

Citation style

Goldfrank, David: Rezension über: Vladislav Dmitrievič Nazarov (ed.), *Predstavitel'nye instituty v Rossii v kontekste evropejskoj istorii XV-seredina XVII v.*, Moskva: Drevlechranišče, 2017, in: *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* / jgo.e-reviews, jgo.e-reviews 2019, 1, S. 65-69, <https://recensio-stag.lorax.syslab.com/r/e4228884f37c452a8502c9195140a997>



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).

bis zu Todesanzeigen in Belgrader Tageszeitungen – doch recht heterogen ausfiel. Soviel sei allerdings gesagt: Das Material wurde treffend gewählt und bietet trotz oder gerade wegen des oft sehr düsteren Inhalts eine lesenswerte Lektüre. In diesem Sinne kann ich „Велики пат – Der große Krieg“ jedem an der Thematik Interessierten nur ans Herz legen und dem Buch eine große Verbreitung und positive Resonanz wünschen.

JEREMIAS D. SCHMIDT
Regensburg

Predstavitel'nye instituty v Rossii v kontekste evropejskoj istorii XV – seredina XVII v.

[Repräsentative Organe in Russland im Kontext der europäischen Geschichte (15. – Mitte 17. Jahrhundert)]

Sost. Vladislav D. Nazarov. Moskva: Drevlechranišče, 2017. 315 S., Tab. ISBN: 978-5-93646-299-3.

In October 2013, the German Historical Institute in Moscow and the Institute of Universal History of the Russian Academy of Sciences held a conference devoted to the late medieval and early modern representative institutions of Russia and the rest of Europe. Of the 52 abstract submitters (two of them not on the program), five came from Western and Central Europe (one originally from Belarus), one each from Belarus and Ukraine, and the other 45 from Russia, mostly Moscow. Two contributions concerned theory and terminology, one covered Europe in general, 12 covered the majority of Europe to the west of Poland, four covered Lithuanian Rus', and one the entire region of the Livonian War. Of the contributions on Russia, three focused on the period before the *Smuty* (Time of Troubles – understood as the period from 1598 to 1619), four on the time after the *Smuty*, three partially addressed the *Smuty*, and 21 concentrated solely on the *Smuty*, including two based on foreign reports and 13 on specific regions. Thus, the conference's three main areas of focus were the variety of late medieval and early modern European experiences, the *Smuty*, and Russia's early modern regional history.

Unfortunately, only 28 of the presentations were published in the volume under review, though all of the extended abstracts or *tezisy* – most with footnotes – are found in the 200-page conference book (*Soslovnoe predstavitel'stvo v Rossii v kontekste evropejskoj istorii [vtoraja polovina XVI – seredina XVII vv.] [...]. Tezisy dokladov*. [Corporative representation in Russia in the context of European history (second half of the 16th century to the mid-17th century) (...). Abstracts of lectures.] Moskva 2013). Among the

24 missing items, seven are relevant in terms of providing a comparative perspective on the Russian experience, including those on the territory of the Livonian War, the late Tudor succession issue, the Navahrudak *seimiki* (dietines) from 1598 to 1613, the 17th century Holy Roman Empire, 17th century Spanish and French ecclesiastical taxes, and the workings of the 16th–17th century Hungarian Diet. Also absent from the volume are the articles on Sibir’ and the Middle Volga region, one on Vladimir, one on the southern districts of Russia, two on Nizhnii Novgorod during the *Smuty*, and one on the interplay between the state and local *zemskie miry* (land assemblies) during Vasilij Shuiskii’s reign (1606–10).

In lieu of a substantial framing introduction, the volume’s first four essays present contrasting approaches, which help the reader to place the subsequent information and analysis of Russia’s institutions within a European context. NINA A. KHACHATURIAN’s comparisons cover a wide range of perspectives arguing that the representative institutions had both variety and individuality, which both fostered and obstructed modernization via consolidation and particularism. The volume’s lone and contrarian attempt to generate *Begriffsgeschichte*, MIKHAIL A. BOITSOV explores and debunks the entire notion of medieval *soslovno-predstavitel’nye instituty* (corporative-representative institutions), which was actually developed by late-Imperial liberal scholars. He claims instead that the deputies may have assembled before general sessions in the form of “houses”, “chambers”, or “curias”, but they still represented particular entities, and the very notion of *soslovie* (estate) representation did not exist in medieval or early modern Europe. For ARNO STROHMEYER, however, *Stände* or estates stand at the core of the early modern Habsburg institutions, which he depicts as not only part of opposition movements in the four crown lands under scrutiny, but also emerging as sovereign in the Dutch States General. His concluding focus on political contractual theory and practice across Europe invites us to draw an analogy with the never mentioned Ukrainian Hetmanate, if not with Russia. However, SERGEI E. FEDOROV’s generalizing description of England’s bicameral parliamentary system and the systems in Scandinavia and Eastern Europe (neither of which have a Roman legacy), which he contrasts with *soslovie* (estate) systems elsewhere in Europe, is unconvincing. The volume’s only other West European contribution by CORNELIA SOLDAT brings into play the four extant German printed *Flugschriften* about Russia issued in 1595, 1606, 1610, and 1614, and she notes that three of these marketed informative and disinformative propagandistic leaflets mentioned a royal council of sorts.

