problématique principale, comme si elle s’était imposée en retard seulement. R. Lavoie en fait le pivot de son texte, mais d’un texte fort court qui résume à grands traits ce qu’il nous reste à connaître des statistiques de la criminalité. D’autres études dévoilent une information plus circonstanciée, mais souvent sans faire référence aux crises de la fin du Moyen Âge. Mais à tout prendre, cet éclatement est le lot de toutes les publications nées, comme celle-ci, d’un colloque ou d’une table ronde. Sans trop prendre garde au problème de fond, l’on y retrouvera un bouillonnement d’idées et de découvertes, pas toujours dégrossies, mais du moins fraîches et stimulantes. La criminalité, la morale publique et l’équilibre politique des villes médiévales sont encore des domaines à défricher et à ce stade, il importe de multiplier les monographies pour reconstituer un tableau d’ensemble. Manosque se met à contribution.

Lucie Larochelle
Université de Provence

* * *


Comme le titre l’indique, cet intéressant répertoire débute avec les travaux de l’après-guerre — c’est-à-dire à partir du moment où l’intérêt pour l’histoire contemporaine commence à devenir significatif en Belgique. Il s’arrête en 1975, mais sera poursuivi. Il comprend 1 093 titres, répartis de la façon suivante : tout d’abord, 394 titres se rapportant à des questions de politique intérieure, d’idéologies ou d’institutions; 109 à des sujets de relations internationales, militaires ou coloniales, et 299 à l’économie ou à la société. Ce sont là les orientations principales. On compte ensuite 65 sujets d’histoire religieuse ou d’histoire de la laïcité; 51 centrés sur l’enseignement; 73 consacrés à la presse, et 21 autres aux sciences et aux techniques, aux arts et aux lettres, aux sports et aux loisirs. Ce répertoire comprend en outre 15 titres se rapportant à l’un ou l’autre pays ayant dépendu naguère de l’administration belge : Zaïre, Burundi et Rwanda, et une quarantaine de sujets de diplômes témoignant d’un certain intérêt pour d’autres pays (3,6 %).

L’auteur s’est efforcé de vérifier les références travaux en main et y est parvenu dans 90 % des cas, ce qui l’a amené à préciser autant que possible les différents endroits où ces travaux de licence ou de doctorat sont conservés. Il a également tenu à enrichir son répertoire d’un intérêt bibliographique complémentaire en signalant les livres ou articles résultant de ces travaux d’études. Ce n’est pas négligeable : une fois sur trois en moyenne, en effet, ceux-ci ont abouti à une ou plusieurs publications. L’ouvrage se termine par un index des auteurs et un index détaillé des matières.

Hubert Watelet
Université d’Ottawa

* * *


While the past twenty years have seen a multitude of works depicting the life of the average man and woman in various historical settings, few such local studies have appeared on Russia. The
problem has been an inaccessibility of sources, combined with the restrictive rules of the Soviet archival system. While Steven L. Hoch’s work suffers from these restrictions, it is an admirable attempt to reconstruct the daily life of a village in the last sixty years of Russian serfdom. Hoch chose to focus on Petrovskoe, a village in Tambov gubernia (province) owned successively by three members of the Gagarin family. He assures us that this village differed from others only in the survival of its written records, but the existence of such records probably means that the estate was better, or at least more, managed than its typical neighbor.

Hoch believes that the peasant were knowledgeable farmers and provided themselves with an adequate diet. According to him, the serfs had enough calories, since it was in the interest of both the lord and the peasant not to let them starve. In good years, there was a surplus, and the field peasant would accumulate wealth, which came mainly in the form of livestock. There were also periodic subsistence crises when any accumulation would vanish. But most of the time the majority seemed well fed, eating meat with regularity. Sanitary conditions in Petrovskoe, however, were far from ideal. As a result, although the birthrate approached the biological maximum, a forty-six per cent infant mortality rate lowered population growth as did recruitment for the army.

Hoch’s main interest is in the majority of the peasant, who worked the Gagarin fields. The system in Petrovskoe was the barshchina, for which Hoch consistently uses the term corvee. He seeks to show what factors were used to drive the peasant to work the landlord’s fields. The chief elements of social control, he finds, were not the whip and the sword, but the peasant commune (mir) and the patriarchal family. It is in these findings that the importance of the book lies. The family was a multigenerational unit headed by a patriarch, usually over the age of forty. Often he was retired, the average age of leaving the fields being in the mid-fifties. He had control over his family, the seat in the corner of the cottage under the icon, a right to arrange his children’s marriages and an ability to prevent them from leaving the household. His interest coincided with that of the bailiff, who in turn used the patriarch to keep the peasant family under control.

