that a scholar of his caliber expended much erudition and effort for a very modest reward.

ROBERT O. CRUMMEY
University of California, Davis

IVAN GROZNYJ IM SPIEGEL DER AUSLÄNDISCHEN DRUCKSCHRIFTEN SEINER ZEIT: EIN BEITRAG ZUR GESCHICHTE DES WESTLICHEN RUSSLANDBILDES. By *Andreas Kappeler*. Geist und Werk der Zeiten: Arbeiten aus dem Hist. Seminar der Universität Zürich, no. 33. Bern: Herbert Lang. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1972. 298 pp. sFr. 44, paper.

Andreas Kappeler is primarily concerned with describing the image of Ivan IV Groznyi created in the sixteenth-century continental European printed pamphlets and books dealing with Muscovy, works that provide facts not found in other sources and that had a significant influence on subsequent perceptions of the tsar in the West and in Russia itself. A second aim of the author is to describe and analyze the most important items of such Western *Rossica*, since they have not been studied in their entirety and are in most cases extremely rare today. Kappeler's book will be valuable both as a reference guide to this literature—the coverage seems to be exhaustive—and as a stimulus to further research.

Given his stated aims, there are a number of things the author probably should have done, although in the process it would have meant writing a much longer book. The most important criticisms of Kappeler's work have been detailed by A. L. Goldberg (in *Istoriia SSSR*, 1973, no. 5, pp. 209–11). For one thing, the book's value as a reference guide is somewhat diminished because Kappeler fails to indicate in sufficient detail the dependence of one author's work on another's, or the relation of one edition of a pamphlet to the other editions of the same. Establishing what was the original, unedited version is significant if such publications are to be used as sources. A second failing of the book is that the author avoids evaluating the historicity of the material in the publications he analyzes and describes. Although it is interesting to know the image that Ivan's Western contemporaries had of him, by itself this image does the modern historian little good. Kappeler does indicate where it may have influenced political decisions in the West, but too infrequently does he tell us when one or another item of information is unique, apparently accurate, or the like. Obviously his painstaking research has led him to do much of the necessary comparison of the Western sources with Russian ones to establish the veracity of the former, but too few of the results of such comparison appear in the book.

Among the numerous interesting observations which Kappeler makes is that sixteenth-century *Turcica*, that extraordinarily abundant Western literature about the Ottomans, clearly influenced the contemporary *Rossica*. One wishes that the author had elaborated on this point to indicate precisely how much of the image of Ivan may have derived from the image of the sultan or a more generalized view of any ruler of a "rude and barbarous kingdom."

The very important question of precisely how the sixteenth-century image of Ivan influenced subsequent historiography and popular conceptions has been left by the author for further study, which one hopes he will pursue.

DANIEL CLARKE WAUGH
University of Washington