

(1797), also in the framework of other testimonies. Two studies concern the German population under Russian rule, whether colonists or the Baltic Germans: Winfred A. Kohls's essay on the treatment of the colonists' problem by the Russian press under Alexander III and Inge Auerbach's article on Alexander V. Meyendorff's efforts in favor of Baltic German refugees after World War II. Finally, two studies deal with theater and literature, always in the same thematic context. The first is Georg von Rauch's study of Pastor J. G. Gregory's German poem, complimentary to the Russians (and obviously to the tsar!), written in 1667 in Stuttgart. The second is Hans-Bernd Harder's thorough article on the contributions by N. M. Karamzin, Lyon 1790 (in German prose), and A. I. Turgenev, Stuttgart 1827 (Russian verse), to the *Stammbuch* of the German poet, Friedrich von Matthisson.

This tribute to Amburger is a valuable collective performance, not only because it makes available to the students of Russian-Western relations much heretofore unpublished material but also because of its high methodological level, which would have been appreciated by the meticulous scholar so honored.

MARC SZEFTEL

University of Washington (Emeritus)

A DISCOURSE CONCERNING THE JUST CAUSES OF THE WAR BETWEEN SWEDEN AND RUSSIA: 1700-1721. By *P. P. Shafirov*. Introduction by *William E. Butler*. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, 1973. xii, 294 pp. \$35.00.

Shafirov was certainly one of the most interesting persons raised to prominence by Peter the Great; and his defense of what we might call Peter's "aggression" against Sweden, written for both foreign and domestic consumption, is no doubt one of the most important literary monuments of the reign. The volume under review contains first and foremost a photographic reprint, from a faulty microfilm supplied by the Lenin Library, of Shafirov's (and Peter's) "Razsuzhdenie, kakie zakonnye prichiny . . . Petr Pervyi . . . k nachatiu voiny protiv Korolia Karola 12 Shvedskogo 1700 godu imel . . .," which apparently was compiled for the most part in 1716 and first published, in St. Petersburg, the following year. It was reprinted twice, in Moscow in 1719 and in St. Petersburg in 1722, the latter in an edition of twenty thousand! This is followed by a reprint of the contemporary English translation of the semiofficial German edition of the "Razsuzhdenie," which was not complete: neither the German nor the English translation included the original introduction and dedication or the original appendix of supporting documents drawn from Russian archives, some of which may now be unavailable. And with these Mr. Butler, of the University of London, has provided an introductory essay and an index, the former contributing useful details about Shafirov and the history of the text based partly on research in the Soviet Union as well as an interesting commentary written from the point of view of a specialist in international law.

But other historians, particularly Petrine specialists, will find some of Butler's suggestions regarding the historical context and significance of the "Razsuzhdenie" precarious, if not untenable; and linguists may find the remarks in their direction too rudimentary. Moreover, besides being available in the main Soviet libraries,

copies of the original Russian editions can be found in four places in this country, including the Library of Congress and the New York Public Library (though there are none, apparently, in Britain). And the incomplete, secondhand (and anonymous) English translation printed here is the same one that was first printed in the second volume of F. C. Weber, *The Present State of Russia* (London, 1722), and reprinted in 1968 in the Da Capo/Frank Cass series. Thus it is hard to support Butler's claim that he has "discovered" or "rediscovered" something here.

In other words, though useful and convenient, this book is neither a scholarly edition of the "Razsuzhdenie" nor a scholarly translation of the complete original text. In view of these considerations, and the book's price, one must conclude, a little sadly: *caveat emptor*.

JAMES CRACRAFT
University of Illinois, Chicago

POLITISCHE UND GESELLSCHAFTLICHE VORSTELLUNGEN IN DER AUFSTANDBEWEGUNG UNTER PUGAČEV (1773–1775). By *Dorothea Peters*. FORSCHUNGEN ZUR OSTEUROPAISCHEN GESCHICHTE, vol. 17. Osteuropa-Institut an der Freien Universität Berlin, Historische Veröffentlichungen. Berlin: Otto Harrassowitz, 1973. 364 pp. DM 78, paper.

Although this important synthesis appeared in West Germany when the USSR was celebrating the bicentennial of the Pugachev revolt, it was actually finished five years earlier. The author was able to use such works published in 1966–68 as those of Mavrodin, Andrushchenko, and Rozner in Russian and Paul Duker and Marc Raeff in English. But the reader may find it difficult to appraise the book fairly if he has already familiarized himself with more recent publications in Russian or English, by writers such as J. T. Alexander and R. E. Jones.

But certainly if one thinks in terms of 1968, this book offers many new facts and conclusions of great value to those who are interested in Russian history but have not made a special study of the literature in Russian on the topic. Its aim is not to retrace the course of the revolt, of which it makes only passing mention, but to define the chief characteristics and above all the viewpoints of those concerned: the rebels, the possessing classes, the government, and its leaders. Putting the question thus, the author was compelled to bypass it in a discussion of previous interpretations (in her historiographical introduction) and to end with conclusions integral in a certain philosophy of history, since all studies in the USSR have been guided by Marxist methodology.

In regard to the rebels, the conclusion is that theirs was not a truly revolutionary movement, because they had no objective clearly defined in advance. It was a heterogeneous assemblage of malcontents who, rather than having a vision of the future, often expressed the desire to return to a generally idealized past. The only element of unity was provided by Pugachev himself, who was content to promise in concrete terms to each segment of his followers what it more or less consciously desired. The Iaik Cossacks, who formed the initial nucleus of the rebellion, aspired to regain their prerogatives and were deeply divided into privileged and poor; the other Cossacks disappointed the hopes Pugachev placed in them. The peasants, who at the end made up the most numerous element, were protesting against the economic and legal oppression which grew ever more onerous: the serfs against