

KNIAZHESKIE USTAVY I TSERKOV' V DREVNEI RUSI, XI–XIV VV.

By Ia. N. Shchapov. Akademiia nauk SSSR, Institut istorii SSSR. Moscow: "Nauka," 1972. 340 pp. 1.63 rubles.

The blurb describes this book as the "first Marxist monograph devoted to the history of the Old Russian church." Actually the book consists essentially of extended textological essays on the two great legal monuments, the Statutes of Vladimir and Iaroslav, which governed the church's relations with the rest of the world and to some extent its internal discipline. They are supplemented by a short preface, a longer conclusion, a seven-page table facilitating comparison of the most important editions of the statutes, and the usual apparatus, although unfortunately there is no bibliography of the many secondary works referred to in the footnotes. (One of Shchapov's own articles, not mentioned in the book, anticipates many of its main points: "Drevnerusskie kniazheskie ustavy i tserkov' v feodal'nom razvitii Rusi, X–XIV vv.," *Istoriia SSSR*, 1970, no. 3, pp. 125 ff.)

In the first essay Shchapov begins by assessing the most important works on the Statute of Vladimir, from that of Miller (or Müller) in the eighteenth century to that of V. N. Beneshevich and S. V. Iushkov in the twentieth, highlighting in the process the positive elements of each contribution as well as its errors or shortcomings. Building on this foundation, and with the help of some new evidence, Shchapov adumbrates his own account of the relations between the oldest texts of the Statute, which he then diagrams (p. 37: one notes that many of the crucial links are "archetypal"—hypothetically original—texts). Next is a detailed critical-historical examination of (according to Shchapov's scheme) the four main redactions of the Statute, and then of the archetype of two of them, after which the archetype of this entire group of redactions is reconstructed and analyzed and then compared with yet another group of redaction of the Statute that has been similarly studied. Each level builds (descends?), *textologically*, from the preceding—the whole edifice culminating in the reconstruction, in seven articles, of *the* archetypal text of the Statute of Vladimir (of the common archetype, more precisely, of the group of redactions and of the single redaction just referred to), whose content is then analyzed to establish the date and place and the conditions of its composition (pp. 38 ff.; for the reconstructed original text, see pp. 120–21). This first section of the book concludes with two shorter textological essays on the statutory charters (*ustavnye gramoty*) of Prince Rostislav Mstislavich and Bishop Manuel of Smolensk (pp. 136 ff.), and of Prince Sviatoslav Olgovich of Novgorod (pp. 150 ff.). These are treated as local adaptations, in their formularies or in their basic content, of the Statute of Vladimir. Owing partly to their relatively fine state of preservation, they illustrate well the situation of the church when and where they arose as well as distinct stages in the history of the Statute itself.

Similarly, in the second main essay of the book Shchapov examines the Statute of Iaroslav at length and with the same ends in mind (pp. 178–306). Again he reviews critically, and justly, the work of his predecessors, both historians and textologists. He points out that neither of the most recent authorities, Beneshevich or Iushkov, produced a definitive (*svodnoe* or *polnoe*) edition of the Statute and that the one published twenty years ago by Zimin was based on Iushkov's incomplete research—incomplete because it did not include a thorough textological study of all surviving manuscript copies of the document, which amount to more than ninety and date from the fourteenth to the nineteenth centuries. (See Zimin, ed.,

Pamiatniki russkogo prava, Moscow, 1952, vol. 1, pp. 257 ff. This volume also contains what has been the standard edition of the Statute of Vladimir, pp. 235 ff. Abbreviated English translations of both statutes based on these editions are printed in George Vernadsky et al., eds., *A Source Book for Russian History from Early Times to 1917*, New Haven, 1972, vol. 1, pp. 39–40.) As Zimin admitted in the edition cited, we still lacked a secure textological basis from which to exploit the Statute's huge potential as a source for medieval Russian history (it was Zimin, apparently, who suggested that the present work be undertaken). This Shchapov has set out to provide, leaving us with a reconstructed archetypal text of the original Statute (pp. 293–96), an account of its sources and later versions, and much else besides.

