“a very kingdom of churches and monasteries” (66), was nevertheless the site of some of the bitterest tensions between clergy and crown.

The second volume contains editions of selected documents (marked with an asterisk next to their précis in the first volume) and a scholarly apparatus. The work that Linehan has done in editing these texts in addition to completing the survey is unparalleled, and will be happily welcomed by those unable to retrace his steps in the archives. To give one example of the kind of promising material available here, Linehan gives side-by-side editions of two variant versions of document 422a, which documented the evidence given by various witnesses to the conflict between the church of Coimbra and the monastery of Santa Cruz de Coimbra in 1253. Once again, Linehan’s footnotes identify peculiarities, deletions, erasures, variations, and other features of the manuscripts, although prior knowledge of the form and formulas of papal documents and of the places and people in question will be necessary in making full use of this resource. Occasional color plates in both volumes (for example, the image of No. 1144 in Vol. II, p. 484) give the researcher a sense of the appearance of these documents.

Within the apparatus Linehan gives first, a list of papal chancery scribes appearing in the Portuguese documents, organized alphabetically by name; second, chronological lists of taxatores and distributores, papal secretaries (from 1350–1413), and other chancery marks, accompanied by fifty-five figures with a list of documents on which they appear; third, an alphabetical list of procurators (procuratores) including references to documents, dates, and the name of the person or institution on whose behalf they were acting; and finally, an index of incipits and a general index. These inclusions are analogous to those created for the volumes of the Index and other contributions to Bartoloni’s censimento, and accordingly Linehan provides cross-references to the twenty-two apparatus previously published. This erudite effort will make it simple for those searching for prosopographical information on those associated with the papal court, particularly the procurors, responsible for shepherding clients’ cases through the complex papal bureaucracy, and briefly discussed by Linehan (53–61) to track individuals across national boundaries, and will also aid those researching the operation of the curia itself. In short, these volumes are a formidable addition to Linehan’s already extensive work, which has highlighted the importance of the late medieval religious history of the Iberian peninsula. As a tool for the serious researcher, this survey clearly and accurately lays the track towards creating new histories that give the litigious but devout Portuguese church its due.

KATE CRAIG, History, UCLA


Christian Raffensperger opens his study—to a somewhat disarming effect—with an admission about the virtual impossibility of making any firm claims about the history of Kievan Rus’. Indeed, the problem of sources available for this period, of their paucity and questionable origins, could render any study of early medieval Rus’ problematic. To Raffensperger’s credit, having made his
disclaimer, he proceeds to make an argument that is as substantiated—given the available evidence—and persuasive, as it is ambitious. This study attempts to do exactly as its title claims, namely to reimagine medieval Europe by including Kievan Rus’ as its easternmost part, “the last Christian kingdom before the pagan steppe tribes and Muslims on the Volga and in Central Asia” (188). Revising Dimitri Obolensky’s classic *The Byzantine Commonwealth*, Raffensperger traces important “connections in a few key areas, specifically dynastic marriages and religious and trade connections, to show the engagement of Rus’ with Europe” (3). This thesis challenges the understanding of Rus’ (and of Russia in the centuries to come) as a principality on the margins, both geographically and in terms of its importance to the development of the rest of Europe. Moreover, Raffensperger devotes his first chapter to demonstrating that Byzantine culture and the political weight of the Roman Empire exerted their influence throughout Europe and therefore one must rethink the very idea of the “Byzantine commonwealth,” perhaps even expand its borders to include all of Christendom (to say nothing of the impression the Byzantine Empire left upon the early Islamic Caliphate).

The book is organized around the three sub-arguments that support Raffensperger’s thesis: prevalence of dynastic marriages between Rus’ and European nobility (chapters 2 and 3), trade connections between Rus’ and Europe (chapter 4), and, finally, the formation of Rusian semi-independent micro-Christendom that cultivated relationships with both the Byzantine Empire and Latin Christendom (chapter 5). Working with a relatively thin source-base pertaining to Rus’ itself, Raffensperger draws masterful analogies and provides examples from contemporary texts to support his point. His analysis of primary sources written about Rus’ is particularly impressive, as it demonstrates that the Kievan principality and Kiev itself were viewed by European merchants and chroniclers as part of the European realm and even as a gateway to more exotic lands to the east.

