



History of Anthropology Newsletter

Volume 9
Issue 1 *Spring 1982*

Article 7

1-1-1982

Current Essays in the History of Russian Anthropology: A Bibliographical Note

David Koester

Sergei Kan

BIBLIOGRAPHICA ARCANIAI. CURRENT ESSAYS IN THE HISTORY OF RUSSIAN ANTHROPOLOGY:
A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTEDavid Koester, University of Chicago
Sergei Kan, Northeastern University

Since 1956 the Miklukho-Maklai Institute of Ethnography under the auspices of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR has published a series of essays in the history of Russian ethnography, folklore, and anthropology (Ocherki istorii Russkov etnografi, fol'kloristikii, i antropologii). Appearing some one to seven years apart, the eight volumes published thus far have contained a total of 110 essays. These eight volumes are a subset of the Trudy Instituta Etnografii Im. N. N. Miklukho-Maklaia (Works of the Miklukho-Maklai Institute of Ethnography), a larger series of general ethnographic works. They begin as volume 30 (1956), and continue as volumes 85 (1963), 91 (1965), 94 (1968), 95 (1971), 102 (1974), 104 (1977), 107 (1978).¹

The collection of historical essays emerged out of a nationalistic movement begun in the fifties to heighten awareness of Russian contributions to all areas of scientific scholarship--physics, chemistry, sociology, geography, ethnography, etc. The spirit of this movement manifests itself through at least four research goals implicitly evident in the essays and sometimes explicitly expressed by the editors (B. K. Sokolova, vols. I, II; R. Lipets, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII; A. Reshetov and T. Stanyukovich, VII). The primary goal is to examine and assess the contribution of past Russian and Soviet scholars to ethnography both within the confines of Soviet science and around the world. Tokarev's lead article, "Contributions of Russian Scholars to the International Science Ethnography" ("Vklad russkovo uchenia k mezhdunarodnikh nauka etnografii"), embraces this goal and sets the tone for the series by surveying the relationship of early Russian ethnographic research to its West European counterparts.² In analyzing the works of such early ethnographers as V. N. Tatishchev and K. M. Ber, Tokarev succeeds in showing the ethnographic character of their work and its importance to Russian ethnographic research, though he is unable to demonstrate strong influence outside of the Russian Empire. A second goal, also embodied in Tokarev's paper, is to search for origins of Russian ethnographic research. The search for origins has a two-fold character, looking both for specific ethnographic influences and for precursors within the broader frame of Russian scholarly research. Poets, scientists, geographers and journalists are all included as contributors to the development of Russian ethnographic thought. Many of the indirectly related scholars are brought into the analysis in an attempt to search for "democratic tendencies" or post-revolutionary ideas in this pre-revolutionary ancestry. This search represents a third of the four research aims and is part of the statement of purpose given in editor V. K. Sokolova's introduction to Volume I: "to show the development of progressive democratic tradition and its struggle with conservative and liberal tendencies [directedness] in the study of the customs, culture, and art of a people." He further adds that early revolutionary-democratic scholars set an example for how "science ought to serve the people and help them in their liberating struggle." A final aim of the series is to make use of and acquaint readers with unpublished archival materials. Papers on such topics as ethnographic research in

eighteenth century Siberia are enriched by the use of explorers' journals and travel accounts which have been, until now, buried in Soviet archives.

These four research aims lend a special character to both the structure of the series as a whole and the content of the papers themselves. Historiographically, the most striking characteristic of the collection is that it is heavily biographical. Of the 110 papers, 32 are based on the ethnographical importance of individual men and numerous others are primarily biographical. They are especially numerous in Volumes I and II. Some papers such as "V. N. Tatishchev and Russian Ethnography," and "A. N. Pypin and Russian Folklore Studies at the end of the Nineteenth and beginning of the Twentieth centuries," assess the work of recognized founding figures of Russian ethnographic and folklorist research. Others examine the influence of more distantly related figures such as the journalist and revolutionary, Chernyshevsky, or the poet and national hero, Pushkin. Because popular thought (the thought of the people) and social criticism are regarded as significant aspects of Soviet social theory, the search for contributions, origins, and "democratic tendencies," leads to a broad range of scholarly figures.

Though we have so far been discussing only ethnography, the essays cover all of the Soviet anthropological framework which includes ethnography, anthropology, and folklore. As in most European traditions, anthropology is used only to refer to physical anthropology. Many of the volumes contain papers which examine the contribution of pre-anthropological students of human physical nature. Ethnography in their terms includes ethnography, ethnology, and historical archeology. Believing in the importance of data in theory formulation and validation,³ Russian (and Soviet) ethnographers have worked both to collect large amounts of ethnographic data over their vast, many-peopled empire and to work out theories of human origins and development. Today, collecting and preserving data remains the major focus of Soviet ethnographic research. Soviet and Russian folklore continues a rich tradition that grew largely out of early XIX century interests in Slavic folklore. This collection of essays, reflecting contemporary Soviet research, emphasizes ethnography much more heavily than anthropology, and somewhat more than folklore. All told there are forty-four papers on purely ethnographic studies, twenty-three on folklore, and twelve on (physical) anthropology. Of course there are also cross-breeds; for example, in the biographical sketches there are scholars such as Lomonosov who, both chemist and poet, was linked to ethnography through science and to folklore through literature. To greater and lesser extents the volumes maintain a diversity of topics, and the evaluation of contributions, the search for origins and early revolutionary ideas, and the use of archival materials contribute to and sustain this disciplinary diversity.

