

perverted the church, which was also accused by the people of having introduced "Polish luxury," "Polish creed," and the tendencies towards supremacy of the Polish clergy. The patriarch Nikon was a perfect representative of these tendencies. Opposition resulted, and the revision of the sacred books, which was undertaken by Nikon, gave the opposition acute character. The *Raskol* (lit. "splitting" or "schism") made its appearance, and gathered under its banner, not only those who accused Nikon of "Polish" and "Latin" tendencies, but also all those who were for the old customs, for federative and communist principles of social organization, and who revolted against serfdom, centralization, and the suppression of municipal life. A series of insurrections broke out under the banner of the "eight-ends" cross of the *Raskolniks*. Barbarous persecutions by Alexis, Peter I., and their followers did not kill out an opposition which inspired with fanatical enthusiasm the best elements among the Great Russians, and induced its supporters to submit to the fire by thousands at a time, while others rather than submit went to colonize the forests of the Arctic littoral, or betook themselves to Siberia. Profound modifications have taken place in Russian nonconformity since its first appearance. It would be impossible to enumerate them all here, but the following points of primary importance must be mentioned. (1) The mere protest against Nikon's "innovations" (*novshchestva*) led, in the course of two centuries, to a mere servile adherence to the letter of the vernacular Scriptures—even to obvious errors of earlier translators—and to interminable discussions about minor points of ritual and about unintelligible words. (2) Another current which now pervades the whole of Russian nonconformity is that proceeding from rationalist sects which had already spread in north-west Russia in the 16th century, and even in the 14th. These have given rise to several sects which deny the divinity of Christ or explain away various dogmas and prescriptions of orthodoxy. (3) Protestantism, with its more or less rationalistic tendencies, has made itself increasingly felt, especially during the present century and in southern Russia. (4) Hostile critics of the Government, and especially of the autocracy, with its army of officials and its system of conscriptions, passports, and various restrictions on religious liberty, are found more or less in all the nonconforming bodies, which see in these manifestations of authority the appearance of the Antichrist. Several of them refuse accordingly to have any dealings whatever with the official world. (5) Another tendency pervading the whole of Russian nonconformity is that which seeks a return to what are supposed to have been the old communist principles of Christianity in its earlier days. All new sects start with applying these principles to practical life; but in the course of their development they modify them more or less, though always maintaining the principle at least of mutual help. (6) Finally, all sects deal more or less with the question of marriage and the position of woman. A few of them solve it by encouraging, at least during their "love-feasts"—absolutely free relations between all "brethren and sisters," while others only admit the dissolubility of marriage or prohibit it altogether. On the whole, leaving the extreme views out of account, the position of woman is undoubtedly higher among the dissenters than among the Orthodox.

These various currents, combining with and counteracting one another in the most complicated ways, have played and continue to play a most important part in Russian history. The mutual assistance found in dissenting sects has preserved many millions of peasants from falling into abject misery, the nonconformists enjoying, as a rule, a greater degree of prosperity than their Orthodox neighbours. The leading feature of Russian history, the spread of the Great Russians over the immense territory they now occupy, cannot be rightly understood without taking into account the colonization of the most inaccessible wildernesses by *Raskolniks*, and the organization of this by their communities, who send delegates for the choice of land and sometimes clear it in common by the united labours of all the young men and cattle of the community. On the other hand, the nonconforming sects, while helping to preserve several advantageous features of Russian life, have had a powerful influence in maintaining, especially among the "Starobrodskys," the old system of the Moscovite family, subject to the despotic yoke of its chief, and hermetically sealed against instruction.

It is worthy of notice that since the emancipation of the serfs nonconformity has again made a sudden advance, the more radical sects preponderating over the scholastic ones, and the influence of Protestantism being increasingly felt. Nonconformity, which formerly had no hold upon Little Russia (though it had penetrated among Protestant Estonians and Letts, and even among Moslem Tartars), has suddenly begun to make progress there in the shape of the "Stunda," a mixture of Protestant and rationalistic teaching, with tendencies towards a social but rarely socialistic reformation.

The Russian dissenting sects may be subdivided into (1) the "Popovtsy" (who have priests), (2) the "Bezpopovtsy" (who have none), and (3) numerous spiritualist sects, "Dukhovnyie Khristiane." The Popovtsy (5 to 6 millions) are again subdivided into

two classes,—those who recognize the Austrian hierarchy, and those who have only Orthodox "runaway priests" ("Byeglopovtsy"). The latter have recently received unexpected help in the accession of three Orthodox priests of great learning and energy. Moreover, there are among the Popovtsy about a million of "Edinovyersty," who have received Orthodox priests on the condition of their keeping to the unrevised books. They are patronized by Government.

The Bezpopovtsy embody three large sects—the Pomory, Fedoseevtsy, and Filipovtsy—and a variety of minor ones. They recognize no priests, and repudiate the Orthodox ritual and the sacraments. They avoid all contact with the state, and do not allow prayer for the czar, who is regarded as the Antichrist. They may number about 5,000,000 in west, north, and north-east Russia, and represent, on the whole, an intellectually developed and wealthy population. Of the very numerous smaller sects of Bezpopovtsy, the "Strauniki" (Errants) are worthy of notice. They prefer to lead the life of hunted outcasts rather than hold any relation with the state.

The spiritualists, very numerous in central and southern Russia, are subdivided into a great variety of schools. The "Khlsty," who have their "love-feasts," their "Virgins," sometimes flagellation, and so on, represent a numerous and strong organization in central Russia. The "Skoptsy" ("Men of God," "Castrati") occur everywhere, even among the Finns, but chiefly in Orel and Kursk, and in towns as money-brokers. The "Dukhobortsy" communities (warriors of the Spirit), chiefly found in the south-east, are renowned as colonizers. They are spreading rapidly in Caucasia and Siberia. The "Molokany" (a kind of Baptists), numbering perhaps about one million, are spread also in the south-east, and are excellent gardeners and tradesmen. Both are quite open to instruction, and have come under the influence of Protestantism, like the "Stunda" in Little Russia and Bessarabia. The "Sabbathers" and the "Skakuny" (a kind of Shakers) are also worthy of notice; while a great variety of new sects, such as the "Nemolyaki" ("who do not pray"), the "Vozdykhateli" ("who sigh"), the "Neplatelshchiki" ("who do not pay taxes"), the "Ne-Nashi" ("the Not-outs"), and so on, spring up every year.

The aggregate number of *Raskolniks* is officially stated at nearly one million, but this is quite misleading. The ministry of interior estimated them at 9,000,000 in 1850 and 9,500,000 in 1859. In reality the number is still higher. In Perm alone they were recently computed at a million, and there would be no exaggeration in estimating them at a total of from twelve to fifteen millions.¹

The old subdivisions of the population into orders possessed of Class unequal rights is still maintained. The great mass of the people, division 81.6 per cent., belong to the peasant order, the others being—nobility, 1.3 per cent.; clergy, 0.9; the "meschane" or burghers and merchants, 9.3; military, 6.1; foreigners, 0.2; unclassified, 0.5. Thus more than 63 millions of the Russians are peasants. Half of them were formerly serfs (10,447,149 males in 1858), the remainder being "state peasants" (9,194,891 males in 1858, exclusive of the Archangel government) and "domain peasants" (842,740 males the same year).

