

ORTHODOXIE UND HÄRESIE IM ALTEN RUSSLAND. By *Edgar Hösch*. Schriften zur Geistesgeschichte des östlichen Europa, vol. 7. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz in Kommission, 1975. 321 pp. Paper.

In recent years Soviet and Western specialists in medieval Russian history have devoted considerable attention to the problem of heresy, with diverging results. In this thorough and meticulous monograph of some 150 pages of text and approximately 1,300 footnotes, Edgar Hösch explores all occurrences of heresy in Russia from the eleventh through the middle of the sixteenth century.

He concludes that all accusations of heresy before the end of the fourteenth century are either unsubstantiated or do not in fact have anything to do with heresy as such. Hösch then discusses the Strigol'niki of the late fourteenth-early fifteenth centuries, the much studied Judaizers of a century later, and the various mid-sixteenth-century heretics. There are no documented cases of heresy in late sixteenth-century Muscovy.

Hösch pays particular attention to the significance of translated Byzantine anti-heretical writings for the development of conceptions of heresy in Russia, especially because the Russians for several hundred years had no actual heresies to which to "apply" Byzantine ideas. The continuity of stereotypic terminology in refuting heretical belief precludes the literal interpretation of many antiheretical accusations. Hösch quite rightly calls for more study of the Russian manuscripts of translated anti-heretical miscellanies in Soviet archives.

Hösch insists upon an internal, religious explanation of heresy, and argues forcefully against the conceptual framework of Soviet scholarship, derived from Engels, which interprets heresy as a mode of socioeconomic protest. Nearly two-thirds of all identified heretics in Muscovy were clerics, and none expressed any "anti-feudal" social program. He is also vigorous in rejecting recent Soviet attempts to see elements of Renaissance humanism in the mentality of the heretics, whose views reflect less secular freethinking than common medieval religious concerns.

Hösch postulates that the period from the mid-fifteenth to the mid-sixteenth century was a formative one in the history of the Russian Orthodox church. Freed from the tutelage of the Constantinopolitan patriarchate, the church had to come to terms with the new centralized Muscovite autocracy. The problem of heresy obviously played a crucial role in the evolution of the church. Organizationally, the need to combat heresy led to the development of the Church Council as an institution, with fateful results in the seventeenth century. Ideologically, cooperation with the state in repressing religious dissent fostered a new religious consciousness in which, under the impact of the theory of Moscow-the Third Rome, religious and political conformity became intertwined. The outgrowth of this process, rather than of any "deal" between the Josephans and the Muscovite rulers over ecclesiastical landholding and autocratic theory, was the politicization of heresy in the sixteenth century so well illustrated by such cases as that of Maxim the Greek.

While grateful for Soviet research on the manuscripts of the sources, Hösch is particularly acute in criticizing Soviet scholarship, which he does not treat as a monolith, both substantively and conceptually for numerous instances of faulty logic. The case he makes is impressive, although not everyone will go as far as he has in dismissing nonreligious factors in medieval Russian church history. It seems to me, too, that the key to the ideological and emotional fanaticism of the Josephans in extirpating heresy lies somewhat more in the apocalyptic and eschatological, rather than messianic, context of the Third Rome theory, to which Hösch devotes only passing attention. Needless to conclude, Hösch's fine study will become essential reading for

anyone interested in heresy, as well as in the intellectual and cultural history of Muscovy.

CHARLES J. HALPERIN
Indiana University

HISTORY OF RUSSIA, vol. 9: THE AGE OF VASILY III. By *Sergei M. Soloviev*. Edited, translated, and with an introduction by *Hugh F. Graham*. Gulf Breeze, Fla.: Academic International Press, 1976. 273 pp.

To isolate a single portion of Solov'ev's *History of Russia* for scrutiny unavoidably violates the author's concept of Russian history as an organic continuum and his overriding purpose of demonstrating the gradual evolution of the Russian state. Of the many components of Solov'ev's great work, however, the contents of this volume are of particular value today because the age of Vasiliï III—the more than forty years between 1505 and the assumption of sovereign authority by Ivan IV in 1547—has tended to be dismissed by scholars, before as well as after Solov'ev, as little more than a bridge between the far more colorful and exciting dramas of Russian life and politics under Ivan the Great and Ivan the Terrible.

Dazzled by the marked changes identified with the reigns of Vasiliï's father and son, historians have looked upon Vasiliï III as either the feebler successor of the former or the pallid precursor of the latter, but there is evidence that Vasiliï left a more positive impression on his contemporaries: the boyar Bersen-Beklemeshev found him a much stricter custodian of sovereign authority than his father, and Emperor Maximilian's ambassador, comparing Vasiliï with Ivan III, noted that Ivan began things, while Vasiliï completed them. Solov'ev's own evaluation was terse: "Comparing Vasily with his father in other respects, one can say with certainty only that he was less famous for military glory than his father, as Karamzin justly noted."

On the whole, time and Soviet as well as foreign scholarship have looked kindly upon Solov'ev's historical work. It still occupies a preeminent place among Soviet and foreign surveys of Russian history both for its scale and range and for the author's sometimes uncritical but always meticulous attention to his sources. The late L. V. Cherepnin, the eminent Soviet historian who edited the principal recent Russian edition (on which Mr. Graham's translation is based), described among the enduring virtues of Solov'ev's work his view of the Russian past as an integral process of internal development and his search for the links between events and structures in Russian history.

As Mr. Graham has noted, through extensive quotation from contemporary sources Solov'ev has sought to convey the flavor of the time and the attitudes of those who lived then. For the same purpose, Solov'ev cast his narrative in a form close to paraphrases of the documents he used. The availability and range of such sources—chiefly monastic chronicles, treaties, and other legal documents of the period, together with a handful of descriptions by foreigners who visited Moscow in the course of the early sixteenth century—have somewhat concentrated Solov'ev's account on Muscovite governmental institutions as they grew and responded to the demands of foreign affairs and the requirements of domestic administration. In the nearly 100 years since Solov'ev wrote, a mass of additional material touching on the sixteenth century has been unearthed (sometimes literally) and published. It has become a simple task to identify and lament lacunae in Solov'ev's opus. But while we now see better what he did not succeed in enfolding into his vision of Russian history, that which Solov'ev did include remains an indispensable guide for serious students of Russian history.

Mr. Graham's translation is thoroughly competent, and his introduction and very careful, complete footnotes make of this volume a welcome window into sixteenth-