fourth centuries B.C. agrees with the results of scientific analyses and cross-cultural comparisons of various finds. That the period of the Pazyryk barrows might have lasted into the fourth century B.C. is indicated by some parallels with Greek art, specifically the forms of griffins. (Cf. Rudenko, pl. 141, and A. Roes, "Achaemenid Influence upon Egyptian and Nomad Art," *Artibus Asiae,* 15, parts 1–2 [Ascona, 1952], pp. 26–27.)

The picture that emerges from Rudenko's writings is that of a tribe of pastoral nomads native to the mountain steppes of South Siberia, not necessarily related linguistically or ethnically to other nomadic tribes inhabiting the Eurasian steppes, but sharing a common steppe culture and way of life. The best known of these steppe nomads are of course the Scythians of the Pontic region, and it is possible to speak of a Scythian culture practiced by many unrelated steppe tribes.

The translator's preface is in some cases oversimplified in the interpretation of Rudenko and the subject in general. For instance, Thompson says (pp. xxix, xxxi) that Rudenko identified the builders of the Pazyryk barrows as Yue-Chi, and that this "seems feasible." As far as I can tell, Rudenko makes no such definite identification here, although he did in an earlier work (*Kul'tura naseleniia Tsentral'nogo Altaia,* p. 176). In the book under review he merely associates the Altai tribes with various Chinese tribes (pp. 211, 227). Thompson gives a rudimentary explanation of animal-style art (p. xxx) which does not do justice to the complexities of this problem as discussed by Rudenko or to the wide range of opinions held by other scholars. (For a survey of this subject by a Western scholar, one might read K. Jettmar's *Art of the Steppes* [New York, 1967], chap. 8.) There are also a few instances of proper names not translated from the Russian, as Astiag instead of Astyages (p. 225). Finally, the price of the book seems excessive.

ANN FARKAS
Columbia University

EARLY CHRISTIAN AND BYZANTINE ART. By *Irmgard Hutter.* Foreword by *Otto Demus.* Universe History of Art Series. New York: Universe Books, 1971. 191 pp. 189 plates (49 in color). $6.95.

This compact, sturdily bound volume offers a concise, well-illustrated introduction to its topic. The book is part of a new series whose texts are being prepared chiefly by German scholars. The author of this book is a member of the Byzantine Institute, University of Vienna. The quality of the binding, paper, and illustrations is excellent, making the book, printed in Germany, a fine pictorial survey of its topic, which includes architecture as well as the other arts. Careless editing, however, has, for example, divided the Roman Empire in 305 with reference to Honorius, made the synagogue at Dura Europos "one of the oldest places of Christian [*sic*] worship," and allowed Julian to reign from 361 to 383—all of these errors are indexed.

The text is too concise for its intended audience. The unending flood of introductory texts has long since created its own abstract, dehydrated vocabulary and phraseology, which pass, as in a litany, from one author to another, drawing sustenance from present-day economics rather than from direct apprehension of those constituent facts which generated or materially affected the works presented. Successive cryptic "headline" sentences, often filled with unexplained terms, can be interpreted or deciphered by the experienced art historian but will leave the neo-

https://doi.org/10.2307/2493552 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 Križanić), 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

https://doi.org/10.2307/2493552 Published online by Cambridge University Press