

DICTIONARY OF RUSSIAN HISTORICAL TERMS FROM THE ELEVENTH CENTURY TO 1917. Compiled by *Sergei G. Pushkarev*. Edited by *George Vernadsky* and *Ralph T. Fisher, Jr.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1970. xi, 199 pp. \$12.50.

This dictionary has been conceived as a very broad undertaking. Not only terms pertaining to Russian history from Kievan Rus' to 1917 have been carefully studied in it, but also West Russian terms used in the Grand Principality of Lithuania from the beginning of the fourteenth to the end of the sixteenth century. To quote from the preface: "Included are civil, military, and ecclesiastical offices and ranks . . . ; terms used in the political and judicial system and in social relationships; and terms from the realms of economics and finance. . . ." Most entries offer much more than simple translations, for they are followed by historical sketches which, though by necessity sober, contain a wealth of information, at times giving this dictionary the character of a small encyclopedia of Russian historical terminology prior to 1917.

To compose such a dictionary many materials have to be thoroughly studied—publications of sources, dictionaries, and monographs, whether Russian, Soviet, or American. They have been listed in the preface and in the list of references (pp. 197–99). The inquiry has been most diligent and thorough, and one gets the impression of exhaustiveness. One is also struck by the great solidity of knowledge displayed. The translations are precise, the explanations pertinent, and the historical data accompanying them of basic importance. Those of us who have been teaching Russian history know how many pitfalls are presented by its terminology, and how many opportunities there are for confusion. Now, with this dictionary available, misunderstandings can be avoided and inconsistencies of interpretation concerning sometimes crucial terms removed. An immense scholarly and teaching service has thus been performed by Professors Pushkarev, Vernadsky, and Fisher.

This reviewer found very few items of disagreement or criticism. Perfection, however, is not of this world, and there are remarks to be made which, we believe, if heeded, will enhance the value of this excellent book when it is reprinted in a new edition. Among these remarks, the most important concerns the translation of *pomes't'e* as "fief," which raises the whole arduous problem of feudalism in Russia, abundantly discussed in the historical literature (among others, in my "Aspects of Feudalism in Russian History," in *Feudalism in History*, ed. R. Coulborn, Princeton, 1956). As there was no bilateral feudal contract at the basis of *pomes't'e*, this translation is not adequate. Among Western terms "benefice" (Lat. *beneficium*) would be more appropriate (ibid., p. 175). Another objection concerns the dictionary's reference to *udel* (though otherwise excellently explained) as "appanage," and not, as would be more appropriate, "patrimonial principality" (cf. Alexandre Eck, *Le Moyen âge russe*, Paris, 1933, p. 583). Although this inexact translation of *udel* has become customary in English-language writings on Russian history, its wide use has not made it correct, for the nature of "appanage" in England or France was different. Appanages were given by the kings, out of their royal domain, to those of their children who were excluded from succession as compensation for this exclusion (cf. G. Lepointe, *Petit vocabulaire d'histoire du droit français*, Paris, 1948, p. 21). The Russian *udel* is something different!

Among other translations it is confusing to find *dvorianin* translated as "courtier," a term which could be applied only to a small portion of *dvoriane*. It is a most difficult term for an English equivalent. An etymological translation is hardly possible, and of all alternatives "nobleman" seems to be the least objectionable.

On the other hand, to translate *tiaglo* as "burden" is etymologically and also substantively hardly defensible. One cannot separate the interpretation of this term from the verb *tianuti* frequently used in the sources for fiscal and labor obligations toward another person or a locality. It is usually accompanied by the preposition *k* (to) and the dative, for example, *a k tomu selu tianuti derevni* (*Pamiatniki russkogo prava*, 3:57, a 1410–31 charter). The literal translation of this phrase is "And (the following) hamlets pulled toward this village" (i.e., owed to it duties and obligations). Eck (p. 275) rightly translated *tianut'* into French as *mouvoir* and *tiaglo* as *mouvance* and more specifically as *taille* (p. 583). While *tiaglo* unquestionably was a heavy burden, Eck's translation appears more exact. In English "tallage" would be much better than "burden." Especially, the translation of *tiaglye liudi* as "men of burden" (p. 57) raises great doubts, because of possible associations (physical burden?); one would prefer "talliable people." In this connection, one must recall that M. Vasmer has derived *tiaglo* from *tiaga*, an etymology which upholds the criticism expressed by this reviewer (*Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg, 1956, 2:166).

Less important qualifications may be omitted because of lack of space: they are not numerous. There are certain inconsistencies of terminology: the ruler of Muscovy has been called "grand prince" (which is correct) but also "grand duke" in other places (pp. 39, 46, 66, 77, 157). *Partiia Narodnoi Svobody* has been translated as "Party of National Freedom," while on the same page 83 *Partiia Narodnykh Sotsialistov* has been rendered as "The People's Socialist Party." There are also other minor shortcomings, but all of them notwithstanding, one feels gratitude and admiration for this remarkable and most useful performance. This volume is intended to be companion to a *Sourcebook of Russian History* now in preparation, another important endeavor that will also fill a most urgent need.

MARC SZEFTTEL
University of Washington

DAS BILD DES ABENDLANDES IN DEN ALTRUSSISCHEN CHRONIKEN. By Günther Stökl. Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen: Geisteswissenschaften, no. 124. Cologne and Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1965. 64 pp.

The title essay on the image of the West in the early (eleventh to sixteenth century) Russian chronicles was originally read by Professor Stökl of the University of Cologne before a group of German scholars, most of them not specialists in Russian history. The reading was followed by a discussion. In published form, both the paper (now provided with footnotes and résumés in English and French) and the discussion reflect their origin. The first is necessarily an overview, illustrative rather than analytical in its use of facts; the second soon wanders away from the topic. The essay proceeds from the following premise: "It seems expedient . . . to concentrate in the first instance on the comparatively easy question of what the early Russian chroniclers knew about the West. Then the answer to the further question of what they thought about the West will readily emerge of itself" (pp. 13–14). Unsurprisingly, the evidence presented indicates that the extent and accuracy of chronicle information about a Western country was directly related to the amount of contact the Russians had with it. More tentatively, it suggests that prolonged contact tempered religious hostility (e.g., in thirteenth-century Galicia-Volynia and Novgorod). But on the whole the chronicles have little to say about