

in the sixteenth century. They offer only a selection from Dr. Andreyev's abundant scholarly production in different fields pertaining to Russian studies during a period of nearly forty years. Four of these articles belong to the pre-World War II epoch and were originally published in *Seminarium Kondakovianum*, the famous Prague yearbook, between 1932 and 1938. The rest are the result of continuous scholarly activity from 1953 to 1969 and have appeared in different journals, yearbooks, and Festschriften. Seven of the articles are in Russian, the rest in English.

What is striking about almost all of these studies is Andreyev's skillful use of iconographical materials as documents of cultural history. His attention to the intimate relation between the religious pictorial material and the development of ideas in Old Russia, especially Muscovy, is amazingly keen, and seems to be the author's particular talent, unexcelled by others in this field. To be more specific, his seven studies on the role of Ivan Viskovaty, *d'iak* and adviser to Ivan IV, throw a bright light on the mystico-didactic trend in icon-painting characteristic of the century and a half preceding Peter the Great's era. In this connection Andreyev was led to analyze the interpolations in Muscovite sixteenth-century chronicles, and firmly established the same Viskovaty as their author. Four other studies deal with the activity of the Pskov-Pechery monastery. They arrive at novel points of view, and very convincing ones, concerning the monk Filofei's epistles on the Third Rome and Kurbsky's connection with the monastery. All of the articles are of the same high competence and illuminating originality. One must hail the appearance of these studies in a form making them readily accessible to scholars.

MARC SZEFTEL

University of Washington

ARSENII MATSEEVICH MITROPOLIT ROSTOVSKII, 1696–1772. By G. M. Soldatov. St. Paul: Published by the author, 1971. 130 pp. \$4.50, paper.

Because of our understandable concern with the Russian revolutions of the twentieth century and their more immediate antecedents, the study of older, basic institutional and cultural history has been comparatively neglected. In the case of church history, our own secular, liberal values, which sometimes lead us to accept phenomena without attempting to explain them, also have stood in the way of study. Yet the church was a major political and economic force, and the main cultural vehicle of the people. One has only to compare the number and depth of studies of secularization of church lands in England or France with the lack of such studies (excepting Zavialov and a few others) for Russia. The present book by Soldatov is the first extensive work since 1912 on the chief clerical opponent of secularization in Russia. Unlike previous works, it is not biased either for or against Arsenii. It is accurate and uses the basic original and secondary works available in America, with the exceptions noted below. The book is limited, however, by its biographical nature; though it formulates well important questions of economics, cultural values, and so forth, it does not probe them. Secularization is accepted as an inevitable result of modernization: Arsenii is portrayed as an unrealistic man with outmoded ideas, yet realistic (it is hinted) in seeing secularization as tied to the question of church autonomy. Was it so? If it was, how and why? There are works the author could have used—Barsov's *Sv. Sinod*, Blagovidov's *Ober-prokurory*, Shakhovskoy's

Zapiski, Miliutin's *O nedvizhimykh imushchestvakh dukhovenstva*, and others—which would have deepened his study. The book has a short introduction by E. Magerovsky.

This volume seems to be concerned with clarifying the role of Arsenii as a possible saint—with negative conclusions. Though limited in audience because it is in Russian, the book is nonetheless a much-needed and objective work.

ELLIOT BENOWITZ
Portland State University

PEASANT UPRISINGS IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY FRANCE, RUSSIA, AND CHINA. By *Roland Mousnier*. Translated by *Brian Pearce*. New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1970. xx, 358 pp. \$10.00.

THE EUROPEAN PEASANTRY: THE FINAL PHASE. By *S. H. Franklin*. London: Methuen & Co., 1969. xvi, 256 pp. \$8.00.

The only link between the two books joined in this review is that both deal with the ancient class of the peasantry; otherwise they are very distant in subject and scope. Franklin's is a sociological study of the state and prospect of European peasantry, East and West; Mousnier's is a historical story of seventeenth-century peasant revolts in France, Russia, and China. Perhaps the two books share one more aspect—both are works of real scholarship, yet both, for different reasons, tend to leave the mind unsatisfied.

In Mousnier's case the reason is obvious enough. The author's reputation vouches for the quality of his material and his handling of it, but it is difficult to identify either unity of subject or of conclusions in this book. In the mid-seventeenth century "revolts flared up all round the world" (p. xix), but "the period 1640–1660 had no monopoly on disturbances. It was both preceded and followed by long periods of riot and upheaval" (p. xviii). Moreover, in "western Europe the peasant revolts were not isolated and cannot be understood without taking account of the activities of the towns and the help rendered by other social groups" (p. xix). Having thus indicated how disjointed the subject is bound to be, in time and space and in substance, Mousnier chooses to look at peasant revolts in three selected countries, "because their social structures are very different" (p. xix).

The three countries in fact were three different worlds, when communications were at best adventurous, and there was nothing like a political or social philosophy to spread from one to the others. Indeed, even within them social life was largely localized. One general conclusion the author allows himself is that these revolts were "reactions against the state" (p. 348), against growing centralization and spreading bureaucracy; hence the troubles began in the towns and not on peasant initiative. In France, to succeed, "the peasants would have had to unite . . . and march on Paris, but they do not seem to have thought of doing this" (p. 339). Life was local, and so was the trouble; any suggestion of uniformity would be misleading. The grievances which peasants everywhere had in common were the burden of taxes and other imposts, periodically made worse by natural calamities, such as epidemics and the failure of crops, and, generally, the abuses of officials. Hence as a frequent common feature the peasants simply demanded a return to and respect for traditional "customs": "these crises of anger did not make revolutionaries of them" (p. 342). Beyond these local reactions, the author believes it