The volume’s four Russian contributions on different Western European phenomena are thoroughly researched and soundly reasoned. Basing her contribution heavily on archival and printed original sources, ANNA A. ANISIMOVA carefully reconstructs the 14th–15th century use of appeals to Parliament by the elites of what later became Plymouth in the acquisition of full borough rights for this rising port on lands formerly under the control of the chief of the local abbey and secular manor.

ANNA A. MAIZLISH focuses on the 14th–15th centuries, analyzing the interplay between rival Burgundian and Imperial dynastic ambitions and regional estates, especially Flanders and Brabant, in the process of the founding of the Netherlands States General. SUSANNA K. TSATUROVA analyzes the interface between the French Estates General and the Parlement de Paris in the 14th–16th centuries, and describes how the latter came to see itself both as representing French society and as the guardian of monarchical legitimacy, and even exercised state power in the early 1400s, a period analogous to Russia's *Smuty*. Finally, a historiographical review by ANASTASHIA A. PALAMARCHUK depicts the specifics of late medieval–16th century Scotland's unicameral but three-estate parliament, the distinct Lords of the Articles, the sometimes distinct Court/Parliament of the Four Burgs, and the fully separate MacDonald clan-dominated Council of the Isles, as well as the consistent non-participation in any of these bodies by the clan-run highlands.

The volume's three excellent native contributions on the Grand Duchy of Lithuania demonstrate the similarities and differences between Western Rus' and Muscovy in terms of overall development, although the contribution lacks specific comparisons. With recourse to the Lithuanian Metrika and reproductions of registers from 1440–92, ANDRII V. BLANUTSA explains how the chronically under-funded Lithuanian crown used land grants (94 in Smolensk, as if pre-figuring Moscow's Novgorod policies – but not stated as such) and delegated full authority to the frequently changing governors (entitled *namestnik*, *starosta*, or *derzhavets*) in order to maximize income, military service, and eastern border defense. Blanutsa does not, however, mention the Grand Duchy's *seim* (parliament) in his contribution. NINA A. SKEP'IAN illuminates the complex interplay between crown, magnates, and *shliakheta* (gentry); the offices of the senior clerk (*pisar*), the vice-chancellor, and the Vilnius and Troki *voevody* (voivodes); the Lithuanian Statutes and the Union of Lublin; and the *pany-rada* (Council of Lords) and *seimiki* (provincial assemblies) – and the relationship of all these bodies with the office of the chancellor in the Grand Duchy over the course of the 16th century. Further, tracing the development of the *seim* and the *seimiki*, and their interface with interconfessional relations in the Grand Duchy, ANASTASHIA A. SKEP'IAN shows how Orthodox *shliakheta*, though excluded from the highest posts – which required conversion to Catholicism – retained their religion, political participation, and influence into the 1650s.

As for Muscovy's *zemskie sobory* (land/state assemblies), BORIS N. FLORIA provides a systematic account of the rise and decline of *sobor* participation in imposing and collecting extraordinary taxes in Russia from 1612 to 1682, and notes, *inter alia*, the unusual role of three archimandrites as *sobor* delegates and tax collectors in 1614. ANDREI P. PAVLOV's contribution depicts the attendees of the *sobory* who elected Mikhail Romanov in early 1613 and those who signed the loyalty pledge in May, showing the fluidity of this institution and its socially variegated delegates. He highlights that Cossacks and Moscow commoners forced the *sobor* to select Mikhail rather than the

(anti-Polish) pro-Swedish candidate favored by the predominating servicemen from southern and western town districts in attendance. Appending an unpublished *pomestnyi prikaz* (service estate office) threat to confiscate service lands as a penalty for missing combat assignments, DMITRII S. LISETSEV demonstrates how administrative documents shed new light on the 1614 *sobor*. TATIANA A. LAPTEVA then specifically elucidates the role of provincial *vybornye dvoriane* (select court-men) and *deti boiarskie* (servicemen) and their attempts to standardize and enforce service and tax obligations via the summoning and actions of the *sobory* after the *Smuty*, and especially following the death of Patriarch Filaret in 1633 up until 1648.

