

life of Tatishchev which through careful and painstaking work provides a full chronological record of Tatishchev's career in state service and his activity during removal or retirement from the bureaucracy. It is a useful catalogue of Tatishchev's service to the Russian state in the reigns of monarchs from Peter the Great to Elizabeth. Daniels includes also a discussion of Tatishchev's role in the affair of 1730 and informs us of the content of his subject's scholarly and literary works.

In speaking of what he refers to as a slowing down of the pace of reform after Peter's death, the author refers to the traditional-minded nobility as opposed to supporters of modernization. He does not, however, attempt to make clear the differences in the manner in which each group (Tatishchev's in particular, as proponents of "modernization") conceived of the state in relation to their function in it. Daniels does not attempt to explain what psychic rewards Tatishchev acquired from the state, nor does he discuss the degree of Tatishchev's dependence on his salary. He speaks of his subject's *Weltanschauung*, but he does not tell us really what the *Weltanschauung* was; nor is he interested in discussing how Tatishchev's political philosophy, religious attitudes, historical thought, and scientific interests may be related to each other and to his career in a fundamental way. Perhaps to do so the author would have to speculate, and he may be too cautious for that. But he does speculate in more conventional historiographical ways about less important matters. And perhaps if he had been more concerned with the relation between Tatishchev's career and his view of the world, he would not have claimed that his "writings bear witness to the transformation of the nobility in the first half of the eighteenth century." For insofar as the Russian nobility's concept of the state and service is concerned, Tatishchev represents only one group among them.

FREDERICK I. KAPLAN  
*Michigan State University*

BORODINO AND THE WAR OF 1812. By *Christopher Duffy*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973. 208 pp. \$10.00.

This is first and foremost a book for the military history enthusiast. Christopher Duffy is a lecturer in war studies at the Royal Military Academy, Sandhurst, and was one of the advisers to the BBC team who made the television serial of Tolstoy's *War and Peace*. His book is primarily a detailed descriptive account, based on a wide range of Russian and other sources, of the battle of Borodino, set within the framework of a rather brief sketch of the campaign as a whole. Mr. Duffy's colleagues in the Department of Military History at Sandhurst—Peter Young, David Chandler, Antony Brett-James, and Richard Holmes—have made some notable contributions in recent years to the study of Napoleonic warfare, and readers of Duffy's book will find not only the same enthusiasm for and undoubted expertise in the Napoleonic period of military history but also considerable familiarity with Russian historical writing on the 1812 campaign. The result is a work which provides a competent account of the war as a whole, some valuable insights into the technical capabilities of the forces involved and how arms and troops were managed in combat, together with an enthralling reconstruction of the development of the fighting at Borodino.

As a study of the campaign as a whole Duffy's account does not have much to add to the existing Western literature apart from a clear recognition of the accomplishments and importance of Barclay de Tolly without belittling the merits of

Kutuzov. As a study of the fighting at Borodino it is the best-informed and most informative account to date in English. There is a vast literature in Russian on the battle, and though Duffy has not covered it all, he has digested a great amount and presents an admirably clear analysis of its successive stages, notable for its unerring emphasis on the salient features and sober assessment of the role of individuals and formations. Here again he does justice to Barclay without denigrating Kutuzov. He is probably correct in stressing the crucial importance of Platov's apparently futile cavalry thrust against the French left, which enabled Barclay to rally his almost broken forces, but he is disappointingly brief on the Russian use of artillery (evidently he is unaware of A. P. Larionov's 1962 article on this subject), and his account of the action around the Shevardino Redoubt derives from the reports of Ermolov and Barclay, whose version of events has been challenged by another Soviet historian, L. P. Bogdanov. Mr. Duffy, however, has no particular ax to grind, and his book is attractive both for its scholarship and for its readability.

BARRY HOLLINGSWORTH  
*University of Manchester*

THE CLASSROOM AND THE CHANCELLERY: STATE EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN RUSSIA UNDER COUNT DMITRY TOLSTOI. By *Allen Sinel*. Russian Research Center Studies, 72. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973. xiii, 335 pp. \$14.00.

The publication of a monograph on a phase of the history of education in pre-revolutionary Russia is a welcome event, since such works are rather rare, especially in English. All the more so when the volume is thoroughly documented and makes a serious effort to be objective with respect to a person who has generally been characterized as a reactionary.

The author concentrated his research on the work of Dmitrii Aleksandrovich Tolstoy as minister of education (1866–80). With the exception of Sergei Semenovich Uvarov, who was minister of education from 1833 to 1849, Tolstoy held this office longer than any other official. It is all too easy to trace Tolstoy's devotion to autocracy, nationality, and orthodoxy to the influence of Uvarov and to infer that both ministers were equally reactionary. Both initiated educational reforms to achieve identical goals, but Tolstoy's reforms, as Sinel demonstrates, achieved results that advanced Russian education.

Count Tolstoy was bred a bureaucrat par excellence. As a faithful servant of his tsarist master, he fought the influences of Catholicism, liberalism, and revolutionism. A dedicated Slavophile, he glorified the Russian tradition in education. Yet as an educated man and historical scholar he did not disdain to learn from the educational experience of other countries, particularly Germany. He was not troubled by the ideological inconsistency of borrowing from Western nations; the main thing was the attainment of the regime's objectives by the most expeditious and effective ways, regardless of origin.

Sinel analyzes in a dispassionate manner the successes and failures of Tolstoy's reforms in elementary, secondary, higher, and teacher education. The evidence shows that there was some democratization of the student population in secondary education, an outcome unintended by Tolstoy but also not overturned. His fair-mindedness was discerned in his remark that the gymnasium was not for the aristocracy as such, but rather for aristocrats of intellect, knowledge, and hard