

A small inconvenience is the absence of page numbers on the list of illustrations and in the text references to figures; a certain amount of leafing-through is required of the reader.

ANN FARKAS  
Columbia University

ISTORICHESKIE SVIAZI ROSSII SO SLAVIANSKIMI STRANAMI I VIZANTIEI. By *M. N. Tikhomirov*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1969. 373 pp. 1.43 rubles.

A volume of collected articles by an important scholar is always a welcome addition to library shelves, particularly when the collected articles treat a central theme. Such would seem to be the rationale behind publishing a book of articles by the late Academician M. N. Tikhomirov on the general theme of Russia's relations with other Slavic countries and Byzantium. The success of such a volume, however, is vitally dependent on judicious editing. Poor editing, unfortunately, is the hallmark of the volume under review. The book boasts two substantial interpretive articles on the main theme of the collection. The article "Routes from Russia to Byzantium in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries" (from *Vizantiiskie ocherki*, 1961) is a very useful study of this question, although Tikhomirov probably overemphasizes the typicalness of the journey of Metropolitan Pimen down the Don to Constantinople. Likewise the article "Historical Ties of the Russian People with the South Slavs from the Earliest Times to the Middle of the Seventeenth Century" (from *Slavian-skii sbornik*, 1947) raises several interesting points. Tikhomirov sees the area around the mouth of the Danube as a place of almost unbroken cultural contact between Russians and Slavic Bulgarians from Antic times on, and suggests several connections between Russia's military campaigns south of the Danube and the First Bulgarian Empire's internal and external political history. But the editing! The first two short articles in the collection (which are basically the same article recast) are subsumed under the article on Russo-Byzantine communications routes, while a short study tracing Ivan IV's lineage to a Serbian despotic family through his mother Helen Glinsky is also part of the larger article on Russia and the South Slavs; a brief discussion of one of the sources for our knowledge of Ivan's Serbian ties is really but a codicological appendix to the larger article.

The collection at hand also includes three short articles on the Cyrillic alphabet. One of them, here published for the first time, suggests that the Cyrillic alphabet was created by St. Cyril on the model of the "Russian letters" he saw in the Crimea. These "Russian letters," Tikhomirov believes, were from the Greek alphabet, with additional symbols added for Slavic. Another heretofore unpublished article in the collection connects unexpected terms in Kievan judicial texts (*desiatina*, *deviatina*, *dacha*, and *milost'*) with similar words employed among other Slavic peoples. Yet another previously unpublished article attempts quite successfully to reconstruct the common source used in compiling the Primary Chronicle, the First Novgorod Chronicle, and the Polish Chronicle of Jan Długosz. Of considerably narrower interest, but important for the specialist, is the first publication of the non-Russian Slavic colophons in manuscripts of the State Historical Museum, and a description of the early printed Cyrillic books in the museum's collection. Also reprinted here the reader will find Tikhomirov's publication and discussion of the manuscripts of the *Imennik* of the Bulgar princes (from *Vestnik drevnei istorii*, 1946), his

introduction to the 1961 edition of the *Zakon Sudnyi liudem*, and miscellaneous reviews of books and journals devoted to south Slavia. These reviews from the mid-1940s are marred by a tendentious neo-Pan-Slav tenor (as are several of the articles), and do little to serve the memory of an important Soviet historian. The reader cannot help wondering if Tikhomirov's memory might not have been better served by submitting the previously unpublished materials included here to the appropriate specialized journals, and devoting the paper used for this padded volume to publishing Tikhomirov's "largely completed" book on the early Russian chronicles (see the introduction, p. 12), of which the previously mentioned article on a Russian source of Dlugosz's chronicle is a chapter.

GEORGE P. MAJESKA  
*State University of New York, Buffalo*

VNESHNIAIA POLITIKA DREVNEI RUSI. By *V. T. Pashuto*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1968. 472 pp. 1.80 rubles.

The foreign relations of Kievan Russia were far more active than many Western scholars have recognized. This study traces their growth and diversity and describes some of the problems that Early Rus' encountered in establishing relations abroad. The author, a well-known specialist in the "period of feudalism," has divided his work into two parts: the first covering the early tenth to the end of the eleventh century, and the second dealing with the end of the eleventh century to the Mongol conquest. The organization is topical and chronological. Although the larger view of foreign relations is sometimes obscured by the magnitude of the subject and by frequent transitions in discussion from one region of Europe and Asia to another, this is not a serious handicap in a work that is well written and packed with illuminating information. Indeed, one can feel only admiration for the author's prodigious exploration of Russia's neglected involvement in many affairs of Europe and Asia that affected trade, territorial expansion, war, and dynastic interest.

Pashuto is obviously sympathetic with the efforts of Rus' to expand and to overcome foreign opposition to the spread of Russian influence over neighboring peoples. Powerful foreign princes, he emphasizes, were generally hostile to Rus' and sought to discourage its growth. The foreign policy of Rus' he sees as an extension of the internal policies of the ruling class that were realized through diplomacy, war, and various forms of political and economic pressure. Russia in the first period of its foreign relations was an emerging polity that had ill-defined borders and tenuous connections with many neighboring peoples whose political organization was primitive. Foreign relations were implemented by campaigns into neighboring and distant lands in search of trade and trade agreements. The acceptance of Christianity by Rus' strengthened and determined its foreign relations and brought it "into the circle of great Christian powers of the medieval world" without subordinating its diplomacy to the church. Pashuto emphatically rejects the concept of a Scandinavian conquest of Rus', and suggests that although Russia and England both came simultaneously into the orbit of Scandinavian conquests, Rus' knew how to protect its independence while England did not. In the second stage of foreign relations, the influences of polycentrism prevailed. Strong princes and towns acted independently, established relations with outside powers, and precipitated internecine struggles that undermined the nascent "unity" in foreign policy. Tradition, nevertheless, continued to be influential even in this period and promoted alliances that were