

THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF RUSSIA IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

by KNUD RAHBEK SCHMIDT, *University of Aarhus*

This brief sketch is in no way meant as an attempt to offer an exhaustive or final solution to the problems concerning the social structure of Russia in the early Middle Ages. The aim of the author has been, firstly, to outline the apparently incompatible prevailing opinions in this field and to probe the more or less contemporary sources on which these opinions are based, secondly, from these sources to point to some principal lines in the historical development of the social terminology of the period, and finally to discuss the possibility of establishing contact between the conflicting conceptions, from a study of social terminology.

I.

It is a fact well known to students of the history of Russia from the foundation of the Kiev kingdom to about 1200 that the number of divergent conceptions of the social structure and the development of this period more or less corresponds to the number of investigators. Within Russian studies in this century, however, there are two historians whose works have had an undeniably profound influence on the study of this field, in Russia and the Soviet Union, as well as abroad: V. O. Kl'učevskij (1841-1911) and B. D. Grekov (1882-1953). For many years these eminent scholars studied the history of their people, published a number of articles and monographs on special subjects and collected their results and theories in monumental works. There are, however, fundamental differences between the works of the two historians, in their approach as well as in their results. Coincident with the political division of the world in our days, these differences have led to the acceptance of only one of the scholars in each of the two political hemispheres, so that while Kl'učevskij is still the authority in the western world, he has more or less been superseded by Grekov in the Soviet Union and the Socialist countries.

Kl'učevskij characterizes his approach as sociological. His description of Rus' from the 8th to the 13th century is briefly as follows.¹ The first part of the period sees the foundation of a number of towns and trading stations along the Dnepr and its tributaries, with the larger trading towns,

goroda, as centres. The most important political fact was the division of the country among the towns, the most important economic fact being foreign trade based upon forestry, hunting, and bee-keeping. From the 8th century the Dnepr was a major trade route—*put' iz Var'ag v Greki*—and the important exports were furs, honey and wax, whereas the agricultural output covered no more than home consumption. At the same time there was a lively trade with the Arabic and Khazar East. On this basis the oldest trading centres of Rus' came into existence, the majority along the Dnepr-Volchov line, where foreign trade southward across the Black Sea was developed, with a smaller number of towns on the eastern route to the Azov and the Caspian Seas. When the Pečenegs threatened the trading routes, the towns were fortified, and the populations comprised the *var'agi*, armed merchants, who neither socially nor occupationally differed from the remainder of the inhabitants. Even before the middle of the 9th century each of these fortified trading centres subjugated the surrounding territories (*gorodovaja oblast' = torgovoj okrug*) and the towns and their territories were later to become constituent administrative parts of the Kiev Rus'. In the 9th and 10th centuries the Varangian kingdoms were created, among these the Kiev Rus' with Kiev as the most important trading centre in Rus'.

The logical conclusion of this was for Kl'učevskij that the treaties between Rus' and Byzantium were agreements made to assure the Russian *k'nazi* and *bojare* that their agents, (*posly*), could sell their share of levied taxes, *dan'* (i.e. fur, honey, wax, and slaves) in Byzantium and thus enable them to buy silk, gold, wine and vegetables there. A similar interchange of goods was carried through by the free merchants, the *gosti* of the treaties.

The upper class proper was the Royal *družina*, the members of which did not differ essentially from the merchants of the towns in the 11th century. The upper layer were the Royal *muži* and *bojare*, the lower consisting of the *detskije* and the *otroki*. The inhabitants were organised on a military scale, and the elected military leaders, *starcy gradskije*, and the upper class of the *družina* formed the Kiev Rus' council, *bojarskaja duma*. Before the foundation of the kingdom the term for a member of the upper class of a town was *ogniščanin*, according to Kl'učevskij a slave-holder; until about 1050 the most important article of commerce was slaves. Later when the kings' power declined, the *veče* of the citizens inherited the dominant position formerly held by the merchant upper classes.

Due partly to the numerical growth and ramification of the Royal household and partly to the campaigns against the enemy from the steppes the number of *družina* members increased considerably. The *družina* be-

came a serving class; each *kn'az'* had hundreds of men whose interest was not in agriculture but in trade and pay.

