

Slavic Review
45/2 (1986): 315-16

ROSSIISKOE GOSUDARSTVO V SEREDINE XVI STOLETIIA. TSARSKII ARKHIV I LITSEVYE LETOPISI VREMENI IVANA GROZNOGO. By Sigurd O. Shmidt. Edited by D. S. Likhachev. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Nauka, 1984. 278 pp. Illustrations. 1.60 rubles, cloth.

A generation of distinguished Soviet specialists on premodern Russian history is passing with the untimely deaths in recent years of Aleksandr A. Zimin, Nataliia A. Kazakova, Vadim I. Koretskii, and Nikolai E. Nosov. Sigurd Ottovich Shmidt is another important member of that generation, the long-time president of the Academy of Sciences Archaeographic Commission, and the mentor of several young scholars who are now making important contributions to the study of Muscovite history.

The content of Shmidt's latest book is best revealed by its subtitle, but the volume is important more for interesting details than for the development of any coherent theme. The bulk of the volume brings together material the author has been studying for years concerning the royal archive of the sixteenth century and the contemporary descriptions of its contents (Shmidt published a new edition of the archival inventories in 1960). In discussing the formation and organization of the archive, he frequently acknowledges his debt to Zimin's detailed analysis of what it contained, although he disagrees with Zimin in some points of detail. Shmidt's essays provide a good idea of the sources for certain kinds of documentation that found its way into the archive and the relation between the archive and other institutions of government. He also offers some extended terminological excursus on such words as *kazna*. His evidence concerning the archive suggests that the process of centralization and bureaucratization in Muscovy was far from complete by the end of Ivan IV's reign. Although he cites some interesting comparative material for other European states, one disappointment of the book is that he fails to develop these comparisons so that we can obtain a clear idea of where Muscovy fits in the European context.

The short section of essays on the illuminated chronicles of the time of Ivan IV contains some interesting comments on the historiography of the compilation and editing of the texts. What he relates about the forthcoming work of his students, A. A. Amosov and V. V. Morozov, on the codicology of the manuscripts in question tantalizes us, but curiously he is nearly silent on the conclusions of B. M. Kloss, with whom they apparently disagree about the dating of the famous interpolations concerning important political events of Ivan's reign. In examining specific instances, such as the disgrace of some of the boyars in 1546, Shmidt finds various parallels between the political ideas in the chronicles and in the writings attributed to Ivan IV.

Unfortunately, there is absolutely no connection between this short last section of the book and the more substantial first one. Most readers will also find annoying the dual

system of footnotes, in which additional information is at the bottoms of pages but citations grouped at the ends of chapters. The book contains a long list of abbreviations (in lieu of a bibliography) and an index of names.

DANIEL CLARKE WAUGH
University of Washington