

tiii but returns to his survey of eighteenth-century historiography, which is less original and significant than part 1.

Among other new materials of particular interest to specialists is the journal, from the Müller portfolios, in which the beleaguered German historian records the discussion (in 1749–50) of his thesis concerning the origins of the Russian people, a dramatic episode which has most often been described from the tendentious viewpoints of Müller's antagonists, especially Lomonosov. Of interest also is the comparison of Catherine's published *Notes on Russian History* with the manuscripts and the detailed treatment of V. V. Krestinin's relations with A. R. Vorontsov, the latter based on correspondence between 1787 and 1794. This work may be found in part 2.

Diffuse presentation of material, references to individual historians scattered across three volumes, and the author's device of interpreting his subject often in the form of observations on views of others rather than independent formulations—all render hazardous an evaluation of his judgments on individual historians. Pesh-tich began his serious work shortly before World War II. He prepared for two decades and published over yet another decade. The author owed his readers a clarification of the seeming ambiguities and contradictions in his judgments. He might have ended his long labor not by describing local history in the second half of the eighteenth century but by giving a thorough recapitulation of his conclusions. An index is also needed.

Pesh-tich in text and footnotes demonstrates a formidable acquaintance with the primary materials concerning his subject. Owing to his untimely death in 1972, readers must now look to his students for further analysis of individual topics raised but not fully developed in this work—for example, the role of sectarian writings in the formation of eighteenth-century historical thought, the uses of Petrine history as a form of opposition after 1725, a consecutive history of state intervention in historical writing, and the nature of the Russian enlightenment.

JOAN AFFERICA
Smith College

THE CRIMEAN WAR. By R. L. V. French Blake. Concise Campaigns. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1972. x, 181 pp. \$9.50.

This small volume is one of a series of guidebooks and makes no attempt to cover all aspects of the Crimean War. The effort to explain the origins of the war is sketchy and unsatisfactory. On the other hand, it presents a careful and objective treatment of the campaigns, based on the leading Western studies of the war. The author also cites Todleben's *Défense de Sébastopol* and Tolstoy's *Sevastopol Sketches*, but gives little else from the Russian side. He seems, however, to be free from the usual British Russophobia and is unsparing in his criticism of many of the British commanders and civil servants. He is also willing to praise the French and the Russians when it is merited. The treatment is more inclusive than most histories of the Crimean conflict, for it deals with the Danube campaign of 1854, the fighting in Asia Minor throughout the war, and the naval operations in the Black, Baltic, and White seas, and even the brief fighting in Kamchatka.

The chief merit of the book is that it presents a detailed and well-reasoned

account of the main campaigns, free from rhetoric and written in a clear and understandable fashion. There is a helpful chronological table of events from early 1853 to April 1856, and there are numerous excellent maps. The volume has many fine illustrations from contemporary drawings by William Simpson.

But though the author has given a well-organized and understandable account of the war, he has failed to offer a well-rounded picture, for there is almost nothing on the Russians and their problems. He never suggests that throughout the war most of the Russian army was concentrated in Poland, along the Austrian frontier, and in the Baltic region, because of fear of attack by Austria, Prussia, and Sweden. The terrible logistical problems of supplying an army in the Crimea when there was no railroad south of Moscow are not even suggested, and there is no mention that often the Russian cannon in Sevastopol were woefully short of powder and projectiles. Written by an Englishman for an English public, this book is probably the best concise history of the Crimean War available. It does not, however, answer all the questions.

JOHN SHELTON CURTISS
Duke University

RUSSIAN JOURNALISM AND POLITICS, 1861-1881: THE CAREER OF ALEKSEI S. SUVORIN. By *Effie Ambler*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1972. 239 pp. \$12.50.

Effie Ambler's study of the career of Aleksei S. Suvorin, the publisher of the important St. Petersburg newspaper *Novoe vremia*, is a useful addition to the sparse literature on Russian journalism in English. The heart of the book is devoted to the journalist's career from 1861 to 1881, but it also contains substantial material on the relation between politics and journalism. Well written in places, the book describes Suvorin's evolution from a close associate of liberals and radicals to a rabid nationalist, anti-Semite, and political conservative after his purchase of *Novoe vremia* in 1876. The tale ends in 1881, when, according to the author, Suvorin's "political metamorphosis" was completed. The remainder of his life, to 1912, is treated in a brief epilogue.

The author's choice of 1881 as a cut-off date seems arbitrary. She notes that after 1881 Suvorin became important as an entrepreneur and publisher of children's and classical literature. In this respect, then, the author has ignored a most essential period of Suvorin's activities. Moreover, she provides little explanation for the turnabout Suvorin performed in 1876. She admits that he was not a systematic thinker and that it is "impossible to determine Suvorin's private thoughts and intentions in 1876." But even unsystematic journalists leave some traces of their thinking in their letters. Because the author limited her research to published sources and to material Suvorin printed in his newspaper, her book becomes a simple description and not an explanation of Suvorin's apostasy. In his lifetime, Suvorin was called by a critic a "weather vane" of Russian society. If he was, then a more intensive analysis of his ideas and evolution might have cast light on the change in mood of Russian educated society around 1876.

Lacking an explanation, the book remains a description of Suvorin's odyssey. As such, there is little justification for ending the story in 1881. Furthermore, the author does not make full use of some of Suvorin's "principles": he remained a defender of "small deeds" as opposed to utopias; he opposed bureaucratic abuses;