

that one of the links between the old and new political police is the lessons that Lenin and Dzerzhinsky, as experienced quarries of the Okhrana, passed on to the Cheka. On a broader scale of analysis, however, Hingley is less persuasive, citing the old explanation of Russian autocracy as a reaction to the size and diversity of the empire. But through several centuries the use of the secret police against the Great Russian core of the population has greatly outweighed its application to national minorities or in Siberian Russian life. Hingley's own narrative seems to sustain the conclusion that this institution was developed at the center as a reaction to problems right there, such as the Decembrist uprising, and was only later extended in any strength to the periphery.

The problem is complicated because Hingley is far from wishing to assert that the continuity of police repression is fairly steady over the past hundred years. He is sharply anti-Communist, and is at pains to show how much more limited, and often humane, tsarist political police action was, compared to Soviet. He sees the Russian Revolution as a basic interruption of historical continuity, and the zest and penetration of the book increases appreciably after this point. The problem of Russian continuity and Soviet peculiarity remains far from settled at the end.

If *The Russian Secret Police* is stronger on narrative than analysis, the chief events associated with this institution are well told: the Third Section against the intellectuals, the struggle with the *narodnik* terrorists, the careers of Zubatov, Azef, and Malinovsky, the rise of the Cheka, the Great Purges, the fate of Beria, and finally the repression of the contemporary intellectuals. Hingley has read the secondary literature judiciously, but one may differ with him on this or that point. Has he given enough attention to recent Soviet research, based on newly discovered archival materials, concerning the assassination of Stolypin? Is it really clear that the Seventeenth Party Congress demoted Stalin from command of the secretariat? Can we accept without query Orlov's lurid account of K. V. Pauker's re-enactment of the execution of Zinoviev? Does not Svetlana Alliluyeva's reference to her father's anxiety when she was once alone with Beria support the rumors (evidently unknown to her) that the police chief indulged a Lolita complex? Hingley's suggestion that Stalin was worried about a political plot using Svetlana as a hostage seems farfetched. In citing the glorification of the Cheka and Dzerzhinsky on the fiftieth anniversary of the Revolution, Hingley seems unaware that this process had started on a large scale in the early sixties, evidently to counteract "unhealthy" interpretations of the anti-Stalin campaign.

Opinions are bound to differ about many problems in the history of such a covert institution. Taken as a whole, this is a competent account and a welcome addition to the growing list of surveys of selected themes in Russian history.

ROBERT H. MCNEAL

*University of Massachusetts at Amherst*

THE CHURCH REFORM OF PETER THE GREAT. By *James Cracraft*.  
Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1971. xii, 336 pp. \$13.50.

This work traces Peter the Great's ecclesiastical reforms from their inception at the close of the seventeenth century to the end of his reign in 1725. Biographical sketches of Peter and Feofan Prokopovich draw attention to their place within

the broader perspective of contemporary European trends. The second chapter deals briefly with the general Russian setting from 1649 to 1721. Chapters 3 and 4 examine the church reform itself, describe the extinction of residual patriarchal institutions, and survey the evolution of the newly formed Synod. The final two chapters summarize the effects of the reform on the clergy and on education.

The main strength of this work lies in its plan for painstaking adherence to the sources. However, the author's gathering of his documentation has been more effective than his use of it, as evidenced by the following partial cross section of deficiencies involving misdating, mistranslation, and misinterpretation.

Through uncritical acceptance of a source, an erroneous date is given to the meeting between Adrian and Peter (pp. 24, 65, 128). Also incorrect are the month in the decree of "May" 1719 (pp. 161–62) and the year in which the percentage estimate of households was made (p. 84). Two dates, January and February 1716, are ascribed to one and the same decree (p. 133), while the date for the final Synodal order authorizing publication of the *Dukhovnyi reglament* and its Supplement is omitted altogether (p. 235).

Mistranslations erroneously enlarge the inmate population of Moscow almshouses (p. 91) and add a new signatory, "Ioan" (instead of *Iona*), to the *Dukhovnyi reglament* (p. 159). Notwithstanding the author's assurances otherwise, *zhalovan'e* should still be translated "salary" (p. 161), and the document that he calls in one place "a written instruction to the Synod" (p. 259) and in another "a note to the Synod" (p. 269) turns out to be in fact neither of these.

Major documents are misinterpreted, as with Patriarch Adrian's "instruction" (p. 96), the ukase of September 1722 (p. 260), and Prokopovich's essay, *Rozysk istoricheskii* (p. 60). The decrees of 1698 (p. 85, n. 2) and 1694 (p. 97) are made out to have been more broadly applicable than they really were, while functions sufficiently extensive are not attributed to Petrine fiscals (p. 138). There is a discrepancy between the author's version of the signing of the *Dukhovnyi reglament* and the sequence of signatures as they appear in the printed sources (p. 160), and inaccuracies mar the description of the cases involving Tveritinov (pp. 132–33) and Varlaam of Irkutsk (p. 140). Too peremptory is the author's rejection of Runkevich's suggested *terminus a quo* for the Petrine church reform (p. 86).

Contrary to the author's assertions, the series of charters by which the church was guaranteed administrative autonomy and jurisdiction did not originate in Mongol times (p. 100), the titles by which Iavorsky became known ("exarch," etc.) were not attributed to him by "later authorities" only (p. 115), Boltin did not receive three hundred rubles as a "bonus" (p. 177), and the tragic massacre of Jews in 1648 cannot be ascribed to "Russian [Muscovite] authorities" (p. 71).

The Petrine ecclesiastical reform badly needs a solid and reliable documentary exposition in English, such as this one, with revision, can still become.

ALEXANDER V. MÜLLER  
San Fernando Valley State College

RUSSIA SINCE 1801: THE MAKING OF A NEW SOCIETY. By Edward C. Thaden. New York, London, Sydney, Toronto: John Wiley and Sons, 1971. xii, 682 pp. \$10.95.

The author proposes "to depict modern Russian history in the perspective afforded by the economic, social, cultural, and intellectual forces that have transformed