

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,

Professor Avrich's study displays many virtues. His subjects are fascinating, his breadth of reading is impressive, his prose is generally graceful, and his book is nicely produced. As a contribution to the voluminous scholarship on these subjects, however, it is of rather mixed value. The quality of its constituent parts varies considerably, too. Avrich's short essay on Bolotnikov, for example, is a pale reflection of the standard studies by Platonov and Smirnov, whereas his lengthier treatment of Razin appears more original. The brief study of Bulavin corresponds to the significance of its subject, but Avrich's interpretation of Pugachev is disappointing, although he accords him the greatest amount of space as the most important of the four.

The analysis of the reasons for the revolt and its peculiar ideology is the strong point of the essay on Pugachev. Yet this analysis is inferior to Marc Raeff's recent essay, which explicated the same subjects in half the space. An uneven narrative, frequent distortions, and occasional errors also weaken Avrich's treatment. Thus he provides skimpy, misleading accounts of such important events as the rebel sieges of Orenburg and Yaitsk, just as he muddles episodes at Osa, Kazan, and Saratov, and the details of Pugachev's execution. Minor mistakes include referring to Peter Panin as Pavel and miscounting Pugachev's imprisonments and attacks on Kazan. At times the author's enthusiasm leads to a slapdash use of sources. For example, when he mentions Catherine's disdain for the rebel manifestoes, he refers to those issued in July 1774, whereas her comment was made six months earlier when the situation was quite different. Yet most such inaccuracies—however unnecessary—are minor.

Broader criticisms would note the considerable repetition—for example, the dogged insistence on the overwhelming role in the revolts of the idea of imposture and of the widespread, omnipresent millenarian and apocalyptic expectations of the masses. Perhaps Avrich's twentieth-century perspective beguiled him into assuming the existence, or exaggerating the significance, of class divisions in early modern Russia. Indeed, here and in other respects Avrich uncritically follows populist and Soviet historiography. One may even question whether these four revolts should be treated together. Although Avrich recognizes their complexity and the many ways they differ, he insists on their basic similarities. But his assertion that Bolotnikov somehow "set the pattern" for the other revolts rings false when one recalls that nothing like the Time of Troubles occurred again until 1917.

JOHN T. ALEXANDER
University of Kansas

IMPERIAL RUSSIA, 1682-1825: THE COMING OF AGE OF MODERN RUSSIA. By *Marc Raeff*. Borzoi History of Russia, vol. 4. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971. xi, 176 pp. \$2.95, paper.

This is the first of six volumes which together will comprise a new general history of Russia. Each volume is to be written by a leading expert. The stated purpose of the series is to "overcome the main fault of general histories—the attempt on the part of one historian to cover the whole span of a complex and very long process within a very large society." The approach has been taken before, notably in Miliukov's *Histoire de Russie*, and it is a matter of course nowadays in Soviet his-