assertions of influence or of borrowing are not a substitute for textual comparisons, for the careful definition of concepts, or for the investigation of sources, all of which are lacking in the present work.

Ironically there was a Russian tradition in education, one which unites the Domostroi to Feofan and to Mirievo’s Book on the Duties of Man and Citizen, but it is undetectable in Black’s study, and is obscured even by his inclusion of Elizabeth Gorky’s translation of the latter work. That tradition is based upon the constant repetition of certain exhortations from the Book of Proverbs, the chief source for the educational parts of the Domostroi. Sadly the integrity of Mirievo’s text is shattered by the inexcusable elimination of the scriptural citations to each and every paragraph, thereby modernizing a very traditional Christian text of the Central European Aufklärung.

The book is horrifically written and disorganized throughout. The reader constantly is forced to ask why materials are where they appear; the comments of foreigners on the deficiencies of Muscovite education, for example, appear in the chapter on Peter the Great. Phraseology is often curious: in what way was Peter’s educational reform based on “think-tank” procedures? Introductory sentences and conclusions frequently have no relation to the text itself. Illustrative of the book’s illogical and confused style is the following passage, in which no single sentence follows meaningfully from the preceding:

The nobility resented compulsory education and by the 1720s it was the Church that carried on the real business of educating Russia’s youth once again. With the promulgation of the Table of Ranks, new efforts by Peter to systematize Russian society had some effect, and teachers were given the right to the tenth rank. Unfortunately, most of these efforts came to naught after the great monarch’s death. According to most accounts, the number of students in Peter’s secular schools in the late 1720s was approximately 2,000, of a population of some thirteen million. Diocesan schools, which had been ordered opened in 1721 accounted for about 2,500 more pupils by the end of Peter’s reign. Nonetheless, the door to a purely secular enlightenment was now at least ajar.

Although literacy had been made compulsory for the clergy and children of the nobility, even that ruling was not rigidly adhered to. By mid-century, the university section of the Academy of Sciences . . . was closed for lack of students.

An acceptable survey of early modern Russian education remains to be written.

Max J. Okenfuss Washington University


The international conference of which this volume is the proceedings with some modifications was organized by the British Study Group on Eighteenth Century Russia. Both the topics covered and the nature of source material utilized reflect the general orientation of that group: to produce original research on relatively obscure topics neglected by scholars interested in broader issues of Russian politics and society. The book contains two lectures and twenty papers from six panels.

Franco Venturi’s opening lecture is a fascinating discussion of how the political motivations of the Scottish intellectuals such as Henry Home, William Robertson and David Hume led them to engage in what was probably the first debate of feudalism in Russia and reach the same conclusion as Pushkin was to reach, Feodalizma u nas ne bylo, i tem
khuzhe. Anthony Cross' lecture, different from the one presented at the conference, illustrates, through illuminating little vignettes, how diverse were the types of Russian visitors to England and the experiences they carried back home with them often to encounter utter frustration and dismay.

The first panel entitled "Comparisons and Contrasts in Russian and English Literature in the Eighteenth Century" is composed of four papers. The Soviet scholars, Iu. D. Levin, and G. P. Makogonenko, who sent in their contributions later without having attended the conference, tackle the familiar topics of Ossian in Russia and Radishchev and Sterne respectively, and raise various methodological questions related to cultural assimilation and transference. D. E. Budgen's paper is a refreshing attempt to trace the concept of fiction in eighteenth-century Russian literature through the application of the tools of modern literary criticism. W. G. Jones discusses how Novikov made use of eighteenth-century English satire as a vehicle for the moral purging of Russian society without succumbing to indiscriminate Anglophilia.

Of the three papers constituting the second panel, "The Organization of Cultural Life: the British and Russian Experience," Max Okenfuss' is an attempt to put an end to the somewhat artificial yet perennially asked question whether Novikov was a philosophe or obscurantist by drawing a comparison with an earlier British publisher, Robert Dodsley, who, like Novikov, also published a wide variety of material. Stephen Baehr's analysis of the Russian courtly spectacles and C. A. Johnson's account of the history of the Wedgewood "Frog Service" ordered by Catherine the Great demonstrate the central role which the Russian court played as organizer of Russian aristocratic culture. The third panel, "Anglo-Russian Technological and Commercial Relations," is led off by A. S. Fedorov's survey of Russo-British technological and scientific links in the eighteenth century, the only paper read in Russian at the conference. It is followed by a detailed examination of the process of negotiations which led to the conclusion of the Anglo-Russian commercial treaty of 1766 by P. H. Clendenning. D. S. Macmillan's paper is an illustration of how the new trade arrangement actually worked in the case of the Scottish trade with Russia while A. Kahan addresses himself to another hitherto neglected aspect of Anglo-Russian relationships—Russia's contribution to the industrial revolution in Great Britain through her export not only of raw materials but also such manufactured goods as finished linen.

The first two papers on the next panel, "The Institutionalization of Science in Eighteenth-century Britain and Russia," bring out more clearly than any other paper in the volume the contrasting characteristics of the two societies under study. While G. E. Turner illustrates how scientific activities arose in Europe as natural responses of individual scholars, amateurs, businessmen, and craftsmen to the changing needs of their social, economic, and intellectual environment, Iu. Kh. Kopelevich argues quite convincingly why the Academy of Sciences in Russia had to be a part of the state enterprise unlike any other scientific institutions in Europe upon which it was supposedly modelled. In the third paper on the same panel, R. W. Home by contrast demonstrates how, in spite of the state-directed character of Russian scientific efforts, an ambitious academician or a commercially motivated foreigner to both cultures could almost single-handedly foster academic exchanges between Russia and Britain.

B. Meehan-Water's paper on elite politics which is on the next panel devoted to society and social movements is perhaps the boldest both in scope and method in the entire volume. Relying upon a computer analysis of the 179 members of the Russian generalitet in the second quarter of the eighteenth century, she draws a number of conclusions which run counter to popularly conceived notions concerning Russian high politics and clearly demonstrates the advantages of using quantitative analysis. P. Spiro traces the extensive British coverage of the Pugachev revolt in an ingenious effort to discern the British perception of Russian and Russians underlying their comments on particular