well. Ivanits’ synthesis of this material plus her comprehensive bibliography will be of use not only to folklorists but to literary critics as well as they explore one of the richest, but often elusive, areas of Russian literature, that of the interaction between folk belief and literature. The book is a welcome addition to the field.

Adele Barker
University of Washington


Students of Russian history will welcome Alexander Vucinich’s survey of the impact of Darwinism on Russian scientific thought. Vucinich traces the various routes and translations by which Darwinism became known in Russia, its reception by scientists and scientific institutions and its criticism in the Russian press. He analyzes the attempts of Russian thinkers to extend Darwinism to embryology, paleontology, anthropology and other disciplines. An analysis of the criticism of Darwinism in the 1880s by the eminent Russian embryologist, Karl von Baer, opens a discussion of anti-Darwinists such as Nikolai Danilevskii.

Vucinich’s excellent survey through chapter 4 (to the end of the 1880s) covers material familiar to specialists. Chapters 5 through 9 begin a welcome and innovative analysis of the new challenges to Russian Darwinism from the 1880s to 1917 in the areas of mechanism, vitalism, neo-Lamarckism, the developing theory of genetics and others. Vucinich also discusses those theologians, philosophers and scientists who rejected Darwinism entirely. In these chapters, Vucinich constructs a valuable synthesis of parallel developments in European and Russian Darwinism and anti-Darwinism. The discussion is commendable for its lucid exposition of complex issues relating biology to philosophy, such as the various meanings and functions of teleology in evolutionary theory.

Vucinich labels the Russian advocates of an 1890s Darwinism open to new and conflicting interpretations from Western Europe as “unorthodox Darwinsians.” He calls their opponents, such as K. A. Timiriazev, “orthodox Darwinsians.” Timiriazev insisted on the 1860s Darwinism as the most “progressive” theory of biological evolutions and as the most “progressive” political weapon against tsarism. By contrast with Timiriazev’s view, one could be by the 1890s a reputable anti-Darwinist in evolutionary biology and an equally reputable “progressive” in opposition to the tsarist autocracy. Vucinich makes that point so persuasively that he puts to rest all simple correlations between one’s attitude to Darwinism and to politics in Tsarist Russia after the 1880s.

Not all of Vucinich’s survey goes so smoothly. Chapter 10 on Darwinism and the Russian radical intelligentsia is not integrated with the rest of the text to the occasional detriment of both. The chapter does not include Dmitrii
Pisarev and Nikolai Chernyshevskii, who are inadequately discussed elsewhere. Pisarev's sometimes crude interpretation of Darwinism loses much of its significance when discussed outside the context of Pisarev's ideology of nihilism.

The summary of Nikolai Chernyshevskii's radical critique of Darwinism does not make clear its significance because it is sandwiched into a long chapter devoted primarily to the conservative critique of Darwinism by Nikolai Danilevskii. The two men had nothing in common except that both wrote in the 1880s. The claim that "Chernyshevskii's arguments helped bring an end to the uncritical worship of Darwinism as a pillar of academic liberalism" seems overstated because this process was already well under way. What is significant about Chernyshevskii's critique is the retrospective light it throws on the earlier debate among the Russian radical intelligentsia about the social meaning of Darwinism.

Vucinich writes that the eminent Russian Darwinian paleontologist, Vladimir Kovalevskii, "did not fare well in academic employment" and blames the negative attitude of the government toward proponents of Darwinism: "The much belated recognition of [Kovalevskii's faculty appointment to Moscow University in 1880] did little to mend his broken spirit. In 1883 he committed suicide." The implication is misleading. Kovalevskii was a miserable university lecturer owing to frayed nerves, as he complained to his brother in their correspondence (not cited by Vucinich), because of the tenuous state of his financial speculations. He had invested all of his inadequate resources as well as money from trusting friends in a Baku oil speculation which failed in 1883. Kovalevskii could not face bankruptcy or the shame of having failed his friends.

The discussion of Vladimir Kovalevskii reflects Vucinich's tendency to consider Russian Darwinists largely within the framework of the reception and development of Darwinism in Russia. This simplifies Russian motives and makes the survey more a tale of the ultimate fate of Darwinism than of its complex interaction with the unique conditions of life, personal and professional, faced by those Russians concerned with various aspects of Darwinism. It sometimes leads to an unnecessary adulation of Darwin and Darwinism, two separate terms which Vucinich uses interchangeably. It also results in a Whiggish view that pre-Darwinian biologists "helped make the Darwinian revolution a logical and inevitable step in the history of nineteenth-century biological thought."

The title of the book is confusing. The book is not about Darwin the man and Russian thought. Nor is it basically about the impact of Darwinism on Russian social thought among the radical intelligentsia. It is primarily concerned with the influence of Darwinism on Russian scientific and academic thought and institutions from the 1860s to 1917. This is an area in which Vucinich is a leading scholar. As an analyst of institutional attitudes and various schools of thought concerned with Darwinism, Vucinich has written an admirable survey documented by reference to Tsarist and Soviet