

Citation style

Korobeinikov, Aleksandr: Rezension über: Jan Arend (ed.), *Science and Empire in Eastern Europe. Imperial Russia and the Habsburg Monarchy in the 19th Century. Proceedings of the Annual Conference of Collegium Carolinum, Bad Wiessee, 5-8 November 2015*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2020, in: *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas / jgo.e-reviews*, JGO 70 (2022), 1-2, S. 224-227, <https://recensio-stag.lorax.syslab.com/r/ae354353fe06473f976197e276d87584>



Franz Steiner Verlag

IM AUFTRAG DES
Leibniz-Instituts für Ost- und Südosteuropaforschung

copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

in Constantine VII's *De administrando imperio*, despite the identification made by the early twentieth-century historian J. B. Bury and endorsed by scholars like Gottfried Schramm (*Altrußlands Anfang*. Freiburg 2002, pp. 393 f.). Dismissing the derivation of *Hólm* from Old Norse 'island' and *garðr* from Slavic *gorod*, 'town', Jackson asserts of bilingual placenames that "the second, word-building, element is of foreign origin (cf. Aldeigju-borg), but never vice versa" (p. 72). Whether or not this holds true of Rus', it is scarcely the case in the Viking world in general, as witness the so-called 'Grimston hybrids' and other compounds known from the British Isles (See, e.g. Gilian Fellows-Jensen: *Scandinavian placenames in the British Isles*, in: Stefan Brink / Neil Price (eds.): *The Viking World*. London 2008, pp. 391–400). Indeed, at one point (p. 75) Jackson seemingly accepts that the name *Hólmgarðr* may have followed the princely powerbase's shift to Novgorod (literally, 'New Town' in Slavic) from Riurikovo Gorodishche, the fortified town two kilometres to the south, looking onto Lake Il'men. This site is girted with waters of one sort or another and, in the words of its foremost excavator of the late 20th and early 21st century, its "insular character was far the most marked in spring, when the low-lying areas around it flooded and water lay in the meadows for a long time" (E. N. Nosov: *Novgorodskaja zemlia. Severnoe Priil'men'e i Povolkhov'e*, in: N. A. Makarov (ed.): *Rus' v IX-X vekakh. Arkheologicheskaja panorama*. Moscow, Vologda 2012, p. 108). Given that the spring-floods were peak-period for travel and shipping goods across the Eastern Lands, and that Riurikovo Gorodishche was the site of a major Nordic powerbase from no later than "the very beginning of the ninth century" (*ibid.*, p. 109), it could well have received the name 'Island-town' (*Hólmgarðr*) at an early stage. The views of our leading authority on Riurikovo Gorodishche should probably outweigh our author's dismissal of advocates of 'Island-town' as "perhaps not being familiar with the topography of the locality de visu" (p. 72, n. 2).

JONATHAN SHEPARD
Oxford

JGO 70, 2022/1–2, 224–227

Science and Empire in Eastern Europe. Imperial Russia and the Habsburg Monarchy in the 19th Century. Proceedings of the Annual Conference of Collegium Carolinum, Bad Wiessee, 5–8 November 2015

Ed. by Jan Arend. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2020. 334 S. = Bad Wiesseer Tagungen des Collegium Carolinum, 38. ISBN: 978-3-525-31074-8.

The *imperial turn* in modern historiography has had a significant impact on the development of new topics in the scholarship on the history of European continental empires. After the heyday of imperial studies, environmental history and the history of science occupied an important place in imperial historiography. The extent of recent developments in the history of science of the Russian and Habsburg empires is reflected in the collection of essays *Science and Empire in Eastern Europe: Imperial Russia and the Habsburg Monarchy in the 19th Century*. The book resulted from the annual convention of the Collegium Carolinum in 2015. It makes an important contribution to the analysis

of the relationship between the empire and science during the “long 19th century” and beyond in Central and Eastern Europe. Even though the research topic itself is not new, especially regarding the European maritime empires, what distinguishes this volume is its regional focus. The book deals mainly with the Russian and Habsburg empires, only partially touching on the German case and completely bypassing the Ottoman Empire, which leaves the comparative study of European continental empires for further research.

