

Gorchakov, was not a Russian, not a classmate of Pushkin, and not an imperialist, has fared badly at the hands of most historians generous enough to pay attention to a man who conducted Russia's foreign relations for an astounding forty years.

Harold N. Ingle has written neither a biography nor a study of Nesselrode's entire career. He has concentrated instead on one aspect of the minister's diplomacy—his political Anglophilia born of a conviction that the peace of Europe depended on good relations between Russia and Great Britain. Having studied an impressive amount of archival and published sources, Ingle shows that Nesselrode, the proponent of "European policy," consistently used his influence to mitigate conflicts (the *Vixen* affair, the Persian campaign against Herat, the problem of the straits) and to promote their peaceful solution. The ultimate defeat of his policies does not prove that they were undesirable or unwise.

Harold Ingle's study is sensitive, urbane, but too brief. His position is "revisionist" in that he approves of a diplomat who has been attacked from the right and from the left. Ingle may have gone too far in his "rehabilitation" of Nesselrode, however, by attributing too much influence to a man who was a diplomatic technician, not a creator of foreign policy.

It is regrettable that more attention has not been paid to the preparation of the manuscript for the press. Errors in transliteration, misspellings, and plain typographical errors are annoyingly numerous. This measured and sober study deserved better of its editors and publishers.

FIRUZ KAZEMZADEH
Yale University

REBELS IN THE NAME OF THE TSAR. By *Daniel Field*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976. xvi, 220 pp. \$9.95.

Daniel Field's *Rebels in the Name of the Tsar* offers well-chosen documents and intelligent, balanced commentary concerning two famous cases of Russian "naïve monarchism": the Bezdna peasant demonstration and massacre of 1861 and the so-called "Chigirin affair" of 1877. At both Bezdna and Chigirin, Great Russian and Ukrainian peasants invoked the name of the tsar-*batiushka*, their benevolent ruler and protector, when they claimed to carry out his will in refusing to obey the orders of officials and soldiers who actually were the approved local representatives of the tsar. Field describes very well the dilemma "naïve monarchism" posed for the Russian intelligentsia, especially in regard to Iakov Stefanovich's attempt to manipulate the credulity of the Chigirin peasants in order to obtain popular support for the Russian revolutionary movement. But Field is also inclined to see the peasant as being somewhat less naïve than tsarist officials, educated Russians, and historians have believed them to be, and he leaves open the possibility that certain peasants might have tried to manipulate the symbolism of the tsar-*batiushka* for their own purposes—that is, to obtain what had been denied them, sizable land allotments and freedom (*volia*). But the evidence available to Field does not permit him to argue this point very convincingly.

In his introductory chapter, "Myth of the Tsar," Field quite correctly points out that such abstractions as "*narod*" and "the peasantry" can be used glibly and that it is easy to forget that "these terms subsume millions of individual men and women." He suggests, therefore, that historians might imitate philologists and anthropologists by trying to "plot social myths on a map," in order to indicate how myths changed with the passage of time and "varied in their intensity from place to place." To do this well, the historian would certainly have to take into account variations in peasant attitudes, customs, nationality, and social organization as well as the historical back-

ground of the particular areas under consideration. Field, however, makes little effort to establish the historical individuality of the Bezdna and Chigirin peasants for the reader. In discussing the "Chigirin affair," for example, he mentions that the peasants in the Chigirin area were Ukrainians, but does not make clear that the Chigirin District is located in the Right-bank Ukraine, an area traditionally dominated by Polish landowners and officials and Polish social and economic institutions, and that the Russian government had undertaken—and only with partial success—to change all of this during the 1840s and again during the 1860s and 1870s. Can one understand the social myths of a given group of peasants without taking into account the traditional social and economic system of the area in which they live and the precise nature of the interaction of these peasants with the officials (in the Chigirin District, officials were either Poles or imported Great Russians) and with the government under whose authority they happened to find themselves?

I do not want to end this review on a negative note. Field's book is a welcome addition to the list of carefully edited and competently translated source materials now available for use in the classroom. His suggestive commentary on the social myths of the Bezdna and Chigirin peasants hopefully will serve to open the eyes of students to how intellectually stimulating the study of history can be. Teachers of Russian history can be grateful to Professor Field for writing this book and to Houghton Mifflin Company for publishing it.

EDWARD C. THADEN

University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

NICHOLAS KARAMZIN AND RUSSIAN SOCIETY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY: A STUDY IN RUSSIAN POLITICAL AND HISTORICAL THOUGHT. By *J. L. Black*. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1975. xvi, 264 pp. \$17.50.

The long overdue revival of scholarly interest in Karamzin as an important cultural figure, begun by Iurii Lotman twenty years ago, now seems to be losing steam. The focus, particularly in the Soviet Union, has been on Karamzin's literary career, and by and large it can be said that justice has been done to his verse and prose fiction. The significance of Karamzin's political and historical thought still needs attention, however, although Richard Pipes, as long ago as 1959, pointed the way for further studies with his excellent edition of and commentary on Karamzin's *Memoir*. Karamzin has long been a bone of contention between Russian liberals and conservatives. Indeed, a study of the wrangling that his works aroused in the nineteenth century is most revealing: it served for what had to pass for serious social and political discussion of major national issues in constrained circumstances. Clearly, we cannot look to published Soviet scholarship for a dispassionate assessment of Karamzin's role, that is, anything truly objective is not likely to get published. Happily, Professor Black has stepped forward to redress the previous imbalance in Karamzin scholarship with his well written, thoroughly researched study. One may regret his decision to focus exclusively on "political and social thought," as indicated in his title, rather than attempting to survey Karamzin's total achievement in all fields—after all, we have several recent books that deal with Goethe's multifarious interests. Nevertheless, Black's book is most welcome: it does justice to the literature in English, German, and Russian, and provides us at last with a judicious study of Karamzin's considerable impact on Russian society.

JOHN G. GARRARD

University of Virginia