

serfdom as a "juridical process," making it unnecessary "to tell the whole story of the peasantry in this period."

The author applies the same principle in his discussion of the "rise of the middle service class" (which he often erroneously refers to as the "gentry") and in his still more detailed section entitled "Enserfment of the Russian Peasantry." This involves painstaking accumulation of all the relevant decrees he has been able to find in his wide reading of the extensive secondary literature, occasionally supplemented by direct reference to published source material, the latter dating mainly from the nineteenth century. He has to acknowledge that by no means all of the decrees were enforced or enforceable. Still more troublesome is the fact that on the most crucial points he has to rely on decrees which he describes as "putative." He regards the *Ulozhenie* of 1649 as the culmination of the process of enserfment, and attempts to show that its provisions simply formalized antecedent legislation, though many of these provisions have no such antecedents and are fairly obviously just ratification of practices that had grown up extralegally, and thus require significant concessions to a "nondecree" interpretation.

The most valuable portion of this book is part 3, "The Gunpowder Revolution in Muscovy," which takes almost half of the text. From the same kind of materials he used in parts 1 and 2, the author has assembled an imposing array of scattered facts which—despite a high degree of cocksureness, and because of his aversion to comparative history—he has been unable to work into a picture altering the views of his predecessors in the interpretation of the course of Russian developments. Notwithstanding repeated confident assertions (resembling the advertising principle that if one writes the same thing often enough, the reader will begin to believe it), he has the grace in his concluding remarks to admit: "This, of course, is all in the realm of speculation." In a sort of coda, he worries what seems to him the almost insoluble problem why the state did not use the "gunpowder revolution" to "roll back" the enserfment of the peasantry, and concludes that it was because of a "hypertrophic state power."

The value of the book lies not in Hellie's attempts at interpretation but in the industry with which he has assembled both factual and opinionated data provided by some three hundred other authors. A patient and careful reader may thus more conveniently review the problems dealt with and draw his own conclusions. The notes, which occupy 109 pages toward the back of the book, are helpfully correlated with the pages to which they refer, and the index is unusually workable.

JESSE D. CLARKSON
Brooklyn College

KHOLOPSTVO I KREPOSTNICHESTVO (KONETS XV–XVI V.). By *E. I. Kolycheva*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1971. 255 pp. 99 kopeks.

ZAKREPOSHCHENIE KREST'IAN I KLASSOVAIA BOR'BA V ROSSII VO VTOROI POLOVINE XVI V. By *V. I. Koretsky*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1970. 366 pp. 1.40 rubles.

Since 1953 Soviet scholars have made significant advances in understanding the social history of early modern Russia. This has entailed finding new archival sources to complement those published by the Imperial Archaeographical Commission, and

also overcoming the “charm of perfection” presented by B. D. Grekov’s massive *Krest’iane na Rusi*.

Both books under review are good examples of recent Soviet scholarship on sixteenth-century society. Kolycheva analyzes hereditary slavery between Russian medieval slavery (studied by her sponsor, A. A. Zimin) and limited service contract slavery (*kabal’noe kholopstvo*), which succeeded full slavery in Muscovy (the subject of V. M. Paneiak’s numerous articles and book). Her monograph, following several articles, is refreshingly undogmatic and demolishes several standard clichés. She shows that not all slaves were tax-exempt, that some slaves owned their inventory, and that some slaves were bound to their allotments rather than their owners. Kolycheva’s thesis is that slavery was not a dying institution; moreover, the government did much to perpetuate it, and the church nothing to curtail it. Using archival materials and published primary sources creatively (particularly the abridged redaction of the *Russkaia Pravda*, which she argues was more important for contemporaries than the *Sudebnik* of 1497), Kolycheva shows that slaves were far from homogeneous, that elite slaves played a central role in the army and in administering Russia until the 1555–56 abolition of *kormlenie* and the magnates’ estates, while the majority worked at some detailed fifty menial occupations and crafts. How many slaves there were is unknown (I would guess from 5 to 15 percent of the population), but Kolycheva shows their distribution: some owners had hundreds, others only a few. Magnates with hundreds had a far higher proportion of peasants working their estates (they were more successful in competing for mobile labor), while the small middle-service class landholders were more dependent on slave labor and therefore had more interest in slavery than the magnates did. In an important chapter on slave law (published earlier in *Istoricheskie zapiski*, vol. 85, 1970), Kolycheva argues that the *Russkaia Pravda*’s view of the slave as an object was fading, and that he was becoming the law’s subject, significantly less discriminated against because of his unfree status. This evolution culminated in the *Ulozhenie* of 1649, where it is stated that a slave could be a witness in court, equal to women and the abased peasant-serfs.

