

drafted into the army, and from the phrase ‘Menia zaberut v Galitsiiu’ it is logical to suppose that he fears being sent to the Galician front. ‘Curtson’ appears at least twice for ‘Curzon’ (p. 86); Otto Hoetzsch’s book should have the title *The Evolution* [not *Revolution*] *of Russia* (p. 32), and a translated sentence from it speaks of Russia’s ‘Balkan provinces’, where Hoetzsch had ‘Baltic’. There is much mis-spelling of Russian words in Cyrillic, and stress-marking on Russian names is unreliable. Aleksandr Tvardovsky and Dmitrii Shostakovich appear in the list of personalities with a birth-date but no date of death.

The partial coverage of sources, particularly non-Russian sources, is disappointing and leaves one with a sense that Part I is less than complete. The other blemishes are relatively minor and do not detract seriously from an informative ‘life’ and a valuable collection of Bulgakov’s lesser known short works in an attractively-produced volume.

Kevin Windle  
Australian National University

James Cracraft, *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Culture*. Cambridge, Mass., and London, Eng.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. 2004. xvi + 560 pp.

This is the third in a series of volumes by Cracraft which includes *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Architecture* (Chicago, 1988) and *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Imagery* (Chicago, 1997). As these three titles suggest, Cracraft quickly moves beyond the debate, dating since the early nineteenth century and which originally pitted Slavophiles against Westernizers, over the merits of Peter’s reforms, to focus instead on their mechanics. Coinciding as they do, first, with Gorbachev’s reforms, and now those of Putin, his works indicate a renewed interest in Russian statecraft rather than supposed ideological signifiers. Cracraft’s approach owes much to the modernization paradigm, although he offers many qualifications of it. Despite its problems (most notably its ethnocentricity), modernization is justified for a reading of the intention behind Peter’s reforms. The emperor explicitly compared Russia to Western Europe and consciously imitated many aspects of European statecraft, from his establishment of the collegial system of government down

to that of a penal labour regime known as *katorga*. Cracraft's work therefore amounts to a detailed examination of the State's development of techniques for the purpose of organizing and modifying society. In this latest volume, he 'recounts in detail the verbal transmission to Russia under Peter of contemporary European naval, military, bureaucratic-legal, scientific, and literary practices, values, and norms, thereby documenting the crucial first stage in the constitution of a modern Russian verbal culture, one that necessarily included a standardized written language' (xi). Church Slavonic's eclipse by a 'new civil type' of language (181) whose very orthography and characters Peter personally oversaw and approved had, as Cracraft acknowledges, begun prior to his assumption of the throne, yet the explosion in print publications under Peter greatly accelerated this process. Peter's commissioning of translations of numerous monographs on science and military affairs necessitated the incorporation into Russian of thousands of foreign terms. Cracraft's long lists of them within the body of his text and in appendices become wearisome to read after some time, but nevertheless substantiate his case that there was a revolution within at least what might be called Petrine Russia's printed linguistic culture.

However, the extent of this revolution beyond the borders of this linguistic culture was limited for a considerable period of time and therefore necessitates several qualifications of the term. If revolution is defined as rapid change within no more than several decades, then Cracraft's argument holds true for only a small percentage of Russia's population. The church's continued prominence combined with the dispersed rural majority's illiteracy and impoverishment meant that Peter's revolution from above took a very long time to permeate throughout society. Indeed, Cracraft's evidence suggests one explanation for how 'modern' Russia became such a bifurcated society, with an essentially European elite ruling over a static, landed peasantry which arguably demonstrated little cultural development as late as the 1920s. In other words, Petrine-inspired modernization allowed for the hyper-development of an elite caste which then used its print-based 'knowledges' to restrict the development of much of the rest of Russian society. Cracraft deals only glancingly with this question, and a fuller and more conceptual approach would have been helpful.

In chapters dealing separately with naval, military, bureaucratic, and scientific and literary developments, Cracraft meticulously summarizes individual texts, but his lack of any kind of linguistic theory renders his

insistence on a 'verbal transmission' of norms, etc., from Europe to Russia problematic, and suggests a dated faith in nomenclature's supposedly prescriptive power to serve as a vehicle of cultural transmission. This is where his explanation of the reforms' mechanics breaks down, given that 'verbal transmission' is not synonymous with 'cultural transmission', as he implies. Context matters, after all, and during the early eighteenth century the context (political, cultural, intellectual) in Russia was considerably different than in Europe. The different interpretations Russians made of the Western notions of 'a state ruled by law' (i.e., the German *Rechtsstaat*) and 'liberalism' (*liberalizm*), as historians Marc Raeff, Anna Geifman, and others have shown, are two, somewhat later, examples of this.

Cracraft's scholarship is however erudite and capacious, reflecting his overall expertise on Petrine Russian. Whereas his study may disappoint discriminating literary scholars, similar to Richard Wortman's recent two-volume study of 'scenarios' it demonstrates for historians and political scientists how new avenues might be taken to illuminate the State's exercise of power in Russia. Furthermore, it should serve as a spur for novel approaches in the study of statecraft in general. Cracraft's work is best suited for experts and advanced post-graduate students.

Andrew Gentes  
The University of Queensland

Elizabeth Osborn and Kazimierz M. Slomczynski, *Open for Business. The Persistent Entrepreneurial Class in Poland*. Warsaw: IFIS Publishers, 2005, 280pp.

It is generally accepted, including by the authors of this volume, that to have a genuine market economy one must have a well-developed entrepreneurial class. They define entrepreneurs as 'those who own small and medium enterprises in the non-agricultural sector, who employ people, and who are actively involved in the operation of their businesses' (p.19). The book, therefore, is explicitly not about those running big businesses, including owner-managers of the oligarch type. The authors claim to demonstrate that in transition economies entrepreneurs have a particularly important role, filling a gap created by the relative lack of capitalists, i.e. individuals or groups with