

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

only in terms of a protest against the revision and correction of the service books. The history of the Raskol demonstrates that this was an utterly complex phenomenon in Russian religious life, the diverse ramifications of which it is impossible to deal with in this context" (p. 359). It is not exaggerating to assert that Professor Zenkovsky has accomplished the task outlined by Smolitsch.

This monumental study, introduced by a brief summary in English, undertakes to present in full the Russian schism of the seventeenth century. For this purpose the book has been subdivided into six parts which are devoted to the crisis of Muscovite civilization after the Time of Troubles; the attempt to bring about a religious and moral regeneration as pursued by the ecclesiastical party of the Zealots (*bogoliubtsy*); the period of the precarious success of this party at court, in church, and in society; the personality, activities, and discomfiture of Nikon; the ecclesiastical revolution and resistance movement (i.e., the Raskol proper); and finally the growth of the Old Believers' Church and its breaking up into several sectarian groups during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Zenkovsky's own research and narrative are based on the results of the scholarly investigations of predecessors such as Melnikov-Pechersky, Golubinsky, Kapterev, Platonov, Florovsky, Kartashov, Tschizewskij, and others. He, too, makes it abundantly clear that the so-called Nikonian reforms do not sufficiently explain such an elemental outburst of religious, national, and social passion as the Raskol was. He also understands it as a tragic manifestation of the thoroughgoing cultural crisis, in whose grip Muscovite seventeenth-century society found itself and to cope with which successfully and creatively the leaders of this society were prepared neither spiritually, morally, nor politically.

Zenkovsky, however, goes far beyond the findings of his predecessors by providing a much wider frame of reference for these tragic events. He takes great care to adduce well-documented evidence that the Muscovite crisis cannot be seen as isolated from what was going on in the non-Muscovite world. Western as well as Ukrainian influences in varying intensity, Protestantism in its various forms, especially as established in Poland-Lithuania, the Counter Reformation, diverse native sectarian trends and revivals, open or clandestine, of underground heretical movements (cf. the ominous role played by the hermit Kapiton and his followers)—all these tendencies of the age reverberated, often distortedly, in Muscovite society, contributing to the slow but inexorable disintegration of the Old Muscovite outlook, but also to the will to regenerate and defend it at all costs.

So what is given here is the entire historical background of the external as well as the internal development of church and society during this deeply troubled period. Occasionally the presentation, with its enormous historical perspectives, comprises the horizons of the entire cultural history not only of Muscovy but also the Ukraine and, selectively, Lithuania during the reign of the first Romanov rulers. In this context it must be stressed that Zenkovsky by no means neglects the political and social factors favoring the growth of the schism. Nevertheless he never allows himself to be trapped by the pitfall of easy reductionism—that is, the desire to explain a spiritual phenomenon by purely secular references. On the contrary, he never forgets that, with all the social and political factors militating for the schism, it was and remains a basically ideational and religious phenomenon.

In view of the vastness of the subject matter, the bibliography is necessarily restricted. Nevertheless, instead of the weak elaboration by Victoria Pleyel, for example, one would have preferred to see listed Rudolf Jagoditsch's *Leben des*

Protopopen Avvakum (Berlin, 1930), whose excellent introduction can still maintain its place alongside such standard works as Pascal's. It is questionable whether the origins of the sect called the Khristovshchina (also known under the names *Khlysty* and *Liudi bozhie*) can be traced to Western sources. The assumption of K. K. Grass, in his fundamental two-volume study *Die russischen Sekten* (Leipzig, 1907), that this religious group might be a curious survival of much older gnostic heresies such as the Messalians or Euchites has never been convincingly refuted. As far as the German mystical poet and enthusiast Quirinus Kuhlmann and his friend Konrad Nordermann are concerned (both of whom were burned at the stake in Moscow in 1689 as heretics), the thorough dissertation by Walter Dietze, *Quirinus Kuhlmann: Ketzer und Poet* (Berlin, 1963), must now be consulted, some ideological bias notwithstanding. Also the unfortunately lost voluminous study about Nikon by the German-Estonian church historian Baron von Stromberg, about which Robert Stupperich reported in detail in the *Zeitschrift für osteuropäische Geschichte* (vol. 9, 1935), could have been mentioned.

In spite of these desiderata there can be no doubt that Professor Zenkovsky's magnum opus will for many years to come be the authoritative presentation, and an eminently readable one at that, of this fascinating and tragic chapter in Russian religious, cultural, and social history.

HEINRICH A. STAMMLER
University of Kansas

THE SPIRITUAL REGULATION OF PETER THE GREAT. Translated and edited by *Alexander V. Muller*. Publications on Russia and Eastern Europe of the Institute for Comparative and Foreign Area Studies, no. 3. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1972. xxxviii, 150 pp. \$10.00.

The new constitution of the Russian Orthodox Church, as it appeared in the *Dukhovnyi Reglament* in 1721 and was put into force by an imperial manifesto, was for the outside world such a remarkable event that the text was translated very soon afterward into German (1724 and 1725) and English (1729). The present new English translation is based on the official text from the *Polnoe sobranie zakonov*. As the translator mentions (p. 85), he has corrected it in accordance with the manuscript published by P. V. Verkhovskoy in his monumental work, *Uchrezhdenie Dukhovnoi kollegii i Dukhovnyi reglament* (Rostov, 1916). The points at which such correction has occurred are not indicated. Peter's manifesto of January 25, 1721 (pp. 3-4), the oath taken by members of the Synod (pp. 5-6), the text of the law proper (pp. 7-56), and the supplements (pp. 57-84) are supplied. In general the translation is accurate. In texts of law, much depends on individual expressions. For example, is "Spiritual Regulation" the best translation? "Ecclesiastical" would conform better to the contents than "spiritual," in spite of the author's arguments against "ecclesiastical" (p. 86).

The translator provides an introduction (pp. ix-xxxviii) to the text, in which he wishes to be "as brief and clear as possible." The brevity is linked with a certain one-sidedness. The author speaks of a "college," mentioning only in a note (p. 94) that it was renamed "Synod" on the day it opened. The manifesto refers to *sobornoe pravitel'stvo*, which means more than "conciliar administration." *Ponezhe est' sobor* indicates that the ecclesiastical character of the institution needs to be stressed. In the reviewer's opinion the significance of the theologian and ecclesiastical official Feofan Prokopovich is not fully explained, because the transla-