

references to the number of scribes and the primary sources of the codex. The Glagolitic text of the *Psalter* has been rendered without notes. However, Professor H. G. Lunt's observations on the scribes of the *Psalter* made in conjunction with Altbauer's new photostatic edition are added as an appendix to the volume. It was the intention of the editor to render the original Slavic text of the *Psalterium Sinaiticum* as authentically as possible. For this reason, almost no graphic alteration or retouching was done.

The new edition of the *Psalter* calls for a fundamental revision of the various views propagated in the past. At the same time, it opens a wide array of new problems which concern linguists as well as paleographers and literary critics and suggests further inquiry on a comparative basis.

NIKOLA R. PRIBIC  
Florida State University

OCHERKI RUSSKOI KUL'TURY XIII-XV VEKOV. Vol. 1: MATERIAL'NAIA KUL'TURA. Vol. 2: DUKHOVNAIA KUL'TURA. Edited by A. V. Artsikhovskiy, A. M. Sakharov, et al. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1969. Vol. 1: 480 pp. 2.48 rubles. Vol. 2: 436 pp. 2.62 rubles.

These two volumes, comprising twenty chapters written by fourteen scholars, are undoubtedly of great interest to both the scholar and the general reader. This is a most competent survey of Russian civilization during the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, which has never been presented in such detail, nor have so many aspects of this period ever been included.

Perhaps A. M. Sakharov, who wrote the introduction and the chapter on "Religion and the Church," had the most difficult task. This erudite historian tries to widen the historiographical basis of his monograph, and therefore includes an examination of the differing views held by scholars regarding the Mongol influence on Russia. Sakharov mentions, *inter alia*, the views advanced by the Eurasian school of thought, and although this is a welcome step forward, the account is not accurate and avoids explaining the Eurasian theories which he does not intend to scrutinize, merely dismissing them as part of the "anti-Soviet ideologies." Most regrettably he does not even mention P. N. Savitsky, a leading theorist and scholar, as well as geographer, economist, and historian, whose contributions to the development of the Eurasian school of thought were vital. No mention either is made of the criticism directed at the Eurasians in the twenties and thirties by such eminent scholars as P. N. Miliukov and A. A. Kizeveter, or the current American and German research into this Russian intellectual trend. Sakharov does not mention, for instance, V. A. Riasanovskiy's most important book *Obzor russkoi kul'tury*, vol. 1 (New York, 1947), which examines the problem of Mongol influence (pp. 381-411)—on which he is an expert—and refutes the validity of the Eurasian theories. Sakharov cannot, of course, forgo assessing Russia as a feudal society. Would it not have been a great improvement had he included a detailed criticism of the many views which conflict with this theory? Sakharov's survey of the role of the Russian Church contains many interesting details, but unfortunately it is obvious that he tends to attribute a negative attitude to the church whenever possible. Thus he states that the church acted as a brake on the development of the economy in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, that the first attempts to "legalize" the enserfment of the peasants occurred on church lands, and that the church was culpable

of the cultural backwardness of Russia and steadily increased these retrograde elements after the Mongol invasion. Sakharov remains silent on the process which was taking place at that moment—the transformation of the church into a national and classless institution from the urban aristocratic role it played in the first centuries after the Christianization of Russia. Sakharov also seems to forget that the church was the only possible vehicle for education.

Most of the other chapters cannot fail to please, since they reveal a multitude of facts mostly brought to light by Soviet archeological research. A. D. Gorsky, dealing with agriculture and rural crafts, divides his topic into a whole series of subsections prefaced with an assessment of the catastrophic state of agriculture after the departure of the Mongols. The section on agriculture is extremely well documented. The writer has used both archeological data and written sources to prove the points he makes, and the result is in every way a first-rate piece of work. Cattle raising and poultry farming are both most carefully scrutinized. In passing, the author reveals that Herberstein's assertion that the Russians did not shoe their horses is typically false. Equally interesting are the sections on fishing, hunting, apiculture, saltpanning, and forest industries. This is the first time that both so many newly proved and so many well-established facts on early Russian civilization have been united to form a coherent and impressive picture. B. A. Kolchin, in an excellent chapter on trades, gives an account of how iron ore was mined, smelted, and worked, as well as similar processes in the manufacture of steel. He also discusses the felling of timber, and the use the wood was put to, as well as the various techniques involved in spinning, weaving, tanning and leatherwork, bone carving, glass blowing, pottery making, the production of chemicals (i.e., coal-tar dyes, potash, etc.), jewelry making, and even the use of simple machines. This is a most instructive work for those who might have thought that medieval Russia was a completely primitive society. M. G. Rabinovich writes about the various kinds of dwellings and the areas of habitation. I would stress that *ves'* (see vol. 1, p. 232, n. 5) is an ancient Slavonic word for "village." In Czech, for example, it still means village.