According to the provisions in *Pravda Russkaja*, the population was divided politically into three classes: (1) the "serving" royal *muži*, (2) the ordinary, free, tax-paying, "non-serving" *ludi* of town and country, and (perhaps) (3) the *cholopy* in private service and regarded more as things than as human beings. Economically the population was divided into another 3 categories: (1) the *bojare*, privileged landowners coming from the royal *muži*, besides two classes of landed *ludi*, (2) the *smerdy*, who were free "state farmers" owning their dead stock and (3) the *najmity* and the *rolejnyje zakupy*, who were unfree, working on private lands, and of a status similar to that of the *cholopy*.

The wealth of Rus' in the 11th and 12th centuries was thus based on slave labour; the enormous increase in slave-holding up to about 1150 was the basis for the growth of agriculture. Before the 11th century there were no private lands, in the 12th century there were "some". The migrations of the population towards the Upper Volga, where there were few towns, resulted in the predominance of the agricultural "classes".

Grekov's description of the social relations in Rus' are in brief outline as follows.² According to the oldest *Pravda Russkaja*, there are only two classes: the *muži*, who were free, land-owning knights, and the *čel'ad'*, who are not only slaves. The *kn'azi* and *bojare* of the treaties are representatives of the upper classes in Rus', and are identical with those named "the best of *muži*'s" in the story of Queen Olga's revenge, and together with the *kupcy*, the *gosti* of the treaties, they concluded the treaties. The treaties prove Rus' to be a state and a class society with the wealth, authority and power in the hands of "the best of *muži*'s". The *stacy* of the chronicle were regional *bojare*, *senatores terrae*, while the *bojare* were dignitaries of the princely court.

The ecclesiastical *Ustav* of Jaroslav divides the *bojare* into several groups which, however, are far above the common people, and a proof of the existence of such stratified classes Grekov finds in the *Vita* of Theodosios of Kursk. The power of the "regional" *bojare* was based on landed property. The (*posly* of the treaties were envoys of the "great *bojare*", the territorial magnates, whose lands were cultivated by the *čel'ad'*, and who had military and civil servants. The stability of these classes is proved by finds of seals. The *bojare* were not necessarily members of the *družina*.

As early as the 10th century the Kiev kings, *kn'azi*, owned large territories, among other places, around Novgorod, and so did the regional *bojare* of this district, the difference being merely a quantitative one. The riches of the *kn'azi* and the *bojare* in the form of gold, silver and precious

fabrics were procured either as booty or in exchange for the yield of hunting and beekeeping on their lands. The basis of their wealth was land.

In the presentation of the Rus' society in the oldest written sources, Grekov sees the result of a long development of feudalism right from the 6th century, though he admits that he cannot make out all phases of this process. The development and growth of the manors brought about a sharp distinction between the privileged landowners and the members of the *obščina*, the organisation of the farming population. Moreover, the landowners confiscated communal lands and made the peasants bondmen, and the members of the *obščina* who were forced away from the communal lands were made dependent as well. Thus three agricultural groups arose: (1) peasants, who were members of the *obščina* and as yet independent of the landowners, (2) the bondmen on their copyhold farm, and (3) the landless labourers.

The *Pravda* of the Jaroslav sons shows the organisation of the Royal demesne from the 9th century. It is a typical feudal manor, surrounded by the *obščina*. The law is made to protect the manor, with its domestic animals and servants, against the common people of the village. The "full" *Pravda*, which Grekov does not date, extends the list of servants on the manors of the *kn'azi* and the *bojare* and divides them into two categories: (1) the servants, *otroki*, *tiuny*, and others, and (2) the producers, *r'adoviči*, *smerdy*, *cholopy* and *remeslenniki*.

The term *čel'ad'* was, in Grekov's opinion, a very elastic one. It comprised two main categories: the *cholopy*, who were slaves, and the *smerdy*, who were not slaves, thus standing for the bulk of the lower servants of the manor. In the *Pravda* of the Jaroslav sons the *r'adoviči* and the *smerdy* formed part of the *čel'ad'*. The *cholopy* were also called *raby*. Accordingly Rus' was a feudal society, not a society of slave-holders. True, the old patriarchal slavery continued to exist, but the slaves mentioned in the earliest sources were used for export rather than work. As a result of the rising of 1113 a number of restrictions on admittance to the *cholopstvo* were introduced in the full *Pravda*. Although the term *cholop* lived on, its meaning changed from slave to serf. The *r'adoviči* of the full *Pravda* were not *cholopy*, but formed part of the *čel'ad'*. They became *r'adoviči* by agreement—consequently there existed a feudal relation between land-owner and *r'adoviči*. The *zakupy* were originally *smerdy* who by agreement with the lord of the manor became dependent on him against a certain sum of money. By paying back this sum they could return to their former independent status. The *smerdy* were always peasants in possession of the means of production; when the *obščina* lands fell into the hands of the

landowners some of them were bondmen, while others were free and under the jurisdiction of the state. They paid tax and formed the bulk of the agricultural class. The free *smerdy* and the serf *smerdy* were the main productive forces of feudal Kiev Rus'.

