

area of Slavic reference work and should be used profitably by both scholars and information specialists for years to come" (vol. 53, no. 1 [Spring 1994]: 296–98).

Croucher retired in August 2005, after 25 years as the Slavic bibliographer at Indiana University and nearly 35 years in Slavic librarianship. *Books, Bibliographies and Pugs: A Festschrift to Honor Murlin Croucher* (2006) was published to honor his professional accomplishments.

Due to his expertise in the field, countless librarians, scholars, graduate and undergraduate students, and just ordinary people consulted him. Their inquiries covered a broad range of disciplines and an almost unlimited range of Slavic studies topics. One of Croucher's great professional skills was the ease and accuracy with which he ably answered reference requests. Once in a while a reference title would not come to mind, so he would simply take the student or faculty member to the appropriate resource within the library stacks. His excellent work, as well as firm dedication to the profession, earned him widespread respect from Slavic scholars and librarians alike. Croucher took the stereotypical image of a stuffy and bookish bibliographer and reshaped it, giving it a truly human face. His legacy will continue through the wonderful collections that he developed and through the work of all the librarians whom he taught and inspired, as well as through the many students and scholars he ably assisted. Surviving Croucher is his longtime partner, Fred M. Clark, professor of Portuguese at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

GREGORY C. FERENCE
Salisbury University

BRADLEY L. SCHAFFNER
Harvard University
September 2011

Andrei Ivanovich Pliguzov, 1956–2011

With the death of Andrei Pliguzov in Moscow on 26 March 2011, Russian historians lost one of their most brilliant and independent minds. Following in the footsteps of his teachers Nikolai N. Pokrovskii and Aleksandr A. Zimin, Andrei represented the best tradition of Russian critical scholarship. His profound expertise in the study of manuscripts, intimate familiarity with Russian archives and library collections, courage in asking provocative questions, and passion for historical inquiry, writing, and teaching inspired many in Russia, Europe, and the United States. Andrei's most important scholarly legacies are his studies of medieval Russian church history and his prodigious publication of sources from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries. Andrei's engagement and impact went far beyond his specialization, however: he was a facilitator, organizer, and editor of scholarship, an outspoken critic of the Marxist and nationalist discourses of Russian historiography, and a charismatic individualist who won the admiration and affection of many colleagues and friends.

In his scholarly publications—which comprise twenty authored, edited, co-edited, and translated books as well as countless articles—Andrei constantly invoked past generations of Russian scholars. Much of his work can be understood as a resumption and continuation of scholarly endeavors that had been interrupted, thwarted, or suppressed by the Soviet regime. For example, he greatly admired the researchers at the Imperial Archeographic Commission, most notably P. M. Stroev, A. S. Pavlov, V. G. Druzhinin, and S. A. Belokurov. Following their paths through Russian archives and libraries, Andrei reexamined the manuscripts they had studied and published. As editor in chief and principal author of *Russkii feodal'nyi arkhiv XIV–pervoi treti XVI veka*, vols. 1–5 (Moscow, 1986–92), republished as a cohesive whole in 2008, Andrei took up a very significant unfinished research agenda: the reconstruction of medieval church archives, particularly the lost archive of the Moscow metropolitans. His articles and commentary in this work comprise a masterpiece of extensive research and codicological analysis based on a wide array of manuscripts from collections all over Russia, especially the metropolitanate's epistolary, "formulary" codices. Andrei likewise helped publish the invaluable *Sochineniia: Kniga glagolemaia Fotios* (Moscow, 2005), a collection of Metropolitan Fotii's writings.

The monograph *Polemika v russkoi tserkvi pervoi treti XVI stoletia* (Moscow, 2002) reveals Andrei at his analytical best. Complementing and affirming Donald Ostrowski's revisionist work on the Synod of 1503 and Nil Sorskii, Andrei radically rethinks the problem of the sixteenth-century "non-possessors" (*nestiazhateli*), identifies which of the works attributed to Vassian Patrikeev are likely authentic, and shows that this seminal, alleged founding father of a movement did not advocate confiscating church lands, but, rather, having episcopal officials manage them, as per the church canons. Indeed, Vassian Patrikeev's most important work was his redaction of the *Kormchaia kniga*, Russia's version of the Greek *Nomocanon*. Andrei's book also shows that the alleged struggle over Russian church lands—a notion first introduced by nineteenth-century historians—is a historiographic construction derived from false analogies with western nation states and the flawed assumption that the Kremlin's centralization policies promoted secularization. In fact, Andrei demonstrates that the size of church lands increased dramatically as the Kremlin expanded its authority over church institutions.

Other contributions by Andrei address the Kulikovo Battle (*Zhivaia voda Nepriadvy* [Moscow, 1988]), the Union of Florence, the Time of Troubles, early modern Old Belief, regionalism in Russian history (in particular, the Siberian and northern frontiers), documents from the reign of Empress Elizabeth, and the place of ethnic minorities in the Russian imperial imagination (*Tekst-Kentavr o sibirskikh samoedakh* [Moscow, 1993]). His essays on historiography (for example, in *Russian History/Histoire Russe* 25 [1998]) dissect and expose the legends of Russian and Soviet scholarship. Using the example of medieval church history, Andrei urges scholars to remain true to the historical evidence, abstain from generalizations, and dare to formulate new research questions. His thoughts remain very relevant today as a resurgent Orthodox nationalism once again makes the critical study of church and religion difficult, if not impossible, within Russia. Andrei's own scholarship remains a model for others who do not want to participate in what Andrei termed the Russian "carnival of history" (*istoricheskii karnaval*).

Andrei hoped that Russian medieval church history would remain an important subject of analytical inquiry in Russia. That was the principal purpose behind his many publications of sources. He also believed that keeping alive the memory of great scholarship would inspire "a new generation of scholars . . . [for whom] church history had ceased to be a forbidden zone for concrete historical knowledge [*perestala byt' zapretnoi zonoï dlia konkretno-istoricheskogo znaniia*]" (*Russian History/Histoire Russe* 25 [1998]: 408). He published manuscripts by his late mentor Aleksandr A. Zimin and introduced the Russian translation of John Fennell's *The Crisis of Medieval Russia* (and added appendixes). Andrei's published commentaries on the scholarship of Viktor I. Buganov, Edward L. Keenan, and Aleksandr I. Klibanov are dedicated to three historians for whom Andrei had the highest regard and warm affection.

When he was at the top of his career—before the onset of his tragic illness—Andrei was an intellectual powerhouse. His encyclopedic mind and singular archival knowledge were shared generously with western scholars who sought him out for advice. His responses to research papers—particularly in seminars at the Institute of History and Harvard University—were polished lecture presentations in their own right. They were incisive, thought-provoking, always cutting to the essence, and sometimes even a bit intimidating. Andrei relished the spotlight, perhaps because he had been a successful television journalist before becoming a historian, but few minded because he was stunning in his eloquence. Andrei also wrote poetry, and there was something of the poet in his way of speaking and writing. Those of us who were fortunate to experience Andrei's dazzling intellect, captivating personality, caustic but good-natured humor, and passion for historical research will always be grateful for the time we had with him.

GEORG B. MICHELS
University of California, Riverside
with

DAVID GOLDFRANK
Georgetown University
September 2011