

ories. One difficulty with this method is that each scholar may give uneven emphasis to problems which especially interest him.

Raeff has not overcome this difficulty. Despite a topical format offering chapters on politics, empire, economy, social classes, religion, education, and intellectual life, the result is not so much a broad survey of Russian life during the period in question as a résumé of the author's published research. Students familiar with Raeff's monographs and articles will find no novel interpretations here, and teachers searching for a text on the period will be disappointed with the somewhat narrow focus on the bureaucratic elite. Yet some of the chapters are very good. The section on government, although limited primarily to the Senate and state council, provides an excellent summary of the interaction between politics and institutional development. The survey of imperial policy from the Baltic to Bashkiria ties together a broad, complex process in a brief and thoughtful sketch. The important essay "Les Slaves, les Allemands et les 'Lumières'" is condensed and rewritten in English, making it now available to undergraduate students.

What Raeff has done, in essence, is to give us a compendium of his work and thought. He has taken essays scattered in numerous publications and brought them into a single brief volume. It should provide useful supplementary reading for courses on the middle period of Russian history to inform students of the views of our leading specialist on eighteenth-century Russia.

DAVID L. RANSEL

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

RUSSKAIA ISTORIOGRAFIIA XVIII VEKA. 3 vols. By S. L. Peshtich. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1961, 1965, 1971. Vol. 1: 276 pp. 1.22 rubles. Vol. 2: 344 pp. 1.63 rubles. Vol. 3: 173 pp. 1.01 rubles.

It has taken a decade to publish the doctoral dissertation which the late S. L. Peshtich defended in 1963. Intending to write the first specialized work on the development of eighteenth-century Russian historical thought, the author grounded his study in a thorough review of secondary literature and an independent reading of published and unpublished eighteenth-century works. His main goal was to elucidate "not only the dependence of historical views on political ideas, the struggle of classes and the social and economic position of the country, but also how history was used for political purposes in the interests of ideological influence and practical application in diplomacy and legislation, military affairs, in teaching institutions and reference manuals, in the periodical press, in literature and the arts." He assumed as well the task of describing sources and defining their value, without however pretending to a "many-sided, exhaustive analysis" of the subject. Finally, in addition to concern for both *istoriografiia* and *istochnikovedenie*, he declared a preference for treating those aspects of eighteenth-century historical work which in his view required more adequate study. Careful reading of the monograph shows the author's strength in the second of his goals, the critique and analysis of sources, and his increasing preoccupation with the third. His presentation thereby provides a richness of detail and introduces minor figures and secondary subjects seldom treated at such length in a single work, but at the same time it deprives the whole of that balance and internal coherence which the reader expects of a historiographical work of such scope.

The book is addressed to a broad audience, from scholars in the field, teachers, and students to “those interested in the development of Russian culture and social thought,” but its loose organization and contending goals can scarcely satisfy all. The specialist benefits from extremely detailed analyses of manuscripts but must surely be familiar with the lengthy bibliographies which introduce and often dominate individual chapters. The general reader would require extensive familiarity with eighteenth-century historiography in order to appreciate the value and place of many topics stressed because previous investigations had ignored them. The scrupulousness of the bibliographical work enhances the book’s usefulness to students of the eighteenth century; and the careful presentation of both prerevolutionary and Soviet views, often in extensive paraphrase, will perhaps encourage greater respect for the complexity of issues raised by eighteenth-century historians. The book’s faulty structure, however, leads to tedious repetition and the diffusion of judgments, which, together with scant concern for consecutiveness, integration, and style, often leaves the reader confused. The wide range of subject matter—particularly chapters on local history, the review of historical materials in eighteenth-century journals, and historical themes in literature and art—can be very instructive; but all topics can hardly be treated systematically and analytically in such short space, and the reader frequently meets the author’s apologetic reference to his summary approach (*konspektivnost’*).

Part 1 contains Peshtich’s most original work. He describes the five redactions which he located of the *History of the Swedish War* and attempts to trace the manuscript’s history and Peter’s part in its drafting. This very interesting material on official uses of history could have been summarized more effectively, and the reader would have welcomed an analysis of the specific value of this source when compared with modern interpretations.

The most original contribution concerns Tatishchev’s *Russian History*, the subject of Peshtich’s candidate’s thesis and a sizable portion of this monograph. A painstaking search of major archives in Moscow and Leningrad uncovered twice the known number of manuscripts relating to the *History*. Peshtich scrupulously describes, compares, and classifies them, and attempts to determine the sources on which they were based. He concludes that the two known redactions of the *History* were preceded by an initial compilation of chronicles (*letopisnyi svod*) which has been lost. The first redaction—assumed by several eighteenth-century historians and many of their successors to be a *letopisnyi svod*—is, in Peshtich’s opinion, a history in the form of a chronicle. In writing it, he says, Tatishchev took increasing “liberties” with the sources as he moved from ancient to more recent times. What might appear a dry reconstruction of sources and description of the composing process becomes central to the contentious question of evaluating the authenticity of the so-called Tatishchev *izvestiia*—the information used by Tatishchev which no extant sources confirm. Peshtich suspected that Tatishchev interpreted the sources in accordance with his historical ideas and falsified them to suit his social and political views. The author’s work in identifying and analyzing the manuscripts is considered essential to any future description and evaluation of their significance, as Professor Valk writes in the recent Academy edition of the *History*. (A review of the debate concerning Peshtich’s conclusions may be found in that edition, vol. 7, pp. 24–27.) Regrettably in part 2 Peshtich does not proceed to analyze thoroughly the second redaction or to develop his arguments concerning the Tatishchev *izves-*

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. Peshlich 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.

Peshlich 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