

gesting topics on which much work remains to be done by specialists in this most significant area of Near Eastern and Russian history.

THEOFANIS G. STAVROU  
University of Minnesota

DIE NESTOR-CHRONIK. Introduced and annotated by *Dmitrij Tschizewskij*. Slavistische Studienbücher, vol. 6. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1969. xix, 325 pp. DM 38, paper.

Among other important texts made available to scholars in this series, the Russian Primary Chronicle is presented to us in an excellent reprint preceded by Professor Dmitrij Tschizewskij's introduction (pp. vii-ix) and followed by his notes, a bibliography up to 1968, and two genealogical tables concerning the Russian princes mentioned in the Chronicle (pp. 297-325).

The reprint itself reproduces the "Chronicle according to monk Laurentius' copy," which contains the oldest preserved manuscript of the Primary Chronicle, often referred to as Nestor's Chronicle, a title adhered to also by Tschizewskij, although in his introduction he correctly states that the whole text of the Primary Chronicle could not have been written by Nestor, who joined the Kiev Monastery of the Crypt (*Pecherskii monastery'*) only after 1073. The Laurentian Chronicle, on the other hand, went far beyond 1110, the date on which the Primary Chronicle ends in this copy, for it was continued up to 1377 as the Suzdal Chronicle. Tschizewskij's reprint does not go beyond 1110—reproducing, this reviewer surmises, the 1910 edition of the *Povest' vremennykh let* by the Archaeographical Commission, including the two indexes (personal names and geographical terms). This 1910 edition follows in everything (except the indexes, obviously) the complete edition of 1897 of the Laurentian Chronicle by the same Archaeographical Commission, the so-called third edition, and by far the best. Only the preface (pp. xi-xix) was taken by Tschizewskij from the complete 1897 edition, but he introduces important corrections by E. F. Karsky, who in 1926 reworked this preface for his own edition of the Laurentian Chronicle, lately reprinted in 1962. One does not get the impression that anything more was borrowed by Tschizewskij from the Karsky edition, for neither the variants nor the notes at the bottom of the reprinted text nor, especially, the text itself shows such borrowings. One is thus surprised to read on the verso of the title page that the 1926 edition was the basis of this reprint. Aside from the preface the book is rather the edition of 1910 (1897), a much better one. (For criticism of the Karsky edition see D. S. Likhachev, "Arkheograficheskii obzor spiskov 'Povesti vremennykh let,'" *Povest' vremennykh let*, vol. 2, Moscow and Leningrad, 1950, p. 152.)

Professor Tschizewskij's scholarly notes are a notable contribution to the understanding of the Chronicle.

MARC SZEFTTEL  
University of Washington

STUDIES IN MUSCOVY: WESTERN INFLUENCE AND BYZANTINE INHERITANCE. By *Nikolay Andreyev*. Preface by *Elizabeth Hill*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1970.

This volume is a collection of fourteen articles (406 pages including the 28-page index), thirteen of which deal with the cultural history of Muscovy, predominantly

in the sixteenth century. They offer only a selection from Dr. Andreyev's abundant scholarly production in different fields pertaining to Russian studies during a period of nearly forty years. Four of these articles belong to the pre-World War II epoch and were originally published in *Seminarium Kondakovianum*, the famous Prague yearbook, between 1932 and 1938. The rest are the result of continuous scholarly activity from 1953 to 1969 and have appeared in different journals, yearbooks, and Festschriften. Seven of the articles are in Russian, the rest in English.

What is striking about almost all of these studies is Andreyev's skillful use of iconographical materials as documents of cultural history. His attention to the intimate relation between the religious pictorial material and the development of ideas in Old Russia, especially Muscovy, is amazingly keen, and seems to be the author's particular talent, unexcelled by others in this field. To be more specific, his seven studies on the role of Ivan Viskovaty, *d'iak* and adviser to Ivan IV, throw a bright light on the mystico-didactic trend in icon-painting characteristic of the century and a half preceding Peter the Great's era. In this connection Andreyev was led to analyze the interpolations in Muscovite sixteenth-century chronicles, and firmly established the same Viskovaty as their author. Four other studies deal with the activity of the Pskov-Pechery monastery. They arrive at novel points of view, and very convincing ones, concerning the monk Filofei's epistles on the Third Rome and Kurbsky's connection with the monastery. All of the articles are of the same high competence and illuminating originality. One must hail the appearance of these studies in a form making them readily accessible to scholars.

MARC SZEFTEL  
*University of Washington*

ARSENII MATSEEVICH MITROPOLIT ROSTOVSKII, 1696–1772. By G. M. Soldatov. St. Paul: Published by the author, 1971. 130 pp. \$4.50, paper.

Because of our understandable concern with the Russian revolutions of the twentieth century and their more immediate antecedents, the study of older, basic institutional and cultural history has been comparatively neglected. In the case of church history, our own secular, liberal values, which sometimes lead us to accept phenomena without attempting to explain them, also have stood in the way of study. Yet the church was a major political and economic force, and the main cultural vehicle of the people. One has only to compare the number and depth of studies of secularization of church lands in England or France with the lack of such studies (excepting Zavialov and a few others) for Russia. The present book by Soldatov is the first extensive work since 1912 on the chief clerical opponent of secularization in Russia. Unlike previous works, it is not biased either for or against Arsenii. It is accurate and uses the basic original and secondary works available in America, with the exceptions noted below. The book is limited, however, by its biographical nature; though it formulates well important questions of economics, cultural values, and so forth, it does not probe them. Secularization is accepted as an inevitable result of modernization: Arsenii is portrayed as an unrealistic man with outmoded ideas, yet realistic (it is hinted) in seeing secularization as tied to the question of church autonomy. Was it so? If it was, how and why? There are works the author could have used—Barsov's *Sv. Sinod*, Blagovidov's *Ober-prokurory*, Shakhovskoy's