

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

of the relatively slow growth of the densely settled, old farming areas of European Russia and the early migrational outflow to Novorossia, which shifted in the nineteenth century to an easterly movement toward the Lower Volga, Ural borderlands, and Siberia.

Among the shortcomings of this work are the absence of maps (which could have facilitated the analysis of the voluminous information), the lack of explicit demographic components of change, and the failure to apply numerical methods to the data. These weaknesses are minor compared to the contribution this work has made to the study of the historical population geography of Russia.

ROBERT N. TAAFFE
Indiana University

URAL I ZAPADNAIA SIBIR' V KONTSE XVI-NACHALE XVIII VEKA.

By *A. A. Preobrazhensky*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1972. 392 pp. 1.81 rubles.

The title does not accurately reflect the substance of this book, for as the author confesses in the conclusion, the work does not pretend to be a systematic study of the history of the Urals and Western Siberia in this period. Instead Preobrazhensky presents a series of six essays, uneven in size and scope, with themes as varied as the attachment of Western Siberia to Muscovy in the sixteenth century, the migration of peoples to the Urals and Western Siberia in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century, the search for "fugitives" in the Urals in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century, and the class struggle in the Urals and Western Siberia in the same period.

The main emphasis of the book is the lengthy fifth essay on the genesis of capitalism in the Urals and Western Siberia in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century. Preobrazhensky reiterates the thesis rejected at the June 1965 Soviet historical conference that the seventeenth century saw a "new period" in Russia in which the genesis of capitalism occurred. The conference has been discussed by Samuel Baron in "The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism in Russia: A Major Soviet Historical Controversy" (*American Historical Review*, June 1972, pp. 715-29). Preobrazhensky continues to reject the committee report of the conference and cites Lenin at length (pp. 214-25), as in 1965, to substantiate his viewpoint. Though the reviewer finds the interpretation of interest mainly as evidence that the 1965 debate continues, the author's claim to have obtained new archival materials is of greater interest to the Western reader. However, the author's "new" evidence in regard to private manufacturing on the eastern frontier is disappointing. His study examines the metallurgical plants of the Tumashev brothers in the seventeenth century and F. Molodoy in the early eighteenth century by reworking evidence used in his earlier work on this subject. The reviewer does not find that the author's archival sources refute criticisms of fellow Soviet historians such as N. I. Pavlenko in *Istoriia metallurgii v Rossii XVIII v.* (1962), who doubted that one isolated example of the Molodoy plant indicates the tie between peasant industry and manufacturing in the Urals in the seventeenth century, or in more recent criticism by E. I. Zaozerskaia that the author inflated the production figures of the Tumashev plant. Preobrazhensky had best return to the archives for further examples of the "new" phenomena in early capitalism in seventeenth-century Russia.

Preobrazhensky's discussion of the relations between the Russians and the