

tive statement). Such an investigation might help to throw light on the inter-boyar rivalries during Ivan IV's minority.

On the debit side must be placed the totally inadequate and inaccurate index. What can be more frustrating than chasing abbreviated references to works not mentioned previously? See, for example, the reference to "N.P. (E?) Andreev" on page 342 (note 69). The map, which excludes Lithuania, is also poor. There are, as well, several points on which one could disagree with Zimin's findings: for example, he is unconvincing in his rejection of the widely held view that Vassian Patrikeev was *not* brought to trial for any openly expressed disapproval of Vasillii III's divorce and that he *continued* to enjoy the grand prince's favors *after* 1525—after all, Zimin produces no evidence to disprove Vassian's successful *chelobitie* of 1526 (*Akty, sobrannye . . . Arkheograficheskoi ekspeditsiei*, vol. 1, no. 173), and the fact that Silvester evidently survived the crisis of 1553 can hardly be cited as a parallel case. In his analysis, in chapter 12, of the Bersen-Beklemishev and Maxim the Greek affair some of Zimin's statements require further elucidation and confirmation. It is pure speculation to suggest that Maxim, "a man of dubious moral purity," hoped to lessen his guilt by incriminating Bersen or that he "hoped that he, as a foreigner, would enjoy a certain immunity" (pp. 278–79); nor is there sufficient evidence to show that Iurii Ivanovich was suspected of secret relations with the Crimean Tatars (p. 282).

However, these are minor points, and they do not really detract from the essential value of Zimin's work; furthermore, it would be odd if the reviewer of a book of these dimensions did not carp at *some* of the author's findings. Zimin has now covered the period 1505 to 1584 in his three major historical monographs. It is to be hoped that he will continue his work up to the accession of the first Romanov.

JOHN FENNELL  
Oxford

OCHERKI RUSSKOI DIPLOMATIKI. By S. M. Kashtanov. Moscow: "Nauka," 1970. 502 pp. 1.88 rubles.

The ancillary historical disciplines have in recent years begun to receive much-needed attention from Soviet specialists. One of the best and most important of the studies which have appeared is Sergei Mikhailovich Kashtanov's book, which provides for the first time a detailed guide to techniques of formal diplomatic analysis of Russian documents. The material covered is much broader in its implications than the book's title would suggest; though intended for the specialist, the work should be studied carefully both by those using documentary material as an historical source for medieval and early modern Russia and by anyone planning to work with old Russian manuscripts.

Kashtanov's first chapter, much of which has appeared before, defines the subject and objectives of diplomatics and lays out the methodology of studying the form of documents. In defining the subject as acts ("documents which reflect a legal transaction," p. 8) and the objective as "the study of acts as sources" (p. 10), he has opened himself to criticism: in the first instance for adopting too narrow a definition and in the second too broad a one (see the remarks by Edward L. Keenan in *Kritika*, 6 [1970]: 67 ff.). However, his stress on formulaic analysis

and his exposition of it adhere to generally accepted principles worked out for the study of Western medieval documents.

Chapters 2 and 3 provide concrete examples of analysis, based on material taken from the author's pathbreaking studies of immunity charters. One type of these charters (*tarkhannye gramoty*) from the 1530s and 1540s is the subject of formulaic analysis in chapter 2. Kashtanov delineates a number of characteristic formulae for their *dispositio* and establishes convincingly the genealogies of the formulae. From this he is able to derive important conclusions about the political history of the period, familiar from his previous book on the subject. The material of chapter 2 does not provide a complete manual of diplomatic forms for Russian documents—something which we still badly need—but, consistent with the author's aims, a much narrower example of applied methodology.

Chapter 3 demonstrates well how formulaic analysis may help establish the veracity of an act's *narratio* and, through the example analyzed, answers in the negative the disputed question whether immunity charters were annulled in 1575–76 under Semen Bekbulatovich. The concern of the chapter is not directly that of the traditional diplomatist (the authenticity of a document), for Kashtanov believes that his wide-ranging analysis of an act should, as a matter of course, settle the question of authenticity. He does show here how that can be done, even though he deals only with one portion of a document that does not necessarily indicate the authenticity of the whole.

