

charters and other legal documents, the path which led the Russian peasant into serfdom. Beginning with the establishment—regional and intermittent—of the St. George's Day rule (only in 1589 did it become a general policy), the author leads us on to the "forbidden years" (the first was 1581/82), to the tightening of the regulations in 1594, to the further restrictions (modified by greater flexibility) during the famine years and the Smuta, and the subsequent extensions of the right to reclaim runaway peasants after five, ten, fifteen, and then nine and ten years. He is chiefly concerned with legal aspects and with the reasons (fiscal and military) for the legislation—less so with social implications. Inasmuch as the records regarding the enforcement of the rules are skimpy, especially for early times, the author is cautious: "It is possible that . . .," "there is some evidence . . .," "it is very likely . . .," "it might be interpreted as . . .," and so forth. In any case, the practice was different from the law. Limits to enforcement were set by the power of rich landowners, monasteries, boyars, courtiers, by vacillations of the government, by regional conditions and differences, by corruption, and by innumerable other practical impediments. Many peasants had gone to frontier regions, others were hidden by their new masters, and exceptions had to be made when the runaway peasants were married or in debt. Indeed, the author contends, and very appropriately, that intentionally the government regulations "effectively opened an avenue through which the legal migration of peasants might continue within the legislative framework of serfdom" (p. 190).

The final stage came with the census of 1645–47 and the laws of 1649. The author interprets this stage as the outcome of a power struggle between government and rich landlords and wealthy monasteries. The government decided to support the servitor landlords against the other two forces, even though it appeased the monasteries by neither confiscating nor distributing their estates. Thus the pattern for Russia's governmental structure was set. At first it was costly, because the government had to shoulder new financial obligations, had to become involved in endless procedures for the recovery of peasants, had to make exceptions to safeguard those in military service and others as well, and had to make adjustments for changes necessary for its system of tax collection. Briefly but correctly the author points out that the new arrangements benefiting the service nobility went hand in hand with a further degradation of the peasantry.

The merits of the work are that it presents the story essentially from the legal (the government's) point of view—a view usually subordinated by historians to considerations regarding the fate of the peasantry—and that it deals with an almost inescapable legal evolution, as the government sought through legislation to meet past difficulties and to seize present opportunities rather than concern itself with the unknown future.

WALTHER KIRCHNER
Princeton, New Jersey

FORSCHUNGEN ZUR OSTEUEROPÄISCHEN GESCHICHTE, vol. 15. Edited by *Mathias Bernath, Horst Jablonowski, and Werner Philipp*. Osteuropa-Institut an der Freien Universität Berlin, Historische Veröffentlichungen. Berlin and Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1970. 306 pp. DM 78.

The latest volume of this series as usual presents the historian of Russia with interesting and rich fare. Although the five contributions vary greatly in length

and chronological focus, they have a unity of theme. They all address themselves to the fundamental question of the nature of Russian political thought, and each article contributes discussions and illustrations of some aspect of the problem.

The second half of the volume (pp. 145–306) is taken up entirely by the doctoral dissertation of Bernhard Dilger on the political views of A. D. Gradovsky (1841–89), the well-known jurist, publicist, and political scientist *avant la lettre*. Dilger gives a comprehensive summary of Gradovsky's notions of constitutional and administrative law, the national question, social problems, and the systematic development of public law as a field of scholarship. The summaries are competently done, clear, and accurate. They lead to the following observations concerning Gradovsky's political views: (1) he made a seminal distinction between government and administration, with stress on the positive role of the latter; (2) his outlook was ambiguous and blurred with respect to contemporary issues, mainly as a result of his failure to see the broader context and deeper dynamics of the critical problems of his time (nationalism, the sociopolitical impact of economic change, the relationship between individual and community). Gradovsky's outlook illustrates the confusion of the Russian intelligentsia vis-à-vis the reality of authority. His scholarly work, on the other hand, gave academic recognition and standing to administrative law but did not provide useful guidance to the activists in politics. It may also be worthwhile to note Gradovsky's intellectual and scholarly debt to German jurisprudence and political economy (L. Stein, R. Mohl, R. Gneist), although his practical ideals owe much to an idealized picture of English social and constitutional patterns.

Although Dilger's study is quite informative, it skirts the basic problems in Gradovsky's political thought and does not bespeak genuine understanding of the Russian context to which Gradovsky was reacting. Dilger fails to deal adequately with the tension resulting from the conflicting claims of the individual personality and the needs of the community which bedeviled Gradovsky. Although he points out that Gradovsky refused to identify the claims of the individual personality for full development with hateful "individualism," Dilger does not clarify the philosophical and ethical implications of this position. Gradovsky's political thought is not put into the context of Russian ethical and political thinking, yet quite obviously in their existential vagueness and philosophical ambiguity Gradovsky's ideas reflect the absence of a tradition of juridical reflection and hardheaded conceptual analysis. Like most Russian political writers Gradovsky wavered between ethical judgments and formal taxonomy of political categories and institutions. Thus he never came to grips with the actual problems of political theory.

Suggestions for the origins of this state of affairs in Russian political thought may be derived from the other four contributions. In the most elegant and thoughtful essay of the volume ("Die gedankliche Begründung der Moskauer Autokratie bei ihrer Entstehung 1458–1522," pp. 59–118), Professor Philipp reviews the evidence for the earliest expressions of Russian political thinking in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. On the basis of a thorough, balanced, and critical analysis of the sources and of their interpretations, Philipp concludes that the autocratic rule of the grand dukes of Moscow arose ad hoc in practice without the benefit of programmatic statements (p. 116). The so-called political works of churchmen (Nil Sorsky, Iosif Sanin, Vassian Patrikeev, Filofei, etc.) in the reigns of Ivan III, Vasiliï III, and the minority of Ivan IV, were not so much discussions of politics as expressions of ethical and religious ideals and claims to historical prescription. In short, Philipp concludes, "Da weder die Geistlichkeit konkrete Vorstellungen

vom Inhalt dieser politischen Ordnung unter einem Zaren entwickelt hatte, . . . blieben *regnum* und *sacerdotium* im Denken ungeschieden. Damit entfiel jede bewusste Konfrontation und fruchtbare Durchdringung von politischen und geistlichen Vorstellungen, von politischem Handeln und normenstiftenden Überlegungen."

I share this conclusion, but I would nuance it somewhat by pointing out that Philipp's notion of political thought is too narrowly Western, and it owes its conceptual sharpness to the confrontation of church and state in early Christian and medieval times. It is, therefore, necessary to develop a conceptual framework and vocabulary capable of dealing adequately with the ethical and existential aspects of Russian social and political musings. For after all, even these vague cogitations had an important effect on the history of Russian political and social institutions.

The "existential" dimension finds illustration in the three remaining essays of this volume. In a brief note ("The Periodicity of the Mongol Tribute as Paid by the Russian Princes," pp. 7–13) Michel Roublev shows on the basis of very fragmentary and hard to interpret evidence that the tribute to the Tatars was collected annually, providing the grand duke of Moscow with important financial resources. Oswald P. Backus tries to show ("Treason as Conception and Defections from Moscow to Lithuania in the 16th Century," pp. 119–44) that in the political practice and thought of the second third of the sixteenth century the notion of "treason" had not yet been unambiguously defined, while the traditions of appanage autonomy had not yet died out completely. As an illustration he adduces the case of the "departure" of Semën Fedorovich Belsky from Moscow and his political activities in Lithuania and the Crimea. As an afterthought, this case is compared and contrasted with the flight of Prince Kurbsky a score of years later. The interesting incident with Belsky throws much light on "steppe politics" (Edward Keenan's term) in the sixteenth century—the opportunities they afforded and the limitations they imposed on the adventurous. It forms a nice pendant to the career of Prince Dmitrii Vishnevetsky (cf. Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay, "Un condottiere lithuanien du XVI^e siècle, le prince Dimitrij Višneveckij et l'origine de la *Sěč'* Zaporogue d'après les Archives ottomanes," in *La Russie et l'Europe: XVI^e–XX^e siècles*, Paris and Moscow, 1970, pp. 149–67).

The crucial problem of the relations between the grand duke of Moscow and the nobility (appanaged princes and old Moscow service families) is tackled by Gustave Alef in the most original contribution to the volume ("The Crisis of the Muscovite Aristocracy: A Factor in the Growth of Monarchical Power," pp. 15–58). Reversing the perspective of traditional historiography which accounts for the emergence and triumph of autocracy in terms of the grand duke's strength, Alef argues that the latter's victory was due to the basic weakness of the nobility. He shows that a principal factor in the nobility's weakness as a class was the Slavic tradition of equal inheritance, which within a couple of generations forced most nobles to offer their services to the princes. The grand duke of Moscow, who became the richest of all potential employers, could wield the whip. This bland summary of Alef's main conclusion does not do justice to the wealth of information, historical insight, and source analysis to be found in his article. For instance, Alef makes much of the Black Death as the principal cause for delaying the process of impoverishment until the fifteenth century when other circumstances had secured Moscow's pre-eminence among all principalities. Vying for the grand duke's favors, the noble servitors—both newcomers and established Muscovite families—could

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'ITSEV. 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^o 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