

formation (all known today) on the Russian representatives at Florence, Isidore and the bishops of Tver and Stavropol, who (unlike Isidore) left Florence and did not sign the unionist decree. When Ostroumoff quotes a Western source it is again only to support the Orthodox position (e.g., Traversari on the "deceptions" of the papal court at Florence). Unlike some modern Western historians Ostroumoff rightly stresses certain incidents of protocol that occurred before the council, such as the patriarch's refusal to kiss the pope's foot ("Whence does he derive this right?"), but which are important in revealing the differing mentalities of the two peoples. The author casts no blame on the Greek people as a whole, not reflecting the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Rus' belief that the Greeks were apostates from Orthodoxy. Rather he seeks, as he affirms, to show the "lawless character of the Council" (canonically not even all the patriarchs signed); that actually the "Greeks vanquished the Latins on all points" (cf. Joseph Gill, who in his *Council of Florence* says that the Greeks were not able to stand up to the Latin syllogistic reasoning); and that it was Latin "cunning," "bribery," and the work of four Greek "traitors," Bessarion ("When he disputed with the Latins it was only to show off his power of speech"), Dorotheus, Isidore, and Gregory the Almoner, that brought about the "fraudulent" union.

Because of its avowedly apologetic character (so open as to be refreshing), its age (the book was first published in Russia in 1847 and translated into English a century ago), its lack of a more modern critical viewpoint, and (perforce) its inability to profit from the large amount of recent scholarship (e.g., works of Gill, Hofmann, Geanakoplos, etc.), the book can be of only limited value to a modern scholar studying the Council of Florence as an objective, many-sided historical event. However, it provides a very good summary in English and a kind of commentary (in the footnotes) on Syropoulos. (Incidentally, Syropoulos has finally been published only this year in a critical edition with French translation by V. Laurent.)

DENO J. GEANAKOPLIS
Yale University

HISTORY OF THE COSSACKS. By *W. G. Glaskow*. New York: Robert Speller & Sons, 1972. vii, 163 pp. \$6.00.

A new work on the Cossacks arouses interest not only because of their long and unique role in East European affairs but because of the relatively few reliable accounts of their history, especially in West European languages. The need for an updated, balanced study of Cossack society, therefore, is real and long overdue. Unfortunately, this book does not fill the need. The author, an émigré Don Cossack officer, no doubt had his reasons for defining "Cossackia" as the land bordered on the west by the Ukraine, on the north by Russia, on the east by Turkestan, and on the south by the Caucasus, but he has not made clear why a history of the Cossacks does not include more than passing references to Cossack communities of the Dnieper, Siberia, Transbaikal, and other parts of the Russian state. What he has written is not so much a history of Cossackdom as a sketch of the Cossacks of the Don area who somehow become the prototypes of and the spokesmen for all Cossacks.

The author's basic assumptions, as well as the organization and methodology of his work, leave much to be desired. He contends that much of what is known about

the Cossacks in the West is erroneous, because it comes mainly from "the narrow and arbitrary official history of Tsarist or Soviet Russia or from sources inimical to the Cossacks." It is his purpose to correct the misinformation and to demonstrate why the Cossacks "are a completely separate and independent people." The evidence he submits is selective and in general more overwhelming than convincing. Russian sources are cited at length in the text, "so that we cannot be suspected of partiality," but often without adequate references to editions and page numbers, and no Russian titles appear in the bibliography. In some chapters there is a considerable overlapping and repetition of ideas. The footnotes are scanty and refer primarily to the final chapter, which deals with the Cossacks as a group in the twentieth century.

The author is at his best in describing the sociopolitical structure, economy, and military tradition of the Don Cossacks. In his discussion of the Cossacks as people and Cossack administration, useful insights are provided on their institutions and psychology. One admires his forthrightness in proclaiming his convictions and in identifying what he sees as the causes of the Cossack problem. But his broad generalizations and tendentiousness in describing the Russian treatment of the Cossacks quickly rule him out as an impartial interpreter of a great subject. The virtues of the Cossacks are uniformly extolled, their shortcomings minimized or ignored. All in all this book illustrates once more the difficulties of combining history with advocacy of a cause, in this case an independent Cossack state.

C. B. O'BRIEN
University of California, Davis

THE RISE OF THE ROMANOV. By *Vasili Kliuchevsky*. Translated and edited by *Liliana Archibald*, assisted by *Mark Scholl*. London: Macmillan. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970. 371 pp. \$12.50.

It has long been fashionable for English-speaking students of Russian history, while praising Kliuchevsky's five-volume *Kurs russkoi istorii*, to condemn C. J. Hogarth's pre-1914 translation as labored and inaccurate—often implying that they could readily do better. In most cases such smugness has been unwarranted, for Kliuchevsky's combination of technical terminology and rhetorical elegance is much easier to enjoy than to translate.

These obstacles did not deter Liliana Barou Archibald, formerly a teacher of Russian history in New Zealand. In 1958 she produced a translation of Kliuchevsky's volume 4 under the title *Peter the Great*. It was published by the eminent Macmillan and St. Martin's Press and praised by professional reviewers as "admirable" and "far superior" to Hogarth's. That success evidently led the same publishers to issue the present work, which is described as a translation of volume 3. Meanwhile, in 1968 another translation of volume 3 had been done by Natalie Duddington (Chicago: Quadrangle Books; introduction by Alfred J. Rieber).

After studying the new Archibald volume and comparing it with the 1937 Russian edition on which it is based, as well as with the other two translations, I have the unwelcome duty of reporting that it is not as good as the Duddington translation and in some respects is inferior to Hogarth's. One curious shortcoming is that the last three chapters of the Russian volume are omitted from this translation without any explanation in the foreword or elsewhere. Since those chapters