the editor of the volume under review. Although offered as the first installment of that important project, Perfecky's volume was in fact prepared originally under different auspices as a doctoral dissertation. Therefore, the reader would be wise to heed the editor's warning that the Perfecky volume "shows the present state of research" (p. 7) and will need revision. As indicated by my critical comments, there is some justification for going one step further and suggesting that its publication was a bit premature.

> DANIEL CLARKE WAUGH University of Washington

THE SHAPING OF CZARDOM UNDER IVAN GROZNYJ. By Bjarne Nørretranders. Reprint of the 1964 Copenhagen edition, Variorum Reprint S4. London: Variorum Reprints, 1971. 188 pp. £6.

This book, a welcome and much-needed reprint of a work (first published in 1964) by a Danish scholar, is important to all those interested in the reign of Ivan IV, in the tsar's ideas, and in the relation between theory and practice in Ivan IV's statesmanship. Nørretranders's first work on Ivan IV, which appeared in Danish in 1956 under the title *Ivan den Skraekkelige i Russisk Tradition*, is far more informative than scholarly perhaps, but in 1959 he published his translation (into Danish) of Ivan's correspondence with Kurbsky, and in 1963 he wrote a most interesting article, "Ivan Groznyj's Conception of Tsarist Authority," *Scando-Slavica*, 9 (1963): 238-48.

The author fully appreciates the magnitude of the task he sets himself not only in trying to define the tsar's views but also in seeking out the logic of his actions in the light of his theories. In doing this he makes full use of current—especially Soviet—scholarship, and twice expresses regret that A. A. Zimin's *Oprichnina Ivana Grosnogo* (1964) appeared just too late to take it into account in writing this book.

The analysis of Ivan's letters to Kurbsky (chapter 2) is masterly. The author points out the close interrelations between the various subjects mentioned in the tsar's epistles. Nørretranders rightly insists that Ivan is attempting a *scriptural*, *historical*, *political*, and *personal* justification of his actions and adds, "This personal justification is a long, connected argument in the form of a sort of autobiography, and occupies a good fifth of the total text of the message" (p. 28). The author is correct that Ivan's historical justification supports the political one. It would be difficult not to agree with him that Ivan introduced into Russian literature "propaganda not for the Faith, but [advocating] the supremacy of the Czar" (p. 33). This book contains many thought-provoking observations on the nature of the tsar's and Kurbsky's writings (for the latter, chapter 4 is especially fruitful). Consequently it is a most valuable contribution to the specialist literature on the theories that underlay the formation of the Muscovite state in the sixteenth century.

There are, however, a few inaccuracies that should not pass unnoticed. The author in outlining the tsar's views refers to them as Ivan's "programme." It would seem more correct to call it his "outlook" or *Weltanschauung*. Ivan certainly had a political program of action as a ruler, but it changed at least four times—even if the central point, the desire to retain complete power, remained unaltered.

Some bibliography is notable for its absence, such as S. V. Bakhrushin's works. After all, so many of the Soviet historians—including Zimin—base their interpretations of the period on Bakhrushin's theories, as did I. I. Smirnov when writing about the problem of the Chosen Council. Nor is there any reference to G. V. Forsten's fundamental work on the Baltic question.

In discussing the role of the leading Muscovite diplomatist, *d'iak* Ivan Viskovaty (pp. 168–69), it would perhaps be correct to include the fact that at the Zemsky Sobor of 1566, Viskovaty was the only member who advocated ending the war with Livonia. This surely goes to prove that he was a realist who preferred a bad peace to a good war. There does not appear to be any basis for supposing that Viskovaty had "some connection with Baškin" (p. 119), that is, with heretical circles, nor is there any grounds for writing "of two Makarijs, of a split personality, and an extremely ambivalent policy" (pp. 120–21).

But despite these and other details, this book is a lucid and most interesting attempt to discern a pattern of logical continuity in the history of Russia in the sixteenth century.

> NIKOLAY ANDREYEV University of Cambridge

RUSSIA MEDIAEVALIS. Vol. 1. Edited by John Fennell, Ludolf Müller, and Andrzej Poppe. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1973. 235 pp. DM 48, paper.

This promising new journal is intended to provide a forum for the work of specialists outside the Soviet Union on what may broadly be taken as Ancient Rus' from about 800 to the end of the Time of Troubles (1613). Written in the major scholarly languages of the West and in Russian, the contents include articles. lengthy reviews, authors' abstracts, news of the profession, and a very extensive annotated bibliography (beginning with works of 1970). Perhaps the most stimulating of the excellent contributions in volume 1 is the article by Poppe, in which he argues that the cult of Boris and Gleb, and hence the writings about them, could not have appeared before the 1050s. The other articles include Müller's examination of excerpts from a homily of Basil the Great in Monomakh's Pouchenie, Fennell's study of the chronicle sources concerning the struggle for power in 1252, and H. Gaumnitz's word index to the Zadonshchina. If there is one area for improvement in the journal, that would be the already impressive bibliography. It is intended to be complete but presumably will be more so when the editors enlist additional contributors. The organization of the bibliography is not entirely satisfactory, with the use of the ill-defined categories of "religious" and "secular" for literature and the absence of any suitable section for works on social and economic history.

Could one hope that this important journal will be produced at a price that would not restrict it solely to the shelves of a few major research libraries?

DANIEL CLARKE WAUGH University of Washington

V. N. TATISHCHEV: GUARDIAN OF THE PETRINE REVOLUTION. By Rudolph L. Daniels. Philadelphia: Franklin Publishing Company, 1973. vii, 125 pp. \$8.95.

Recognition of the importance of V. N. Tatishchev in the political, administrative, and intellectual history of eighteenth-century Russia has been increasing during the past twenty-five years. Daniels has compiled a biography of the professional