The serfdom which had sprung up in Russia in the 16th century, and became consecrated by law in 1609, taking, however, nearly one hundred and fifty years to attain its full growth and assume the forms under which it appeared in the present century, was abolished by law in 1861. This law liberated the serfs from a yoke which was really terrible, even under the best landlords; and from this point of view it was obviously an immense benefit, the results of which are apparent now. But it was far from securing corresponding economic results. Along with the enrichment of the few, a general impoverishment of the great mass followed, and took proportions so alarming as to arouse public attention and to result in a great number of serious investigations conducted by the state, the provincial assemblies, scientific societies, and private statisticians. The general results of these inquiries may be summed up in the subjoined statement.

The former "dvorovyye," attached to the personal service of their masters, were merely set free; and they entirely went to reinforce the town proletariat. The peasants proper received their houses and orchards, and also allotments of arable land. These allotments were given over to the rural commune (*mir*), which was made responsible, as a whole, for the payment of taxes for the allotments. The size of the allotments was determined by a maximum and by a minimum, which last, however, could be still further reduced if the amount of land remaining in the landlord's hands was less than one half of what was allotted to the peasants. For these allotments the peasants had to pay, as before, either by personal labour (twenty to forty men's days and fifteen to thirty women's days per year), or by a fixed rent ("obrok"), which varied from 8 to 12 roubles per allotment. As long as these relations subsisted, the peasants were considered as "temporarily obliged" (*vremennno obyazannyye*). On January 1, 1882, they still numbered

¹ See Schapoff on Russian *Raskol*; *Sbornik of State Regulations against the Raskolniks*; and very many papers printed in reviews, chiefly in *Otech. Zapiski*, *Dyelo*, *Vyestnik Evrope*, &c., by Schapoff, Yuzoff, Prugavin, Rozoff, &c.

1,422,012 males; but this category is now disappearing in consequence of a recent law (December 28, 1881).

The allotments could be redeemed by the peasants with the help of the crown, and then the peasants were freed from all obligations to the landlord. The crown paid the landlord in obligations representing the capitalized "obrok," and the peasants had to pay the crown, for forty-nine years, 6 per cent. interest on this capital, that is, 9 to 12 roubles per allotment. If the redemption was made without the consent of the peasants—on a mere demand of the landlord, or in consequence of his being in arrear for the payment of his debts to the nobility hypothec bank—the value of the redemption was reduced by one-fifth. The redemption was not calculated on the value of the allotments, but was considered as a compensation for the loss of the compulsory labour of the serfs; so that throughout Russia, with the exception of a few provinces in the south-east, it was—and still remains notwithstanding a very great increase of the value of land—much higher than the market value of the allotment. Moreover, taking advantage of the maximum law, many proprietors cut away large parts of the allotments the peasants possessed under serfdom, and precisely the parts the peasants were most in need of, namely, pasture lands around their houses, and forests. On the whole, the tendency was to give the allotments so as to deprive the peasants of grazing land and thus to compel them to rent pasture lands from the landlord at any price.

The present condition of the peasants—according to official documents—appears to be as follows. In the twelve central governments the peasants, on the average, have their own rye-bread for only 200 days per year,—often for only 180 and 100 days. One quarter of them have received allotments of only 2.9 acres per male, and one half less than 8.5 to 11.4 acres,—the normal size of the allotment necessary to the subsistence of a family under the three-fields system being estimated at 28 to 42 acres. Land must be thus rented from the landlords at fabulous prices. Cattle-breeding is diminishing to an alarming degree. The average redemption is 8.56 roubles (about 17s.) for such allotments, and the smaller the allotment the heavier the payment, its first "dessiatina" (2.36 acres) costing twice as much as the second, and four times as much as the third. In all these governments, the state commission testifies, there are whole districts where one-third of the peasants have received allotments of only 2.9 to 5.8 acres. The aggregate value of the redemption and land-taxes often reaches from 185 to 275 per cent. of the normal rental value of the allotments, not to speak of taxes for recruiting purposes, the church, roads, local administration, and so on, chiefly levied from peasants. The arrears increase every year; one-fifth of the inhabitants have left their houses; cattle are disappearing. Every year more than half the adult males (in some districts three-fourths of the men and one-third of the women) leave their homes and wander throughout Russia in search of labour. The state peasants are only a little better off.

Such is the state of affairs in central Russia, and it would be useless to multiply figures, repeating nearly the same details. In the eight governments of the black-earth region the state of matters is hardly better. Many peasants took the "gratuitous allotments," whose amount was about one-eighth of the normal ones.

The average allotment in Kherson is now only 0.90 acre, and for allotments from 2.9 to 5.8 acres they pay from 5 to 10 roubles of redemption tax. The state peasants are better off, but still they are emigrating in masses. It is only in the Steppe governments that the situation is more hopeful. In Little Russia, where the allotments were personal (the *mir* existing only among state peasants), the state of affairs does not differ for the better on account of the high redemption taxes. In the western provinces, where the land was valued cheaper and the allotments somewhat increased after the Polish insurrection, the general situation might be better were it not for the former misery of peasants. Finally, in the Baltic provinces nearly all the land belongs to German landlords, who either carry on agriculture themselves, with hired labourers, or rent their land as small farms. Only one-fourth of the peasants are farmers, the remainder being mere labourers, who are emigrating in great numbers.

The situation of the former serf-proprietors is also unsatisfactory. Accustomed to the use of compulsory labour, they have failed to accommodate themselves to the new conditions. The 700,000,000 roubles of redemption money received from the crown down to 1877 by 71,000 landed proprietors in Russia have been spent without accomplishing any agricultural improvement. The forests have been sold, and only those landlords are prospering who exact rack-rents for the land without which the peasants could not live upon their allotments.

As showing a better aspect of the situation it must be added that in eighty-five districts of Russia the peasants have bought 5,349,000 acres of land since 1861. But these are mostly village-traders and grain-lenders (*kulaks*). A real exception can be made only for Tver, where 53,474 householders united in communities have bought 633,240 acres of land. There has been an increase of

wealth among the few, but along with this a general impoverishment of the mass of the people.¹

The ancient Scandinavians described Russia as *Gardariki*,—the The country of towns,—and until now Great Russia has maintained village this character. The dwellings of the peasantry are not scattered over the face of the country, but aggregated in villages, where they are built in a street or streets. This grouping in villages has its origin in the bonds which unite the peasants in the village community—the *mir*, or the *obshchina*.

When Haxthausen first described the Great Russian *mir*, it was considered a peculiarity of the Slavonian race,—a view which is no longer tenable. The *mir* is the Great Russian equivalent for the German, Dutch, and Swiss "mark" or "allmend," the English "township," the French "commune," the Polish "gmina," the South Slavonian "zadruga," the Finnish "pittäjä," &c.; and it very nearly approaches, though differing from them in some essential features, the forms of possession of land prevailing among the Moslem Turco-Tartars, while the same principle is found even among the Mongol Buriat shepherds and the Tungus hunters.

The following are the leading features of the organization of the *mir* among the Great Russians.

The whole of the land occupied by a village—whether be the landlord recognized by law—the state, a private person, or a juridical unity, such as the *voisko* of the Cossacks—is considered as belonging to the village community as a whole, the separate members of the community having only the right of temporary possession of such part of the common property as will be allowed to them by the *mir* in proportion to their working power. To this right corresponds the obligation of bearing an adequate part of the charges which may fall upon the community. If any produce results from the common work of the community, each member has a right to an equal part of it.

According to these general principles, the arable land is divided into as many lots as there are working units in the community, and each family receives as many lots as it has working units. The unit is usually one male adult; but, when the working power of a large family is increased by its containing a number of adult women, or boys approaching adult age, this circumstance is taken into account, as well as the diminution from any cause of working power in other households.

