

tribution to the textological study of the testaments is his identification of the numerous biblical quotations to be found in the Testament of Ivan IV. The source for the quotation "iako Bogu ne gnevatisia, i iako smertnu ne voznositesia, i dolgoterpelivu byti k sogreshaiushchim," which Howes does not identify (pp. 161, 322, n. 51), is apparently Agapetus, 21.

As far as the general issues are concerned, the editor offers some observations about the changing concept of the state as reflected in the testaments without probing too deeply into such problems as the use and meaning of the term *votchina*. Why and in what sense did the Muscovite rulers refer to Tver, Novgorod, Pskov, Polotsk, and Livonia as their "patrimonies"? In his testament Ivan IV did not apply the latter term to Kazan and Astrakhan, although other official Muscovite sources claimed that the khanates were also "patrimonies" of the Muscovite rulers. Furthermore, Howes refrains from addressing himself to one of the most crucial developments in the history of Russia—the transformation of the Muscovite state from a homogeneous national state into a heterogeneous empire (state of states) composed of a diversity of tsardoms, lands, and cities. This new status of the Muscovite state becomes evident in the Testament of Ivan IV by the manner in which the latter bequeathed the tsardoms of Kazan and Astrakhan as well as the Livonian land to his son Ivan, and by the elaborate description of the nationalities and territories of the Kazan *tsarstvo*. Finally, an integration of the editor's evaluation of the testaments into the broader framework of Muscovite political thought would have been most desirable. In short, although Professor Howes has provided scholars with a useful translation of the testaments, we still await a definitive study of these crucial documents.

JAROSLAW PELENSKI
University of Iowa

RUSSIAN EMBASSIES TO THE GEORGIAN KINGS (1589–1605). 2 vols.

Edited by *W. E. D. Allen*. Works Issued by the Hakluyt Society, second series, nos. 138 and 139. Texts translated by *Anthony Mango*. Cambridge and New York: Published for the Hakluyt Society at the Cambridge University Press, 1970. vol. 1: xxxii, 368 pp. vol. 2: ix, pp. 369–640. \$18.50, set.

This new two-volume monograph by the well-known specialist on the history of Transcaucasia and the Caucasus, W. E. D. Allen, represents a translation into English of the documents of Russo-Georgian relations published in his time by S. A. Belokurov. The translation is accompanied by substantial commentaries, and in preparing them the author used not only other Russian materials but also Georgian sources, such as *Kniga bol'shogo chertezha* and Vakhushti's *Geographical Description of Georgia*. The book is provided with an extensive introduction which presents an historicogeographical background of the events dealt with in the translated documents. The author's attempt to show the role of geographical conditions of the various regions of the Caucasus in their historical development seems very fruitful, because unless natural conditions are taken into account it is scarcely possible to understand the specifics of the historical development of the mountain and valley regions of this area.

It must be noted that the content of the book is significantly broader than the title would suggest: the author not only treats Russo-Georgian relations proper but to a greater or lesser extent also illuminates events in neighboring countries—Iran,

Azerbaijan, Ottoman Turkey, and in the north Caucasus—without which it is difficult to understand the political situation of that time and the very bases of Russo-Georgian relations in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

A bibliography is appended, as well as genealogical tables of the ruling houses of Russia, Iran, Turkey, Georgia, the Crimea, and of the Shamkhals of Tarku. Finally, there are some very interesting maps and illustrations.

The evident merits of the book include the author's good knowledge of the literature, both prerevolutionary Russian and—especially important—Soviet, including Soviet Georgian. At various points Allen polemizes with other authors, contesting certain viewpoints of Soviet historiography, in particular those expressed in *Ocherki istorii SSSR*. In a short review it is not possible to deal with all these cases, and therefore I raise only one question. On page 70 Allen reproaches "many Western and Soviet historians" for defining social relations in the Caucasus of that period as feudal.

Allen, of course, is not a Marxist, although at times (for example, pp. 2–3) he cites Marx, and he understands feudalism in the spirit of classical bourgeois historiography as a certain system of political relations characterized by the presence of a feudal hierarchy. But insofar as the forms of social structure in Oriental countries at this time differed from this classical scheme, he, like many other Western historians, does not consider them feudal. In this connection his viewpoint is very close to the interpretation by Turkish historians of the social order of the Ottoman Empire, which they also are not inclined to consider feudal.

On the contrary, the majority of Soviet historians regard the social order of the Ottoman Empire, Safavid Iran, and the states of Transcaucasia as variants—concrete forms—of feudal formation. These forms by virtue of many secondary characteristics of course differ from various examples of European feudalism, but by a series of fundamental features connected with the type of exploitation of the peasants and the urban poor must be related to the feudal formation.

If one speaks of the social order of the Georgian states of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it is much closer to European forms of feudalism than what we see at the same period in Iran or Turkey. Georgian feudalism in its basic features took form in the thirteenth century and eventually, under the influence of a series of factors, as a whole underwent only insignificant changes right up to the union of Georgia with Russia. And it is scarcely correct to compare, as Allen does, the Georgian social order with the clan order of the Scottish Highlands. Such a comparison, in my view, might be more apt for the mountain regions of Georgia—the Khevsurs, T'ushians, and other societies—and also many regions of the North Caucasus, but not for the core territory of Georgia.

One might polemize with Allen also on a series of other more detailed problems. Nevertheless, the book, insofar as it familiarizes the Western reader with many aspects of the history of the peoples of our country in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, may be evaluated very positively.

It may be added that Allen's monograph already is known to Soviet historians and is taken account of in their work—for example, see M. Svanidze, *From the History of Georgian-Turkish Relations in the 16th–17th Centuries* (1971), in the Georgian language.

A. P. NOVOSELTSEV
*Institute of the History of the USSR,
USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow*