

script. The manuscript is described, and the history of the document reproduced in it is discussed. It is suggested that the work was compiled sometime between the eighth and fourteenth centuries, probably in the earlier part of that period, perhaps early in the ninth century. That work, however, incorporated an earlier collection, which contains extracts from no writer later than the seventh century, and "it may already have been in existence at the time" (p. xviii). The introduction also discusses the intention of the compiler in his polemic against Monophysites and supporters of the Council of Chalcedon, and his collection of a number of extracts from Nestorian writers on Christological subjects. There are also discussions of the text of the Bible used in the extracts, and there are indexes of biblical and other quotations, of subjects, and of names.

The editors have given us a careful and scholarly edition, and their judgments are usually convincing. Their translation also maintains a high scholarly standard, notwithstanding a few places where another opinion is possible. The style is sometimes rather Germanic for English taste, but this is a negligible defect from the scholarly point of view. The editors have earned the gratitude of students of Syriac, and also students of church history and Christian doctrine, by their labors.

J. A. EMERTON  
Cambridge, England

PSALTERIUM SINAITICUM: AN 11TH CENTURY GLAGOLITIC MANUSCRIPT FROM ST. CATHERINE'S MONASTERY, MT. SINAI. Edited by *Moshe Altbauer*. Skopje: Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 1971. xvi, 360 pp.

Among the 3,300 manuscripts held in the library of the monastery of Saint Catherine on the Sinai, there are 47 Old Church Slavonic manuscripts brought to the Sinai as a gift by priests and pilgrims from Slavic regions. The most ancient of these Old Slavic manuscripts are the *Psalterium Sinaiticum* and the *Euchologium Sinaiticum*, both closely related in time, both of Macedonian provenience, and both written in Glagolitic letters. Whereas the *Euchologium* has been accessible in a photostatic copy for several decades (it was published in 1941 by the Slovenian scholar R. Nahtigal), only two Cyrillic transliterations exist of the Glagolitic *Psalterium*, the oldest preserved Slavic translation of the Psalms. The first of these transliterations was made in 1883 by L. Geitler under rather unfavorable conditions in Saint Catherine's itself. The second, prepared by the Russian scholar S. N. Severianov, was based on photographs made in 1907 by the Russian Byzantium explorer, V. N. Beneshevich. In 1918 Severianov died without having finished the edition. It was E. F. Karsky who took care of Severianov's work, provided it with a preface, and published it in 1922.

Neither of the Cyrillic transliterations can be considered a substitute for the Glagolitic original, and many of the false conclusions and erroneous interpretations may be ascribed to the inadequate rendering of the original text. This obvious gap in scholarship stimulated Professor Moshe Altbauer, of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, to make accessible a photostatic edition of the original Glagolitic text of the *Psalter*. He was assisted by the research committee of his university as well as the Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts in Skopje. The new edition has been provided with a thorough English introduction giving a meticulous description of the manuscripts and their graphic and decorative systems. It includes

references to the number of scribes and the primary sources of the codex. The Glagolitic text of the *Psalter* has been rendered without notes. However, Professor H. G. Lunt's observations on the scribes of the *Psalter* made in conjunction with Altbauer's new photostatic edition are added as an appendix to the volume. It was the intention of the editor to render the original Slavic text of the *Psalterium Sinaiticum* as authentically as possible. For this reason, almost no graphic alteration or retouching was done.

The new edition of the *Psalter* calls for a fundamental revision of the various views propagated in the past. At the same time, it opens a wide array of new problems which concern linguists as well as paleographers and literary critics and suggests further inquiry on a comparative basis.

NIKOLA R. PRIBIC  
Florida State University

OCHERKI RUSSKOI KUL'TURY XIII-XV VEKOV. Vol. 1: MATERIAL'NAIA KUL'TURA. Vol. 2: DUKHOVNAIA KUL'TURA. Edited by A. V. Artsikhovskiy, A. M. Sakharov, et al. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1969. Vol. 1: 480 pp. 2.48 rubles. Vol. 2: 436 pp. 2.62 rubles.

These two volumes, comprising twenty chapters written by fourteen scholars, are undoubtedly of great interest to both the scholar and the general reader. This is a most competent survey of Russian civilization during the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, which has never been presented in such detail, nor have so many aspects of this period ever been included.

Perhaps A. M. Sakharov, who wrote the introduction and the chapter on "Religion and the Church," had the most difficult task. This erudite historian tries to widen the historiographical basis of his monograph, and therefore includes an examination of the differing views held by scholars regarding the Mongol influence on Russia. Sakharov mentions, *inter alia*, the views advanced by the Eurasian school of thought, and although this is a welcome step forward, the account is not accurate and avoids explaining the Eurasian theories which he does not intend to scrutinize, merely dismissing them as part of the "anti-Soviet ideologies." Most regrettably he does not even mention P. N. Savitsky, a leading theorist and scholar, as well as geographer, economist, and historian, whose contributions to the development of the Eurasian school of thought were vital. No mention either is made of the criticism directed at the Eurasians in the twenties and thirties by such eminent scholars as P. N. Miliukov and A. A. Kizeveter, or the current American and German research into this Russian intellectual trend. Sakharov does not mention, for instance, V. A. Riasanovskiy's most important book *Obzor russkoi kul'tury*, vol. 1 (New York, 1947), which examines the problem of Mongol influence (pp. 381-411)—on which he is an expert—and refutes the validity of the Eurasian theories. Sakharov cannot, of course, forgo assessing Russia as a feudal society. Would it not have been a great improvement had he included a detailed criticism of the many views which conflict with this theory? Sakharov's survey of the role of the Russian Church contains many interesting details, but unfortunately it is obvious that he tends to attribute a negative attitude to the church whenever possible. Thus he states that the church acted as a brake on the development of the economy in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, that the first attempts to "legalize" the enserfment of the peasants occurred on church lands, and that the church was culpable