Despite the visible role of ecclesiastics in Russian politics at the time, the Church receives only modest attention in the volume. ANDREI S. USACHEV meticulously identifies the bishops and abbots in attendance at the Moscow synod (*Osviashchennyi sobor*) of 1556, as well at the *zemskii sobor* of the same year. Examining the participation in *sobor* activities of a specific churchman, DMITRII G. DAVIDENKO places the role played by the Greek immigrant Arsenii Elassonskii (of Thessaly) during the years 1598–1613 in the context of the ranking, staffing, and property of Moscow cathedrals, as well as the fortunes of the patriarchate.

Contributions about the regions take a different approach, with mostly locally based scholars enabling the reader to view a good deal of history ‘from below’, or at least from the middle. ELENA N. SHVEIKOVSKAIA recapitulates the rise and flourishing of local self-governing institutions and *miry* (plebeian assemblies) in the Russian North during the mid-16th–mid-17th century, noting, *inter alia*, the instructions to the Dvina region in late 1612 to form a socially mixed delegation: five clergy, five *streltsy* (musketeers), and 20 townsmen and rural folk – as if the plebeians themselves were divided into three estates. ANNA L. KHOROSHKEVICH’s essay on the *mélange* of Russians (servitors and peasants), Mordvinians, service Tatars, “Lithuanians”, and Livonian Germans involved in regularizing service lands and increasing enserfment in the Arzamas region, c. 1580–1610, sheds light on the nature of *sosloviiia*, but does not provide any insights into representative institutions. Without exploring the causes of class antagonisms in southern Severia, but, similar to several other Russian scholars in assuming the aptness of the term “corporation” to cover the service strata, IGOR’ O. TIUMENTSEV credits the comparatively larger group of soldiers (including Cossacks), more weakly developed urban-civilian element, and thinner layer of *vybornye dvoriane* for the weaker representative institutions there in 1604–05 – this, except for the peasant assemblies, which defected from Tsar Boris Godunov to the Pretender Dmitrii. ANATOLII L. GRIAZNOV and ANNA N. GUSLISTOVA identify the 12 and 22 men (among the latter, three *zemskie tseloval’niki* (police-judicial officials), three “best”, seven “middle”, and seven “younger” men) from their city of Vologda, who signed, respectively, the 1608 appeal to neighboring Tot’mā (and then to Velikii Ustiug, Sol’ Vychegodsk, Viatka, and Perm’) and the 1618 petition for tax relief – thereby indicating the social and geographic inclusivity of this form of

local urban activism. LIUDMILA B. SUKINA's account of the role of her city Pereiaslavl'-Zaleskii's (then 300-year old) herring homage ritual in Jan Sapeha's futile appeal to the local Cossacks and young gentry to support Moscow and the Poles in 1611 sheds light on regional, social, and political divisions but again does not enhance our understanding of representative institutions. Accompanied by three useful tables regarding the distribution of tax burdens and collection duties in Novgorod under Swedish occupation (1611–1617), ADRIAN A. SELIN's contribution depicts the interface between local self-governing bodies and a society he views as too complex and variegated to refer to the strata as *sosloviia* (although, to rejoin Moscow, Novgorod sent a delegation headed by an archimandrite with two *dvoriane* [court servitors] and two delegates from the civilian-urban *posad* – that is, a delegation of clergy, nobility equivalent, and burgers). PAVEL V. CHECHENKOV places the two May 1613 *sobor* signatories from his city Nizhnii Novgorod (the preeminent *vybornyi dvorianin* and the brother of the *streltsy* captain) in the context of the known prosopography and allotted landholdings of the local servicemen. ANDREI V. BELIAKOV argues that the peaceful inclusion of clan-dominated eastern Meshcheriia into Muscovy explains why four Tatars (or three Tartars and a Mordvinian) signed the May confirmation in Tatar, the only example of service “foreigners” (i.e., non-Orthodox) participating in a *zemskii sobor*. From Rostov-na-Donu, NIKOLAI A. MININKOV reviews Don Cossack-Moscow relations and precisely how this host influenced the *sobory* of 1613 and 1642 without directly participating in them. From Voronezh, VLADIMIR N. GLAZ'EV illuminates the problems of the southern border towns and the selection of their *zemskii sobor* deputies in the 1630s and 1640s, as well as their remuneration for attendance and their often successful service careers.

In sum, the volume under review (improved when supplemented by the 2013 conference book) contains a great deal of useful original source-based information and interpretive food for thought, marred only by the poor English in the translated summaries in the appendices.

DAVID GOLDFRANK
Falls Church, VA