

phyte nonplused. The author has worked under severe restrictions of space (only 46 of 191 pages were allotted to continuous verbal discourse), but frequent fugitive reference to unillustrated works contributes more to her problem than to its solution. Despite this, she has managed to delineate sharply the major developments and characterize, occasionally vividly, significant monuments. This is accomplished in part by equating the history of art with descriptions of successive styles—a view of the discipline which is at once widespread, modern, narrow, and totally un-Byzantine—and in part by seeing Byzantine art chiefly as the product of a series of classic revivals. This last theme has been repeated so often by so many that one is finally inclined to disbelieve it, if only because so many revivals have been identified that interstices between them have virtually disappeared. Sharply compressed texts like this one reveal a pressing need for radical revision of Byzantine art history.

WILLIAM C. LOERKE
Dumbarton Oaks Research Library

EUROPE IN THE RUSSIAN MIRROR: FOUR LECTURES IN ECONOMIC HISTORY. By *Alexander Gerschenkron*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1970. ix, 158 pp. \$4.95.

This brief book, based on lectures delivered at Cambridge University in 1968, contains in small compass those features we have come to associate with Professor Gerschenkron's work: the ability to throw fresh light on familiar themes in economic history, an extraordinary range of interest and knowledge, and a very sharp pen. His central purpose is to see what certain aspects of Russian economic history can tell us about some leading themes that have been advanced in the study of European economic history.

First, he examines the adequacy of Max Weber's hypothesis regarding Protestant ethics and the spirit of capitalism in accounting for the early entrepreneurial role of the Old Believers. After a most absorbing review of Old Believer principles and practices, he concludes that Sir William Petty was closer to the truth in his observation some 270 years ago that "trade is not fixed to any species of religion as such, but rather . . . to the heterodox part of the whole."

After an illuminating excursion into the economic views of the ardent Catholic Iurii Krizhanich (or Juraj Krizanić), Gerschenkron turns to the phenomenon of mercantilism (chiefly as interpreted by Eli Heckscher) as it may pertain to the headlong reforms of Peter the Great. Again, some significant differences or anomalies appear, attributable in good part to the fact that the "Russian State was poor but strong."

At first glance it might appear that Gerschenkron is devoting too much effort to a critique of writers, now dead, whose work has been subject to a good deal of revision and modification. But this is not the point: Gerschenkron is in the process of defining more precisely Russia's relationship to Europe, and the device he employs is singularly fruitful in setting the stage for his general interpretation of economic development and his highly graduated picture of the European (including the Russian) scene as various stages and problems are encountered.

This interpretation emerges in his final lecture, devoted centrally to the pattern of Russian industrialization in the three decades preceding World War I. His discussion is, apparently, sidetracked by a vigorous polemic with E. H. Carr—polemic in the grand manner. But after one has cleared the smell of gunsmoke

from one's nostrils, it is evident that real issues are at stake here. The divergent implications of the Gerschenkron and Carr views of twentieth-century and Soviet Russian history far transcend the particular disputes between the two men.

This reviewer found the book to be marvelously stimulating, both for the insights provided and for a dozen fascinating questions it opened for exploration.

HENRY L. ROBERTS
Dartmouth College

ORIGINES D'UNE BOURGEOISIE RUSSE, XVI^e ET XVII^e SIÈCLES:
MARCHANDS DE MOSCOVIE. By *Jacqueline Kaufmann-Rochard*. Paris:
Flammarion, 1969. 307 pp. 29 F.

Evidently a doctoral dissertation, this smallish book is uncommonly ambitious in its reach. It strives for a comprehensive treatment of Muscovy's merchant class—its origins and modes of development, its various strata, its social relations, economic activities, interplay with the state, and even its family life. Since we have heretofore had no such work in any language, the volume is to be welcomed, for it constitutes a handy, informative, and mainly sound introduction to the subject.

The work's deficiencies are in good part a result of its large scope. The author relies heavily on secondary rather than primary sources, particularly on the studies of such able Soviet historians as Bakhrushin, Baklanova, Serbina, Tikhonov and Merzon, and Vvedensky. Indeed it is not much of an exaggeration to characterize her work as a synthesis of these and some other writings. She not only has not used the archival sources which she lists in the bibliography but has dipped into the published documents only sporadically, incomprehensibly has neglected such important contemporary accounts as Rodes and Kilburger, has not consulted (or slighted) important works of Smirnov and Zaozersky, Bazilevich's articles, and also the German and English literature on the subject. Accordingly, many aspects of this complex theme are treated too cursorily, and the author sometimes (in chapter 2 for example) falls prey to schematism. She also appears now and then to be the captive of her sources, whose categories and modes of analysis she tends to adopt uncritically. Fresh questions and probings are not much in evidence. The book is well organized and well written, but one notes occasional errors of fact and, from time to time, the absence of necessary qualifications.

The body of the work is largely descriptive, with interpretation saved for the crucial and interesting last chapter. Here the author brings into relief the Russian merchants' many disabilities, and contrasts their circumstances with those of their Western counterparts. In spite of the great differences, she insists on the applicability of the term "bourgeoisie"—a proposition which is certainly debatable. Debatable too, and deserving further investigation, are other theses advanced: that the Russian merchants left the conduct of external trade to foreign merchants because all their energies were consumed in organizing the internal market; that social differentiation among the merchants was so marked, and hostility of the lesser elements to the superior so intense, that the latter were driven into alliance with a landowning-servitor class whose interests were basically contrary to theirs. Whatever the book's deficiencies, it pulls together more than enough evidence to persuade anyone of the existence and significance of the merchants in Muscovite society.

SAMUEL H. BARON
University of California, San Diego