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eine interdisziplinäre Arbeit den wissenschaftlichen Ansprüchen der betroffenen Fachdisziplinen genügen. Dafür ist es unverzichtbar, den aktuellen Forschungsstand und die neuesten wissenschaftlichen Methoden zu kennen sowie die ältere Literatur nur als Historiographie zu verstehen.


JUKKA KORPELA
Joensuu


This collection of fifty-six short pieces, the longest thirteen pages and most ten pages or fewer, covers topics in Russian history and culture from the twelfth century to the post-Soviet era. Most are in Russian and the rest in English. Thirty-six authors are from Russia, fourteen from Hungary, with one or two each from five other countries. While some of the contributions address the stated theme of alternatives or turning points,
many of the others are microstudies of issues in particular regions and periods. Some pieces address neither historical nor cultural themes, like A. V. GEL’VIKH’S study of individualistic versus collectivist values in Russian socialist ideology, V. N. KRUGLOV’S analysis of administrative-territorial structures in the twentieth century, or RABEKAH EVERETT’S piece on partial reform equilibrium in the Gorbachev and Yeltsin eras. Everett’s article cites good sources but does not add anything new to them. Nor does MIKHAIL TURCHENKO’S description of changes in Russian region’s electoral systems, 2003–2013 or DYMTR GAFAROWSKI’S article on Russia’s role in post-Soviet common economic structures. E. V. BONDARIK’S discussion of the mass media in post-Soviet Russia, O. V. MOROZ’S description of the emergence of hate speech in recent years, and A. V. LANSKIKH’S piece on national stereotypes among young people on reality shows are really communication theory.

The best articles challenge previous historiography on important issues effectively, such as A. A. KALASHNIKOVA’S argument that changes in the Muscovite judicial system in the fifteenth and the first half of the sixteenth centuries were not just imposed top-down but also were shaped from below by the clergy, nobles, and peasants who appeared in court. E. V. BORODINA uses the implementation of Peter I’s judicial reforms, 1717–1727, to illustrate the transition from Muscovite to imperial rule. A. A. BOGDANOV draws upon a large number of official acts to describe the changes in the monetary system in the eighteenth century. ALEXANDRA MEDZIBRODSZKY places Sergei Bulgakov’s idea of progress clearly in the context both of his overall work and concepts of progress in broader Russian intellectual history. V. V. TIKHONOV portrays the tension between state authorities and humanities scholars at the end of the imperial period, and, similarly, R. R. GIL’MINTONOV shows convincingly the efforts of the editors of Krasnaia letopis’ to reconcile their academic standards with the demands of the new Bolshevik state to write scholarly history that still would follow the party line.

E. N. SMIRNOV aptly summarizes the continuing debate over historical memory in the new Russia, particularly how textbooks should treat the Soviet era. Smirnov cites Putin’s 2013 statement that it is necessary to show respect for all the pages of our past (p. 463) to underscore Putin’s insistence that a uniform and positive image of Russia’s history should be taught in schools. IA. A. LAZAREV questions both Ukrainian historians’ claim that Peter I destroyed Ukrainian national unity and Russian assertions that Ukraine then became an integral part of the empire. Instead, Lazarev shows that relations between the two nations were more complex than either historical school claims.

Some pieces portray real turning points, as SUHAJDA SZALBOLCS uses newspaper articles and county and national diet proceedings to show how Hungarian views of Russia changed after the 1830–1831 Polish uprising. E. D. BALGODETELVA demonstrates how the judicial reforms of 1864 led to a new sense of professionalism in the legal profession. COSMIN IONIȚĂ shows how Russian diplomacy towards the Balkans changed after the Balkan Wars of 1913–14, and A. V. KOCHЕVA and E. I. RABINOVICH
use local archival material and media sources to show how the state’s efforts succeeded in recruiting more women as industrial workers in the Urals during the 1930’s to meet the production needs of the First Five Year Plan. V. V. SHISHKOV traces the continuity in the power relationships between the center and periphery from the Russian Empire to the Russian Federation of today. Both concentrate authority in a leader. He quotes Ia. Plais, “the elite is monolithic and consolidated around one leader, the president, who expresses the interests of the political class” (p. 409).

Many of the articles, while not directly advancing the theme of alternatives and turning points, still are well researched and well-argued studies on specific topics. TAMÁS PÉDERI uses the Novgorod chronicles and key secondary sources to describe how medieval Novgorod waged war. D. A. BESSUDNOV analyzes the first campaign of the 1558–1583 Livonian War using material from Prussian archives. A. L. KLEITMAN uses novel sources, such as sermons and products of oral tradition, to describe the reaction to the Time of Troubles in the Lower Volga region. R. V. BOLDYREV discusses the Swedish tax system in occupied Novgorod, 1611–1615, and E. M. KONCHAKOVA describes the Swedish administration of the city at the time. E. V. SHMELEVA’s article on the lesser nobility in seventeenth-century Siberia builds on previous studies of the topic.

