

life of Boris Godunov, drawing heavily from the classic accounts by Karamzin, Soloviev, and Platonov and the more recent scholarship of Zimin and Vernadsky. For those who know little of this period of history, his work can serve as a useful introduction.

Grey states that his intention was "to scrape away the accumulated calumnies of Boris Godunov and to portray him as an able and also an honest and even humane ruler." He then attempts to clear Godunov of implication in the death of Tsarevich Dmitrii by arguing the lack of evidence for such a charge. Yet he can adduce no new data for a rehearing of Godunov's case. Instead he marshals extensive examples of Godunov's humaneness and consideration as a ruler, hoping to clear his name by demonstrating that an act of murder was beyond his capability. Thus Grey's arguments rest upon data as tenuous as that often employed by Godunov's detractors. The serious reader will be better served by the impressive study of Godunov's reign by S. F. Platonov, recently reissued in English translation by Academic International Press.

Although Grey is careful to avoid factual errors, he employs an archaic system of transliteration for Russian names (e.g., Otrepyev) that will annoy those who feel that standardization in this realm has already been achieved. The author also reproduces Polish names in their Russian form (Mnishek, Krakov), instead of following the more rational custom of retaining their native spelling. The bibliography is sparse and dated.

JOSEPH L. WIECZYNSKI

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

THE SYSTEMATIZATION OF RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT: SOCIAL EVOLUTION IN THE DOMESTIC ADMINISTRATION OF IMPERIAL RUSSIA, 1711–1905. By *George L. Yaney*. Urbana, Chicago, London: University of Illinois Press, 1973. xvi, 430 pp. \$13.50.

Mr. Yaney sets himself the formidable task of studying the "historical evolution through which the servitors gradually came to organize themselves to some extent around their common pretense and/or aspiration to operate within a formal legal-administrative system—the process by which the servitors came to depend on one another to act and think as if they believed that their laws and authorities had to be in logical order in order to possess legitimacy" (p. 5). The conceptual vagueness (and stylistic clumsiness) of this formulation compounds the difficulties of the reader, nor does Yaney's adherence to an outdated and simple-minded nominalist positivism help things. The author has obvious difficulty in dealing with abstract concepts; for example, the Senate is an institution, a legal symbol, an abstraction, a political system, a social group, and a set of rules at one point or another in the book. At another point (pp. 124–25) Yaney equates equity and system, and confuses digest and code (p. 263).

Put in less pretentious words than his own, Yaney's thesis is simple and quite suggestive: Since Peter I tried to undertake the modern transformation of Russian administration, and until 1905 (the logic of the cut-off date is not spelled out), the imperial government, both local and central, experienced three fundamental patterns of organization. The first one was senatorial (1701–1801), which according to Yaney continued the pre-Petrine function of exacting tribute and conscripting servitors, and merely aimed at discovering the law operative in society and ordering

it. The latter led to the second, ministerial, pattern operative from 1802 to 1862. It was characterized by the central government's attempt to impose reforms on society and give new direction to the nation's life. Finally, the successes brought about by the ministerial pattern, as well as the requirements of post-Emancipation economic developments, led to full bureaucratization—that is, the penetration of administrative machinery into the very fabric of peasant life. The particularity of the Russian situation, as Yaney recognizes, was the survival of the personal character of authority, which acted as the driving mechanism of evolution both at the central and the local levels. To this end, too, it would have been desirable to have an account of the social structure of Russian officialdom (promised in the subtitle), but Yaney fails to deal with it.

In developing his argument the author has a number of interesting observations to make, particularly on the nature and changing character of local authorities (governor, *zemskii ispravnik*) and their relations with supreme organs of power (Senate, ministries); on the relationship between central institutions and traditional patterns of local (peasant) society (though I fail to be convinced by the assumption of a necessary connection between serfdom and the senatorial pattern of government); on the relationship between technical bureaucratic necessities and the political and moral aspirations of the educated elites. The book will be read with interest by the dilettante and polymath for suggestive generalizations. The aficionado of comparative history may also find grist for his mill, especially on the mechanisms and structures of administrative relationships (on the model of Otto Hintze's brilliant "Wurzeln der Kreisverfassung in den Ländern des nordöstlichen Deutschland" and "Staatenbildung und Kommunalverwaltung"). He will also correct some of Yaney's false notions of the peculiarity of Russian developments in the sixteenth to eighteenth century on the basis of the experience of Western Europe in early modern times. The serious student of Russian history, however, will remain less than satisfied.

