the end of the Soviet Union, because during the ‘long’ period of the collapse not a single book of the updated LM series was published, although some international preparatory tasks were completed. At the same time, with archivists from Poland, the work of Patricia

¹ The LM-228 book published in Moscow in 2008 was a joint project by Russian and Belarusian scholars, financed by Russia’s Science Humanitarian Fund and the Belarusian Republic Fundamental Research Fund, see *Sudebnaia kniga vitebskogo voevody, gospodarskogo marshalka, volkovyskogo i oboletskogo derzhavtsy M.V. Klochko / 1533–1540*. (Litovskaia Metrika. Kniga No 228. Kniga sudnykh del No 9), podgotovili V.A. Voronin, A.I. Grusha i dr. (Moscow, 2008), p. 525. Review by A. Dubonis: *Lietuvos Metrikos naujienos*, No 10–2007/2008 (Vilnius, 2009), pp. 30–33.

² A.L. Khoroshkevich, ‘Poslednie publikatorskie nachinaniia V.T. Pashuto i ikh sud’ba’, *Vostochnaia Evropa v istoricheskoi retrospektive: k 80-letiiu V.T. Pashuto* (Moscow, 1999), pp. 295–296.

³ Ana Leonidovna Khoroshkevich raised the idea of updating the publishing, see A.L. Khoroshkevich, ‘K istorii izdaniia i izucheniia Litovskoi Metriki’, *Acta Baltico-Slavica*, ed. T. Cieślak, t. 8 (1973), p. 91.

Kennedy Grimsted was completed and published in 1984⁴. Did the organisational ability of Polish scholars at the time surpass the results of the Soviet updated Metricians?⁵ In December 1980, an agreement between the academies of sciences of Poland and the USSR was signed to begin the publication of the books of the *Metrica* (two books during 1981–1985)⁶. A joint international editorial board was formed. After a few years (in 1984–1985⁷), the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of History joined this programme. Already at that time, the renewal of LM research and publishing began to be concentrated in Vilnius, without doubt due to the activities of Egidijus Banionis and the favour of the Institute's Science Administration. Methodic publishing recommendations were issued,⁸ and in 1988 a scholarly conference devoted to the problems of the LM was organised. Banionis began to prepare a book in the Soviet *Metriciana* plan, the unpublished part of the LM-5 book of legations⁹.

In Moscow at that time, the reviewed LM-6 book had to be prepared. Its publication was held back for all sorts of reasons, Muscovite colleagues from the Russian Institute of History mentioned them more than once¹⁰. However, the preparers acquired an advantage, because they could take into account the experience of publishing several dozen books in Lithuania, Belarus, Poland and Ukraine: until 2012 more than 60 books of 15th to 18th century LM were published. The Muscovites do not hide the fact that they evaluated it when issuing their publication (p. 10), but remained silent on what palaeographic practices of the Lithuanians and Belarusians they

⁴ P. Kennedy Grimsted, I. Sułkowska-Kurasiowa, *The Lithuanian Metrica in Moscow and Warsaw: reconstructing the archives of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania* (Cambridge (Mass.) 1984), XVII [1], 73 [1] p.; VII, 278, [1] c. (with reprint: S.L. Ptashitskii, *Opisanie knig i aktov Litovskoi Metriki* (St Petersburg, 1887), 109 c. (appendixes)).

⁵ *Metryka Litewska: księga sigillat 1709–1719*, ed. A. Rachuba (Warsaw, 1987), 265, [2] s.

⁶ V.T. Pashuto, A.L. Khoroshkevich, 'Sovmestnaia publikatsiia sovetskikh i pol'skikh istorikov', *Voprosy istorii* (1981), No 2, pp. 158–160; M. Bychkova, *Litovskaia Metrika – sovmetnoe izdanie sovetskikh i pol'skikh istorikov*, *Istoriia SSSR* (1981), No 4, pp. 214–215; T. Wasilewski, 'Polsko–radzieckie prace nad wydaniem Metryki Litewskiej', *Kwartalnik historyczny*, No 4 (1981), pp. 1169–1171.

