

and seventh centuries. From the seventh through the ninth century, settlements grew larger and the material culture became richer, but the author supposes that Slavic society remained tribal except for the early ninth-century state of Great Moravia. A great gap seems to separate Procopius's "dirty" Sklavini and Antes from the Slavs who adopted Christianity and Byzantine culture. Yet throughout their history the pre-Christian Slavs were a people of amazingly conservative and rather modest material culture and way of life; often they were influenced by more sophisticated or more powerful neighbors.

In a work of this scope, generalizations and oversimplifications are unavoidable. The kinds of evidence available to the author probably do not always justify the certainty of her tone. Yet Professor Gimbutas must be heartily congratulated for tackling a large and difficult subject and for successfully producing a basic source-book for pre-Christian Slavic history.

ANN FARKAS  
Columbia University

THE TESTAMENTS OF THE GRAND PRINCES OF MOSCOW. Translated and edited, with commentary, by *Robert Craig Howes*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967. xvii, 445 pp. \$10.00.

Specialists involved in the teaching of early Russian history are painfully aware of the scarcity of competent professional translations of source materials for this period. Professor Howes's translation of the testaments of the grand princes of Moscow should therefore be welcomed as a valuable addition to the resources of both academic teacher and scholar. The thirteen testaments, ranging from the time of Ivan Kalita to Ivan IV, represent one of the most important sources for the study of the political, legal, and social history of Muscovite Russia. Their crucial significance was initially recognized by A. E. Presniakov in his famous classic work, *Obrazovanie velikorusskogo gosudarstva: Ocherki po istorii XIII-XV stoletii* (Petrograd, 1918). Howes, however, seems to be unaware of Presniakov's pioneering efforts in the study of the testaments.

In his photographic reproduction of the texts of the thirteen testaments Howes relied on the most authoritative edition by L. V. Cherepnin, *Dukhovnye i dogovornye gramoty velikikh i udel'nykh kniazei XIV-XVI vv.* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1950). Generally speaking, the translation of the documents is satisfactory and devoid of major mistakes or misrepresentations, but the application of a method of simplification and modernization is evident. In many instances, Howes leaves difficult terms untranslated, though he comments on them in footnotes and provides the necessary glossary.

It is apparent from the introductory survey and the footnotes that the editor encountered certain difficulties when handling materials from the Russian chronicles and other sources. Howes's indiscriminate use of sixteenth-century chronicle compilations (specifically the Voskresensk and the Nikon codices) as a source of factual information is an obvious shortcoming. His account of the first mentioning of Moscow in the chronicles (pp. 3-4) is footnoted with a reference to the Voskresensk Chronicle (p. 4, n. 3; *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei* [cited hereafter as *PSRL*], 7 [1856]: 38), but neglects earlier sources, such as the Hypatian Chronicle (*PSRL*, 2 [1908<sup>2</sup>/1962]: 339-40) and the Codex of 1479 (*PSRL*, 25 [1949]: 39). Similarly, in his discussion of the several legends describing Moscow's founding the editor fails

to acknowledge the most recent critical edition of texts edited by M. A. Salmina, *Povesti o nachale Moskovy* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1964). Even more doubtful is the editor's almost exclusive dependence on the Nikon Chronicle for the account of various events of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (cf. pp. 6–7, n. 6; p. 9, n. 15; p. 29, n. 22) and the use of the adaptation of the Life (*Povest'*) of St. Sergius of Radonezh from the Nikon Chronicle instead of the more reliable texts of the latter's Life from the edition of N. S. Tikhonravov, *Drevniia zhitiia prepodobnago Sergiia Radonezhskago* (Moscow, 1892–1916).

The treatment of the well-known ideological legend according to which Vladimir Monomakh allegedly received the imperial regalia from the Byzantine emperor (pp. 99–103) is simply inadequate. Howes quotes a description of the transfer of the regalia from the Voskresensk Chronicle (under the year 1113), and is apparently unacquainted with the textological history of this legend. As a case in point, he does not refer to such important ideological treatises as the Epistle of Spiridon-Savva and the *Skazanie o kniaz'iakh Vladimirskikh*, both of which provided the foundations for the legend in question and preceded the compilation of the Voskresensk Chronicle. The critical edition of these texts by R. P. Dmitrieva, *Skazanie o kniaz'iakh Vladimirskikh* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1955), is not mentioned by the editor. Although he seems to be vaguely familiar with the fifteenth- (or early sixteenth-) century origins of the legend, Howes prefers to believe that there is some historical basis to it and that "it is, of course, impossible to deny flatly that these regalia—the box, the cross and the Golden Cap—did not come down to Ivan the Terrible from Prince Vladimir Monomakh" (p. 102). Such a view is not only confusing but has no serious support in contemporary scholarship. Another piece of Muscovite ideological propaganda to be found in the Voskresensk Chronicle—the story about the relics of the Passion of Our Lord which allegedly had been given by the Byzantine emperor to Oleg of Kiev in 912 (p. 231, n. 20)—has been introduced by the editor in his scholarly apparatus. This story is a complete invention, since Oleg and his Russes were pagans at that time and certainly would not have qualified as recipients of such precious gifts. Incidentally, the Voskresensk Chronicle was not "composed during the second half of the sixteenth century" (p. 101), for its last recension originates from the period between 1542 and 1544. Another shortcoming is the editor's reliance mainly on Soloviev for reference footnotes on important facts and developments in Russian history, such as the incorporation of Tver or Novgorod, the temporary conquest of Polotsk, and the explanatory comment on *strel'tsy* (pp. 280–81, nn. 46, 48; p. 348, n. 161; p. 327, n. 74). With all due respect for the grand old man of Russian nationalist imperial historiography, one should not altogether neglect a number of very distinguished Russian historians whose contributions to the understanding of the problems involved have superseded Soloviev's.

