

acquisition of Byzantine political theories, and Bogomilism is interpreted in part as a facet of popular resistance to the dominance of Byzantine civilization in Bulgaria.

In a final section Obolensky provides a general analysis of the factors which aided in the diffusion of Byzantine culture and hindered its reception in various countries, and discusses the features common to the commonwealth—literature, art, religion, and law. The consistency of Byzantine policy toward its northern neighbors throughout its history is stressed. From the time of Justinian, Byzantine diplomacy developed a complicated network of alliances with the peoples beyond its borders which stretched deep into the Caucasus and the steppes of Central Asia. Imperial patronage of missionary activity from the seventh century emphasized Orthodoxy and the supreme position of the universal Christian emperor as inseparable. Throughout Eastern Europe, finally, it was Byzantine monasticism which became the vehicle of cultural diffusion. From the point of view of the Slavic countries, Obolensky believes, the greatest appeal of Byzantine culture lay in the ideas and institutions it offered to monarchy. If East European monarchs acknowledged the theoretical suzerainty of the Byzantine emperor, they were also autonomous rulers of their own peoples, and through conversion to Christianity they gained divine sanction for their rule as well as the impressive trappings of the Byzantine court. Resistance to Byzantine culture, the author concludes, was deep-seated and long lasting, and expressed most strongly as a resistance to Christianity. In pagan revivals, magic, and the development of popular heresies the residue of resistance to Byzantine culture may be detected in Russia as well as Bulgaria. Finally, Obolensky discusses the appeal of Byzantine culture in the late Middle Ages, and concludes with an epilogue on the survival of Byzantine traditions after the fall of Constantinople.

This is a rich book of great importance. The format of the series prescribes that the work emphasize narration and interpretation rather than extensive bibliographical discussion. Nevertheless, the depth of the author's scholarship is evident at all times. This work will be invaluable for students of Byzantine history or Slavic history, and scholars will gain equally from Obolensky's considered judgments.

DOROTHY ABRAHAMSE  
*California State College, Long Beach*

ENSERFMENT AND MILITARY CHANGE IN MUSCOVY. By *Richard Hellie*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1971. ix, 432 pp. \$14.50.

Dr. Hellie is convinced that the enserfment of the Russian peasantry must be accounted for either on the basis of state decrees or of broad economic and social developments in which the state did not play the major role; he condemns "the many futile attempts which have been made to combine the uncombinable." With this in mind he surveys all suggested interpretations, from the amateur Tatishchev, who, like Karamzin, worked on the "decree" principle, through the mature professional historians, such as Kliuchevsky and Platonov, who developed "non-decree" interpretations, continued by Soviet historians until the Stalin period. Yet his own position is: "A decree interpretation seems to be correct in the light of the evidence currently available." To be sure, this rests on the definition of

serfdom as a "juridical process," making it unnecessary "to tell the whole story of the peasantry in this period."

The author applies the same principle in his discussion of the "rise of the middle service class" (which he often erroneously refers to as the "gentry") and in his still more detailed section entitled "Enserfment of the Russian Peasantry." This involves painstaking accumulation of all the relevant decrees he has been able to find in his wide reading of the extensive secondary literature, occasionally supplemented by direct reference to published source material, the latter dating mainly from the nineteenth century. He has to acknowledge that by no means all of the decrees were enforced or enforceable. Still more troublesome is the fact that on the most crucial points he has to rely on decrees which he describes as "putative." He regards the *Ulozhenie* of 1649 as the culmination of the process of enserfment, and attempts to show that its provisions simply formalized antecedent legislation, though many of these provisions have no such antecedents and are fairly obviously just ratification of practices that had grown up extralegally, and thus require significant concessions to a "nondecree" interpretation.

The most valuable portion of this book is part 3, "The Gunpowder Revolution in Muscovy," which takes almost half of the text. From the same kind of materials he used in parts 1 and 2, the author has assembled an imposing array of scattered facts which—despite a high degree of cocksureness, and because of his aversion to comparative history—he has been unable to work into a picture altering the views of his predecessors in the interpretation of the course of Russian developments. Notwithstanding repeated confident assertions (resembling the advertising principle that if one writes the same thing often enough, the reader will begin to believe it), he has the grace in his concluding remarks to admit: "This, of course, is all in the realm of speculation." In a sort of coda, he worries what seems to him the almost insoluble problem why the state did not use the "gunpowder revolution" to "roll back" the enserfment of the peasantry, and concludes that it was because of a "hypertrophic state power."

The value of the book lies not in Hellie's attempts at interpretation but in the industry with which he has assembled both factual and opinionated data provided by some three hundred other authors. A patient and careful reader may thus more conveniently review the problems dealt with and draw his own conclusions. The notes, which occupy 109 pages toward the back of the book, are helpfully correlated with the pages to which they refer, and the index is unusually workable.

JESSE D. CLARKSON  
*Brooklyn College*

KHOLOPSTVO I KREPOSTNICHESTVO (KONETS XV–XVI V.). By *E. I. Kolycheva*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1971. 255 pp. 99 kopeks.

ZAKREPOSHCHENIE KREST'IAN I KLASSOVAIA BOR'BA V ROSSII VO VTOROI POLOVINE XVI V. By *V. I. Koretsky*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1970. 366 pp. 1.40 rubles.

Since 1953 Soviet scholars have made significant advances in understanding the social history of early modern Russia. This has entailed finding new archival sources to complement those published by the Imperial Archaeographical Commission, and