

On the other hand, to translate *tiaglo* as "burden" is etymologically and also substantively hardly defensible. One cannot separate the interpretation of this term from the verb *tianuti* frequently used in the sources for fiscal and labor obligations toward another person or a locality. It is usually accompanied by the preposition *k* (to) and the dative, for example, *a k tomu selu tianuti derevni* (*Pamiatniki russkogo prava*, 3:57, a 1410–31 charter). The literal translation of this phrase is "And (the following) hamlets pulled toward this village" (i.e., owed to it duties and obligations). Eck (p. 275) rightly translated *tianut'* into French as *mouvoir* and *tiaglo* as *mouvance* and more specifically as *taille* (p. 583). While *tiaglo* unquestionably was a heavy burden, Eck's translation appears more exact. In English "tallage" would be much better than "burden." Especially, the translation of *tiaglye liudi* as "men of burden" (p. 57) raises great doubts, because of possible associations (physical burden?); one would prefer "talliable people." In this connection, one must recall that M. Vasmer has derived *tiaglo* from *tiaga*, an etymology which upholds the criticism expressed by this reviewer (*Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg, 1956, 2:166).

Less important qualifications may be omitted because of lack of space: they are not numerous. There are certain inconsistencies of terminology: the ruler of Muscovy has been called "grand prince" (which is correct) but also "grand duke" in other places (pp. 39, 46, 66, 77, 157). *Partiia Narodnoi Svobody* has been translated as "Party of National Freedom," while on the same page 83 *Partiia Narodnykh Sotsialistov* has been rendered as "The People's Socialist Party." There are also other minor shortcomings, but all of them notwithstanding, one feels gratitude and admiration for this remarkable and most useful performance. This volume is intended to be companion to a *Sourcebook of Russian History* now in preparation, another important endeavor that will also fill a most urgent need.

MARC SZEFTTEL
University of Washington

DAS BILD DES ABENDLANDES IN DEN ALTRUSSISCHEN CHRONIKEN. By Günther Stökl. Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen: Geisteswissenschaften, no. 124. Cologne and Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1965. 64 pp.

The title essay on the image of the West in the early (eleventh to sixteenth century) Russian chronicles was originally read by Professor Stökl of the University of Cologne before a group of German scholars, most of them not specialists in Russian history. The reading was followed by a discussion. In published form, both the paper (now provided with footnotes and résumés in English and French) and the discussion reflect their origin. The first is necessarily an overview, illustrative rather than analytical in its use of facts; the second soon wanders away from the topic. The essay proceeds from the following premise: "It seems expedient . . . to concentrate in the first instance on the comparatively easy question of what the early Russian chroniclers knew about the West. Then the answer to the further question of what they thought about the West will readily emerge of itself" (pp. 13–14). Unsurprisingly, the evidence presented indicates that the extent and accuracy of chronicle information about a Western country was directly related to the amount of contact the Russians had with it. More tentatively, it suggests that prolonged contact tempered religious hostility (e.g., in thirteenth-century Galicia-Volynia and Novgorod). But on the whole the chronicles have little to say about

the West. Stökl tends to attribute this silence to ignorance; still, the argument from silence is particularly dangerous in analyzing a source for the kind of information it does not ordinarily seek to provide. In any event the essay is, in the author's words, a "preliminary attempt," and is of value not so much for its conclusions as for its wealth of detail. I found particularly instructive discussions of terminology: the meaning of ethnic names, the Italian influence on Muscovite diplomatic vocabulary, and much more besides.

BENJAMIN UROFF

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

THE "CHOSEN COUNCIL" OF IVAN IV: A REINTERPRETATION.

By *Antony N. Grobovsky*. New York: Theo. Gaus' Sons, 1969. vii, 171 pp.

Grobovsky's book is the outcome of his doctoral thesis. His subject, "The Chosen Council," is one that in view of its complexity demands a most detailed knowledge of the source material of the period and a clear realization of the historical scene in the forties and fifties of the sixteenth century in Muscovite Russia, as well as complete familiarity with the historiography of the problem as it stands at the moment. The author has bravely taken the bull by the horns and produced a not uninteresting piece of research, although it would not appear that he has been able to reach any incontestable conclusions. He is certainly correct in his criticism of S. V. Bakhrushin's theories both on the Chosen Council and on the general situation at that moment, for Bakhrushin could not or would not take into consideration the role of the church and of Metropolitan Macarius, and tends to interject too modern and too contemporary an approach into sixteenth-century politics. For if the part played by the metropolitan is not taken into consideration, no picture of the Muscovite state at this time can be arrived at which is either true or comprehensible. It has long been my contention (cf. *Slavonic and East European Review*, 40, no. 94 [1961]: 258-59; 38, no. 91 [1960]: 569-71; 37, no. 89 [1959]: 532-34) that these theories, which have so hindered the development of Soviet historical thought, should be re-examined. Grobovsky has done so, and deserves the credit for it. Unfortunately, he is not as yet fully conversant with this period, and therefore his book tends to have rather shaky foundations.

Grobovsky exerts himself to the utmost to prove that the Chosen Council as an institution, or as a private group or society, did not exist. He considers that they were merely well-intentioned individuals. Possibly, but then, too, possibly not. Bakhrushin was, of course, in error when he metamorphosed the Privy Council into the "Chosen Council." I. I. Smirnov in his excellent study, "The Problem of the Chosen Council," in *Ocherki politicheskoi istorii russkogo gosudarstva 30-50kh godov XVI veka* (1958) nearly succeeded in providing the key to this problem, but when on the threshold of apparent success, reverted to acquiescence in Bakhrushin's theories. To my mind, Kurbsky's words on the Chosen Council in his *History of the Grand Prince of Moscow* are much clearer than Grobovsky is prepared to admit. Had he started by delving more deeply into Kurbsky's meaning, it is possible that he would have been off to a better start. Grobovsky's main difficulty appears to be that he seems as yet unable to clarify for himself Muscovite governmental functions and structure. Thus for example he is attracted by the fallacies advanced by D. N. Alshitz and tends to be mesmerized by the subject's complexities. Unfortunately, too, while Grobovsky cites two of my articles, he has