

sky bore his devotion as a cross. Gleason sees in Kireevsky an increasing tendency to internalize the disharmony of Russian reality after his marriage and the trauma of 1848. The "mysticism" and jaundiced view of Europe in the 1850s are thus traced back, in the manner of Masaryk, to the pathology of the Nicholaevan era.

MARIA BANERJEE
Smith College

ROSSIIA I PARIZHСКАIA KOMMUNA. By *B. S. Itenberg*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1971. 202 pp. 67 kopeks.

The author is the leading Soviet historian of the "populist" phase of the Russian revolutionary movement in the 1870s. His latest book on Russia and the Paris Commune develops themes put forward in earlier works, such as *Pervyi International i revoliutsionnaia Rossiia* (1964) and *Dvizhenie revoliutsionnogo narodnichestva* (1965): West European social movements, especially those associated with the International, have had a profound influence on Russian revolutionary events from the 1860s on. Thus Itenberg has continued a careful assault on the most hallowed generalizations about populist anti-Westernism and neo-Slavophilism. Not unlike his earlier studies, his latest is a "series of essays" on social opinion "within various circles of Russian society," including liberals, conservatives, reactionaries, and the autocracy itself (p. 6). In addition to the usual revolutionists, one finds the positivist journalist, G. N. Vyrubov, the antinihilist but progressive internationalist, P. D. Boborykin, and the professor, A. V. Nikitenko. The latest book reaches further toward 1917 than the earlier works, including thirty pages on the contributions of the Commune to Lenin's notions of revolutionary governance. But the book can only scratch the surface of this most intriguing historical problem.

A long chapter on P. L. Lavrov includes archival materials on Lavrov and the Commune, but repeats, almost verbatim, Itenberg's essays in *Istoriia SSSR* (no. 2, 1971), *Prometei* (1971), and elsewhere. (Incidentally, the Russian translations published in *Istoriia SSSR* do not render the French originals with absolute fidelity.) Elsewhere as well Itenberg cites neglected journals and unpublished documents from Soviet archives ("Third Section," censorship department, criminal court records, and the personal papers of Lavrov, Vyrubov, and M. M. Stasiulevich). The book has an alphabetical index, lamentably rare in Soviet publications of this kind.

Itenberg tries to do too much in a short book. The several essays do not combine into one set of conclusions. But the volume is unquestionably a valuable contribution to the literature on the Paris Commune and a welcome continuation of Itenberg's investigations into the history of Russian radical social movements.

ALAN KIMBALL
University of Oregon

VLADIMIR SOLOV'EV UND MAX SCHELER: EIN BEITRAG ZUR GESCHICHTE DER PHÄNOMENOLOGIE IM VERSUCH EINER VERGLEICHENDEN INTERPRETATION. By *Helmut Dahm*. Munich and Salzburg: Anton Pustet, 1971. 468 pp.

At first glance there seems to be nothing interesting about a comparison between philosophers as different as Soloviev and Scheler. It is true that they both talked

about love. However, Scheler was an ethical thinker and phenomenologist, while Soloviev used love in a more systematic, ontological-metaphysical context. Such first impressions undergo radical revision on reading this tightly argued book. Dahm shows that—whether or not there was a direct influence of one on the other—there is a similarity in conceptual structure between these two thinkers, such that one is justified in talking about an obverse complementarity. The first chapter shows this for the basic notions of philosophy, the second for the nature of knowledge, the third for the relationship between religion and metaphysics, and the fourth for philosophy as system. The fifth chapter deals with some special problems—especially that of a direct influence of one on the other. The sixth chapter is a tightly knit conclusion.

In chapters 7, 8, and 9 Dahm comes to the most fascinating part of his enterprise. Having dealt in the seventh chapter with Russian philosophy from Soloviev to Shestov, he devotes the eighth to the Soviet image of Soloviev and the ninth to the Soviet view of Scheler. The upshot of all this is the suggestion that through a “Russian” return to Soloviev, “Soviet” philosophers are coming through Scheler to a real involvement with contemporary phenomenology. It is with phenomenology that the “new wave” in Soviet philosophy is dealing; it is with phenomenology that the “orthodox” feel themselves obliged to deal in their polemics.

This book is filled with fascinating suggestions. It represents creative history of philosophy in the best meaning of the term. For this very reason it is often hard to assimilate. But the richness of the material makes the effort well worth the while.

THOMAS J. BLAKELEY
Boston College

USSR: A CONCISE HISTORY. By *Basil Dmytryshyn*. 2nd edition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971. xv, 585 pp. \$12.50.

Since this important textbook on Soviet history was not reviewed in this journal when it first appeared in 1965, publication of a second edition provides an opportunity to evaluate it briefly. Its distinctive feature is that the last third consists of forty-one appended documents, including in full such useful items as Lenin's “April Theses,” the 1936 Constitution, and Khrushchev's 1956 “secret speech.” Thus it serves particularly well the teacher who wants students to work through and savor some key primary sources of Soviet history. The text, however, contains only a few cross references to the documents, and the documents have neither introductions nor notes.

The narrative itself is indeed concise, only a little more than half the length of Treadgold's *Twentieth Century Russia*, a textbook which is more broadly conceived, substantial, and thorough, but which lacks documents. On the other hand, Dmytryshyn's account is more factual and a bit longer than the only other comparable survey, J. P. Nettl's *The Soviet Achievement* (1967). The latter is more interpretive, more challenging, better written, and has superb illustrations, many in color. Nevertheless, Dmytryshyn's book probably serves the beginning student somewhat better.

In fact, complaints about this textbook verge on quibbles. It is, as the preface claims, a reasonably “complete, accurate, clearly organized, and dispassionate” survey of major trends of development in the Soviet Union, while not purporting