

Mariyam Kerimova

Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow
mkerimova@yandex.ru

Russian Ethnology at The End of the 19th – the First Third of the 20th Century. Schools and Methods

The article is devoted to the emergence and development of ethnological knowledge in Russia since the last decades of 19th to the end of the 1920s. The Development of Ethnology in Russia is considered in the context of the overall development process of world science. The author pays special attention to the reception of different schools of Western Ethnology of the Russian science.

Key words:

history of the Russian Ethnology, scientific ethnological society, school of the Russian Ethnology, the end of the 19th - the first third of the 20th century

The article analyzes the patterns of development of Russian ethnography/ethnology of the last decades of 19th – the first third of 20th century in the context of the overall development processes of world ethnology. Particular attention is given to the influence of different schools of western ethnology on Russian science.

In the mid-19th century ethnographic societies, ethnographic museums and journals were created in several European countries and in America, many ethnographic expedition to different regions of the world, as well as scientific congresses and conferences were periodically organized. One of the first scientific societies was “Parisian Society of Ethnolog” (1839); in 1842 in New York City “The American Ethnological Society” was founded. Then, similar societies were created in England (1844), Germany (1869) and Italy (1871).

In this regard Russia was not far behind the West. In 1845 the Imperial Russian Geographical Society (IRGO) with the Department of Ethnography was founded. The society focused its activity not so much on the study of the past, but on the present state of the peoples of the Russian Empire. One of the main directions of the IRGO became the systematic collection of ethnographic materials. The regional offices of the IRGO were established; the first of them was the Caucasian Department, followed by Eastern Siberian, Western Siberian, Northwestern, Orenburg, Southwest, Amur, Turkestan and Yakut Departments.

Primarily the IRGO organized expeditions for studying the population of the North, Urals, Siberia, Middle East, Central Asia and the Caucasus; the expedi-

tions to China, Mongolia, Africa and New Guinea were also undertaken (expeditions of G.N. Potanin, V.V. Radlov, N.M. Przewalski, G.E. Grum-Grzhimailo, D.A. Clemenz, A.V. Eliseev, N.N. Maclay and others). Collected materials were published in the following editions: “Zapiski IRGO”, “Vestnik IRGO”, “Izvestia IRGO”, “Etnograficheskie sborniki” and in the “Zhivaya starina” journal. From the first years of its existence the Department of ethnography started creating the Ethnographic museum and publishing ethnographic programs and ethnographic maps.

An important event was the establishment in 1864 of the Imperial Society of Devotees of Natural Science, Anthropology, and Ethnography (IOLEAE) which lasted 68 years.¹ The Anthropological (1864) and Ethnographical (1867) Departments were created within IOLEAE. The first significant activity of the Society was the Russian ethnographic exhibition in Moscow (1867), one of the main objectives of which was to organize the Museum of Ethnography. In preparation for the exhibition in Moscow many ethnographic exhibits flocked from all regions of the Russian Empire and foreign Slavic countries (1200 household items, 450 sets of folk costumes, etc.). These collections formed the basis of Dashkovsky Ethnographic Museum in Moscow. And in 1879 Anthropological exhibition was opened in Moscow; its exhibits were included in the Museum of Anthropology of Moscow University.

Ethnographic Museum has also been developed as part of the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences (founded in 1879) in St. Petersburg. In 1903 it was awarded an expanded name – Peter the Great Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography, Russian Academy of Sciences (MAE). In 1902, Ethnography Department separated from the Russian Museum; it became the basis of the independent State Museum of Ethnography of Peoples of the USSR (established in 1934), later renamed as the Russian Ethnographic Museum (REM).

From 1870s to 1900s IOLEAE published the following journals: “Etnograficheskoye obozreniye” (Ethnographic Review), “Estestvoznaniye i geografiya” (Natural History and Geography), “Russkiy antropologicheskiy jurnal” (Russian anthropological journal), “Zemlevedeniye” (Geography), as well as the regular edition of “Izvestiya” and “Trudy” IOLEAE. Diverse publishing and expedition activity made scientific knowledge available for a wide range of readers. More and more devotees of natural sciences, anthropology and ethnography appealed to IOLEAE, attending lectures organized by the leading members of society. Along with Moscow University IOLEAE has become a major scientific and educational center for enthusiasts and professionals. In the 1920s IOLEAE resumed temporarily interrupted activities by a series of scientific expeditions and the work of their departments and commissions, but in 1924 ceased to exist.