The thematic spectrum of the volume represents a wide and diverse range of fields and approaches to the study of the history of science and its interplay with empire. However, this variability does not always benefit the book, since some of its parts sometimes barely echo each other. The volume consists of seven parts each including one to three articles. It opens with an introductory part by JAN AREND, who carefully summarizes the recent historiography of the interrelationship between imperial order and the practice of science in western European empires and projects the further developments in this field, explaining how this volume fills a gap in studying the continental empires of Central and Eastern Europe. Arend addresses several important points that distinguish modern studies on the connections between science and empire. This includes, for instance, an examination of science as “a complex and multilayered social and cultural practice” (p. 5); reciprocal relations between science and empire in terms of knowledge production, practices of governing, and spaces for self-representation; careful attention to the imperial peripheries; the importance of continuous space in the context of continental empires, which allows us to see the separation between “own” and “foreign” as less prominent than in overseas empires (p. 6). The study of science in the context of imperial Russia and the Habsburg monarchy, as Arend emphasizes, demonstrates that despite the traditional perception of European continental empires as “non-modern” and the “decline narrative” (p. 11) applied to them, both overseas and land-based empires were similarly modern in terms of the relationship between science and empire in the 19th century. Moreover, some of the features of the science practiced in continental empires mirrored those in nation-states, a finding that prompted new perspectives in post-imperial studies. Ultimately, science and the various forms of imperial order, as well as their reciprocal relations, are the focus of the volume – how scientific practices appeared in the imperial context, and how science influenced the change of the imperial order in the 19th century – these and many other questions are explored in excellent essays of this volume.

The first two parts, “Learned Societies and Academies” and “Universities”, examine the interrelations between scientific associations, societies, and universities on the one hand and imperial institutions and actors on the other. MACIEJ JANOWSKI analyzes various scientific associations in partitioned Poland. Although the members of these associations performed important social tasks, held scientific discussions and speculated about the future of Poland, they had a minor impact on the intelligentsia because of a “civil society utopia” and the unrealistic expectations of the associations’ enthusiasts. The example of partitioned Poland demonstrates that the “scientific” nature of associations was not of decisive importance, unlike the social function and tasks performed by the intelligentsia in unfavorable political circumstances. JAN SURMAN applies a trans-imperial comparison to the history of science by looking at the Habsburg higher education system through the eyes of two foreigners, Ludwik Tęgoborski (a Polish diplomat from the Russian empire) and William Wilde (an Irish ophthalmologist and folklorist). While the opinions of Tęgoborski and Wilde on the higher education system offer valuable insights into the Habsburg intellectual culture,

they rather place the authors within the reform movements in the British and Russian Empire respectively. Although Tęgoborski and Wilde agreed on the backwardness of Habsburg's education system, their perspectives demonstrate different approaches to the intellectual culture of Austria: as an imperial bureaucrat of Russia interested in the stability of the monarchical rule in a multi-ethnic empire, Tęgoborski expressed extreme skepticism regarding the culturalized-nationalized rhetoric at Habsburg universities, whereas for Wilde, being a nationalist Irish subject of the British Empire, it was crucial to underline that the culturally privileged Germans were losing ground. The concluding part to this section is the essay by ANDREI ANDREEV on the generations of superintendents at Russian universities. Departing from the traditional historiography of superintendents as "reactionaries", Andreev rather considers them as mediators between empire and universities who were able to defend the interests of universities and professors. Acting as university supervisors, superintendents were responsible not only for regulating university life but also for ensuring the rights and freedoms of students and professors following the idea of the "classic" research university.

