PROJECT MUSE®

European, National, and (Anti-)Imperial: The Formation of Academic Oriental Studies in Late Tsarist and Soviet Russia

Vera Tolz

Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History, Volume 9, Number 1, Winter 2008 (New Series), pp. 53-81 (Article)

Published by Slavica Publishers

DOI: 10.1353/kri.2008.0004

➔ For additional information about this article

<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/kri/summary/v009/9.1tolz.html>

European, National, and (Anti-)Imperial

The Formation of Academic Oriental Studies in Late Tsarist and Early Soviet Russia

VERA TOLZ

This article focuses on the circulation of knowledge within the discipline of Oriental Studies in Russia and in Europe from the 1880s to the late 1920s. In this period, two processes, closely intertwined but vectored in opposite directions, shaped the nature of science and scholarship. These processes were nationalization (“the emergence of the nation as the structuring unit and the principal arena of scientific activity”) and internationalization (increased international cooperation as well as competition among scholars from different countries).¹ Even though Russian Oriental Studies as an established academic discipline dates back to 1804, it was only in the 1880s that a community of Orientalist² scholars sharing a common identity and partaking in a clearly defined program of study emerged in Russia.³ The period from the 1880s

I am grateful to the organizers of and participants in the workshop “The Circulation of Knowledge and the History of the Human Sciences in Russia and in the USSR” for their valuable comments. Thanks are also due to Dmitrii Bratkin for his assistance in collecting material in Russian libraries. A grant from the Arts and Humanities Research Board (AR 17345) provided me with the financial assistance to pursue research for this article. The article has also been published in *Orientalism and Empire in Russia*, ed. Michael David-Fox, Peter Holquist, and Alexander Martin, *Kritika Historical Studies* 3 (Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers, 2006), 107–34.

¹ Elizabeth Crawford, Terry Shinn, and Sverker Sorlin, eds., *Denationalization of Science: The Contexts of International Scientific Practice* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993), 10. This book offers a comprehensive survey of the “rise of international science in the age of nationalism,” 11–15.

² The words “Orient,” “Eastern,” and, indeed, “European” are used here in the full knowledge that these are intellectual constructs whose meaning has changed historically. The word “Orientalist” is used to describe those professionally involved in studying the societies of the Middle East and Asia. It does not have the negative connotation with which this word has been loaded since the publication of Edward Said’s *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978). References in this article are to the 1995 edition of Said’s book.

³ The period between 1880 and 1914 was also a time when major advances were made in Oriental Studies in Germany, Austria, and elsewhere in Europe. See Suzanne Marchand,

to the 1920s was the time when the discipline in Russia boasted the greatest names, particularly Baron Viktor Rozen (1849–1908) and a group of his disciples, including Vasilii Bartol'd (1869–1930), Nikolai Marr (1864–1934), and Sergei Ol'denburg (1863–1934).⁴ Within the Russian academic community, Oriental Studies was perceived in that period as the strongest discipline, which, on a par with Russian Studies, was most widely recognized internationally.⁵ Furthermore, the above-mentioned Orientalists believed that their discipline was central to the key questions facing Russia at the time. According to Bartol'd, "[t]he fulfillment by Russians of their historic missions in the West and in the East is closely linked to the situation of Russian scholarship."⁶ In his view, "[m]aybe modest works by Russian Orientalists more than other achievements of Russian culture will contribute to the peaceful unification of the peoples of the East with Russia."⁷ These scholars agreed that "the prestige and immediate interests" of Russia required Russian scholars to be in the lead internationally in the study of various nationalities populating the Russian empire.⁸ Thus, in the eyes of these scholars, their work was explicitly linked to the management of the nationality question in Russia, to the search for Russian national identity, and to Russia's imperial ambitions.⁹

These positions of Russian scholars and, in many ways, the development of Russian Oriental Studies in the period under review reflect general contemporary trends in European scholarship. Since the 19th century, this scholarship had been shaped by several forces. First, the roots of a rapid development of various branches of the humanities are to be found in a "larger positivist enterprise [of the Enlightenment] that sought empirically verifiable information

"German Orientalism and the Decline of the West," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 145, 4 (2001): 468.

⁴ Other disciples of Rozen made important scholarly contributions, most notably the Arabists A. I. Schmidt and I. Iu. Krachkovskii. The present article, however, discusses in detail only the four scholars, because in addition to being leading academics, they also left many ideological statements, explicitly addressing questions that went well beyond their individual fields of study. Marr and Ol'denburg were also major public figures.

⁵ Mikhail Rostovtsev, "Mezhdunarodnoe nauchnoe obshchenie," *Russkaia mysl'*, kn. 3 (1916): 78.

⁶ V. V. Bartol'd, "Vostok i russkaia nauka," in his *Sochineniia* (Moscow: Nauka, 1977), 9: 542.

