

such as the December 6 Committee, the *Petrashchevtsy*, and so forth. In short, Lincoln has provided a richly documented, balanced, clear, and well-argued account of an important subject. It is a first-rate achievement which doubtless will provide the standard for its subject for many years to come.

JAMES T. FLYNN
College of the Holy Cross

RUSSIAN ORTHODOXY UNDER THE OLD REGIME. Edited by *Robert L. Nichols and Theofanis George Stavrou*. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1978. xiv, 261 pp. + 8 pp. plates. \$16.50, cloth. \$6.95, paper.

Published symposia are necessarily uneven in quality; pioneering investigations of neglected topics are more apt to be so. The present volume consists of papers read at a symposium at the University of Minnesota in April 1976: four on the Russian church, society, and culture, five on church and state (the divisions are quite arbitrary), and two bibliographical aids. The title of the volume is accurate: both Muscovy and the Soviet Union are excluded, as are religious phenomena inside Russia but outside the official church.

Donald Treadgold opens the first half of the book with a chatty and wide-ranging survey of the problems of the Orthodox church in an increasingly secular world. He asks: How well equipped was the church to perform its self-imposed and state-imposed tasks in the areas of education, pastoral care, sacramental ministry, and theology? James Cracraft's essay on Feofan Prokopovich examines Feofan's early academic career, a topic that has been neglected in past studies, and the influence of his Roman education on his subsequent teaching at Kiev. Cracraft's conclusions may need to be altered, however, because of V. M. Nichik's recent discoveries of Feofan's manuscript courses. Robert L. Nichols insists, almost intemperately, that historians, and educational historians in particular, acknowledge the church's contribution to the nation's culture and educational level. His own eclectic appreciation may suggest solid dissertation topics. The best and most substantive essay in the first section is the one by Gregory Freeze, who gives an account of the forgotten Belliustin "affair" of the late 1850s, which was the impetus for church reform in the next decade. One eagerly awaits Freeze's study of the transformation this affair sparked.

The essays in the second half of the book are shorter. In an introductory overview, Marc Szeftel maintains that neither caesaropapism nor a Protestant *summus episcopus* can adequately describe the relationship between church and state from 1721 until the Revolution. Alexander Muller and David Edwards, respectively, examine the legislation of Peter's ecclesiastical inquisitors (whose secular parallels were the fiscals, who were charged with internal surveillance), and of Nicholas I's overprocurators, who attempted to fashion the church's administration into that of a post-Speranskii ministry. Finally, two essays by John Meyendorff and Paul Valliere focus on 1905. Meyendorff examines a collection of remarkable clerical cahiers, and documents how subservient and unimaginative the hierarchy had become after two centuries of subordination. When Russia's fundamental laws and institutions were called into question in 1905, the future organization of the church was hotly debated. Some argued for the restoration of the patriarchate, others for a conciliar (*sobornyi*) church. This topic is examined by Paul Valliere.

Edward Kasinec of the Ukrainian Center at Harvard University has contributed a solid bibliographical essay. Covering printed sources, reference works, and unpublished sources, it is up to his usual high standards. The guide to Western-language literature on Orthodoxy is more eclectic, but useful.

If one wanted an overview of the role of the official church in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Russia, this would not be the first book to read. Its contents are too varied and disconnected. But if a student wants to know what is being done, and what the possibilities are for research in this field, this is a good place to start.

MAX J. OKENFUSS
Washington University

RUSSIAN ALTERNATIVES TO MARXISM: CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM AND IDEALISTIC LIBERALISM IN TWENTIETH-CENTURY RUSSIA. By *George F. Putnam*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1977. xii, 233 pp. \$13.50.

Putnam's book, which has been preceded by a few articles of his on individual thinkers of the reign of Nicholas II, is a serious, balanced work without a hero or a scheme for retroactively saving Russia from communism—much as one might have wished it to have been saved. His aim, he tells us, is to learn more about “what was lost or repressed in Russian culture, what needs or desires may lie unfulfilled” in Soviet Russia (p. vii). He studies his subject in its own terms; “to explain how [ideas] are related to social-economic forces and interests is a task which no one yet knows how to do” (p. ix), he declares, which is certainly a refreshing change from those dreadful Soviet studies in intellectual history prefaced by accounts of the rise in grain prices. But this is certainly not his last word on the subject, as will be noted below.

The structure of the book hinges on the selection of two men to focus upon—Serge Bulgakov and Paul Novgorodtsev. The author declares that the period produced three Russian alternatives to Marxism: “God-seeking” (Merezhkovskii, Hippus, Rozanov), Christian socialism (Bulgakov, Berdiaev), and idealistic liberalism (Novgorodtsev, Struve, Frank), and proceeds to concentrate on the last two approaches. Things were not quite so tidy, as Putnam knows. Ern, Svetsitskii, and others were also Christian socialists and founded a Brotherhood of Christian Struggle, which is better described as communist (though not Bolshevik), but there was no other politically active body of the kind. As for more or less idealistic liberals, there was the whole Kadet Party, not to mention other groupings within and outside its ranks. But Putnam is seeking to contrast the evolving views of the two men mentioned, not to trace their political and intellectual influence—which indeed was slight. In order to do so, he interweaves the story of the Religious-Philosophical Meetings and Societies that existed in St. Petersburg (1901–3 and 1907–14) and Moscow (1905–14), as well as in Kiev and Tiflis, which are mentioned but not described here. However, his account drops the St. Petersburg group in 1910 and the Moscow one in 1908, and treats the former in three separate segments; he has his reasons, but the reader's task is not eased by the sequence he has chosen. Bulgakov joined the first St. Petersburg “Meetings” when they were already under way, and he had much to do with founding the Moscow “Society” and reestablishing the St. Petersburg group as a “Society.” Putnam's difficulty is that Novgorodtsev had nothing to do with any of these groups, and thus Novgorodtsev has to be forced into the narrative occasionally (p. 68, for example). That is not to say that either man is neglected. Not merely the writings but the fundamental assumptions of both Bulgakov and Novgorodtsev are analyzed extensively and fairly. Putnam draws on non-Russian writers to do so: Mannheim, Piaget, Voegelin, Philip Rieff, Erik Erikson. The choice might not be exactly mine, but their works are used judiciously; there is no rubbish about how X “has shown” something Putnam wants to believe, and he is afraid neither to analyze his subjects, praise them, nor find fault with them.