For dividing the arable land into lots, the whole is parted first into three "fields," according to the three-field rotation of crops. As each field, however, contains land of various qualities, it is in its turn subdivided into, say, three parts—of good, average, and poor quality; and each of these parts is subdivided into as many lots as there are working units. Each household receives its lots in each of the subdivisions of the "field," a carefully minute equalization as to the minor differences between the lots being aimed at; and the partition is nearly always made so as to permit each householder to reach his allotment without passing through that of another.

To facilitate this division, the community divides, first, into smaller groups (*tyt, zherbyevka*, a "ten," an "eight," &c.), each of which is composed, by free selection, of a number of householders—the community only taking care that each shall not be composed of rich, of poor, or of "turbulents" exclusively. The division of the land is first made among such groups, and the subdivision goes on within these. The division into groups facilitates also the distribution of such work as the community may have to accomplish—as when a bridge or a dike has to be repaired, or a meadow mowed—and the work cannot be done by the community as a whole.

As sickness, death, removal, and other incidents bring about changes in the distribution of working power among the different households, or when the number of working units in the community has increased or decreased, a redistribution of land (*peredel*) follows. Whether the land be a burden (the taxes exceeding its rental value) or a benefit, its division is received by the households whose working power has increased or decreased; additional lots, and *vice versa*. The *peredel* may be "partial" or "general." In most cases a mere equalization of lots among several families will serve, and a general redistribution is resorted to only when greater inequalities have arisen. On the whole, these redistributions are rare, and the precariousness of land-holding which has been supposed to be a consequence of the *mir* proves to have been exaggerated. More detailed inquiries have

¹ See Tanson's *Researches on Allotments and Payments* (2d ed., 1881) and *Comparative Statistics of Russia* (vol. II.); *Statistics of Landed Property*, published by Central Statistical Committee; works of the Committee on Taxation, and those of the Committee of Inquiry into Petty Trades (12 vols.); *Report of the Commission on Agriculture*; *Collection of Materials on the Village Community* (vol. I.); *Collection of Materials on Landholding*, and *Statistical Descriptions of Separate Tamboff, Poitava, Saratoff, &c.*; Kavelin, *The Peasant Question*; Vasilchikoff, *Land Property and Agriculture* (2 vols.), and *Village Life and Agriculture*; Ivanukoff, *The Fall of Serfdom in Russia*; Shashkoff, "Peasantry in the Baltic Provinces," in *Russkaya Mysl*, 1883, III. and IX.; V. V., *Agric. Sketches of Russia*; Golovatchoff, *Capital and Peasant Farming*; Engelhardt's *Letters from the Country*; many elaborate papers in reviews (all Russian); and Appendix to Russian translation of Reclus's *Geogr. Univ.*

shown that no redistribution is made without urgent necessity. Thus, to quote but one instance, in 4442 village communities of Moscow, the average number of redistributions has been 2.1 in twenty years (1858-78), and in more than two-thirds of these communities, the redistribution took place only once. On the other hand, a regular rotation of all households over all lots, in order to equalize the remaining minor inequalities, is very often practised in the black-earth region, where no manure is needed.

Besides the arable mark, there is usually a *vygon* (or "common") for grazing, to which all householders send their cattle, whatever the number they possess. The meadows are either divided on the above principles, or mowed in common, and the hay divided according to the number of lots. The forests, when consisting of small wood in sufficient quantity, are laid under no regulations; when this is scarce, every trunk is counted, and valued according to its age, number of branches, &c., and the whole is divided according to the number of lots.

The houses and the orchards behind them belong also, in principle, to the community; but no *peredel* is made, except after a fire or when the necessity arises of building the houses at greater distances apart. The orchards usually remain for years in the same hands, with but slow equalizations of the lots in width.

All decisions in the village community are given by the *mir*, that is, by the general assembly of all householders,—women being admitted on an equal footing with men, when widows, or when their male guardians are absent. For the decisions unanimity is necessary; and, though in some difficult cases of a general *peredel* the discussions may last for two or three days, no decision is reached until the minority has declared its agreement with the majority.

Each commune elects an elder (*starosta*); he is the executive, but has no authority apart from that of the *mir* whose decisions he carries out. All attempts on the part of the Government to make him a functionary have failed.

Opinion as to the advantages and disadvantages of the village community being much divided in Russia, it has been within the last twenty years the subject of extensive inquiry, both private and official, and of an ever-growing literature and polemic. The supporters of the *mir* are found chiefly among those who have made more or less extensive inquiries into its actual organization and consequences, while their opponents draw their arguments principally from theoretical considerations of political economy. The main reproach that it checks individual development and is a source of immobility has been shaken of late by a better knowledge of the institution, which has brought to light its remarkable plasticity and power of adaptation to new circumstances. The free settlers in Siberia have voluntarily introduced the same organization. In north and north-east Russia, where arable land is scattered in small patches among forests, communities of several villages, or "volosts," communities, have arisen; and in the "voisko" of the Ural Cossacks we find community of the whole territory as regards both land and fisheries and work in common. Nay, the German colonists of southern Russia, who set out with the principle of personal property, have subsequently introduced that of the village community, adapted to their special needs (Claus). In some localities, where there was no great scarcity of land and the authorities did not interfere, joint cultivation of a common area for filling the storehouses has recently been developed (in Penza 974 communes have introduced this system and cultivate an aggregate of 26,910 acres). The renting of land in common, or even purchase of land by wealthy communes, has become quite usual, as also the purchase in common of agricultural implements.

Since the emancipation of the serfs, however, the *mir* has been undergoing profound modifications. The differences of wealth which ensued,—the impoverishment of the mass, the rapid increase of the rural proletariat, and the enrichment of a few "kulaks" and "miroyedes" ("mir-eaters"),—are certainly operating unfavourably for the *mir*. The *miroyedes* steadily strive to break up the organization of the commune as an obstacle to the extension of their power over the moderately well-to-do peasants; while the proletariat cares little about the *mir*. Fears on the one side and hopes on the other have been thus entertained as to the likelihood of the *mir* resisting these disintegrating influences, favoured, moreover, by those landowners and manufacturers who foresee in the creation of a rural proletariat the certainty of cheap labour. But the village community does not appear as yet to have lost the power of adaptation which it has exhibited throughout its history. If, indeed, the impoverishment of the peasants continues to go on, and legislation also interferes with the *mir*, it must of course disappear, but not without a corresponding disturbance in Russian life.¹ The co-operative spirit of the Great Russians shows itself further

¹ See *Collection of Materials on Village Communities*, published by the Geographical and Economical Societies, vol. 1. (containing a complete bibliography up to 1880). Of more recent works the following are worthy of notice.—Litchinsky, 1880; *Collection of Materials for the History of the Village Community in the Ukraine*, Kieff, 1884; Emenko, *Researches into Popular Life*, 1884; Hantower, *On the Origin of the Crimean Possession*, 1884; Samokvasov, *History of Russian Law*, 1884; Kessler, *Zur Geschichte und Kritik des bäuerlichen Gemeinde-Besitzes in Russland*, 2 vols., 1884; and papers in publications of Geographical Society.

in another sphere in the *artels*, which have also been a prominent feature of Russian life since the dawn of history. The *artel* very much resembles the co-operative society of western Europe, with this difference that it makes its appearance without any impulse from theory, simply as a natural form of popular life. When workmen from any province come, for instance, to St Petersburg to engage in the textile industries, or to work as carpenters, masons, &c., they immediately unite in groups of from ten to fifty persons, settle in a house together, keep a common table, and pay each his part of the expense to the elected elder of the *artel*. All Russia is covered with such *artels*,—in the cities, in the forests, on the banks of rivers, on journeys, and even in the prisons.

