

them over two pages, with the sewing of the binding disfiguring the middle of the picture.

NIKOLAY ANDREYEV
Cambridge University

INDEX TO THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE MONGOLS. By *Igor de Rachewiltz*. Uralic and Altaic Series, vol. 121. Bloomington: Indiana University Publications, 1972. 347 pp. \$16.00.

The *Secret History* is the oldest narrative text in Mongolian (A.D. 1240), and represents a semilegendary history of Chingis Khan and his ancestors, extending into the time of his successor, Ögedei. There are text editions of that work, translations, and a good dictionary of words occurring in the text, compiled by Haenisch (1939, reprinted in 1962). The dictionary does not list all grammatical forms of the words attested, nor does it indicate all occurrences of each word. Therefore the dictionary is of little use in cases in which it is important to have a particular word in all contexts in which it occurs, or to have all its grammatical forms attested in the text. The book under review is therefore a timely and useful publication because it enables the reader to find a particular word in all contexts, and lists all grammatical forms of each word. The first part of the book (pp. 1–174) contains the text which follows the line arrangement of Pelliot's edition (P). Each line is preceded by a code number indicating the page and line of P. The second part (pp. 177–343) is an alphabetical index of all words and forms to which code numbers referring to the pages and lines concerned are added. The third part (pp. 345–47) represents a finding list which enables the user of the index to find out to which paragraph of Pelliot's edition the code numbers refer. Pelliot's transcription has been slightly modified (*c* instead of *č*, *j* instead of *ǰ*, etc.), but Pelliot's text has not been corrected. Thus, P 59 *qatqun* should be *hatqun* "squeezing in the hand," and so forth (see *Bull. of the Inst. of Hist. and Phil., Academia Sinica*, vol. 39, p. 270). However, the corrections must be left for later research. De Rachewiltz's index is to be welcomed as a valuable publication which will serve as a basis for compilation of a grammar and a complete dictionary of the language of the *Secret History*.

NICHOLAS POPPE
University of Washington (Emeritus)

THE HISTORY OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE. By *Ivan N. Ostroumoff*. Translated by *Basil Popoff*. Boston: Holy Transfiguration Monastery, 1971. x, 313 pp. \$2.00, paper.

For those desirous of an unreconstructed, strictly Orthodox account of the position taken by the Greek Church on the points at issue at the Council of Florence, this book can be of use, since it follows most faithfully the extremely valuable if biased account of the pro-Orthodox, Byzantine ecclesiastic-historian Syropoulos, whom most Western historians have for centuries unjustly neglected. Yet he alone provides material on the behind-the-scenes thoughts and activities of the Greeks which can be found nowhere else. Ostroumoff refers also to the pro-unionist work of the Greek, Dorotheus of Mitylene (but almost invariably to prove him wrong), and uses some material from the Synodal library of Moscow. The latter provides in-

formation (all known today) on the Russian representatives at Florence, Isidore and the bishops of Tver and Stavropol, who (unlike Isidore) left Florence and did not sign the unionist decree. When Ostroumoff quotes a Western source it is again only to support the Orthodox position (e.g., Traversari on the "deceptions" of the papal court at Florence). Unlike some modern Western historians Ostroumoff rightly stresses certain incidents of protocol that occurred before the council, such as the patriarch's refusal to kiss the pope's foot ("Whence does he derive this right?"), but which are important in revealing the differing mentalities of the two peoples. The author casts no blame on the Greek people as a whole, not reflecting the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Rus' belief that the Greeks were apostates from Orthodoxy. Rather he seeks, as he affirms, to show the "lawless character of the Council" (canonically not even all the patriarchs signed); that actually the "Greeks vanquished the Latins on all points" (cf. Joseph Gill, who in his *Council of Florence* says that the Greeks were not able to stand up to the Latin syllogistic reasoning); and that it was Latin "cunning," "bribery," and the work of four Greek "traitors," Bessarion ("When he disputed with the Latins it was only to show off his power of speech"), Dorotheus, Isidore, and Gregory the Almoner, that brought about the "fraudulent" union.

Because of its avowedly apologetic character (so open as to be refreshing), its age (the book was first published in Russia in 1847 and translated into English a century ago), its lack of a more modern critical viewpoint, and (perforce) its inability to profit from the large amount of recent scholarship (e.g., works of Gill, Hofmann, Geanakoplos, etc.), the book can be of only limited value to a modern scholar studying the Council of Florence as an objective, many-sided historical event. However, it provides a very good summary in English and a kind of commentary (in the footnotes) on Syropoulos. (Incidentally, Syropoulos has finally been published only this year in a critical edition with French translation by V. Laurent.)

DENO J. GEANAKOPLIS
Yale University

HISTORY OF THE COSSACKS. By *W. G. Glaskow*. New York: Robert Speller & Sons, 1972. vii, 163 pp. \$6.00.

A new work on the Cossacks arouses interest not only because of their long and unique role in East European affairs but because of the relatively few reliable accounts of their history, especially in West European languages. The need for an updated, balanced study of Cossack society, therefore, is real and long overdue. Unfortunately, this book does not fill the need. The author, an émigré Don Cossack officer, no doubt had his reasons for defining "Cossackia" as the land bordered on the west by the Ukraine, on the north by Russia, on the east by Turkestan, and on the south by the Caucasus, but he has not made clear why a history of the Cossacks does not include more than passing references to Cossack communities of the Dnieper, Siberia, Transbaikal, and other parts of the Russian state. What he has written is not so much a history of Cossackdom as a sketch of the Cossacks of the Don area who somehow become the prototypes of and the spokesmen for all Cossacks.

The author's basic assumptions, as well as the organization and methodology of his work, leave much to be desired. He contends that much of what is known about