⁷ Arkhiv Rossiiskoi akademii nauk, Peterburgskoe otdelenie (PO ARAN) f. 68, op. 1, d. 13, "Rech' pered zashchitoi dissertatsii na temu: Turkestan v epokhu mongol'skogo nashestviia," 15.

⁸ The quote is from V. V. Bartol'd, "Zadachi russkogo vostokovedeniia v Turkestane," in his *Sochineniia*, 9: 522. See also V. R. Rozen in *Zapiski Vostochnogo otdeleniia Russkogo arkhologicheskogo obshchestva* (hereafter ZVORAO) 1, 1 (1886): 39.

⁹ This position was not seen by the scholars as in any way contradicting their arguments in favor of "pure scholarship" with no immediate practical purposes. See V. V. Bartol'd, "Obzor deiatel'nosti Fakulteta vostochnykh iazykov," in his *Sochineniia*, 9: 177.

about all societies everywhere.”¹⁰ In terms of methods used to extract and process this information the pride of place belonged to those developed by classical philologists. Second, the ideology of nationalism assigned special importance to the study of scholars’ own societies within their contemporary boundaries. Belief in the division of the world above all into nations placed nationality at the center of historical, archaeological, philological, and ethnographic research.¹¹ Simultaneously, (nation-)states became increasingly involved in funding and setting agendas for scientists and scholars.¹² Finally, imperialism, another important political force with its own ideologies, also had an impact on various humanities disciplines, especially Oriental Studies.¹³

This article discusses how the interaction among these pan-European processes played out in the case of Russian Oriental Studies. It starts by showing how modern Russian Oriental Studies took shape as an academic discipline under the impact of the debate in Russia about national identity. It then discusses the impact of the pan-European processes of nationalization and internationalization on Russian Oriental Studies by focusing on the role of Rozen and his disciples. It further demonstrates how the imperialist discourse promoted at international congresses of Orientalists was subverted by scholars’ attempts to incorporate the Orient into Russian identity and how the belief in pan-European methods of scholarship co-existed with the criticism of some of the approaches of European scholars, leading to claims about the moral superiority of Russian scholarship. It will be shown that in the course of World War I, this criticism of European Oriental Studies sharpened, particularly on the part of Marr and Ol’denburg. It will be argued that

¹⁰ Thomas R. Metcalf, *Ideologies of the Raj* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 26.

¹¹ John E. Craig, *Scholarship and Nation Building: The Universities of Strasbourg and Alsatian Society, 1870–1939* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984); Vera Tolz, “Orientalism, Nationalism, and Ethnic Diversity in Late Imperial Russia,” *Historical Journal* 48, 1 (2005): 127–50.

¹² See, for instance, Peter Wagner, ed., *Social Sciences and Modern States: National Experiences and Theoretical Crossroads* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

¹³ Frederick Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler, *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); Bernard S. Cohn, *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996); David Kopf, *British Orientalism and the Bengal Renaissance* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969). On the impact of nationalism and imperialism on German Oriental Studies, see a special issue on German Orientalism in *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa, and the Middle East* 24, 2 (2004), in particular Jennifer Jenkins, “German Orientalism: Introduction,” 98 and 99. See also Sheldon Pollock, “Deep Orientalism? Notes on Sanskrit and Power beyond the Raj,” in *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament: Perspectives on South Asia*, ed. Carol A. Breckenridge and Peter van der Veer (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993), 76–133; and Kaushik Bagchi, “An Orientalist in the Orient: Richard Garbe’s Indian Journey, 1885–1886,” *Journal of World History* 14, 3 (2003): 281–326.

their attacks on “bourgeois” scholarship in the early Soviet period were acts of political opportunism only to a limited extent. They were also a logical continuation and development of the views which these scholars began to expound in the last prerevolutionary decades.

There is a striking similarity between the criticism of European Oriental Studies as first expressed by Bartol'd and then more strongly and in an ideologically charged way by Marr and Ol'denburg, on the one hand, and by such contemporary critics as Edward Said, whose work *Orientalism* (1978) paved the way for a wide scholarly literature on the subject, on the other. The article demonstrates that a clearly identifiable connection exists between Said and his Russian predecessors, thus arguing that one of the fashionable trends in the recent Western analysis of the history of European scholarship from the postcolonial perspective is, in fact, Russian in origin.

Nationalism and the Origins of Oriental Studies in Russia

Scholars have noted the connection between the development of Russian academic Oriental Studies (i.e., university teaching and academic research in this field) and the debate on Russian identity and national destiny in the first half of the 19th century. To demonstrate this link, they cite statements from individual Orientalists to the effect that the discipline should serve the Russian nation and that, because the “Orient” could be found within Russia's frontiers, the Russians had an advantage over their West European counterparts in studying it.¹⁴ But this focus on the statements of individual scholars overlooks more compelling evidence that nationalism (i.e., the stimulus vectored inward to Russia itself) was the prime motivation to develop Oriental Studies in Russia. This most compelling evidence can be found in the history of the institutionalization of Oriental Studies as a coherent discipline with a developed research agenda.

