

they do not indicate an expert knowledge of the period and are occasionally erroneous. (At the bottom of page 226 Granovsky is assigned a wrong subject for his lectures, Pogodin a wrong view of the origin of the Russian state, and Peter Kireevsky a wrong year of death.) The Russian is also shaky at times, in transliteration and terminology. To cite a recurrent problem, although an initial Russian *z* can properly be translated into German with an *s*, this should not be done in an English text. The volume contains an index of personal names and a subject index.

NICHOLAS V. RIASANOVSKY
University of California, Berkeley

A TOUR OF RUSSIA, SIBERIA AND THE CRIMEA, 1792-1794. By *John Parkinson*. Edited with an introduction by *William Collier*. *Russia Through European Eyes*, no. 11. London: Frank Cass, 1971. xix, 280 pp. £4.00.

This book is a condensed version of the diary of John Parkinson, a clergyman and "Oxford don," who as a companion to a young British nobleman made a "grand tour" of Europe which led him via Stockholm to Russia.

The first hundred pages deal with the three-quarters of a year which Parkinson spent in Stockholm, St. Petersburg, and Moscow. There is not much of interest in this account. The writer relates chiefly the conventional, deals with court stories, dinners, balls, and love affairs, and says little about life in general or, except for the Hermitage and the interior of some palaces, of the sights. He met many well-known figures, and speaks of Dr. Pallas, Quarenghi, the imperial family, Catherine's favorites, and the upper crust of the nobility. He sometimes makes acid remarks—about a lady "almost too foolish to laugh at and too lousy to be approached" (p. 94)—and seldom misses an occasion to disparage the late Potemkin.

The diary changes in character, and in interest to the historian, when Parkinson leaves Moscow, which he calls "forlorn and uncomfortable" (p. 99), and travels via Kazan and Perm to Tobolsk. He begins to describe the scenery and takes an interest also in the life of peasants (with whom he stays on his journey) and in some social and political affairs. We are surprised to hear him say that he found beyond Perm "the manners, the language, and the luxuries of every other place" so that he could "fancy himself" in some "great capital rather than in a village on the borders of Siberia" (p. 117). Since very few English travelers penetrated so deeply into the Russian empire and left accounts, his diary, though he lacks sensibility, is a useful supplement to other travel reports, such as those by the Swiss surgeon Jacob Fries and the American John Ledyard. On his return, he spent some time in Sarepta, which (with its German-Swiss colony) he described as a place unequalled for the "goodness of the people and for all the comforts of life" (p. 151). Going on to Astrakhan, Georgievsk, and Bakchisarai, he describes scenery, people, curiosities, and native habits. Though a clergyman, he never mentions attending divine service, except occasionally for Orthodox, Mohammedan, or Buddhist worship. A brief account of his return via Kiev and Moscow to St. Petersburg concludes the journey.

Parkinson shows little sympathy for the Russians. Quoting Quarenghi, he speaks of them "from first to last as a set of rascals" (p. 42). He states that they are "totally destitute of principle" (p. 48), "destruction being an enjoyment and pleasure to them" (p. 143), and that the foreign colonists in Sarepta "look on the

Tartars, the Calmucs, the Tchovashes and the Mordvans to be better people than the Russians" (p. 144); and he condemns their corruption and "blind servility" (p. 171).

The editor gives a brief, well-written introduction. His footnotes serve mainly to give biographical information or—rather general—historical explanations. The whole makes no pretense at deep insights or new information but gives lively impressions of an unassuming foreign traveler in regions of Russia which at the time were rarely visited and described by foreigners.

WALTHER KIRCHNER
Princeton, New Jersey

RUSSKAIA DEREVNIA V REFORME 1861 GODA (CHERNOZEMNYI TSENTR, 1861–1895 GG.). By *B. G. Litvak*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1972. 423 pp. 1.81 rubles.

This book is a doctoral dissertation the object of which was "to explain the role and significance of the reform in the capitalist evolution of the black-soil center, showing its importance to the change in the economic condition of the peasant in the process of capitalist differentiation" (p. 43). The research was restricted to the gubernias of this region (Voronezh, Kursk, Orel, Riazan, Tambov, and Tula), for here was to be found, as Lenin had observed, the "true Russian pomeshchik" and the predominance of the wage economy (p. 31). Although no doubt this approach was suitable for the author's purpose, thus limited the book gives a myopic view of the reform as a whole, for, as is well known, the settlements pertaining both to the allotment of land and the redemption payments were quite different in the black-soil area.

The acceptability of the thesis probably depends less on the results of the author's research than on the reader's concurrence on certain key doctrinal points, for example, that *barshchina* (corvée) is most clearly understood as wage labor (p. 150). As a thesis, therefore, the book could have only limited interest.

Litvak has—as all good doctoral candidates must—documented his work thoroughly; the book contains 165 tables detailing by gubernia and by uезд the disposition of the peasant population, the land available for peasant use prior to the Emancipation and the obligations that attended such use, and the changes in these factors which resulted from the land allotment and the redemption payments which accompanied the Emancipation. The essay based on this documentation, however, consists of little more than a recapitulation of the data contained in the tables or a conversion of those data to percentages. There are some interesting accounts of the allotment and redemption settlements as concluded at specific villages. There is also an informative review of the literature contemporary to the postreform period. But the analysis is hesitant, and the conclusions are for the most part restricted to those which Lenin has already provided.

The story is also incomplete. To show the changing economic conditions of the peasantry in the postreform period one must view the land allotment and its attendant financial obligations in terms of the successive redivision of the land into smaller units and in terms of the rapidly falling prices of grain in the last two decades of the century.

FRANK WATTERS
California State University, Chico