II.

It is most surprising that two learned scholars can reach such widely different conclusions, the more so because their representations, in all essentials, are based upon the same written sources; it must be noted, however, that, in using later as well as foreign sources as evidence, Grekov proves a most daring scholar. One main reason for the divergencies is undoubtedly a difference of basic view and approach in the two scholars; another reason is to be found in the fact that neither of them has paid sufficient attention to the genesis of the sources, which has brought them into a misinterpretation of their contents as well as their chronological interrelation.

The principal sources are, firstly, the chronicles, the Nestor Chronicle, *Povest' vremennych let* (PVL) and the First Novgorod Chronicle, *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis'* (NPL); secondly, various editions of the temporal laws, Jaroslav's Pravda (P I), the Pravda of the Jaroslav sons (P II), the "abridged" Pravda (P III) and the full Pravda (P IV); thirdly, the Church laws, especially Jaroslav's Ustav, and finally the more or less correctly dated treaties of the period.

I shall attempt, in very brief outline, to classify the sources according to the answers to the following three questions: (1) when were they drafted (written or compiled)? (2) where in Rus'? and (3) by whom (what was the social and linguistic background)?

From a close study of the text of PVL³ and on the basis of several penetrating analyses of the problems concerning its genesis, combined with the theories of Šachmatov, Istrin, Stender-Petersen and Lichačëv,⁴ we get the following picture of the history of the chronicle. In all essentials it was drawn up (i.e. partly formulated on an older chronicle, possibly with additional compilations, and partly composed) in the famous Kiev Cave Monastery not later than 1113. It contains the following elements:

1. The ecclesiastical history of Rus' until the Praise of Jaroslav, drawn up in Kiev before or about 1050, in a pronounced clerical style.
2. The profane history of Rus' until 1050, written in the Cave Monastery between 1060 and 1106, and based upon oral tradition of the *družina*.
3. The annals proper from 1060 to 1110, written in the Cave Mon-

astery. The entries of each year are largely contemporary with the conditions and events mentioned.

4. The story of the blinding of Vasil'ko, probably written between 1112 and 1118, by an eye-witness, the ecclesiastical diplomatist Vasilij.

5. The accounts of the Cave Monastery, written in the pronounced clerical style between 1074 and 1107, by the chroniclers of the monastery, among them Nestor.

6. The cosmographic introduction written by Nestor shortly before 1113.

7. The *Poučenije* of Vladimir Monomach, written between 1117 and 1125, consisting of a profane and an ecclesiastical part.

8. The peace treaties with Byzantium, the problems of which will be treated under the account of the fourth group of sources.

The NPL as it has come down to us in the Synodal manuscript is far less complicated. Consistent with the results of Šachmatov, L'apunov, Lichačëv and Nasonov⁶—though there are points of disagreement as well—the following is the author's conception of it. It is a copy of a chronicle kept up by the clergy of the Jacob Church in Novgorod from about 1140. Two of the chroniclers are known to us; Herman Vojata, who died in 1188, and Timofej, who started in 1230. Its source was the official Vladika chronicle, compiled in the 1130s on the basis of the PVL and an older Novgorod chronicle. The text falls into two sections: the shorter part from the abrupt start in 1016 till about 1118 which to an extensive degree rests on sources from Kiev, and the later and more elaborate text which does not imply sources outside Novgorod except in the account of the conquest of Constantinople in 1104. The entries of each year are mostly contemporary, and first and foremost they deal with conditions and events in Novgorod. The documentary and matter-of-fact quality characteristic of the Novgorod chronicle contrasts remarkably with the literary style of the PVL.

As far as the date and character of the profane laws are concerned, the author subscribes in all essentials to Tichomirov's theory.⁷ The codification of P I took place in Novgorod about 1016. It seems reasonable to consider the first 10 paragraphs a codification of an older customary law. If, however, we are to regard them as part of a customary law for the whole realm, we must consider the second parts of the 1st and the 9th paragraphs, and the 10th paragraph, to be Novgorodian additions, as the terms *rusin*, *slovenin*, *var'ag* and *kolb'ag* were hardly current terms in Kiev—compare Nestor's difficulty in defining them in the cosmographic introduction. The original P II was formed not later than 1072; the section from paragraph 27, *pokon virnyj* and *ustav mostnikom*, being later

additions. In accordance with Kl'učevskij's account of the current monetary system, we believe the P III to belong to the period about 1150, and finally we confine the P IV to Novgorod shortly after 1209.

