

Peking at conciliation: it would grant the Russians the commerce they wished if only they would halt their advance in Central Asia. Soon the Russians vastly expanded their trade by suspending those clumsy and costly caravans and boosting frontier deals at Kiakhta instead—but their Central Asian push continued, with well-known results.

As Mancall points out, the Kiakhta agreement worked for the Russians until 1860, by which time their attitudes as well as those of the West Europeans toward the nonwhite world had undergone tremendous changes, leading to far greater appetites and grabs. The book's conclusion, "An Hypothesis as Epilogue," is absorbingly interesting for the author's challenging views on the "new Western concepts of the intellectual order" and the "new technology by which the West was subjecting East Asia to its new concept of world order." His ideas of political history and social anthropology, coupled with his linguistic and research talents, lead us to hope that Mancall will produce at least two more books as brilliant as the one under review—for the periods 1729–1860 and 1861–1949.

One minor correction: Yury Krizhanich (Juraj Križanić), the exile in Tobolsk who in 1675 met and helped with information the tsar's China-bound envoy Nikolai Milescu or Spathary, was not "of Serbian nationality" (p. 77), an error all too often made in historical literature. He was a Croat.

To the sources on Krizhanich given by Mancall (p. 326), he should have added the latest Soviet publication of the Croat monk's *Politika* (Moscow: "Nauka," 1965), containing the original and its new Russian translation, and, above all, some thirty-five pages of illuminating comments by two Soviet scholars.

In the ample bibliography, to the journals of Adam Brand as issued in London in 1698 (and in French in Amsterdam in 1699) and of E. Isbrants Ides in London in 1706, Mancall would have done well to add the Russian translation of both, *Zapiski o russkom posol'stve v Kitai (1692–1695)*, published in Moscow in 1967 under the auspices of the Academy of Sciences: the corrections and comments by M. I. Kazanin, the Soviet translator, are exceedingly valuable.

ALBERT PARRY

Colgate University (Emeritus)

LA GRANDE COMMISSION LÉGISLATIVE, 1767–1768: LES CAHIERS DE DOLÉANCES URBAINS (PROVINCE DE MOSCOU). By *François-Xavier Coquin*. Preface by *Victor-L. Tapié*. Publications de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de Paris-Sorbonne. Série "Recherches," vol. 67. Paris and Louvain: Béatrice Nauwelaerts, 1972. ix, 258 pp.

The *nakazy* (instructions, *cahiers*) given to the deputies to the Legislative Commission of 1767 by their electors provide an inexhaustible source of information on mid-eighteenth-century Russia. To date they have been used to shed light on various aspects of cultural life (education, literacy, freedom of expression, and so forth) or on the demands of specific groups. Among the latter, pride of place has been held by the nobility, whose sociocultural physiognomy has been well delineated on the basis of the *nakazy* to its deputies. Curiously, however, the *nakazy* have not been adequately exploited with reference to the "free" peasantry or the urban classes. It is the latter gap that Mr. Coquin endeavors to fill.

In the first half of his book Coquin retraces in useful detail the procedures for the election of the deputies and the drafting of their *nakazy*. On the basis of his

review of both the published and the unpublished sources he makes the following valuable observations: Catherine's electoral rules mark an innovation in state policy in that they define the urban community as the totality of those living within the geographic confines of a town. This was a conscious effort to break down the self-contained narrowness of each social group and to think in terms of a dynamic urban population with its own social character and needs. In so doing Catherine was obviously inspired by what could be observed in contemporary Europe. Coquin is correct in questioning the ideological impact of the *philosophes* on Catherine and her advisers, but he might have pointed to and elaborated on the influence of cameralism and legislative practice. To what extent did the urban population follow Catherine's lead and fulfill her expectations? Coquin's findings do not provide a clear-cut answer. In fact, the merchants (whom it would have been nice to see more fully described) dominated the procedure and turned the urban *nakazy* into a vehicle for their own complaints and demands. The participation of other urban groups was minimal. In most cases their representatives merely signed the *nakazy*, and their needs were mentioned only sporadically and almost as an after-thought.

The second half of the volume summarizes clearly and fully, along topical lines, the major concerns and issues that preoccupied the merchants. Not surprisingly, fiscal and judicial problems were at the center of their attention, but specific professional needs were also mentioned. The merchants fought for the maintenance, or even reintroduction, of their economic monopolies (displaying a genuinely "medieval" static conception of society), with little concern for those issues that might affect the entire urban population and a total lack of interest in such aspects of progress as education. Coquin's list of perceived needs and demands offers informative data on the urban reality in mid-eighteenth-century Russia. But his picture remains a bit shallow. He does not penetrate the dynamics of economic attitudes, values, and self-perception along the lines he pursued so successfully regarding the peasants in an earlier book, *La Sibérie: Peuplement et immigration paysanne au XIX^e siècle* (1969). Admittedly, to obtain a full picture of Russian towns and of the social and mental universes of their inhabitants (along the lines of the école des *Annales* which American colonial historians are extending imaginatively) one would have to go beyond the *nakazy* and delve into the as yet unmined (and largely inaccessible) local archives. Perhaps our Soviet colleagues will be prompted to move in this direction by Coquin's effort.

The book is very well written, lucidly organized, and beautifully produced. Coquin displays an excellent historical sense, dealing with the problems of eighteenth-century Russia in their own terms, within the compass of the mental horizons of its contemporaries. The single criticism one might make in this connection is that the author does not pay enough attention to the contemporary European—especially Central European—context, and thus misses opportunities for comparative judgments that might better reveal the dynamics and limitations of the Russian case. One annoying error should be mentioned (it is the only significant one): on page 183, in note 19, Coquin defines the *Polnoe sobranie zakonov* as a code. Actually it was merely a collection of laws from which the code—*Svod zakonov* (1st ed., 1835)—was later distilled. The volume concludes with a translation of four urban *nakazy* and a very useful selective bibliography.

MARC RAEFF
Columbia University