

twentieth century, which can only be itemized in the space allotted here: various kinds of land tenure, craft enterprises, capitalism in peasant agriculture, the commune in its last years, state agrarian policy, recent Soviet historiography on the peasant question in the early twentieth century, among other topics.

Although the main focus of the collection is agrarian history, this reviewer found interesting and worthy of note the several articles that deal with factory labor and urban social history, particularly those of the well-known Soviet historians P. G. Ryndziunsky, M. K. Rozhkova, and L. M. Ivanov, the editor. Ryndziunsky, a leading urban historian, has provided a revealing account of the process of emancipation, not on the estates, but in the industrial center of Ivanovo, Russia's "Manchester." Its owner, Count Sheremetiev, is the villain of the piece, fleecing the poorer peasants of their real and personal property. The case Ryndziunsky selects for study is hardly typical, but is an enlightening account of the involved struggles and negotiations of the emancipation process in one famous locality. So it was in part that the Sheremetievs, mortgaged to the hilt in the early nineteenth century, came out of the emancipation rather better off. Ryndziunsky tells us how they did it at the expense of the poorer peasants, as well as the millionaire serfs.

Rozhkova, another accomplished Soviet historian of the nineteenth-century economy, studies rural factories in the most highly industrialized district of Moscow Province in the 1860s and 1870s (Bogorodsky). Despite the very large size of some of these factories, she comes to two interesting conclusions: (1) the number of home workers continued to be very large, side by side with very big factories, and (2) there was a larger percentage of hereditary or second generation workers in the rural factories than in the cities.

Of particular value to the newly emerging schools of Russian urban history in the USSR and the United States is Ivanov's description, based on the 1897 census and other published statistics, of the changing social structure of Russia's modernizing cities in the last years of the old regime. Ivanov particularly focuses on the significant in-migration at this time of both nobles and peasants, and their absorption into a more modern urban socioeconomic order.

WILLIAM L. BLACKWELL
New York University

RUSSIAN HISTORY ATLAS. By *Martin Gilbert*. Cartographic consultant, *Arthur Banks*. New York: Macmillan, 1972. 146 maps + 34 pp. \$4.95.

This atlas has the admirable aim of telling the history of Russia almost solely through maps. The text is limited to brief notes in boxes inserted on each map. The book's main virtue is that it gives a large number of maps for a low price. The maps are uncluttered and easy to read. Some of them are not commonly encountered in other atlases of Russian history. There is a good index.

The limitations of the work are serious, however. Some of them stem from the same basic decisions that made possible the reasonable price. The restriction to black and white meant that the maps had to be simple if they were to be readable. They have been kept simple by the use of imprecise, schematic cartography and by the omission of a great deal of important information.

The bibliography of works consulted is fairly long, but fails to include several of the most relevant general historical atlases and—even more inexplicably—omits such direct rivals as the atlases of Adams-Matley-McCagg, Chew, Goodall, and

Horrabin-Gregory. Each of those works contains ideas that could have made Mr. Gilbert's book better.

The maps, despite their simplicity, contain quite a few mistakes. A sample: On map 32 Tsaritsyn appears on the Don, which is wrongly labeled as the Donets. Along with outright errors there are instances of poor judgment. For example, on maps 27 (covering 1460–1860) and 35 (covering 1500–1916) there is no indication that the river labeled "Ural" and the town labeled "Uralsk" were known as the Iaik and as Iaitskii Gorodok for most of the period covered by those maps. Indeed, the pre-Catherinian names are mentioned nowhere in the book. Quite a few slips can also be found in the explanatory notes, short as they are. On map 18 we read that Novgorod was crushed in 1478 "by Ivan the Terrible."

The shortcomings of the book become somewhat understandable when one realizes that Gilbert, although still only in his thirties, is the official biographer of Winston Churchill and the author of several works on British and general European history, as well as of five other Macmillan atlases including those on British, American, and Jewish history. For someone in a hurry he has done surprisingly well. Even if this atlas falls far below the Russian work of Bazilevich and others, and even if in significant respects it is inferior to several of its English-language competitors and to the usual Macmillan standards, it is nevertheless a useful addition to a category that remains poorly represented in English.

RALPH T. FISHER JR.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

CHAADAYEV AND HIS FRIENDS: AN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY OF
PETER CHAADAYEV AND HIS RUSSIAN CONTEMPORARIES. By
Raymond T. McNally. Tallahassee: Diplomatic Press, 1971. v, 315 pp. \$15.00.

Two years after his translations of the *Philosophical Letters* and the *Apologia of a Madman*, Professor McNally follows with a revised portrait of Chaadaev. His aim is to "complement" rather than supplant the biography by Charles Quénet (1931) on the basis of unpublished manuscripts found in the archives of the Pushkin House and the Lenin Library. The main contention of this book is that Chaadaev's later thinking was significantly shaped by his efforts to substantiate the thesis about Russia's backwardness proclaimed in his first letter, and that this switch from attack to defense was a result of relentless probing by the Slavophiles.

The exposé of the Slavophile position is, unfortunately, the weakest part of this study. Vague references to value systems of intelligentsias around the world are a poor substitute for a proper discussion of Slavophile ideas and temperament. Even the basic textbooks on the subject are unaccountably ignored. McNally does better with more concrete problems, such as the comparison between Chaadaev's and Kireevsky's conceptions of early Russian history or the polemic with Khomiakov about the Norman origin of the Russian State. He proves a careful reader of Chaadaev's unpublished reply to Khomiakov's article of 1843 "About Rural Conditions," uncovering the irony in remarks about the historical "self-abnegation" of the Russian people. He is right in suggesting that the softening of Chaadaev's criticism of Kievan Rus' in this manuscript does not really alter the substance of his philosophy of history. Kiev was redeemable only because it maintained "friendly relations with old Rome," still the chosen vessel of universal history. A closer look at church history evidently taught Chaadaev that the Eastern