

dignitaries in the 1930s are still in existence and would probably have provided some of the intellectual independence of viewpoint that seems to be lacking in so much published Mongolian work of the Soviet period.

Of the book's 423 pages of text, 380 pages deal with history before World War II. Roughly the first half of the book is almost entirely new information, never before offered with such a degree of authority and reliability. In fact, the whole book is a triumph of clear and felicitous writing. It is a pleasure to recommend it highly.

ROBERT A. RUPEN

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

A COURSE IN RUSSIAN HISTORY: THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

By *V. O. Kliuchevsky*. Translated by *Natalie Duddington*. Introduction by *Alfred J. Rieber*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968. xl, 400 pp. \$8.95.

The choice to include Kliuchevsky's volume on seventeenth-century Russian society in the Quadrangle Series on Russian History was an excellent one, providing a nice complement to the first retranslation of Kliuchevsky (*Peter the Great*, St. Martin's Press, 1958). It is thus the second revision of the useful but inadequate translations by C. J. Hogarth (London, 1911–31). Based on the 1957 Soviet edition in Russian, the new version flows smoothly and resounds the masterful style that made Kliuchevsky the most popular university teacher of history in Russia. We owe much to Natalie Duddington for this achievement.

In a solid, scholarly introduction, Professor Albert J. Rieber examines the work, life, and critics of Kliuchevsky the historian with a view to placing him in modern historiography. This is no easy task, because, as Rieber points out, Kliuchevsky as a social thinker tended to feel and reflect the strong currents of change and resistance to change in Russian society and state. Thus his "true" colors in matters epistemological and methodological are important questions of interpretation for both Soviet and pre-Soviet scholars (Plekhanov, Presniakov, Miliukov, Tkhorzhevsky, Pokrovsky, Zimin, and others; see pp. xxv–xxxiii, in particular). For some, Kliuchevsky grounded his method in economic materialism, while for others he worked essentially as a positivist (resembling, I think, Durkheim and his approach to historical process). And at times he seems to have wavered in the direction of idealism. Rieber offers his own rather pragmatic assessment, stating that "two main themes dominated Kliuchevsky's view of the sweep of Russian history: colonization or mastery of the land, and unification or creation of common identity and purpose" (p. xxx). This interpretation is especially logical in retrospect, for it largely accounts for the special features of Russian institutions. One also sees these major concerns prominent in the political-ideological dialogues about Russian national development at all points on the spectrum. The events and ideas in seventeenth-century Russia are replete with evidence supporting Rieber's view.

This new edition is thus much better for instructional purposes than the earlier translation. Both beginning and advanced students of Russian history will find the book valuable and highly readable, and because Kliuchevsky frequently differentiated between Russian and European experience, students of comparative historical method will also be interested. Many of the questions raised by Rieber about Kliuchevsky, his supporters and opponents, and his generalizations on historical process offer good material for further research. These are only a few of

the interesting features of this outstanding contribution to Russian historical literature.

Questions of interpretive emphasis and nuance could be discussed at some length, but we are limited here to a few points. One of Kliuchevsky's leading concerns centered on Russia's need for new systems of cognition—for "cultural work," "men who could manage," "teaching . . . handicrafts and industries" (p. 7). The implications for institution-building are great, especially in the seventeenth century. One's preferences here and there for other terms in translation are perhaps natural—for example, "liberal studies" rather than "free learning" for *svobodnye ucheniia* (p. 337). Nonetheless, this volume deserves a sincere welcome by the field.

WILLIAM K. MEDLIN
The University of Michigan

RUSSISCHER INTELLEKT IN EUROPÄISCHER KRISE: IVAN V. KIREEVSKIJ (1806–1856). By *Eberhard Müller*. Beiträge zur Geschichte Osteuropas, vol. 5. Cologne and Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1966. xii, 512 pp. DM 56.

This impressive volume about "the father of the Slavophile movement," Ivan V. Kireevsky, concentrates, as is indicated by the title, on relations between Russia and Europe, especially the Russian view of European culture and thought. The author rightly stresses that Kireevsky's Slavophile persuasion grew out of the changing Russian attitudes.

Kireevsky's chief ideological goal was to find a formula that would blend European and Russian historic tradition into a unity. At the beginning of his career he saw no radical difference between European and Russian civilization. But in 1838 he began to distinguish clearly between a European and a Russian cultural tradition, whose relationship he believed to be the same as the one between Schelling's negative (rational) and positive (intuitive) philosophy. The negative, rational, or European tradition and the positive, intuitive, or Early Russian tradition (which Kireevsky identified as genuinely and purely Christian) became the two aspects of Kireevsky's analysis of the current historical moment. The ideal for him was Early Russian civilization, whose spiritual achievement he thought should inspire the solutions for the problems of his time—problems involving Europe and the unfortunately half-Europeanized, half-civilized modern Russia.

Mr. Müller divides his book into two parts (preceded by a short biography of Kireevsky). The first part discusses the varying attitudes toward Europe and Russia in Kireevsky's thought (pp. 45–348), and the second deals with the "Philosophical Starts" ("Philosophische Ansätze") (pp. 349–484) from which Kireevsky sought to develop his own religious and nationalistic philosophy—a philosophy he believed would culminate in proof that reason and faith, logic and intuition could be blended in a higher unity.

The sources of Kireevsky's thinking (e.g., the Church Fathers, Pascal, German idealism) are carefully examined, and his use of them is persuasively discussed. As a result, one cannot help realizing that Kireevsky's own contribution to Slavophile ideology (apart from its main tendency) is quite limited. That is also the impression one gets from reading his few relevant articles. They consist of frequent repetitions of the same borrowed ideas in a hazy and pretentious style. One is sometimes tempted to ask whether Müller does not overrate some of Kireevsky's