

Such a curiosity is the result of the improper periodization and terminology introduced by Russian historians for political reasons" (pp. 859–60).

I submit that this treatment of my *History* misrepresents its substance and structure. To cite only the most crucial passage neglected by Professor Horak, I write on page 154: "The Lithuanian-Russian principedom also attracts the attention of historians of Russia because of its role in the linguistic and ethnic division of the Russians into the Great Russians, often called simply Russians, the Ukrainians, and the White Russians or Belorussians, and its particular importance for the last two groups. While the roots of the differentiation extend far back, one can speculate that events would have taken a different shape if the Russians had preserved their political unity in the Kievan state. As it actually happened, the Great Russians came to be associated with the Muscovite realm, the Ukrainians and the White Russians with Lithuania and Poland. Political separation tended to promote cultural differences, although all started with the same Kievan heritage. Francis Skorina, a scholar from Polotsk, who, early in the sixteenth century, translated the Bible and also published other works in Prague and in Vilna, has frequently been cited as the founder of a distinct southwestern Russian literary language and, in particular, as a forerunner of Belorussian literature. The Russian Orthodox Church too, as we know, finally split administratively, with a separate metropolitan established in Kiev to head the Orthodox in the Lithuanian state. The division of the Russians into the Great Russians, the Ukrainians, and the Belorussians, reinforced by centuries of separation, became a major factor in subsequent Russian history."

Professor Horak, of course, does not have to agree with the scheme outlined in this quotation. Nevertheless, the quotation (which, incidentally, prominently concludes the entire third part of the *History*) should be sufficient to demonstrate that I do not give the Great Russians historical priority over the Ukrainians, that my Ukrainians do not appear in the seventeenth century out of nowhere, and that I have no desire to delete ancient Kiev, or ancient Galicia for that matter, from the rich historical heritage of the Ukrainians. As to the terminology used by scholars in this entire range of historical issues, I join Professor Horak in being dissatisfied with it and in hoping for improvement. Personally I opted in my *History* for the most readily understood and most readable English, with, as the quoted paragraph indicates, some necessary explanation.

May I conclude by again welcoming Professor Horak's efforts to achieve more clarity and precision in the very difficult field to which he addresses himself.

NICHOLAS V. RIASANOVSKY  
*University of California, Berkeley*

TO THE EDITOR:

Dr. Jesse Clarkson's review of Richard Hellie's *Enserfment and Military Change in Muscovy* (*Slavic Review*, September 1972, pp. 658–59) is inadequate in several respects. It hopelessly confuses Hellie's argument and, most important, fails to alert the reader that this is an important new book about a major subject. With this in mind I offer the following comments, not so much to rebut Clarkson, but to encourage others to read Hellie's book.

Hellie writes about the most momentous questions of early modern Russian history, the origins of serfdom and its significance in the emergence of Muscovite absolutism. Despite Clarkson, he is firmly in touch with the sources, both of legal

and of social history. He brings together for the first time the important source criticism on the origin of serfdom by Soviet scholars of the past two decades which have so complicated the understanding of the issues that one can no longer facilely divide interpretations according to classical "juridical" or "socioeconomic" schools. Hellie's narrative is dense and occasionally repetitive, but the book is simply the best study in any language of its subject, and thus a major accomplishment.

Hellie is not so much interested whether the burden of evidence supports one or another theory on the origin of serfdom, as in explaining the interrelationship between the development of the early modern Muscovite state and its unique socio-economic and geographical environment. Contrary to Clarkson, Hellie scrupulously discusses the sparse evidence about peasant dependency in medieval Rus' to the 1580s, and his conclusions, if more limited than those of Kliuchevsky, Grekov, et al., seem to me more satisfactory. What the review misses is Hellie's appreciation that one cannot account for the growth of peasant bondage in the critical years from the 1590s to the 1650s without writing about the dynamics of early Romanov state building. And Hellie offers lessons from comparative history which, for me at least, make it quite clear that the origins, the comprehensive pattern, and the harshness of peasant bondage at that time were of a new order without precedent in the sorts of peasant dependency which one associates with medieval serfdom. It is with reference to these last two points that Hellie writes about effects of the "gunpowder revolution" in Muscovy, a lengthy digression which Clarkson inexplicably finds at once "valuable" and yet a failure in "altering the views of his [Hellie's] predecessors." Although this second half of the book is a book in itself, Hellie convincingly and with originality shows that the "revolution" decisively, but not inevitably, turned imperial decision-making and the efforts of minor service men (whom Hellie, contrary to Clarkson, takes pains not to call a "gentry") to creating the ponderous bureaucratic service state with which Muscovy emerged as a major power in Europe.

DAVID B. MILLER  
*Roosevelt University*

PROFESSOR CLARKSON REPLIES:

Professor Miller is quite right; he does not attempt to rebut my comments. His appraisal of what Dr. Hellie has done does not seem to differ, except semantically, from mine. I wrote of Hellie's "wide reading of the extensive secondary literature, occasionally supplemented by direct reference to published source material"; Miller describes this process by writing that Hellie "is firmly in touch with the sources" and that he "brings together for the first time the important source criticism on the origin of serfdom by Soviet scholars." Perhaps Miller is thus in closer rapport with current usage of the term "sources."

It is harder to understand how he can write that "Hellie is not so much interested whether the burden of evidence supports one or another theory on the origin of serfdom"; my remarks on this score (and others) were based on passages quoted from Hellie's own book, strongly emphasized in his introduction and continued through parts 1 and 2. Nor do I see why Miller finds "inexplicable" my praise of the industry Hellie shows also in part 3, coupled with regret at its lack of originality.

Inexplicable to me is Miller's concluding remark about Hellie's nonuse of the