

picture of the reception given the "peasant" from the provinces by the Europeanized literary world. Indeed, throughout the book Moser follows the literary and personal relationships between Pisemsky and a whole flock of the leading figures of the age—Turgenev, Ostrovsky, Nekrasov, Apollon Grigoriev, and Dmitrii Pisarev among others. The treatment of these relationships is important not only for the light it throws on Pisemsky's literary fortunes but also for the total picture it provides of the shifting literary attitudes of the age.

However, the author is not wholly successful in his essay in literary history. When, for example, he comes to that crucial novel in Pisemsky's career, *Troubled Seas*, he gives a faithful description of everyone's dissatisfaction with the work, but fails to explain why Pisemsky's star fell at this moment. Was it the weaknesses of the novel or the biases of its readers? In short, Moser leans toward journalistic accuracy when the subject matter cries out for judicious analysis. The problem Moser fails to come to grips with is not so much the decline of Pisemsky's reputation after *Troubled Seas*—he was not a great writer, as Moser freely admits—but rather the seemingly incomprehensible respect his extraordinarily gifted contemporaries accorded him. We are told that Leskov, among other major writers of the period, greatly admired Pisemsky's fiction. Later critical opinion has clearly diverged from this judgment; however, Moser is never able to account for the importance Pisemsky enjoyed in the estimation of his contemporaries.

A considerable part of the book is given over to plot synopses for nearly every work Pisemsky wrote—undoubtedly a service for the numerous readers with a serious interest in Russian literature who have read very little of Pisemsky's total output. These passages do not, however, really contribute much to the author's aim of illuminating literary history.

In a final chapter Moser attempts to identify those qualities of Pisemsky's fiction which mark him as one of the most representative realists in nineteenth-century Russia. He judiciously calls attention to Pisemsky's representation of social reality as "the unlovely and corrupt." He notes that material gain and "physiological urges" operate as the motivating forces behind social action in his work. Such qualities ally Pisemsky with the tradition of Balzac and Flaubert; but while Moser briefly compares Pisemsky with all his major Russian contemporaries, he neglects the foreign writers to whom this Russian is in many ways more akin.

In sum, this study is a useful volume, but fails to achieve its principal aim—an analysis of literary history—in a wholly convincing way.

KARL D. KRAMER
University of Michigan

KONSTANTIN PETROVIČ POBEDONOSCEV UND DIE KIRCHENPOLITIK DES HEILIGEN SINOD, 1880–1905. By *Gerhard Simon*. Kirche im Osten: Studien zur osteuropäischen Kirchengeschichte und Kirchenkunde, monographienreihe vol. 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969. 280 pp. DM 34.

The title fails to suggest the riches of this volume. While the author has dealt at length with the famous Over Procurator, he also presents a broad picture of the Russian Orthodox Church before and during his incumbency, and in the final chapter evaluates his rule. This is a significant work, impressive in the wealth of its sources and in breadth of understanding of Russian religious life. It is convincing and leaves no important question unanswered.

While Dr. Simon's account of Pobedonostsev's role in church affairs is not especially new, it is highly revealing in its analysis of the convictions of this powerful figure. Distrusting almost everybody, including the leading churchmen, he did not train effective assistants or successors. He fiercely opposed the new ideas that were entering Russia, not by theological argument, which he felt was hopeless, but by sheer negation backed by the civil power. He was intolerant of religious dissent, even that of the Old Believers, who were medieval in outlook and largely loyal to the tsar. Lutherans and Catholics also experienced repression, and the native evangelicals felt even greater rigor. On the dynamic Stundists—who were essentially Baptists—he unleashed the full power of his punitive measures.

Perhaps because of Pobedonostsev's negative outlook, his power in secular affairs declined steadily, and by 1900 he had little influence in the government. His power over the Russian Church, however, remained strong, and was exerted chiefly through the lay officials of the Synod and of the diocesan consistories; even the higher clergy were little more than figureheads. In his zeal for the good of the church, he insisted on deciding even trivial matters. He devoted much effort to improving the incomes of the clergy and achieved a rapid increase in the number of parochial schools.

The author makes it clear that Orthodoxy fared ill under Pobedonostsev. Thanks to its obscurantism the intellectuals were almost lost to the church, and workers and peasants often turned from it because of its ties with the Establishment. Even worse, the sons of the clergy were rejecting priestly careers, rioting in the seminaries, and assaulting their superiors. When Pobedonostsev retired in 1905, the church was already in dire straits.

This is a valuable book. It deserves a better format.

JOHN SHELTON CURTISS
Duke University

CONTINUITY IN HISTORY AND OTHER ESSAYS. By *Alexander Gerschenkron*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1968. xi, 545 pp. \$10.00.

This companion volume to *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective* (1962) rounds out the publication of Alexander Gerschenkron's shorter papers, in which he develops various further facets of his main thesis. This thesis asserts, in effect, that the more backward a country is at the beginning of its initial effort at industrialization, the more discontinuous or unstable will be its rate of economic growth—the sharper will be the upward curve of industrial output, and the greater the relative emphasis on producers' goods, on large plants and enterprises, and on the role of the state and other central institutions.

It is both a strength and a weakness of this thesis that it is based to a considerable extent on the single case of Russia, represented in this volume by the long essay "Russia: Agrarian Policies and Industrialization, 1861–1914" (originally published in the *Cambridge Economic History*), and elsewhere by several book reviews. The economic development of Russia both before and since the Revolution fits Gerschenkron's thesis very well, and he has contributed more than any other scholar to our understanding of the interrelationship of agriculture and industry in modern Russian economic history. But could his thesis be applied to any Asian country other than Japan? He has not attempted to do so, and this reviewer at