Kl'učevskij rightly considers Jaroslav's *Ustav* contemporary with P I; the model is undoubtedly a Bulgarian translation of Byzantine law.

On our general theory of the genesis of the PVL and supported by Istrin's studies⁸ we believe the treaties with Byzantium, T912, T945, T972, to be translations by the group of learned translators at the court of Jaroslav in the 1130s. Probably they formed part of the oldest version of the chronicle; T907 is mainly composed of fragments of T912.

It should be noted that many of the suggested dates and places of composition are hypothetical, inasmuch as conclusive proof cannot be had. The author has attempted to procure an applicable basis, a connected working hypothesis which is at any rate exempt from internal contradictions; in cases of doubt as to the date of composition we have chosen the latest probability.

III.

Even from the brief accounts of the conceptions of Kl'učevskij and Grekov it is evident that a true understanding of the meanings of the social terms is an essential prerequisite for a correct interpretation of the sources. By social terminology we understand the stock of social, political, and occupational terms of groups or individuals.⁹

In texts, fragments or groups of texts of the kind treated above, we may expect the stock of terms in each text, fragment or group of texts to form a unity characteristic of the time and place as well as of the social and linguistic background. Consequently, in order to find out what information a text gives of the meaning of its terms one should first of all regard each term as part of a system, a unity. Secondly, one should endeavour to disregard any previous knowledge of its meaning, whether it is an everyday word or one stemming from the presentation of other scholars, i.e., the meaning of the terms must be specified according to the context in which we meet it. It stands to reason that in texts spanning almost four centuries we expect a quantitative development of the terminology, an increase of the number of terms running parallel to the development of the society from a primitive to a more complex one, as well as a qualitative development, a change of meaning within each term.

Whereas there is a general acceptance among scholars that a knowledge of the time and place of the genesis of our texts is a necessary prerequisite

for the analysis of the terms, the demand for knowledge of the social and linguistic background may require a comment.

An examination of the language of the treaties with Byzantium by Istrin proved the language to be Russian, i.e. the literary language of that time, Church Slavonic, based upon Bulgarian with traits of Russian. In the rest of the PVL the Russian features are more pronounced than in all other sources.¹⁰ It should be noted that they are by no means equally marked in all parts of the chronicle. Lichačev in his survey of literature translated from Greek and Bulgarian finds this literature to be closely connected with the Church but detached from reality and nationality.¹¹ To this we may add that this detachment must naturally be reflected in the social terminology.

A terminological analysis of the first two main parts of the PVL, the Russian ecclesiastical history (K) and the profane history of Rus' (V) till 1050 proves the justice of an inquiry into the nature of the language of the different texts because it informs us of the varying degree of influence from "classical" (i.e. Bulgarian) Church Slavonic and from Russian Church Slavonic.

K contains 25 social terms, V has 29. Only 11 of these are found in both texts: *bojare*, *čad'*, *družina*, *ludi*, *muž*, *naročityj*, *otrok*, *rab*, *raba/roba*, *starejšina* and *var'ag*. A comparison between these and the vocabulary of the "classical" Old Church Slavonic texts, mainly Gospels,¹² will show that 21 out of the 25 terms in K and 16 out of the 29 terms in V occur in "classical" Old Church Slavonic. Only 4 terms in K are not found in the "classical" texts: *master*, *pisec*, *povar* and *var'ag*, of which *pisec* and *povar* are terms for clerical occupations. Among the "non-classical" terms in V we find such characteristically Russian terms as *birič*, *detskij*, *grid'*, *kon'uch*, *posadnik* and *starosta*. To this must be added that several terms common to the texts have a double meaning, firstly a general one (*muž*=man, husband; *otrok*=boy; *ludi*=people) and secondly, a specifically social one (*muž*=a royal *muž*; *otrok*=a younger member of the *družina*; *ludi*=the citizens). In K these terms mostly have their general, in V their specifically social meaning.