The industrial *artel* is almost as frequent as the preceding, in all those trades which admit of it. A social history of the most fundamental state of Russian society would be a history of their hunting, fishing, shipping, trading, building, exploring *artels*. *Artels* of one or two hundred carpenters, bricklayers, &c., are common wherever new buildings have to be erected, or railways or bridges made; the contractors always prefer to deal with an *artel*, rather than with separate workmen. The same principles are often put into practice in the domestic trades. It is needless to add that the wages divided by the *artels* are higher than those earned by isolated workmen.

Finally, a great number of *artels* on the stock exchange, in the seaports, in the great cities (commissionaires), during the great fairs, and on railways have grown up of late, and have acquired the confidence of tradespeople to such an extent that considerable sums of money and complicated banking operations are frequently handed over to an *artelshik* (member of an *artel*) without any receipt, his number or his name being accepted as sufficient guarantee. These *artels* are recruited only on personal acquaintance with the candidates for membership, and security reaching £80 to £100 is exacted in the exchange *artels*. These last have a tendency to become mere joint-stock companies employing salaried servants. Co-operative societies have lately been organized by several *zemstvos*. They have achieved good results, but do not exhibit, on the whole, the same unity of organization as those which have arisen in a natural way among peasants and artisans.²

The chief occupation of the population of Russia is agriculture. Only in a few parts of Moscow, Vladimir, and Nijni has it been abandoned for manufacturing pursuits. Cattle-breeding is the leading industry in the Steppe region, the timber-trade in the north-east, and fishing on the White and Caspian Seas. Of the total surface of Russia, 1,237,860,000 acres (excluding Finland), 1,018,737,000 acres are registered, and it appears that 39.9 per cent. of these belongs to the crown, 1.9 to the domain (*udél*), 31.2 to peasants, 24.7 to landed proprietors or to private companies, and 2.3 to the towns and monasteries. Of the acres registered only 592,650,000 can be considered as "good," that is, registered only 592,650,000 can be considered as "good," that is, capable of paying the land tax; and of these 248,630,000 acres were under crops in 1884.³ The crops of 1883 were those of an average year, that is, 2.9 to 1 in central Russia, and 4 to 1 in south Russia, and were estimated as follows (seed corn being left out of account):—Rye, 49,185,000 quarters; wheat, 21,605,000; oats, 50,403,000; barley, 13,476,000; other grains, 18,808,000. Those of 1884 (a very good year) reached an average of 18 per cent. higher, except oats. The crops are, however, very unequally distributed. In an average year there are 8 governments which are some 6,930,000 quarters short of their requirements, 35 which have an excess of 33,770,000 quarters, and 17 which have neither excess nor deficiency. The export of corn from Russia is steadily increasing, having risen from 6,560,000 quarters in 1856-60 to an average of 23,700,000 quarters in 1876-83 and 26,623,700 quarters in 1884. This increase does not prove, however, an excess of corn, for even when one-third of Russia was famine-stricken, during the last years of scarcity, the export trade did not decline; even Samara exported during the last famine there, the peasants being compelled to sell their corn in autumn to pay their taxes. Scarcity is quite usual, the food supply of some ten provinces being exhausted every year by the end of the spring. Orach, and even bark, are then mixed with flour for making bread.

Flax, both for yarn and seed, is extensively grown in the north-west and west, and the annual production is estimated at 6,400,000 cwts. of fibre and 2,900,000 quarters of linseed. Hemp is largely cultivated in the central governments, the yearly production being

² See Isaëff on *Artels in Russia*, and in Appendix to Russian translation of Reclus: Kalatchoff, *The Artels of Old and New Russia*; *Recueil of Materials on Artels* (2 vols.); Scherbina, *South Russian Artels*; Nevroff, *Stock Exchange Artels* (all Russian).

³ The division of the registered land is as follows, the figures being percentages of the whole:—

	Arable Land.	Forests.	Meadows, Pasture.	Unproductive.
Peasants' holdings.....	53.8	10.1	26.6	9.5
Private holdings.....	27.2	37.6	23.1	11.9
Crown and domains.....	1.7	64.3	1.6	32.4
Total.....	26.3	38.7	15.9	19.1

1,800,000 cwts. of fibre and 1,800,000 quarters of seed. The export of both (which along with other oil-bearing plants reached the value of 136,816,000 roubles in 1882) holds the second place in the foreign trade of Russia.

The culture of the beet is increasing, and in 1884 785,700 acres were under this root, chiefly in Little Russia and the neighbouring governments; 68,900,000 cwts. of beetroot were worked up, yielding 5,119,000 cwts. of sugar, while fifty-five refineries (twenty-six of them in Poland) showed a production valued at 18,888,530 roubles in 1882. Tobacco is cultivated everywhere, but good qualities are obtained only in the south. In 1876-80 an average area of 101,600 acres was under this steadily increasing culture, and the crop of 1884 yielded 86,400,000 cwts. The vine, which might be grown much farther north than at present, is cultivated only on Mount Caucasus, in Bessarabia, in the Crimea, and on the lower Don for wine, and in Ekaterinoslav, Podolia, and Astrakhan for raisins. The yearly produce is 10.8 million gallons in Russia, 10.0 in the Caucasus, and 24 in Transcaucasia.

Market gardening is extensively carried on in Yaroslavl for a variety of vegetables for exportation, in Moscow and Ryazan for hops, and in the south for sunflowers, poppies, melons, &c. Gardening is also widely spread in Little Russia and in the more fertile central governments. Madder and indigo are cultivated on Caucasus, and the silk-worm in Taurida, Kherson, and Caucasia. Bee-keeping is widely spread.

The breeding of live stock is largely carried on in the east and south, but the breeds are usually inferior. Good breeds of cattle are met with only in the Baltic provinces, and excellent breeds of horses on the Don, in Tamboff, and in Voronezh. Since the emancipation, the peasants have been compelled to reduce the number of their cattle, so that the increase in this department does not correspond to the increase of population, as is shown by the following figures:—

	1851.	1882.
Cattle.....	20,962,000	23,845,100
Sheep.....	37,527,000	47,508,970
Swine.....	8,886,000	9,207,670

A more thorough registration of horses for military purposes gives a return of 21,203,900 horses in Russia and Poland, that is, 255 horses per 1000 inhabitants—a proportion which is elsewhere approached only in the United States. They are kept in largest numbers in the three Steppe governments and on the Urals (550 and 384 per 1000 inhabitants), while the smallest proportion occurs in the manufacturing region (155 per 1000 inhabitants). 90 per cent. of the total number of horses belong to peasants; these are mostly of a very poor description. Infectious diseases make great ravages every year. In 1882 no less than 121,500 cattle and 14,110 horses perished from that cause.¹

Fishing is a most important source of income for whole communities in Russia. No less than 2000 to 3000 inhabitants of Archangel are engaged in fishing on the Norwegian coast and in the White Sea, the aggregate yield of this industry being estimated at 200,000 cwts., including 150 million herrings. These fisheries are, however, declining. Fishing in the Baltic is not of much importance. In the estuaries of the Dnieper, Dniester, and Bug it gives occupation to about 4000 men, and may be valued at less than 1,000,000 roubles. The fisheries in the Sea of Azoff, which occupy about 15,000 men, are much more important, as are also those of the lower Don, which last alone are valued at over 1,000,000 roubles a year. The chief fisheries of Russia are, however, on the Caspian and in its feeders: those of the Volga cover no less than 6000 square miles, and those of the Ural extend for over 100 miles on the sea-coast and 400 miles up the river. The lowest estimates give no less than 4 million cwts., valued at 15 million roubles, of fish taken every year in the Caspian and its affluents. The fisheries on the lakes of the lake region are also worthy of notice.

