Corrections, Changes, Updates, and Commentary for

*Muscovy and the Mongols*

(Toward a 2nd Edition)

p. 5, fn. 17, end:


p. 6, fn. 22, lines 1–2:

**reads**: *Polnoe sobranie russkih letopisei (PSRL)*, 40 vols., St. Petersburg/Petrograd/Leningrad and Moscow, Arkheograficheskaia komissiia, Nauka, and Arkheograficheskii tsentr, 1843–1995,

**should read**: *PSRL*,

p. 6, fn. 22, line 3:

**reads**: 1843–1995,

**should read**: 1841–2002,

p. 7, lines 1–3:

**reads**: Gennadii and later Church writers to the heretics as Judaizers. But referring to heretics generally as “Jews”

**should read**: Gennadii and the hegumen Iosif Volotskii to the heretics as adopting Jewish practices. But accusing heretics generally of being “Jews”

p. 19, fn. 62, line 2:

**reads**: Grand Duke Ol’gerd

**should read**: Grand Duke Algirdas (Ol’gerd)

p. 20, line 9:

**reads**: Ol’gerd

**should read**: Algirdas

p. 24, fn. 85, line 3:

**reads**: zemli.” The

**should read**: zemli.” But we do have evidence of the blinding of others who had no claim to the throne. Under 1069, the *Povest’ vremennykh let* (174,2) tells us Mstislav Iziaslavich blinded some of those who freed his father’s enemy Vseslav of Polotsk. Under 1257, the Novgorod I Chronicle reports that Alexander Nevskii cut off the noses of some and put out the eyes of others who had led his son Vasilii astray. *Novgorodskaiia pervaiia letopis’*, p. 309. The
p. 24, fn. 85, lines 7–9:

reads: Also, it seems unlikely that blinding would be used on someone who was not a rival for the throne just to punish that person.

should read: The same objection might be made about a postscript to a collection of excerpts from saints *vitae* and edificatory and chronicle notes of the Kirillo-Beloozero Monastery in which the Hegumen Gurii Tushin testifies that the boyar Fedor Vasil’evich Basenok was blinded in 1463. *Opisanie 24-kh rukopisnykh sbornikov XVI veka Novgorodskoi Sofiitskoii biblioteki, nakhodiashchaisya nyne v Sanktpeterburgskoi dukhovnoi akademii*, ed. F. K. Smirnov, St. Petersburg, Tipografiia A. Transhelia, 1865, p. 61.

p. 45, line 8:

reads: they held.

add footnote: In the first half of the sixteenth century, this was true of *pomeshchiki* only in the non-Novgorodian *uezdy*. See Donald Ostrowski, “Early Pomest’e Grants as a Historical Source,” *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, vol. 33, 2000, pp. 57–60.

p. 46, line 16:

before the word Thus, add: In the late sixteenth century, Fletcher described “four lords of the chetverti” who ran the administration, mustered the troops, and led them into battle as field marshals.


p. 51, fn. 64:


should read: Commonwealth,” p. 193.

p. 55, fn. 86, line 1:

reads: vol. 4, pp. 468, 536; vol. 6, pp. 244–245;

should read: vol. 4 (1925), pp. 460, 466; vol. 6, p. 51;

p. 58, fn. 100, line 8:

reads: Kollman,

should read: Kollmann,

p. 58, fn. 100, end:

p. 60, after line 9:

**add:** As Kotoshikin describes it, a person had “to earn” or “qualify for” (*dosluzhit’sia*) a *pomest’e* through service.

**then add a footnote:** Kotoshikin, *O Rossii*, p. 95.

**continue in text:** Chancellor tells us that “[i]f any man behave himself valiantly in the field,” then he was given a *pomest’e*.

