

Zitierhinweis

Dunning, Chester S.: Rezension über: Dmitrij V. Lisejcev, Prikaznaja sistema Moskovskogo gosudarstva v epochu Smuty, Moskva-Tula: Grif i K, 2009, in: Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas / jgo.e-reviews, JGO 62 (2014), 1, S. 125-126, heruntergeladen über Website



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.

nat der Avaren nachzuweisen sind, bleibt ja auch unbestritten. Seine Berufung auf das Postulat, die gemeinsame slavische Religion sei ein Konstrukt (S. 166), ist kein Argument gegen die Plausibilität von Radoslav Katičićs Untersuchungen zu Parallelen in der vorchristlichen Sakraltopographie in Kroatien einerseits und im Raum der Ostslaven andererseits, vielmehr bilden die Befunde von Katičić ein gewichtiges Argument für eine nicht nur von außen zugeschriebene Einheit der Slaven. Um zu erklären, warum z. B. Adam von Bremen und, ihm folgend, Helmold von Bosau eine Völkertafel der Slaven kennen, müsste man, folgte man Curta und Dzino, entweder den Transfer von Buchwissen aus dem byzantinischen Raum bis an Weser und Elbe postulieren oder aber davon ausgehen, dass unabhängig voneinander zweimal genau dasselbe Verfahren der Zuschreibung erfolgt ist.

Es gereicht Dzino zum großen Verdienst, wie vollständig er die verschiedenen Forschungspositionen referiert. Gewiss hat er dabei Recht, dass die jeweiligen Positionen von den jeweils aktuellen geschichtspolitischen Interessen mitdiktiert sind. Die Heranziehung von „De administrando impe-

rio“ hat es im Sinne pro-jugoslawischer Orientierungen schon im späten 19. Jahrhundert leichter gemacht, in der frühmittelalterlichen Geschichte südslavische Gemeinsamkeiten zu entdecken; doch dadurch geraten die Glaubwürdigkeit der Quelle und der kognitive Befund nicht *a priori* in Zweifel. Unabhängig vom Anerkennen der Konstrukthaftigkeit des Textes und unter Berücksichtigung der Intentionen des Werkes ist es plausibel, in den Erzählungsvarianten dieser Quelle über die Kroaten einen gemeinsamen, stark verfremdeten Traditionskern zu erkennen, was ich, Radoslav Katičić folgend, auch für den Splitter Chronisten Thomas archidiaconus aus der Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts gelten lassen möchte.

Beim Stand der Dinge dürfte die Debatte zwischen „Migrationisten“ und „Autochthonisten“ in der Frage der Ethnogenese der Kroaten noch lange unentschieden bleiben, bzw. es wird nicht definitiv zu klären sein, welchen Anteil Wanderungsbewegungen an den Umbrüchen hatten. Dzino bietet uns eine hilfreiche, vor schnellen eindeutigen Antworten warnende Zwischenbilanz.

Ludwig Steindorff, Kiel

DMITRIJ V. LISEJCEV: Prikaznaja sistema Moskovskogo gosudarstva v epochu Smuty. Tula: Grif i K, 2009. 788 S. ISBN: 978-5-8125-1253-8.

At the dawn of the seventeenth century Russia endured a horrific "Time of Troubles", a chaotic period of political unrest, famine, assassination, civil war, and foreign military intervention that followed the extinction of the old ruling dynasty in 1598 and ended (more or less) with the establishment of a new dynasty by Tsar Mikhail Romanov in 1613. At the height of the Troubles many people doubted that Russia would survive as an independent country; for a while it seemed more likely that it would be conquered by Poland-Lithuania or Sweden. Russia did, of course, survive, and one of the main reasons was the survival and continued functioning of its central state bureaucracy staffed by dedicated, literate professionals. The development of early modern Russia's central government departments (*prikazy*) has long been an important subject of study, but the tasks facing anyone trying to trace the activities of Russian bureaucrats through the Time of Troubles are especially daunting. Surviving sources are scarce and widely scattered, and there are many gaps in them. The chaos

of the Troubles led – among other things – to the existence of two Russian governments for more than a year (in Moscow and Tushino), each with its own bureaucracy and bureaucrats. The Troubles also led to a two-year occupation of Moscow by Polish forces, resulting in a functioning pro-Polish bureaucracy and the inevitable emergence of an anti-Polish national liberation movement complete with its own *prikazy* staffed by capable *d'iaki* (secretaries). Indeed, Russian bureaucrats played many important roles in the Time of Troubles. In addition to helping the state survive, individual *d'iaki* occasionally demonstrated considerable courage, initiative, and personal agency rivalling that of any Russian lord.

