

ing the problem rather than with reaching a consensus, although at times a common ground was achieved. In retrospect, the frankness of the discussion and the absence of stereotyped phraseology were perhaps the greatest achievements of the meeting.

The Lehrbach conference was obviously only a beginning, but a happy one at that. One hopes that it will be followed by similar meetings that are as well planned and executed.

KAZIMIERZ GRZYBOWSKI  
Duke University

#### MICHAEL CHERNIAVSKY 1922–1973

When Michael Cherniavsky, Andrew Mellon Professor of History at the University of Pittsburgh, and adjunct professor of history at Columbia University, died suddenly at his home in Pittsburgh on July 12, 1973, he was fifty years old. Born in Harbin into a family of émigrés from Russia, Cherniavsky received his early education in English-speaking establishments in China: Tientsin Grammar School and St. John's University in Shanghai. He arrived in this country in 1939 and enrolled in the University of California at Berkeley, from which he obtained all his degrees. His studies at Berkeley were interrupted by his war service with the U.S. Army Air Force Intelligence in the Southwest Pacific between 1942 and 1945, and his academic career began in 1951, the year in which he obtained his doctorate.

The two determinants of Cherniavsky's thinking, writing, and teaching were also among the determinants of his actions and his adult life-style. They were the personal and intellectual impact of Ernst Kantorowicz—first as teacher and later as life-long friend—and the passion for the Russian Revolution. It was Kantorowicz's political theology, his interest in History's great figures, and in the ruler cult, and his skillful handling of artistic sources in elucidating abstract concepts of the Middle Ages that informed Michael's work on early Russian history—his treatment of the princely saints, his preoccupation with the myth of power, the attention he paid to the Old Believers' pictorial propaganda, and his fascination with the rulers' portraits in the Annunciation Cathedral. Michael's chief contribution to scholarship lies in his application of the tenets elaborated by Kantorowicz to that segment of ancient Rus's and Muscovy's past where investigators too often wander among imaginary reconstructions of the various *izvody* of chronicle accounts, or are on obligatory, if futile, search for class struggles. The proof of Michael's passion for the Russian Revolution, its antecedents, and its aftermath is in his other writings: his book *Prologue to Revolution: Notes of A. N. Iakhontov on the Secret Meetings of the Council of Ministers, 1915* (1967), his earlier brilliant essay "Corporal Hitler, General Winter and the Russian Peasant," *Yale Review*, Summer 1962 (pp. 547–58), and his other musings on the Soviet style of war. This proof is also in the kind of basic questions Michael would raise: while Kantorowicz would discuss historical causality in general, Michael would imply the regularity of the historical process in his search for the preconditions of a revolution.

It was not a simple matter to reconcile these two determinants: the teachings of Kantorowicz, the patrician and the rifle-carrying fighter against the Spartakists in Berlin and the Räterepublik in Munich in 1919, who never made clear what kind of existence was to be attributed to the ideas whose history he pursued, and the writings of a Shaposhnikov, or the deeds of a Frunze, neither of whom should have had any doubts about the relation between the base and the superstructure. Yet

Michael did produce such a reconciliation. To see how he did it in conceptual terms, we have only to turn to his short essay of 1968 ("The Charismatic Figure in History," *Civilization*, ed. A. Taylor, pp. 588–90). The essay quotes the myth of Frederick II, Kantorowicz's hero. Of the three charismatic personalities it singles out, one of them, Alexander the Great, is universal. The second, Julius Caesar, was treated as such in a book by Gundolf, a member of the Stefan George circle and young Kantorowicz's protector. But the third was Michael's own choice. It was Lenin. From his fascination with the Revolution came the involvement in the Berkeley Oath Controversy (1950), and, later on, in the teach-ins. However, by 1970, the year of Michael's last-but-one of his seven trips to the Soviet Union, the fascination had begun to turn into the sadness of disappointment with the Soviet present.

