

the Cossacks in the West is erroneous, because it comes mainly from "the narrow and arbitrary official history of Tsarist or Soviet Russia or from sources inimical to the Cossacks." It is his purpose to correct the misinformation and to demonstrate why the Cossacks "are a completely separate and independent people." The evidence he submits is selective and in general more overwhelming than convincing. Russian sources are cited at length in the text, "so that we cannot be suspected of partiality," but often without adequate references to editions and page numbers, and no Russian titles appear in the bibliography. In some chapters there is a considerable overlapping and repetition of ideas. The footnotes are scanty and refer primarily to the final chapter, which deals with the Cossacks as a group in the twentieth century.

The author is at his best in describing the sociopolitical structure, economy, and military tradition of the Don Cossacks. In his discussion of the Cossacks as people and Cossack administration, useful insights are provided on their institutions and psychology. One admires his forthrightness in proclaiming his convictions and in identifying what he sees as the causes of the Cossack problem. But his broad generalizations and tendentiousness in describing the Russian treatment of the Cossacks quickly rule him out as an impartial interpreter of a great subject. The virtues of the Cossacks are uniformly extolled, their shortcomings minimized or ignored. All in all this book illustrates once more the difficulties of combining history with advocacy of a cause, in this case an independent Cossack state.

C. B. O'BRIEN
University of California, Davis

THE RISE OF THE ROMANOV. By *Vasili Kliuchevsky*. Translated and edited by *Liliana Archibald*, assisted by *Mark Scholl*. London: Macmillan. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970. 371 pp. \$12.50.

It has long been fashionable for English-speaking students of Russian history, while praising Kliuchevsky's five-volume *Kurs russkoi istorii*, to condemn C. J. Hogarth's pre-1914 translation as labored and inaccurate—often implying that they could readily do better. In most cases such smugness has been unwarranted, for Kliuchevsky's combination of technical terminology and rhetorical elegance is much easier to enjoy than to translate.

These obstacles did not deter Liliana Barou Archibald, formerly a teacher of Russian history in New Zealand. In 1958 she produced a translation of Kliuchevsky's volume 4 under the title *Peter the Great*. It was published by the eminent Macmillan and St. Martin's Press and praised by professional reviewers as "admirable" and "far superior" to Hogarth's. That success evidently led the same publishers to issue the present work, which is described as a translation of volume 3. Meanwhile, in 1968 another translation of volume 3 had been done by Natalie Duddington (Chicago: Quadrangle Books; introduction by Alfred J. Rieber).

After studying the new Archibald volume and comparing it with the 1937 Russian edition on which it is based, as well as with the other two translations, I have the unwelcome duty of reporting that it is not as good as the Duddington translation and in some respects is inferior to Hogarth's. One curious shortcoming is that the last three chapters of the Russian volume are omitted from this translation without any explanation in the foreword or elsewhere. Since those chapters

were not included in Mrs. Archibald's translation of volume 4, there is a gap between the two works.

Other kinds of defects can be listed briefly. Kliuchevsky's table of contents and chapter headings are left out. The chapters bear no titles but simply numbers. These omissions are only partly offset by the inclusion of an index. Despite the foreword's assurance that the translator's interpolations will be put in brackets, ordinary parentheses are used throughout; hence the reader can only guess which parenthetical explanations are Kliuchevsky's own and which are the translator's. The transliteration system is applied very inconsistently. There are quite a few misprints, as well as mistakes in English punctuation, grammar, and usage. Many of Kliuchevsky's phrases and sentences are completely omitted without any indication of ellipses. Indeed, the translation is often so loose as to be called not a translation but an edited version. Kliuchevsky's first-person lecturing style is converted into passive or third-person constructions. His informal references to such things as his own era and his own religious beliefs are twisted into impersonal references to prerevolutionary Russia made from the standpoint of today. Some of his vivid word pictures vanish. For example, where he says the Cossack assembly "punished unsatisfactory [leaders] by plunging them into the water, having filled their shirts with plenty of sand," the translation reads simply: "Undesirable Cossacks were drowned." Several geographical references are inaccurate, such as "at Pechora" for *za Pechoru* (beyond the Pechora River) or "Northern Territory" for *Severskaia zemlia* (the Seversk region in the basins of the Seim and Desna, not far from Kiev). Among the many mistranslations some are simply careless, like "rural landowners" for *sel'skoe zemledel'cheskoe naselenie* (rural agricultural population). Others suggest inadequate knowledge of special historical terms, like "urban nobility" for *gorodovye dvoriane* in the sense of provincial nobles as distinguished from those of the capital. Especially striking are the various combinations based on that category of petty noblemen known as the *deti boiarskie*. Even after encountering repeated references to "boyar children" the reader may not be fully braced for such items as "grandchildren of boyars" (*synov'ia detei boiarskikh*) or "children of retired boyars" (*otstavnye deti boiarskie*).

For the several scores of passages I compared, the Duddington version usually provided the best combination of accuracy and readability. The Archibald version was generally less precise than either Duddington's or Hogarth's, but it did read more smoothly than Hogarth's, and that is a significant accomplishment in view of the difficulty of the task. Mrs. Archibald's book has one asset that neither of the others has. Its footnotes contain an extensive bibliography of related works in West European languages, keyed to the pertinent passages in the text.

RALPH T. FISHER JR.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

RUSSIAN REBELS, 1600–1800. By *Paul Avrich*. New York: Schocken Books, 1972. ix, 309 pp. \$10.00.

This work comprises a brief introduction, separate chapters on four prominent rebels of the period (Bolotnikov, Razin, Bulavin, and Pugachev), and a conclusion that links their movements to the revolutions of 1905 and 1917. Judged as a synthesis in English of previous scholarship, somewhat removed from the sources,