⁷ The topic of the Lithuanian *Metrica* began to be mentioned in 1984–1985 in the account of the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Science History Institute, see *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis. 1985 metai* (Vilnius, 1986), p. 156.

⁸ *Metodicheskie rekomendatsii po izdaniiu i opisaniuu Litovskoi Metriki*, sostavili A.L. Khoroshkevich, S.M. Kashtanov (Vilnius, 1985), p. 133.

⁹ *Lietuvos Metrika (1427–1506). Knyga Nr. 5. Užrašymų knyga 5. Litovskaia Metrika: kniga zapisei 5*, prep. by E. Banionis (Vilnius, 1993), p. 402.

¹⁰ No longer believing in the issuance of the LM-6 book, LIH scholars published it, see *Lietuvos Metrika. Knyga Nr. 6 (1494–1506). Užrašymų knyga 6*, ed. A. Baliulis (Vilnius, 2007), p. 518.

found acceptable and appropriate. Our question is justified, because until the appearance of the LM-6 book, the same LM-6 book authors Margareta Bychkova and Oleg Khoruzhenko, in a published article and review¹¹ about the *Metrika* issued in Lithuania, had found little praiseworthy in Lithuanian archaeographic practice and results achieved.¹² As a final and unquestionable truth, and with the help of the methodological recommendations of Khoroshkevich and Kashtanova, Muscovite colleagues ‘measured’ the level of scholarly development of the first few LM books issued in Lithuania. They did not find valuable examples, and if any were discovered, they were taken over in silence, but carefully selected and panned the deficiencies and weaker places of the Lithuanian publications.

They called the simplified transliteration of the old Russian text *древнерусский текст*¹³, abandoning the outdated ‘old Russian’ Cyrillic letters, as the most inappropriate practice. One can only partially agree with this allegation. Indeed, by conveying the whole old Cyrillic spelling of the text of the LM book, one would no longer have to resolve intricate philological questions, for example for which period – the making of the document and its transcription into an LM book at the beginning of the 16th century, or the rewriting of the book at the end of the 16th century – the graphic form of the letter hides the sound. For example, the simplest vowel ‘e’ in some of the LM books is presented as ‘ε’, and elsewhere as ‘e’, and in another LM we discover that ‘ε’ ≠ ‘e’ since the latter is more similar to the modern pronunciation of ‘ə’. The sound *ja* ‘я’ is presented by two different letters ‘а’ or ‘ѧ’, the scribes often used outside any rule, but as a personal sentiment for one or another form of the letters. Looking at the letters used in the LM-6 documents published in Moscow (on p. 12 of the Introduction the principles of transliteration are explained) the usage of ‘ω’ *omega*, ‘ø’ *fitā*, ‘γ’ *uk* seems pointless. For example ‘ω’ is written at the beginning of the word, in other headings only ‘o’, *uk* the writing of ‘γ’ and ‘y’ one cannot see any rule at all – they are artificial ornaments of the text’s ‘scholarliness’. Perhaps only the preservation of the letters ‘ѧ’, ‘Ѧ’, ‘ѧ’, ‘Ѧ’ in the publication would be scientifically meaningful. In scholarly literature on similar questions, it was noted a long time ago that the orthographic diversity of the Cyrillic texts of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (GDL) was just the personal choice of the scribe in order to vary the text with the sophisticated graphics of the letters, but not any norm

¹¹ O. Khoruzhenko reviewed LM-6 prepared by A. Baliulis, see *Novosti Litovskoi Metriki*, No 10–2007/2008 (Vilnius, 2009), pp. 5–8.

