Bulgakov traversed the more complex path. He began as a good Orthodox son of a priest, became a Marxist, rejected Marxism, and finally became a priest himself. To be more accurate, his rejection of Marxism was only partial. He continued to be convinced that something called a "Christian political economy" could rest on Marxian socioeconomic analysis, and he insisted on combining religion and politics in a manner from which other liberals, "idealistic" or not, recoiled. As for Novgorodtsev (What was his parentage? Putnam seems not to know and neither does *Novyi entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*.), he was first a good student, then a good professor, without ever being an ardent member of any circle or sect. He insisted on *not* mixing his Orthodox religion, which he took seriously, with his politics, in which he showed both detachment and commitment—he served time in prison for his part in the Vyborg Manifesto of 1906.

Putnam's final chapter, "The Priest and the Professor," tells us much about his conception of the book. He concludes that Bulgakov spoke for the Russian church, Novgorodtsev for the universities, during the reign of the last tsar. Of course, Putnam does not mean that those constituencies supported all or most of the ideas of the two men, though the suggestion bears on the issue—which he has raised at the outset—of whether ideas and social interests may be related.

The book is well written, carefully edited, and mostly free from errors in detail. Dionysius the "Aeropagite" is a delightful misspelling; it is discouraging to find Uvarov's slogan again given in the wrong order as "Autocracy, Orthodoxy, Nationality"; the second "s" is consistently dropped from the name of John Curtiss; the Social Democrats' Second Congress was in 1903, not 1902; the correct form is "Social*ist* Revolutionaries." But these are minor matters. The careful analysis of Bulgakov's and Novgorodtsev's ideas has philosophical substance, historical significance, and application to times and places other than the Russia of Nicholas II. Not only is the "level of discussion for the whole field of early twentieth-century Russian culture" raised by the book, as Martin Malia says on the dust jacket, but a long step has been taken toward the rediscovery of what has been called the lost decade of Russian history (1907–17). The period has much to tell present-day Russians of all political and cultural shadings, and others as well. The most noteworthy aspect of the book is that it is written by an author who is obviously thinking deeply and continuing to learn from other times and places how better to understand twentieth-century Russia, and who can be expected to illuminate the searches of all of us in the future.

Donald W. Treadgold
University of Washington

LENIN I ROSSIIA: SBORNIK STATEI. By *S. G. Pushkarev*. Frankfurt/Main: Possev-Verlag, 1978. 195 pp. DM 19.50, paper.

This selection of essays, written between 1956 and 1976, concentrates on the period between 1914 and 1923, analyzing the Bolshevik seizure of power and considering Lenin's views on international affairs. Pushkarev's aim is to demystify the Revolution—as seen in his account of the taking of the Winter Palace—and to reduce the historical Lenin to fallible, human proportions. Pushkarev aligns himself with those who see the Bolshevik regime as something foreign and alien to traditional Russian values. According to these essays, the regime rested on Latvian bayonets and German money. Pushkarev's interpretations have their supporters, especially among Russian émigrés, but they are subject to serious challenge by Western historians.

Alfred Erich Senn
University of Wisconsin, Madison

https://doi.org/10.2307/2497238 Published online by Cambridge University Press