Since the mid-19th century the interest in study of life and living conditions of the peasantry, family and neighborhood community, and customary law has been

¹ For details, see: Kerimova 2007b, 137-141.

increasing in Russian science. In this regard, an activity of the private V.I. Tenishev Ethnographic Bureau (1898-1901) was extremely significant. In 1897 it published the "Program of ethnographic information about the peasants in Central Russia", which covered all aspects of the life of the peasants. The works of M.M. Kovalevsky, E.I. Yakushkin, I.V. Ogramovich, M.A. Bolshakov, M.V. Dovnar-Zapolsky, A.N. Maximov and others have contributed to study of social and family life.

In the last quarter of the 19th century such areas as the study of the history of the economy, including its earliest forms (N.I. Ziber's works) developed; there was an interest in the study of folk art (V.N. Kharuzina, M.A. Balakirev, N.A. Yanchuk, etc.); the investigation of folk beliefs and folklore (works of A.I. Kirpichnikov, P.V. Shein, N.F. Sumtsov, M.V. Dovnar-Zapolsky, V.F. Miller, N.N. and B.N. Kharuzins, L.Y. Sternberg, etc.) continued; material life (clothing, dwellings) – works of E.N. Eleonskaya, D.I. Svyatskoy, N.N. and A.N. Kharuzins and others; social and family life – works of A.J. Efimenko, E.I. Yakushkin, N.M. Yadrintsev, V.N. Maynov, S.V. Pakhman, etc.).

An intensive study of all areas of life and living conditions of Southern and Western Slavs continued as well (P.A. Rovinsky, P.A. Kulakovsky, P.N. Milyukov, A.A. Shakhmatov, V. Yagitch, N.P. Kondakov, E.N. and V.V. Vodovozovs, A.N. Kharuzin, etc.).

In the last quarter of the 19th – early 20th century the works of the Western scholars: E. Tylor, E. Grosse, J. Deniker, F. Engels, L. Morgan, E. Durkheim and others – were translated to Russian. Publishing of their works was an illustration of the growing interest of Russian scientific thought to the achievements of European and American ethnology.

In the last two decades of the period in question new information was delivered to scientific societies from political exiles. They were deported to Siberia where they carried out stationary research of indigenous peoples (P.S. Efimenko, I.A. Khudiakov, P.N. Rybnikov, V.G. Bogoras, L.Y. Sternberg, V.I. Jochelson etc.). Due to their investigations in the beginning of the 20th century the number of ethnographic materials and publications significantly increased, as well as the level of theoretical and methodological generalizations.

Russian ethnography stepped into the new century, having a fine tradition and accumulated baggage of extensive research. After the revolution the ethnographic education centers have been founded in Russia. In newly formed Petrograd Geographic State Institute (1918–1925) under the leadership of L.Y. Sternberg and V.G. Bogoras Ethnographic Department was created; in Moscow – Ethnographic Department of the Faculty of Social Sciences (1922–1925) (FON). At the same time teaching of ethnography started in Kiev, Minsk, Baku, Tbilisi, Samarkand, Irkutsk and other cities of the USSR (Tolstov 1957, 32). At Physics and Mathematics faculty of Moscow University there was developing activities of the Department of Anthropology under the supervision D.N. Anuchin, who sporadically read lectures on ethnography (Tokarev 1978, 359–361).

In 1917 in the Academy of Sciences, along with the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography (MAE), which was rapidly expanding their scientific work, there was such a large ethnographic center as the Commission for the Study of the Tribal Composition of the USSR (KIPS), later transformed into the Institute for Study of the peoples of the USSR. As part of the Academy of Sciences the Commission for the Study of the natural productive forces and the Commission of the field studies were created. A new stage in the study of small peoples of the North and Siberia turned in the Committee on indigenous peoples of the government of the USSR. On the remote bases, the Committee had sent a new generation of young ethnographers – L.Y. Sternberg's and V.G. Bogoras' students. In 1930 the Institute of the Peoples of the North was established in Leningrad.

