

POMESHCHICH'I KREST'IANE V ROSSII: FEODAL'NAIA RENTA V XVII-NACHALE XVIII v. By *Iu. A. Tikhonov*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1974. 335 pp.

Tikhonov's monograph is basically a statistical analysis of peasant labor services (*barshchina*) and dues in kind and cash—all subsumed under the rubric "feudal rents"—on service-tenure estates (*pomest'e*) in the central Russian districts (*Zamoskovnye krai*) during the seventeenth and first quarter of the eighteenth centuries. Drawing heavily upon archival material from the Service Land Chancellery (*Pomestnyi Prikaz*), the author examines peasant obligations to their lords during three periods—before legal enfranchisement in 1649, from 1649 to the introduction of the household tax in 1679, and from 1680 until the establishment of Peter's "soul tax"—in order to (1) determine the types and prevalence of peasant obligations found on service-tenure estates, and (2) assess the burden of dues upon the peasant population. Tikhonov's analysis indicates that the most widespread and basic form of obligation was labor, which was required on 89 percent of the estates; cash payments were collected on about 20 percent of the estates, and payments in kind constituted a relatively minor form of obligation. He finds no evidence to suggest any pattern in the evolution of obligations over time.

Although the data reveal a wide range of variation among estates, the author concludes that obligations per peasant household in general rose over the hundred and twenty-five years examined. But the extent to which this represented a real increase in peasant burdens is difficult to assess because of Tikhonov's failure to provide sufficient indication of the size, landholdings, and productivity of the typical peasant household. Despite its limitations, a hypothetical "production-consumption" model of the sort developed by R. E. F. Smith (*Peasant Farming in Muscovy*) and by A. L. Shapiro and his associates (*Agrarnaia istoriia severo-zapada Rossii*) would have been illuminating on this question.

Perhaps Tikhonov's most significant contribution is his conclusion that peasant resistance, the rise of state taxes (particularly the sharp increase during the early eighteenth century), and state requisitioning of peasant labor placed, at least temporarily, an upper limit on the demands the *pomeshchiki* could impose upon their peasants. And although Tikhonov himself shies away from this conclusion, it is probably not accidental that large-scale confiscations of service-tenure land from *pomeshchiki* unable to bear the burdens of state demands occurred during these years. Thus, this study documents yet another aspect of the high cost at which the Russian garrison state survived and expanded.

A. M. KLEIMOLA
University of Nebraska, Lincoln

THE DREAM OF LHASA: THE LIFE OF NIKOLAY PRZHEVALSKY (1839–88), EXPLORER OF CENTRAL ASIA. By *Donald Rayfield*. Athens, Ohio and London: Ohio University Press and Elek Books Ltd., 1976. xii, 221 pp. Plates. Maps. \$13.50.

Ohio University Press is the American distributor of this volume, originally published by Elek Books Limited of London. This detail is mentioned at the outset because a book published by a university press suggests a scholarly orientation. Rayfield, a lecturer in Russian at Queen Mary College, University of London, and author of *Chekhov: The Evolution of his Art*, tends to treat his present subject as if he were writing a traditional literary biography. Overall, this is a competently written narrative based on Przhevalsky's writings and a number of Russian biographical accounts. Two volumes of Przhevalsky's earlier travels appeared in London in 1876, *Mongolia, the Tangut*

Country and The Solitudes of Northern Tibet, followed by a third, *From Kulja across the Tian Shan to Lob Nor*, in 1879.

The book contains no footnotes, although there is a select bibliography and indexes to Persons and Places and Animals and Plants. Two inadequate maps are included, as well as a selection of photographs taken mainly from *Ot Kiakhty na istoki Zheltoi reki* (St. Petersburg, 1888). The format of Rayfield's book suggests an orientation toward armchair travelers, not specialists. The author provides details on Przhevalsky's gentry background and on his attachment to the Smolensk countryside—how he learned to hunt and how he developed this sport into one of his life's consuming passions. The reader can follow Przhevalsky's military career, his informal studies in zoology and botany in Warsaw, and, finally, the completion of his studies at the General Staff Academy which eventually qualified him to lead expeditions. (The expeditions were undertaken in his role as a career military officer and with official support and instructions.) The book offers some insight into the political context of late nineteenth-century inner Asian exploration as a function of the unsettled border rivalries between China and Russia and of the potential focus of conflict over Tibet with the British in India.

Przhevalsky, who never did reach Lhasa, is perhaps best known for discovering the Central Asian wild horse. He mapped, hunted, collected zoological and botanical specimens, and generally dominated the indigenous nomadic peoples he encountered with his superior weapons (which he sometimes equated with a higher morality). Although it is possible to understand the author's embarrassment concerning his subject's lusty imperialism and aggressive racism, Rayfield's lack of serious attention to the area's ecological and anthropological complexities limits the academic value of this work. His failure to make judicious use of the past century's abundant international scholarship on this important area, in order to place Przhevalsky in context, also severely restricts its utility as a general source.

JOEL M. HALPERN

University of Massachusetts, Amherst

THE ROOTS OF RUSSIAN COMMUNISM: A SOCIAL AND HISTORICAL STUDY OF RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY 1898–1907. By *David Lane*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1975 [Assen, The Netherlands, 1969]. xvi, 240 pp. \$4.95, paper.

Professor Lane's well-known 1969 monograph has been reprinted in a paperback edition which contains no revisions. The justification for reviewing it here is the absence of a review of the 1969 edition in *Slavic Review*.

At its best (which means in part 1 [pp. 11–58]), the book is a successful attempt to reassess the social composition of the early Russian Social Democratic Party and its supporters and to demonstrate the inadequacy of the notion, still widespread in the mid-1960s, that Russian Marxism, bolshevism in particular, was an intelligentsia-based movement without significant worker support. Few scholars would defend this notion today, but it would be a mistake to underestimate its appeal at a time when titles such as *Three Who Made a Revolution* (1956) were well entrenched and the title *The Making of a Workers' Revolution* (1967) was still novel.

Lane's most impressive contribution, which is unlikely to be superseded unless and until Soviet authorities open up access to party archives, is his careful analysis of the characteristics—profession, *soslovie*, education, nationality, age—of S.D. Party members in the period 1898–1905. Most of the data on which he bases this part of his investigation are derived from volume 5 of the Soviet publication, *Deiateli revoliutsion-*