In most of his commentaries on the individual testaments—particularly with regard to their dating—Howes follows the fundamental archeographic work of L. V. Cherepnin, *Russkie feodal'nye arkhivy* (2 vols.; Moscow and Leningrad, 1948–51). Concerning the dating of the Testament of Ivan IV, he accepts the judgment of S. B. Veselovsky (between early June and August 6, 1572) and fails to refer to the important article by R. H. Skrynnikov, who maintains that the writing of this testament was begun in 1564 and that it was re-edited in 1566, 1569, and 1572 without ever having been completed ("Dukhovnoe zaveshchanie tsaria Ivana Groznogo," *Novonaidennye i neopublikovannye proizvedeniia drevnerusskoi literatury*, in *Trudy otдела drevnerusskoi literatury*, 21 [1965]: 309–18). Howes's most significant con-

tribution to the textological study of the testaments is his identification of the numerous biblical quotations to be found in the Testament of Ivan IV. The source for the quotation "iako Bogu ne gnevatisia, i iako smertnu ne voznositesia, i dolgoterpelivu byti k sogreshaiushchim," which Howes does not identify (pp. 161, 322, n. 51), is apparently Agapetus, 21.

As far as the general issues are concerned, the editor offers some observations about the changing concept of the state as reflected in the testaments without probing too deeply into such problems as the use and meaning of the term *votchina*. Why and in what sense did the Muscovite rulers refer to Tver, Novgorod, Pskov, Polotsk, and Livonia as their "patrimonies"? In his testament Ivan IV did not apply the latter term to Kazan and Astrakhan, although other official Muscovite sources claimed that the khanates were also "patrimonies" of the Muscovite rulers. Furthermore, Howes refrains from addressing himself to one of the most crucial developments in the history of Russia—the transformation of the Muscovite state from a homogeneous national state into a heterogeneous empire (state of states) composed of a diversity of tsardoms, lands, and cities. This new status of the Muscovite state becomes evident in the Testament of Ivan IV by the manner in which the latter bequeathed the tsardoms of Kazan and Astrakhan as well as the Livonian land to his son Ivan, and by the elaborate description of the nationalities and territories of the Kazan *tsarstvo*. Finally, an integration of the editor's evaluation of the testaments into the broader framework of Muscovite political thought would have been most desirable. In short, although Professor Howes has provided scholars with a useful translation of the testaments, we still await a definitive study of these crucial documents.

JAROSLAW PELENSKI  
University of Iowa

#### RUSSIAN EMBASSIES TO THE GEORGIAN KINGS (1589–1605). 2 vols.

Edited by *W. E. D. Allen*. Works Issued by the Hakluyt Society, second series, nos. 138 and 139. Texts translated by *Anthony Mango*. Cambridge and New York: Published for the Hakluyt Society at the Cambridge University Press, 1970. vol. 1: xxxii, 368 pp. vol. 2: ix, pp. 369–640. \$18.50, set.

This new two-volume monograph by the well-known specialist on the history of Transcaucasia and the Caucasus, W. E. D. Allen, represents a translation into English of the documents of Russo-Georgian relations published in his time by S. A. Belokurov. The translation is accompanied by substantial commentaries, and in preparing them the author used not only other Russian materials but also Georgian sources, such as *Kniga bol'shogo chertezha* and Vakhushti's *Geographical Description of Georgia*. The book is provided with an extensive introduction which presents an historicogeographical background of the events dealt with in the translated documents. The author's attempt to show the role of geographical conditions of the various regions of the Caucasus in their historical development seems very fruitful, because unless natural conditions are taken into account it is scarcely possible to understand the specifics of the historical development of the mountain and valley regions of this area.

It must be noted that the content of the book is significantly broader than the title would suggest: the author not only treats Russo-Georgian relations proper but to a greater or lesser extent also illuminates events in neighboring countries—Iran,