The basic work unit was the tiaglo, a husband and wife unit which plowed the landlord’s field and shared an allotment granted by the commune. They lived in the hut of the patriarch father and were prevented by bailiff and commune from establishing a separate residence. The wealth of the extended family depended in large measure on how many active tiaglos shared the cottage in proportion to non-workers. It was to the interest of both the landlord and the patriarch to see that a peasant married young, gained his allotment early, and began his labor on the estates. Accidents of birth or death could make the family well-to-do or poor. “Fate could indeed be generous, but only temporarily. At Petrovskoe, whether owing to random or biological factors, the rich got poorer, the poor richer” (113). This cyclical nature of wealth and poverty has been noted by others, and bears important implications for the Communist agricultural experiments in the twentieth century.

The other main element of social control was the peasant commune. The whole society met infrequently, but the elders, who were the heads of the patriarchal families, met often. They had to allot land to new peasant tiaglos, to provide recruits for the army, and to present bribes to the public officials who might otherwise involve the peasants in time-consuming legal processes. These functions, especially recruitment, provided them with a social control that the patriarchs were loath to relinquish. Hoch’s findings on the social control exercised by the peasant mir contrast sharply with the views of the Slavophiles, who saw the commune as essentially democratic, and with the views of the socialists, who saw it as a primitive form of socialism. The young peasant may have resented the commune, but since the patriarch (his father) and the bailiff had the power to beat him or to send him away as a recruit if he resisted, he could do nothing. At any rate, he could look forward to the day when he headed the family, had the seat beneath the icon, and controlled his children’s lives.

The bailiff’s role in the discipline of the estate was more marginal. He was responsible for seeing that the peasants worked the fields and for administering punishments, usually to adult males in private, although there were clearly beatings in the field by overseers as well. In a two-year period of the 1820’s most of the adult males received at least one beating with a birch rod, many more than one, although brutality declined as serfdom drew to a close. The most common reason for a beating
was theft, usually of wood or grain. The peasants saw theft from each other to be immoral but regarded the grain and wood of the Gagarins as their own. The beatings were an unpleasant part of life and were accepted as such.

Hoch’s interpretation of the peasant commune and the patriarchal family does much to revise our picture of this vital aspect of life in Imperial Russia. He argues, “In the end, far outweighing the economic exploitation of the landlord was the social oppression of serf over serf” (160). His study, however, covers only one village in one area of a vast empire throughout which serfdom existed. Other such studies, in other areas, are needed before generalization can be made.

Jackson Taylor, Jr.
University of Mississippi


Kris Inwood’s *Canadian Charcoal Iron Industry* is not, as its title might imply, a general history of Canadian charcoal iron in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It is instead a more narrowly defined analysis of two closely related historical issues: why — when elsewhere in Europe and United States charcoal iron production declined in the mid-nineteenth century — did this seemingly antiquated industry survive in Canada, and why, more specifically, did Canadian charcoal iron outputs diminish significantly in the 1870s and 1880s then increase again in the 1890s, peaking in 1913. The author argues that the contributions made through scholarly examinations of charcoal iron to an understanding of technological diffusion, the survival of “old” technologies, and eighteenth and nineteenth century industrialization have made charcoal iron a “celebrated industry” (i). Inwood contends that the major addition his analysis makes to the international literature on charcoal iron is the identification of several key changes in charcoal iron smelting and in the production of charcoal whose importance to the industry was not previously recognized. Implications from the study for Canadian economic history are equally, if not more, interesting. For example, Inwood concludes that despite popular assumptions, scientific advance did not ultimately discriminate between old industries and new. Scientific discoveries benefitted both coke iron and the traditional industry, charcoal iron. Perhaps the same pattern occurred in other industries.

Technology was central to charcoal iron’s fate, as were markets. The industry’s decline before 1890 can be explained in part by competition created by technical changes which reduced costs and enhanced quality in the production of steel and coke iron. Also significant were discoveries of new ways to substitute coke iron for charcoal iron in foundry work. Charcoal iron possessed hitherto unique advantages of low cost, resistance to stress, light weight, and a capacity to assume intricate shapes. These helped the industry survive through the lean years, with tariff protection perhaps assisting. Nevertheless, by the 1870s other products shared many of these qualities. Canadian charcoal iron’s salvation came through the adoption of new techniques in the 1890s. These included the introduction of superheated, “hard-driven” furnace blasts and re-designed charcoal kilns which created both marketable by-products and charcoal which did not disintegrate despite both long distance transportation by rail and the heavy blast furnace tonnages now possible with charcoal’s new load-bearing capacities.

These techniques had nevertheless been available in the United States since the 1870’s. Why had they not reached Canada then and why had older techniques instead persisted? The answer was not, for example, that Canadian iron masters were in any respect less progressive. Quebec ironmakers, for instance, were active participants in the United States based Association of Charcoal Iron Workers, which vigorously promoted new technology; Quebec ironmakers were in all certainty beneficiaries of a healthy international flow of technical information. Nor did entrepreneurial aversion to risk-taking