¹² M.E. Bychkova, O.I. Khoruzhenko, ‘Sovremennye printsipy izdaniia kirillicheskikh dokumentov Litovskoi metriki’, *Trudy Instituta Rossiiskoi istorii*, 8 (Moscow, 2009), pp. 70–86.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 72–73.

of spelling. The norm was the toleration of this variety in the relatively unified Cyrillic writings.¹⁴

It makes no sense to publish all the outdated letters in the text and convert the publication into a souvenir of fancy letters. The Cyrillic texts of the GDL chancelleries are not 'old-Russian' texts; therefore, the LM preparers, with justification, adapt a simplified scheme of publishing transliteration created by their own archaeographic traditions for the published documents. The usage of outdated letters in the text of a historical document written in the GDL Cyrillic alphabet gives it little exceptionality. Their use in the text of the manuscript and the transliteration in the publication, here one has to agree with Muscovite colleagues, could be discussed in the introductions of the published books. Deeper diplomatic studies would be needed for proving the preserved features of the original documents in the copies of the LM books. Working with hundreds of copies in a single book is just a waste of time. To all this it must be added that the search for uniqueness can be useless, because we are publishing at best a copy of a copy of an original document appearing at the end of the 16th century while making copies of the old LM books. Muscovite colleagues also encountered this when in the original of the No. 6 document copied in the LM-6 book they did not find important juridical clauses for some reason written in the copy (p. 426 [No. 6], and p. 517 [No. 579]). One can compare the numerous duplicate copies of the same documents in other LM books of the same time. We will be convinced that conveying the graphic appearance of the letters was not the most important task for the scribes, they would even 'edit' the document: change the lexicon, omit words and phrases, and so on. Finally, linguists of the Old Russian language, on the basis of 'old-Russian' texts, the expression and transformation into the GDL Ruthenian (Belarusian and Ukrainian) language in the 15th and 16th centuries find not in the graphics of the outdated Cyrillic letters of the LM books, but in the phonetics, vocabulary and morphology of the texts of the same books.¹⁵

The publishers of the LM-6 book followed the principle of conveying all the forms of the letter in the manuscript. But they did not publish the letter 'α' *alfa*. Without comments, it was rendered as 'a'. After checking the accuracy of the transcription of the first three documents, we found a few errors. In document No. 1 instead of 'o' two times 'e' is written

¹⁴ I. Kremko, 'O kharaktere iazykovoi normy Statuta Velikogo Kniazhestva Litovskogo 1588 goda', *1588 m. Trečiasis Lietuvos Statutas. Respublikinės mokslinės konferencijos, skirtos Trečiojo Statuto 400 metinems pažymėti, medžiaga*, ed. S. La-zutka et al. (Vilnius, 1989), pp. 197–205.

¹⁵ T. Vlasova, 'Iazyk Pervogo Litovskogo Statuta (1529 g.)', *Pirmasis Lietuvos Statutas ir epocha*, ed. I. Valikonytė, L. Steponavičienė (Vilnius, 2005), pp. 249–256.

(‘приидучего’ instead of ‘приидучого’, and ‘наше’ instead of ‘нашо’), the incorrect letter in the word ‘светого’ should be ‘светоро’, while ‘св(е)та Петра’ is incorrectly reconstructed as ‘св(е)та(го) Петра’. In document No. 2 there is one error: ‘еще’ instead of ‘ещо’. No. 3 is re-written without error, but it certainly does not prove that in the other documents of the Muscovite publications we will not find transliteration errors. In the last checked document, No. 5, there are mistakes again: instead of ‘ъ’ a few times ‘ь’ is written. In some places one may suspect computer software proofing ‘services’: ‘копь’ instead of ‘копъ’, but not in the case of ‘немь’ instead of ‘немя’. The letters ‘и ни’ were incorrectly read because they had to be ‘ани’. These small errors do not distort the texts, they occur in all publications, but they could have been fewer.