**then add a footnote:** Chancellor, “First Voyage to Russia,” p. 28.

p. 89, fn. 16, line 2:

**reads:** 1851–1871, *PDS*, vol. 1,

**should read:** 1851–1871, vol. 1,

p. 89, fn. 16, line 4:

**add:** Other instances of a foreign envoy’s having a private audience with the Muscovite ruler include the following: Jakob Pisar, ambassador from King Casimir of Poland-Lithuania, with Ivan III and his son Ivan in 1468 (*PSRL*, vol. 8, p. 153; vol. 11, p. 119; vol. 18, p. 218; vol. 25, p. 280; vol. 26, p. 223; vol. 28, pp. 118, 286; *Ioasafovksaia letopis’*, p. 56); Thomas Randolph with Ivan IV in 1569 (*Rude & Barbarous Kingdom*, p. 70); and John Merrick with Boris Godunov in 1602 (*Gentleman’s Magazine*, vol. 94, pt. 2, 1824, p. 227).

p. 89, fn. 18, line 1:

**reads:** Muscovites

**should read:** Russians

p. 89, fn. 18, line 2:

**reads:** (forthcoming).

**should read:** vol. 57, 1998, pp. 585–608.

p. 89, fn. 19, line 4:

**reads:** Slaverei

**should read:** Sklaverei

p. 90, fn. 20, line 2:


p. 90, line 15:

**after the word** tsar. **add footnote:** Herberstein tells us that a councillor would announce that the ambassador *bit chelom*, without the ambassador’s having to perform the act. Herberstein, *Zapiski*, pp. 213, 215; Herberstein, *Notes*, vol. 2, pp. 124, 126.

p. 95, line 1up:

**after the word formulas. add a footnote:** Skrynnikov asserts that the grand-princely

p. 96, line 1 up:
reads: two years
should read: seventeen

p. 97, fn. 48, line 18:
add at the end: The word *pozhalovati* is a calque of *soyurga*- (to grant). Golden, “Turkic Calques,” pp. 110–111.

p. 98, fn. 49, line 10:
reads: Mitteralter
should read: Mittelalter

p. 98, fn. 49, end:
add: We have evidence of an even earlier usage of metaphorical kinship occurring in a Smolensk document from 1340, when Prince Ivan Aleksandrovich refers to Grand Duke Gediminas of Lithuania as “my elder brother.” *SGGD*, vol. 2, no. 8, pp. 10–11.

p. 99, continuation of fn. 49, end of line 13:
add: Chrysos cautions us, however, against accepting the view that this diplomatic terminology implied some kind of political or legal relationship between states or that any notion of a hierarchical world order was in place. See Evangelos Chrysos, “‘Was Old Russia a Vassal State of Byzantium?’” in *The Legacy of Saints Cyril and Methodius to Kiev and Moscow: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Millennium of the Conversion of Rus’ to Christianity. Thessaloniki 26–28 November 1988*, ed. Anthony-Emil N. Tachiaos, Thessaloniki: Hellenic Association for Slavic Studies, 1992, p. 244.

p. 100, line 18:
add: That also seems to be the case in the *Secret History of the Mongols* where Ong-khan declares Temujin his “son” because Ong-khan had an *anda* relationship with Yisegu, Temujin’s father.

then add footnote: *Secret History* (Cleaves), sec. 164, pp. 87–88; “Secret History” (Rachewiltz) *PFEH*, vol. 13, p. 52. Earlier Ong-khan (Toghril) had referred to Jamuqa as “younger brother”, but that was in relation to Temujin who was Jamuqa’s *anda*. *Secret History* (Cleaves), sec. 104, 108, pp. 40, 44; “Secret History” (Rachewiltz) *PFEH*, vol. 5, pp. 150, 154. Jamuqa, in return, refers to Toghril as “elder brother.” *Secret History* (Cleaves), sec. 106, p. 42; “Secret History” (Rachewiltz) *PFEH*, vol. 5, p. 152. But neither Pelliot and Hambis nor Rachewiltz see this phrase as indicating anything more than respect. *Histoire des*
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p. 118, line 13:
- **after the word** domain. **add:** Under 1284, the Nikon Chronicle reports the protection by Tatars of merchants from Europe and Constantinople in the Chernigov land.
- **then add footnote:** *PSRL*, vol. 10, pp. 163–164

p. 121, line 8up:
- **reads:** the Simeonov and Nikon chronicles report that in 1388,
- **should read:** a number of chronicles report that, in 1376, a metropolitan named Marko came from St. Catherine’s Monastery in the Sinai to Moscow for donations and, later in the year, Niphontus, Archimandrite of the Holy Archangel Michael Monastery in Jerusalem came to Moscow for donations, which helped him to become Patriarch of Jerusalem, and, in 1388,

p. 121, fn. 69:
- **reads:** vol. 11, p. 94; vol. 18, p. 138.
- **should read:** vol. 8, pp. 24, 52; vol. 11, pp. 25, 94; vol. 18, pp. 117, 138; vol. 24, p. 132; vol. 25, pp. 192, 214.

