

W. Bruce Lincoln, 1938–2000

W. Bruce Lincoln, one of the most distinguished historians of Russia, died on 9 April 2000. Born in Suffield, Connecticut, on 6 September 1938, he received an A.B. from the College of William and Mary in 1960 and a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago in 1966. After serving for a year on the faculty of Memphis State University, he accepted a position at Northern Illinois University (NIU), where he taught until 1999. From 1982 to 1986, he was Presidential Research Professor; from 1986 to 1990, University Research Professor; and from 1990 to 1999, Distinguished Research Professor and NIU Foundation Professor of Russian History. At the time of his death, he was Distinguished Research Professor, Emeritus.

While many Russian historians of his generation fixed their attention on the revolutionary movement and the Soviet “experiment,” Lincoln charted an independent course; he chose to explore the complex relationship between instinctively cautious tsars and reform-minded bureaucrats. In this regard, two of his early studies deserve mention: *Nicholas I: Emperor and Autocrat of All the Russias* (1978) and *In the Vanguard of Reform: Russia’s Enlightened Bureaucrats, 1825–1861* (1982). These works established his reputation as a leading authority on the last century of Romanov rule.

But, although his work was well received in learned circles, Lincoln had already concluded that Russian history was too essential to international understanding and too universal in appeal to be confined to the academy. Without compromising the rigorous standards of scholarship that he had set for himself, he began to write for an educated but nonprofessional audience. In prose that rivaled that of accomplished novelists, he brought Russia’s turbulent past alive for many thousands of men and women. And not only those who were English-language readers; books of his also appeared in German, Polish, Spanish, Italian, and Turkish editions.

Blessed with a rare gift for synthesis, Lincoln did not scale down the historical landscapes he sketched for interested publishers. The first of his panoramas to appear, *The Romanovs: Autocrats of All the Russias* (1981), was an 852-page tour de force that became a main selection of Macmillan’s Library of World History Book Club and a Selection of the Book-of-the-Month Club. It was matched in its conceptual boldness and stylistic grace by *The Conquest of a Continent: Siberia and the Russians* (1994) and *Between Heaven and Hell: The Story of a Thousand Years of Artistic Life in Russia* (1998).

Among Lincoln’s other books, his narrative powers are perhaps most fully on display in *In War’s Dark Shadow: The Russians before the Great War* (1983, a main selection of the Book-of-the-Month Club), *Passage through Armageddon: The Russians in War and Revolution* (1986), and *Red Victory: A History of the Russian Civil War* (1989). In these stirring epics, he captured a time of bitter suffering and violent death, of utopian dreams and vanished hopes. Along the way, he painted verbal portraits of entrepreneurs, aesthetes, reformers, revolutionaries, counterrevolutionaries, and the last Romanovs. But he also focused attention on nameless peasants and workers whose daily lives revealed much about the meaning of larger events. Such events, he showed, exhibited historical continuities—the burdens of an autocratic tradition. That tradition is likely to be evident again in the book he completed while fighting a quiet and courageous battle against cancer—*Sunlight at Midnight: St. Petersburg and the Rise of Modern Russia*.

If Lincoln’s remarkable oeuvre possesses a unifying theme, it is that many of the problems that have bedeviled Russians were rooted in their failure to develop a sense of civic responsibility and to create a strong civil society. The Great Reforms of the 1860s, he wrote in *The Great Reforms: Autocracy, Bureaucracy, and the Politics of Change in Imperial Russia* (1990), “comprised a body of legislation designed to renovate ancien regime Russia and to create the framework for a citizen society in place of the rigidly defined society of classes in which autocratic politics and aristocratic class interests ruled the lives of Russians.” Only such a society, he was convinced, could have held the horsemen of the apocalypse at bay.

Lincoln's own sense of responsibility was not only civic but professional—which explains why he devoted so much time and energy to service. His was a familiar presence on selection committees for Fulbright-Hays, the International Research and Exchanges Board, and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Often he acted as a referee for major scholarly journals, including the *Slavic Review*, and more than two dozen publishers. He did consulting work for the Smithsonian Institution, the Hillwood Museum, and the National Museum of American Art, the *Chicago Tribune*, the *Los Angeles Times*, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Radio Moscow, Nightline, Cable News Network, and the Public Broadcasting System. Twice (1986–89, 2000) he served as a member of the board of directors of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies. These were ways of educating the public, advancing serious research, and supporting young scholars.

This concern for the future of the craft is the side of Lincoln that is least well known. Only those who worked under his direction can appreciate fully the understanding and dedication with which he sought to initiate them into the profession. In this effort, despite heavy demands on his time, he gave unstintingly of himself. An unusually good listener and a constructive critic, he never allowed his students to lose heart. No matter how much red ink they found on the pages of their papers, they left his presence convinced that things were proceeding very well indeed.

Nor was that all. Quietly but insistently, Lincoln instilled in his students the confidence—subsequently proven to be well placed—that if they were willing to work diligently, they could compete on equal terms with the best members of their generation. And after they began their careers, he continued to serve faithfully as confidant, adviser, and example.

In the life of almost everyone who has achieved some measure of success, there is someone to whom an unrepayable debt of gratitude is owed. For most, if not all, of his students, Bruce Lincoln was that someone. His death is a grievous loss to his avid readers and the vocation to which he lent such distinction; it is a devastating loss to those of us who were privileged to know him and to call him friend.

LEE CONGDON
James Madison University
September 2000

Richard Mobray Haywood, 1933–2000

Richard Mobray Haywood, associate professor of history at Purdue University, died on 17 June 2000 after struggling with illness since early April. We mourn his loss and extend sincere sympathies to his family.

Haywood came to Purdue in 1969, having studied at Amherst College (New York University), Oxford University (where he also played soccer), Columbia University, and the University of Munich. Over the course of his career, Haywood was the recipient of several prestigious awards, including fellowships from the International Research and Exchanges Board and from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

His work on the railways of Russia took him to the archives of the former Soviet Union in 1983 and 1990. Haywood's two books, *The Beginnings of Railway Development in Russia in the Reign of Nicholas I, 1835–1842* (1969) and *Russia Enters the Railway Age, 1842–1855* (1998), were widely recognized for their meticulous expertise and interpretive breadth, grounded in what he lovingly called the "German method" of scholarship. Both books were pioneering efforts, establishing Haywood as "the leading historian of early Russian railroad development" and one of the leading historians of the late Russian empire, as one recent tribute put it (see John McKay's review of *Russia Enters the Railway Age*, in *Slavic Review* 59, no. 3).

At Purdue, Haywood taught a variety of courses, combining his interests in Byzantine history, eastern Europe (where he traveled widely), early Russian state formation, and modern Russian history. A demanding and dedicated teacher, he was reluctant to leave his students even when the physical pain of illness became severe. His students remember him