A. V. Artsikhovskiy describes clothing, food, domestic implements, and means of transport with the accuracy and scrupulous attention to details which is the hallmark of this distinguished archeologist. V. L. Iarin provides a useful survey of coinage, minting, and money systems. B. A. Rybakov, an eminent expert on military history in Early Russia, gives an excellent account of military knowledge and strategy of the period, along with a number of plans and maps. This for the most part must be accepted as proof positive, although Alexander Nevsky's Polar Campaign in 1256 remains only a fascinating hypothesis. Rybakov also writes on education, and gives an impressive summary of the data available on this subject, including the mass of facts that have accumulated recently (including the Novgorod birchbark texts). V. V. Kostochkin describes the defense systems of the age. A. K. Leontiev deals with the law and the courts, and P. S. Kuznetsov writes about the Russian language used at that time. O. V. Orlov produces a literary history of the period, interspersing his accounts of the main literary works with generalizations which are sometimes open to criticism—particularly his periodization (2:119). Taken as a whole his survey is a useful attempt to link the literary development with concurrent historical events. N. N. Voronin, an authority on the history of Russian architecture, has produced a most valuable chapter with some interesting reproductions. G. I. Vzdornov's chapter on painting gives a thoughtful account of

the development of the various regional schools of icon painting. M. A. Ilin discusses the decorative arts.

These two volumes are a most fruitful source of knowledge for all those interested in this period, for they depict not only the main achievements of Russia but also the general level of her civilization throughout three centuries of medieval development.

NIKOLAY ANDREYEV  
Cambridge University

STUDIEN ZUR LIVLANDPOLITIK IVAN GROZNYJS. By *Norbert Angermann*. Marburg/Lahn: J. G. Herder-Institut, 1972. viii, 134 pp.

Dr. Angermann has published three essays on Ivan the Terrible's Livonian policy which are of scholarly interest despite the fact that so much has been written on this chapter of history. In his first essay he deals with Ivan's motives for invading Livonia in 1558. Obviously a comprehensive study of motives would demand a wide range of investigations into political and economic as well as psychological and environmental issues. Angermann confines himself to discussing primarily two aspects. One concerns the influence economic factors exercised on Ivan's decisions. The tsar's failure to support the Russian merchants dealing with Livonians seems to confirm the conclusion suggested by recent historians that the desire to open trade-ways to the West was not decisive in his planning. The other aspect concerns Ivan's desire to regain what he claimed as his *votchina*. Angermann justly stresses this point, although he does not see a clear connection between it and the question of the tribute demanded by Ivan, which marked the final break between tsar and Livonians. Although the author takes up a number of additional, minor points, he does not discuss the threat which Poland-Lithuania put to Muscovy, the fear of which certainly carried as much weight as other motives.

The second essay, based largely on a study of the *razriadnye knigi*, gives a useful description of Ivan's administrative set-up in Livonia, including a list of the voivodes who were charged with the administration.

The last essay takes up a very important question and merits careful consideration. Angermann argues that Ivan was faced by advisers practically unanimously opposed to his desire to conquer Livonia rather than pursue his actions against the Tatars. They were thus not divided into two parties, as is generally contended. Of course, they all supported the tsar when the decision was taken by him. The evidence for these internal Muscovite debates is necessarily limited, but Angermann considers what there is for each of Ivan's advisers individually.

The scholarly treatment by the author makes his short book a valuable contribution.

WALTHER KIRCHNER  
Princeton, New Jersey

RUSSKOE STAROOBRIADCHESTVO: DUKHOVNYE DVIZHENIIA SEMNADTSATOGO VEKA. By *Sergei Zenkovsky*. Forum Slavicum, vol. 21. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1970. 528 pp. DM 96.

In his book about Russian monasticism (*Russisches Mönchtum*, Würzburg, 1953) the late Igor Smolitsch makes the following remark about the schism in the seventeenth-century Russian Church: "It would be wrong to explain the Raskol