p. 122, line 4:
- **reads:** 1445.
- **should read:** 1445, but this is more likely 20,000 rubles.

p. 124, line 8:
- **before the word** Under, **add:** The “Chronicle Notes of Mark Levkeinskii” tells us that the Nogais came with 80,000 horses in 1530; with 30,000 horses in 1531; and with 50,000 horses in 1534.
- **then add a footnote:** “Letopisnye zapisi Marka Levkeinskogo,” pp. 12–13.

p. 124, fn. 83, line 3:

p. 124, fn. 84, line 2:

p. 126, fn. 97, line 4:
- **reads:** Mittalters
- **should read:** Mittelalters
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p. 139, line 21:
reads: Sadi
should read: Said

p. 148, line 2:
after the word Rus’, add a footnote: Some chronicles do report Rus’ as the ulus of the Tatar khan. See, e.g., under 1348, when Grand Prince Semen asks Khan Janibeg protection from Lithuania. PSRL, vol. 7, p. 215; vol. 10, p. 219; vol. 20, p. 185; vol. 23, p. 109; vol. 25, p. 177; vol. 28, pp. 72, 233. And the Galician-Volynian Chronicler uses the phrase “for at that time the Rus’ princes were under Tatar rule” (v voli tatar’skoi) to acknowledge the sovereignty of the Qipchaq khan. PSRL, vol. 2 (1908), cols. 888 (1282), 897 (1287). On the chroniclers’ claim that Rus’ was an ulus of the Tatar khan, see Charles J. Halperin, “Tsarev ulus: Russia in the Golden Horde,” Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique vol. 23, 1982, pp. 257–263, where he argues that “all Russian declamations of fealty to the ulus to which they belonged, the tsarev ulus, must be invented fantasies, exercises in bending the truth to suit tendentious political purpose” and that “the sources, to be blunt, lie…” (261). See also Halperin’s comments on vole in his “The East Slavic Response to the Mongol Conquest,” Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi, vol. 10, 1998–1999, p. 104.

p. 155, lines 14–15:
reads: led a mixed Rus’ and Tatar army against a mixed Tatar and Rus’ army led by an emir
should read: led a large army gathered from the various principalities of Rus’ against a predominantly Tatar army led by an emir

p. 159, lines 5–6:
reads: but then treated this hypothetical construct as equivalent to an extant chronicle.
should read: but eventually came to the same conclusion as Shakhmatov.
then add a footnote: Lur’e, Dve istorii, pp. 113–114.

p. 159, fn. 69, end:

p. 166, line 5:
p. 166, line 7:
reads: in Cyrillic.
should read: in Cyrillic in Muscovy.

p. 166, fn. 12, end:
add: In 1351, Grand Prince Semen spent 8 days with his army at the Ugra River opposite Grand Duke Algirdas and his army. PSRL vol. 7, p. 216; vol. 10, p. 223; vol. 18, pp. 97–98; vol. 20, p. 186; vol. 23, p. 110; vol. 24, p. 120; vol. 25, p. 178; vol. 26, p. 115; vol. 28, pp. 72, 233; Priselkov, Troitskaia letopis‘, p. 372.

p. 175, fn. 45, line 3:
reads: vol. 7,
should read: vol. 8,

p. 175, fn. 45, line 3:
reads: 152–163.

p. 176, fn. 51, line 1:
reads: O. A.
should read: O. I.

p. 176, fn. 12, line 4:
reads: Bewusstein
should read: Bewusstsein

p. 179, line 1:
reads: Mazoretski
should read: Mazowiecki

p. 180, fn. 72, end:
add: Cherniavsky has the opposite opinion, that tsesar’ meant “junior emperor,” so that tsar’ referred to the khan, and tsesar’ referred to “his heir and co-ruler.” Cherniavsky, “Khan or Basileus;” p. 67.

