

of the individuals, and whether they were urban or rural, native sons or strangers; the density of clergy in the area and the proximity of institutions of control such as the seminary and the diocese; the curés' subordination to their bishops (who were almost all nonjurors) and the degree of their politicization. There is also the question of *mentalité*. Historians — Tackett among them — have recognized that within the clergy of the late eighteenth century there were two conflicting mindsets: the first, Tridentine and traditional, conditioned by hierarchy and dedicated to the salvation of souls, the second, more modern, accustomed to an enlightenment vocabulary of citizenship, utility, and the well-being of peoples. The latter was conducive to the oath, the former tended to oppose it.

Other historical inquiries have taken a new direction, focusing less on the individual priests and more on the interaction between priests and their parishes, so complex that it is difficult to see "who ultimately was the leader, and who was the led" (p. 159). For every priest who defied his congregation, to take — or refuse — the oath, there were more whose options conformed to the will of their parishioners, whose actions were taken within a circle of approval and applause. In Tackett's words, "ecclesiastical reactions essentially mirrored the local attitudes and mindset of the population" (p. 184). Seen in this light, the oath ceases to be an affair merely of the clergy and becomes a sort of national referendum, a sampling of provincial society's attitudes towards the structures of civil government and of Church. "Throughout most of *rural* France, clerical options were related less to individual career experiences than to the broader cultural assumptions and opinions of fellow citizens and fellow clergymen across whole *pays* or provinces" (p. 288).

If one accepts this model of clerical-lay interaction, a new set of questions appears. The striking regional differences in oath-taking must be explained, at least in part, by differences in lay society. Tackett has investigated all of these: differences in language, in the degree of urban-rural interpenetration, in the dispersal or concentration of the population, in the strength and density of "clericalism", in fear of Protestants or resentment against the activities of the local elites, or dislike of centralization. The whole problem of causation becomes "vastly more complicated and problematic", as he admits (p. 182) — and yet, in the final analysis, much more significant, since the whole culture is now at issue. Most of the single-cause arguments are laid to rest, but "clusters" of causes appear. It is Tackett's thesis that the particular mix of these causes resulted in different reactions in different parts of the country. "Substantially different regional reactions and trains of logic had come together in forming the oath geography" (p. 299).

In contrast to his data, which is presented with an air of finality, Tackett's conclusions are cautious and tentative. At the end of it all, the reality of the oath crisis, and of those 50,000 individual choices, eludes a tidy definition, and he offers only the outlines of understanding. The deepening of uncertainty — that is the final reward for so much patient scholarship. But his description of the complicated human context in which the event took place is enlightening and thought-provoking. This work is an enormous advance on anything that has gone before.

Elizabeth Rapley
University of Ottawa

* * *

Reginald E. Zelnik, (trans. and ed.) — *A Radical Worker in Tsarist Russia: The Autobiography of Semen Ivanovich Kanatchkov*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986. Pp. xxx, 472.

1879 was a momentous year for Russian history. Joseph Stalin was born then, and so was Semen Ivanovich Kanatchkov. In the annals of history, they are not of equal significance. Stalin looms large in Russian history, throwing such a shadow that Kanatchkov is difficult to find. But these men came from very similar backgrounds and both ended up in the Bolshevik movement.

Stalin's journey from peasant to radical revolutionary has been recorded, but the record has been altered and is largely unreliable. Kanatchkov's sojourn from peasant-worker to Bolshevik

worker-revolutionary has also been chronicled, by Kanatchkov himself, and this record, in contrast to Stalin's account, is both reliable and readable. It is now available in a superb translation, with an introduction, by Reginald E. Zelnik. Kanatchkov has earned himself a place in history, not only as a narrator of the turmoil in Russia at the turn of the 19th century and the impact this had upon workers and peasants, but as a probable prototype of what actually happened in Stalin's case, too. In that sense, history might ultimately elevate Kanatchkov, not to equal stature with Stalin, but at least out of his shadow.

A Radical Worker in Tsarist Russia is an extraordinary book. It tells the story of how a young peasant-worker, Semen Kanatchkov, altered his outlook on life against the background of industrialization and the revolutionary movement in Russia. Kanatchkov educated himself, learned a skill, became a leader and spokesman for the workers of Russia, and ultimately joined the Bolshevik movement. The story is complex, involving conflicts and adjustments with religion, parental authority, intellectuals, and radical revolutionaries. It is a powerful drama, written in prosaic prose, of what happens when change is explosive, roots are severed, and men are set adrift. Interestingly, in the case of Kanatchkov, he looked for new roots in the Bolshevik movement, but for roots which fulfilled the same needs which the traditional Russian society of orthodoxy, patriarchal family, and community provided. As Zelnik comments in his excellent introduction, it is almost as if Kanatchkov came full circle: he abandoned family and dogma in the village to find family and dogma in the Bolshevik movement. The memoir ends in 1905, on the eve of the Revolution, and we never do know whether Kanatchkov found the anchors for which he was searching and whether he fit in with the Bolshevik cosmology.

The book is a valuable document of the Russian revolutionary movement. Its importance stems from its eye-witness approach and its commitment to accuracy. It helps to flesh out with personal detail such classical stories of the revolutionary movement as Franco Venturi's *Roots of Revolution* and James Billington's *Fire in the Mind of Men*. We learn a great deal about Russia at the turn of the century, its people, its hopes, and its promises. The book is particularly poignant and tragic when one reads what people like Kanatchkov were attempting to do against the background of what happened under Stalin.

Stalin and Kanatchkov were born in the same year, and maybe they tell the same story of what happens to people when they overthrow tradition and cut roots. In that sense, they complement one another: Kanatchkov tells us what Stalin was probably like before 1905, and Stalin tells us what Kanatchkov probably would have been like in the 1920s and 1930s.

Dennis J. Dunn
Southwest Texas State University

* * *