Hunting is an important source of income in north and north-east Russia, no less than 400,000 squirrels and 800,000 grouse, to mention no other game, being killed in different governments, while sea-hunting is still productive on the shores of the Arctic Ocean.²

Notwithstanding the wealth of the country in minerals and metals of all kinds, and the endeavours made by Government to encourage mining, including the imposition of protective tariffs even against Finland (in 1885), this and the related industries are still at a low stage of development. The remoteness of the mining from the industrial centres, the want of technical instruction and also of capital, and the existence of a variety of vexatious

¹ See *The Year 1884 with regard to Agriculture*, published by the Ministry of Interior (so also preceding years); the publications of the Minister of Finance; Yanson's *Comparative Statistics of Russia, 1880*; Appendix to Russian translation of Reclus; and Savorin's *Russkij Kalendar*.

² *Bibliography*.—Beer and Danilevsky, *Fishery Researches in Russia*, published by Minister of Domains, 9 vols.; Veniaminoff, *Fishing in Russia, 1876*; Sidoroff, *Northern Russia, and Contributions to the Knowledge of Northern Russia, 1882*; Grimm, *The Work of the Aral-Caspian Expedition*.

regulations may be given as the chief reasons for this state of matters. The imports of foreign metals in the rough and of coal are steadily increasing, while the exports, never otherwise than insignificant, show no advance. The chief mining districts of Russia are the Ural Mountains and Olonetz for all kinds of metals; the Moscow and Donetz basins for coal and iron; Poland and Finland; Caucasus; and the Altai, the Nertchinsk, and the Amur mountains.

Gold is obtained from gold-washings in Siberia (63,194 lb in 1882), the Urals (16,850 lb), Central Asia (325 lb in 1881), and Finland (42 lb); silver in Siberia (16,128 lb), and partly on Caucasus (1232 lb), the quantity steadily decreasing; platinum in the Urals (3600 to 4600 lb every year). Lead is extracted along with silver (19,416 cwts. in 1881; 357,260 cwts. imported); zinc only in Poland (89,650 cwts.; half as much is imported); tin in Finland (194 cwts.; 40,000 cwts. imported). Copper is worked in several governments of the Ural region, in Kazañ, Vyatka, Caucasus, Siberia, and Finland, but the industry is a languishing one, and the crown mines show a deficit (65,000 cwts.; double this amount is imported). Iron-ores are found at many places. Excellent mines are worked on the Urals; and iron mines occur also in large numbers throughout the Moscow and Donetz basins, as also in the western provinces, not to speak of those of the Asiatic dominions, of Poland, and of Finland (bog-iron). In 1881 the annual production of pig-iron (which covered only two-thirds of the consumption) was stated as follows, (in thousands of cwts.):—Urals, 6153; central Russia, 1092; Olonetz, 42; south and south-west Russia, 501; Poland, 951; Finland, 413; Siberia, 85. The iron and steel throughout the empire amounted to 10,720,000 cwts. in 1882. European Russia alone produced in 1882 31,520 cwts. of copper, 7,703,000 cwts. of pig-iron, 4,981,300 cwts. of iron, and 3,799,600 cwts. of steel.

The production of coal is rapidly increasing and in 1882 reached 46,270,000 cwts., three-fourths being produced by the Donetz basin, and one-fifth by that of Moscow. Poland, moreover, yielded 27,950,000 cwts. of coal in 1882, and the Asiatic dominions about 800,000 cwts. Nearly 34,000,000 cwts. are imported annually. The extraction of naphtha on the Apsheron peninsula of the Caspian has been greatly stimulated of late, reaching about 20,000,000 cwts. in 1883 (4,600,000 cwts. of kerosene, 1,000,000 cwts. of lubricating oils, and 300,000 cwts. of asphalt).

Russia and Siberia are very rich in rock-salt, salt springs, and salt lakes (16,360,000 cwts. extracted; 3,746,000 imported). Excellent graphite is found in the deserts of the Sayan Mountains and Turukhansk. Sulphur is obtained in Caucasia, Kazañ, and Poland (2000 to 5000 cwts. extracted; 70,000 to 170,000 cwts. imported). The mining and related industries occupy altogether about an aggregate motive force (steam and water) of 73,500 horse-power and 305,000 hands.³

Since the time of Peter I. the Russian Government has been manufacturing in its efforts for the creation and development of home manufactures. Important monopolies in last century, and heavy and petty protective, or rather prohibitive, import duties, as well as large industries money bounties, in the present, have contributed towards the accumulation of immense private fortunes, but manufactures have developed but slowly. A great upward movement has, however, been observable since 1863. About that time a thorough reform of the machinery in use was effected, whereby the number of hands employed was reduced, but the yearly production doubled or trebled. In some branches the production suddenly rose at a yet higher rate (cottons from 12 million roubles in 1865 to 209 million in 1882). The following figures for European Russia, without Poland and Finland, will give some idea of this progress:—

	Number of Establishments.	Workmen Employed.	Yearly Production in Roubles.	Production per Workman.
1851	9,256	456,596	157,372,000	317
1861	14,060	559,533	295,560,000	528
1870	18,892	463,093	452,660,000	977
1882	56,905	954,971	1,126,033,000	1,187

These figures lose, however, some of their significance if the corresponding rate of progress in manufacturing productivity in western Europe be taken into account. Besides, since the great improvements of 1861-70 the industrial progress of Russia has been but slow. The manufactories of rails and railway plant, and even the Ural iron-works, are in a precarious condition. The textile industries, though undoubtedly they have made great advances, are subject to great fluctuations in connexion with those of the home crops, and are thus in an abnormal state. The artisans labour for twelve, fourteen, and sometimes sixteen hours a day, and their condition, as revealed by recent inquiries, is very unsatisfactory. Many causes contribute to this,—the want of technical instruction, the want of capital, and

³ See the yearly accounts in *Mining Journal*; Dobronitzkiy, *Mining in the Russian Exhibition of 1883* (detailed account); publications of the Minister of Finance; Köppen's "Mining Industry of Russia," in *Mining Journal*, 1880, and *Ivestia Geog. Soc.*, 1880; Marvii's *Petroleum Industry of Russia*, 1885.

above all the want of markets. Russia has not, and cannot have, such foreign markets as the countries which first attained an industrial development. Her colonies are deserts, and in the home markets the manufacturer only finds 80 millions of poverty-stricken people, whose wants are nearly all supplied by their petty domestic industries.

These, that is, the domestic industries which are carried on by the peasants in conjunction with their agricultural pursuits during the long days of idleness imposed by the climate and by the reduced allotments of land, continue, not only to hold their ground side by side with the large manufactures, but to develop and to compete with these by the cheapness of their products. Extensive inquiries are now being made into these domestic industries (*kustarnoye proizvodstvo*). 855,000 persons engaged in them along with agriculture (*kustari*) have already been registered, and an unexpected variety of industries, and a still more unexpected technical development in several of them, have been disclosed by these researches. The yearly production of the 855,000 *kustari* who have been registered reaches 218,444,000 roubles; while the total number of peasants engaged in the industries, mostly in Great Russia and northern Caucasia, is estimated at a minimum of 7,500,000 persons, with a yearly production of at least 1,800,000,000 roubles, or more than double the aggregate production of the manufactures proper.

