

Professor Avrigh's study displays many virtues. His subjects are fascinating, his breadth of reading is impressive, his prose is generally graceful, and his book is nicely produced. As a contribution to the voluminous scholarship on these subjects, however, it is of rather mixed value. The quality of its constituent parts varies considerably, too. Avrigh's short essay on Bolotnikov, for example, is a pale reflection of the standard studies by Platonov and Smirnov, whereas his lengthier treatment of Razin appears more original. The brief study of Bulavin corresponds to the significance of its subject, but Avrigh's interpretation of Pugachev is disappointing, although he accords him the greatest amount of space as the most important of the four.

The analysis of the reasons for the revolt and its peculiar ideology is the strong point of the essay on Pugachev. Yet this analysis is inferior to Marc Raeff's recent essay, which explicated the same subjects in half the space. An uneven narrative, frequent distortions, and occasional errors also weaken Avrigh's treatment. Thus he provides skimpy, misleading accounts of such important events as the rebel sieges of Orenburg and Yaitsk, just as he muddles episodes at Osa, Kazan, and Saratov, and the details of Pugachev's execution. Minor mistakes include referring to Peter Panin as Pavel and miscounting Pugachev's imprisonments and attacks on Kazan. At times the author's enthusiasm leads to a slapdash use of sources. For example, when he mentions Catherine's disdain for the rebel manifestoes, he refers to those issued in July 1774, whereas her comment was made six months earlier when the situation was quite different. Yet most such inaccuracies—however unnecessary—are minor.

Broader criticisms would note the considerable repetition—for example, the dogged insistence on the overwhelming role in the revolts of the idea of imposture and of the widespread, omnipresent millenarian and apocalyptic expectations of the masses. Perhaps Avrigh's twentieth-century perspective beguiled him into assuming the existence, or exaggerating the significance, of class divisions in early modern Russia. Indeed, here and in other respects Avrigh uncritically follows populist and Soviet historiography. One may even question whether these four revolts should be treated together. Although Avrigh recognizes their complexity and the many ways they differ, he insists on their basic similarities. But his assertion that Bolotnikov somehow "set the pattern" for the other revolts rings false when one recalls that nothing like the Time of Troubles occurred again until 1917.

JOHN T. ALEXANDER  
*University of Kansas*

IMPERIAL RUSSIA, 1682-1825: THE COMING OF AGE OF MODERN RUSSIA. By *Marc Raeff*. Borzoi History of Russia, vol. 4. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971. xi, 176 pp. \$2.95, paper.

This is the first of six volumes which together will comprise a new general history of Russia. Each volume is to be written by a leading expert. The stated purpose of the series is to "overcome the main fault of general histories—the attempt on the part of one historian to cover the whole span of a complex and very long process within a very large society." The approach has been taken before, notably in Miliukov's *Histoire de Russie*, and it is a matter of course nowadays in Soviet his-

tories. One difficulty with this method is that each scholar may give uneven emphasis to problems which especially interest him.

Raeff has not overcome this difficulty. Despite a topical format offering chapters on politics, empire, economy, social classes, religion, education, and intellectual life, the result is not so much a broad survey of Russian life during the period in question as a résumé of the author's published research. Students familiar with Raeff's monographs and articles will find no novel interpretations here, and teachers searching for a text on the period will be disappointed with the somewhat narrow focus on the bureaucratic elite. Yet some of the chapters are very good. The section on government, although limited primarily to the Senate and state council, provides an excellent summary of the interaction between politics and institutional development. The survey of imperial policy from the Baltic to Bashkiria ties together a broad, complex process in a brief and thoughtful sketch. The important essay "Les Slaves, les Allemands et les 'Lumières'" is condensed and rewritten in English, making it now available to undergraduate students.

What Raeff has done, in essence, is to give us a compendium of his work and thought. He has taken essays scattered in numerous publications and brought them into a single brief volume. It should provide useful supplementary reading for courses on the middle period of Russian history to inform students of the views of our leading specialist on eighteenth-century Russia.

DAVID L. RANSEL

*University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign*

RUSSKAIA ISTORIOGRAFIIA XVIII VEKA. 3 vols. By S. L. Peshtich. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1961, 1965, 1971. Vol. 1: 276 pp. 1.22 rubles. Vol. 2: 344 pp. 1.63 rubles. Vol. 3: 173 pp. 1.01 rubles.

It has taken a decade to publish the doctoral dissertation which the late S. L. Peshtich defended in 1963. Intending to write the first specialized work on the development of eighteenth-century Russian historical thought, the author grounded his study in a thorough review of secondary literature and an independent reading of published and unpublished eighteenth-century works. His main goal was to elucidate "not only the dependence of historical views on political ideas, the struggle of classes and the social and economic position of the country, but also how history was used for political purposes in the interests of ideological influence and practical application in diplomacy and legislation, military affairs, in teaching institutions and reference manuals, in the periodical press, in literature and the arts." He assumed as well the task of describing sources and defining their value, without however pretending to a "many-sided, exhaustive analysis" of the subject. Finally, in addition to concern for both *istoriografiia* and *istochnikovedenie*, he declared a preference for treating those aspects of eighteenth-century historical work which in his view required more adequate study. Careful reading of the monograph shows the author's strength in the second of his goals, the critique and analysis of sources, and his increasing preoccupation with the third. His presentation thereby provides a richness of detail and introduces minor figures and secondary subjects seldom treated at such length in a single work, but at the same time it deprives the whole of that balance and internal coherence which the reader expects of a historiographical work of such scope.