

Zitierhinweis

Scheliha, Wolfram von: review of: Boris N. Florja (ed.), Belorussija i Ukraina. Istorija i kul'tura. 5: Sbornik stat'ej, Moskva: Inslav RAN, 2015, in: Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas / jgo.e-reviews, jgo.e-reviews 2018, 2, p. 24-27,
<https://www.recensio.net/r/f704513ef8634e99927cdd7a989234d2>

First published: Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas / jgo.e-reviews, jgo.e-reviews 2018, 2

**Jahrbücher für
Geschichte
Osteuropas**



copyright

Dieser Beitrag kann vom Nutzer zu eigenen nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken heruntergeladen und/oder ausgedruckt werden. Darüber hinausgehende Nutzungen sind ohne weitere Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber nur im Rahmen der gesetzlichen Schrankenbestimmungen (§§ 44a-63a UrhG) zulässig.

grundlegend umzudenken. Die vorgeschlagene, aus der Naturwissenschaft entlehnte, Metapher hier von einer Breccie zu sprechen, wo trotz ‚Verbackung‘ der einzelnen Elemente zu einem neuen Ganzen letztere doch unterscheidbar bleiben, kann man durchaus einiges abgewinnen. Es lädt zumindest zum Nachdenken über imperiale Inklusionskonzeptionen (bzw. deren Weiterwirken, etwa am Beispiel innerstädtischer Phantomgrenzen) ein.

Trotz der heterogenen Ansätze im Einzelnen und den verständlichen methodischen wie analytischen Schwierigkeiten des angestrebten raumzeitlichen Vergleichs ist hier ein ansehnlicher Beitrag zur Diskussion von Phantomgrenzen und der sozialen Raumproduktion gelungen. Bezeichnend für alle Beiträge ist dabei nicht allein der Versuch, entlang eines gemeinsamen Forschungskonzeptes zu arbeiten, um dadurch die vorhandenen Theorien (erfolgreich) zu präzisieren. Vielmehr liegt ein zentraler Zugang zu den behandelten Themen in der den Autorinnen und Autoren jeweils eigenen Sozialisierung begründet. Erst eine bewusst genutzte Zwei- oder Mehrsprachigkeit erlauben es, solchen Phänomenen, die oftmals nur auf sehr subtile Weise in der Gesellschaft aufzuspüren sind, nachzustellen und sie für eine weitere wissenschaftliche Diskussion sichtbar zu machen. Die Grunddisposition des Untersuchten ist gewissermaßen durch den sprachlich-kulturellen Hintergrund der Schreibenden vorcodiert. Insgesamt sind sowohl der vorliegende Band wie auch der in gleichem Maße dadurch dokumentierte übergeordnete Forschungsansatz selbst Ausdruck und zugleich Substrat einer Gesellschaft, die sich offensichtlich aufgemacht hat, die Nationalstaatskonzeptionen des 19. Jahrhunderts abzuschütteln.

KURT SCHARR

Innsbruck

Belorussija i Ukraina. Istorija i kul'tura

Vyp. 5: Sbornik stat'ej. Gl. red. B. N. Florja. Moskva: Inslav RAN, 2015. 539 S. ISBN: 978-5-7576-0334-6.

The book under review is the fifth volume of a series on Belorussian and Ukrainian history and culture that started under the umbrella of the Russian Academy of Science in 2003. It was originally designated as a yearbook, but after the publication of the third volume in 2005/06 it took five years until the release of the fourth in 2011, and another four years to the appearance of this fifth volume. Editor-in-chief is the distinguished historian Boris Floria who turned 80 in December 2017. Authors come from Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldavia; all contributions are written in Russian.

The volume comprises 16 articles and four book reviews. Although Floria is specialized in Medieval and Early Modern history, only three contributions are devoted to these periods, three other focus on the imperial and ten on the early Soviet period of the 1920s and 1930s.