All these institutions actively published new detailed ethnographic maps and collections of works. Commission for the Study of the Tribal Composition of the USSR published 17 issues of "Izvestiya", many maps and Journal "Chelovek" (A man). MAE and the Geographical Society published the works of ethnographers; 4 volumes on the ethnography of the peoples of the USSR were published by Ethnographic Department of the State Russian Museum.

In the 1920s Central Museum of Ethnography (CMN) and Museum of the Central Industrial Region (MCPO) were organized in Moscow; well-known ethnographers B.A. Kuftin, V.V. Bogdanov, A.N. Maksimov etc. worked there. During only 1925 CMN carried out 14 expeditions to different regions of the USSR (Altai, Minusinskaya oblast', different regions of the Caucasus, Ukraine, Lapland etc.).

Complex and specialized museums of Kiev, Kharkov, Tbilisi, Tashkent and other capitals of the Union republics and districts, as well as the museums of regional studies of Moscow, Saratov, Tomsk, Krasnoyarsk and many other *oblasts* became large centers of ethnological research. A lot of local history societies appeared; these societies fulfilled different scientific works including ethnographic one.

In the 1920s important profile ethnographic institutions such as the State Academy of the History of Material Culture in Leningrad were organized – there were the Ethnological Department there. In Moscow section of Ethnology of the Institute of History of the Russian association of research institutes of social sciences (RANION) was created; their works were published in "Uchonyje zapiski" (Scientific Notes) of the Institute. Archaeological and Ethnographic Museum of Moscow University was founded, the Museum published three volumes of "Trudy" (1926–1928). There was a large work conducted in Institute of study of ethnic and national cultures of the peoples of the East (Moscow) headed by N.Y. Marr; the young ethnographers from national republics took post-graduate training there.

In autonomous Soviet republics research institutions were founded, in almost all of them there were Ethnographic Sectors. At the beginning of the 1920s within the Academy of Sciences in the union republics (Ukraine, Belarus) the ethnographic institutions, periodicals, museums and offices of musical ethnography were created (Tolstov 1957, 35).

In 1926 the journal “Etnografiya” (receiver of the prerevolutionary “etnograficheskoye obozreniye”) was out in Moscow; the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography in Leningrad published “Sbornik MAE”.

The characteristic of directions, schools and movements in the Russian science is extremely important. Following the mythological school ² the evolutionism, based on positivist science took advantageous position in Russian ethnography in 1870s. Following positivist method the researchers proceeded primarily from accurate observations and facts, gave an objective interpretation of the empirical data, comparing them in time and space, grouping conditions for creation general conclusions and hypotheses. Thanks to positivism the ethnographic description of the peoples has become systematic analysis of material and spiritual culture of the peoples of the world.

Proponents of evolutionary theory understood the development process only as a gradual (from simple to complex) one-line quantitative change, denying the revolutionary transition from quantitative to qualitative changes, as well as the role of fundamental changes in the development process. The main idea of evolutionists was an approval of the full identity of the historical paths of different peoples and uniformity of their cultural development that caused disputes and disagreements among the supporters of this trend and among their opponents. To this school were inherent elements of psychologizing and biologizing of social and cultural phenomena, as well as one-sided interpretation of the comparative-historical and the remnants methods.

The most consistent supporters of evolutionary school in Russian ethnography were, for example, E.Y. Petri, D.A. Koropchevsky, N.F. Sumtsov, M.V. Dvornar-Zapol'sky, I.N. Smirnov (Tokarev 1978, 359).

