

*To Russia and Return* is not without serious flaws. At no point does Nerhood or the publisher indicate why the work was undertaken or for what readership it was intended. Moreover, in spite of its goal of listing "all available reports of journeys to Russia," the catalogue is far from complete, at least for the Muscovite period, with which the reviewer is most familiar. A number of important seventeenth-century accounts are missing (Brereton and Carlisle, for example), and, remarkably enough, there is no mention of any of the full texts of Giles Fletcher's oft-edited classic, *Of the Russe Commonwealth*. Nerhood seems much more at home with more recent pilgrims to the promised land: his work will probably be most valuable to students of British and American images of, and attitudes toward, Russia in the past century.

Nerhood's compilation is a monument to the vanity of hundreds of casual tourists and to the self-inflicted blindness of generations of Russophiles and Russophobes, pro- and anti-Communists. More significant, it is a tribute to the handful of dedicated travelers who did their best to understand the complexities of Russia's institutions, culture, and mores and to present their findings to readers in the English-speaking world.

ROBERT O. CRUMMEY  
Yale University

IMPERIAL CONSTANTINOPLE. By *Dean A. Miller*. New York, London, Sydney, and Toronto: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1969. ix, 226 pp. \$8.95, cloth. \$4.95, paper.

Dean A. Miller's book is a strange volume. It contains a mixture of theories and facts that touch on all sorts of subjects (from Chinese rulers and Assyrian texts to purely Byzantine sources and problems) and makes reference to many personages, past and present (from Eusebius of Caesarea and Michael Psellos to Sigmund Freud and Lewis Mumford). Unfortunately, much of this discussion is not only extraneous to the subject but is also far from being clearly stated. Many pages of the book show a lack of distance between the author and the theories he has read about, and frequently the result is a misconnection of modern theories with Byzantine sources and Constantinopolitan life. Related to this problem is another less than satisfactory aspect of the volume—the continuous and exaggerated emphasis on symbolism and ritual. There is no doubt that these elements were important in Byzantium and Constantinople, but the author insists on finding them everywhere and at all times and is therefore led to statements and conclusions that can hardly be accepted as correct.

It is a pity that a number of interesting remarks and good observations that Mr. Miller has made in his text are lost in questionable theoretical discussions and factual materials already known. This is particularly true of some of his remarks concerning bureaucracy (pp. 86, 110), religious festivities (p. 126), and the peasants' relationship to the city (p. 143). Moreover, although he uses primary sources and secondary works, the author does not give us much new information on his subject. On the other hand, it is a little surprising to note the absence of certain modern works from his bibliography (for example, Gustave Schlumberger, *L'Épopée byzantine à la fin du dixième siècle*; Georg Ostrogorsky, *Die ländliche Steuergemeine des byzantinischen Reiches im X. Jahrhundert*; George I. Brătianu, *Privilèges et franchises municipales dans l'Empire byzantin*; Glanville Downey, *Constantinople in the Age of Justinian*). Also, there are too many mistakes in the spelling of titles of many publications, particularly those in French and Latin, throughout the volume and in the bibliography at its end.

Clearly, Mr. Miller has made an effort to approach the subject of Constantinople and its role in Byzantine life in the tenth century in a new way, to introduce fresh views and theories, but it seems equally clear that he has attempted too much and has been overwhelmed in the process. The result is a work sometimes interesting, sometimes confusing, at times almost fascinating and at other times quite irritating. It is unfortunate to have to conclude that the positive qualities of this book can hardly balance its shortcomings.

BARIŠA KREKIĆ  
Indiana University

A HISTORY OF THE HUSSITE REVOLUTION. By *Howard Kaminsky*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967. xv, 580 pp. \$15.00.

This is a fascinating ideological and sociological analysis of Hussite history seen as a movement of reformation and revolution. Kaminsky sees the two as intimately tied together. He sets the Hussite revolt in the larger context of "world-historical terms" both in its relationship to late medieval history and to the phenomenon of revolution "as a fundamental challenge to the old order." The approach is a fruitful dialogue with recent Czech Marxist interpretations of Hussitism. He shares with them their insight into and appreciation of the social-revolutionary character of the movement but is free from ideological strait jackets which tend to reduce the religious issues either to insignificance or simply to medieval expressions of the class struggle. For though Kaminsky's interpretation is "admittedly sociological," he is free from doctrinaire presuppositions and pursues his work as a dedicated historian.

While he sees his role chiefly as that of an *interpreter* of what happened and why, he allows the primary sources to inform him (and the readers of his book); he makes a successful attempt to enter into the minds which participated in this late-medieval religious development, and he traces very carefully the historical setting of the extremely complex developments. His conscientious insistence on understanding and showing the particular situations which led to the various developments may be, paradoxically, the only weakness of the book. The mass of data presented, none of which is insignificant, makes the story often rather difficult to follow. This is, though, perhaps inevitable, because of the many events and changes in the period analyzed, and because the author cannot expect many of his Western readers to be familiar with Hussite history. The work is thus a rich contribution to Western scholars for a better understanding of what was involved in the Hussite struggle. The author, deeply versed in *Czech Hussitica*, offers to the West the harvest of the profuse scholarship and interpretations locked in Czech books and journals. His extensive and lengthy footnotes are especially helpful. Yet he is certainly not just an interpreter of Czech scholars. He does not accept uncritically their reconstructions of Hussite history. His fine sensitivity to and understanding of the history of Christian thought and his penetrating sociological analysis will be valuable and stimulating also to those familiar with the Czech literature.

One of the advantages of Kaminsky's presentation is that he quotes at length from primary sources; the Czech names and words are flawlessly printed; the Latin passages in the notes are as a rule left untranslated. Two long appendixes contain the Latin texts of documents relating to the Tabor-Prague controversies regarding the extent of the revolution in religious thought and practice and regarding Taborite adventism, chiliasm, and warfare. All of these present important documentation for many of Kaminsky's theses.