The distinction made by Yaney between the three patterns—senatorial, ministerial, bureaucratic—is somewhat spurious. The Senate—however constituted—was not primarily interested in discovering the law operative in society. Any cursory acquaintance with the workings of the Senate will show its positive role as innovator and transformer. While it is true that the Senate's influence declined in the nineteenth century, the ministers retained (as Yaney admits) many characteristics of earlier officials, and the main problem—that of collegiality (or its inadequate practice)—remained at the center. Nor were the bureaucratic institutions after 1861 so unlike earlier ones, again as implicitly shown by Yaney. We seem to be confronted not so much by three distinct organic patterns, each arising out of the preceding according to an immanent structural and functional logic, as by a single organism that retains its essential identity while undergoing an evolution. In any case, where do the self-image and the possibilities of choice on the part of the members of Russian government-society come in? Yaney explicitly affirms his belief in the possibility of individual choices by Russian officials (p. 388), but his whole argument and exposition lead to the contrary conclusion: whatever the aspirations, self-image, symbols, and concepts of the elites, the pattern of relationships among the members of government-society was set by the inherent structure of the system as a whole. Any attempt at intervention was destructive (Yaney is right in stressing that the difficulties of the imperial system stemmed from progress, not backwardness and stagnation). Is it not better then to leave things to evolve naturally? But

natural evolution, too, by the inherent logic of its constitutive forces led to destruction. What are we left with? Yaney's own methodological and conceptual inadequacies preclude him from dealing with factors that were not inherent in the system—in short, forces outside the self-contained pattern he projects onto the imperial institutions. And one must admit of some skepticism about Yaney's reliability in guiding us through the complexities and dynamics of institutional history in the light of such linguistic horrors as *predsedatel zemskogo uprava* (p. 231), *uezdnyi chlen okružnoi sudy* (p. 236), and “imperial chief apartment” for *imperatorskaia glavnaia kvartira* (p. 252)!

MARC RAEFF
Columbia University

ROSSIIA I VELIKAIA FRANTSUZSKAIA BURZHUAZNAIA REVOLIUTSIIA KONTSA XVIII V. By K. E. Dzhedzhula. Kiev: Izdatel'stvo Kievskogo universiteta, 1972. 452 pp. 2 rubles.

K. E. Dzhedzhula holds that bourgeois historians have undervalued the importance of the French Revolution for Russian history, misunderstanding or ignoring Russia's role in the revolutionary decade, and excluding Russian domestic developments from the broad currents of social and economic change which were transforming European institutions. To redress the balance, he argues that internal developments in autocratic Russia were generating indigenous antifederal, anti-absolutist social movements; that the French Enlightenment, the cutting edge of the bourgeoisie's attack on royal absolutism, similarly provided an arsenal of ideas for educated Russia; and that the Revolution itself not only sharpened and reinforced these “progressive-democratic tendencies,” but sparked a violent reaction against domestic “Jacobinism” and fostered a predominantly counterrevolutionary foreign policy. The arguments and evidence he musters to develop these general propositions are of unequal value, and there are some extraordinary lacunae.

The third chapter, which covers peasant riots, mutinies in the armed forces, revolutionary circles, and the literature of protest—both published and underground—is useful. Dzhedzhula summarizes a considerable body of unpublished material, and though his attempt to connect peasant uprisings causally with the French Revolution is unconvincing, he defines a substantial enlightened group which was responsive to the Revolution and which foreshadowed the Decembrist generation. The remainder of the book is less impressive. French cultural influences are documented in excruciating detail, but since the focus is exclusively French, and the discussion primarily concerned with contacts rather than the substance of ideas, the result is to distort the entire intellectual picture. A monolithic view of the Enlightenment is particularly indefensible in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, while to ignore English and German contributions creates a demonstrably false impression of educated Russia.

Dzhedzhula's discussion of the autocracy's reaction to the Revolution is, if anything, even less satisfactory. His long concluding chapter, which argues that the struggle against the Revolution dominated Russian foreign policy, rests largely on antirevolutionary rhetoric and lacks solid political evidence. Given the period's complexities, and the wealth of archival as well as published sources available to analyze them, it is difficult to take this selectively documented and highly argumentative exposition seriously. On the domestic side, Dzhedzhula chooses to define reaction