In the first third of the 20th century many Russian scientists embraced the ideas of cultural-historical school, which established in the tide of critique of evolutionism from the standpoint of supporters of concrete empirical knowledge in cultural anthropology. The so-called “theory of cultural circles” was at the heart of this school. Its methodological principles were espoused by the German ethnographers L. Frobenius, F. Graebner, W. Schmidt etc. One of the main theses of this school was a hypothetical statement that every cultural phenomenon occurs once from the

² Along with the evolutionary school, which occupied a dominant position in the Russian ethnography, there was mythological school, which appeared in Germany in the late 19th century in order to explain the religious rituals of Europeans. Priority was the study the spiritual culture of the Indo-European peoples. Dominant solar theory of this school explained the emergence of religion from the impersonation by ancient people of celestial phenomena (sun, moon, lightning, etc.), which they could not explain. Representatives of these schools have relied mostly on guesswork and exclusively on Indo-European data that narrowed their horizons. The main representatives of the mythological school in Europe were A. Kuhn, B. Schwartz, M. Müller, M. Breal, W. and J. Grimm. In Russia, the followers of the mythological school became F.I. Buslayev, A.N. Afanasiev, A.A. Potebnya, O.F. Miller.

original center, in one or more regions of the world, and then spread by diffusion. In the works of representatives of cultural-historical school the main focus was the study of the spatial distribution of cultural phenomena. The whole history of culture came to moving and bedding of several cultural circles (layers), which were essentially divorced from specific peoples.

Some ideas of this school in Russia were perceived by A.N. Maksimov, V.V. Bogdanov, B.A. Kuftin, P.F. Preobrazhensky, D.C. Zelenin, V.G. Bogoras, and S.P. Tolstov, though they took many principles of the cultural-historical school with large adjustments.

One of the trends of diffusionism was an anthropogeographical school founded by the German ethnographer, geographer and sociologist F. Ratzel. The main thesis of the scientist came down to the idea that cultural phenomena were placed in direct dependence on the nature of the environment. The anthropogeographical school has been characterized by absolutisation of the geographical factors. Ratzel explained similarity of cultural phenomena in different nations by borrowings spreading by migration, hence to ethnic history reduced to constant migrations of peoples caused by natural conditions. V.G. Bogoras was a follower of some of ideas of this school was in Russia.

The certain Russian ethnographers (A.N. Maksimov, V.G. Bogoras) accepted some ideas of the American historical school, which arose in opposition to evolutionism. A prominent representative of the American historical school F. Boas considered creating a common history of all peoples to be an ultimate goal of the human sciences. Such history should be based on a specific study of each individual nation, its culture and language. He believed that this particular study could not be replaced by abstract schemes. F. Boas had a skeptical view on such a unilateral schools as evolutionism, diffusionism etc. He gave priority to the study of local (Indian) languages, records of texts, study and comparison of the features of culture and social structure of each nation.

Another school of ethnography and sociology considered human society as a special kind of reality, which is not reducible neither to the sum of human individuals, nor to the identity of any physical phenomenon, or a biological organism. The founder of this trend was Emile Durkheim. His method was to study the "social facts" as the phenomena of social life external to the individual, which do not depend on their subjective intentions. Durkheim introduced the concept of "collective consciousness". In contrast to the evolutionists he understood human society not as successive stages of people's adaptation to environmental conditions, but as closed static systems. He denied not only revolutionary, but even evolutionary development. He devoted much attention to questions of morality and the origin of religion, considering totemism to be its oldest form. In the Russian ethnography / ethnology of the last decade of the 19th – early 20th century M.M. Kovalevsky and L.Y. Sternberg perceived certain theses of the sociological school of Durkheim.

L.Y. Sternberg, largely following the principles of evolutionary school, became interested in psychological theory (psychoanalysis) of Freud as well, and used it in his works.

It should be particularly noted, that in the late 19th – early 20th century there was a Russian historical school of well-known ethnographer, folklorist and linguist V.F. Miller. Using a comparative historical method and the typology he advocated the idea of explanation and analysis of Russian folklore and ethnography, drawing on data of Russian history. According to him, “ethnography deals with phenomena of comparatively late origin”, so it should be used, especially the method of historical analysis. Before comparing any cultural phenomena (for example, myths), you need to prepare for this, examine them in a particular historical situation, trace their development and history. V.F. Miller regarded negatively to the mythological school. Following the comparative-historical method, he did not overestimate it, but used it skillfully, in the limits within which this method might have some importance. Speaking about the method of borrowings, he denied mechanical borrowing of cultural achievements of one people from another. Instead, he emphasized that the cultural borrowing is possible only under the condition of radical processing of cultural material (Bogdanov 1988, 245–246; Markov 1916, 117). To a certain extent historical school opposed the formalist method of stringing individual facts without seeking to understand them. The essence of the historical school, unlike evolutionary one, was that it provided an opportunity to work out the questions of acculturation and interaction of individual cultures and “moved from theoretical constructs to the analysis of the specific facts in all their geographical, historical and ethnic complexity.”³ Historical school from mid-1890s gained worldwide recognition and determined creative way of a number of Russian and foreign scientists.