To the casual reader, it might appear that M. Bychkova and O. Khoruzhenko fulfil the methodological recommendations, which they did not see in the Lithuanian publications: next to the reduced vowel consonant the reduced vowel ‘ь’, already indicating the softness of the consonant, provides comments on 195 documents from the 623 published in the book, makes a chronological list of documents, creates modern headlines for them, and provides scholarly informational descriptions of the original document, copies and publication. Indexes of place names and ethnonyms, as well as names of people, are formed separately, but there is no subject index. The chronological list of documents and the indexes of the Muscovite LM-6 book merit the smallest reproaches. The indexes can be assigned to the more informative. Place-names and ethnonyms explained according to the old and current dependence of the place are presented in modern spelling forms (the Lithuanian spelling is not always accurate). In the index of personal names the chronology of the mention of the person in the texts of the published LM book is given, and where possible, the coats of arms of the boyar families is indicated. Other archaeographic scholarly and technical solutions by the preparers of the LM-6 book can be criticised. The reconstruction of ‘ь’ next to the entered raised consonant already raises routine doubts. Usually, softening can be expected in the manuscript, but does one need to *create* a mark in the publication if we mark the raised letter by italics, informing the user of the text about the softness (or hardness) of the consonant? Moreover, the parentheses compulsorily placed in the reconstruction visually overload the text. The block of comments is very fragmented. Bychkova and Khoruzhenko only in rare instances fulfilled the requirements of the methodological recommendations, although they criticised the Lithuanian archaeographers for poor comments. One can justify the shortcomings of the work of colleagues, because the dimensions of the works foreseen for the publication of the sources of the methodological recommendations are unreasonably great, requiring

one to complete solid scholarly research and to present it as concisely as possible¹⁶, for the hundreds of documents in the LM book. The comments of the *Metrica* published by the Lithuanian Institute of History (LIH) are for a long time presented simplified, in the Lithuanian language (such a scholarly language is unacceptable to Muscovite colleagues); the extended title of the document, data on the original of the published document, copies and publishing, explanation of the dating, and other valuable information.

The Muscovite palaeographers made comments on about 30 per cent of the documents published in the LM-6 book. The comments corrected dates, presented explanations of words and concepts, data about the political figures, some of the historical realities linked to the documents, and the situations of locations, natural objects, churches, etc. Although we did not check the accuracy of all the published comments, some of them are impermissibly misleading: in No. 51 (p. 434) the explanation of *окротенство* as *владение* ‘rule’, whereas it should be ‘cruelty, mercilessness’; No. 244 (p. 443) *Pelesa* is a left tributary of the *Merkys*, and not of the *Nemunas*; No. 590 (p. 452) *страда* is not ‘обида’ ‘wrong’, but ‘feeding, food’; No. 604 (p. 453) *рок завитый* is not *сложный, замысловатый* ‘complex, confusing’ term, but ‘final’; no. 616 (p. 454) *плитница* is not *разновидность кирпича* ‘brick style’, but ‘brick, brick manufacturing site’. The explanations of the Lithuanian terms in the comments are a fiasco. Three village inhabitants of the *Karmélava* parish were turned into the names of men’s and women’s clothing (No. 5, p. 425) *свилонци* (*Svylonys*), a type of silk *свила*; *сасу* (*Šešuva?*), woman *сак*; *шатцы* (*Šatijai*), outer piece of clothing *шата*. The term *дяклы* (No. 13, p. 427) is not Polish but Lithuanian: *dėkla*. After document 13 the preparers of the comments make no more comments on Lithuanian matters. It would appear that they and the readers understand the meaning of these Lithuanian words: *дойлид*, *клеть*, *клуня*, *кунпи*, *лейти*, *ройсты*, *свирен*, *скилонди*, *стирта*. The preparers of the commentary trust only the data in the 11th to 16th-century Russian language dictionary, and ignore the fact that official forms in the GDL Ruthenian language for social, domestic, economic and other concepts in the 15th–16th century acquired many different meanings from Moscow’s Russian (Muscovite language). As a result, the Muscovite colleagues had to use the Belarusian-prepared *Гістарычны слоўнік беларускай мовы* (32 volumes were published by 2012). And the more recent by *Maciej*

¹⁶ *Metodicheskie rekomendatsii*, p. 74 (No 399): the justification of the dating, the mutual interfaces of the publication documents and their links to documents not included in the publication, brief information about mentioned persons and events, identification of historical geographical places, their present location, explanations of less frequently used names of measures, money, etc., comments on the more difficult to understand places of the text.