Of course the machinery they use is very primitive, and the wages for a day of twelve to sixteen hours exceedingly low. But the industries are capable of being improved, and it has been brought out that "Paris" silk hats and "Vienna" house furniture sold by substantial foreign firms at Moscow are really manufactured in the neighbourhood of the capital by peasants who still continue to till their fields. All these industries suffer very much from want of credit, and the producers become the prey of intermediaries. But their continued existence and their progress under most unfavourable conditions show that they meet a real want, which is itself the consequence of the peculiar conditions under which Russia, the last to come into the international market, has to develop.

In those very governments where two-thirds of the textile manufactures of Russia are concentrated domestic weaving (for the market, not for domestic use) employs about 200,000 hands, whose yearly production is valued at 45,000,000 roubles. In Stavropol on Caucasus it has so rapidly developed that 42,400 looms are now at work, with a yearly production of 2,007,700 roubles. But no adequate idea could be given of the petty industries of Russia without entering into greater detail than the scope of the present article permits. Suffice it to say that there is no branch of the industries in textiles, leather, woodwork, or metal work, provided it needs no heavy machinery, which is not successfully carried on in the villages. Nearly all the requirements of nine-tenths of the population of Russia are met in this way.

The aggregate production of industries within the empire, inclusive of mining, was stated in 1882 as follows:—European Russia, 1,126,033,000 roubles; Poland, 147,309,000; Finland, 15,130,000. The chief manufactures in European Russia (apart from Poland and Finland), and their yearly production in 1882 in millions of roubles, were as follows:—cotton yarn and cottons, 208.6; other textile industries, 103.5; metal wares and machinery, 107.9; chemicals, 6.6; candles, soap, glue, leather, and other animal products, 61.4; distillery products, 156.0; other liquors, 39.0; sugar, 140.9; flour, 74.0. The remainder are of minor importance. It must be observed, however, that these figures are much below those given for 1879, when the aggregate production of Russian manufactures was computed at 1,102,949,000 roubles, without the mining and related industries, the distillery products, and the flour.

The geographical distribution of manufactures in Russia is very unequal. The governments of Moscow and St Petersburg, with a yearly production of 178 and 134 million roubles respectively, represent together two-fifths of the aggregate production of Russia. If we add Vladimir (91,766,000 roubles), Kieff (73,300,000), Perm (50,500,000), Livonia, Esthonia, Kharkoff, and Kherson (from 30 to 35 millions each), we have all the principal manufacturing centres. In fact, Moscow, with portions of the neighbouring governments, contains half the Russian manufactures exempted from excise duties, while the south-west governments of Kieff, Podolia, and Kherson contain two-thirds of those not so exempted.¹

The main wealth of Russia consisting in raw produce, the trade of the country turns chiefly on the purchase of this for export, and the sale of manufactured and imported goods in exchange. This

¹ See Orloff's *Index of Russian Manufactures*, 1881; Timiryazoff's *Development of Industry in Russia*, and *Industrial Atlas of Russia*; *Materials for Statistics of Steam-Engines*, published by Central Statistical Committee, 1882; *Historical and Statistical Sketch of Russian Industry*, vol. II., 1882; *Annuaire of the Ministry of Finance*; *Russische Revue*, published monthly at St. Petersburg by Roettger. On the petty trades, see *Memoirs of the Committee for Investigation of Petty Trades*, vols. I. to xii., 1879-84; *Recueil of Statistical Information for Moscow Government*, published by the Zemstvo, vols. vi. and vii.; Isaeff's *Trades of Moscow*; several papers in reviews; and an appendix to the Russian translation of Reclus's *Géographie Universelle*; *Resumé of Materials on Russian Petty Trades*, 1874 (all Russian); also Thun, *Russlands Gewerbe*. For the position of workmen in manufactures see the extensive inquiries of the Moscow Zemstvo in its *Recueil*, and the reports of the recently nominated inspectors of manufactures, especially Yanjul, *Sketches and Researches*, 2 vols., 1884.

traffic is in the hands of a great number of middlemen,—in the west Jews, and elsewhere Russians,—to whom the peasants are for the most part in debt, as they purchase in advance on security of subsequent payments in corn, tar, wooden wares, &c. A good deal of the internal trade is carried on by travelling merchants (*gofeni*).

The fairs are very numerous; the minor ones numbered 6500 in 1878, and showed sales amounting to an aggregate of 305 million roubles. Those of Nijni-Novgorod, with a return of 400 million roubles, of Irbit and Kharkoff (above 100 million roubles each), of Romny, Krestovskoye in Perm, and Menzelinsk in Ufa (55 to 12 million roubles), have considerable importance both for trade and for home manufactures. The total value of the internal trade, which is in the hands of 681,116 licensed dealers, is roughly estimated at more than seven milliards of roubles.

The development of the external trade of Russia is seen from the following figures (millions of roubles):—

	1861-65.	1866-70.	1871-75.	1876-80.	1881.	1882.
<i>Exports.</i>						
Articles of food.....	66.1	116.9	200.1	326.2	261.9	350.6
Raw and half-manufactured produce.	102.8	130.1	164.6	197.4	219.5	232.2
Manufactured wares	12.7	15.6	10.1	11.0	13.2	15.8
Cattle.....	11.8	19.1
Total.....	181.6	262.7	374.9	534.6	506.4	617.7
„ in metallic roubles ²	158.4	214.4	319.2	342.3	336.8	370.6
<i>Imports.</i>						
Articles of food.....	60.4	68.5	109.3	122.0	125.7	148.2
Raw and half-manufactured produce.	66.4	116.9	208.4	259.7	278.5	284.7
Manufactured wares	36.1	96.4	132.2	139.2	113.6	135.1
Total.....	162.9	281.8	449.9	520.9	517.8	568.0
„ in metallic roubles...	142.5	229.3	390.3	359.4	344.3	340.8

The chief article of export is grain—wheat, oats, and rye—(24,870,000 quarters, 321,042,000 roubles in 1882), to which the increase of exports is mainly due. This increase, however, does not correspond to an increase of crops, only 10 per cent. of which were exported in 1870 and about 20 per cent. in 1882. Next to grain come flax, hemp, linseed, and hempsed (129,370,000 roubles in 1882); oil-yielding grains (441,000 quarters); wool, tallow, hides, bristles, and bone (31,120,000 roubles). If we add to these timber (35,044,000 roubles) and furs (4,147,000 roubles), 95 per cent. of all Russian exports are accounted for, the remainder consisting of linen, ropes, and some woollen stuffs and metallic wares (7,172,000 roubles to western Europe, 2,888,000 to Finland, and 5,765,000 to Asia).

The chief imports from Europe were in 1882 as follows:—Tea (48,091,000 roubles), liquors (16,124,000 roubles), salt, fish, rice, fruits, and colonial wares (38,446,000 roubles), various raw textile wares (127,986,000 roubles—cotton 72,417,000), raw metals (32,630,000 roubles), chemicals (57,894,000 roubles), and stuffs (22,428,000 roubles). The imports from Asia—chiefly tea—in the same year reached 32,853,000 roubles. The chief imports were from Germany (214,000,000 roubles) and Great Britain (124,700,000), the chief exports to Great Britain (210,000,000), Germany (178,000,000), and France (54,000,000). Even in her trade with Finland Russia imports more than she exports,—the chief imports being paper, cotton, iron, and butter; prohibitory tariffs were imposed on Finnish wares in 1885.

