

tion and the social origins, training, employment, and material support of bureaucrats, army officers, clergy, engineers, scientists, doctors, teachers, literati—in a word, about all skilled personnel who had to be trained and educated for new functions in the haltingly modernizing empire. Leikina also deals with the new institutions, organizations, and media appurtenant to the new social stratum. Finally, she assesses the contribution of the various groups subsumed under the word “intelligentsia” (including the revolutionaries) to the needs of Russian society according to the standards of Leninist historical sociology. One finds in this work an outline of the development and achievements of the professional sector of a *pays réel* in conditions which often impeded its growth. Leikina’s valuable data can easily be translated into other analytical and evaluative systems.

PHILIP POMPER  
*Wesleyan University*

EUROPEAN AND MUSCOVITE: IVAN KIREEVSKY AND THE ORIGINS OF SLAVOPHILISM. By *Abbott Gleason*. Russian Research Center Studies, 68. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972. xii, 376 pp. \$13.50.

The striking quality of Professor Gleason’s book is the sharpness and unity of its argument. He adopts Karl Mannheim’s thesis about German Romanticism as a conservative reaction to the French Enlightenment and Revolution, noting that in Russia, where the state was the product of a “revolution” at the summit, conservative ideologues were, in fact, oppositionists. Gleason is aware of the complexity of the debate within and outside the Elagin salon, but limits his inquiry to those figures who entered Kireevsky’s life. A biographical strategy suits the subject admirably: like many Romantic thinkers, Kireevsky was fascinated by the genesis of ideas and demanded that intelligence respond to the totality of experience. To reconstruct the Kireevsky family style Gleason follows the research of Gershenzon, Koyré, Müller, and Walicki, but never slavishly.

Gleason is illuminating in the discussion of Kireevsky’s first important article (“Survey of Russian Literature of 1829”), in which Koyré had detected seeds of Slavophilism. Instead, Gleason points to the essay’s pro-Western sympathies shared by Kireevsky’s friends of the aristocratic “poets’ party,” who despised hired patriots such as Bulgarin. Even in 1831 Kireevsky lamented the “Chinese wall” of Russia’s cultural isolation and looked wistfully toward Guizot’s triad of European cultural forces—Hellenism, Roman law, Christianity. This raises the question of Chaadaev’s influence, and one wishes Gleason could resolve the argument between Koyré and Müller. He is more definite in denying major significance to Kireevsky’s brief stay in Germany, arguing that for him Europe counted chiefly as the dialectical opposite of Russia.

Kireevsky’s final transformation from European into Muscovite is interpreted—successfully in my opinion—along psychological lines. Even an oppositionist as mild and evasive as Kireevsky could not ignore the repressive reality of Nicholaevan Russia. Faced with the awful dilemma which Herzen described as the choice between the salvation of the individual and Russia, Kireevsky chose Russia, encasing her in a logical scheme by which her backwardness could be justified as fidelity to the past—a spiritual virginity superior to Western ripeness. Unlike Khomiakov, who championed his tradition with verve and the complacency of a natural Tory, Kireev-

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