Neuman concluded, supplemented by Krzysztof Pietkiewicz, itineraries of Grand Duke Alexander remain on the sidelines¹⁷.

Being demanding on the Lithuanian archaeographers, the preparers of the Muscovite LM-6 book were more indulgent with themselves. They did not prepare the subject and term indexes designated in the methodological requirements, and did not explain this decision¹⁸. On the other hand, the efforts of the preparers to replace them with explanations of subjects and terms in comments, or to introduce into the index of locations and ethnic names certain objects, for example, *дом, дорога, имения, место городовое, монастыри, мост* etc, with dependent words, only proves that the index of objects and terms in LM publications is mandatory. We will not praise the colleagues as they praised the Vilnius University palaeographers¹⁹ for the publication of examples of watermarks and scripts. They are not provided in the LM-6 book. In the chronological list, the scholarly literature is cited in an inconvenient manner. First, there are some that are not included in the main list of literature positions with citation abbreviations (pp. 421–422), and second, the descriptors of some of the literature cited additionally in the chronological list are presented abbreviated, for example, *Archiwum Sanguszków* (p. 459, No. 42, and so on).

One exceptional and astonishing feature of the LM-6 publication is the non-use of new LM research, supporting literature. This is not only the ignoring of Belarusian and Polish dictionaries, research and information publications (texts in the Lithuanian language for the Muscovites, apparently, are impenetrable). It is as if the publishers are declaring that the last and most important word about research into Metriciana was spoken in Moscow. In the foreword, the authors repeat the very outdated (1946) conclusions of Nicholas Berezkhov about the structure of the LM books in the 16th century,²⁰ and argue that the LM-6 book was copied from several early books at the end of the 16th century (pp. 5–6), and

¹⁷ M. Neuman, 'Itinerarium Aleksandra Jagiellończyka, wielkiego księcia litewskiego, króla polskiego (czerwiec 1492 – sierpień 1506)', *Studia z dziejów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego XIV–XVIII wieku*, pod red. J. Ochmańskiego (Poznań, 1971), pp. 117–156; M. Neuman, K. Pietkiewicz, 'Lietuvos didžiojo kunigaikščio ir Lenkijos karaliaus Aleksandro Jogailaičio itinerariumas (1492 m. birželis – 1506 m. rugpjūtis)', *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis. 1995 metai* (Vilnius, 1996), pp. 154–240.

¹⁸ One of the preparers of the reviewed publications even announced his reflections on the problems arising when creating the subject indexes. See O. Khoruzhenko, 'Nauchno-spravochnyi apparat v sovremennykh izdaniakh srednevekovykh dokumentov', *Istorijos šaltinių tyrimai*, t. 2, compiled by A. Dubonis (Vilnius, 2010), pp. 209–17.

¹⁹ M.E. Bychkova, O.I. Khoruzhenko, 'Sovremennye printsipy izdaniia kirillicheskich dokumentov', p. 83.

²⁰ N.G. Berezkhov, *Litovskaia Metrika kak istoricheskii istochnik: o pervonachal'nom sostave knig Litovskoi Metriki po 1522 god*, ch. 1 (Moscow–Leningrad, 1946), p. 179 [1].

even more the 6th Book of Inscriptions was made in 1596–1597 (p. 10)²¹. Muscovite colleagues overlooked the opinion of K. Pietkiewicz that early LM books already in the late 15th century and early 16th century had the same appearance as those rewritten at the end of the 16th century²². This was confirmed recently by the list of copied LM books found by Darius Antanavičius²³.

I think that the only reason for the ostentatious carelessness lies in the intentions of the preparers of the LM-6 book to characterise the book of the Chancellery of Lithuania's grand duke as a formless 'pile' of bundles of documents, fibres, and notebooks of 'books' which will turn into a real book at the end of the 16th century. It is surprising that cognate analogues of such a practice of record keeping are sought only in the archive of the Tsar of the Grand Duchy of Moscow in the 16th century²⁴. Both chancelleries, in Moscow and Vilnius, allegedly managed in the same way, in them *древнерусский текст*, 'old-Russian texts' are created: these and similar claims justify the ambitious and aggressive title of the LM book publishing series renewed in Moscow 'Acts of Western Russian History', [*Акты, относящиеся к истории Западной России*], in which we will not immediately find information that an LM book is being published. The concept of the GDL's past as a version of Russia's history is firmly imprinted in the scholarly journal cover published in the 2010s, but nowhere it is explained what considerations determined such failed decisions by the archaographers of the Russian History Institute.

