

## SUMMARY

*The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, also called *The Dynasty Chronicle of the Romanovichi*, is one of the most important monuments of mediaeval Rus' historiography.

As evidenced, these two names serve to refer to the aforementioned monument. The first name is a traditional one; the second one has been introduced by us, since the chronicle touches upon the history of the descendants of Roman Mstislavovich (d. 1205), and hence the Principality of Galicia and Volhynia is connected to this dynasty.

The typology of the above-mentioned monument is somewhat complicated, owing to its complex structure created undeniably by a broadly educated person. This monument should definitely be regarded as the only example of the court chronicle in the mediaeval Rus' historiographic tradition. Therefore, we decided to use the aforementioned term, not the widely-used 'letopis "annals"'.

Seven paper manuscripts comprising *The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* have been preserved until today. The oldest is the Hupatian/Ipatievskyi Codex written at the beginning of the 1420s (*Ипатьевский список*. Библиотека Российской академии наук в Санкт-Петербурге, шифр 16.4.4). Subsequent ones are as follows:

1) the Khlebnikov/Ostrogski manuscript – created at the end of the 1550s/ the beginning of the 1560s and most probably supplemented in c. 1637 (*Хлебниковский список / Острожский (Хлебниковский) список*). Российская национальная библиотека в Санкт-Петербурге, шифр F.IV.230);

2) the Pogodinski/Czetwertynski manuscript, which was completed on 23<sup>rd</sup> March 1621 in Żywotów (Новоживотів) upon the recommendation of Stefan Czetwertuński (*Погодинский список / Четвертинський (Погодинський) список*). Российская национальная библиотека в Санкт-Петербурге, шифр Пог. 1401);

3) the Bundur/Jarocki manuscript, which was completed by a monk of the Kiev monastery of St Nicholas the Hermit in Kiev, Marko Bundur, on 17<sup>th</sup> May 1651 (*Список Я.В. Яроцкого (Список Марка Бундура/*

Я. В. Яроцького, Ręcoris Bundura/Jarockiego). Библиотека Российской академии наук в Санкт-Петербурге, шифр. 21.3.14);

4) the Jermolajev manuscript, created most probably in 1711 in Kiev upon the recommendation of the local governor Dmitry Mikhaylovich Golitsyn (*Ермолаевской список*. Российская национальная библиотека в Санкт-Петербурге, шифр F.IV.231);

5) the Cracow manuscript, written from the Pogodinski/Czetwertynski manuscript upon the recommendation of Adam Naruszewicz between 1781 and 1792 (Biblioteka Ks. Czartoryskich w Krakowie, call no. 122);

6) The RGADA manuscript 1814–1816, written from the Hupatian manuscript by Petr Bolshakov between 1814 and 1816 (*Список РГАДА*, ф. 181, № 10. Российский государственный архив древних актов в Москве, фонд 181, дело 10).

The aforementioned manuscripts are classified as south-Rus' codex, which forms a historical collection, whose substance is built by three fundamental works: *The Tale of the Bygone Years*, *The Kievan Chronicle* and *The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*. In some manuscripts a list of Kiev dukes until the invasion of Batu Khan (Ipatiev, Khlebnikov/Ostrogski and Jermolajev manuscripts) was included, as well as a historical continuation with the information from the turn of the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries (Bundur/Jarocki and Jermolajev manuscripts), *The Tale of St Metropolitan Bishop Peter* (Bundur/Jarocki and Jermolajev manuscripts), *The Tale of the Mamai Battlefield* (Bundur/Jarocki and Jermolajev manuscripts), fragments of *The Book of Esther* (Khlebnikov/Ostrogski manuscript). Following the information included in the Cracow Codex, passages from *The Book of Esther* were also present at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century in the Pogodinski/Czetwertynski manuscript.

Linguistic, content and structural aspects indicate the existence of two fundamental parts of the monument: 1) *The Court Chronicle of Daniel Romanovich*, encompassing the period from the beginning of the narrative (i.e. from the apologia of Roman Mstislavovich to the unfinished tale about the first invasion of Burundai), that is following the chronology of the Ipatiev manuscript from 1709 to 1768. Linguistic arguments enable us to propose a hypothesis on the extension of the discussed period until 1773. Two editions can be distinguished in *The Court Chronicle of Daniel*. The first one was created in c. 1246–1247, the second one encompasses the remaining years, that is after 1258 (with a possible continuation until the second half of 1264); 2) *The Volhynian Chronicle* beginning the narrative after the first invasion of Burundai and finishing with the reign of Vladimir Mstislav (II) Danilovich, that is following the uncertain and imprecise Hupatian chronology, from 1769 to 1800. The above-mentioned part can be divided into two or three editions. It is possible that the first one was written in the milieu of Vasilko Romanovich until approximately the end of the 1260s. The second one, definitely more certain than the previous one, is

the narrative created at the court of Vladimir Vasilkovich until the beginning of 1289. The last one, constituting their continuation, is characterised by an entirely different approach to Lev Danilovich than the previous two and shows the events from the perspective of the milieu of Mstislav (II).

It is also worth emphasizing that earlier parts of the source (*The Chronicle of Daniel*) were edited by later authors, most probably by a chronicler working in the milieu of Vladimir Vasilkovich. Such a form of the monument, with a short continuation created during the reign of Mstislav (II) Danilovich, has been preserved until today. Hence, the beginning of the 1290s can be admitted as a *terminus post quem* of the above-mentioned source. There is no evidence that it was continued until the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century.

It is also impossible to determine the names of the copyists and authors of *The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*. The identification proposals existing in literature take on an exclusively speculative character. We can state with great certainty that there were at least five authors of the source connected to the courts of Mstislav Mstislavovich, Daniel Romanovich (here – perhaps – even two), Vasilko Romanovich, Vladimir Vasilkovich and Mstislav (II) Danilovich respectively. However, it cannot be excluded that it was at the court of Yuri of Galicia or his father that the draft copy of *The Chronicle*, that is the ending, was created. Undeniably, these were the people linked to the duke's chancellery, in any case those who had access to the documents written and kept in it.

*The Dynasty Chronicle of the Romanovichi* is a priceless work, abound in information non-existent in other sources on the history of the Principality of Galicia-Volhynia in the 13<sup>th</sup> century and their relations with different states, including Poland, Hungary, Lithuania or Bohemia.

The title monument is also a remarkable example of spiritual culture of mediaeval Rus', which includes numerous references to the Holy Bible, reflecting the Byzantine-Slavic and ancient origin of the literary translation; works by earlier Rus' authors (*The Sermon on Law and Grace* by Hilarion, *Instruction* by Vladimir Monomakh, *The Tale of the Bygone Years*, *The Kievan Chronicle*, *The Chronicle of Mstislav Mstislavovich*); local normative sources; or even poetry and folklore, including the fragments of the Cumans epic.

The text of the edition was prepared on the basis of the Khlebnikov/Ostrogski manuscript, supplemented by variants from other south-Rus' chronicles created until mid-18<sup>th</sup> century. Despite the fact that this 16<sup>th</sup>-century codex is not the oldest, its copyist, in contradistinction to the 15<sup>th</sup>-century Hypatian/Ipatevskiy Codex, retained its original structure, or more specifically, its narrative did not contain the chronological framework (typical of the Rus' chronicle writing).