p. 181, line 21:
reads: Tatar khans
should read: Nogai princes

p. 181, fn. 78, end:
add: In addition to those case cited by Savva, Vasilii III refers to himself a tsar’ in a document to his tax collectors in 1517 in Lapland. See “Vypiska iz privilegii velikogo kniazia, pozhalovannoi im dikim lopariam s morskogo berega Norvegii,” in V. E. Vozgrin, I. P. Shaskol’skii, and T. A. Shpader, “Gramoty velikogo kniazia

p. 182, line 23:
reads: 1554 from Khan Bekbula
does not read: 1551 the Nogai mirza Belek Bulat

p. 182, fn. 87, lines 2–3:
reads: Khan Bekbula was the grandson of the khan of the Qipchaq Khanate, Ahmed, and the father of Simeon Bekbulatovich (Sayin Bulat).
does not read: See also Kennedy, “Juchids,” pp. 119, 123–124; and Michael Khodarkovsky, *Russia’s Steppe Frontier: The Making of a Colonial Empire 1500–1800*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2002, p. 44. Belek Bulat mirza, who claimed to be descended from the emir Edigei (thus, a non-Chingizid), should not be confused with Khan Bekbula, who was the grandson of the khan of the Qipchaq Khanate Ahmed (thus, a Chingizid), and the father of Simeon Bekbulatovich (Sayin Bulat). For a recent study of the use of the term belyi tsar’ and of allusions in contemporary sources to the “Chingissid ancestry” of Ivan IV, see Charles J. Halperin, “Ivan IV and Chinggis Khan,” *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, vol. 51, 2003, pp. 481–497. Another use of the term belyi tsar’ by the Nogais not mentioned by Halperin is in Mirza Ismail’s letter of 1552 to Ivan IV found in RGADA, f. 127, op. 4, fol. 66 (cited in Il’ia Zaitsev, *Mezhdu Moskvoi i Stambulom. Dzhuchidskie gosudarstva, Moskva i Osmanskaia imperiia (nachalo XV–pervaia polovina XVI vv.*), Moscow, Rudomino, 2004, p. 163).

p. 183, fn. 88, line 1:
reads: “Juchid,”
does not read: “Juchids,”

p. 187, fn. 106, line 1:
reads: Khânates of Kazan’,”
does not read: Khanates of Kazan’ and the Crimea,”

p. 188, line 2:
reads: cite the
does not read: cite Fletcher’s statement: “Their neighbors with whom they have greatest dealings and intercourse, both in peace and war, are first the Tatar; secondly, the Poles. . . .” Confirmation of this priority can be found in the

then add a footnote after the added Fletcher quotation above: Fletcher, “Of the Russe Commonwealth,” p. 191.

p. 193, line 7:
reads: 1580s
does not read: 1560s
p. 195, line 1:
reads: Ivan IV’s activities in the Oprichnina.
should read: Muscovite rulers’ following steppe khans in their policies and actions.

p. 201, fn. 18:
reads: p. 42.
should read: p. 43.

p. 202, fn. 13, end:
add: Kotoshikin says that Ivan ordered Filipp suffocated with a pillow. Kotoshikin, _O Rossii_, pp. 1–2.

p. 203, fn. 18:
should read: Pobedova, _Moskovskaia shkola_, appendix.

p. 209, fn. 40, end:
add: At the point when the council had completed its deliberations, the grand prince did show up and had Metropolitan Zosima look into what the canon laws were regarding heretics. But Ivan III did not formally participate in the proceedings. _AFED_, p. 385.

p. 216, line 11:
reads: of absolutism on
should read: of absolute monarchy on

p. 216, lines 14–15:
reads: combine Hobbes’ view, which was that in the natural state the people chose the ruler, with Bossuet’s views, which was that God
should read: combine the view (accepted by Hobbes among others) that in the natural state the people chose the ruler with the view (accepted by Bossuet among others) that God

p. 217, lines 14–15:
reads: themsel-ves
should read: them-selves.

p. 221, line 3:
reads: the published version

p. 221, fn. 10:
reads: 799.