The only text on the middle ages is authored by Vladimir Fenich from Uzhhorod. He examines the origin of the uniate Bishopric of Mukachevo, the spiritual center of the Rusyns in that time, which does not seem to have been subordinated to any metropolitan see. It was therefore characterized as “monastery see” for the leading role of Saint Nicolas Monastery in the vicinity of Mukachevo. By examining a broad range of sources Fenich unfolds the extraordinary character of the see. Its flock was composed by various ethnicities (Rusyns, Hungarians, Slovaks, and Rumanians), it did not share a common language, and its secular ruler was a Catholic. Floria, in his contribution, analyzes Samoilo Velychko’s chronicle (composed between 1719 and 1725) with regard to how he depicts the Ukrainian elite of the seventeenth century. Mariia Makhan’ko demonstrates how Ukrainian art and Ukrainian artists heavily influenced church art in the metropolitan see of Kazan’ starting in the second half of the seventeenth century until the 1770s.

Turning to the imperial period, Klimentii Fedevich raises an interesting, but highly controversial issue. According to him, Monarchist and Black Hundreds movements in Ukraine substantially contributed to the evolution of the Ukrainian national movement and to the broad support of independent Ukraine in 1917–18. While Russian ultra-nationalist Black Hundreds are usually considered to have been strictly hostile to Ukrainian nationalism and even denying the existence of a Ukrainian nationality, Fedevich argues that the Church, Monarchists and eventually the Black Hundreds for fear of Polish nationalism promoted historical instances of anti-Polish and pro-Russian, anti-Catholic and pro-Orthodox Ukrainian movements like the Cossack insurgence in the seventeenth century especially in Western Volhynia, thus strengthening the Ukrainian national identity especially among the rural population. He also claims a strong personal, conceptual, and organizational continuity between the Ukrainian Black Hundreds and the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA).

A local historical study on the district (*uezd*) of Khotin in the Governorate Bessarabia, now split up between Ukraine and Moldova, is presented by Moldavian historian Marius Tăriță. He focusses on the demographics between 1812 and 1918 and gives lots of additional material in annexes. Pavlo Gai-Nyzhnyk, on the other hand, provides for a biographical sketch of Igor Kistiakivs’kyi who was Minister of the Interior in independent Ukraine in 1918. In a short article, Aleksandr Shubin examines the role of the interethnic relations in Aleksandrovskii district in the Azov region during the rule of the anarchist Nestor Makhno in the Civil War. However, Shubin tends to whitewash and idealize the Makhno-movement by claiming that the assaults on German and Menonite settlers (he doesn’t mention these explicitly) were mainly related to the German occupation of the district in 1918 and that the Makhnovtsy built upon a broad grass root movement of

workers and peasants to establish a self-administrated socialist society, and that they received the support of left-wing Social Revolutionaries. All this, according to Shubin, furthered internationalist ideas that were opposed to the Whites, to Ukrainian Nationalism, and to Bolshevism.

The next two articles deal with military history. Based on archival material, Andrei Ganin outlines how the personnel for the new general staff of independent Ukraine was trained during the civil war and later in Polish exile until 1924. Irina Mikhutina particularizes the first weeks of the 1920 campaign in the Polish-Soviet war when Polish troops successfully took Kyiv.

Topic and method of Timur Kalychenko, a Kyiv-based specialist on economy, are completely different. He gives short biographical sketches of five right-wing Ukrainian clergy who went into exile after the Revolution, namely Fedor Sin'kevich (1878–1946), Grigorii Prozorov (1864–1942), Mikhail Stel'mashenko (1868–1925), and Timofei Liashchenko. Unfortunately, the author provides only very few references. Based on sources from the Brest Provincial Archives, Belarusian historian Aleksandr Babishchevich analyzes the cultural work of the Ukrainian society *Prosvita* (enlightenment) among the Ukrainian population in the Polish Polesie Voivodeship between 1918 and 1939. Naturally, these activities were met with suspicion by Polish authorities and they aimed to prevent a collaboration of the various non-Polish national movements. As Babishchevich shows, Polish apprehensions were well founded. Even Komintern and the Communist Party of Soviet Ukraine supported *Prosvita* with significant funds.

