
REVIEWS

TESTAMENT UND SIEGEL IVANS IV. By *Günther Stökl*. Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, vol. 48. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1972. 87 pp. DM 35.80.

The two studies brought together in this attractive little volume represent the meticulous and thoughtful work for which Günther Stökl has become well respected among historians of Russia, and draw attention once again to the solid development of Russian studies in Germany in recent decades. It is true that the present monographic studies of the "Testament" of Ivan IV and his great seal (*velikaia pečat'*) end by raising more questions than they resolve, but our knowledge of many of the matters associated with these artifacts is still limited—or, rather, questionable—and it is a reflection of Mr. Stökl's integrity that he has presented his observations in this form, without concealing his own puzzlement at a number of aspects of his findings.

In the first study Stökl reviews in most systematic fashion the history of the only extant text of Ivan's "Testament" (which apparently stems from a copy made in 1739), the problems of dating of the presumed original, and the structure of the text. He makes a number of valuable observations about the regalia mentioned in the "Testament," and in particular offers a rather clever solution to the problem of what the puzzling words "skatert', a po nemetski tsentur'" might have originally signified (p. 24). (He reconstructs "skipetr, a po nemetski tseptr'.") The last portion of his examination deals thoughtfully—but perhaps not skeptically enough—with the presumed literary sources of Ivan's advice to his sons. (An appendix contains a German translation of the "literary" portion of the "Testament.")

Stökl concludes that the "Testament," in spite of the many unresolved questions associated with it, presents an entrée into the world of sixteenth-century Muscovy that deserves more attention than it has received (p. 40). With all respect for the useful analysis here presented—or more precisely, because of it—this reviewer must question the manner in which this concluding statement is phrased. For it seems to emerge quite clearly from Stökl's careful discussion that the origins, dating, and contents of this text are indeed questionable, and that one would be ill-advised to study it as a reflection of Muscovite reality of the sixteenth century until its provenance is clearly established. At our present state of knowledge, there seems to be little compelling evidence of its authenticity.

Ivan's great seal is a different matter, and here Stökl's analysis deals with the possible political or ideological significance of the assuredly genuine, if ambiguous, symbolism of the seal's various elements. Only a few of Stökl's many interesting and telling observations can be mentioned here, particularly his identification of the Western—especially Polish—influences that seem to be reflected in the heraldry of the seal (pp. 41, 45, 53) and the confusion or inaccuracy of many of the lesser elements (pp. 59–61).

Here again, precisely because of the thoughtful analysis provided by Stökl's study, one questions the extent to which one may see the "great seal" as a reflection of a Muscovite political ideology in the sixteenth century. The seal itself—or its heraldic "system"—is inconsistent and eclectic; it seems to have been used only

briefly—at the very end of Ivan’s reign—and to have been an aberration of sorts (the analogies in Russian sphragistics are mostly from the seventeenth century). All of which seems to indicate that what the seal reveals is not a fully formed system of political thought, but a moment of change, a *lack* of established tradition, and the beginnings of the kind of amorphous eclecticism and effervescence that characterized Muscovite politics after Ivan’s time.

But one may indulge these speculations only because Stökl has been so careful in avoiding them, and has provided such rich and sound material for those who will follow him in the study of these two singular artifacts. Anyone who does so will have ample reason to thank him for his careful and erudite commentary.

EDWARD L. KEENAN
Harvard University

PROMYSHLENNYE SELENIIA TSENTRAL'NOI ROSSII V PERIOD
GENEZISA I RAZVITIIA KAPITALIZMA. By *Ia. E. Vodarsky*. Moscow:
“Nauka,” 1972. 256 pp. 1.22 rubles.

In the Soviet Union the greatest volume of work in historical geography—and often the most interesting work—is carried out by historians. Vodarsky is one of the outstanding historians so engaged, and in this book he turns his attention to a key problem in Russian historical geography, the origin of towns. Very broadly, Russian towns originated with a defensive role as fortresses, or developed from villages as *commercial centers of trade and manufacturing*. It is this latter process which Vodarsky examines in great detail, as it took place in the former Moscow *guberniia*, the heart of what is now called the Central Industrial Region. His conclusions about the nature of the process are scarcely startling, but they are most solidly based on a considerable volume of fact and conscientious perusal of the archival evidence, including factory records, the “Economic Notes” of the General Survey, and provincial descriptions.

The development went in stages from purely agricultural villages, to villages with individual craft manufacture, to villages with home-based workers (*kustar* manufacture), which began to appear in the seventeenth century. In the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, more peasants took to manufacture, either seasonally in conjunction with working the land, or full time. Gradually a skilled work force, especially in the textile industry, was built up. With the accelerated growth of a capitalist economy in the later nineteenth century, factories and mills were set up in these villages, or the workers were brought to new settlements, established around new enterprises. Unlike some other villages in other parts of Russia, trade played a subsidiary role to manufacturing in the “urbanization” of the rural, village population. Nevertheless, although the agricultural element in the population was minimal, such settlements generally did not acquire formal urban status, a situation which Vodarsky attributes to survivals of feudalism, even after the emancipation of serfs.

The restricted geographical scope and the structure of the book make it a localized work of reference, a very sound piece of evidence toward a generalized picture, rather than an exposition of broad concepts. No less than three-quarters of its length consists of an encyclopedic description, village by village, of about one hundred manufacturing settlements, out of some thirteen hundred in the region. For each