

understanding of Constantinopolitan developments during a century poorly documented in the capital.

Icons from the Central Balkans pose different problems for Krsto Miatev and Svetozar Radojčić, who contribute sections on Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. Although icon painting in these regions may date back quite far, virtually nothing from before the fourteenth century has survived. Both scholars include lengthy historical introductions in which they speculate—on the basis of frescoes and manuscript illumination—on the nature of early icon art. As elsewhere, more tender, humanized images appear during the fourteenth century, and, again, one of the main tasks is to differentiate local characteristics from the Constantinopolitan impulse. An insistent conservatism marks icon painting after the fall of Constantinople in 1453. In part this trend was due to lack of inspiration, but, as Radojčić argues, in the seventeenth century it was the result also of a conscious defense of the Orthodox devotional forms.

Of greatest value in *A Treasury of Icons* are the illustrations. Many works, not published before or recently restored, are included. The plates are large and generally clear; there are numerous details; and the color seems quite good. A catalogue and bibliography of the icons completes this volume, which is useful to the scholar and the general audience alike.

HERBERT L. KESSLER  
University of Chicago

TO RUSSIA AND RETURN: AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF TRAVELERS' ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ACCOUNTS OF RUSSIA FROM THE NINTH CENTURY TO THE PRESENT. Compiled by Harry W. Nerhood. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1969. viii, 367 pp. \$10.00.

With admirable diligence, Professor Nerhood has assembled an annotated bibliography of 1,422 English-language accounts of travelers to Russia and the Soviet Union. His catalogue is remarkable, above all, for the variety of its offerings. The list of travelers' impressions spans the period from 860 to 1964 and includes the works of a most diversified group of authors—Sigismund von Herberstein, George Bernard Shaw, Bob Hope, and Whistler's mother. Among the titles are gems such as *With My Dogs in Russia*, *Over at Uncle Joe's: Moscow and Me*, and, a memento from a long-lost golden age, *A Tramp Trip: How to See Europe on Fifty Cents a Day*.

Nerhood and his publisher have produced a bibliography that is physically attractive, well indexed, and illuminated with brief comments on the contents of almost all of the individual works listed. Because of their brevity, the comments vary greatly in their usefulness. Some are particularly effective. On Corliss and Margaret Lamont's *Russia Day by Day: A Travel Diary*, Nerhood remarks, "Their comments indicate that their prior judgment was correct: the Soviet Union is pregnant with a bright future for the common man" (p. 226). On the other hand, a few of his judgments are highly questionable. Giles Fletcher, we are told, "inaccurately describes what he saw in Moscow" (p. 13), while Caulaincourt's classic memoirs are dismissed with a single sentence, "A somewhat prejudiced traveler describes his journey to, and away from, Moscow . . ." (p. 41). For the most part, however, the comments are useful, particularly when they indicate that a given account contains valuable statistical data or is accompanied by unusual photographs or other illustrative materials.

*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.