Finally, a few words about international scholarly collaboration, the duplication of published LM books, and the scholarly value of the LM-6 books published in 2007 in Lithuania and 2012 in Moscow. LIH palaeographers always open the gates wide to colleagues from Kiev, Moscow, Minsk and Warsaw: they invite them to scholarly conferences, in their scholarly press they publish their research work in their native language, they send information about Metriciana news and try to give as gifts the most recent publications, and according to the possibilities they include

²¹ The conclusions are justified more broadly: O.I. Khoruzhenko, 'Kodikologicheskii aspekt problemy nachal'nogo sostava knig Litovskoi Metriki', *Palaeografia i kodikologija: 300 let posle Monfokona. Materialy Mezhdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii, Moskva, 14–16 maia 2008 g.* (Moscow, 2008), pp. 233–241.

²² K. Pietkiewicz, 'Księga 9 wpisów (записей) Metryki Litewskiej, układ i zawartość, oraz jej kontynuacja do roku 1518 z Archiwum Radziwiłłowskiego', *Lietuvos Metrika. 1991–1996 metų tyrinėjimai* (Vilnius, 1998), pp. 19–20.

²³ D. Antanavičius, 'Naiden reestr original'nykh knig Litovskoi Metriki XVI v.', *Novosti Litovskoi Metriki. Nauchno-informatsionnoe prilozhenie zhurnala "Ezhegodnik istorii Litvy"*, No 12–2010 (Vilnius, 2011), pp. 18–25; D. Antanavičius, 'Originalių Lietuvos Metrikos XVI a. knygų sąrašas', *Istorijos šaltinių tyrimai*, t. 4, comp. by A. Dubonis (Vilnius, 2012), pp. 157–184.

²⁴ O.I. Khoruzhenko, *Kodikologicheskii aspekt*, pp. 239–240.

them in joint projects. The e-mail network always connects everyone reliably, providing possibilities for continuous contact: no one would have hidden from the Muscovites the *lituanica* meanings of the LM-6 book, and hilarious mistakes would have been avoided. The sad Muscovite comment in the Foreword about the (non-) coordination of LM International Project (p. 5, note 2) should not sadden everyone, because there are only two repeated LM publications (in addition to LM-6 there is the musterlist of the Lithuanian army in 1528, published in Vilnius and Minsk), they were prepared independently, and not plagiarised. We will not discuss here the reasons for their publication. One thing can be said: we will not avoid the duplication of publications in the future, because along with the international coordination of scholarly activities the pragmatic affairs of the publishing of important new sources for Lithuanian history, the financing of the publishing, and the related work speed, the dissemination of the results and trade of publications of affairs. Bookshops in neither Moscow nor Minsk trade in Lithuanian publications, like theirs in Lithuania, while the exchanges of these books still go on through personal exchanges. Essentially, one should value the duplication of books as the larger circulation of one publication in the market for East and Central European scholarly publications: since 2009 the LM's print run in Lithuania was reduced by several times.

So we have two LM-6 book publications. The texts of both books have been prepared carefully, although some errors or misunderstandings are inevitable, but as a source of history publications they are reliable. Scientific-information machine wider Muscovite published LM-6, but it is more geared to the GDL *rusica*, but not *lituanica*. The LM-6 book by Algirdas Baliulis has the advantage of a carefully selected subject index, which is not in the Muscovite publication. Essentially, the two versions of the LM-6 book are scholarly publications of sources, which all those who are interested in GDL history in the times of Grand Duke Alexander (1492–1506) can use without suspicion of ignorance and belittling of the completed work.

Artūras Dubonis