

sky bore his devotion as a cross. Gleason sees in Kireevsky an increasing tendency to internalize the disharmony of Russian reality after his marriage and the trauma of 1848. The "mysticism" and jaundiced view of Europe in the 1850s are thus traced back, in the manner of Masaryk, to the pathology of the Nicholaevan era.

MARIA BANERJEE
Smith College

ROSSIIA I PARIZHСКАIA KOMMUNA. By *B. S. Itenberg*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1971. 202 pp. 67 kopeks.

The author is the leading Soviet historian of the "populist" phase of the Russian revolutionary movement in the 1870s. His latest book on Russia and the Paris Commune develops themes put forward in earlier works, such as *Pervyi International i revoliutsionnaia Rossiia* (1964) and *Dvizhenie revoliutsionnogo narodnichestva* (1965): West European social movements, especially those associated with the International, have had a profound influence on Russian revolutionary events from the 1860s on. Thus Itenberg has continued a careful assault on the most hallowed generalizations about populist anti-Westernism and neo-Slavophilism. Not unlike his earlier studies, his latest is a "series of essays" on social opinion "within various circles of Russian society," including liberals, conservatives, reactionaries, and the autocracy itself (p. 6). In addition to the usual revolutionists, one finds the positivist journalist, G. N. Vyrubov, the antinihilist but progressive internationalist, P. D. Boborykin, and the professor, A. V. Nikitenko. The latest book reaches further toward 1917 than the earlier works, including thirty pages on the contributions of the Commune to Lenin's notions of revolutionary governance. But the book can only scratch the surface of this most intriguing historical problem.

A long chapter on P. L. Lavrov includes archival materials on Lavrov and the Commune, but repeats, almost verbatim, Itenberg's essays in *Istoriia SSSR* (no. 2, 1971), *Prometei* (1971), and elsewhere. (Incidentally, the Russian translations published in *Istoriia SSSR* do not render the French originals with absolute fidelity.) Elsewhere as well Itenberg cites neglected journals and unpublished documents from Soviet archives ("Third Section," censorship department, criminal court records, and the personal papers of Lavrov, Vyrubov, and M. M. Stasiulevich). The book has an alphabetical index, lamentably rare in Soviet publications of this kind.

Itenberg tries to do too much in a short book. The several essays do not combine into one set of conclusions. But the volume is unquestionably a valuable contribution to the literature on the Paris Commune and a welcome continuation of Itenberg's investigations into the history of Russian radical social movements.

ALAN KIMBALL
University of Oregon

VLADIMIR SOLOV'EV UND MAX SCHELER: EIN BEITRAG ZUR GESCHICHTE DER PHÄNOMENOLOGIE IM VERSUCH EINER VERGLEICHENDEN INTERPRETATION. By *Helmut Dahm*. Munich and Salzburg: Anton Pustet, 1971. 468 pp.

At first glance there seems to be nothing interesting about a comparison between philosophers as different as Soloviev and Scheler. It is true that they both talked