

Even if the market crowd is unrepresentative and the colorful exaggerations of loudmouth highlander extroverts (mostly male) interacting with liberal Warsaw undergraduates (mostly female) are not necessarily a reliable guide to their voting behavior, let alone their deeper values, I find the interpretations offered in this book largely convincing. It is a welcome addition to the English-language literature on contemporary east European politics (an index would also have been welcome). It might be suggested that, since these data were collected when the chaos of 1990s “shock therapy” was still a vivid memory, they provide little guidance to the significantly different cleavages observable in Poland today. Yet the Podhale villagers who voted enthusiastically for PiS in 2005 seem to have blazed a trail for the rest of the country. Following EU access, many Poles have again found work abroad, especially in Britain. But deep-seated dissatisfaction with those managing the Polish state has evidently not gone away. Anna Malewska-Szałygin notes that those who experience more cosmopolitan forms of life elsewhere through migration do not change their values and opinions concerning problems at home; these tend to remain anchored in the traditional world view.

CHRIS HANN

*Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology*

***Moskva i tatarskii mir: Sotrudnichestvo i protivostoianie v epokhu peremen,***

**XV–XVI vv.** By Bulat Raimovich Rakhimzianov. St. Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Evraziia, 2016. 396 pp. Appendixes. Notes. Bibliography. Chronology. Glossary. 659, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.336

A new book by Bulat R. Rakhimzianov continues on a larger scale his earlier research on Muscovite-Tatar relations and Tatar enclaves within the Muscovite realm, started with his 2009 monograph on the Kasimov Khanate (*Kasimovskoe khanstvo [1445–1552 gg.]: Ocherkii istorii*). In the Introduction, the author states his purpose, to reveal the involvement of Muscovy into the complex system of mutual relations between the “later Golden Horde states” (*pozднезолотоордынские государства*) in the fifteenth through sixteenth centuries (8–9). Drawing on abundant primary sources, mainly Moscow foreign office records (*posol'skie knigi*), both archival and published, Rakhimzianov carefully explores various forms of Muscovite-Tatar cooperation in the period that followed after the disintegration of the Golden Horde.

The book under review consists of two chapters, a conclusion, select bibliography, and three appendices including a chronology of the main events in central Eurasia in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, a glossary, and biographical notes on the persons mentioned in the text. In the first chapter, the author examines the phenomenon of Tatar emigration to Muscovy, which took different forms, from a short stay (euphemistically called *opochiv*, literally “a rest”) to a permanent residence that led to the formation of specific Tatar enclaves, semi-autonomous principalities known as *iurty*. The Kasimov khanate, established in 1445, was the largest among them, but similar Tatar settlements, on the basis of the grand-princely grants, existed also in Romanov (on the Volga), Kashira, Zvenigorod, Serpukhov, and some other Russian towns.

The second chapter focuses upon the administrative status of the Tatar enclaves in the Muscovite realm and their role in maintaining contacts between Moscow, the Crimea, and the Noghay Horde. This section (and the whole book) ends up with enumerating the indicators of Muscovy's deep involvement in the steppe politics and of its long-lasting subordinate status vis-à-vis the Tatar world.

Rakhimzianov is to be commended for presenting a nuanced and colorful picture of Muscovite-Tatar relations in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and he is certainly right to stress that contacts between Muscovy and the Tatar world had much more aspects than conventional historiographical accounts have tended to show (97). He goes too far, however, when he comes to the conclusion that Muscovy was “one of the later Golden Horde states,” although (he admits) “it differed from its Tatar partners and rivals in traditions of state organization and government, as well as in religion, culture, and ruling dynasty” (234). According to Rakhimzianov, what Muscovy had in common with the other later Golden Horde states was its real participation in the struggle for the legacy of the Horde, on par with Tatar polities.

I think the term “a later Golden Horde state,” when applied to Muscovy, is misleading. To begin with, the Muscovite rulers had never claimed the legacy of the Golden Horde. And if the only basis for using the term is an active role in steppe politics, then one can also apply it . . . to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania whose rulers hosted the former khans (like Tokhtamysh in the 1390s or Sheikh-Akhmed in the early sixteenth century), plotted with Crimea against Muscovy in the 1470s, sent “gifts” to the ruling khans and their courtiers, and so on.

Moreover, the term “a later Golden Horde state,” when attributed to Muscovy, is unhappy in yet another respect, as it blurs the difference between two types of state organization: khanates-successors to the Golden Horde, on the one hand, and the Muscovite state, on the other. The former preserved the clan-based structures of power and other archaic features of the steppe empire, while the latter in the second half of the fifteenth century had stepped on the path of early modern state building, with sovereignty claims, (proto)bureaucracy, and military innovation.

Still, in spite of some risky generalizations and vague terminology, Rakhimzianov’s book is a valuable contribution to east European history, as it expands our knowledge of both Muscovy and the Tatar world in the period of their dramatic transformation.

MIKHAIL KROM  
*European University at St. Petersburg*

***Russian Peasant Women Who Refused to Marry: Spasovite Old Believers in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries.*** By John Bushnell. Russia and Eastern Europe Series. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2017. 339 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Tables. Maps. \$40.00, paper.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.337

Our field is blessed with a number of excellent studies of Old Believers and sectarians in Russia. Despite the usual reticence of religious dissidents and the consequent limited source base for studying their history, we have informative works on the upheaval in the Russian Orthodox Church in the seventeenth century, the history of dissidents, and at least some sectarians in the next three centuries. These works tell us about institutional settings, religious ideas, and geographical dispersal. They do not, however, offer close observation and analysis of village settings and everyday practices. John Bushnell’s new book takes us a very large step in this direction. In painstaking detail he examines nuptial practices and related economic and demographic effects among Old Believers in the upper Volga provinces of central Russia and in so doing has launched a new and deeply-absorbing field of research on the Russian peasantry.