Józef Pilsudski's policy toward the Belarusian national movement is explored by Gennadi Dedurin. He argues that the Polish president viewed Belarusians as potential allies in the Polish struggle for independence and therefore supported their cause. But Dedurin calls this support “general phrases” and “personal promises”, since archival documents do not substantiate the existence of concrete plans.

The development of academic institutions in Soviet Belorussia is detailed by Mikhail Robinson at the example of Belarusian linguistics. Robinson exploits a vast amount of archival material and describes the foundation of the Belarusian Academy of Science with the support of Russian scholars, the difficulties to recruit qualified academics and the repressions starting in the end of the 1920s following Stalin's shift in his policy toward non-Russian nationalities. Tat'iana Khlynina and Igor' Visil'ev tell a similar story about the Ukrainization in the Kuban region as part of the *korenizatsiia* policy in the 1920s. Konstantin Kutsov, on the other hand, takes up Rusyn history and examines the activity of the Union of Sub-Carpathian Students in Czechoslovakia between 1928 and 1939.

Probably the most controversial piece in this volume is Konstantin Ivangorodskii's review article about the “ethnic history of the East Slavs in the pre-Mongolian period in contemporary” Ukrainian research. Ivangorodskii is affiliated to the chair of Ukrainian history at Khmel'nyts'kyi University in Cherkassy. On more than 40 pages, he discusses various attempts by Ukrainian scholars to prove the existence of a Ukrainian ethnicity

independent from Norman influences and from a postulated common East Slavic ethnicity. While Ivangorodskii gives the appearance of being impartial toward the Ukrainian, Belarusian and Russian national historiographies, his overall conclusions are devastating as he generally attests Ukrainian scholars a “weak methodological-theoretical basis”. But since he does not detail which specific method or theory would help to solve the problem of Early East Slavic ethnicity, his verdict seems somewhat weak itself.

To sum up, this volume offers a wide range of in some cases highly specialized articles covering many regions of Belarus and Ukraine. Readers interested in a discussion of international historiography will hardly be satisfied with most chapters. But scholars with particular research interests may appreciate the presentation of new archival sources.

WOLFRAM VON SCHELIHA

Leipzig

Konkurrierende Ordnungen. Verschränkungen von Religion, Staat und Nation in Ostmitteleuropa vom 16. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert

Hrsg. von Johannes Gleixner, Laura Hölzlwimmer, Christian Preusse und Damien Tricoire. München, Berlin, Leipzig [usw.]: Biblion Media, 2015. 291 S. = DigiOst, 2. ISBN: 978-3-86688-502-8.

Die vorliegende Aufsatzsammlung ist das Ergebnis einer internationalen Tagung an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (LMU), die von Studierenden des Studiengangs Osteuropastudien (LMU München und Universität Regensburg) organisiert wurde (der Veranstaltungszeitraum wird leider nicht genannt). Dem einleitenden Text von den Herausgebern und der Herausgeberin („Religiös-politische Ordnungen in Ostmitteleuropa vom 16. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert“), in dem neben den Leitfragen des Sammelbandes u.a. ein Überblick zur Religionsgeschichte der letzten 30 Jahre gegeben wird, folgt ein eröffnender Beitrag von HANS-JÜRGEN BÖMELBURG („Katholische Konfessionskulturen in Polen: Ein Vergleich von Ordnungsvorstellungen in der zweiten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts [1648–1721] und der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts [1848–1921]“). In seinem interepochalen und asymmetrischen Vergleich zeichnet er die Parallelen wie Differenzen zwischen den katholischen polnisch-nationalen Deutungsmustern und Ordnungsvorstellungen um 1700 und 1900 nach. So habe „einer frühneuzeitlichen Spätkonfessionalisierung der Eliten [...] in der Moderne in Polen eine betont volkskirchliche Reorganisation unter Umgehung der legalistischen höheren Geistlichkeit“ gegenübergestanden, „wodurch ein neuer Kirchlichkeitsstil durchgesetzt“ worden sei (S. 38).