

curl up with Herberstein? The translator's sporadic refusal to make sense out of the text does not improve matters. The transliteration of Russian names is predictably a disaster. It is all a pity, for we badly need an English edition of Herberstein which will, in addition to satisfying the elementary requirements of completeness and accuracy, collate the Latin and German versions and provide enough annotation to guide the reader through this invaluable but treacherous source. Neither function is performed by the earlier translations, both from the Latin, of R. H. Major (in vols. 10 and 12 of *Works Issued by the Hakluyt Society*, series 1), and Oswald P. Backus (Lawrence, Kansas, 1957; a lithographed typescript not generally available).

BENJAMIN UROFF

*University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign*

DIE WÜSTUNGEN IN DER MOSKAUER RUS': STUDIEN ZUR SIEDLUNGS-, BEVÖLKERUNGS- UND SOZIALGESCHICHTE. By *Carsten Goehrke*. Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte des östlichen Europa, vol. 1. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1968. xii, 357 pp. 2 maps. DM 58, paper.

This book provides an extensive and careful examination of changes in the rural settlement pattern in Russia from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century. The apparatus (including a useful glossary, which could have been extended) accounts for almost a hundred pages. Goehrke examines the main terminology of abandonment and comments in detail on such terms as *pust*, *pustosh'*, *porozzhi*, and a group with the *-ishche* ending.

The bulk of the book is devoted to a consideration of the main periods of the process of abandonment and the factors involved. Goehrke argues that the desertions of the fourteenth century, largely due to epidemics including in particular the Black Death, did not lead to changes in the settlement pattern or in the agricultural system; the continuing process of internal colonization in small settlements and of the making of clearances (also a characteristic of the expansion of Slav settlement in some areas) continued, even after the appearance of a three-course system in the fifteenth century. Only in a few old established areas where forest cover was absent—in Opole, for instance—were large farms important in the fifteenth century. At the same time clearance and colonization took place in the central areas around Moscow till the mid-sixteenth century and were characterized by small, non-nucleated settlements; this was the general pattern. The price rises for agricultural produce in the sixteenth century encouraged large-scale landholders to concentrate the settlements on their estates, and this process was also associated with the growth of enserfment.

The late sixteenth century, however, saw the period of clearance and colonization come to an end. The Livonian War, the Oprichnina, the famines and invasions of the early seventeenth century, all contributed to a mass abandonment of settlements which reached as much as three-fourths of the total in the Novgorod and Pskov areas and around Moscow in the 1580s. The only areas virtually untouched in the period 1580–1620, which Goehrke refers to as the Great Waste Period, were remote, such as Viatka, Perm, Kazan, and the lower Volga. The difficulties of this period involved a stagnation in population growth and a decline in population in the waste areas; this contributed to an active expansionist

colonization. Factors such as increasingly burdensome obligations, on the one hand, and the leaching of forest soils, on the other, led to increased desertion, especially on smaller service estates which, moreover, tended to be located in areas likely to suffer from warfare. The growth of serfdom was in part the result of the government's attempt to limit this peasant mobility; avoidance of these burdens might be achieved by rising to the status of a privileged servitor, or falling into servitude as a *bobyľ* or *kholop*, or by flight.

Small settlements were now, and for long remained, characteristic of much of European Russia, but they were also those settlements which were hardest hit; many were not resettled. Larger nucleated settlements were found especially on the periphery and around Moscow. Large landowners took advantage of desertion and serfdom to consolidate their previous policy of nucleation. There are thus significant differences from the West European history of settlement and desertion, even though the general pattern of rural production changing to a three-field system follows the Western model.

This is an interesting and important attempt to deal with the problem of desertions interpreted in a wide sense. Goehrke has used a wide range of sources, and his general picture would no doubt evoke agreement, though there may be reservations about some points. For instance, it seems possible that the Black Death in Russia was not a major contributing factor to the early desertions; if small dispersed settlements with relatively weak market links were characteristic, epidemics might be largely restricted to towns and their interconnecting routes. We lack evidence partly because Russian medieval rural archaeology is weak. Perhaps the most important aspect of this study, however, is that it is a further contribution to an explanation for the differing pattern of Russian historical development not in terms of some external accident such as the Mongol invasions, but of internal factors. The positive side of the desertions was that they led to changes in the patterns of settlements and landscape, but, as Goehrke notes, this restructuring was 150 to 200 years later than in Germany owing to the fact that land clearance took longer.

R. E. F. SMITH

*University of Birmingham*

ON THE CORRUPTION OF MORALS IN RUSSIA. By *Prince M. M. Shcherbatov*. Edited and translated with an introduction and notes by *A. Lentin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. xi, 339 pp. \$16.50.

Students can now read in English one of the most frequently quoted sources on eighteenth-century Russian social history, thanks to Mr. Lentin's fine rendition. As the reader will easily see from the juxtaposed Russian text, the editor achieves a fluency, readability, and style which literal translation of Shcherbatov's clumsy prose would scarcely yield. Some readers may prefer "manners" to "morals" as closer to the eighteenth-century meaning of the title and may, in general, wish for a more consistent and sometimes less modern rendering of political and social terms, but all in all Lentin's version demonstrates considerable editorial skill. (In only one place [p. 133] did this reviewer note a mistranslation of Shcherbatov, who believed unhesitatingly that in the past Russian rulers had practiced preferential promotion of members of illustrious families before others.) The text is accompanied by useful notes which introduce the reader to principal personages and events mentioned in the text and to a wide selection of secondary works on manners and politics in the eighteenth century.