

Zitierhinweis

Halperin, Charles J.: Rezension über: Jurij Vasil'evič Seleznev, Russkie knjaz'ja pri dvore chanov Zolotoj Ordy, Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "Lomonosov", 2017, in: Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas / jgo.e-reviews, JGO 66 (2018), 4, S. 682-684, <https://recensio-stag.lorax.syslab.com/r/f616d62aad774375be743433bfa4673c>



Franz Steiner Verlag

IM AUFTRAG DES
Leibniz-Instituts für Ost- und Südosteuropaforschung

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.

REZENSIONEN

JGO 66, 2018/4, 682–684

Jurij V. Seleznev

Russkie knjaz'ja pri dvore chanov Zolotoj Ordy

Moskva: Lomonosov, 2017. 265 S. ISBN: 978-5-91678-345-2.

In this well-researched and clearly written monograph Iurii Seleznev brings together material from his five previous books and numerous articles to demonstrate that the Rus' princes were indeed integrated into the social and political structure of the Juchid ulus (later called the "Golden Horde" by Muscovite book-men). During the 250 years of Tatar rule, the Rus' princes assimilated Tatar political culture. Although they might influence decisions in the Horde, they had no formal role in Horde decision-making. Therefore, in our terms, they were both insiders and outsiders in the Tatar world.

"Russkie kniaz'ia pri dvore khanov Zolotoi Ordy" consists of an "Introduction" (pp. 7–8); three chapters on Rus'-Horde relations (pp. 9–43), the ruling stratum (*stroj*) of the Juchid ulus (pp. 44–104), and the trips of the Rus' princes to the Horde (pp. 105–177); a "Conclusion" (pp. 178–183); book end-notes (pp. 184–217) without publication data; a list of sources and literature (pp. 218–262), which contains full citations; and a list of abbreviations (p. 263). The listed pagination in the "Table of Contents" is completely wrong. A color miniature of Rus' princes traveling to the Horde graces the cover, and Irina Tibilova has provided original black-and-white drawings of Tatars and Rus' in the form of marginal illustrations on every other page that adorn the text, a different combination of images for each chapter. However, despite Seleznev's scrupulous attention to geography, there are no maps.

Seleznev has gradually expanded the scope of his source base. Few sources survive from the Horde itself, primarily charters to the metropolitans of the Rus' Orthodox Church, but he continues to make good use of archeology, and Arabic and Persian sources. Here he makes much more use of translated Armenian and Georgian sources, the "Secret History of the Mongols," and later Turkic chronicles to extract comparative evidence to developments in the Juchid ulus and Rus' under Tatar rule to other Mongol successor states and sedentary subjects. All non-Rus' sources are utilized in Russian translations.

The Rus' chronicles in no uncertain terms ascribe to the khans the right to install Rus' princes on their thrones. The Rus' princes spent a considerable amount of their time traveling to and from the steppe to pay homage to the khans either in Sarai or the Horde's nomadic camp, which they visited at length. The Rus' princes performed military service at the command of the khans and continued to pay tribute to the khans even after the Horde had fragmented sufficiently that the khans could not control Rus' princely succession. Nevertheless, too much current Russian historiography presents the Rus' princes as if they were independent. In addition, although the chronology and trajectory of Tatar rule over Galicia-Volynia differed from that in Vladimir-Suzdalia, the outcome was the same.

Despite his scholarly understanding of the dynamics of Horde society and politics, Seleznev continues, albeit rarely, to label the Tatars "predators" (*zakhvatchiki*) (e.g. p. 10), a word not found in contemporary Rus' sources. He copiously quotes the original sources directly (not in modern

Russian translation) to substantiate his conclusions. His list of secondary works contains only selective publications in western languages, which he almost never cites in his actual notes.

Because I have already provided a detailed summary and critique of the contents of Seleznev's previous five books, from which the present monograph mostly borrows with light stylistic revisions ("Iu. V. Seleznev's Contribution to the Study of the Juchid ulus," in: *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie* 2[4] [2014], pp. 74–94), let me call attention here to some novel material in his new book.

Drawing upon two articles he co-authored with T. V. Zhdanova (which he modestly if confusingly ascribes only to her authorship in his bibliography), Seleznev illustrates how Rus' chroniclers wrote death notices, not full obituaries, of Horde rulers, signifying their importance to Rus' political interests, but omitted details found in obituaries of Rus' princes, such as the time of death and details of their burial, although for obvious political reasons the name of the khan's successor was habitually provided. Seleznev presents a largely convincing case that by writing that the khans "died" (*umre*) rather than "passed away" (*prestavit'sia*), as Rus' princes did, the chroniclers indicated that after death the khans were not going to the same place as the Rus' princes; as non-Orthodox Christians, they did not begin a life in heaven after leaving this world (pp. 22–28).

Recent historiography, including by Seleznev, has been paying increasing attention to the utilization of Christian modes of thought via scriptural language to describe Rus'-Tatar relations. In this book he finds evidence of the still nascent development of the concepts of the Babylonian captivity or Egyptian slavery of the Old Testament Hebrew people as metaphors for Tatar rule (pp. 13–14, 116–117).

Seleznev interpolates a discussion of the fascinating problem of the relationship between ethnic-, clan-, in general kinship-based authority within the Horde and "public" authority (*potestas*) from positions in its administrative structure (p. 48).