Two chapters on dynastic marriages stem from a peculiar fact that forty out of fifty-two known dynastic marriages joined Rus’ to the royal houses of Europe (112). After contextualizing the practice of dynastic marriages during the period, Raffensperger proceeds to demonstrate that these were not merely a way to avoid the prohibition on consanguineous unions, but rather means to important political ends. Dynastic marriages between Rus’ and Europe were ways to resolve conflicts, create a long-distance alliances, or even support an exiled ruler with a view to his eventual return to power (this strategy, for example, underpinned the marriages of the daughters of Prince Iaroslav the Wise to Harald Hardrada and Andrew of Hungary). No less interesting, although perhaps somewhat speculative, is Raffensperger’s discussion of the fact that Rusian princesses influenced European naming practices—the best known example being the introduction of the name Phillip into the Capetian family tree—which may suggest that they possessed certain agency, perhaps as “virtual embassies” (83) of Rus’ at foreign courts, although there is too little evidence to argue anything beyond that.

Chapter 4 is devoted to east-west trading connections between Rus’ and the rest of Europe. This chapter is the shortest, but it provides a fascinating glimpse of the diversity of economic ties that focused on Kievan Rus’. As
Raffensperger points out, in addition to a well-discussed north-south trade routes through the Dnieper and the Volga river systems, Russian traders were plugged into the European trading networks via Poland and Bohemia, as well as the Baltic. European merchants, on the other hand, viewed Rus’ as a gateway into the trans-Eurasian trade routes to the east, the Silk Road in particular.

The final chapter, “The Micro-Christendom of Rus’,” draws heavily—as it is clear from its title—on Peter Brown’s theory of micro-Christendoms, or Christian states that, before the papal reform in the High Middle Ages, remained semi-independent and confident that their form of Christianity was the most sacred. In accordance with Brown’s theory, after the initial conversion through their ties to Constantinople (and Prince Vladimir’s marriage to Byzantine Princess Anna), Russian elites attempted to create a self-contained Christendom in miniature, complete with a “locus of worship inside Rus’” (183) that mirrored Constantinople’s important sites (such as the Golden Gate and Hagia Sophia) and even cultivated local metropolitans in order to weaken—as Raffensperger interprets it—the reliance on Constantinople. Even generations prior to the mass conversion of 988, when Vladimir’s grandmother, Ol’ga, was baptized in Constantinople by the emperor himself, she followed this unambiguously pro-Byzantine act by offering German emperor Otto I to send his own mission to Kiev. Moreover, by adopting Slavonic liturgy from Bulgaria, Kievan rulers were presumably following Bulgaria’s own path towards the formation of a micro-Christendom, linked to, but not controlled by Constantinople.

This review cannot fully do justice to the wealth of material contained in the book. Raffensperger’s impressive command of secondary works in Russian as well as a number of other languages is rivaled by an equally diverse selection of primary sources. The scholar is particularly apt at contextualizing his evidence in a larger picture of European history and thus provides an excellent volume for any scholars of medieval Europe who seek to broaden their horizons and to avoid the anachronistic Cold-War-era partition of Europe, the remnants of which can be found in historiography to this day. On the other hand, the book will be of interest to the scholars of medieval Rus’ and Byzantium, especially where it pertains to the cultural and political impact the latter had on the rest of Europe. The example of Rus’ convincingly demonstrates that a reimagining of what constituted Europe during this time is both possible and necessary.

EUGENE SMELYANSKY, History, UC Irvine


Translation studies encourages dynamic modes of intellectual engagement and critical self-reflection, not only within medieval studies and contemporary theory, but also within ongoing discourses of nationalism, postcolonialism, and global ethics. As critics such as Lawrence Venuti have argued, the act of translation reveals and encodes linguistic, cultural, and racialized hierarchies and power structures. In recent years translation studies has aspired to unsettle and interrogate such power structures in addition to exposing them; as the essays Emma Campbell and Robert Mills have collected demonstrate, medieval