as early as the seventeenth century, the Solovetskii library had branches and lent books. The chapter on the Putiatina mineia contains an informative digression on Novgorodian teratological ornament, and the chapter on the Kirillo-Belozerskii library really comes to life with tales of Kirill, Ferapont, Efrosin, and other personalities related to the collection. He discussed such personalities as Archbishop Gennadii of Novgorod and Metropolitan Makarii in the chapter "On the Eve of Printing," and he devotes a whole chapter to the famous Illustrated Annal (Litsevoi letopisny svod) and the ten Godunov Psalters.

The first half of the book (pp. 1-68), as described above, best answers the reader's expectations, since in it Rozov deals heavily with actual manuscripts and collections, whereas in the "Studies" in the remainder of the book, he spends too much time trying to give a general impression of the "repertoire" of the manuscript books of the later centuries, sometimes just summarizing their contents (e.g., pp. 80-85). Nonetheless, the last half also contains much interesting material. Rozov stresses that printed books in the seventeenth-century were almost exclusively ecclesiastical in nature, and that most other literature was still being spread mainly by manuscripts, many of which by this time were originating not in the scriptoria of the Tsar or the Metropolitan, but in the Diplomatic Chancellery. Rozov is at this best when he dissects an actual manuscript or a collection of them, as he does with the Titov Collection (pp. 96-103), where he makes particularly telling use of inscriptions, even using them for a sociological analysis of the owners and readers of manuscript books in the Povolzh'e area where most of the collection was assembled. The last chapter, which treats the nineteenth century, deals less with the manuscripts than with their collectors, especially the little-known M. la. Diev (pp. 108-110), and ends with a digression on Vera Panova's interpretation of the Russian past in her Liki na zare, which seems rather out of place in a book about manuscripts. Apart from a brief description of Old Believer manuscripts of the Pomor'e area (pp. 113-117), this last chapter has little on the manuscripts themselves, and one can only wish that Rozov had given (and will give) us more about the actual manuscripts of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries, featuring the kind of detail he gave us in the first part of the book.

I have a few specific minor criticisms of this worthwhile book: some of the illustrations (v. p. 15, p. 27, p. 49) are of such poor quality that they might just as well have been omitted, especially since they disillusion the reader after Rozov's exciting prose treatment; there is no general recommended bibliography at the end, which is an unfortunate omission; there is no index and no explanation of abbreviations used in the footnotes, which latter could well confuse the neophyte; the whole book is heavily weighted towards the Leningrad collections, which Rozov naturally knows best, but which does not really give us as balanced a general picture as could perhaps have been achieved.

In conclusion, although this books is avowedly non-scholarly in intent, there is much in it that will be of interest to historians, librarians, linguists, and literary scholars, especially those studying the medieval period. It is too bad more scholars cannot write about this subject in as lively a manner.

Richard W. F. Pope
York University


All scholars working in the earlier periods of Russian history depend upon information supplied by foreigners to a greater extent than is true of other major European countries. Russian source materials do not become abundant or variegated until the eighteenth century. This rule applies to native historians as well, but they have displayed a certain reluctance to acknowledge it and have been hesitant to make accounts by foreign observers widely available. In the 1860's the Chteniia series published translations of some foreign reports, but the project had been essentially abandoned by the end of the decade.

To focus on the reign of Ivan the Terrible (1533-1584), a few documents concerned with Anglo-Russian relations were subsequently published.1 They were followed by translations of

1. Iu. Tolstoi, Pervye 40 let snoshenii mezhdu Rossieiu i Anglieiu (St. Petersburg, 1875).
significant foreign observers like Herberstein,2 Giles Fletcher,3 and Taube and Kruse,4 but to this day there are no adequate Russian editions of Stryjkowski, Guagnini, Oderborn, or Possevino. Soviet historians, with access to new archival material, have produced many excellent, stimulating and provocative studies of Russia's early history, but they have shown an even greater reluctance than their tsarist predecessors to make sound critical translations of essential foreign sources available. The one exception is Schlichting's De moribus et imperandi crudelitate Basilij Moscoviae Tyranni brevis enarratio,5 which A. I. Malein, a scholar of the pre-Soviet generation, brought out in 1934, and it is almost entirely deficient in critical analysis. Soviet historians are quite content to cite older editions of foreign writers without comment whenever a need to do so arises. It is not easy to assign reasons for this oversight, but Soviet scholars have shown themselves to be at least equally as sensitive to criticism of early Russia's backwardness as tsarist scholars were. One characteristic foreign commentators on Old Russia tended to have in common was a hostility, which often verged on contempt, for the country and its people.

Outside Russia the situation has been even less satisfactory. In America a recent compilation has endeavored to track down every reference to Russia in English from early times to the present.6 An excellent critical edition of Olearius has recently been published.7 For the sixteenth century, a sound edition of the reports of a number of English commercial men and officials who sojourned in Muscovy came out not long ago.8 In the case of Giles Fletcher three editions in two years might be considered an embarrassment of riches.9 Yet for Herberstein, the first foreign Slavicist, the scholarly world must still rely on Major's old translation,10 and other demands have been met merely by reissuing unchanged Adelung's hoary compendium.11 Epstein's monumental edition of Heinrich von Staden has encouraged few imitators.12 Our knowledge of what foreign observers wrote and, in some cases, even of who they were is clearly inadequate. However, the reign of Ivan the Terrible now forms a happy exception, thanks to Andreas Kappeler's new book. His study is in some ways reminiscent of Kluchevskii's fascinating reconstruction of life in sixteenth-century Muscovy from the reports of foreign visitors,13 but it marks a significant critical and methodological advance upon Kluchevskii's pioneering effort.

Kappeler has confined his analysis to continental European writers and purposely excluded the English. He has amassed an enormous amount of material. To obtain it he ransacked archives and libraries not only in Leningrad, Warsaw and Gdańsk, but also in such places as

2. A. I. Malein, Zapiski o moskovitskikh delakh (St. Petersburg, 1908).
3. S. M. Seredonin, Sochinenia Dzhil'sa Fletchera kak istoricheskii istochnik (St. Petersburg, 1891).
6. Harry W. Nerhood, comp., To Russia and Return. An Annotated Bibliography of Travelers' English Language Accounts of Russia from the Ninth Century to the Present (Columbus, Ohio, 1968).
13. V. O. Kluchevskii, Skazaniia inostrantsev o Moskovskom gosudarstve (Petrograd, 1918).