

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.

The quality of the translation, however, is not matched by scrupulousness in describing Soviet archival sources of the manuscript. Lentin's listing is both erroneous and incomplete. His work was not based on the original manuscript. This original manuscript did not, as he suggests, leave the country at the time of the Russian revolutions but passed from private hands through the Yaroslavl Archival Commission to GAFKE in 1926 and is currently located in TsGADA, fond 1289, op. 1, ed. khr. 518a, ll. 88–128. It contains none of the deletions characteristic of the nineteenth-century copies used for the present edition. Of these copies Lentin erroneously identifies his Manuscript A as TsGADA, fond 170, no. 4772, a collection which in fact contains no Shcherbatov manuscripts. Examination of MS A, on deposit in the Cambridge University Library, convinces this reader that Lentin obtained it from the Historical Museum in Moscow, a depository which he fails even to mention. MS A is the second of two copies held by the museum (GIM, fond 440, ed. khr. 1052, ll. 226–370, 371–426 ob.) and is written in the hand of M. P. Zablotsky-Desiatovsky, who discovered and published a number of Shcherbatov's works in the 1850s. In addition to Lentin's MSS B, C, and D, another copy can be found in LOII, fond 155, ed. khr. 328—one that was used, as the manuscript clearly indicates, in connection with the publication of the essay in the second volume of Shcherbatov's collected works (1898). Thus the original and six nineteenth-century copies are extant in Soviet archives. In addition to the published editions cited by Lentin, the work appeared also in *Vseobshchaia biblioteka* (1906) and in *Vsemirnyi vestnik* (1907).

The translation is introduced by an essay in which the editor aims “to indicate the nature and scope of the aristocratic ideal in Shcherbatov's philosophy, to trace its development against the background of his personal development and that of the eighteenth-century Russian nobility, to indicate the influence on it of the school of Natural Law and the philosophies of Montesquieu, Hume and Holbach; to examine Shcherbatov's view of the traditional status of the nobility as seen in his *History of Russia* and his other writings, and to analyse the final crystallization of his views as expressed in *On the corruption of morals in Russia*” (p. 8). Unfortunately, the limited space—some ninety pages—does not permit Lentin fully to carry out this ambitious design. Summarizing the views expressed in Shcherbatov's principal writings, Lentin attributes to Shcherbatov the belief that “absolutism was basically an evil system, directly responsible for inefficient government, injustice and corruption” and that “Russia should be given constitutional government; first, a new code of laws should be drawn up, including a clearly stated series of fundamental laws, which would reduce the status of the monarch to that of a constitutional figure-head, and would entrust supreme power to a small, aristocratic oligarchy” (p. 98). This portrait in my view is very much overdrawn and fails to account satisfactorily for inconsistencies in Shcherbatov's work, some of which can be found in the document at hand. More extensive study of the nobility in the eighteenth century and earlier might perhaps have prompted Lentin to revise his conclusions.

Appended to the translation are three letters relating to the period 1722–27 and two tables by which Lentin seeks to demonstrate the eclipse of the “Old Nobility” in the eighteenth century. These tables must be used with caution, for they erroneously identify as “New Nobility” a number of old families (e.g., Vorontsov, Vsevolozhsky, Bibikov, and others), thus undermining the conclusions. The bibliography contains many but not all primary and secondary materials relating to Shcherbatov's life and work. The chronological list of Shcherbatov's works un-

fortunately lacks any arguments for dating individual manuscripts and cannot be accepted in all particulars. It might be noted, finally, that Lentin uses an obsolete number to identify the last of three major archival collections; the citation should read TsGADA, fond 1289 (see *Lichnye fondy arkhivov SSSR*, vol. 2, 1963). This fund contains perhaps the largest repository of Shcherbatov papers—originals of his works, correspondence, and extensive papers relating to the management of his estates.

JOAN AFFERICA  
Smith College

RUSSIA AND THE MEDITERRANEAN, 1797–1807. By *Norman E. Saul*.  
Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1970. xii, 268 pp. \$8.75.

Russia's place in the Mediterranean has become the subject of increasing interest in international politics in recent years. One gets the impression that the Eastern Question, in a new form, is still very much alive. Saul deals with one of the crucial and unique aspects of Russia's relations with the Mediterranean and the Ottoman Empire.

The book is a detailed study of diplomacy and war during the critical decade that opened with Napoleon's thrust into the Mediterranean and closed with the Peace of Tilsit. This decade witnessed an unprecedented alliance between Russia and the Ottoman Empire. These traditional enemies were brought together because of the threat presented by the French Revolution and its ambitious general. Saul proves conclusively that the major reason for Russia's incursion into the Mediterranean was not Paul's infatuation with the Order of Malta, as is often posited by various historians, but rather his concern with the balance of power in the area and his fear that the Ottoman Empire would be dismembered.

The opening of the Straits to Russian naval units, which resulted from that alliance, was of pivotal importance in establishing a Russian protectorate over the Ionian Islands. Access to the Straits also enabled Russia to intervene in the affairs of the Italian states, and was a precondition for the important role that Russia was to play in determining the fate of the eastern and central Mediterranean. The defeats of Austerlitz and Jena, together with Russia's unwelcome attempts to establish bases on the Balkan coast of the Adriatic, undermined Russia's position in Constantinople. The result was war with Turkey and the closure of the Straits to Russia's naval units. Its bases and its navy in the Mediterranean were eventually liquidated.

Saul succeeds, through meticulous analysis of an impressive amount of archival material and other primary sources, in proving the existence of an intimate relationship between Russia's involvement in the Napoleonic wars and its interest in the Mediterranean and the Ottoman Empire. He presents a detailed, close study of intricate personal relations which influenced policy-making. His conclusions are concise and clearly drawn.

The major shortcoming of the book is the omission of Ottoman sources. Since the Russo-Turkish alliance was one of the principal elements of Russian policy in the Mediterranean in the decade 1797–1807, the lack of evidence from Ottoman sources constitutes a regrettable flaw in an otherwise fine, scholarly study. Unfortunately this shortcoming is common to many studies dealing with the Eastern Question.

Saul's book is certainly a most valuable addition to the historical literature on