Moscow school of V.F. Miller gave such talented ethnographers and folklorists as Kharuzins, I.S. Anisimov, P.G. Bogatyrev, A.D. Grigoriev, V.A. Gordlevsky, E.N. Eleonskaya, A.V. Markov, B.M. and Y.M. Sokolovs, S.K. Shambinago, M.V. Nikolsky, N.M. Mendelson.

Kharuzins – known ethnographers and founders of teaching ethnography in Russian universities – used a systematic approach in their scientific practice. They apply the principles not only of historical, but also of the schools listed above, and took from them the theses and methods acceptable to their views.

It should be noted that throughout the 1920s Soviet ethnographic school was founded on Marxist methodology formed in the USSR. P.I. Kushner was one of its most striking representatives.

As for the methods used in Russian ethnography of the studied period, there were comparative historical method, method of remnants and method of direct observation (in modern terminology, the method of participant research).

³ Details about the Russian cultural-historical school and the second generation of its representatives (P.M. Preobrazhensky, B.A. Kuftin, V.V. Bogdanov etc.) see: Alymov, Reshetov 2003. On schools and methods used in the works of Kharuzins see: Kerimova 2011b, 759; Kerimova, Naumova 2003, 7–39.

References

- Alymov, S. S. and A. M. Reshetov. 2003. "Boris Alekseevich Kuftin: izlomy zhiznennogo Puti." In: *Repressirivannye etnography*, ed. D.D. Tumarkin. Vol.I. Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura: 227–269.
- Bogdanov, V.V. 1988. "O nauchnom metode Millera." In: *V.F. Miller. K stoletiyu so dnya rozhdeniya*. NA IEA RAN. F. 21 (Bogdanov V.V.). D. 8. L.
- Kerimova, M. 2007a. "Nikolaj Haruzin in Vasilij Kandinski." *Traditiones* 36/1: 229–274.
- 2007b. "Imperatorskoye obshchestvo lubitelei estestvoznaniya, antropologii i etnografii isud'ba ego arkhiva." *Etnograficheskoye obozreniye* 1: 137–141.
- 2009. "Pervaya etnograficheskaya vystavka 1867 i problemi kulturnogo vzaimodejstviya slavyanskikh narodov." *European integration and cultural diversity* 3. Moscow: IEA RAN.
- 2011a. "The creation of the journal 'Ethnographic review' (1889–1916) (archival materials in. A. Bogdanov)." *Anthropological forum* 15: 397–412.
- 2011b. *Zhizn' otdannaya nauke. Sem'ya etnografov Kharizinykh. Iz istorii rossijskoi etnografii (1880–1930-e gody)*. Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura.
- Kerimova, M. and O. Naumova. 2003. "Aleksei N. Kharuzin." *Anthropology and Archeology of Eurasia* 42/2 (Fall 2003): 7–39.
- Markov, A.V. *Obzor trudov V. F. Millera po narodnoi slovestnosti. Pamyati dorogogo uchitelya*. Pg., 1916. [Reprint from: Izvestiya ORYS. St. Petersburg. 1916. T. 19–20. Book. 1].
- Slezkine, Y. 1993. "Sovetskaia etnografiia v nokdaune: 1928–1938." *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie* 2:113–125.
- Tokarev, S. A. 1978. *Istoriya russkoi etnografii*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Tolstov, S. P. 1957. "Sorok let sovetskoj etnigrafii." *Sovetskaya etnografiya* 5: 31–55.