Since 1956 Koretsky has published a score of articles (regrettably not cited here), and his book has been long awaited. His argument is well known. His major contribution has been his mining of the Novgorod archives, where he found putative allusions to governmental decrees binding all peasants to the land in 1592–93 (the culmination of the Forbidden Years, initiated in 1581 to repeal the right of removal on St. George’s Day), and indications that simultaneously, or in 1594 (this point is confused), a five-year time limit was placed on suing for the recovery of “exported” peasants (*vyvoz*). These documents were published in the *Arkheograficheskii ezhegodnik za 1966 god*, and have been incorporated in interpretations of the enserfment, including my own *Enserfment and Military Change in Muscovy*. (In this, as in all other possible instances, the Koretsky book cites archives rather than published documents, making it difficult for foreigners to study the context of the citations.) Despite his own contributions toward proving that the enserfment was a product of state lawmaking, Koretsky argues unconvincingly—and unconvinced? (see p. 78)—that serfdom’s origins date to the ninth century, that sixteenth-century developments inevitably stemmed (as Marx said was usually the case) from the imposition of corvée to meet the needs of the growing towns. (Many scholars doubt the significance of corvée until the 1590s—after the introduction of the Forbidden Years.)

What is both impressive and convincing is Koretsky's demonstration that the Forbidden Years were a governmental response to the plight of the middle service class: the intense labor shortage caused by Ivan IV's attempts to collect taxes to pay for the twenty-five-year Livonian War, the Oprichnina depredations, and natural disasters. (Kolycheva adds that masses of Russians were taken as military captives by invading armies during the war.)

Koretsky devotes considerable attention to the land cadastres of the 1580–90s (an appendix lists 156 of them), exaggerating their role in the enserfment. Chapter 4 analyzes the development of the 1597 law on limited service contract slavery requiring the debtor to serve for his lord's life and forbidding loan repayment. He properly argues that this development must be examined in the context of the simultaneous laws enserfing the peasantry. But he may be overstating his case when he argues that a 1592 law on slaves probably had a time limit on suing for recovery of fugitives analogous to that for "exported" peasants, or that in the 1590s there was hardly any difference between peasants and slaves. (Kolycheva's case on the confluence of the status of the peasants and agricultural slaves is more convincing.)

Kolycheva's book is the better piece of scholarship. Every section contains new ideas. Her only significant shortcoming is a failure to discuss the future impact of the two classes of slaves. Certainly the slavish deference that governing officials rendered the tsar after 1556 must have stemmed in large measure from their having assumed functions recently executed by genuine slaves. This was true in both the central and the provincial administrations, and helps to explain why the new middle service class had such difficulty in developing a gentry élan, a feeling that it was part of the ruling class. Moreover, the presence of the institution of slavery was crucial as a model for abasing the bound peasants.

Koretsky's production contains relatively little that is new or original besides his archival discoveries. The last chapter, on civil disorders, proves nothing (least of all any connection between the enserfment and the Time of Troubles), and has no point—other than ideological respectability. The work is also marred by unsupported assertions: that there was an Assembly of the Land in 1575 (see also *AE za 1969 god*), an increase in agricultural productivity, a widely practiced concealed sale of peasants, a dramatic increase in landlord usury. He also can be faulted for arguing from the classics (Karamzin, Kliuchevsky, Grekov) and ignoring the scholarship and refutations of his contemporaries.

Since neither author seems to know any foreign language, they are limited to translated travel accounts, which practically rules out comparative possibilities. Both works are fundamentally narrative history and make no attempt to apply modern social scientific methods of analysis. Both authors perpetuate V. O. Kliuchevsky's myth of the existence of an institution called the "Boyar Council." Neither book has a bibliography; only Koretsky has even a names-and-places index. Lastly, "Nauka" will not win any prizes for book production; it is regrettable that Kolycheva's work is a cheap edition poorly glued between paper covers.

Despite these modest shortcomings, both books are significant contributions to our knowledge of early modern history.

RICHARD HELLIE
University of Chicago