In many ways, the fourth chapter of the book is the most far-reaching in its implications. Kashtanov's broad definition of diplomatics embraces here "diplomatic codicology," or the study of manuscript books containing acts. Codicological study of Russian manuscripts is still in its infancy, a fact which makes Kashtanov's contribution especially worth while. The example he chooses is ideal for its complexity (for the beginner perhaps too complex)—one of the *sborniki* put together in the nineteenth century by P. M. Stroev from various fragments of old Russian manuscripts. Kashtanov demonstrates beyond any doubt that the fragments were taken from a number of the copybooks of the Trinity-Sergius Monastery. In passing, he indicates that a number of other former Stroev manuscripts (now in GPB, Pogodin Collection) were formed in the same way.

Codicological analysis by its complexity is not easily explained; yet Kashtanov has handled a difficult task remarkably well. To aid in the welter of detail about changes and types of handwriting, watermarks, foliation, signatures, and so on, he provides numerous tables and summarizes each stage of his conclusions. About the only aspect of the analysis in which, it seems to me, he might have refined his methodology concerns the use of watermarks, which, in the absence of other indicators, can provide very precise information on the division of a manuscript into gatherings, the loss of folios, and so on. Kashtanov might have attempted to summarize his findings in one table by abstracting from all the data those showing where significant breaks in the manuscript occur. Without such a summary picture, it is very difficult to piece together from codicological analysis an overall picture of a manuscript's component parts or to see a "reconstructed" manuscript in its original form.

Kashtanov's conclusions regarding the need to apply codicological analysis to other Stroev manuscripts in the Pogodin Collection are important and timely. In my opinion, conclusions based on the texts in these manuscripts—and in thousands of

other old Russian *sborniki*—will be incomplete until detailed codicological analysis of the kind illustrated in this book has been applied. Moreover, Kashtanov's analysis of handwriting and paper makes it only too clear why proper reference guides to these subjects must be compiled before codicological analysis will pay in full the investment in time which it requires.

The concluding chapter of Kashtanov's study contains texts of hitherto unknown immunity charters from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, many of them from the Stroev manuscript analyzed in the preceding chapter.

One hopes that more contributions to the ancillary disciplines used by the Russian medievalist will soon appear and be of the same excellence as Kashtanov's book. Emphasis on basic methodology and source criticism can only be welcomed wherever the study of medieval Russia is undertaken.

DANIEL CLARKE WAUGH  
University of Washington

THE TIME OF TROUBLES: A HISTORICAL STUDY OF THE INTERNAL CRISIS AND SOCIAL STRUGGLE IN SIXTEENTH- AND SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSCOVY. By *S. F. Platonov*. Translated by *John T. Alexander*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1970. xvii, 197 pp. \$6.50, cloth. \$2.45, paper.

The teaching of Russian history, particularly of the pre-Petrine era, has long been hampered by a shortage of adequate scholarly works in English. In recent years there have appeared several translations and republications of foreign accounts of Muscovy as well as other documents of that period. Kliuchevsky on the seventeenth century and Presniakov's *Formation of the Great Russian State* have also been translated, and now Platonov's popular version of his classic work on the Time of Troubles is available. These older works have retained their value, and many more should be translated. But of principal importance in any such undertaking must be an introductory historiographical essay to inform the student of more recent scholarly interpretations. This is not supplied by Professor Alexander in the book under consideration, and it is the only serious objection that one can raise to this otherwise worthwhile translation. Platonov's interpretation of the origins of the troubles is, after all, somewhat dated, and instructors who assign this work to their students will have to explain what is acceptable and what is not. Since most professors of Russian history are more familiar with the post-Petrine era, I fear that this will not be done adequately. The translation, except for a few rough spots, is quite readable and accurate. I do object, however, to the translation of *pole* as "field." "Steppe" or "prairie" would have been better. The book has several useful appendixes: genealogical tables, a chronological table, a glossary of terms, an annotated bibliography, and an index. Professor Alexander should be encouraged to continue with his translations, and if he does not feel himself to be qualified to write an historiographical essay—as he has indicated in this case—he should invite one of his colleagues to make that contribution.

THOMAS ESPER  
Case Western Reserve University