intricate linguistic and comparative textological analysis, as demonstrated not only by the abundance of footnotes but also by the bibliographical and documentary details in the accompanying volume on sources. Clearly, Prof. Strumiński's scholarly range and erudition is extraordinary.

The publication addresses both the specialist and the incidental scholar. The latter may simply study the text and ignore the sources volume. Indeed, for the uninitiated, there is a very useful glossary of terms. However, there is also one significant shortcoming: the rather inadequate introduction ("Foreword") by the translator. Although it provides some information on the historical, biographical, textological and various technical aspects, it is rather too cursory and general. This fine work of translation and scholarship deserves a more detailed analysis of the general historical background and significance of the tracts to Ukrainian cultural and intellectual history. This reviewer was prompted to consult the introduction to the 1987 facsimile edition by Omeljan Pritsak and the present translator. Although useful, it is also inadequate. Kopystens'kyi's *Palinodia* is generally recognized as a very significant expression of the Rutheno-Ukrainian worldview of the "First Revival."

Given the fact that the only major critical analysis of *Palinodia* (V. Zavitnevich's "Palinodiia" Zakharii Kopystenskogo i ee mesto v istorii zapadno-russkoi polemiki XVI i XVII vv.) dates back to 1883, there a great need for an updated study. However, it appears that Prof. Strumiński, having toiled so diligently and ably at this initiative, happily relinquishes this mandate to others.

Alexander Sydorenko
Arkansas State University


This is a book with practical value and historiographical significance. Students of Russian history will welcome it as an extensive treatment of the mid-eighteenth century, which they elsewhere often find only briefly bracketed by the overshadowing presence of the two "greats" at either end: Peter I and Catherine II. Now they have available a convenient resource for the intermediate period.

Dr. Anisimov has filled his volume with copious details drawn from a wide array of Russian and foreign sources, some of them familiar, others quite new. The approach adopted for this book prompts a comparison, though obviously on a different scale, with the monumental history of Russia by S. M. Solov'ev. As in Solov'ev, here one also finds pieced together a mosaic of narrative accounts, expository sketches, and biographical vignettes, all of which are closely tied to the consulted materials. While these individual elements contribute much that is specifically informational, they are grouped in such a way that their combination makes it possible to formulate a general picture of the period.

In marshaling his data, Anisimov has avoided the temptation to impose an overarching theory of development for describing the course of historical events. This represents a major break with historical writing of the Soviet epoch and certainly is worthy of comment.

So strange has been the course of the twentieth century, that even in 1998 one still feels almost a sense of psychological dissociation at abandoning familiar terminology long
lodged in consciousness by interminable repetition and undertaking to review a book on Russian history, published in Russia, that makes prominent use of the word “Russia” in its original title. It almost defies explanation that something seemingly so simple and commonplace can be experienced as extraordinary.

Today it is well known that, in June 1988, the Soviet press ran articles about the cancellation of final examinations for more than 53 million students in the Soviet Union. The reason for this unprecedented action arose from growing recognition that “history textbooks had taught generations of Soviet children lies that poisoned their ‘minds and souls’.” To make up for the absence of acceptable historical material, the newspaper Izvestiia called for immediate steps to prepare an entirely new history curriculum for the fall term. Meanwhile, teachers were thrown on their own resources to assemble classroom readings and prepare their lectures.

It was in the preliminary stages of this scholarly, pedagogical, and ideological turbulence that Anisimov’s work was published in Moscow in 1986, its original title Russia in the Middle of the Eighteenth Century: The Struggle for the Legacy of Peter the Great. Viewed in the context of surrounding events, this book appeared at a major turning point in the history of Russia and at a defining moment for Russian historiography. That it bears the marks of that unsettled period should come as no surprise.

Anisimov’s book represents a step in the direction of reasserting scholarly independence from the ideological constraint that for decades had shrouded historical expression. Both in content and in approach, it looks backward in order to move forward in recovering the country’s national identity. It seeks to accomplish this by reverting to previous interpretations, combining them with recent materials, and edging toward new understandings. The effort, understandably awkward, is essentially restorative and curative. The work’s appearance marks a definite stage in the revitalization of Russian historical writing.

The book’s nine chapters can be divided in two major parts. In the first part, an introduction describes the dynastic troubles over succession after Peter the Great and illustrates the political situation that forms the background for Elizabeth’s accession. The main focus then comes to be put on foreign affairs, including diplomatic relations and military campaigns up to Elizabeth’s death and Russia’s own “diplomatic revolution.” The second part backtracks to Elizabeth’s coronation and concentrates on internal affairs, sketching the characteristics of her advisors, exploring the interaction between political activities and personal ambitions, and highlighting various features of the high culture of the court. An epilogue examines the origins and traces the rise to influence and power of the future Catherine the Great.

The text has been ably and felicitously translated by John T. Alexander, whose expertise is made quite evident in his ability to maintain accuracy and offer a pleasing rendering of oftentimes technical terminology. Illustrations in this version include some, though not all, of the portraits in the original publication. Two maps, with designations correlated to the text, show regions, major cities, rivers, and borders between countries. A bibliography of recent scholarship in English and a general index will also be helpful to the reader.

As for negatives, newcomers to Russian history may find some passages daunting. One of these comes right at the beginning, where a maze of post-Petrine dynastic connections and conflicts poses a test of stamina for the uninitiated. (A genealogical chart would be a helpful addition.) Another is in the conclusion where the author attempts to draw from an analysis of the case involving Feofilakt Lopatinskii by focusing only on se-