which would lead to a degree of bureaucratic constraint on the powers of the emperor. This struggle, and Miliutin's role in it, remains unillumined in Miller's book.

In an especially interesting chapter Miliutin emerges as a militant chauvinist on the Polish question, employing the pages of the War Ministry's official journal to impugn the integrity of Polish culture. But a more ambitious study of Miliutin must be attempted before it will be possible to relate his attitude toward Poland to his role in Russia's "forward policy" in Turkestan and his broad influence on foreign policy in general through the period of the Russo-Turkish War.

The book is generally well researched, but the failure of the author to consult primary and secondary materials now available to Western scholars in Soviet archives and libraries results in lacunae even within the work's limited purview.

Despite the disappointments and shortcomings listed above, with so many important facets of the Great Reforms still to be carefully examined, Miller's clear account of the military reforms is a useful and welcome addition to the field.

PETER CZAP, JR.
Amherst College

THE MAJOR WORKS OF PETER CHAADAEV: A TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY. By *Raymond T. McNally*. Introduction by *Richard Pipes*. Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969. xix, 261 pp. $7.95.

Not only was Chaadaev an important figure in Russian intellectual history; he was also in a certain sense the starting point of that history. Yet for more than fifty years the only direct access to his work has been the Gershenzon edition, published in Moscow in 1913. It is with some joy, therefore, that one can greet both Raymond McNally's critical edition of the French texts published in Berlin in 1966 and his English translation of those texts in the present volume. This is especially so, since McNally has thoroughly acquainted himself with the work of Russian scholars such as Dmitri Shakhovskoi, work of discovery and collation that the Soviet Union is still reluctant to publish even though Chaadaev has recently been consecrated as an "acceptable" figure in the history of Russian revolutionary thought—an idealist and an aristocrat but nevertheless a revolutionary.

McNally knows the texts and has managed to straighten out much of the garble of the Gershenzon edition. His translation, except for a very few curious usages (such as "traditive" on p. 31), is excellent. He captures Chaadaev's eloquence and poignancy in an English that yet manages to sound, like Chaadaev's French, slightly stilted and archaic, with long cadences and a kind of weariness of breath, and all this without departing far from the literal meaning of the original. There joy ceases, however. I am afraid the volume leaves much to be desired.

The title, to begin with: why the "major" works? Was Chaadaev the author of any minor works? Since he was not a professional writer and all his work is at best fragmentary, it makes no sense to divide the texts into major and minor, or public and private for that matter. It is true that the eight philosophical letters, as McNally has constituted them here, have a kind of coherence and seem to have been intended for publication, in a sense that was not nearly so clear in the Gershenzon edition. Nevertheless, their coherence is far from complete; except for the first letter, they are unusually opaque documents. And the fragment called "Apology of

a Madman" is clearly the mere beginning of an essay. Surely these texts would have been greatly enriched if accompanied by Chaadaev's more personal correspondence, much of which echoes and reinforces the themes of the philosophical letters, even if it is not as yet possible to publish a definitive edition of Chaadaev's letters. Even those few collected by Gershenzon would have helped. And why does McNally apply as his standard of textual discrimination, as he says he does, what Chaadaev might have chosen around October 1836? Granted, the year 1836, with the publication of the first philosophical letter and the official declaration of insanity, was a crucial one for Chaadaev—but he lived on for another two decades. Why not the *fullest possible* text, with variations indicated? The Gershenzon edition of the "Apology" contains a whole long paragraph which has been eliminated in McNally's version. There is little enough of Chaadaev as it is.

Richard Pipes's introduction, while admirably and trenchantly written, makes an extraordinarily imperceptive statement about Chaadaev: "No other major Russian thinker gave the counsel that he did in answer to the perennial question 'What is to be done?': create a quiet preserve of inner peace and withdraw from an active life even while outwardly participating in it" (p. xviii). Surely this is a failure to distinguish the particular, personal advice Chaadaev gave Mme Panova, the recipient of the philosophical letters, and the major message of those letters, which is that Christianity means the creation of the Kingdom of God on earth, and that this creation has to be understood *socially*!

While McNally corrects this misconception in his introductory essays and in his notes, these also leave much to be desired. Chaadaev, who cared above all for unity, should not have his life and his ideas treated separately, as is done here. And although sensible and well informed, McNally disposes of too much of the controversy surrounding Chaadaev in too simple and too doctrinaire a manner—as, for example, in the discussion of his "mysticism." As for the notes, they are far more helpful with substantive references and allusions than they are with the ideational sources of Chaadaev's thought or with genuine obscurities in the text. In general, the notes are too skimpy, too restricted to the merely factual.

Finally, I miss a whole aspect of Chaadaev that McNally does little more than allude to: his impact on Russian literature, especially by way of Pushkin. In a little known, but brilliant essay on Chaadaev, the poet Mandelshtam wrote that Chaadaev was the first Russian educated in Europe who genuinely "came back." The meaning of that statement is not immediately clear, but I believe its proper elucidation and interpretation would tell us more about the significance of Chaadaev than has yet been done by the historians.

SIDNEY MONAS
University of Texas

BERDIAEV I ROSSIIA (FILOSOFIIA ISTORII ROSSII U N. A. BERDIAEVA). By *N. Poltoratsky*. New York: Obshchestvo Druzei Russkoi Kultury, 1967. vi, 270 pp. Paper.

This book is a welcome addition to the growing literature on Nicholas Berdiaev. It is the only book to deal definitively with Berdiaev's interpretation of Russian history, set against a background of his conception of universal history. Scholarly and well researched, it should find some resonance not only among those who are interested in Berdiaev himself as a thinker but also among those who have a more general interest in Russian history, particularly Russian cultural history. Berdiaev's views—