

ing tourists in the Soviet Union will ever see): "The iconostasis in the Cathedral, carved by Ivan Zarudny, is a magnificent and very typical example of Petrine architecture. The richness of the modeling and the profusion of carved figures combine with the painted icons and the brightly colored paintings under the dome to create an effect of great elegance and splendor. The pictures in the Cathedral were mostly painted by Russian artists." Words, just words, sliding away from imperative problems of style, technique, and historical and cultural significance.

If Kaganovich's text is devoid of practical criticism, Chernov's and Girard's is festooned with provocative statements. Here is one: "In the eyes of Western historians the style of the Kremlin is not really Russian. . . ." Well, as Gertrude Stein might have said, "If it isn't Russian, what is it?" Later on we are told that in the Tretyakov Gallery "there is too much to see: the visitor who can afford only a single day may well feel discouraged." In the first place there really isn't *that* much to see, and certainly having much more to see hasn't prevented millions of people with only a day to spare from visiting the Louvre, the British Museum, our own Metropolitan Museum, or the Hermitage in Leningrad for that matter, and getting something out of the experience. What a pity it would be if travelers in Moscow were deterred by such irresponsible remarks from having at least a glimpse of the magnificent icons—to say nothing of the absorbing display of nineteenth-century painting—in the Tretyakov!

In *Arts of Russia* the color plates, which are tipped in, range from poor and indifferent to good and very good. The best of them show examples of the decorative arts and occasionally odd or unexpected views of familiar buildings, thereby at least enlarging the illustrative documentation of Russian architecture, which needs it. But the illustrations must be handled with caution, because there are occasional slips, such as two views of the Church of Saint Nicholas in Suzdal, one of which must be reversed.

The illustrations in *Splendors of Moscow* are even more erratic. They are at their worst when coping with great works of art (surely there has never been a poorer color reproduction of *The Virgin of Vladimir*, that most delicate of icons), and are best when dealing with less significant situations. There is a fine view of Gogol's grave in the Novodevichi Monastery, and a lively one of the Belorussian Railway Station. The color plates were made in Paris, but since the books were printed in Geneva, one may regret that the plates could not have been made by Swiss craftsmen.

GEORGE HEARD HAMILTON
*Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute
and Williams College*

ZARUBEZHNAIA ROSSIIA: ISTORIIA I KUL'TURNO-PROSVETITEL'-
NAIA RABOTA RUSSKOGO ZARUBEZH'IA ZA POLVEKA (1920-
1970). By P. E. Kovalevsky. Paris: Librairie des Cinq Continents, 1971. 347
pp. \$5.50.

In this book Kovalevsky, professor emeritus of Russian history and the history of literature at the Sorbonne, writes a history of émigré cultural activities in many of which he himself took part. In his introduction he divides the Russian Diaspora into three periods: 1920 to World War II, the war years, and since 1945. He considers only the first period as "Russia Outside of Russia," because during those

nineteen years the number of Russians abroad was the largest (one million), and entire former provinces of the empire with a large Russian population (almost nine million) had become independent countries. Also at that time émigrés were more strictly delineated as a separate body. The author concentrates on this first period, covering the other two whenever pertinent.

Part 1 of the book briefly outlines the paths of dispersion and gives names of those who were instrumental in the settling, as well as statistics by country. Part 2 is devoted to cultural and educational work. The author describes the Russian schools and universities throughout the world, outlines the main contributions in the various academic disciplines and in industry, and lists the major publications. Several of the chapters pertaining to academic matters are updated and expanded revisions of Kovalevsky's previous books, *La dispersion Russe* (1951) and *Nashi dostizheniia* (1960). Émigré activities during the war years are also briefly discussed. In Part 3 a lengthy presentation of literature (including a chapter by Iurii Terapiano on poetry) and the arts is followed by a general description of the postwar period and the social and civic organizations. Throughout the book Kovalevsky uses the same approach: for each topic he gives a brief, comprehensive outline, lists many names and titles, and mentions appropriate articles, books, and bibliographies.

There are a few omissions. For example, Preobrazhensky's *Russkie v Latvii* and the works of the modernist painter and writer Sergei Charchoune are not mentioned. References to these books and authors, however, can be easily obtained from other bibliographies listed in the book.

The book offers a clear, comprehensive picture of the preservational, informational, and creative activities of the Russian emigration and its contribution to twentieth-century Russian culture.

LUDMILA A. FOSTER
Durham, North Carolina

THE HABSBURGS AND EUROPE, 1516–1660. By *H. G. Koenigsberger*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1971. xv, 304 pp. \$8.50.

Professor Koenigsberger's volume consists of three essays. The first two, published previously in *The Cambridge Modern History*, deal with an evaluation of the reigns of Charles V and Philip II, and the third, taken from a collective work edited by Professor Hugh Trevor-Roper, pertains to the Thirty Years' War and the reign of Ferdinand II. Considering the character of the book, the lack of a scholarly apparatus is perhaps understandable, but the absence of a bibliography is truly regrettable. Thus all things considered, these three stimulating survey chapters written in broad strokes for comprehensive collective works do not fit very well into the framework of a monograph. In particular the connection between the second and third essays is thin. More important, the author sees the relationship between the Habsburgs and Europe during the period under discussion as primarily that of the Spanish Habsburgs to Western Europe and at the most—imperfectly—to Germany, but certainly not to East Central Europe. Such an interpretation is appropriate for the middle period, the reign of Philip II, but is only partly correct for that of Charles V. It is a highly questionable one for the administration of Ferdinand II, which in importance of domestic