broad range of his academic courses from poetry and rhetoric to theology and physics. Robert L. Nichols makes the most extensive claims for Orthodoxy as an intellectual force in his essay on the Church and the Enlightenment. His views on the contribution of Church education to the professions of law, medicine and teaching are solidly grounded in the sources. His portrayal of the complex struggle within the Church during the reign of Alexander I over the degree and kind of Western thought that could be admitted into Church education is too brief and unclear. Unfortunately, without a thorough treatment of this problem it is difficult to account for the decline of Church education as an intellectual force in the nineteenth century. Turning to David W. Edwards essay in Part Two on the Church and Nicholas I still leaves this crucial question unresolved. The author shows clearly enough the deadening effect of Nicholas' ruthless policy of bureaucratization on the Church hierarchy. But neither he nor any of the other contributors explores the relationship between the purely administrative and the educational reforms of Nicholas' Over Procurator, Count N. A. Protasov. Yet it was precisely his curriculum reform which represented both a triumph of one faction in the intra-church struggle of Alexander's reign and a tradition going back to Prokopovich. These are the kinds of connections that the editors might have made explicit without having to provide an integrated history of the Church.

In Freeze's subtle analysis of the Belliustin affair it becomes clear that by the late 1850s the bishops were opposed to reforms aimed at ending the isolation, theological rigidity and dependent position of the white clergy. Yet the publication abroad of the priest Belliustin's exposé led to a new reform movement from below. Under the name of "clerical liberalism," it prepared the way for the crisis within the Church in the early twentieth century. The essays by Father John Meyendorff and Paul R. Vailiere reveal how widespread the demands for change had become by that time among churchmen. In 1905 the bishops stunned the Synod with their appeals for reform. At the center of their demands stood the idea of a church council. In a brilliant essay, Vailiere links the practical demand for a council with theological debate about its nature. His analysis illuminates in an exciting and original fashion profound theological and political differences among leading churchmen and lay intellectuals. The book concludes with Edward Kasinec's useful bibliographical essay and list of sources on Orthodoxy.

The book certainly fulfills its main objective of stimulating further thought about the Church. One cautionary lesson for this reader at least is the advisability of avoiding an arbitrary division in future research between the cultural and the institutional aspects of Orthodoxy; indeed the best essays here do just that. Otherwise, scholars may repeat the error of Orthodox clerics who, it would appear, too often accepted too readily a sharp distinction between what was God's and what was Caesar's while the bureaucratic state displayed no such scruples.

Alfred J. Rieber


This is yet another in the series of books and articles on Fedorov that have appeared in the past few years. It adds little that is of value and does so only by demanding extreme patience of the reader. Professor Koehler seems to have had a great deal of material which she more or less organized into eight boxes or chapters; she then forgot to organize the boxes. She is indebted to numerous Russian, German, and French secondary sources—as well, of course, as the primary ones—but seems to have made no attempt to evaluate them. The book has no focus: it consists of numerous quotations and paraphrases of
notes. Koehler's English style reads, when grammatical, like that of a literal and not at all smooth translation from a foreign language.

Koehler states the aim of her book in her final paragraph (p. 143): "an attempt to bring into focus Fedorov's intellectual role and to expound his teachings." Koehler starts with the usual biographical sketch, moves on to Fedorov's main philosophical concepts crucial to the realization of the "common task," his influence on younger contemporaries, on later Russian philosophers, on artists, and on both the Soviet Union and the émigré population. It ends with a few pages on Western philosophers whose ideas have some affinity with those of Fedorov and a chapter on the possible origins of Fedorov's theories.

After laborious reading it becomes apparent that Fedorov's main concepts—aside from the central idea that man's task is to achieve the resurrection of his ancestors and, through this, universal brotherhood and the transfiguration of nature—aren't the use of technology to achieve his religious end, the union of theory and practice in terms of the practical application of science on the one hand and the education of the peasants on the other, and the importance of Asia both as the original seat of the human race and because of Russia's cultural and physical affinities with China. Fedorov finds the Christian task one of turning back time by men's producing not descendants but ancestors. This is to be done by means of science and by a synthesis of scientific and religious dedication. Thus science will be transformed from an instrument of destruction into a means for continued life and resurrection: irrigation, weather control, interplanetary travel.

These views impressed and variously affected not only Dostoevskii, Tolstoi, and Solov'ev, but, through Solov'ev most of the Symbolist and Scythian poets (Koehler names Viacheslav Ivanov, Belyi, Sologub, Briusov, Blok, Kliuiev and, she implies, Esenin). They also impressed K. Tselkovskii, "the father of Soviet rocketry" and the "scientific" poetry of the immediate post-revolutionary era, as well as, through the intermediary of Bogdanov, a number of Proletcult writers such as Kirllov and probably Voloshin. Through Tselkovskii Fedorov also influenced Tselkovskii's friend, the geographer and science-fiction writer, I. Zabelin. Fedorov's views are echoed by the Futurists Maiakovskii and Khlebnikov, and, through Khlebnikov, by Zabolotskii. Fedorov, says Koehler, may also have influenced Skriabin who, in turn, may have influenced Boris Pasternak; in any event, Doctor Zhivago expresses many ideas similar to those of Fedorov. Thus, in brief, Fedorov influenced almost all Russian writers concerned with life, death, or science-fiction. Even Gorkii did not escape Fedorov's pervasive persuasive power, nor of course, did Siniavskii.

But this is only part of Fedorov's influence. Most striking is his influence on Russian communist ideology and on Soviet Science and technology. This is evident not only in the Davydov plan to divert rivers for the sake of irrigation and in the Soviet thrust into space, but—in a distorted way—more pointedly in the main Soviet goals, the conquest of death (symbolized in the mummification of Lenin) and the brotherhood of man. Fedorov also bolsters the Marxist principle of the union of theory and practice. And he is an inspiration for Boronetskii and N. Trubetskoi, the founders of émigré Eurasianism.

As for influences on Fedorov, discussed in the last chapter, Koehler suggests eighteenth-century social philosophers, French utopian socialists, Herzen (we are not told why), the Slavophiles, and the Eastern Orthodox church fathers as well as Christian and specifically Orthodox dogmas. She does not mention the Gospels here.

In the case of the affinities between Fedorov's thought and Soviet ideology and programs, Koehler is rather impressive. In the case of the artists that came after Fedorov, she is less convincing: the influence is, she admits, mostly indirect, through Solov'ev, and Fedorov himself thought that Solov'ev distorted his views. The Fedorov-Skriabin-Pasternak connection is quite possible, but the faint probability of a connection between Fedorov and Skriabin and the equally faint probability of an influence of Skriabin on Pasternak are not acceptable as part of the evidence. Yet this is one of Koehler's major