

## Foreword

---

History, as they say, is both an art and a science. Yet, there are various ways to describe that divide. One such way is the description of H. Stuart Hughes – that is, the difference between identifying something and placing it within a chronological sequence, on the one hand, and understanding something by giving it meaning, on the other.<sup>1</sup> By »something« he meant events of the past. And by »meaning« he meant identifying its interconnectedness with other events of the past. In this sense, to have the narrative (the story telling) identify the interconnectedness represents the subjective art. The study of the sources themselves (*Quellenkunde*, *istochnikovedenie*, *études de sources*, fontology), labeling something accurately and focusing on the present and on the physical object that exists in the present represents a science because the findings can be tested, verified, or refuted by others. Yet, the split, as Hughes realized, is not so neat. During the last half century or so, narratology (*narratologie*), whose origins can be traced back to Russian Formalism of the early twentieth century, has taken its place as a scientific approach.<sup>2</sup> And there is much in fontology that lends itself to artistic idiosyncratic subjectivity.

Take Ihor Ševčenko's study of the narrative behind *The Fragments of Toparcha Gothicus*, which the philologist Carl Benedict Hase (1780-1864) published in 1819. *Toparcha Gothicus* was presumably the earliest extant narrative source about early Rus'. Ševčenko argued and provided convincing evidence, in contrast, that it was an early nineteenth-century forgery, probably written by Hase himself, based in part on letters of a certain Mrs. Guthrie published in 1802 and possibly on an account of Napoleon's ill-fated military expedition

---

1 Hughes, H. Stuart: *History as Art and as Science: Twin Vistas on the Past*, New York: Harper & Row 1964, S. 5-6.

2 I have in mind, in particular the work of Hayden White, whose quadruple tetrad has been called a »bedrock of order.« White, Hayden: *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press 1971.

into Russia in 1812.<sup>3</sup> In doing so, Ševčenko contributed to the history of this text and thus allows us better to evaluate its value as a source for the events being described in it.

Much of the work of Edward L. Keenan was devoted to the history of particular texts, such as the *Kazan' History*; the apocryphal correspondence attributed to Andrei Kurbskii and Ivan IV, the *History of the Grand Prince of Moscow*, the *Iarlyk* attributed to Ahmed Khan, the *Tale of Igor's Campaign*, and so forth.<sup>4</sup> In each case, as with Ševčenko's work on *Toparcha Gothicus*, Keenan concluded that the text is not what it appears to be either because it was meant to deceive by the author or because historians have misunderstood what it was meant to be. Most of Keenan's findings have been disputed by other scholars. Yet, because he provided the evidence and logical arguments on which he based his conclusions, his findings can be disputed on a scientific level rather than on a merely subjective like/dislike level.

The metahistorical narratological analysis of the Hayden White kind has tended to focus on historiographical narrative, with the analysis of narrative in sources reserved for literary analysis. Yet, sources such as annals (*letopisi*), hagiographies (*vitae*, *zhitiia*), tales (*povesti*), legends (*skazaniia*), orations (*slova*), and even prayers (*molitvy*) also lend themselves to narratological analyses. One can treat them both as primary source testimonies and as historiographical interpretations of the author.

Delving into the history of a text does not necessarily or even usually result in questioning the authenticity of the text. For example, Kevin Birmingham's recent book *The Sinner and the Saint* provides an in-depth study of the events in the life of Fëdor Dostoevskii leading up to and including his writing of the novel *Crime and Punishment*, but Birmingham also examines, again in

---

3 Ševčenko, Ihor. »The So-called Fragments of Toparcha Gothicus«, in: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 25 (1971), S. 117-188.

4 Keenan, Edward L., Jr.: »Coming to Grips with the Kazanskaya Istoriya: Some Observations on Old Answers and New Questions«, in: *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.* 11 (1964-1968), S. 152-170; idem: »The Jarlyk of Axmed-Xan to Ivan III: A New Reading«, in: *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 12 (1969), S. 47; idem: *The Kurbskii-Groznyi Apocrypha: The Seventeenth-Century Genesis of the »Correspondence« Attributed to Prince A. M. Kurbskii and Tsar Ivan IV, with an appendix by Daniel C. Waugh*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1971; idem: *Josef Dobrovský and the Origins of the Igor' Tale*, Cambridge, MA: Distributed by the Harvard University Press for the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies 2003.

depth, the events surrounding the convicted French murderer Lacenaire and the influence of the reporting of that case on Dostoevskii's own work.<sup>5</sup> Birmingham's focus is on the interior meaning of the text qua text rather than on the external literary meaning. Here the text is what it appears to be and was intended to be taken as such.

Then there are the in-between cases where a text or cycle of texts where there is no question of the authorship but there is a question of what the author intended the text to be taken as. James Macpherson's »translation« of the *Ossian* cycle falls into this category. Denounced as fraudulent at the time by the likes of Samuel Johnson and Walter Scott, and considered to be a forgery by the academic world, *Ossian* has seen attempts made in recent years by scholars to reassess the artistic value of what Macpherson created.<sup>6</sup> His deception, the revivers argue, might have been only in that he claimed he was translating from a physical manuscript not freely interpreting the Celtic idiom of the Scottish Highlands.

Cornelia Soldat is in the tradition of testing a source qua source, and she has distinguished herself as a fontologist (*istochnikoved*), analyzing the so-called *Testament of Ivan IV of 1572*. She has also analyzed the relationship between German pamphlet literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth century and accounts of the reign of Ivan IV. Here she expands her purview to include the narrative of a historical source, the account of Heinrich von Staden on his time serving as a mercenary in the army of Ivan IV. Dr. Soldat's present book focuses on an attempt to find new meaning in the identification of Staden's narrative through its interconnectedness with other narrative sources. In doing so, she enriches our understanding of the text itself, as well as providing more information for us to evaluate its validity as a historical source. In that respect, she has fulfilled the criteria for historical study as both an art and a science.

Donald Ostrowski

Harvard University

---

5 Birmingham, Kevin: *The Sinner and the Saint: Dostoevsky and the Gentleman Murderer Who Inspired a Masterpiece*, New York: Penguin Press 2021.

6 Ostrowski, Donald: *Who Wrote That? Authorship Controversies from Moses to Sholokhov*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press 2020, S. 190-208.

