

the interesting features of this outstanding contribution to Russian historical literature.

Questions of interpretive emphasis and nuance could be discussed at some length, but we are limited here to a few points. One of Kliuchevsky's leading concerns centered on Russia's need for new systems of cognition—for "cultural work," "men who could manage," "teaching . . . handicrafts and industries" (p. 7). The implications for institution-building are great, especially in the seventeenth century. One's preferences here and there for other terms in translation are perhaps natural—for example, "liberal studies" rather than "free learning" for *svobodnye ucheniia* (p. 337). Nonetheless, this volume deserves a sincere welcome by the field.

WILLIAM K. MEDLIN
The University of Michigan

RUSSISCHER INTELLEKT IN EUROPÄISCHER KRISE: IVAN V. KIREEVSKIJ (1806–1856). By *Eberhard Müller*. Beiträge zur Geschichte Osteuropas, vol. 5. Cologne and Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1966. xii, 512 pp. DM 56.

This impressive volume about "the father of the Slavophile movement," Ivan V. Kireevsky, concentrates, as is indicated by the title, on relations between Russia and Europe, especially the Russian view of European culture and thought. The author rightly stresses that Kireevsky's Slavophile persuasion grew out of the changing Russian attitudes.

Kireevsky's chief ideological goal was to find a formula that would blend European and Russian historic tradition into a unity. At the beginning of his career he saw no radical difference between European and Russian civilization. But in 1838 he began to distinguish clearly between a European and a Russian cultural tradition, whose relationship he believed to be the same as the one between Schelling's negative (rational) and positive (intuitive) philosophy. The negative, rational, or European tradition and the positive, intuitive, or Early Russian tradition (which Kireevsky identified as genuinely and purely Christian) became the two aspects of Kireevsky's analysis of the current historical moment. The ideal for him was Early Russian civilization, whose spiritual achievement he thought should inspire the solutions for the problems of his time—problems involving Europe and the unfortunately half-Europeanized, half-civilized modern Russia.

Mr. Müller divides his book into two parts (preceded by a short biography of Kireevsky). The first part discusses the varying attitudes toward Europe and Russia in Kireevsky's thought (pp. 45–348), and the second deals with the "Philosophical Starts" ("Philosophische Ansätze") (pp. 349–484) from which Kireevsky sought to develop his own religious and nationalistic philosophy—a philosophy he believed would culminate in proof that reason and faith, logic and intuition could be blended in a higher unity.

The sources of Kireevsky's thinking (e.g., the Church Fathers, Pascal, German idealism) are carefully examined, and his use of them is persuasively discussed. As a result, one cannot help realizing that Kireevsky's own contribution to Slavophile ideology (apart from its main tendency) is quite limited. That is also the impression one gets from reading his few relevant articles. They consist of frequent repetitions of the same borrowed ideas in a hazy and pretentious style. One is sometimes tempted to ask whether Müller does not overrate some of Kireevsky's

“subtle” formulations. What Kireevsky says, apart from the main theses, very often lacks logic and inner cohesion.

Müller, who obviously stands above his subject, makes Kireevsky into a far more interesting and consistent thinker than his own writings seem to justify. In some cases one would wish more criticism, and one would like a less serious attitude toward the verbose vagaries of Kireevsky’s pseudophilosophical parlance. Quite often Müller quotes an unprecise or doubtful statement from Kireevsky and elaborates on it with his own excellent understanding of the subject. The result is the impression that Kireevsky saw all this, which I am afraid is hardly true (see, for example, the section “Fichte, Schelling, Hegel” beginning on page 367).

The importance of the Slavophile ideology does certainly justify an incisive and detailed study of Slavophile writings. No doubt there was a tendency in Russian scholarship to dismiss Slavophile theories on the whole as untenable (mainly because thinking which started from presuppositions of faith was not considered to be “scholarly”). Yet one should be careful not to ascribe to these theories too solid a metaphysical background, especially in Kireevsky’s case.

This extremely circumstantial book by Mr. Müller (whose only stylistic deficiency is his unwieldy, somewhat Hegelian language), would have been still better if the author had kept more of a critical distance from his subject. But the book certainly is a substantial contribution to our knowledge and understanding of the development of Slavophile thought.

V. SETCHKAREV
Harvard University

THE BEGINNINGS OF RAILWAY DEVELOPMENT IN RUSSIA IN THE
REIGN OF NICHOLAS I, 1835–1842. By *Richard Mowbray Haywood*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1969. xvii, 270 pp. \$9.00.

In terms of far-reaching change, the laying of a railway network was one of the most important achievements of nineteenth-century Russia, yet neither in the USSR nor elsewhere has a really comprehensive history of the Russian railways been published. This book, dealing with the pioneer Tsarskoe Selo Railway and the decision to build the St. Petersburg–Moscow line, narrows the gap by eight crucial years.

Although an excellent summary is provided of transportation development before 1835, most of the book is necessarily devoted to the debates that preceded each of the empire’s hesitant steps into the railway era. The author rightly refrains from mockery of those who opposed railways, for in novelty and magnitude the decision to enter the railway age in Nicholas’s day is comparable with a modern nation’s decision to enter the atomic age. Moreover, the antirailway arguments were often worthy: Russia did have climatic peculiarities, she did already possess a canal system which was the envy of other nations, she did lack private capital. Railway supporters could appeal only to the imagination, forecasting the cumulative benefits that railways would bring. Nicholas I was not unimaginative and, being an autocrat, could overrule the pessimists. And thus the railways were started.

In this book the most creditable character seems to be the builder of the Tsarskoe Selo Railway, Franz Anton von Gerstner (a Slav, according to the Pan-Slavists). Although allowed to build only a fraction of what he planned, he built well. Even if he failed to anticipate that passengers would catch fire when his engines were fueled with native birchwood, he did insist on the highest engineering