

the emperor's general strength of will and his despotic proclivities, while noting his genuine liberalism and idealism. In seeking to explain the discrepancy between Alexander's libertarian ideals and his autocratic practices, the author perceptively suggests that what really requires explanation is "not the failure to fulfill his grand adolescent dreams in his backward empire, but the fact that he held to these ideals" despite the discouraging events of his reign.

Inasmuch as McConnell has so carefully demolished various myths about Alexander I, it is disappointing to note that he has, probably inadvertently, supported the extravagant and certainly unprovable view that if Alexander had only been able to carry through his projected reforms, Russian society unquestionably would have evolved in the direction of democracy. One can easily agree that there were numerous "lost opportunities" in Alexander's reign and that the course of Russian history might have been very different if certain proposals had been enacted; but it is surely hyperbolic to assert that the implementation of Speransky's proposals "would have averted the despair which in December, 1825, turned hundreds of the flower of the empire's youth ('Decembrists') into hopeless rebellion against autocracy and serfdom; it might also have averted 1881, 1905, and 1917 and achieved the emancipation of 1861 much earlier" (p. 75).

There is an inordinate amount of detail on military and diplomatic events for a work presumably focused upon Alexander's performance as "paternalistic reformer." On the whole, however, this volume will serve as an excellent supplementary text for courses in Russian (and general European) history.

JUDITH COHEN ZACEK  
Albany, New York

THE THIRD HEART: SOME INTELLECTUAL-IDEOLOGICAL CURRENTS AND CROSS CURRENTS IN RUSSIA, 1800-1830. By *Peter K. Christoff*. Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 77. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1970. 130 pp. 34 Dutch guilders.

Over the past decades Mr. Christoff has been working on a monumental, multi-volume history of Slavophilism. One must infer from what he says in the preface to this slender volume that he became not a little tired by the slowness of his progress on a study of Ivan Kireevsky (or discouraged by the publication of Eberhard Müller's important monograph, *Russischer Intellekt in europäischer Krise: Ivan V. Kireevskij (1806-1856)*, Cologne and Graz, 1966) and decided to publish the introductory background material separately. It was an unfortunate decision. The book has no clear focus as Christoff ranges superficially over a variety of topics (folklorism, medievalism, mysticism, free masonry, idealism, etc.), none of which he treats accurately or adequately. In a vain effort at originality he constructs a pretentious and outright silly conceptual framework ("hub concept of flow of influences"). He makes an annoying number of factual mistakes or inaccurate generalizations and offers neither new evidence nor information. As a matter of fact he makes an incredible admission: "Since this is a field in which much work is being done, I have not found it possible to utilize publications that have appeared since about the end of 1963" (p. 8). Christoff's main thesis is that the intellectual and experiential development of the intelligentsia of the 1830s has a strong, permanent Russian component (the "third heart" of his puzzling title). This is perfectly true (although by no means a novel discovery in the historiography

of the subject). But in that case Christoff should have been aware also of the eighteenth-century background and should not have given the impression that the trends he describes made their appearance in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Even a cursory glance at Hans Rogger's monograph or Iurii Tynianov's seminal study (*Arkhaisty novatory*)—both published long before 1963, by the way—should have helped Mr. Christoff to a more correct perspective.

MARC RAEFF  
Columbia University

OTMENA KREPOSTNOGO PRAVA V ROSSII. By *P. A. Zaionchkovsky*.  
3rd edition. Moscow: "Prosveshchenie," 1968. 368 pp. 90 kopeks.

The first (1954) edition of this work marked the high point of Soviet studies on the reform era, surpassing in scope the best prerevolutionary scholarship. The first revision (1960) introduced valuable chapters on the emancipation of state and crown serfs, and on the extension of the reforms in 1863 to Lithuania, White Russia, and Right Bank Ukraine. The present second revision adheres to the general interpretation of its predecessors but has been considerably refined in detail. A judicious yet sweeping synthesis of all Russian research on the emancipation, it sets forth the mature conclusions of the most distinguished specialist in the field.

Several chapters from the first revision appear unaltered in the latest volume. These include the several sections devoted to the application of the legislation after 1861. In these chapters Professor Zaionchkovsky confines himself to bringing his earlier arguments into sharper relief and to softening or deleting the more overtly ideological passages. His emphasis on the importance of regional variants, and on the continuity of prereform elements in the early capitalist era in Russia, is unchanged.

The principal revisions concern the character of serfdom before 1855, the role of peasant disorders in provoking the downfall, and the process by which the statutes of emancipation were drafted. On the character of agriculture under serfdom Zaionchkovsky has come to assign even more importance than before to the increasing differentiation within the peasantry, the same development that has recently been detailed so meticulously by I. S. Kovalchenko. For example, the notion that increased *obrok* levies pauperized all *obrok*-paying serfs is revised to take note of the fact that many members of that class were at the same time benefiting from substantial increases in the productivity of their own plots. Such considerations lead the author to reiterate his view that the crisis in the prereform countryside arose from tensions among the different levels of serf agriculture rather than from any general collapse of the system.

Against this background, Zaionchkovsky reassesses the voluminous statistics on peasant disturbances which Soviet historians have gleaned from police records. He decries the "striving to exaggerate the dimensions of peasant disturbances" and the concomitant failure to categorize specific outbreaks according to the conditions that gave rise to them. Though he advanced this critique in article form a decade ago, Zaionchkovsky now goes further and asserts that the decisive issue in forcing national leaders to appreciate the need for change was not the peasant rebellions but the Crimean War. Serf uprisings after 1856 hastened the implementation of decisions already taken by the autocracy but did not force the decisions themselves.