

lie's book. Mr. Hellie is a very cautious translator, so cautious that when a major difficulty is faced, the Russian term, although thoroughly explained in a note, is left untranslated—for example, *okolnichii*, rank second to that of a boyar, or *zhilets* (discussed above). This may be bending over backward, but certainly is not misleading. On the other hand, so much is explained in the notes that the understanding of the text is conveyed most adequately. The scope of this book is wider, for it covers Muscovite society as a whole, which Hellie follows group by group in nine chapters, involving many texts, some of them quite extensive. He has drawn heavily on the Law Code (Ulozhenie) of 1649, having translated *in extenso* chapters 7, 8, 11, 19, 20, and 22, next to a partial translation of chapters 10, 15, and 21 (in all, 338 articles of the Ulozhenie, which certainly is a sizable contribution). He also has translated the Toropets Administrative Charter of 1590/91 (pp. 34–47), and the petition on forbidding foreign merchants to trade, 1648–49 (pp. 66–91). Chapter 7 is devoted to “The Enserfment of the Peasantry” (pp. 92–232), while chapter 8 deals with “Bondage in Muscovy” (pp. 233–301). Hellie's division of his texts according to the stages of enserfment, each stage preceded by his analysis of it, throws much light on the process of enserfment and contributes to its understanding. The book would require more polishing, and further search for English equivalents of the Russian terms would be most desirable, but even as it stands now, this modestly presented endeavor deserves scholarly praise.

MARC SZEFTEL  
*University of Washington*

RUDE AND BARBAROUS KINGDOM: RUSSIA IN THE ACCOUNTS OF SIXTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLISH VOYAGERS. Edited by *Lloyd E. Berry* and *Robert O. Crummey*. Madison, Milwaukee, and London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968. xxiii, 391 pp. \$7.50.

This is a good edition of valuable sources: a selection of the most important writings on Muscovy by Englishmen who came as traders and diplomats following the discovery of the White Sea route by Richard Chancellor in 1553 and the establishment of the Russia Company a year later. It includes the account of Chancellor's voyage, in the Clement Adams version; the *First Voyage* (1557–58) of Anthony Jenkinson; Sir Thomas Randolph's brief description of his mission of 1568–69; the verse letters of George Turberville, who was Randolph's secretary; Giles Fletcher's *Of the Russe Commonwealth*, first published in 1591; and Sir Jerome Horsey's *Travels*, a record of his almost continuous residence in Russia from 1573 to 1591. Texts are modernized but based on original manuscripts or first editions, with substantive variants recorded when they are not available elsewhere. Graceful and perceptive essays introduce each author and evaluate his work; a general introduction sets the historical background. The scholarly apparatus also includes extensive textual commentaries, a comprehensive and accurate glossary of Russian terms, and two maps. Although the editors accept joint responsibility for the product, the preparation of the text is primarily credited to Mr. Berry and the introductory material to Mr. Crummey, the commentaries being a collaborative effort.

I would trade Turberville's amusing but trivial poems for some more of Horsey. But this may be an eccentric taste—Horsey is often more trouble than he is worth. In general the selection is very sound, even to the inclusion of Fletcher's work. Al-

though the most important item, it seems at first glance the most dispensable: this is the fourth edition of *Russe Commonwealth* since 1964. But it is also the most satisfactory in combining an accurate yet readable text with adequate historical commentaries. Fletcher attempted a systematic description and interpretation of how Russia was ruled, and ended by portraying a society wholly subservient to and exploited by a single man, the tsar. The accuracy of this portrayal has been sharply challenged (most comprehensively by S. M. Seredonin, whose *Sochinenie Dzhil'sa Fletchera* remains an indispensable reference), and highly praised (most recently by Richard Pipes in the facsimile edition co-edited with J. V. A. Fine, Jr.). Crummey strikes a judicious balance. He gives full credit to Fletcher's analytical sophistication and impressive accumulation of data. Yet he warns the reader not only against Fletcher's errors of fact but, most important, against his "excessive simplification," his "failure to appreciate those features of the Muscovite administration which ran counter to the prevailing currents of absolutism and centralization" (p. 99).

It is in the nature of things that no commentator ever succeeds in providing definitive answers to all the questions raised by a text. The present editors have been particularly skilled in explicating discussions of diplomatic and commercial affairs, notably in disentangling Horsey's peculiarly muddled narrative. They seem a little less sure-fingered in dealing with Muscovite internal affairs. There remain passages which would benefit from elucidation or verification; a few of the editors' own generalizations might be questioned. But these are minor matters which do not seriously affect the considerable merits of this volume.

BENJAMIN UROFF  
University of Illinois

EKONOMICHESKOE RAZVITIE GORODOV BELORUSSII V XVI-PER-  
VOI POLOVINE XVIII V. By Z. Iu. Kopyssky. Minsk: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka  
i tekhnika," 1966. 228 pp. 76 kopeks.

The author of this mine of information asserts that through it he wishes to dispose of the "myth" that Belorussian cities withered during the sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth century and also of subordinate myths that the use of Magdeburg Law by the cities was closely linked with the power of the great principality of Lithuania, that Lithuanian and Polish nobles enserfed the cities and their citizens, that the Catholic Church, with the help of the king and of Polish nobles, displaced the Orthodox Church in Belorussia, and that all these factors contributed to the alienation of the city from the countryside—the ultimate cause of the alleged decline of Belorussian cities—an alienation in which the decline of the *veche* tradition played a significant role.

Kopyssky shows that Magdeburg Law was not a mere extension of princely power but that the magistracies of cities played an increasingly significant role, borrowing from the law of other cities (Vilna in particular) and from the rules of guilds. He shows the important political and economic role played by guilds, a refutation of the view that nobles enserfed the cities. Moreover, he strengthens the image of a high degree of city self-government by delineating instances of successful opposition by the guilds to the Catholic Church and to the Uniats. In basic agreement with Pokhilevich, he goes further in showing that the country was economically important to the city: not only did peasants need to be able to buy