

Moreover, he describes in at least survey fashion (pp. 13–19) the most important of the numerous sources on the history of the Mongols, although no reference at all—and this corresponds to his narrow description of the Golden Horde—is made to the Russian chronicles and other Slavic materials or to Latin documents, for example those of Poland-Lithuania. A significant enrichment is provided the author's description by a wealth of illustrations and a great quantity of beautiful drawings interspersed with the description especially of objects of material culture; a few maps and genealogical diagrams are also included.

The reviewer has read the book with pleasure and has learned much from many of the chapters. The author's clear style is a delight. The book will certainly find many admirers. As a whole it qualifies as a thorough if also narrow survey of the complex events of the Mongol era.

BERTOLD SPULER  
*University of Hamburg*

THE MODERN HISTORY OF MONGOLIA. By C. R. Bawden. New York and Washington: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968. xvii, 460 pp. \$11.50.

This excellent book offers two significant contributions and two very welcome bonuses. It fills in the period of Mongolian history between Genghis Khan and the twentieth century; and it adds Mongolian-language sources as confirmation, for the most part, of the information we already had from Russian-language sources for the revolutionary period in this century. The bonuses are that the book is extremely well written and that it includes many excellent illustrations. Particular attention is called to the photographs of the 1962 Genghis Khan stamps and the monument erected at that time for the Great Khan's eight hundredth birthday anniversary—particular attention because of the political cause célèbre that developed about the anniversary celebration, with the Russians opposing and the Chinese approving, and the purges and rewriting of history that occurred before the Russians considered the "damage" undone.

Essentially nothing in Bawden's book, based on Mongolian-language sources, changes interpretations of this reviewer's *Mongols of the Twentieth Century* (1964), based on Russian-language sources, about the Mongolian People's Republic in the Soviet period; and both books tend to weaken or even discredit interpretations popularized by Owen Lattimore. Lattimore credits far more initiative and control to the Mongols themselves over their own political and cultural development in the Soviet period than this reviewer and Bawden find.

One Russian source published recently, A. V. Burdukov's *V staroi i novoi Mongolii* (Moscow, 1969), adds more information to what the Russian sources already say about the 1910–21 period than all the Mongolian sources seem to provide. Still missing are good accounts based on Japanese sources for, say, 1900–1940, but particularly the 1930s, and accounts based on Chinese sources for Manchu administration in the nineteenth century as well as twentieth-century information up to the time of the forced ejection of most Chinese in the mid-1920s.

Bawden's story is not really as strong as it ought to be on the Buddhist Church in Outer Mongolia; the kind of firsthand description and analysis provided in English by Binsted in 1914 ("Life in a Khalkha Steppe Monastery," *Journal of the Royal Asian Society*, 23: 847–900) apparently appeared in none of Bawden's Mongolian sources. Then, some fugitive Mongolian-language sources eluded Bawden: Zhamtsarano's handwritten notebooks recording interviews with lamas and church

dignitaries in the 1930s are still in existence and would probably have provided some of the intellectual independence of viewpoint that seems to be lacking in so much published Mongolian work of the Soviet period.

Of the book's 423 pages of text, 380 pages deal with history before World War II. Roughly the first half of the book is almost entirely new information, never before offered with such a degree of authority and reliability. In fact, the whole book is a triumph of clear and felicitous writing. It is a pleasure to recommend it highly.

ROBERT A. RUPEN

*University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill*

A COURSE IN RUSSIAN HISTORY: THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

By *V. O. Kliuchevsky*. Translated by *Natalie Duddington*. Introduction by *Alfred J. Rieber*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968. xl, 400 pp. \$8.95.

The choice to include Kliuchevsky's volume on seventeenth-century Russian society in the Quadrangle Series on Russian History was an excellent one, providing a nice complement to the first retranslation of Kliuchevsky (*Peter the Great*, St. Martin's Press, 1958). It is thus the second revision of the useful but inadequate translations by C. J. Hogarth (London, 1911–31). Based on the 1957 Soviet edition in Russian, the new version flows smoothly and resounds the masterful style that made Kliuchevsky the most popular university teacher of history in Russia. We owe much to Natalie Duddington for this achievement.

In a solid, scholarly introduction, Professor Albert J. Rieber examines the work, life, and critics of Kliuchevsky the historian with a view to placing him in modern historiography. This is no easy task, because, as Rieber points out, Kliuchevsky as a social thinker tended to feel and reflect the strong currents of change and resistance to change in Russian society and state. Thus his "true" colors in matters epistemological and methodological are important questions of interpretation for both Soviet and pre-Soviet scholars (Plekhanov, Presniakov, Miliukov, Tkhorzhevsky, Pokrovsky, Zimin, and others; see pp. xxv–xxxiii, in particular). For some, Kliuchevsky grounded his method in economic materialism, while for others he worked essentially as a positivist (resembling, I think, Durkheim and his approach to historical process). And at times he seems to have wavered in the direction of idealism. Rieber offers his own rather pragmatic assessment, stating that "two main themes dominated Kliuchevsky's view of the sweep of Russian history: colonization or mastery of the land, and unification or creation of common identity and purpose" (p. xxx). This interpretation is especially logical in retrospect, for it largely accounts for the special features of Russian institutions. One also sees these major concerns prominent in the political-ideological dialogues about Russian national development at all points on the spectrum. The events and ideas in seventeenth-century Russia are replete with evidence supporting Rieber's view.

This new edition is thus much better for instructional purposes than the earlier translation. Both beginning and advanced students of Russian history will find the book valuable and highly readable, and because Kliuchevsky frequently differentiated between Russian and European experience, students of comparative historical method will also be interested. Many of the questions raised by Rieber about Kliuchevsky, his supporters and opponents, and his generalizations on historical process offer good material for further research. These are only a few of