The editor and translator have not overcome all their problems, beginning with geography. There is no such place as "Nizhegorod"; it is a transposition of the Russian adjective "Nizhegorodskii" for the city of Nizhnii Novgorod into a non-existing Russian or English noun; the towns are Pereaiaasl not Pereiaroslavl and Murom not Muroma, the province Tavrida (or Taurida or Tauride) but not Tavriia. There are helpful footnotes, but there is one howler (p. 66) in which the explanation is exactly reversed of what black and white clergy are. The black clergy were so named not because of their vestments but for reasons connected with taxation; the black clergy are monks, not parish priests; the white clergy are the latter. I have checked the translation in a few spots, and have found few errors. However: Kant said, "I had to limit the field of knowledge in order to make room for faith" not "I should have to limit" (p. 216), which makes no sense; evangel'skaia vest' (p. 336) is not "the Evangelical news" but the Good Tidings from the Gospel (the first four books of the new Testament); there was no "Social Christian" party; the author merely characterized the Mennonite-Baptist political union as "social-Christian" in nature; the party is Socialist Revolutionary not Social Revolutionary. The typos are legion.

The translator professes "passionate" admiration of the book (p. ix), though she is willing to protest mildly that the author "does not seem particularly willing to grant that the continuing development of sectarian communities [i.e., after destruction of the bourgeoisie to which Klibanov attributes sectarianism] was possible" (p. xiii). This reviewer cannot share her passion. One may acknowledge the author's devoted labors and diligent scholarly searching, and find the information he presents on the economic background of persons and groups among the sects useful and interesting. Nevertheless the treatment of Christian doctrines, which either account for or justify the whole story, varies from the only technically correct to what is painfully and embarrassingly wrong. For example: "Man was dethroned, and in . . . Baptist teaching there appeared the concept of "Divine Providence"" (p. 251); contrary to Baptist teaching, "there lived in the minds of its ordinary followers . . . the hope for a better earthly life, and whether they admitted it to themselves or not, this hope was dearer to them than heavenly Canaan" (p. 260); the Unitarians rejected "the dogma of predestination and the dogma of the redemptive sacrifice of Christ, closely connected with the concept of a pitiless, vengeful and frightening God" (p. 353). The italics are added, but they underline not the only things wrong with such sentences. It is hard to be enthusiastic about a history of music written by the tone-deaf, even if the deafness is compulsory rather than voluntary.

Klibanov's fine monograph of 1960 on religious movements in the fourteenth to sixteenth century shows what he is capable of. It is no wonder that the best Soviet historians avoid the modern period.

Donald W. Treadgold
University of Washington


This book is distinguished by a coherence of perspective and a sociological acumen that place it well above the few other books that have been devoted, in whole or in considerable part, to the "prehistory" of Russian parties—specifically, to the formation of the Union of Liberation (Soiuz Owbozhdeniia), which is its primary institutional focus. No higher compliment comes to mind than to say that had I written a book on the subject—an idea I once entertained seriously—I fancy that it would have looked very much
like this one. To my mind, it is the first account to have gotten the story essentially right (my own book on the constitutionalist movement was in press when it appeared).

The main question Fröhlich's book seeks to answer is, "How did consistent political groupings evolve in Russian society" at the beginning of the twentieth century without benefit of parliamentary institutions or the possibility of free and legal association? (p. 2). Fröhlich does more, however, than simply describe how the various associations culminating in the Union of Liberation evolved— he does that well enough, and with more attention to purely informal associations such as personal contacts, salons, journalistic circles, and to voluntary organizations, than most of his few predecessors (Donald Treadgold, George Fischer, Richard Pipes, Shmuel Galai, E. D. Chermenskii, Nathan Smith); but in the end he brings forward little new information along these lines beyond what he has been able to glean from some recent specialized source studies (Shatsillo, Shlemin, Simonova, Krasavin, Emmons, et al.). He also seeks to explain why groups took on the form, elaborated the programs, and generally behaved as they did. Occasionally, the explanations are too formulaic and abstract; for the most part they are convincing.

Fröhlich quite properly, in my opinion, avoids the term "liberal" in designating the movement he is studying in favor of "constitutionalist," which he defines in terms of objectives—primarily, establishment of a parliamentary system—rather than in terms of ideological precepts or social theories directly.

His general explanation of the activation of the constitutionalist movement at the beginning of the century is not unfamiliar: it was the product of the rise of a bürgerliche Intelligenz, defined à la Max Weber in terms of cultural-intellectual and professional characteristics, itself a product of educational and economic development, in the context of an intransigent political system. The economic crisis at the turn of the century provided the catalyst, in a crisis of regime confidence and a crescendo of criticism of regime performance by the would-be opposition, that brought about the rapid coalescence of constitutionalist groups.

Fröhlich accordingly rejects the Maklakovian explanation of the new political activism at that time in terms of the displacement of an "old" gentry liberalism by a "new" intelligentsia liberalism as too simplistic, it was rather a matter of the "coordination of various elements of the new intelligentsia in the functional context of a modern intellectual elite." (p. 241) In other words, he sees the constitutionalist movement at the beginning of the century as an expression of a new social formation, albeit one that had grown out of the traditional, gentry and bureaucratic, elites. The Union of Liberation was representative, at least in its leadership (and that was what counted in so loose an organization), of a fairly limited group of the elite of the new professional intelligentsia, and its role in the revolution of 1905 was accordingly far from being one of supreme leadership in the struggle against the old regime.

There is one major flaw in Fröhlich's story, in my opinion. He so completely identifies constitutionalism with the new intellectual-professional elite as virtually to obliterate the role in the movement of the "old" zemstvo liberals, who, while they may often have shared many of the values of their non-gentry counterparts (and of course, there are many well-known examples of men who were simultaneously full-fledged members of the professional intelligentsia and "zemstvo activists"), nevertheless remained a group distinct, with real local interests, both economic and political, and a tradition of service and noblesse oblige. They played an important part in the history of Russian constitutionalism, as the formation and history of the Octobrist Party, for one thing, clearly demonstrates.

This serious distortion of the character of Russian constitutionalism, as the author himself defines it, is undoubtedly related to his decision to break off detailed analysis of developments before the onset of the revolution of 1905 and the period of actual party formation. It is impossible to draw an informed conclusion about the social character of Russian constitutionalism, either in regard to the zemstvo gentry or urban groups beyond...