

Tartars, the Calmucs, the Tchovashes and the Mordvans to be better people than the Russians" (p. 144); and he condemns their corruption and "blind servility" (p. 171).

The editor gives a brief, well-written introduction. His footnotes serve mainly to give biographical information or—rather general—historical explanations. The whole makes no pretense at deep insights or new information but gives lively impressions of an unassuming foreign traveler in regions of Russia which at the time were rarely visited and described by foreigners.

WALTHER KIRCHNER  
Princeton, New Jersey

RUSSKAIA DEREVNIA V REFORME 1861 GODA (CHERNOZEMNYI TSENTR, 1861–1895 GG.). By *B. G. Litvak*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1972. 423 pp. 1.81 rubles.

This book is a doctoral dissertation the object of which was "to explain the role and significance of the reform in the capitalist evolution of the black-soil center, showing its importance to the change in the economic condition of the peasant in the process of capitalist differentiation" (p. 43). The research was restricted to the gubernias of this region (Voronezh, Kursk, Orel, Riazan, Tambov, and Tula), for here was to be found, as Lenin had observed, the "true Russian pomeshchik" and the predominance of the wage economy (p. 31). Although no doubt this approach was suitable for the author's purpose, thus limited the book gives a myopic view of the reform as a whole, for, as is well known, the settlements pertaining both to the allotment of land and the redemption payments were quite different in the black-soil area.

The acceptability of the thesis probably depends less on the results of the author's research than on the reader's concurrence on certain key doctrinal points, for example, that *barshchina* (corvée) is most clearly understood as wage labor (p. 150). As a thesis, therefore, the book could have only limited interest.

Litvak has—as all good doctoral candidates must—documented his work thoroughly; the book contains 165 tables detailing by gubernia and by uезд the disposition of the peasant population, the land available for peasant use prior to the Emancipation and the obligations that attended such use, and the changes in these factors which resulted from the land allotment and the redemption payments which accompanied the Emancipation. The essay based on this documentation, however, consists of little more than a recapitulation of the data contained in the tables or a conversion of those data to percentages. There are some interesting accounts of the allotment and redemption settlements as concluded at specific villages. There is also an informative review of the literature contemporary to the postreform period. But the analysis is hesitant, and the conclusions are for the most part restricted to those which Lenin has already provided.

The story is also incomplete. To show the changing economic conditions of the peasantry in the postreform period one must view the land allotment and its attendant financial obligations in terms of the successive redivision of the land into smaller units and in terms of the rapidly falling prices of grain in the last two decades of the century.

FRANK WATTERS  
California State University, Chico