

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

efficacious intellectual endeavor and might even justify the rehearsal of the tired clichés of Russian “underdevelopment.”

Errors are not infrequent, including Jenkins for Jenkinson (p. 44), *Spasskaia vorota* for *Spasskie* (or *Spasskiiia*) *vorota* (p. 206), and the use on the same page (p. 207) of *pomest'e* as the singular form and *pomestia* as the plural. In addition, occasional laxity in giving credit to another author (e.g., to Jerome Blum for at least the passage at the bottom of page 33) is most distressing.

The appendixes and bibliographies, though a thoughtful addition, do little to redeem the work. It should never have been published in its present form. May we not with some justification expect a synthetic study to make at least a moderately exciting interpretive contribution to our historical knowledge?

KARL VON LOEWE

New Brunswick, New Jersey

CATHERINE THE GREAT. Edited by *L. Jay Oliva*. Great Lives Observed series. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1971. viii, 184 pp. \$5.95, cloth. \$2.45, paper.

CATHERINE THE GREAT: A PROFILE. Edited by *Marc Raeff*. World Profiles series. New York: Hill and Wang, 1972. xiii, 331 pp. \$6.50, cloth. \$2.45, paper.

Professor Oliva's contribution is divided into three sections, preceded by a brief introduction. The first contains a variety of documents including excerpts from Catherine's memoirs and letters and several familiar edicts. The second reproduces the observations, some of dubious historical worth, of courtiers and assorted foreigners. No attempt is made to evaluate the merits of the passages presented. Not represented at all are members of the lesser nobility (*Bolotov*, for instance) or, except for *Radishchev*, of the bureaucracy. This is unfortunate, since such works are not readily accessible to the undergraduate, for whom this compilation is presumably intended. Most disappointing is the concluding section. The flyleaf promises “analyses in retrospect by leading historians, political scientists, and other modern observers.” Offered are excerpts from *Karamzin*, “*Hertzen*,” *Kliuchevsky* (the inadequate 1931 English translation), *Pokrovsky*, *Smirnov*, *Gershoy*, and *Billington*, none of whom would consider himself a specialist on eighteenth-century Russia.

The quality of the bibliography leads one to suspect that Oliva has intentionally steered clear of Russian-language sources. After enumerating and commenting adversely on the insubstantial nature of existing English-language biographies, Oliva cites only two Russian-language ones: *Bilbasov's Istoria [sic] Ekaterina [sic] Vtoroi* (St. Petersburg, 1885 [sic]), which he describes as a twelve-volume work, although only the first two volumes ever appeared; and *Bruckner's [sic] Istoriia Ekaterina [sic] Vtoroi* (St. Petersburg, 1885), which, he might have noted, is a translation from the German (Berlin, 1883). By failing to come to grips with his Russian-language materials, Oliva has proved to this reviewer's satisfaction that there are simply not enough important sources available in Western languages alone to arrive at a balanced and meaningful portrayal of Catherine II.

Professor Raeff has made an effort to overcome the dearth of English-language scholarship on Catherine II by offering us a collection of twelve essays (ten in translation) designed to elucidate “most particularly Catherine's intellectual development and accomplishments and her influence on contemporary Russian