

the development of the various regional schools of icon painting. M. A. Ilin discusses the decorative arts.

These two volumes are a most fruitful source of knowledge for all those interested in this period, for they depict not only the main achievements of Russia but also the general level of her civilization throughout three centuries of medieval development.

NIKOLAY ANDREYEV  
Cambridge University

STUDIEN ZUR LIVLANDPOLITIK IVAN GROZNYJS. By *Norbert Angermann*. Marburg/Lahn: J. G. Herder-Institut, 1972. viii, 134 pp.

Dr. Angermann has published three essays on Ivan the Terrible's Livonian policy which are of scholarly interest despite the fact that so much has been written on this chapter of history. In his first essay he deals with Ivan's motives for invading Livonia in 1558. Obviously a comprehensive study of motives would demand a wide range of investigations into political and economic as well as psychological and environmental issues. Angermann confines himself to discussing primarily two aspects. One concerns the influence economic factors exercised on Ivan's decisions. The tsar's failure to support the Russian merchants dealing with Livonians seems to confirm the conclusion suggested by recent historians that the desire to open trade-ways to the West was not decisive in his planning. The other aspect concerns Ivan's desire to regain what he claimed as his *votchina*. Angermann justly stresses this point, although he does not see a clear connection between it and the question of the tribute demanded by Ivan, which marked the final break between tsar and Livonians. Although the author takes up a number of additional, minor points, he does not discuss the threat which Poland-Lithuania put to Muscovy, the fear of which certainly carried as much weight as other motives.

The second essay, based largely on a study of the *razriadnye knigi*, gives a useful description of Ivan's administrative set-up in Livonia, including a list of the voivodes who were charged with the administration.

The last essay takes up a very important question and merits careful consideration. Angermann argues that Ivan was faced by advisers practically unanimously opposed to his desire to conquer Livonia rather than pursue his actions against the Tatars. They were thus not divided into two parties, as is generally contended. Of course, they all supported the tsar when the decision was taken by him. The evidence for these internal Muscovite debates is necessarily limited, but Angermann considers what there is for each of Ivan's advisers individually.

The scholarly treatment by the author makes his short book a valuable contribution.

WALTHER KIRCHNER  
Princeton, New Jersey

RUSSKOE STAROBRADCHESTVO: DUKHOVNYE DVIZHENIIA SEMNADTSATOGO VEKA. By *Sergei Zenkovsky*. Forum Slavicum, vol. 21. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1970. 528 pp. DM 96.

In his book about Russian monasticism (*Russisches Mönchtum*, Würzburg, 1953) the late Igor Smolitsch makes the following remark about the schism in the seventeenth-century Russian Church: "It would be wrong to explain the Raskol