The book under review here, by the historian Dmitrii Liseitsev, explains better than any previous study how the Russian central state bureaucracy functioned at the beginning of the seventeenth century and how it managed to survive the Time of Troubles scathed but remarkably intact, retaining the essential infrastructure for resuming Russia's rapid expansion under the Romanovs. Liseitsev's fine book is the result of many years of painstaking research. The first section of the book consists of a thorough review of the historiography of early

modern Russia's *prikaz* system. (Unfortunately, Liseitsev barely mentions relevant Western scholarship by Marshall Poe and Peter B. Brown.) The second section of the book consists of a detailed examination of the major sources for reconstructing the history of the Russian bureaucracy during the Time of Troubles. Here Liseitsev demonstrates deep familiarity with the sources, and he offers some very interesting observations. For example, in discussing "Pisanye zakony Rossii" (pp. 93–99), the author makes a plausible case for that curious work influencing the composition of Giles Fletcher's "Of the Russe Commonwealth" (1591). But Liseitsev goes too far in asserting (pp. 102–104) that the French captain Jacques Margeret's "Estat de L'Empire de Russie et Grande Duché de Moscovie" (1607) was influenced by Fletcher's controversial book. And there is not a shred of evidence that Margeret carried a copy of Fletcher's book with him when he departed France for a career in military service in Eastern Europe.

Liseitsev devotes considerable space to tracing the evolution of the various *prikazy* from the reign of Boris Godunov to Mikhail Romanov. Along the way, he describes in detail the somewhat arcane classifications and hierarchies within the bureaucracy and the changes that occurred in them over time. One of the real strengths of this book is how closely Liseitsev sticks to his sources and how keenly he examines surviving shards of evidence to draw reasonable conclusions about how the bureaucracy functioned and evolved under very stressful conditions. Of particular interest to this reviewer, Liseitsev discusses the generally positive (and normal) relationship between the controversial Tsar Dmitrii and his bureaucrats. The author makes good use of scholarship by Natalia Rybalko demonstrating that there was no wholesale turnover of personnel under Tsar Dmitrii; most bureau-

crats who worked for Boris Godunov continued to work for Dmitrii. Liseitsev quietly rejects the outdated idea that Tsar Dmitrii was overthrown by a popular uprising (pp. 468–469). The author devotes considerable attention to the military bureaucracy which was incredibly active during that era of civil war and foreign intervention. But Liseitsev is also careful to discuss all parts of the central state bureaucracy, including the *prikazy* associated with the new spiritual office of Patriarch. In addition to helping demystify the Time of Troubles, this somewhat dry material can be usefully mined to help chart the evolution of the state and church bureaucracy in the decades following the Troubles. Finally, I know of no better exploration of the status and activity of the *d'iaki* during Russia's nightmarish Time of Troubles than that contained in the last section of Liseitsev's book.

Appendix 1 contains concise biographies of many *d'iaki* who served in Russia's central state bureaucracy during the early seventeenth century. End notes allow the reader to trace in the sources the career(s) of specific bureaucrats. (Readers will also wish to consult NATALIIA RYBALKO: Rossiiskaia prikaznaia biurokratiia v Smutnoe vremia nachala XVII v. [Moskva 2011], which contains an exhaustive accounting of *d'iaki* serving during the Time of Troubles.) Appendix 2 lists all known *prikazy* (departments) that were in operation during the Time of Troubles and contains notes for tracing Russia's beleaguered bureaucracy during that chaotic period. A forty page bibliography and a very useful fifty page index end this monster of a book in which Liseitsev has made accessible to his readers a staggering amount of information and scholarship. This book is a major accomplishment and a very important contribution to our understanding of the confounding Time of Troubles.

Chester S. Dunning, College Station, TX

Der Krimkrieg als erster europäischer Medienkrieg. Hrsg. v. Georg Maag, Wolfram Pyta und Martin Windisch. Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2010. 282 S., Ill. = Kultur und Technik, 14. ISBN: 978-3-643-10633-7.

Die zwölf in dem Band versammelten Beiträge stammen aus einer gemeinsamen Tagung des Internationalen Zentrums für Kultur- und Technikforschung der Universität Stuttgart, der Université de Nancy und des Stuttgarter Institut Français von

2005. Ein mehrfach zitiertes Referenzwerk zum Thema ist die zehn Jahre alte Monographie des Kunsthistorikers ULRICH KELLER (The Ultimate Spectacle. A Visual History of the Crimean War. Amsterdam 2001), der selbst im umfangreichsten Beitrag des Bandes eine Kurzfassung seiner Ergebnisse liefert. Was den Krimkrieg zu einem „modernen Krieg“ gemacht habe, so Kellers These, sei die Verwendung der neuen Bildmedien (Photographie, Lithographie und Presseillustration), mit denen erstmals auch „breite Bevölkerungsschichten“ hät-