

has just thirty-four pages to do the same for the Penza and Voronezh areas, where the rebels were active longer and more extensively. Prokofieva's lucid sketch surpasses Kurmacheva's in every respect. Kurmacheva investigates her phase of the revolt district by district, an approach which fosters repetition and produces a fragmented picture of events, since she provides no overview of the many localized outbreaks. As a result she exaggerates the significance of her small piece of the action. Prokofieva maintains a balance between the operations of Pugachev's main force and those of secondary bands, soberly discounting the inflated estimates of rebel numbers that other, less cautious, researchers have offered. G. I. Semeniuk's attempts to prove that the Kazakhs (Kirghiz) contributed importantly to the revolt are unconvincing. The rebel seizure of Kazan is seriously distorted by E. I. Glazatova, who has ignored N. F. Kalinin's careful reconstruction of this episode. Several other sections treat narrow subphases of the revolt that are of peripheral interest even to specialists.

For me the most interesting chapter is R. V. Ovchinnikov's discussion of the tsarist government's investigation and repression of the rebellion, since it parallels my own monograph on the subject (1969). Our interpretations generally coincide, but his assertion (p. 392) that Catherine never saw Captain Mavrin's report of May 1774 about the causes of the revolt is incorrect. The manuscript division of the Leningrad Public Library has preserved a letter from Catherine to Potemkin that proves the opposite (GPB, f. 227, op. 1, no. 34, l. 126). Of more general interest are Mavrodin's concluding reflections upon the revolt. His piece reiterates many ideas expressed previously, but also cautiously questions some orthodoxies. For instance, the Yaik Cossacks are admitted to have held the Russian peasantry in low esteem (p. 467; also p. 28, n. 96).

Considering the time and effort lavished on these hefty volumes, one cannot help questioning their value. Although they contain much excellent scholarship, they are not definitive to the degree that specialists require. Volume 3 in particular oscillates between extreme attention to detail, with overly copious citations, and rather popularized treatments, sometimes based on secondary works. One gets the impression that administrative, technical, and economic desiderata exerted baneful influence on the shape of this work.

JOHN T. ALEXANDER
University of Kansas

N. M. KARAMZIN: A STUDY OF HIS LITERARY CAREER, 1783-1803.

By A. G. Cross. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press. London and Amsterdam: Feffer & Simons, 1971. xxi, 306 pp. \$12.50.

Why, some readers may wonder, has Anthony Cross given his book a title which promises less than the book has to offer? Why, for instance, does the title set a twenty-year temporal framework when in fact Cross goes beyond 1803 to discuss such works as the *Memoir on Ancient and Modern Russia* (1810-11) and the *History of the Russian State* (written between 1804 and 1826), which he praises as "the climax of [Karamzin's] whole career as a writer" (p. 224)? And why does the title speak only of a "literary" career while the book itself frequently dwells on Karamzin's role as an historian and political thinker?

Other readers may quibble that the book gives *less* than the title promises, and that "literary" problems have not received their due. One of Karamzin's claims to

fame was his reform of Russian prose style; Cross has some material on this, but the reader who wants to understand what Karamzin's reform was all about will get more from K. Skipina's article (listed, to be sure, in Cross's bibliography). By the same token Cross's third chapter, on the *Letters of a Russian Traveler*, contains much information, yet the student who wishes to know how Karamzin's *Letters* fit into the "literary journey" genre should read T. Roboli's article (also listed in the bibliography). Again, Karamzin is remembered as a gifted representative of Russian sentimentalism, but what sort of movement was Russian sentimentalism? Some scholars (Blagoy, for example) have attempted to define it, and a few have warily distinguished between "progressive" sentimentalism and other varieties. Readers might have welcomed a fresh, systematic (and, possibly, polemical) analysis by Cross. The sixth chapter, dealing with Karamzin's verse, may strike literary theoreticians as pretty tame stuff, perhaps rightly so, since "it was in prose that Karamzin wrote his best poetry" (p. 192).

It all seems to boil down to a question of readers' preference and author's selection. Cross has chosen to focus on Karamzin's *ideas*—social and political ideas as well as aesthetic—telling us where Karamzin got them, how he adapted them to the tastes of his Russian readers, and how he continued to press them on his readers even as the ideas themselves underwent transformation. Doubtless such works as the *Memoir* and *History of the Russian State* are discussed, the book's title notwithstanding, because one could hardly do justice to the spectrum of Karamzin's thought otherwise. Literary theory and formal analysis, meanwhile, have moved over to make room for *Geistesgeschichte*.

Students of comparative literature, Russian intellectual history, and Russian literature courses where the emphasis is on themes, motifs, and *Geistesgeschichte* will find many illuminating passages in Cross's book. It belongs on any general reading list devoted to eighteenth-century Russia.

HORACE W. DEWEY
University of Michigan

RUSSLANDS AUFBRUCH INS 20. JAHRHUNDERT: POLITIK—GESELLSCHAFT—KULTUR, 1894–1917. Edited by *George Katkov, Erwin Oberländer, Nikolaus Poppe, and Georg von Rauch*. Olten and Freiburg: Walter-Verlag, 1970. 347 pp.

RUSSIA ENTERS THE TWENTIETH CENTURY, 1894–1917. Edited by *Erwin Oberländer, George Katkov, Nikolaus Poppe, and Georg von Rauch*. Translated by *Gerald Onn*. New York: Schocken Books, 1971. 352 pp. \$12.00.

This collective work, by thirteen authors from Germany and Britain, some of whom are of Russian origin, appeared first in German a year earlier than the English edition. It contains a lot of information which would be useful to students, covering a wide range of political, legal, economic, and cultural problems, taken essentially from the last two decades of the imperial Russian regime.

Inevitably the contributions are of unequal value. In this reviewer's opinion the two best are "The Agrarian Problem" by H. T. Willetts and "Russian Schools" by Oskar Anweiler. Both are models of the selection of relevant and important information and of its intelligent interpretation. The part of the book which the student is likely to find most useful is the last four chapters, which deal with intellec-