

but in a somewhat distorted fashion. Thus, for example, in the light of the archeological data available, it is not very convincing to place the migration into the area of the early Sarmatians, bearers of the Prokhorovka culture, and the domination there of "Scytho-Sarmatians" as early as the fourth century B.C. Furthermore, certain archeological findings of the northern Black Sea coast are not persuasively identified with the Sarmatians. The relations of the Sarmatians with other tribes of the northern Black Sea steppe and their ancient city-colonies are in general accurately described. The historical activity of the Sarmatians in Central Europe, especially the Danubian region, on the borders of the Roman Empire, is illuminated in a detailed manner. In addition to extensive citation of written material, the author relies mainly on studies of the Sarmatians in Hungary. Their relations with German tribes, the Romans, and the Huns are chiefly reconstructed by means of written sources; archeological evidence is employed very subjectively and often unconvincingly. Many philological comparisons and ethnic identifications are not persuasive. Thus, for example, the presence of Sarmatian elements in Poland and in England is very doubtful. The Sarmatian origin of several Slavic peoples—for example, the Antes, Serbs, and Croats—is also not very convincing.

In general Sulimirski's book, taking account of the main achievements of contemporary archeology and presenting for the first time in a single monograph the entire process of historical development of this great mass of Iranian-speaking tribes and the details of the emergence of their peculiar culture, represents a valuable contribution to the study of the Iranian-speaking Sarmatians. The book is richly illustrated with pictures of Sarmatian artifacts and historical maps.

K. F. SMIRNOV

Institute of Archeology, USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow

THE SLAVS. By *Marija Gimbutas*. *Ancient Peoples and Places*, vol. 74. London: Thames and Hudson, Ltd. New York and Washington: Praeger Publishers, 1971. 240 pp. \$10.00.

Making abundant use of archeological, literary, and linguistic evidence, Professor Gimbutas traces the history of the Slavs from their putative beginnings in the early second millennium B.C. to the rise of the Slavic states in the ninth and tenth centuries A.D.: "Initially an insignificant, repeatedly subjugated Indo-European group living north of the Carpathian mountains and the middle Dnieper river area, the Slavic farmers through their persistence managed to survive and ultimately succeeded in occupying a vast territory in Central and Eastern Europe and the Balkan Peninsula" (p. 14).

As she develops this theme, Professor Gimbutas deals admirably with the many controversies and problems of early Slavic culture. Tribal names in historical records, social structure, religion, the origins and original homeland of the Slavs (in the early second millennium B.C. Kurgan culture of the North Carpathian region)—the author examines the evidence and puts forth her own conclusions for these and numerous other topics. She sees a cultural continuity of nearly two millennia during the Bronze and Iron Ages, and suggests that Slavs remained in their homeland from 200 B.C. to A.D. 400 despite the various barbarian invaders who overran the region. A true Slavic culture emerged about 500, and the migrations took place in the sixth

and seventh centuries. From the seventh through the ninth century, settlements grew larger and the material culture became richer, but the author supposes that Slavic society remained tribal except for the early ninth-century state of Great Moravia. A great gap seems to separate Procopius's "dirty" Sklavini and Antes from the Slavs who adopted Christianity and Byzantine culture. Yet throughout their history the pre-Christian Slavs were a people of amazingly conservative and rather modest material culture and way of life; often they were influenced by more sophisticated or more powerful neighbors.

In a work of this scope, generalizations and oversimplifications are unavoidable. The kinds of evidence available to the author probably do not always justify the certainty of her tone. Yet Professor Gimbutas must be heartily congratulated for tackling a large and difficult subject and for successfully producing a basic source-book for pre-Christian Slavic history.

ANN FARKAS
Columbia University

THE TESTAMENTS OF THE GRAND PRINCES OF MOSCOW. Translated and edited, with commentary, by *Robert Craig Howes*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967. xvii, 445 pp. \$10.00.

Specialists involved in the teaching of early Russian history are painfully aware of the scarcity of competent professional translations of source materials for this period. Professor Howes's translation of the testaments of the grand princes of Moscow should therefore be welcomed as a valuable addition to the resources of both academic teacher and scholar. The thirteen testaments, ranging from the time of Ivan Kalita to Ivan IV, represent one of the most important sources for the study of the political, legal, and social history of Muscovite Russia. Their crucial significance was initially recognized by A. E. Presniakov in his famous classic work, *Obrazovanie velikorusskogo gosudarstva: Ocherki po istorii XIII-XV stoletii* (Petrograd, 1918). Howes, however, seems to be unaware of Presniakov's pioneering efforts in the study of the testaments.

In his photographic reproduction of the texts of the thirteen testaments Howes relied on the most authoritative edition by L. V. Cherepnin, *Dukhovnye i dogovornye gramoty velikikh i udel'nykh kniazei XIV-XVI vv.* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1950). Generally speaking, the translation of the documents is satisfactory and devoid of major mistakes or misrepresentations, but the application of a method of simplification and modernization is evident. In many instances, Howes leaves difficult terms untranslated, though he comments on them in footnotes and provides the necessary glossary.

It is apparent from the introductory survey and the footnotes that the editor encountered certain difficulties when handling materials from the Russian chronicles and other sources. Howes's indiscriminate use of sixteenth-century chronicle compilations (specifically the Voskresensk and the Nikon codices) as a source of factual information is an obvious shortcoming. His account of the first mentioning of Moscow in the chronicles (pp. 3-4) is footnoted with a reference to the Voskresensk Chronicle (p. 4, n. 3; *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei* [cited hereafter as *PSRL*], 7 [1856]: 38), but neglects earlier sources, such as the Hypatian Chronicle (*PSRL*, 2 [1908²/1962]: 339-40) and the Codex of 1479 (*PSRL*, 25 [1949]: 39). Similarly, in his discussion of the several legends describing Moscow's founding the editor fails