

fame was his reform of Russian prose style; Cross has some material on this, but the reader who wants to understand what Karamzin's reform was all about will get more from K. Skipina's article (listed, to be sure, in Cross's bibliography). By the same token Cross's third chapter, on the *Letters of a Russian Traveler*, contains much information, yet the student who wishes to know how Karamzin's *Letters* fit into the "literary journey" genre should read T. Roboli's article (also listed in the bibliography). Again, Karamzin is remembered as a gifted representative of Russian sentimentalism, but what sort of movement was Russian sentimentalism? Some scholars (Blagoy, for example) have attempted to define it, and a few have warily distinguished between "progressive" sentimentalism and other varieties. Readers might have welcomed a fresh, systematic (and, possibly, polemical) analysis by Cross. The sixth chapter, dealing with Karamzin's verse, may strike literary theoreticians as pretty tame stuff, perhaps rightly so, since "it was in prose that Karamzin wrote his best poetry" (p. 192).

It all seems to boil down to a question of readers' preference and author's selection. Cross has chosen to focus on Karamzin's *ideas*—social and political ideas as well as aesthetic—telling us where Karamzin got them, how he adapted them to the tastes of his Russian readers, and how he continued to press them on his readers even as the ideas themselves underwent transformation. Doubtless such works as the *Memoir* and *History of the Russian State* are discussed, the book's title notwithstanding, because one could hardly do justice to the spectrum of Karamzin's thought otherwise. Literary theory and formal analysis, meanwhile, have moved over to make room for *Geistesgeschichte*.

Students of comparative literature, Russian intellectual history, and Russian literature courses where the emphasis is on themes, motifs, and *Geistesgeschichte* will find many illuminating passages in Cross's book. It belongs on any general reading list devoted to eighteenth-century Russia.

HORACE W. DEWEY  
University of Michigan

RUSSLANDS AUFBRUCH INS 20. JAHRHUNDERT: POLITIK—GESELLSCHAFT—KULTUR, 1894–1917. Edited by *George Katkov, Erwin Oberländer, Nikolaus Poppe, and Georg von Rauch*. Olten and Freiburg: Walter-Verlag, 1970. 347 pp.

RUSSIA ENTERS THE TWENTIETH CENTURY, 1894–1917. Edited by *Erwin Oberländer, George Katkov, Nikolaus Poppe, and Georg von Rauch*. Translated by *Gerald Onn*. New York: Schocken Books, 1971. 352 pp. \$12.00.

This collective work, by thirteen authors from Germany and Britain, some of whom are of Russian origin, appeared first in German a year earlier than the English edition. It contains a lot of information which would be useful to students, covering a wide range of political, legal, economic, and cultural problems, taken essentially from the last two decades of the imperial Russian regime.

Inevitably the contributions are of unequal value. In this reviewer's opinion the two best are "The Agrarian Problem" by H. T. Willetts and "Russian Schools" by Oskar Anweiler. Both are models of the selection of relevant and important information and of its intelligent interpretation. The part of the book which the student is likely to find most useful is the last four chapters, which deal with intellec-

tual, religious, and cultural trends. On these subjects there is at present considerably less literature of good quality available in English than on political and economic subjects.

Of the political chapters the one by Lothar Schultz on constitutional law covers familiar ground, but explains the main problems clearly and well. The chapter by Erwin Oberländer on political parties is superficial and blurred. It would be interesting to learn how this writer formed the opinion that the view that the Bolsheviks were "the only really important political group in Russia" and that their victory was preordained by historical necessity has been "espoused by the majority of western observers." What is an observer, and what is western?

Miss Violet Conolly shows, in her chapter on the "nationalities question," the grasp of detail and the sense of political realities which one has learned to expect of her. Her discussion of the Ukrainian problem is fair, but leans to the Russian point of view. Her account of Turkestan is admirable, but she leaves out the Caucasus and Transcaucasia. The only weakness of her contribution is that she does not distinguish sufficiently between Russification, as practiced under Nicholas II, and the earlier policies of the tsars. She writes: "The criterion of acceptance was not race but loyalty to the personal autocracy of the Tsar." The first half of this sentence is certainly true, but the second ceased to be true precisely in the period with which this book deals. Loyalty to the tsar did not protect Armenians from having their school funds confiscated, Baltic peoples (Estonians and Latvians as well as Germans) from having their schools Russified, or Tatars from being harried by Orthodox missionaries backed by the secular power. These matters are well discussed in the chapter, but the facts she gives contradict her generalization. The chapter by Hans Bräker on "The Muslim Revival in Russia" is of much lower quality. It is based on a few excellent secondary sources, but has some curious errors. The author refers to Rizaeddin Fakhreddin-oğlu as "Oglu" (which is like referring to Popovich as "Ovich"), and he appears to believe that Djemaladdin al-Afghani and Mohammed Abduh were Indians.

HUGH SETON-WATSON  
*University of London*

STOLYPIN I TRET'IA DUMA. By *A. I. Avrekh*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1968. 520 pp. 2.24 rubles.

A student of the State Duma is concerned with all aspects of Russian political thought at the beginning of the twentieth century, and the relevance of the various political philosophies to the resolution of basic problems. The Russian parliamentary scene was a kaleidoscope of attitudes, opinions, and dogma in which organizational instability and splintering were inevitable. And the Duma represented a society with little tradition for compromise. Forced to contend with old racial and cultural animosities and the changes that accompany a swift industrial revolution, the infant parliamentary institution was in a position that would have been difficult under the most favorable circumstances. The analyst can only help to unravel this extraordinarily complex scene by identifying as accurately as possible the contribution of each sociopolitical element. The least productive approach is an *a priori*, dogmatic one which holds that only Lenin's and other Bolshevik positions regarding the Duma were correct because the inevitable revolution was to be Bolshevik.