He has also added a sub-chapter on the relationship of the Chernigov and Turov-Pinsk princes to the khans (pp. 137–144).

Seleznev's fascinating discussion of the timing of Tatar executions of Rus' princes to take place when the moon was not visible has not appeared previously in his books. This was, obviously, a pre-Muslim Horde practice, mentioned by Shui Tin, a Song Chinese envoy to the Mongols in 1235–1236 under Kagan Ugedei (pp. 142–143).

Lack of evidence sometimes complicates analyzing how all-Mongol institutions found in the Mongol Empire and other successor states functioned in the Juchid ulus. Seleznev makes the intriguing suggestion that the "Court" (*dvor*) of the khans in Rus' chronicles was actually the Horde's version of the Imperial Guard (*keshig*) originally created by Chingis (p. 58). This question deserves further study.

At the same time, Seleznev presents some less persuasive conclusions. To ascribe unlimited authority to the khan but then observe that the khan had obligations he had to fulfill or some of his subjects would pack up and leave his realm (p. 54) seems *prima facie* contradictory. To extrapolate that the Juchid ulus could put 220,000 to 230,000 warriors in the field because each ulus-tuman (*t'ma*) could field 10,000 cavalry (p. 97) depends upon the Horde's ability to maintain such a troop strength over a long period, when, as I have mentioned before, we have reliable evidence that the Ilkhans could not do so; some tumans could mobilize far fewer than 10,000 troops. I am very skeptical of Plano Carpini's description of a case in which Batu supposedly imposed the levirate upon Rus' princes (pp. 139–140). These criticisms hardly impair the scholarly value of the monograph.

In conclusion, Iurii Seleznev's "Russkie kniaz'ia pri dvore khanov Zolotoi Ordy" demonstrates yet again that there is much more to be learned about the Juchid ulus and Rus'-Tatar relations, and much more that Seleznev has to teach us about this subject. Anyone interested in medieval Rus' history may read this monograph with great profit.

CHARLES J. HALPERIN

Bloomington, IN

JGO 66, 2018/4, 684–686

Thomas M. Bohn

Der Vampir. Ein europäischer Mythos

Köln, Weimar, Wien: Böhlau, 2016. 368 S., 20 Abb., 2 Ktn. ISBN: 978-3-412-50180-8.

„Gibt es Blutsauger wirklich und muss man Angst vor den Toten haben?“, fragt der an der Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen wirkende Osteuropahistoriker Thomas M. Bohn in der Einleitung seiner 2016 erschienenen Monographie. Mit dieser bewusst „kindlich“ formulierten Fragestellung nimmt er ironisch eine ganze Literatur- und Sachbuchgattung aufs Korn, die am Vampir-Mythos eher weiterschreibt statt ihn – wie sie meist vorgibt – zu dekonstruieren. Letztlich verlegt der Wissenschaftler seinen Schwerpunkt auf eine akademischere Fragestellung, indem er sich vornimmt, mehr über die „Ursprünge des Vampirglaubens“ zu erfahren und zu berichten (S. 9). Wichtig ist ihm dabei eine „Rückbindung dieses Phänomens an seinen historischen Ort“. Transsilvanien/Siebenbürgen spielt bei diesem Ansinnen – zu Recht – eine stark untergeordnete Rolle. Bohn konzentriert sich auf die Phase zwischen der „Entdeckung“ des Vampirs im 18. Jahrhundert bis zum Erscheinen des Stoker'schen *Dracula*-Romans im Jahr 1897. Das „Bild des Blutsaugers im lateinischen Abendland“ (S. 10) sieht Bohn in diesem Zusammenhang schon viel früher durch die Jahrhunderte und über den Kontinent geistern. Für ihn ist der Vampir insofern auch als europäischer Mythos zu rehabilitieren. Der Autor schöpft dabei aus dem Vollen: einerseits als ausgewiesener Osteuropa-Experte, andererseits als Mitherausgeber einschlägiger Editionen und Studien zum (vermeintlichen) *Dracula*-Rollenmodell, dem walachischen Fürsten Vlad III., dem Pfähler (*Corpus Draculianum. Dokumente und Chroniken zum walachischen Fürsten Vlad dem Pfähler 1448–1650. Bd. 3: Die Überlieferung aus dem Osmanischen Reich. Postbyzantinische und osmanische Autoren.* Hrsg. von Thomas M. Bohn / Albert Weber / Adrian Gheorghe. Wiesbaden 2013; *Vlad der Pfähler – Dracula. Tyrann oder Volkstribun?* Hrsg. von Thomas M. Bohn / Rayk Einax / Stefan Rohdewald. Wiesbaden 2017).

Im ersten Kapitel des Hauptteils stellt der Autor seinen Zugang zum Vampir-Mythos vor: In der ‚klassischen‘ Vampir-Definition – der Vampir als schädigender Untoter, der sein Grab verlässt, um das Blut der Lebenden zu saugen – kreuzten sich „bis heute Missverständnisse der Aufklärung mit Fehldeutungen der Romantik“, die zur Tradierung von negativen Klischees über das östliche Europa führten (S. 17). Bohn möchte das Phänomen als imperiale Kategorie verstanden wissen und sucht und findet den Vampir in den Übergangs- und Grauzonen der mittel- und osteuropäischen Großmächte bzw. dort, wo sprachliche, konfessionelle und kulturelle Einflusszonen aufeinander-