

These illustrations of palaces, people, and paraphernalia are both enjoyable and instructive. Together with what solid meat there is in Miss Cowles's narrative, they make a work which should not be ignored even if it should have been much more carefully written.

RALPH T. FISHER JR.

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

U ISTOKOV KRUPNOGO PROIZVODSTVA V RUSSKOI PROMYSHLENNOSTI XVI–XVII VEKOV: K VOPROSU O GENEZISE KAPITALIZMA V ROSSII. By *E. I. Zaozerskaia*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1970. 476 pp. 1.97 rubles.

In 1953 E. I. Zaozerskaia published an impressive monograph on light industry in Russia during the first quarter of the eighteenth century (*Razvitie legkoi promyshlennosti v Moskve v pervoi chetverti XVIII v.*). The roots of large-scale industrial production in Russia go back to the seventeenth and even the sixteenth century, however, so even that book discussed activities of the pre-Petrine period. With the present volume Madame Zaozerskaia turns her full attention to the origins of large-scale production in early modern Russia. Studies in this area by P. G. Liubomirov and others have by no means exhausted the subject, so Zaozerskaia's contribution is welcome.

Zaozerskaia investigates the production of salt, iron (with some attention to copper), and cloth (ranging from crude woollens to silk). She takes ten workers in an enterprise in this period as the major index of "large-scale production." Productivity and profitability are other, but—as I interpret her discussion—subsidiary indices. The forms of production considered are diverse: manufactories, peasant and *posad* (artisan suburb) production, monastery workshops, and such large premanufacturing state enterprises as the Oruzheinaia Palata or Aleksei Mikhailovich's linen factory at Izmailovo.

The author has done a remarkable amount of research with primary materials, both archival and published, and has made extensive use of secondary literature. Her problem, of course, is that since sources usually shed little light on the internal life of the enterprises with which they deal, she is sometimes forced to make arbitrary assumptions on whether or not an enterprise is "large-scale," or even concerning its characteristics as an industrial enterprise. On the other hand, she is judicious in interpreting information she feels the sources do disclose. She admits the generally feudal character of labor in even the most advanced enterprises; she makes no sweeping claims for the extent of industrial modernization or capitalist development during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; she does not press the case which was once made for regarding Russian innovations of the period as indigenous. As is so often true of economic history, style (probably) had to be sacrificed to exactitude and detail, but her study of small-scale iron production ("melkie promysly," pp. 199–253) is almost a masterpiece of its genre: lucid, forceful, engaging.

Although this book is a major achievement, some critical comments are in order. A book on this subject should certainly discuss salt, iron, and textiles—but the exclusion of industries such as paper, gunpowder, and glass is neither justified nor justifiable. Moreover, the three industries the author selected are handled in strikingly different ways: salt-making occupies almost half the volume and is subjected

to a much more detailed discussion than iron or cloth; the section on salt probably makes a more original contribution to our knowledge of Russian economic history than other parts of the volume. The author assumes that large-scale iron production was both profitable (pp. 358–59) and of high quality (pp. 241–50). These contentions are probably correct, but enough contrary evidence exists on both points to necessitate a major examination of those questions.

The reader well may wonder (the author herself offers no broad interpretations on the subject) if large-scale production emerged in Russia on a truly significant scale during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The burden of Zaozerskaia's work might well be to impress one with the diversity and strength of artisan production. Even if she succeeds in demonstrating capitalist tendencies among artisan producers in this period, it would appear that these very developments strengthened rather than undermined peasant industry's competition with modern manufacturing. What, then, does this conclusion do to the Marxist assertion that mankind is governed by universal laws of economic development?

JOSEPH T. FUHRMANN
Tusculum College

THE ORIGINS OF CAPITALISM IN RUSSIA: INDUSTRY AND PROGRESS IN THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES. By *Joseph T. Fuhrmann*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1972. xvi, 376 pp. \$12.50.

Many crucial topics in pre-Petrine Russian history have never been the subject of an English-language monograph. Yet the lack of a book on a subject is not an adequate justification for publication, though it seems to have been the sole criterion for this book. Intended as a synthesis of conventional historical wisdom on the related subjects of manufacturing and early capitalism in Russia, this work is a collection of revealing sketches in entrepreneurial biography linked to a useful account of Russian industrial policy, but within a poorly defined conceptual framework. The study was originally a dissertation on seventeenth-century Russian iron manufacturing, and little of merit lies outside the temporal or topical limits of that work. Other industrial activities, such as silk, paper, and glass manufacturing, have been treated less extensively in the past, hence are relatively neglected by Fuhrmann as well. A great deal of space is devoted to the general role and impact of the foreigner in Russia, but the author seems reluctant to draw any significant conclusions.

When Fuhrmann seeks to analyze the phenomena he describes, the book becomes seriously flawed by contradictions and simplisms. At one point he states that a critical difference between Western Europe and Russia is that in the former "the manufactory was an indigenous development" (p. 8); but when he discusses this same issue later (pp. 265–66), he contends that "Russia was not really so very different," since other, West European, nations also imported foreign entrepreneurs and technology for the purpose of manufacturing. The simultaneous unsophisticated application of Marxist historical theories and careless use of such terms as "feudal" and "bourgeois" lead the author inexorably to the conclusion that "serfdom was the main barrier to extensive capitalist development in Russia during this period" (p. 258). A certain causal relationship between serfdom and weak capitalistic development cannot be denied convincingly. However, the articulation of the structure of which these two interrelated phenomena were constituent (and symbiotic) parts would be a more