

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-

tor relies on outmoded literature. The interpretation advanced in 1913 by Kartashev, which is also included in Florovsky's *Puti russkago bogosloviia* (1937), is no longer defensible. The close analysis of the works of Feofan leads to different conclusions; compare the reviewer's *Staatsgedanke und Religionspolitik Peters des Grossen* (1936), his article "Feofans Prokopovičs theologische Bestrebungen" (*Kyrios*, 1937), his report to the International Historical Congress in Moscow in 1970, "Die kirchlichen Beziehungen zwischen West und Ost im Zeitalter Peters I," and Hans-Joachim Härtel, *Byzantinisches Erbe und Orthodoxie bei Feofan Prokopovič* (1970).

The translator has indeed taken care to consult the most important literature, but it is to be regretted that the newer literature on Feofan eluded his attention. The biographical data on him are insufficient. The characterization of his theological and denominational leanings is likewise subject to challenge. Feofan was an Orthodox bishop of the eighteenth century and as such was conscious of his position. He delimited himself from the Western confessions. The thesis that he based the Dukhovnyi Reglament on Protestant ecclesiastical ordinances remains unproved. The concepts of "college" and "consistory" in the Latin letter to Markovich (Epistula 20) prove nothing, especially since in it the "college" is characterized as *perpetua synodus gubernatrix*. Florovsky's conception of the Reglament as a program is accurate, though it requires amplification. It was intended to introduce a reform of the Russian Orthodox Church but no Reformation on the Protestant model. Peter, like Feofan, was thoroughly conscious of the primitive-church and Byzantine character of their church and wished to preserve this likeness.

If the contemporary history of Russian literature in modern times places Feofan Prokopovich at its inception and also values his ecclesiastical-political work highly, it characterizes him properly. Also for this reason it is important that the Dukhovnyi Reglament is available in English translation and generally accessible. To be sure, it demands an attentive, unprejudiced, and critical reader.

ROBERT STUPPERICH

Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster

IZMENENIIA V RAZMESHCHENII NASELENIIA ROSSII V XVIII-
PERVOI POLOVINE XIX V. (PO MATERIALAM REVIZII). By V. M.
Kabuzan. Moscow: "Nauka," 1971. 190 pp. 1.02 rubles.

Studies of population change in tsarist Russia have been impeded by the paucity of reliable information pertaining to the pre-Reform period. Although ten censuses were conducted between 1719 and 1858, only modest use was made of these archival data until relatively recent publications of Kabuzan evaluated this information and placed it in a comparable territorial-administrative framework. In effect, the current study is a statistical handbook of population change during this period with a commentary on the implications of the data. The book contains 141 pages of statistical tables showing male population by guberniias and raions, migrational balances, broad occupational and landowning categories, and urban population for the ten census periods. The author first presents these data in the national boundaries at each census and then provides similar coverage for the entire period within the boundaries that existed in 1721, and also the latter part of the eighteenth century, in order to isolate natural population growth from gains through territorial acquisitions. The major substantive contribution, however, is the documentation