In sum, Shchapov has contributed in this book a model of textological research to be imitated by workers on other documents but not, with respect to these, likely to be surpassed. Moving by laborious steps backwards in history, "from the most recent versions to the earlier ones, from the surviving texts through the archetypes of [their] recensions, groups, and redactions to the oldest texts," he has convincingly reconstructed the original Statutes of Vladimir and Iaroslav (and promises, in a second volume, to publish his editions of other medieval princely statutes and charters relating to the church). He has shown, more or less conclusively and often for the first time, (1) that the "Statute of Vladimir" arose in connection with a "whole complex of political and ecclesiastical measures by Prince Andrei Bogoliubsky and above all with the building of the stone church of Our Lady (1158) and the struggle for the transfer of the ecclesiastical center of northeastern Rus' to Vladimir (second half of the twelfth century)" (p. 133); (2) that in turn this statute's ultimate sources were two charters of Prince St. Vladimir of Kiev (one, dated to 996, granting the tithe in support of his new church of Our Lady, and the other, from before 1011, granting immunity from princely or secular jurisdiction to the clergy of Kiev); and (3) that in every important case the changes that took place in the numerous versions of the Statute which sprang up all over medieval Russia can be isolated and their historical significance assessed. But on the question of the tithe, or *desiatina*, which was unknown in Byzantium, Shchapov appears oblivious to any suggestion that the practice was borrowed from the West, where it was widespread at the time. At one point he describes it as the "traditional Old Russian means" of supporting the church (p. 149: "traditional" since when? since Vladimir?), and (therefore?) makes no effort to explain its appearance in Vladimir's charter of 996.

Shchapov has also shown that the Statute of Iaroslav should be definitely linked with the contemporaneous *Pravda Russkaia* as one of the two basic codes of Old Russian law, the former concerned with marriage and divorce matters (with "intra-class conflicts") and the latter with criminal cases (with "inter-class conflicts"); that it should also be seen, after the Statute of Vladimir (after the original charters on which the latter is based), as the second great stage in the written formulation of the rights and privileges of the Old Russian church; that it was first composed in Kiev in 1051–53, in the last years of Iaroslav's reign and during the brief term of Metropolitan Ilarion, who was, "not coincidentally," a native; that it underwent many, often major, and always historically significant modifications; that the system of monetary fines which it prescribes (charted on pp. 258–63) can tell us much about the society and economy in which it first arose

as well as help to date it; that its provisions—most interestingly—contain abundant testimony of the nature and survival of indigenous, pre-Christian laws and customs with which to refine or expand, sometimes greatly, what little we know from other sources; and that from the fifteenth century both it and the Statute of Vladimir ceased to be operative law and became “historical-polemical literary documents” to be used by churchmen or princes to show the antiquity of the church’s establishment, the care of former princes for its material well-being, or the justice of claims to the inheritance of the Old Russian lands (though it should be remarked that to some degree these documents, like similar ones in the West, had always played this role).

Shchapov’s sophisticated, erudite, often brilliant work embodies the finest principles of contemporary Soviet *tekstologiya* as applied to medieval Russian documents. But perhaps a word of caution, for that very reason, is needed. Likhachev and other practitioners have defined textology as an independent discipline (see, for example, D. S. Likhachev, “Osnovnye printsipy tekstologicheskikh issledovaniĭ pamiatnikov drevnerusskoi literatury,” in Likhachev et al., eds., *Tekstologiya slavianskikh literatur*, Leningrad, 1973, pp. 219 ff.); and pursuing them on the point we might indeed posit a certain incompatibility between the methods and aims of textological, as against those of historical, research. The deductive, often purely hypothetical nature of much textological argumentation (as noted above and as Shchapov freely admits, p. 8) does not combine easily with the more inductive, factual approach of historians. Nor is the objective—proper to textology—of elucidating the history of a text the goal of history itself, which must be more capacious. And Shchapov’s attempt to achieve simultaneously both textological and properly historical ends may account for the weaknesses, speaking generally, of this work: the appearance, on occasion, of elements of circular reasoning; the transformation, here and there, of larger historical assumptions into tools of textological analysis whose relevance is not always made clear; and the drawing, now and then, of major historical conclusions that are not adequately supported by evidence that has been skillfully adduced for the purpose, usually, of dating a text. Shchapov has demonstrated that we need a more exact and comprehensive knowledge of the history and content of these documents in order to understand not just the church’s position but many other aspects of medieval Russian life as well. He explicitly recognizes the enormous importance of the church in Old Russian society (e.g., p. 309). But if his excursions into the history of the “interrelations of the secular and ecclesiastical powers in Rus’” in the eleventh to fourteenth centuries are frequently suggestive, his book makes no important conceptual advance in handling the basic historical question of the nature and development of the Old Russian church.

We must not ask for the moon. Our reservations notwithstanding, Shchapov has given us new or firmer answers to many old questions and has opened up whole avenues of research. His book ought to be read by anyone interested in medieval Russia or in—for comparative purposes—the Middle Ages elsewhere.

JAMES CRACRAFT

University of Illinois at Chicago Circle