It is customary to date the origins of Oriental Studies in Russia to the reign of Peter the Great, when Russia's status as a European empire was first officially proclaimed. Throughout the 18th century, however, we see only Russian rulers' attempts to train on an *ad hoc* basis a few people as translators and interpreters in the Oriental languages that were important for Russia's foreign policy. There were no academic Oriental Studies and no societies and centers in the field at the time. All the projects aimed at establishing such centers failed because they lacked governmental and social support.¹⁵

¹⁴ Nathaniel Knight, “Grigor'ev in Orenburg, 1851–1862: Russian Orientalism in the Service of Empire?” *Slavic Review* 59, 1 (2000): 74–100; Nicholas Riasanovsky, “Asia through Russian Eyes,” in *Russia and Asia: Essays on the Influence of Russia on the Asian Peoples*, ed. Wayne S. Vucinich (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1972), 13.

¹⁵ A. P. Bazilians and I. M. Grinkrug, “Tri proekta organizatsii izucheniia vostochnykh iazykov i Vostoka v Rossii XVIII–XIX stoletii,” in *Formirovanie gumanisticheskikh traditsii otechestvennogo vostokovedeniia (do 1917 g.)* (Moscow: Nauka, 1984), 34–36.

Only at the beginning of the 19th century did the academic teaching of Oriental Studies begin at Russian universities. In 1804, the statutes of Moscow, Kazan, and Khar'kov universities introduced the teaching of Oriental languages there. At St. Petersburg University, established in 1819, chairs in Arabic and Persian were created at the outset. Yet, at this initial stage of the development of Oriental Studies in Russian academia one cannot yet speak about Oriental Studies as an institutionalized academic discipline.¹⁶ Instead, a few individual scholars worked in isolation in four existing centers of academic learning with a modest increase in the number of specialists in the 1830s. Any attempt at creating a center for Oriental Studies with a coherent program of teaching and research failed.

The situation changed dramatically in the 1840s. This period, marked by the Westernizer–Slavophile debate over the essence of Russian national identity and by the emergence of civil society, also witnessed the establishment of a series of learned societies with sections focused on Oriental Studies. The creation of these societies was accompanied by debates over their goals. The groups within the societies that advocated the focus on Slavic Studies and on cultural and historic ties between Russians and other peoples living in the Russian state won the battles over research agendas informed by the cosmopolitan worldview of the Age of Enlightenment. In relation to Oriental Studies, the victorious approach indicated the focus on “Russia’s own Orient”—that is, prioritizing research on the eastern borderlands of the Russian empire. Thus, as their West European counterparts did under the impact of nationalism, Russian scholars decided to adapt their research agendas “to the frontiers of the present state.”¹⁷ It is significant that until the early 20th century there were no learned societies solely devoted to Oriental Studies.¹⁸ Instead—and it is significant for

¹⁶ Tuska Benes, “Comparative Linguistics as Ethnology: In Search of Indo-Germans in Central Asia, 1770–1830,” *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa, and the Middle East* 24, 2 (2004): 117–32, focuses on German scholars who worked for the Russian Academy of Sciences in the late 18th and the early 19th centuries and conducted research on the Caucasus and Central Asia. Using a very limited source base and providing little evidence, the article claims that this research “furthered Russian imperial expansion” (129). On the limited nature of these scholars’ contribution not only to the formulation of Russian imperial policies but even to the development of academic Oriental Studies in Russia, see N. I. Veselovskii, “Svedeniia ob ofitsial’nom prepodavanii vostochnykh iazykov v Rossii,” in *Trudy tret’ego mezhdunarodnogo s’ezda orientalistov v S. Peterburge 1876*, vol. 1, ed. V. V. Grigor’ev (St. Petersburg: Brat’ia Panteleevy, 1879–80), 106–10; V. V. Bartol’d, “Istoriia izucheniia Vostoka v Evrope i Rossii,” in his *Sochineniia*, 9: 416; and I. Iu. Krachkovskii, *Ocherki po istorii russkoi arabistiki* (Moscow and Leningrad: Izdatel’svo Akademii nauk, 1950), 73–78, 99–105.

¹⁷ Margarita Diaz-Andreu and Timothy Champion, eds., *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1996), 6.

¹⁸ Russia’s societies exclusively dedicated to the study of “the Orient” were the Imperial Society for Oriental Studies, set up in 1900; the Russian Committee for the Study of Central and Eastern Asia (RKSIVA), which began its activities in 1903; and the Society of Russian Orientalists,

the present argument—within the societies dedicated to studying Russia in its multi-ethnic and multicultural variety Russian/Slavic Studies co-existed with Oriental Studies.

