

not present a common front. Taking advantage of the fierce competition among the various groups of the nobility, the grand duke could consolidate his own autocratic authority, thereby setting a political pattern that lasted into the nineteenth century.

Such are the bare highlights of the contributions made to our knowledge and understanding of Russian political thought by this extremely informative and original volume of an ever-valuable series.

MARC RAEFF  
Columbia University

ISSLEDOVANIIA PO ISTORII KLASSA SLUZHILYKH ZEMLEVLAD-  
DEL'TSEV. By *S. B. Veselovsky*. Edited by *V. I. Shunkov* and *S. M. Kashtanov*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1969. 583 pp. 2.65 rubles.

This collection of essays by the late S. B. Veselovsky—the second to appear posthumously—is a many-sided examination of the governing elite of the Muscovite state. By its nature the book is like a large painting in which certain areas (notably the polished and suggestive essay on the Pushkin family) have been completed, but which is for the most part a sketch of an unfinished masterpiece. Genial sketches, of course, are more significant and inspiring than most finished paintings. We have every reason to thank the late V. I. Shunkov and S. M. Kashtanov for editing these essays, for they are invaluable to any student of the Russian nobility.

The heart of Veselovsky's approach is genealogy. His work is, above all, a provocative and ultimately convincing demonstration that a critical study of genealogical records and the reconstruction from them of the detailed history of individual aristocratic families provides an indispensable supplement to the familiar chronicles, service lists, and documents on landholding, and sheds an entirely new light on certain episodes of critical importance in the story of the rise and consolidation of the Muscovite state. A particularly good example is the author's discussion of the reasons for the apparently motiveless behavior of prominent nobles during the civil wars of the mid-fifteenth century.

In a broader sense Veselovsky has used his mastery of genealogy<sup>o</sup> and all of the other source materials to illuminate the evolving relations between the crown and the nobility in Muscovy by tracing the fate of individual families. Several of his most important conclusions in this area differ sharply from traditional historiography. It is his conviction that the governing elite of the period before the Oprichnina was formed by a nucleus of boyar families which had entered the service of the princes of Moscow by the reign of Dmitrii Donskoi and thereby defined their relationship to one another as well. Although there were, to be sure, significant additions to the governing elite in the next two centuries, the turning point in the creation of the Muscovite autocracy is nevertheless to be found at the end of the fourteenth century. From that time, the grand prince's service was so rewarding in material benefits and political influence that few of his servitors actually made use of their much-discussed "right of departure" to seek service elsewhere and, in effect, "put on bast sandals instead of boots."

At the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century, profound political and social crises wrought fundamental changes in the relations of the crown and the nobility. Many aristocratic families disappeared from the scene to be replaced by younger branches of old families or by comparative parvenus; and successive rulers, beginning with Ivan IV, changed the once

clearly defined and sanctioned rules on appointment to important offices and on ceremonial precedence. These later developments, however, Veselovsky treats only in passing. He devotes almost all of his detailed investigations and his analysis to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries—to the origins of the Muscovite polity.

Like any other, Veselovsky's book has some weaknesses, not all of which result from the fact that he did not live to complete and polish it. In at least one important instance he makes extensive use of a source of dubious reliability. In reconstructing the careers of aristocratic servitors, he relies on the so-called Sheremetev list of members of the Boyar Duma, which more recent studies both in the USSR and this country have shown to be very undependable for the period before the seventeenth century. Moreover, Veselovsky on a few occasions seems as willing as his predecessors to rely on an arbitrary reading of passages in the chronicles in order to make their testimony fit his argument.

Yet, if ever the usual reviewer's cliché is true, it is in this case. The faults of the book are insignificant compared with its achievements. For students of the Russian nobility Veselovsky's work is simultaneously an exciting and important monograph, an indispensable handbook, and an exemplary guide to methods of research and modes of inquiry. The culmination of a lifetime of scholarship, the book is an imposing landmark on the road to an understanding of the origin and growth of the Russian monarchy.

ROBERT O. CRUMMEY  
*Yale University*

GRANOVSKII, TIMOFEI NIKOLAEVICH: BIBLIOGRAFIIA (1828–1967).

Edited by S. S. *Dmitriev*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1969. 238 pp. 70 kopeks.

This volume is more than a guide to Granovsky's works and the works about him. For all his contributions to Western medieval studies at Moscow University, Granovsky remains above all a figure of political and social significance. His opposition to the official historiography and his preaching of the causes of progress and freedom made him a hero of liberals and radicals alike. As the introductory articles and the bibliographical listings suggest, he became the model of the progressive scholar—proof that an academic career and interests were not pursued only by conservatives and time servers. Today he is a symbol of the progressive historiography of the past, as shown by the photograph (after page 30) of a delegation of historians from Moscow University visiting his grave in October 1955.

Introductory articles by S. S. *Dmitriev* and E. V. *Gutnova* provide interesting insights into Granovsky's intellectual development and his role in Russian political thought. *Dmitriev* shows the importance of Granovsky's years at the Kister pension in Moscow, where he first came in contact with Moscow's liberal intellectual circles; he argues that Moscow's cultural life had an effect on Granovsky much earlier in his life than has usually been accepted. The article also provides a valuable glimpse of gentry secondary education in the 1820s and 1830s. *Dmitriev's* discussion of the commemorations of Granovsky's birthday and the works written in his honor later in the century suggests Granovsky's role in the intellectual genealogy of Russian liberalism. The bibliography itself is exhaustive and well