Other examples of articles on narrow, but carefully researched topics, are T. S. ROMANIUK’s description of Old Believer Cossack sketes in the Urals in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, M. A. SMIRNOVA’s depiction of Russian merchants’ views on Anglo-Russian commerce during the Napoleonic wars, and KATALIN SCHREK’s analysis of Count K. A. Lieven’s part in Anglo-Russian negotiations, 1825–1826. O. K. ERMAKOVA describes the impact imported German specialists had on the Russian community in the Urals in the first half of the nineteenth century. Other good microstudies are DMITRII BAKSHT’s article on the imperial gendarmerie in Eastern Siberia during World War I and YU. S. PYL’TSYN’s analysis of conflicting views among the Terek Cossacks during the Civil War. Similarly, AKOS FORIS describes Hungarian occupation forces’s complicity in the Holocaust in Western Ukraine during World War II, and V. L. MARYNENKO portrays Soviet repression of ethnic Germans in Ukraine, 1943–1945.

Some contributions, however, merely restate what can be found in other studies, sometimes cited and sometimes not. For example, M. A. KISELEV’s piece on the interregnum of 1730 uses some primary sources but adds little to the work of Philip Longworth and Marc Raeff. S. V. SOKOLOV describes the debate among eighteenth century Russian historians over the proper form of government, but this topic already has been treated effectively by scholars such as Marc Raeff and Cynthia Whittaker. Similarly, ORSOLYA SZANISZLÓ discusses noblewomen’s family obligations based on the memoirs of E. R. Dashkova and A. E. Labzina, but she adds nothing new to the studies she cites by scholars such as N. L. Pushkareva, Gary Marker, and Kyril Fitzlyon. ZSÓFIA MÉSZÁROS’s comparison of German and Russian nihilism has no original insights. One
microstudy, KATALIN VÁRADI’s analysis of Russian diplomacy concerning the 1863 Polish uprising as reflected in two satirical journals, one German and one Hungarian, spends too much time retelling the story of the uprising and claims that “[t]he Polish revolt is a marginal topic in Western historical literature” (p. 191). But there are extensive discussions of it, for example, in the works of R. E. Leslie, Norman Davies, Piotr Wandycz, and in The Cambridge History of Poland.

SZILVIA NAGY uses good sources for her article about Vera Zasulich, although she could have cited Jay Bergman, Leopold Haimson, and Barbara Engel, and the story she tells is well-known. Nor do the pieces by VLADISLAVA GAIDUK on the cultural debate over the protsekult and narkompros policies towards the theatre or GIOVANNI CADIOLI’s piece on Bukharin as an alternative to Stalin break new ground. Cadioli, however, is the only contributor to include a full bibliography.

ANTON RESHETOV cites articles from the Soviet press to demonstrate that it presented a very negative picture of Poland and its people during the 1939 invasion, but this is not a surprising conclusion. ESZTER JÓNI does not go beyond the studies she cites in her description of the 1944 Family Law and its impact on women. M. A. MIKHEEV provides a good summary of attempts in the late Stalinist period to increase industrial production in the Urals by exploiting available natural resources and does use some local primary sources but does not change our existing understanding of the topic. ROLAND GÁSPÁR’s discussion of the use of the Romanovs in debates over national identity in contemporary Russia is perfunctory and could have profited from the work of, for example, John Dunlop and Nicholas Riasanovsky. And he is wrong to claim that the image of Peter the Great is fading in contemporary Russia (p. 485). Witness the giant statue of Peter in a ship erected in 1997 in the Moscow River or his prominent role in the Sochi Olympic ceremonies. E. V. OKHOTNIKOVA’s history of the emergence of modern style in Russia at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries adds nothing beyond what several other studies, such as those by Catriona Kelly and W. Bruce Lincoln, neither of which is cited, already have described.

The articles in the separate section labelled “Cultural History” are for the most part competent microstudies: O. V. BUTKOVA on the concept of miracle and the miraculous in the art of the 1920’s, MÁTÉ UR on music in Tolstoi’s Kreutzer Sonata, D. I. OKHOTNIKOV on Blok, MARTINA MORABITO on the Orient in the works of Fedor Sologub, NATÁLIA CEGELNIK on Marina Tsvetaeva, MATHILDE POUPÉE’s description of the 1979 exhibit Paris-Moscow, 1900–1930, and ORSOLYA KIS on Mikhail Bakhtin and the carnivalesque. Okhotnikov does not cite studies on Aleksandr Blok by Avril Pyman or Robin Kemball, and Morabito could have used studies on Sologub by Diana Greene, Vassar Smith, and Murl Barker. Cegelnik could have cited biographies of Tsvetaeva by Simon Karlinsky, Viktoria Schweitzer, and Jane Taubman. Poupée needs more context for the political and cultural context of the Brezhnev era, and she is wrong to claim that there was a “long history of lasting friendship” between France and Russia starting with
Peter the Great (p. 553). Catherine II once called the French foreign minister, the Duc de Choiseul “the cursed enemy of my state and of my person” (Sergei M. Solov’ev: *Istoriia Rossii s drevneisikh vremen*. T. 14. Moskva 1965, p. 404), and what about the Napoleonic invasion of 1812?

In general, the articles in this collection are based on careful research, and, as noted above, some are more than microstudies and effectively challenge existing interpretations. There are grammatical and stylistic errors in some pieces in English by non-native speakers, and many of the articles are too short to do full justice to their topics. Also, many of the authors do not make adequate use of non-Hungarian and non-Russian sources. I applaud the organizers of the conference for providing this opportunity for young scholars to present their work and see it published.
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