p. 221, fn. 11:
reads: A. S. Pavlov, “Vopros o eresi zhidovstvuiushchikh na VI Arkheologicheskom s’ezde,” *Sovremennye izvestiia*, Odessa, September 29, 1884, no. 266; should read: “Mitropolita Zosimy izveshchenie o paskhalii,” col. 798, fn. 7;

p. 233, fn. 58, lines 1–2:

p. 234, lines 24–33:
reads: Formosus, sends the white cowl to Patriarch Philotheus of Constantinople, who is told in a dream to send it to Archbishop Vasilii of Novgorod. Throughout the *Tale*, the author plays fast and loose with chronology, none more so than here. Formosus was pope from 891 to 896, while Philotheus Coccinus was patriarch from 1353 to 1354 and from 1364 to 1376. Apparently it took over four-and-a-half centuries for the white cowl to travel from Rome to Constantinople. In addition, Vasilii became archbishop in 1342, some eleven years before Philotheus became patriarch.
should read: Formosus (891–896), betrays the faith and hides the white cowl because he despises it. After some time, another pope, whose name is not given in the records because he acts so shamefully, sends the white cowl to the Patriarch of Constantinople Philotheus The author of the *Tale* does report that some say the pope’s name was Gervasius or Eugene. Philotheus (Coccinus), who was patriarch from 1353 to 1354 and from 1364 to 1376, in turn, is told in a dream to send it to Archbishop Vasilii of Novgorod. Throughout the *Tale*, the author plays fast and loose with chronology, none more so than here. Vasilii became archbishop of Novgorod in 1330 and ceased being archbishop in 1352, a year before Philotheus first became patriarch. In the Short Redaction, Formosus sends the white cowl to a certain Patriarch Uv enalii (Juv enal?), who then sends it to Archbishop Vasilii. Although whoever wrote the Short Redaction had the correct date (1337) for when Vasilii was archbishop, he treated all three prelates as contemporaries. Yet, Formosus lived over four-and-a-half centuries earlier and there was no such patriarch with the name Uv enalii or Juvenal.

p. 234, fn. 62, lines 6–9:
eliminate the words: Whoever wrote the Short Redaction would have had the correct date (1337), for Vasilii’s being archbishop. But the author of the Short Redaction names the patriarch to whom the cowl was sent as a certain “Uv enalii” (Juvenal?). There was no such patriarch with that name.
p. 236, line 3:
reads: banishment of Archbishop Pimen in 1570.\textsuperscript{67}
should read: deposition and banishment of Archbishop Pimen in 1570\textsuperscript{67} and deposition, arrest, and trial of Archbishop Leonid in 1575.\textsuperscript{67a}

p. 237, line 8up:
reads: in a monastery.
should read: in a monastery, and in 1575 ousted the Novgorodian Archbishop Leonid, had him tried, and imprisoned.

p. 244, line 6up:
reads: Safanovich
should read: Safonovich

p. 245, fn. 4, line 2, after “p. 58.”:
add: Nine years later, Reinhold Heidenstein also used the term when he wrote that Ivan III overthrew the “Tatar yoke” (“Idem Tartarorum iugum primus excussit”). Reinhold Heidenstein, \textit{De bello Moscovitico commentariorum}, Cracow, officina Lazari, 1584, p. 24. (My thanks to Halperin for pointing out the use of the term “tatarskoe igo” in the Russian translation of Heidenstein’s book.)

p. 245, fn. 4, end:

p. 251, Glossary
add a note: Unusual and foreign words and phrases that appear only once in the text are defined where they appear. Unusual and foreign words and phrases that appear more than once in the text are defined here.

p. 252, after line 13:
add: \textit{Posol'skii prikaz} Ambassadorial chancellery (the foreign affairs office).

p. 254, lines 17–19:
eliminate the words: Novgorodians under their prince, Alexander Iaroslavich, defeat Swedes on Neva River

p. 255, line 5up:
reads: Qaraqorum
should read: Sarai
p. 256, lines 11up–12up:
eliminate the words: Toqta becomes khan of Qipchaq Khanate

p. 256, line 6up:
eliminate the words: Toqta dies

p. 258, line 16:
reads: 1353
should read: 1353

p. 261, line 3:
reads: begins
should read: begins;

p. 261, line 4:
eliminate: 1438

p. 261, lines 4–5:
reads: Belev, founds Kazan Khanate
should read: Belev

p. 261, line 17:
reads: 200,000
should read: 20,000

p. 264, line 18up:
add: the Nogai mirza Bek Bulat writes a letter to Ivan IV referring to him as a Chingizid

p. 264, line 17up:
add: the Nogai mirza Ismail writes a letter to Ivan IV referring to him as “belyi tsar”

p. 264, line 13–14up:
eliminate: 1554 Khan Bekbulat sends a letter in which he refers to Ivan IV as a Chingizid

p. 265, line 17up:
reads: Monasteries prohibited from inheriting lands
Monasteries agree at a Church council to register all new land acquisitions with the government in return for being allowed to keep all the lands they had at that point.

