

religion (including the entries “Islam” and “Jews”). Regrettably missing from this new edition are the beautiful color photos included in the earlier editions with depictions of treasures from the Kremlin Armory (for example, the ceremonial robe of Patriarch Nikon). Some of the engravings (for example, from the travel accounts of Olearius and Schleissing) have remained, although reduced in size.

The strengths of this publication are many. First, there is a wide range of topics covering Kievan Rus' and Muscovy including “absolutism,” “art,” “book printing,” “boyars,” “Christianization,” “Feudal disintegration,” “Golden Horde,” “Hesyachism,” “icons,” “literature,” “music and theater,” “Normans,” and “women.” Second, there is a large number of entries on religious figures ranging from heretics (for example, Artemii, Bashkin, Kosoi) to prominent churchmen (for example, Makarii, Slavineckii, Sukhanov). Third, the volume introduces scholars to many lesser-known German, Dutch, and Swedish travelers who wrote accounts of their visits to Russia (such as Goeteeris, Herbinus, Juusten, Peyerle, Schlitte et al.). Finally, there are numerous useful entries on important political figures (other than ruling dynasts) including Ordin-Nashchokin, Rtishchev, and Shakhovskoi that draw on the research of German scholars such as H. Rüss and H. J. Torke, whose work is not sufficiently acknowledged in English-language historiographies.

Many of the entries comprise substantial bibliographies that include references to little-known materials (such as unpublished Ph.D. dissertations). However, American scholars will notice that the volume omits some important English-language titles (for example, C. Dunning on “Bolotnikov”; H. Lunt and D. S. Worth on “Church Slavonic”; R. Hellie on “kholop”; O. Pritsak on “Kievan Empire”; and R. O. Crummey on “court culture”). As a result, these and other entries (for example, “Avvakum,” “Nikon,” and “Old Believers”) do not reflect the latest international research. It is also unfortunate that some important entries (such as “Filaret” and “Women”) are much too short in comparison with less significant entries (for example, the obscure travelers “Juusten,” “Kämpfer,” and “Linschoten”). On the other hand, the volume provides a good synopsis of Soviet scholarship (for example, A. A. Zimin, V. I. Buganov) on topics such as social exploitation, oppression, and resistance, topics that are too often overlooked by Western scholars. This volume serves as a welcome reminder of the strengths of the Soviet scholarly tradition.

The authors must be commended for having completed a comprehensive reference work that reflects erudition in a wide range of subjects. The volume can serve as a basic introduction for both students and scholars. In addition, it offers important information to specialists in early Russian foreign relations, elite politics, heterodox religion, and movements of social and religious protest.

**Georg Michels, University of California, Riverside**

Rakhimzianov, Bulat. *Kasimovskoe khanstvo (1445–1552 gg.): Ocherki istorii*. Kazan': Tatarskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 2009. 207 pp. ISBN 978-5-298-012721-3.

Since 2008, Bulat Rakhimzianov, the author of the book under review, has been Senior Scholarly Researcher at the Center for Ethnographic Monitoring of the Institute of History of the Academy of Science of Tatarstan. Before that, he was an assistant professor in the history department at Kazan' State University. *Kasimovskoe khanstvo (1445–1552 gg.)*, his first monograph, examines the evidence for the early history of a khanate that was founded by the grand prince of Muscovy. Exactly when it was founded is a matter of dispute. Rakhimzianov chooses 1445 as the year Meshchera, the name it was known by in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, was granted as a yurt (ulus, appanage) to the Kazan' tsarevich Kasim. Kasim is first mentioned in the Moscow chronicles in the entry for 1447 as being, along with his brother Iakub, in the service of the Moscow grand prince.

Rakhimzianov poses the following questions: How was it possible that a Muslim state with a Muslim ruler could be located in the middle of Orthodox Russia? Was it a true khanate or merely a principality? Did it meet some internal needs of the Muscovite state or was it primarily a tool of

foreign policy? In answering these and other questions, Rakhimzianov surveys in chapter 1 (pp. 8–46) the primary source evidence, including treaties and testaments, diplomatic documents, military registers, genealogical books, descriptions of archives from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, various materials testifying to the economic life of the khanate, such as income-expense books, tax books, land cadasters, chap books, and so forth, and narratives found in chronicles and foreigners' accounts.

This survey is followed by a discussion of the secondary literature on the topic, including the works of M. G. Khludiakov, K. V. Bazilevich, Edward L. Keenan, V. V. Vel'iaminov-Zernov, and D. M. Iskhakov. In chapter 2 (pp. 47–93), Rakhimzianov analyzes, based on a close reading of both the primary sources and secondary literature, controversial issues of its origins as well as its structure and internal life. Chapter 3 (pp. 94–167) is devoted to the political history of the Meshchera yurt from the mid-fifteenth to the mid-sixteenth centuries. The book has a twenty-one-page bibliography; nineteen illustrations, many in full color; and four appendices: genealogical connections among the rulers of the Kasimov khanate; a chronology of events of the Kasimov khanate in the context of eastern Europe of the period; a list of the variants of the names of Kasimov rulers in Russian sources; and a glossary of terms. There is no index.

Rakhimzianov argues that the Meshchera yurt was founded as part of the agreement Vasilii II made with Ulug-Muhammed after the latter captured the former at the battle of Suzdal' in 1445. According to Rakhimzianov's understanding of the evidence, Ulug-Muhammed, the khan of Kazan' and founder of that khanate, demanded Meshchera as a yurt for his sons Kasim and Iakub. Subsequently, the Kasimov khanate, the name given to it in Russian historiography, became a destination point for Jochid princes entering the service of the Muscovite grand prince. Although, in Rakhimzianov's view, the internal affairs of the Kasimov khanate before the fall of Kazan' in 1552 were conducted autonomously without interference of the Muscovite ruler, its external affairs were controlled by Moscow, particularly in regard to policies toward Kazan'. After the fall of Kazan', however, the earlier function of the Kasimov khanate eroded, and Moscow began to treat it as just another province until its formal separate status was ended in 1681.

A notable aspect of Rakhimzianov's monograph is the author's attempt to integrate fully non-Russian (mostly American and British) studies into his investigation. He spent most of a year at Harvard University on a Fulbright Scholarship studying the non-Russian historiography while preparing the book. If Russian scholarship on the relations of the Rus' principalities with the rest of Eurasia is to continue to progress, it would be well advised to do more along the lines of what Rakhimzianov has done here. In addition, anyone researching the relations of Muscovy with the steppe from the mid-fifteenth to mid-sixteenth centuries cannot afford to ignore Rakhimzianov's valuable contribution.

**Donald Ostrowski, Harvard University**

Werrett, Simon. *Fireworks: Pyrotechnic Arts & Sciences in European History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010. 359 pp. \$45.00. ISBN 978-0-226-89377-8.

This is a book, the author states, “about fireworks and the enduring, widespread, and variegated relations among pyrotechnics, art, and science over three centuries, from the Renaissance to the end of the *ancien regime*” (p. 2). More specifically, its argument is that gunners turned their gunpowder craft into artifice, that “spectacular demonstrations” of fireworks became religious and political theater, that different places evolved distinctive expressions, that the community of “artificers” interacted with natural philosophers, and that, in sum, fireworks “contributed much to early modern science” (p. 3).

The book thus shares several features with its topic. Like fireworks, this is a book of formulas, or in this instance, mixtures of historiographic themes. In particular, it addresses traditional theses in the history of science and technology, notably, the character of a “privileged Scientific Revolution,”