During 1882 the ports of the empire were visited by 13,638 foreign ships (5,337,000 tons), of which number 1436 were to Asiatic ports (391,200 tons). Of the above total only 2489 vessels (623,000 tons) were under the Russian flag (mostly Finnish), while the British alone showed a tonnage of 2,253,000 and the German 639,000. The coasting trade was represented by 35,033 vessels (6,040,000 tons) entering the ports, chiefly those of the Black Sea. The mercantile marine of Russia in 1882 numbered 6383 vessels (727,000 tons), including 604 steamers; of the total number 1593 (254,000 tons) were Finnish. The chief ports are St Petersburg, Odessa, Riga, Taganrog, Libau, and Reval. Baku has recently acquired some importance in consequence of the naphtha trade.³

The rivers of the empire, mostly connected by canals, play a very important part in the inland traffic. The aggregate length of navigable waters reaches 21,510 miles (453 miles of canals), and 12,600 miles more are available for floating rafts. In 1882 51,407 boats, with cargoes amounting to 153,250,000 cwts., valued at 186,480,000 roubles, left the ports on Russian rivers and canals.

² See note 1, p. 72.
³ See *Obzor of the Foreign Trade of Russia in 1882*, published by the Minister of Finance, and the same for trade with Europe in 1883 and 1884.

Corn, firewood, and timber constitute two-thirds of the whole cargoes carried. Within Russia proper, from 5740 to 7400 boats, larger and smaller, worth from four to seven millions of roubles, have been built annually during the last five years (7415 boats, valued at 6,758,000 roubles, in 1882,—18 of them being steamers); most of them are light flat-bottomed structures, which are broken up as soon as they have reached their destination. The number of steamers plying on inland waters, chiefly on the Volga, was estimated in 1879 at 1056 (80,890 horse-power).

Twenty-five years ago Russia had only 993 miles of railways; on January 1, 1883, the totals were 13,428 miles for Russia and Caucasia, 888 for Poland, 734 for Finland, and 141 for the Transcaucasian region, and two years later they had reached an aggregate length of 16,155 miles. The railways chiefly connect the Baltic ports with the granaries of Russia in the south-east, and the western frontier with Moscow, whence six trunk lines radiate in all directions. Several military lines run along the western frontier, while two trunk lines, starting from St Petersburg, follow the two shores of the Gulf of Finland. Of the projected Siberian railway one main line (444 miles), connecting Perm and Berezniki on the Kama with Ekaterinburg and the chief iron-works of the Urals, has been constructed. It has been extended east to Kamyschkoff, and is to be continued to Tiumen, 100 miles farther east, whence steamers ply to Tomsk.

Only 738 miles of the railways of Russia belong to the state, but most of them have been constructed under Government guarantees, involving payment of from 11 to 21 million roubles yearly. On the other hand the yearly increasing debt of the railways to the state amounted to 781,888,800 roubles in 1883. Of the aggregate value of the Russian railways, estimated at 2210 million roubles, no less than 1971 million roubles were held by Government in shares and bonds. The cost of construction has been altogether out of proportion to what it ought to be; for, whereas the average rate per verst (0.663 mile) in Finland was only 20,000 silver roubles, in Russia it reached 60,000, 75,000, 90,000, and even 100,000 roubles. In 1882 21,322 versts (14,136 miles) represented an expenditure of 2,210,047,632 roubles, and their net revenue was only 3.18 per cent. on the capital invested (4982 roubles per English mile in 1882). In 1884 34,674,853 passengers, 2,287,955 military, and 834,500,000 cwts. of merchandise were conveyed by 5808 locomotives and 120,940 carriages and waggons. Fully one-half of the merchandise carried consisted of corn (24 per cent.), coal (18 per cent.), firewood (12 per cent.), and timber (8 per cent.).¹

For the conveyance of correspondence and travellers along ordinary routes the state maintains an extensive organization of post-horses between all towns of the empire, that is, over an aggregate length of 110,170 miles. In 1882 4355 stations, with a staff of 15,560 men and 446,460 horses, were kept up for that purpose. In 1883 242,193,470 letters, newspapers (93,520,000), registered letters, and parcels were carried, of which 29,808,100 belonged to international correspondence. The telegraph system had in the same year an aggregate length of 65,394 miles, with 2,957 telegraph-offices, and 10,222,139 telegrams were transmitted.² (P. A. K.)

PART IV. RUSSIAN HISTORY.

Note III. The Russians, properly so called, belong to the Slavonic race, itself a division of the great Aryan family. It cannot be denied that in the northern and eastern parts of Russia large Finnish elements have become mixed with the Slavs, and Mongolian in the south, but this is far from justifying the prejudiced attempts of Duchinski and others to challenge the right of the Russians to be called an Aryan people. The derivation of the words Russia, Russians (*Rous, Rossia, Rossiane*), has been much disputed. The old-fashioned view was to identify them with the *Rhosolani*, who are now generally believed to have been a Medish tribe. The later and probably correct one is to derive the name from the Finnish Ruotsi applied to the Swedes, and considered by Professor Thomsen of Copenhagen to be itself a corruption of the Swedish word *rothsmenn*, rowers or seafarers. They are Scandinavian

¹ See the *Statistical Sbornik of the Ministry of Roads and Communications*, vols. viii., ix., and x. (roads, canals, railways, and traffic thereon, with maps and graphic representation of traffic); Golovatchoff, "Russian Railways," in Bezobrazoff's *Sbornik Gosudarstvennykh Znaniy*, vols. iv., v., vii., viii.; Rybakoff and Bieloff, *Our Ways of Communication*, 1884; Tchuproff, *Tovarnyie Shtady*, &c. (trade in corn), 1884.

² See *Postal Statistics for 1883* (St Petersburg, 1885), and the *Russkiy Kalendar*.

vikings with whom we first become acquainted in northern Russia, and who in a way founded the empire, although from Arabian and Jewish writers we have dim records of a Slavonic race inhabiting the basin of the Dnieper about the close of the 9th century. In recent times Ilovaiski and Gedeonoff have again attacked the view of the Swedish origin of the invaders. They see in them only Slavs, but they are not considered to have shaken the theory which derives the name from Ruotsi. As the story goes, three brothers, Rurik, Sineus, and Truvor, were invited to Russia, from the north and settled at Novgorod in 862. Nestor calls them Varangians, a name in which most people are willing to see Norsemen. For a long time the Russians and Scandinavians are considered, as we shall find, to be separate races, but at length they are fused, as the Saxons and Normans in England under Henry I. Concerning the origin of the town of Novgorod, which bears a purely Slavonic name, nothing is known; it has been supposed that at first a Finnish settlement existed on its site. According to the legend the three brothers were invited over by a leading citizen named Gostomisl. There is, however, no mention of such a person in the *Chronicle* of Nestor. There is another story that Rurik was the son of the Swedish king, Ludbrat, a person met with in Scandinavian legend, and his queen Umila, the daughter of Truvor at Izborsk on Lake Peipus. On the death of his two brothers without heirs, we are told that Rurik annexed their dominions to his own, and took the title of *veliki kniaz*, or grand-prince. These three brothers are said to have brought two other adventurers with them, Askold and Dir, who, having had a quarrel with Rurik, set out with some companions to Constantinople to try their fortune. On their way they saw Kieff, situated on a rich and grassy plain, in the occupation of the Khazars. Of this city they made themselves masters, and permanently established themselves on the Dnieper. The origin of Kieff itself is involved in mystery. It is first mentioned about the 9th century. Constantine Porphyrogenitus speaks of τὸ καστρὸν τὸ Κιοῦβα τὸ ἐπονομαζόμενον Σαμβάρας. This last word has given much labour to scholars; some are disposed to see in it the Norse *sandbakk*, the bank of sand. It is at Kieff that, according to the legend, St Andrew preached the gospel to the Russians. From this place Askold and Dir sallied forth two years afterwards, with an armament of two hundred vessels, sailed up the Bosphorus, and plundered the capital of the Byzantine empire. The Greek writers give 851 as the date of this enterprise, thus making it precede the arrival of Rurik by eleven years. The emperor at the time of their invasion was Michael III.