The next two parts, "Science on the Imperial Periphery" and "Oriental Studies", open the floor for a discussion on the peripheral and regional dimensions of science and its relation to empire. MATTHIAS GOLBECK's essay on Nikolai Fedorovich Petrovskii, an imperial Russian official in Turkestan, deals with the analysis of ego documents, particularly the correspondence of Petrovskii. It examines the self-description of an imperial Russian official and amateur researcher in the context of the Russian expansion in Central Asia. Even though Petrovskii's main activity was to maintain order and control in the regions of Turkestan, his love for ethnography and local culture helped him not only to show maneuverability in solving local problems but also to earn a name in the professional ethnographic community. The following articles describe different approaches to Oriental studies based on the examples of the Habsburg monarchy and imperial Russia. JOHANNES FEICHTINGER demonstrates that the history of Oriental studies has always been a complex phenomenon, and the Habsburg case of the 19th century with its proclaimed principle of separating *Orientalistik* as "pure" science from politics proves this point. ARPINE MANIERO gives another ambiguous example of how regional universities worked in close cooperation with imperial authorities in the context of comprehension of the Orient. Whereas the establishment of Oriental Studies in Russia was directly connected to the foreign policy and colonial interests of the empire, the ethnographic community at the same time created conditions for the involvement of the indigenous population of the empire in "European academic thinking" (p. 177). In this case, Oriental Studies in Russia were of use to both sides.

Part five "Political Geography and 'Landeskunde'" and part six "Criminology" can be grouped into a common theme of science and post-imperial legacy. Indeed, the role geography and criminal anthropology played in the post-imperial reordering of Central and Eastern Europe underlines the importance to study the imperial roots of these disciplines. Although PETER HASLINGER does not elaborate on the notion of the "post-imperial" *per se*, his study on national geopolitics in the Habsburg monarchy illustrates how geopolitical discourses affected national mobilization, growth of spatial ideas, and political initiative in Poland and Hungary. VOLKER ZIMMERMANN provides an interesting comparative exploration of Austro-Hungarian, German, and Russian criminology. Treating empire on its own terms with the proclaimed principle of diversity, as Zimmermann indicates, allows us to see that ethnic belonging was not always the main marker to fuel suspicion of committing criminal acts; also social, political, and more often economic factors were seen as

pertinent to explain crime. Still, in all imperial cases, attempts were made to prove that some ethnic groups showed a propensity for a certain type of crime, which, according to Zimmerman, testified to the broad discursive influence of colonialism.

The last part on “The Study of Natural resources” touches on the various aspects of natural science. Two essays by Jan Arend and DAVID MOON examine the role of imperial Russian soil science and its influence on global agro-industrial practices in the 20th century.

Science and Empire in Eastern Europe not only offers a great variety of excellent works on the history of science but also projects new ways of thinking about European continental empires and their impact on the scientific developments of imperial and post-imperial worlds. The focus on the relationship between empire and science exemplifies different levels of interaction between imperial institutions and scientific actors, indicates ambiguity in determining the role of science in the development of the imperial order and vice versa, and formulates new ways of studying and analyzing the scientific experience of the empire in the formation of the post-imperial spaces of central and eastern Europe.

ALEKSANDR KOROBENIKOV

Budapest/Wien

JGO 70, 2022/1–2, 227–229

John Connelly

From Peoples into Nations. A History of Eastern Europe

Princeton, Woodstock: Princeton University Press, 2020. VIII, 956 S. ISBN: 978-0-691-16712-1.

East Central Europe, John Connelly writes in his comprehensive political history, “is a space where more of the twentieth century happened – for good and for bad – than anywhere else on the planet” (p. 3). The main process he describes is the transformation of the vast region between the Baltic and Adriatic seas from a conglomerate of multicultural imperial borderlands into independent nation-states with relatively homogeneous populations. In Connelly’s opinion, this region was peculiar in that its nationalists were primarily motivated by the fear that their nation might be extinguished (p. 24). Nationalism, then, stands at the centre of his account.

While the treatment of “national questions” in the interwar and postwar periods is admirably nuanced, Connelly’s theses on nineteenth-century nationalism are more controversial. He rejects the conclusions of those historians who have argued that the Habsburg monarchy was more stable than previously assumed and that a majority of its inhabitants remained “nationally indifferent” or at least ambiguous until the First World War. His book tackles the main weakness of this school of thought: that it cannot always account for the enormous mobilisation that nationalists ultimately achieved. In this sense, the book has perhaps become even more topical since its publication: As Russia wages an imperialist war against Ukraine, the Ukrainian defence has rallied around the flag