

the "forces of aggression and reaction." The editors warn that anti-Communist ideologists, "for purposes of reactionary anti-Soviet propaganda, are resorting to falsification of our fatherland's history, beginning with earliest times. The restoration of historical truth is our duty as citizens, and we would like to think that this collection of articles will help unmask the present-day falsifiers of history and thereby contribute its share to the ideological strengthening of the socialist camp" (pp. 4-5). Similar sentiments echo throughout the volume. Ho hum.

Fortunately the collection includes some essays on a higher level of scholarship. Let us consider two examples. E. I. Kolycheva ("Nekotorye problemy rabstva i feodalizma v trudakh V. I. Lenina i sovetskoi istoriografii," pp. 120-47) surveys the kinds of slavery in pre-Petrine Russia and argues against the widely held view (propounded most persistently by the late B. D. Grekov) that the institution of slavery was markedly declining in Kievan Rus' and continued to decline after Kiev's fall. A. A. Zimin's article "V. I. Lenin o 'moskovskom tsarstve' i cherty feodal'noi razdroblennosti v politicheskom stroe Rossii XVI veka" (pp. 270-93) includes a helpful analysis of the relative power and status enjoyed by aristocratic groups such as the patrimonial or "appanage" princes (*udel'nye kniaz'ia*), the main types of service princes (*slushilnye kniaz'ia*), and others. Zimin also makes a well-documented distinction between the "single" or "united" (*edinoe*) state of fifteenth-century Russia and the "centralized" (*tsentralizovannoe*) state which evolved later.

Other contributions are more limited exercises in Marxist-Leninist historiography. Of the forty-eight footnotes in S. M. Troitsky's article ("V. I. Lenin ob absolutnoi monarkhii v Rossii," pp. 294-311), for example, forty come solely from Lenin, and some of the remaining references are to Marx and Engels.

This collection appeared in 1970 and was designed to celebrate the centennial of Lenin's birth. Well and good, but will the time not come when Soviet editors can bring out such an anniversary issue without imputing absurd motives to their colleagues abroad?

HORACE W. DEWEY
University of Michigan

RELIGIÖSE TOLERANZ IN RUSSLAND, 1600-1725. By *Hans-Heinrich Nolte*.

D 7 Göttinger Philosophische Dissertation. Göttinger Bausteine zur Geschichtswissenschaft, vol. 41. Göttingen, Zürich, Frankfurt: Musterschmidt-Verlag, 1969. 216 pp. DM 48, cloth. DM 38, paper.

Nolte has collected a good deal of data illustrating the religious as well as the economic and legal relations between the Muscovite rulers and their Buddhist, Hindu, Mohammedan, Jewish, and Armenian Christian subjects; in the long chapter devoted to the government's attitude toward the Old Believers we find much material about their inner organization, the difficulties of collecting a surcharge of taxes, and various other administrative problems. What Nolte promises in the title is better illustrated in the chapters devoted to Catholics and Protestants. Probably Muscovite sources are in these cases more numerous and outspoken. In Europe the period 1600-1725 was in general one of religious strife and persecution, not one of tolerance. But a growing number of people did write about the need for more tolerance and for living peacefully with a multitude of denominations. The Musco-

vites were in constant contact with a much wider variety of religions and denominations than any other nation in Europe. Were reflections about the good and evil of tolerance alien to them? Probably not. But they seldom were in the habit of writing down their reflections. The Muscovites' world of ideas has to be distilled from the sources with much effort. Nolte did not even attempt to learn about the intellectual disposition or indisposition of the Muscovites toward tolerance in general; he sees tolerance as a legal and administrative problem. Muscovite intellectual history is a rather risky affair, and it is understandable that Nolte wanted to avoid the possible reproaches of overinterpreting the sources.

But another omission can hardly be excused: Nolte does not see that tolerance was also an eminently political problem. The treatment of Catholics was determined by relations with Poland and by the treatment the Orthodox were given by the Poles; it was also determined by the Union of 1596. The decrees regulating the life of Mohammedans in the Muscovite state were deeply influenced by the restrictions imposed on the Orthodox living under Ottoman rule. The Muscovites were better informed about the living conditions of these Orthodox than about any other group living outside their state. Nolte refers frequently to Ottoman-Muscovite relations (for example, pp. 57, 63, 69, 73, 74, 85), but he fails to see their importance for his topic. For instance, he mentions that in Muscovy muezzins were forbidden public performance (p. 85) and the non-Orthodox were not allowed to ring bells (p. 190), overlooking that it was one of the standard complaints of the Orthodox living in the Ottoman Empire that they were forbidden to ring church bells. The number of small mistakes and misspellings is above average. For example, the Ukrainian historian Golobuckij (correct Russian form of his name p. 207) is mentioned on page 114 once as Golubickij and another time as Gulobickij. Nolte's book is a contribution to the administrative, legal, and partly to the economic aspects of the problem of religious tolerance in Russia; the other aspects are still open to further research.

WALTER LEITSCH
University of Vienna

RUSSIAN MAPS AND ATLASES AS HISTORICAL SOURCES. By *Leonid A. Goldenberg*. *Cartographica*, monograph no. 3. Translated by *James R. Gibson*. Toronto: Department of Geography, York University, 1971. iii, 76 pp. Subscription price, \$12.00 for 3 monographs. Paper.

This brief volume of *Cartographica* originally appeared as "Russian Cartographic Materials of the 17th and 18th Centuries as an Historical Source and Their Classification," in *Problemy istochnikovedeniia*, 1959, no. 7, pp. 296-347. The principal aim of the original version was to characterize the major kinds of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century cartographic documents and thereby bring to the historian's attention a wealth of relatively neglected materials important for research on the historical geography of Russia. One must assume that this translation of Goldenberg's work was designed to provide similar encouragement to historians and geographers outside the Soviet Union.

In roughly forty pages of text, Goldenberg deals with the evolution of Russian cartographic materials, describes their content, and gives an indication of their usefulness as well as their present availability. At times the description seems disjointed and anecdotal. Nonetheless, those unfamiliar with Russian cartographic