Having greatly extended his dominions by subduing the surrounding Slavonic tribes, Rurik died at an advanced age in 879, leaving the regency of the principality and the guardianship of his son Igor to the renowned Oleg.³ This chief subdued Smolensk, a city of the Krivitchi, in 882. Allured by its wealth and advantageous situation, Oleg now resolved to attempt Kieff, which was held by Askold and Dir. The story goes that he took young Igor with him, and disguised himself and his companions as Slavonic merchants. The unsuspecting Askold and Dir were invited to a conference and slain on the spot. Thus was Kieff added to the dominions of Igor, who was recognized as the

³ Both these names are Scandinavian, the original forms being Ingvar and Helgi.

lord of the town.¹ In 903 Oleg chose a wife for Igor, named Olga,² said to have been a native of Pskoff, the origin of which place, now mentioned for the first time, is unknown. We are told that it was a city of importance before the arrival of Rurik. The derivation of the name is disputed, some deriving it from a Finnish, others from a Slavonic root. Oleg next resolved to make an attack upon Byzantium, and his preparations were great both by sea and land. Leo the Philosopher, then emperor, was ill able to resist these barbarians. He attempted to block the passage of the Bosphorus, but Oleg dragged his ships across the land and arrived before the gates of Constantinople. The Greeks begged for peace and offered tribute. Oleg is said to have hung his shield in derision on the gates of the city. We may believe this without going so far as to give credence to Strykowski, the Polish writer, who says it was to be seen there in his time (16th century). The atrocities committed by Oleg and his followers are described by Karamzin, the Russian historian; they are just such as the other Norsemen of their race were committing at the same time in northern and western Europe. The Byzantines paid a large sum of money that their city might be exempted from injury, and soon after Oleg sent ambassadors³ to the emperor to arrange the terms. The treaty was ratified by oaths: the Byzantines swore by the Gospels, and the Russians by their gods Perun and Volos. In 911 Oleg made another treaty with the Byzantines, the terms of which, as of the preceding one, are preserved in Nestor. The authenticity of these two treaties has been called in question by some writers, but Miklosich truly observes that it would have been impossible at the time Nestor wrote to forge the Scandinavian names. Soon after this Oleg died; he had exercised supreme power till the time of his death to the exclusion of Igor, and seems to have been regarded by the people as a wizard. He is said to have been killed by the bite of a serpent, which had coiled itself in the skull of his horse, as he was gazing at the animal's unburied bones. The story is in reality a Scandinavian saga, as has been shown by Bielowski and Rafn. It is also found in other countries. In the reign of Igor the Petchenegs first make their appearance in Russian history. In 941 he undertook an expedition against Constantinople and entered the Bosphorus after devastating the provinces of Pontus, Paphlagonia, and Bithynia. Nestor has not concealed the atrocities committed by the Russians on this occasion; he tells us of the churches and monasteries which they burned, and of their cruelty to the captives. They were, however, attacked by the Byzantine fleet, and overpowered by the aid of Greek fire; many were drowned, and many of those who swam to land were slaughtered by the infuriated peasants; only one of their number escaped. Thirsting to avenge his loss, Igor fitted out another expedition in the spring of the following year. The Greeks were unwilling to run a risk again; they renewed the treaty which had been signed with Oleg, and were only too glad to purchase deliverance from their adversaries. The Russian at first demanded too much, but was finally persuaded by his more prudent attendants: "If Cæsar speaks thus," said they, "what more do we want than to have gold and silver and silks without fighting? Who knows which will survive, we or they? Who has ever been able to conclude a treaty with the sea? We do not go on the dry land, but on the waves of the sea; death is common to all."

¹ This story is considered by the historian Bestuzheff Riumin to be a mere legend invented to explain the connexion between Novgorod and Kieff.

² Here again we have a Norse name. Olga is equivalent to Helga, which in its older form is Holga.

³ It has been observed that the names of the ambassadors in this treaty are purely Scandinavian.

A treaty of peace was accordingly concluded, which is given at full length by Nestor; of the fifty names attached to it we find three were Slavonic and the rest Norse. The two races are beginning to be fused. From this expedition Igor returned triumphant. He was, however, unfortunate in a subsequent attack on the Drevlians, a Slavonic tribe whose territory is now partly occupied by the government of Tchernigoff. The Drevlians had long suffered from his exactions. They resolved to encounter him under the command of their prince Male; for they saw, as a chronicler says, that it was necessary to kill the wolf, or the whole flock would become his prey. They accordingly laid an ambush near their town Korosten, now called Iskorost, in the government of Volhynia, and slew him and all his company. According to Leo the Deacon, he was tied to two trees bent together, and when they were let go the unhappy chief was torn to pieces.

Igor was succeeded by his son Sviatoslaff, the first Russian prince with a Slavonic name. Olga, however, the spirited wife of Igor, was now regent, owing to her son's minority. Fearful was the punishment she inflicted upon the Drevlians for the death of her husband, and the story lacks no dramatic interest as it has been handed down by the old chronicler. Some of the Drevlians were buried alive in pits which she had caused to be dug for the purpose previously; some were burned alive; and others murdered at a *trina*, or funeral feast, which she had appointed to be held in her husband's honour. The town Iskorost was afterwards set on fire by tying lighted matches to the tails of sparrows and pigeons, and letting them fly on the roofs of the houses. Here we certainly have a piece of a *bilina*, as the old Russian legendary poems are called. Geoffrey of Monmouth and Layamon give the same account of the capture of the city of Cirencester by Gurmund at the head of the Saxons, and something similar is also told about Harold Hardrada in Sicily. Finally, at the close of her life, Olga became a Christian. She herself visited the capital of the Greek empire, and was instructed in the mysteries of her new faith by the patriarch. There she was baptized by him in 955, and the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus became her godfather. She did not, however, succeed in persuading her son Sviatoslaff to embrace the same faith, although he took no measures to impede its progress among his subjects. This son was as celebrated a warrior as Oleg; his victories were chiefly over the Petchenegs previously mentioned, a people of Mongol origin inhabiting the basin of the Don. He began, however, the fatal custom of breaking up Russia into apanages, which he distributed among his sons. The effects of this injudicious policy, subsequently pursued by other grand princes, were soon felt. Thus was paved the way for the invasion of Russia by the Mongols, who held it for two hundred years, and communicated that semi-Asiatic character to the dress and customs of the country which the *ukazes* of Peter the Great could hardly eradicate, and which perhaps have not entirely disappeared even in our own times. In his division of the country, Sviatoslaff gave Kieff to his son Yaropolk; to another son, Oleg, the conquered land of the Drevlians; to another, Vladimir, he assigned Novgorod. It would be impossible to interest the reader in the petty wars of these princes. After having gained several victories over the Petchenegs, Sviatoslaff set out on an expedition against the Bulgarians, a Ugro-Finnish tribe, dwelling on the banks of the Volga, the remains of whose ancient capital can still be seen. He made himself master of their country, but his victorious career was cut short at the cataracts of the Dnieper, where he and his soldiers were slain by the Petchenegs. According to the barbarous custom of the times, their prince Kurya made his skull