p. 267, line 4up:
reads: dogovornye
should read: dogovornye

p. 269, after line 21:
p. 270, after line 25:
add: Opisanie 24-kh rukopisnykh sbornikov XVI veka Novgorodskoi Sofiiskoi biblioteki, nakhodiashchikhsia nyne v Sanktpeterburgskoi dakhovnoi akademii, ed. F. K. Smirnov, St. Petersburg, Tipografiia A. Transhelia, 1865.

p. 271, lines 14–16:

p. 271, line 16:
should read: 1841–2002.

p. 277, line 23:
reads: Mittalters
should read: Mittelalters

p. 279, after line 7up:

p. 281, line 26:
reads: Mitteralter
should read: Mittelalter

p. 285, after line 18:

p. 285, after line 18up:

p. 287, line 9up:
reads: historishces Bewusstein
should read: historisches Bewusstsein
p. 289, after line 16up:
add: Khodarkovsky, Michael, ‘‘Not by Word Alone’: Missionary Policies and Religious
Conversion in Early Modern Russia,” *Comparative Studies of Society and History*,
also add: Khodarkovsky, Michael, *Russia’s Steppe Frontier: The Making of a Colonial

p. 289, after line 12up:
add: Khoroshkevich, A. L., *Torgovlia Velikogo Novgoroda v XIV–XV vekakh*, Moscow,

p. 290, after line 13:
add: Kloss, B. M., “Ob avtore i vremeni sozdania ‘Skazanie o Mamaevom poboishche’,”
in *In Memoriam: Sbornik pamiati Ia. S. Lur’e*, St. Petersburg, Atheneum-Fenisks,

p. 290, line 2up:
reads: Slaverei
should read: Sklaverei

p. 294, line 26:
reads: Khanate
should read: Khanates

p. 297, line 3up:

p. 297, between lines 2up–3up:
add: Ostrowski, Donald, “Early Pomest’e Grants as a Historical Source,” *Oxford

p. 300, line 3:
reads: Muscovites
should read: Russians

p. 300, line 4:
reads: (forthcoming).

p. 305, after line 23:
p. 306, line 14:
reads: Spidliak
should read: Špidlík

p. 306, line 20:
reads: 7,
should read: 8,

p. 306, line 12up:

p. 308, after line 3up:
add: Vel’iaminov-Zernov, V. V., Issledovanie o Kasimovskikh tsariakh i tsarevichakh, 4 vols., St. Petersburg, Imperatorskaia Akademii nauk, 1863–1887.

p. 309, after line 9up:

p. 310, after line 20:

p. 310, after line 26:

p. 312, col. 2, after line 1:
add: Algirdas (Ol’gerd) (grand duke of Lithuania), 19 n.62, 20

p. 313, col. 2, line 14:
reads: 182,
should read: 182 n.87,

p. 313, col. 2, after line 15:
add: Belek Bulat (Nogai mirza), 182 and n.87.

p. 315, col. 1, line 2up:
reads: Mazoresteski
should read: Mazowiecki
p. 315, col. 1, line 1 up:
reads: consensus
should read: consensus

p. 316, col. 1, line 16:
reads: Safanovich
should read: Safonovich

p. 318, col. 1, line 29:
reads: 197 n.141
should read: 197 n.141, 236 n.67a

p. 320, col. 2, after line 15 up:
add: Leonid (Archbishop of Novgorod), 236, 237.

p. 322, col. 2, line 6 up:
reads: 80, 131
should read: 80, 97, 132

p. 323, col. 2, line 1:
reads: Quipchaq
should read: Qipchaq

p. 323, col. 2, lines 28–29:
reads: Ol’gerd (grand duke of Lithuania), 19 n.62, 20
should read: Ol’gerd (see Algirdas)

p. 325, col. 2, line 35:
reads: Sadi Aḥmed
should read: Said Aḥmed

p. 325, col. 2:
move the entry for Said Aḥmed to after the entry for Sahlins, Marshall in the same column.
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Please send further corrections to: Don_Ostrowski@harvard.edu