Viewing this tripartite disciplinary framework in historical dimension illuminates the overall structure of the series as it has appeared so far. Each volume contains at least one essay on the history of each of the three fields, but the relative amounts vary with the 'themes' of the volumes. Volume I examines what might be called the pre-institutionalization phase of Russian ethnographic research--the period up to the founding of the ethnography department of the Russian Geographical Society in 1845, and the Society of Enthusiasts of Natural Science, Anthropology, and Ethnography in 1863. In this connection it contains, in addition to the Tokarev paper,

papers on the origins of research dating back to the XII century and papers on the influence of important figures in late XVIIIth and early XIXth century Russian history such as Lomonosov, Pushkin, and the Decembrists. Volume II continues from this period and examines the development of the Society of Natural Science, Anthropology, and Ethnography, and scholars active in the period from the 1860s into the the early XXth century. Volume III in a sense takes a step back and examines the material (archival) basis of these institutions by concentrating on the formation of collections of materials during the period 1840 to the turn of the century. Such papers as "On the History of the P. V. Kireevskiy Collection," by A. D. Soymonov and "P. K. Simoni--Collector and Publisher of Russian Folklore," by M. Ya. Mel'ts are examples. Though the periodization and internal unification of these first three volumes are not rigidly distinct, periodization is stronger here than in any of the later volumes.

The subsequent volumes continue to present a mix of ethnographic, folklorist, and anthropological history. For the most part volumes IV and V examine the formation of revolutionary ideas, "the progressive direction of Russian pre-revolutionary science," from the late XIXth century to the mid-1930s. Most of the papers in Volume VI look at the history of field research far from the Russian capital in places such as Siberia, the Urals, the Far East, and Africa. Volume VII (1971) is devoted to the importance of the Russian Geographical Society and derives from the all-union symposium held in honor of the 125th anniversary of the founding of that society. The most recent volume (VIII, 1978) attempts breadth rather than unity of theme.

From the character of the essays as described above and the research aims behind them we can see that Soviet history of anthropology contrasts sharply with Western. Whereas in much of Western historiographical thought the term "presentism" is used derogatorily, in Soviet writing historical analysis from a present-day point of view is considered a positive and useful way of understanding how early researchers and writers could have come to contribute to modern scholarship. There is a curious tension built into this project between the tradition of Russian nationalism and Marxist historicism. On the one hand, Russian nationalism points historians to all Russian writers and scholars in some way connected with ethnography. On the other hand, those who were "democratic" and revolutionary have a "progressive" significance. Conservative Russians, such as Tatishchev, receive notice and praise from a nationalistic point of view, but their work becomes downplayed because of their failure to contribute to a "progressive" ethnography.

Moreover, Western and Soviet history differ in the degree to which each fosters self-criticism within anthropology. While their Western counterparts have come to feel guilty about anthropology's role in the destruction of cultures, Soviet historians and ethnographers have tended to emphasize the humanism and progressiveness of early researchers such as Miklukho-Maklai. Having had a direct influence on Malinowski, Miklukho-Maklai (cited by Malinowski in his diaries) is considered by Soviet ethnographers as the founder of modern "stationary field research." His extended field work in New Guinea, noted for its care, extensiveness, and humanism, and his role as a revolutionary combine to make him a model for

Soviet ethnographic scholarship. In Soviet thought, ethnographers such as Miklukho-Maklai, while lamenting the loss of traditional cultures, can aid in bringing about progressive changes.

Footnotes

1. These volume numbers as well as the publisher, Akademia Nauk SSR, are necessary pieces of information for locating the series and the historical volumes within it. In some U.S. libraries the series is indexed only under Akademia Nauk, Institut Ethnografii Miklukho-Maklaia.

2. Tokarev has published a history of Russian ethnography which broadly outlines the areas researched in this series. Istoriia Russkoi Ethnografii (Do'ok t yabrskoi period), S. L. Tokarev, Akademia Nauk SSR, Moskva, 1966 [History of Russian Ethnography (The Pre-Revolutionary Period), Academy of Sciences, USSR].

3. Contemporary ethnographer Petrova-Averkiewa suggests that the separation of ethnography and ethnology is inconceivable in practical work. "The method of historicism presupposes a thorough study of this or that process or phenomenon of social life in its historical perspective. Empirical knowledge and theoretical generalizations should be combined in such an inquiry. We do not accept the division of the science into two separate disciplines--ethnography as a 'fact-gathering' science and ethnology as a generalising one." (Soviet and Western Anthropology, E. Gellner ed., p. 24.)

II. A SHORT HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL SUBJECT HEADINGS AT TOZZER LIBRARY

Nancy J. Schmidt
Librarian

Tozzer Library, formerly the Library of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, has a unique card catalogue--a true bibliographic treasure--that includes entries for articles in periodicals and books in addition to entries for books. Materials received since the Library's foundation in 1866 have been analyzed. Since the Library was founded when the discipline of professional anthropology began, and since the scope of the Library's collection has always been international, the Library's catalogue provides the most comprehensive anthropological bibliography available anywhere in the world.

The subject catalog at Tozzer Library is organized by a unique set of headings developed by Roland B. Dixon especially for the Peabody Museum Library. Dixon, the Librarian from 1904 until 1934, was an anthropologist who was more interested in source materials than in anthropological field-work.¹ His keen interest in bibliography and cataloguing led to the development of a personal index of anthropological source materials, which provided the basis for the subject headings and indexing system which he developed at the Library.²

Dixon's first list of anthropological subject headings included topics, geographic areas, and major language families. However, only the