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, Hippius, 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, Sventsitskii, 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.

https://doi.org/10.2307/2497237 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/10.2307/2497237 Published online by Cambridge University Press