

With all the care of its local analysis, the book neglects some vital general aspects. With the new anxiety about conservation there are increasing fears that intensive mechanized agriculture based on artificial fertilizers is using up the very life of the soil—a calamity which could not happen under peasant farming. There is the open evidence that although greatly successful in the industrial sector, the Soviet and other Communist regimes in spite of forceful methods have failed to achieve economic ascendancy in agriculture. It also seems plain that throughout the vast “third world,” in Africa and in Asia, no other society is possible. And this makes it all the more curious that an able and fairly thorough study, which often refers to “peasant society,” completely ignores the great peasant movement of the interwar period, the strong peasant parties throughout Central and Eastern Europe, and their many able leaders. For it is well known that all these were interested not in political power as such but in an alternative society to the industrial West, and to that end had worked out in both theory and practice an impressive sociological foundation for it.

DAVID MITRANY  
*Oxford, England*

KREST'IANSKAIA VOINA V ROSSII V 1773–1775 GODAKH: VOSTANIE PUGACHEVA, vol. 3. By *V. V. Mavrodin* et al. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1970. 488 pp. 12 plates and map. 2.97 rubles.

More than fifteen years and some 1,600 pages later, Professor V. V. Mavrodin and his colleagues have—with this volume—completed their study of the Pugachev Revolt. Their massive labor of love purports to be addressed to a general audience. Yet the power of the ruble apparently indicates otherwise; for volume 3, which embodies the work of eighteen contributors, was issued in a printing of only 1,500 copies as compared with 2,100 and 2,000 for its predecessors, published in 1961 and 1966 respectively. Since I have evaluated the earlier volumes elsewhere, I shall focus upon the latest installment and, in the process, appraise the entire enterprise.

Volume 3 presupposes knowledge of volume 2. Both the numbering of the chapters and the structure of presentation continue the chronological-topical scheme elaborated there. Thus volume 3 opens with a concluding treatment of the first phase of the revolt (September 1773–March 1774), followed by four chapters devoted to its second phase (March–July 1774), six chapters on the third and final phase (July 1774–1775), and five chapters on special topics. Mavrodin's conclusion sums up the whole work. An appendix reprints an article about the fate of Pugachev's family.

All three tomes—especially the third—appear destined for consultation primarily by specialists. Readers unfamiliar with the subject will boggle at the disjointed method of presentation as well as the avalanche of detail. Even scholars versed in the history of the revolt—*pugachevtsy* as they are sometimes dubbed—may puzzle over the layout of volume 3. They will be disappointed at the few fresh formulations ventured, and depressed by the volume's uneven quality. Indeed, the demands of joint authorship evidently dictated that each territory involved in the rebellion, however fleetingly, be accorded equal attention. Hence M. D. Kurmacheva has forty-two pages to study the revolt in the Nizhny Novgorod region, a corner of which Pugachev's main force traversed in only six days; whereas L. S. Prokofieva

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