Маријам Керимова

Руска етнологија у периоду од краја XIX до прве трећине XX века. Школе и методе

У овом чланку се анализира ток развоја руске етнографије/етнологије у периоду од последњих деценија XIX до прве трећине XX века у контексту свеукупног процеса развоја светске етнологије. Посебну пажњу аутор посвећује рецепцији различитих школа западне етнологије у руској науци.

Половином XIX века у Русији се формирају значајна научна друштва: Царско руско географско друштво (ИРГО) и Царско друштво љубитеља природних наука, антропологије и етнографије при Московском универзитету (ИОЛЕАЭ), у чијем саставу су била одељења за етнографију. Циљ ових друштава је било систематично и свеобухватно прикупљање етнографских података, формирање регионалних одељења у Сибиру, на далеком Истоку, у Средњој Азији, на Кавказу, као и организација теренских истраживања. У различитим регионима су теренска истраживања обављали Г. Н. Потанин, В. В. Радлов, Н. М. Пржеваљскиј, Д. А. Клеменц, Н. Н. Миклухо-Маклај и др.

Кључне речи:

историја руске етнологије, руска научна етнолошка друштва, школе руске етнологије, XIX век – прва трећина XX века

Плодна издавачка делатност у оквиру етнографије започиње у последњој трећини XIX века. Излазе специјализовани етнографски часописи и периодична издања радова горепоменутих научних друштава (ИРГО и ИОЛЕАЭ). Прва етнографска изложба у Русији је отворена 1867. године у Москви. Експонати са ове изложбе ушли су у састав новоформираног Дашковског етнографског музеја у Москви. Музејска етнографија развијала се такође у оквиру Музеја антропологије и етнографије Академије наука, који је основан 1879. у Санкт Петербургу.

При крају XIX века велики значај добија израда планског и систематичног етнографског програма. Познати руски етнографи урадили су велики број програма-упитника на различите теме: породични и друштвени живот, обичаји, обреди, празници, фолклор, обичајно право народа Русије и томе слично. Све то доприноси изградњи теоријских основа програмске етнографије.

Једна од особености етнографије периода који обухвата последње две деценије XIX и прву трећину XX века или јесте и та да су многе нове податке достављали политички осуђеници, који су, вољом судбине, били стационарни у Северном Сибиру, те су се тако нашли у прилици да посматрају аутохтоно становништво ове области. аутохтоно становништво Севера и Сибира (П. С. Јефименко, И. А. Худјаков, П. Н. Рибников, В. Г. Богораз, Л. Ј. Штернберг, В. И. Јохелсон и др.). Захваљујући томе, почетком XX века значајно се

увећала количина вредног материјала и публикација, што је у целини повећало ниво теоријско-методолошких уопштавања.

У XX век Русија улази с богатим пакетом прикупљеног материјала. Институционализација етнологије иде убрзаним темпом. Почиње настава етнографије на Московском универзитету, Вишој женској школи и Археолошком институту у Москви, где су прва предавања из етнографије држали Н. Н. и В. Н. Харузини, Д. Н. Анучин и др. Обука студената из етнографије се такође одржавала на Петроградском државном географском институту (1918–1925). Овде је под руководством Л. Ј. Штернберга и В. Г. Богораза основан етнографски факултет. Приближно у исто време, у Москви је било формирано Етнографско одељење факултета друштвених наука (1922–1925) (ФОН). Етнографија почиње да се предаје у Кијеву, Минску, Бакуу, Тбилисију, Самарканду, Иркутску и у другим градовима СССР. Током 20-их година XX века успоставља се совјетска етнографска школа, заснована на марксистичкој методологији. П. И. Кушнер је био један од њених најзначајнијих представника.

Растуће интересовање руске научне мисли за достигнућа европске и америчке етнологије у периоду од последње четвртине XIX до почетка XX века показује и превођење на руски језик радова западних научника: Е. Тејлора, Е. Гроса, Ж. Деникера, Ф. Енгелса, Л. Моргана, Е. Диркема и др.

У овом чланку је упоредо са особеностима школа и покрета у западној науци приказана и рецепција еволуционистичке, културно-историјске школе, дифузионизма, историјске школе Ф. Боаса и др. од стране познатих руских етнолога: Харузиних, Штенберга, Богораза, Преображенског, Зелењина и др.