Similar comparisons at other stages of the historical development between the social terms of clerical and lay texts that are fairly contemporary lead to similar results: the clerical terminology is erudite, general and international, whereas the lay terminology is concrete and Russian. Or to put it differently, the terms of the clerical terminology, being dependent on "classical" Old Church Slavonic, refer to social groups in, for example, Babylon, Egypt, Palestine, Byzantium and in Rus'; they form an artificial, partially closed system, into which the clerical writer tries to fit the actual

social groups of Rus'. The terms of the lay terminology are realistic and identical with the everyday usage of that time, and they refer to actual social groups, including economic and legal categories.

IV.

It appears from the preceding considerations of the social terminology of the chief sources that tenable conclusions based upon the clerical sources must be drawn with extreme care, and, moreover, that we should not mix the terminology of the clerical sources with that of the lay sources. This is not the place for a critical valuation of all Grekov's and Kl'učevskij's more or less injudicious conclusions. It should, however, be pointed out that the appearance in the treaties of terms such as *velikij kn'az'*, *kn'azi*, and *bojare*, forms no sufficient basis for safe conclusions. It is a well-known fact that the term *velikij kn'az'* is no more than a manifestation of Byzantine diplomatic civility and we cannot be so sure that this is not the case with *kn'azi* and *bojare*, and no certain knowledge of the meaning of these terms is provided by the treaties. There is every reason to doubt that before the middle of the 12th century *bojare* was used in secular Russian as a term denoting a well-defined social group, the privileged territorial magnates. This term is not used in legal language before P III (about 1150) and P IV (after 1209).

Moreover, when concluding from Jaroslav's Ustav that there are three categories of *bojare* in Rus' at the time of Jaroslav, Grekov is evidently on ice, as the three categories mentioned in the Church law clearly refer to Bulgarian social categories.¹³

It is only natural that one should be cautious in concluding too much from a statistical survey of the development of the stock of terms of the period in question, if only for the reason that several sources representative of essential phases of the development must be considered to be lost. Nevertheless it may be of some interest. If we consider the stock of terms of the Pravda it appears that before the codification in 1016 two terms for social categories were sufficient, *muž* and *čel'ad'*, i.e. free and unfree. The number of new terms in paragraph 1 is no more than an enumeration of the different (Novgorod) groups within the category of *muži*. Before the codification of P II about 1072 this number of 10 or 12 terms has been increased by *cholop* and *gospodin*. In P II the number of terms amounts to 26 and almost all of the 13 additional terms refer to members of the Royal household, from high officials to unfree servants. When we get to P IV the number of terms is about 60, the majority of new terms referring partly to officials of kings and lords and partly to the various

unfree groups, *tiuny*, *r'adoviči*, *cholopy* and *zakupy*. P III has a smaller stock of terms, only 18, the subgroups of free as well as unfree categories being absent. It is therefore probable that it presents a stage in the social development lower than those of Kiev and Novgorod, which renders plausible the theory presented by Tichomirov that it is from Perm'.

A comparison of the terms of P IV and those of NPL (1118–1240) shows that the chroniclers in their description of conditions and events in Novgorod have had to use almost as many terms as we find in P IV, a little above 50. Twenty-one of these are found in the P IV; of the remainder 8 denote different groups of *muži*, 2 special groups of *ludi*, 8 different crafts, and the rest various civil and military officials; the terms for unfree groups are few (and apparently spacious as well).

Besides the terms for the upper classes, the servants of the kings and the lords, and dependent labour, practically all secular sources contain terms referring to the ordinary free commoners, *ludi*, in the towns as well as in the country.

There is hardly any doubt that the considerable increase of terms from about 1000 to shortly after 1200 reflects an enormous development of Russian society towards higher and more complex forms. The question is then, whether we can point to a period in which the increase is more outstanding, as a result of rather speedy changes in the social and economic life. Apparently we have such a period between 1060 and 1120, in Kiev at any rate. We have already mentioned the increase of terms in P II for groups within the Royal household; it is supplemented by several terms from Monomach's Poučenije. At the same time, in the annals as well as in the story of the blinding of Vasil'ko, a marked differentiation of the groups that form constituent parts of the *družina* of the king or lord takes place, and it seems that a division into two main categories is at hand, an official nobility connected with the court, the administration and the political government, and a landowning nobility. The latter grew out of the older *družina*, the members of which were landowners who, however, were closely connected with the king, and like him relied upon their share of booty and taxation, as well as the Dnepr trade. The picture of the royal *družina* is, as far as division into classes is concerned, strongly reminiscent of the one we get a hundred years later of the Royal Norwegian household from the Norwegian *hirdskrå*.¹⁴

It is a well-known fact that the period between 1060 and 1120 shows many instances of popular revolts: the revolts of the citizens of Kiev in 1068 and 1113, and peasant risings up and down the country. A proof of the increasing pressure of the upper classes on the free commoners is to be found in Monomach's legislation against usury and in his Poučenije.

