

INTELLIGENCIJA: UNTERSUCHUNGEN ZUR GESCHICHTE EINES POLITISCHEN SCHLAGWORTES. By *Otto W. Müller*. Frankfurter Abhandlungen zur Slavistik, vol. 17. Frankfurt: Athenäum Verlag, 1971. 419 pp. [DM 58], paper.

INTELLIGENTSIIA V ROSSII VO VTOROI POLOVINE XIX VEKA. By *V. R. Leikina-Svirskaia*. Moscow: "Mysl'," 1971. 368 pp. 1.68 rubles.

Müller first traces nineteenth-century European (mainly French and German) meanings of the word "intelligentsia," then its Russian and Soviet transformations, and, finally, the reborrowing of the word by Western writers. The evidence he presents supports his conclusion that the word "intelligentsia," like the words "freedom" and "democracy," acquires its substance through historical, legal, and social norms. He shows in considerable detail how a unified, generally employed concept failed to emerge from the ideological ferment in Russia. The author, however, has not written a historical sociology (even though he is occasionally compelled to insert sociological statements) of the Russian intelligentsia, but rather a "word history" of the collective substantive "intelligentsia," concentrating mainly on its uses in Russia in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The methodological self-justifications for the limitations of his study and his selection of material are set forth by the author in a lengthy introduction. Suffice it to say that they will not convince all intellectual and social historians of the value of this kind of study. The central importance of the work of A. Stronin in Müller's word history may give some indication of the relation of word history to the intellectual or social history of the Russian intelligentsia.

The most questionable aspects of Müller's work, even taken on its own terms, are the organization and presentation of dozens of concrete examples of word usage in numerous quotations, many of which seem superfluous. After exposure to still another meaning of "intelligentsia" contained in several more quotations, the weary reader discovers that Müller has condensed most of the useful information derived from them in neat summaries and outlines, such as those presented on pages 95–97, 246–51, and 376–89. Readers can avoid considerable repetition and labored points, yet still satisfy the curiosity generated by the introductory chapter, by restricting themselves to these pages. One can share the author's hope that the contemporary English-speaking world will do what German and Russian writers have failed to do—provide the word "intelligentsia" with precise conceptual content. But there is no evidence of a consensus at this moment.

Leikina-Svirskaia manages to condense her historical survey of the uses of the word "intelligentsia" into a twenty-page introduction. She then presents an attempt at the historical sociology of a social stratum which was called forth by the "needs" of nineteenth-century capitalism, but which performed functions far wider than those intended by the dominant class. There is no need to comment on the Leninist formulas for describing the relation of social groups to each other, their function in relation to the imperial political system, and their progressiveness or lack of it. The author works well within the boundaries set for her. Her sympathies obviously lie with the new stratum, whose several subgroups contained numerous distinguished men and women. She has gathered together a wealth of statistics which illuminate the politics and sociology of modernization in several areas of Russian culture during the second half of the nineteenth century. By means of these statistics, one can find out a great deal about the rate of moderniza-

tion and the social origins, training, employment, and material support of bureaucrats, army officers, clergy, engineers, scientists, doctors, teachers, literati—in a word, about all skilled personnel who had to be trained and educated for new functions in the haltingly modernizing empire. Leikina also deals with the new institutions, organizations, and media appurtenant to the new social stratum. Finally, she assesses the contribution of the various groups subsumed under the word “intelligentsia” (including the revolutionaries) to the needs of Russian society according to the standards of Leninist historical sociology. One finds in this work an outline of the development and achievements of the professional sector of a *pays réel* in conditions which often impeded its growth. Leikina’s valuable data can easily be translated into other analytical and evaluative systems.

PHILIP POMPER  
*Wesleyan University*

EUROPEAN AND MUSCOVITE: IVAN KIREEVSKY AND THE ORIGINS OF SLAVOPHILISM. By *Abbott Gleason*. Russian Research Center Studies, 68. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972. xii, 376 pp. \$13.50.

The striking quality of Professor Gleason’s book is the sharpness and unity of its argument. He adopts Karl Mannheim’s thesis about German Romanticism as a conservative reaction to the French Enlightenment and Revolution, noting that in Russia, where the state was the product of a “revolution” at the summit, conservative ideologues were, in fact, oppositionists. Gleason is aware of the complexity of the debate within and outside the Elagin salon, but limits his inquiry to those figures who entered Kireevsky’s life. A biographical strategy suits the subject admirably: like many Romantic thinkers, Kireevsky was fascinated by the genesis of ideas and demanded that intelligence respond to the totality of experience. To reconstruct the Kireevsky family style Gleason follows the research of Gershenzon, Koyré, Müller, and Walicki, but never slavishly.

Gleason is illuminating in the discussion of Kireevsky’s first important article (“Survey of Russian Literature of 1829”), in which Koyré had detected seeds of Slavophilism. Instead, Gleason points to the essay’s pro-Western sympathies shared by Kireevsky’s friends of the aristocratic “poets’ party,” who despised hired patriots such as Bulgarin. Even in 1831 Kireevsky lamented the “Chinese wall” of Russia’s cultural isolation and looked wistfully toward Guizot’s triad of European cultural forces—Hellenism, Roman law, Christianity. This raises the question of Chaadaev’s influence, and one wishes Gleason could resolve the argument between Koyré and Müller. He is more definite in denying major significance to Kireevsky’s brief stay in Germany, arguing that for him Europe counted chiefly as the dialectical opposite of Russia.

Kireevsky’s final transformation from European into Muscovite is interpreted—successfully in my opinion—along psychological lines. Even an oppositionist as mild and evasive as Kireevsky could not ignore the repressive reality of Nicholaevan Russia. Faced with the awful dilemma which Herzen described as the choice between the salvation of the individual and Russia, Kireevsky chose Russia, encasing her in a logical scheme by which her backwardness could be justified as fidelity to the past—a spiritual virginity superior to Western ripeness. Unlike Khomiakov, who championed his tradition with verve and the complacency of a natural Tory, Kireev-