In 1951, when Kantorowicz moved from Berkeley to the Institute for Advanced Study in the wake of the Oath Controversy, Michael became his research assistant in Princeton. There followed the nine quiet years (1952–61) at Wesleyan University, during which he wrote two of his best-known articles, "Holy Russia: A Study in the History of an Idea," *American Historical Review*, 63 (1958): 617–37, and "Khan or Basileus: An Aspect of Russian Mediaeval Political Theory," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 20 (1959): 459–76, and his most important work, *Tsar and People: Studies in Russian Myths* (1961, reprinted in 1970). The reward for this writing presented itself in 1961 in the form of an appointment at the University of Chicago, where he remained until 1964, and where his friendship and intellectual collaboration with Leopold Haimson took its final shape. The first connection with Columbia came in 1964—at various times he was visiting scholar at the Russian Institute, visiting professor, and, starting in 1969, adjunct professor of history. In the same year, 1964, there began a number of transfers: to Rochester (1964–69), to Albany (1969–72, where he was Leading Professor), and finally to Pittsburgh. These transfers meant an ascent as well. Albany and Pittsburgh were name chairs; and the Mellon Professorship, Michael's last title, ranks among the more prestigious in the country.

Although he moved a great deal in his post-Chicago years, both inside and outside the country, he managed to write two outstanding pieces: "The Old Believers and the New Religion," *Slavic Review*, 25 (1966): 1–39, and "Ivan the Terrible as Renaissance Prince," *Slavic Review*, 27 (1968): 195–211. His part-time base in New York brought him in touch with publishing firms; he became a scholarly organizer on a big scale—an editor for Prentice-Hall and for Random House. For all this activity, he was working on new subjects. The national consciousness of medieval Russia was one of them ("Political Culture and the Emergence of National Consciousness in Early Modern Russia," *James Schouler Lectures in History and Political Science*, 1972, to appear); the iconography of the Annunciation Cathedral in the Kremlin, a project for which he was collecting material during his last trip to the Soviet Union in 1973, was another. He taught brilliantly and, through his seminar at Columbia, became more influential than any of his contemporaries in forming a new generation of students of early Russian history. He was appreciated abroad—in 1971 he was visiting professor at the École Pratique des Hautes Études—and written about at home. He was among the leading historians interviewed in Norman Cantor's *Perspectives on the European Past: Conversations with Historians* (1971).

Seen from the outside, the twenty-two years between 1951 and 1973 were years of ascent and success. It is best to stop short of exploring the landscape in which he was lost in the end.

IHOR ŠEVČENKO  
Harvard University

#### ARTHUR PRUDDEN COLEMAN, 1897–1974

Arthur P. Coleman's academic career was predominantly as a faculty member of the Department of Slavic Languages at Columbia University (1928–48), and as president of Alliance College (1950–62). He was the first American of non-Slavic parentage to obtain a doctor's degree in Slavic at an American university (Columbia, 1925). His most memorable publications are perhaps *Essentials of Polish* (Glasgow, 1944), in collaboration with Maria Patkaniowska, and his pioneering *Report on the Status of Russian and Other Slavic and East European Languages in the United States* (New York, 1948). He was a member of the Executive Committee of the National Federation of Modern Foreign Language Teachers Associations, 1950–59, and president, 1953–55. But he was proudest of his organizational role as founder and the first secretary-treasurer (1941–49) and then president (1950) of the AATSEEL, the first professional association in the Slavic field in America. Those who knew him will remember both his friendly, easygoing good nature and the fervor with which he always sought to foster Polish studies in the United States, especially among those of Polish ancestry.

J. THOMAS SHAW  
University of Wisconsin, Madison

#### DONALD A. LOWRIE, 1889–1974

On October 12, 1974, after a protracted siege of ill health, Donald A. Lowrie died in Meadow Lakes, New Jersey.

Born in 1889 in Seville, Ohio, Lowrie graduated from Wooster College and earned the Ph.D. at Charles University, Prague. He received degrees of doctor *honoris causa* from Wooster College and from the Russian Orthodox Theological Institute, Paris. He was with the YMCA Russian Service in 1916–19 (Tomsk, Moscow, Northern Russia) and with the emigration in 1919–33 (Berlin, Riga, Prague, Belgrade). Thereafter he was at the University of Paris, then Geneva during the war, and from 1946 to 1955 he was director of the YMCA Press in Paris. Among his publications are *The Light of Russia*; biographies of Tomáš Masaryk, Saint Sergius, and Nikolai A. Berdiaev (*Rebellious Prophet*); and translations of Tsankoff and five of Berdiaev's works. He is survived by his wife, Helen Ogden Lowrie.

In the first decades of this century John R. Mott, that great YMCA leader, chose a corps of able young men and sent them out one by-one into the various countries of the world. Their commission was simple: to master the ways of the country and devote their lives to its people. While they were with us we were enriched, and with their passing we are the poorer. Lowrie was one of these men.

WILLIAM C. FLETCHER  
University of Kansas