In this period there were decisive changes in the foreign relations as well. The decay of Byzantium as a trading centre probably had an influence on the Dnepr trade, before the people from the steppes definitively cut off the rich Dnepr trade route in 1068. As far as we can gather from finds of coins, the eastward trade stopped shortly after 1000. The fatiguing fights with the people from the steppes, together with internal conflicts among the Russian kings, disposed of any possible chance of profitable warfare on their neighbours.

On the basis of the above-mentioned main sources, on our observations on the development of the social terminology, and on reliable investigations into the occupational development in Rus',¹⁵ we shall venture to postulate the following thesis:

1. Until the middle of the 11th century agriculture and foreign trade had a preponderant influence on the wealth in Rus' and through that on the income of the upper classes, including the kings. Moreover, kings, as well as members of the *družina*, supplied their income by warfare against their neighbours. Trade was fairly well developed in towns.

2. The breaking-off of the trade routes eastward and southward combined with the decay of military power of the country deprived the kings and the upper classes of important sources of income.

3. As a result of this the kings and the territorial magnates entered on a heightened economic exploitation of the free population in town and country which accelerated the development of feudalism between 1060 and 1120.

The author has expressed his approval as well as his doubts concerning the results of Kl'učevskij and Grekov. Each scholar has pointed out one essential aspect, but at the same time they have neglected another. As matters stand, the author is forced to disagree with both and steer a middle course along the lines suggested in this report. It is hoped that it will lead to a more complex picture of the development of the social structure of medieval Russia.

NOTES

1. V. O. Kl'učevskij, *Kurs russkoj istoriji, čast' 1*, in *Socienija Tom I*, Moscow 1956.
2. B. D. Grekov, *Kijevskaja Rus'*, Moscow 1949.
3. *Povest' vremennych let I-II*, Moscow-Leningrad 1950.
4. A. A. Šachmatov, *Razyskanija*, St. Petersburg 1908; *Povest' vremennych let*, St. Petersburg 1910; *Povest' vremennych let*, Petrograd 1916; V. M. Istrin, *Zamečanija o načale russkogo letopisanija*, Izvestija ORJAS 1921, 1922; Ad. Stender-Petersen, *Die Varägersage als Quelle der altrussischen Chronik*, Acta Jutlandica 1934; D. S. Lichačev, *Russkije letopisi*, Moscow-Leningrad 1947.
5. *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis'* (ed. A. N. Nasonov), Moscow-Leningrad 1950.
6. *Razyskanija*; B. M. L'apunov, *Izследovaniye o jazyke sinodal'nogo spiska I-oj nougorodskoj letopisi*, St. Petersburg 1899; *Russkije letopisi*.

7. M. N. Tichomirov, *Posobije d'la izučenija Russkoj Pravdy*, Moscow 1953; further *Pravda Russkaja I-II*, Moscow-Leningrad 1940-1947.

8. V. M. Istrin, *Dogovory russkich s grekami*, Izvestija ORJAS 1924.

9. See the author's article *Zur Erforschung der sozialen Terminologie in Texten des russischen Mittelalters*, Scando-Slavica, 1958.

10. *Dogovory*.

11. *Voznikneniye russkoj literatury*, Moscow-Leningrad 1952.

12. L. Sadnik und R. Aitzetmüller, *Handwörterbuch zu den altkirchen Slavischen Texten*, Heidelberg 1955.

13. N. S. Deržavin, *Istorija Bolgariji*, II, Moscow-Leningrad 1946.

14. P. A. Munck, *Samlede Afhandlinger*, III, Christiania 1875; *Det norske Folks Historie*, IV, Christiania 1858; *Norges gamle Love indtil 1387*, II, Christiania 1848; R. Keyser, *Norges Stats- og Retsforfatning i Middelalderen*, Christiania 1867; Th. Aschehoug, *Statsforfatningen i Norge og Danmark indtil 1814*, Christiania 1866.

15. As, for instance, B. A. Rybakov, *Remeslo drevnej Rusi*, Moscow 1948; P. N. Tret'jakov, *Sel'skoje choz'ajstvo i promysly*, in *Istorija kul'tury drevnej Rusi*, I, Moscow-Leningrad 1951; A. L. Mongajt, *Staraja R'azan'*, Moscow 1955.