

ception early in 1565 until the Zemsky Sobor of July 1566, and from then until its abolition in 1572. The first period saw the government's previous antiprincely policies extended to include deportation of many titled aristocrats and confiscation of their lands. To refute assertions by S. B. Veselovsky and A. A. Zimin that these measures had no specific antiprincely bias, Skrynnikov painstakingly enumerates those deported and shows that a few princely clans bore the brunt of the early repressions. This policy only increased antagonism, causing the government at the Sobor of 1566 to compromise, if only briefly. With its political base further undermined by the burgeoning opposition, Ivan's government in desperation unleashed mass terror. This second period of the Oprichnina revolved around the fabricated, interrelated "conspiracies" of Prince V. A. Staritsky, the boyar I. P. Fedorov, and the Novgorod region. The years 1567-72 witnessed the absurd culmination of the Oprichnina, whose terror undercut the very supports of the monarchy and ultimately decimated its own creators. Far from masterminding the terror, Tsar Ivan is portrayed as one of its victims—a fearful, unbalanced ruler whose weaknesses were exploited by henchmen like Maliuta Skuratov. Indeed, the author's only quotation from Engels is to the effect that reigns of terror spring not from terror-inspiring personalities but from persons who are themselves terror-stricken.

Skrynnikov ably analyzes the Oprichnina's maniacal logic and multiple contradictions. En route he demolishes Zimin's contentions concerning its supposed anti-appanage, antichurch, anti-Novgorod, and antipeasant policies. These are all seen as unplanned by-products of the government's intolerance of opposition; they are also linked to the Oprichnina's basic economic policy of brazen plundering and to the intrigues of individuals. Moreover, the reasons for the Novgorod campaign of 1570 and its destructiveness are sharply qualified. The author's conclusion deftly criticizes previous interpretations, deflates the number of Oprichnina victims (about four thousand is his own estimate, based on the *sinodik*), and cautiously assays its main results as weakening the aristocracy and the church, while strengthening the gentry and the bureaucracy. Skrynnikov's is scholarship of the highest order.

JOHN T. ALEXANDER  
University of Kansas

DESCRIPTION OF MOSCOW AND MUSCOVY, 1557. By *Sigmund von Herberstein*. Edited by *Bertold Picard*. Translated by *J. B. C. Grundy*. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1969. vi, 105 pp. \$5.00.

In 1549 Sigmund von Herberstein published his *Rerum Moscoviticarum Commentarii*, a description of Muscovy based on his missions as ambassador from the Habsburg court in 1517-18 and 1526-27. In 1557 there appeared Herberstein's own slightly expanded translation into German. In 1966 Bertold Picard published a modernized version of the German text, which rearranged the narrative under five topics—the country, the people, the state, the Muscovite economy, and religion—and in the process omitted a considerable part of the original. This edition was accompanied by a brief biography of the author and a still briefer summary, by Stefan Verosta, of the diplomatic background of his journeys. Now Picard's volume is available in an English translation.

But for whom is it intended? The rearrangement and abridgment of the text make it unsatisfactory for the scholar. The absence of a critical apparatus makes it positively dangerous for the student. And is the general reader really going to

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