construction of belfries achieved the opposite result. In the final analysis, then, the belfry inadvertently became the paramount symbolic feature of Serbian Orthodox Church architecture displacing, if only temporarily, the dome in that role.” (p. 71)

Declan Murphy has produced a most valuable study on perceptions in late Muscovy of how icons should be painted and the quarrel between supporters of Church prescriptions on icon-painting and the proponents of naturalism, as various imaginative painters (some under German influence) disagreed with article 43 of the Stoglav which states: “Let skillful icon painters and their pupils paint from ancient models, [and] let them not depict the divinity from their own fancy by their own conjectures.” (p. 150) Murphy goes on to cite Avvakum's extreme interpretation of this position. In addition to laying out this fascinating debate, Murphy also provides much interesting data on the declining social and economic position of icon painters during the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Robert Croskey demonstrates the presence of large numbers of Byzantine Greeks in Russian service after the fall of Constantinople, showing Maksim Grek was not an unusual phenomenon. Dimitri Conomos' study shows that the Greeks produced much more high quality sacred music under the Ottomans than many non-specialists might have thought. Theofanis Stavrou’s study on Russia and Mount Athos in the nineteenth century provides much interesting material on the career of Porfirii Uspenskii, while Gary Vikan fills out our knowledge on Luke the Cypriot. Finally Richard Clogg provides a variety of interesting observations about the Byzantine legacy (or Great Idea) on Greek behavior in the nineteenth century.

Space does not allow me to elaborate on the four above-mentioned studies or the last three in the volume, but I hope enough has been said to show that the volume is well worth the attention of historians of both Russia and the Ottoman Balkans. One might only criticize the unusually large number of typographical errors and deeply regret that the volume’s editor could not have lived to see the fruits of his valuable conference appear in print.

John V.A. Fine, Jr.

University of Michigan


This collection of essays by ten Polish and three Hungarian historians concentrates on economic and demographic history. The roster of contribu-
tors is impressive. An introductory overview is provided by the Polish editors Maczak and Samsonowicz, followed by descriptions of the "economic landscapes" of Hungary and Poland by László Makkai and Andrzej Wyrobisz. Demographic trends in the region are summarized by Eric Fügedi, and a comparative study of major trends in the agrarian economy of Poland, Bohemia, and Hungary is provided by Leonid Zytkowicz. An essay on viticulture and animal husbandry in Hungary is contributed by István Kiss and a survey of the towns of East Central Europe (admittedly focusing on Poland) is presented by Maria Bogucka. The treatment of economic issues concludes with discussions of the circulation of capital (being chiefly a discussion of precious metal and other mining and its impact) by Marian Malowist and of the region's continental commerce (as distinguished from its Baltic maritime trade) by Jerzy Topolski. The last three essays, somehow less well integrated into the whole, deal with other matters. Andrzej Wyczariski's discussion of the system of power in seventeenth-century Poland promotes a forma mixta interpretation instead of the more traditional notion of "noble democracy," emphasizing the balance of power between monarch, aristocratic senate, and noble constituents. Finally, Jan Białostocki discusses borrowed and indigenous elements of the East Central European Renaissance, primarily in terms of art and architecture, and Janusz Tazbir examines the culture of the Polish Baroque, focusing chiefly upon the indigenous culture of "Sarmatianism."

The volume's regional focus is roughly on the kingdoms of Bohemia, Poland, and Hungary, although, depending on the particular economic, political, or other criteria employed, it excludes or includes the border regions of Prussia and Livonia, Lithuania and Ruthenia, Moldavia and Wallachia, Ottoman-occupied Hungary (one can in fact complain of a troubling lack of clarity in almost all discussion of Hungary in this volume as to its relevance or not to the areas under Ottoman rule), and Lusatia, Brandenburg, and Pomerania. Such inevitable ambiguities notwithstanding, the potential value of this region—comprising the Eastern zone of Europe "incorporated into the Latin world, outside the Ottonian limes"—as a field for fruitful comparison is undoubted. From their earliest emergence, the societies, institutions, and economies of the three kingdoms had enough in common to justify their treatment as a single region.

Unfortunately, the volume's coverage falls short of the goals set out by its title, partly for reasons beyond its editors' control. As Peter Burke notes in his introduction, some Czech and Slovak historians were invited to take part in the creation of this volume, but were "unable to participate." At the same time, while many of the Polish essayists address themselves to regional issues as a whole, their contributions are often based, understandably, on the Polish case. Thus, one comes away from this volume with a good sense of Polish developments, a somewhat less satisfactory one of Hungarian, and an even less clear sense of Bohemian. This seems particularly unfortunate in light of Bohemia's much greater integration into the