

evidence. Particularly tenuous, it seems to me, is the contention that in mid-June the Soviet was as discredited as the Provisional Government in the eyes of the masses. To be sure, the stature of the majority socialist leadership in the Soviet was greatly compromised; often it was no more effective than the government in controlling the restlessness of the masses. However, even in October popular allegiance to the Soviet as an organ of revolutionary government was so strong that the Bolsheviks were unable to dispense with the slogan "All Power to the Soviets!" In analyzing increasing militancy among workers in the pre-July period, Ferro attributes a greater degree of class consciousness to their actions than may be warranted. One wonders whether the opposition of the workers to collaboration with the bourgeoisie was as deeply ingrained as Ferro suggests; certainly their growing frustration with the results of the revolution could explain this attitude. Similarly, that the government and factory owners hedged on the concessions most desired by workers and peasants is clear. However, Ferro's suggestion that this was most of all the result of narrow self-interest on the part of the bourgeoisie, of its fundamental coldness to worker demands, is open to question; the war and the underlying weakness of the Russian economy were probably at least equally responsible. Finally, to this reviewer Ferro's far-ranging narrative seemed a bit fragmented; that is to say, more might have been done to weave the analyses of the February Revolution, political and social attitudes, and foreign policy developments into a more cohesive whole.

In summary, the character of the Williams and Kerensky books is similar; both are reworkings of earlier memoirs by participants whose lives were shaped by the revolution. Of the books reviewed, only Ferro's deserves to be added to the relatively short list of studies, among the many published in the West in connection with the fiftieth anniversary of the Russian Revolution, that contribute substantially to our understanding of that event. Yet this paucity of historically significant literature need not be cause for discouragement. To this reviewer, at any rate, the importance of the fiftieth anniversary to Western historiography lies less in the many works on 1917 that have already appeared than in the fresh scholarly research which the commemorative year stimulated. Surveying the numerous doctoral dissertations dealing with the revolution recently completed in American and West European universities and, perhaps even more important, the many major research projects currently under way, one can predict with some confidence that the ultimate fruits of the anniversary year will be rich indeed.

ALEXANDER RABINOWITCH  
*Indiana University*

OXFORD SLAVONIC PAPERS, New Series, vol. 1. Edited by *Robert Auty, J. L. I. Fennell, and J. S. G. Simmons*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968. 140 pp. 40s.

We have not been used to expecting contributions of principal character in *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, which mostly printed occasional lectures and sometimes source material on bibliography. The issue under review—which initiates a "new series" under the triumvirate editorship of Robert Auty, J. L. I. Fennell, and J. S. G. Simmons—impresses the reader with both the range and the substance of its contents. It is on the whole rather unusual to find, in periodicals of this kind, articles in which the authors take a stand on matters of principal and controversial

character. In the present issue there are two such articles, and they are both contributions that are sure to retain their weight in further discussions. The most important is probably the last paper, by Fennell. On the basis of textual analysis, and following the Soviet scholar A. A. Zimin, the author is trying to settle the controversy over the *Slovo o polku Igoreve*. His argument concerns the "textological triangle" (Slovo—Zadonshchina—Hypathian Chronicle), and his conclusion is an unhesitant subscription to the view that "*Slovo* had as its sources both *Hyp.* and *Zad.*, and that both influenced *Slovo* independently of each other" (p. 137).

Naturally, in a brief review it would be more than presumptuous to take a stand on an issue of this kind. Fennell's analysis is meticulous and skillful and cannot be ignored. However, there are equally skillful and meticulous expositions of opposite views, and at this moment one cannot but echo D. S. Likhachev's gallant and, we must assume, sincere remark in his Oxford lecture that "the dispute cannot be brought to a conclusion until all the work done on the subject [Zimin's book as the first step] has been published" (*OSP*, 13: 46).

Another issue of great interest and importance, and again of controversial character, is discussed in the paper "Church Slavonic Elements in Russian" by Gerta H. Worth. The author has done extensive research on this subject, and she argues very successfully the importance of OCS to the genesis of literary Russian. Here, too, we see what a tremendous amount of work still remains to be done. The author shows convincingly how the advancement of computer science can aid research of this kind, but she is also fully aware of the importance of individual scholarly judgment. In an article it is, of course, impossible to account in detail for all the evaluative statements. Thus one is occasionally left wondering where exactly the author stands on some particular question (e.g., "A great many of Vinogradov's examples are taken from the Igor' Tale, which for various reasons cannot be considered completely reliable evidence," p. 4).

Literary themes are treated in a number of articles either of survey character ("The Medieval Czech Love-Lyric" by R. Auty, "Tolstoy, Shakespeare, and Russian Writers of the 1860s" by Yu. D. Levin of Pushkin House) or analytic ("Pushkin's Secret of Distance" by J. Bayley, "Reaction or Revolution: The Ending of Saltykov's *History of a Town*" by I. P. Foote). J. Sullivan and C. L. Drage present some "Poems in an Unpublished Manuscript of the *Vinograd Rossiiskii*." "The King of the New Israel': Thaddeus Grabianka (1740–1807)" by M. L. Danilewicz discusses an interesting chapter in European diplomacy and intrigue.

ZBIGNIEW FOLEJEWSKI  
University of British Columbia

NOMADS, NORTHMEN AND SLAVS: EASTERN EUROPE IN THE NINTH CENTURY. By *Imre Boba*. The Hague: Mouton. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1967. 138 pp. DM 31, paper.

All existing models of ninth-century East European history have their weaknesses; but it is far easier to criticize them than to construct valid alternative theories. The imprecise, fortuitous, and frequently contradictory nature of the available evidence makes it almost inevitable that the historian who deals satisfactorily with one set of problems will also create new areas in which facts are few and unsubstantiated hypotheses numerous. Imre Boba's monograph, his doctoral dissertation, is the latest reinterpretation of this intractable material.