

longest and possibly the most interesting of the collection. Somewhat revisionist in the Soviet context, it is remarkable for its stress on Peter's personal significance, its abundance of detail, its suggestive qualities, and—it must be said—its analytic meagerness. Peter himself is also the focus of T. S. Maikova's study of the composition of Peter's "Gistoriia" of the Swedish war (pp. 103–32), an essay which abundantly documents the point that Peter was, not just as patron but actually as initiator, author, and editor, a founder, perhaps *the* founder, of modern Russian historiography. Also in the biographical mode is the late A. I. Zaozersky's sensible piece, "Field Marshal Sheremetev and the Ruling Circle of the Petrine Period" (pp. 172–98). M. Iu. Volkov contributes (pp. 311–36) an overly long and disputatious analysis of *starets* Avraamii's "Epistle" to Peter, which students of that episode, and of the first years of Peter's government, will nonetheless want to consult.

The volume concludes with a bibliography by M. P. Pavlova-Silvanskaia of 158 works relating to Peter and his times which were published outside the Soviet Union between 1946 and 1970: a most impressive and useful list.

JAMES CRACRAFT
University of Illinois, Chicago

THE EMANCIPATION OF THE RUSSIAN NOBILITY, 1762–1785. By Robert E. Jones. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973. xii, 326 pp. \$12.50.

Professor Jones's monograph is an expansion of his doctoral dissertation, "The Russian Gentry and the Provincial Reform of 1775" (Cornell University, 1968). It explores various stages in the formulation of state policy toward the nobility during the period between the Manifesto of 1762, which offered noble servitors a conditional opportunity to leave state service, and the Charter of 1785, which redefined the group's legal and political status. Catherine's policies toward the nobility, Jones argues, owed less to the strength of a noble opposition than to problems "she encountered in trying to provide Russia, especially the vast and underdeveloped provinces, with a government capable of defending and promoting the national interest" (p. vi). Jones's aim is "to relate Catherine's treatment of the nobility to the goals of her domestic policy and to her perception of the state's interests" (p. vii).

Relying on published documents, laws, and secondary literature, primarily in Russian and English, as well as on limited use of selected manuscripts, Jones introduces and comments on the principal episodes and issues concerning the relations between state and nobility: for example, the disputed circumstances surrounding Peter's Manifesto; Catherine's early efforts to forestall the extension of noble privilege without antagonizing the noblemen who acquiesced in her rule; conditions in the provinces as reflected in documents of the Legislative Commission; the limitations of bureaucratic absolutism; the sources, contents, and in part the implementation of the provincial reform; and the significance of the Charter to the Nobility in 1785.

Jones contends that a reassessment of the state's requirements at the end of the Seven Years' War permitted the release of noblemen from compulsory service. He affirms, however, with earlier scholars, that the state could not dispense with some

form of their service in the provincial administration. The form chosen—elected representatives dependent on bureaucratic appointees—suggests the need for some qualification of the word “emancipation” in the title. To seek, as Jones does, to elucidate the “why” rather than the “what” of Catherine’s policies is an important approach that will yet engage many scholars. The definition of Catherine’s perception of state interest will require the assimilation of vast quantities of material, the character and context of which must be thoroughly and critically discussed. Rather than making a selective survey of these materials, Jones could have provided a focused and fruitful contribution to the question by submitting to rigorous analysis either the twelve hundred pages of worksheets he saw on the provincial reform of 1775 or the preparatory materials for the Charter of 1785, as a means of elucidating the dilemmas and choices before the empress in formulating policy with regard to the nobility. It seems also that resolution of the many complex issues reviewed by Jones will depend largely on comprehensive study of the Russian bureaucracy in the eighteenth century. Given the extent of the literature on these issues, his own contribution would have benefited from a more complete account of how his source materials, methods, and results differ from the work of his predecessors and contemporaries, particularly that of M. P. Pavlova-Silvanskaia on the provincial reform.

JOAN AFFERICA
Smith College

EMPEROR OF THE COSSACKS: PUGACHEV AND THE FRONTIER
JACQUERIE OF 1773–1775. By *John T. Alexander*. Lawrence, Kans.: Corono-
nado Press, 1973. 245 pp. \$8.50.

Despite the book’s title, Professor Alexander has written what amounts to a chronological narrative of the military events encompassing the Pugachevshchina rather than a biography of the instigator of the rebellion. As such, the work represents the obverse side of the author’s *Autocratic Policies in a National Crisis* (1969). The portrait of the protagonist tends to suffer because of this approach. Pugachev’s frame of reference is especially indistinct. What precisely (if anything) did he have in mind when he promised his followers freedom (*vol’nost’*)? Were his political concepts modern or traditional? Was his wrath directed against the state, the nobility and serfdom per se (pp. 216–17), or simply against the excesses inflicted by these institutions (as Raeff and Pascal argue)? His claim to be Peter III, his solicitation for his “son” Pavel Petrovich, his practice of surrounding himself with a court of bogus ministers, and the contriteness with which he accepted his punishment would seem to reveal his inability to emancipate himself from more traditional ideas of rulership. For further study of Pugachev’s mental attitudes the reader will want to consult Dorothea Peters’s *Politische und gesellschaftliche Vorstellungen in der Aufstandsbewegung unter Pugačev (1773–1775)*, volume 17 of *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte* (1973).

The author concludes with an attempt to introduce a comparative historical perspective, based on current social science categories and terminology. His decision that the uprising belongs to the genre “frontier jacqueries” does not strike one as particularly appropriate, perhaps because the typology employed is the creation of Western scholars, and reflects Western experience.