

Horrabin-Gregory. Each of those works contains ideas that could have made Mr. Gilbert's book better.

The maps, despite their simplicity, contain quite a few mistakes. A sample: On map 32 Tsaritsyn appears on the Don, which is wrongly labeled as the Donets. Along with outright errors there are instances of poor judgment. For example, on maps 27 (covering 1460–1860) and 35 (covering 1500–1916) there is no indication that the river labeled "Ural" and the town labeled "Uralsk" were known as the Iaik and as Iaitskii Gorodok for most of the period covered by those maps. Indeed, the pre-Catherinian names are mentioned nowhere in the book. Quite a few slips can also be found in the explanatory notes, short as they are. On map 18 we read that Novgorod was crushed in 1478 "by Ivan the Terrible."

The shortcomings of the book become somewhat understandable when one realizes that Gilbert, although still only in his thirties, is the official biographer of Winston Churchill and the author of several works on British and general European history, as well as of five other Macmillan atlases including those on British, American, and Jewish history. For someone in a hurry he has done surprisingly well. Even if this atlas falls far below the Russian work of Bazilevich and others, and even if in significant respects it is inferior to several of its English-language competitors and to the usual Macmillan standards, it is nevertheless a useful addition to a category that remains poorly represented in English.

RALPH T. FISHER JR.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

CHAADAYEV AND HIS FRIENDS: AN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY OF
PETER CHAADAYEV AND HIS RUSSIAN CONTEMPORARIES. By
Raymond T. McNally. Tallahassee: Diplomatic Press, 1971. v, 315 pp. \$15.00.

Two years after his translations of the *Philosophical Letters* and the *Apologia of a Madman*, Professor McNally follows with a revised portrait of Chaadaev. His aim is to "complement" rather than supplant the biography by Charles Quénet (1931) on the basis of unpublished manuscripts found in the archives of the Pushkin House and the Lenin Library. The main contention of this book is that Chaadaev's later thinking was significantly shaped by his efforts to substantiate the thesis about Russia's backwardness proclaimed in his first letter, and that this switch from attack to defense was a result of relentless probing by the Slavophiles.

The exposé of the Slavophile position is, unfortunately, the weakest part of this study. Vague references to value systems of intelligentsias around the world are a poor substitute for a proper discussion of Slavophile ideas and temperament. Even the basic textbooks on the subject are unaccountably ignored. McNally does better with more concrete problems, such as the comparison between Chaadaev's and Kireevsky's conceptions of early Russian history or the polemic with Khomiakov about the Norman origin of the Russian State. He proves a careful reader of Chaadaev's unpublished reply to Khomiakov's article of 1843 "About Rural Conditions," uncovering the irony in remarks about the historical "self-abnegation" of the Russian people. He is right in suggesting that the softening of Chaadaev's criticism of Kievan Rus' in this manuscript does not really alter the substance of his philosophy of history. Kiev was redeemable only because it maintained "friendly relations with old Rome," still the chosen vessel of universal history. A closer look at church history evidently taught Chaadaev that the Eastern

“defection” from unity occurred in the eleventh century and not, as he had argued earlier, under Photius in the ninth. Now he could put the blame for Russia’s backwardness on the Tatar yoke, a disaster made possible by the passivity of the Russian character.

Chaadaev’s later manuscripts examined by McNally show no retreat on the subject of Russia’s isolation from Europe. Peter continues as the providential hero of Russian history, and even some of Chaadaev’s initial doubts about his methods are laid to rest.

With regard to the European sources of Chaadaev’s ideas McNally is helpful and innovative. Although agreeing with Koyré that Chaadaev read the writers of the Catholic Reaction, he argues strongly for a crucial influence of Lamennais during Chaadaev’s transition from enlightened rationalism to quasi mysticism. This is documented by references to the two libraries collected by Chaadaev, the second of which was catalogued by Shakhovskoy in the 1930s.

McNally refuses to be perplexed by the seeming contradiction between Chaadaev as the dissenting hussar celebrated by Pushkin and Herzen, and Chaadaev as the supporter of the Holy Alliance. Indeed, this revised portrait confirms the impression that despite sympathies for Lamennais’s “social” Christianity and continued, if theoretical, opposition to serfdom, Chaadaev was at heart a self-styled Moscow Brahmin, chafing at any possibility of common people’s making history or contributing significantly to the spiritual physiognomy of a civilization.

MARIA BANERJEE
Smith College

W KRĘGU POPRZEDNIKÓW HERCENA. By *Wiktoria Śliwowska*. Instytut Historii Polskiej Akademii Nauk. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1971. 365 pp. 70 zł.

The nineteenth-century history of East European nations cannot be properly understood without considering political emigrations. Wiktoria Śliwowska focuses attention on the group of lesser-known political émigrés who left Russia during the three decades between 1825 and 1855. This thirty-year period—the time of Nicholas I—was an era of particularly heavy oppression, which produced the first groups of political émigrés. Any reader acquainted with contemporary Russian and East European affairs can easily draw parallels between past and present. Therefore, only five hundred copies of the book have been published.

The author conducted her research mainly on the insufficiently known materials in the archives of the Russian intelligence and the French Ministry of Justice. The first chapter is a long but essential introduction, which clearly explains the historical conditions giving rise to Russian emigration. The Russian legal system treated as a traitor any person living abroad or remaining abroad longer than was permitted. The property of émigrés was sequestered, and they were often threatened with capital punishment. Beginning in 1844, permission to travel abroad could be given only to persons over twenty-five. Because the cost of a passport was equal to about one-third of a country physician’s yearly income, only members of the upper classes were able to travel.

Particularly interesting is a subchapter entitled “The Formation of the Secret Agency of the Third Section Abroad,” a subject that has never been studied before. Śliwowska’s work greatly enlarges our knowledge of Russian influence on public