The first learned society whose program included Oriental Studies was the Society of History and Antiquities, established in Odessa in 1839. One of its founders was the leading Russian Orientalist of the time, Vasilii Grigor'ev (1816–81). In the 1840s, several other Orientalists joined it. A greater scholarly role was played by two learned societies set up in the 1840s: the Imperial Russian Geographical Society (1845), and the Imperial Russian Archaeological Society (1846). In the 1850s, the geographical societies opened branches in the Caucasus and in Siberia. In the same year, the Oriental Department of the Russian Imperial Archaeological Society was established.

Another wave in the establishment of learned societies was the reign of Alexander II (1855–81), marked by liberalizing reforms and growing social activism. This was another period of intense debate over Russian national identity, in which not just individual intellectuals but also the ruling elite began to take part. Oriental Studies played an important role in the Imperial Archaeological Commission in St. Petersburg (1859); the Society of Lovers of Natural History (*estestvoznaniie*), Anthropology, and Ethnography at Moscow University (1864); the Moscow Archaeological Society (1864), within which Oriental Studies specialists set up the Oriental Commission in 1887; and in the Society for Archaeology, History, and Ethnography in Kazan (1877).¹⁹ Moreover, this was a time when, after Russia's defeat in the Crimean War, anti-Western sentiments were on the increase. In an attempt to define Russia's identity as separate from, and often in opposition to, Western Europe, arguments about the impact of Eastern cultures and traditions on Russia gained a particular prominence that did not subside until the end of the imperial period. Therefore, the accumulation of knowledge about Russia's eastern borderlands further gained in priority, which resulted in a rapid growth of new societies and branches of the existing ones in the borderlands themselves.²⁰

Turning Oriental Studies with the focus on "Russia's Orient" into one of the key priorities of the Imperial Academy of Sciences proved to be more

instituted in Harbin in 1909 and in St. Petersburg in 1910. The creation of RKSIVA was the result of an international initiative. The Society for Oriental Studies and the Society of Russian Orientalists focused on practical tasks mostly in trade and commerce. Most of their members were government administrators and other "practitioners," and these societies never had the same prestige as those dominated by academics. See A. A. Vigasin et al., eds., *Istoriia otechestvennogo vostokovedeniia s sere diny XIX v do 1917 goda* (Moscow: Vostochnaia literatura, 1997), 113–15.

¹⁹ This survey of learned societies is based on A. M. Kulikova, *Vostokovedenie v rossiiskikh zakonodatel'nykh aktakh (konets XVII v.–1917 g.)* (St. Petersburg: Sankt-Peterburgskii filial Instituta vostokovedeniia RAN, 1994), 29–36.

²⁰ Vera Tolz, "Russia: Empire or a Nation-State-in-the-Making?" in *What Is a Nation? Europe 1789–1914*, ed. Timothy Baycroft and Mark Hewitson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 301–2.

difficult than was the case with the learned societies. The societies were created as part of the “national awakening” in Russia, and therefore it seemed logical for the organizers to make Russia itself (with the inclusion of the eastern borderlands) the societies’ main research focus. In contrast, the Academy of Sciences was the oldest institution of learning and research in the Russian empire; it had been established in 1725, before nationalism began affecting Russia’s educated elites. By the 19th century it was set in its ways as an institution reflecting the cosmopolitan and encyclopedic concerns of the Enlightenment. In 1836, new rules for the academy established the “history and cultures of Asian people” as a separate discipline. In 1841, the program of the academy’s Department of Historical, Philological, and Political Studies (called the Department of Historico-Philological Studies from 1844 on) included “research on eastern nationalities of Russia” as a subject. Yet only in the 1890s did Oriental Studies become the second largest area of research after Slavic Studies in the academy with 13 members, all of whom were involved, either in part or entirely, in researching “Russia’s Orient.”²¹ This development finally made Russian Oriental Studies a fully institutionalized academic discipline, which allowed so scrupulous a historian of this branch of scholarship as Bartol’d to talk about the emergence of a specifically “Russian Oriental Studies” by the early 20th century, whose collective achievements (rather than those of isolated academics from Russia) were recognized internationally.²² A key role in completing the “nationalization” of Russian Oriental Studies as well as achieving its simultaneous internationalization was played by Viktor Rozen. A baron from Russia’s Baltic provinces, Rozen did not speak much Russian and wrote only in German until he entered St. Petersburg University. It was there, under the influence of his teacher Grigor’ev, that Rozen turned into a statist Russian nationalist. He accepted Grigor’ev’s view that scholarship should serve the interests of the nation to which a particular scholar belonged.²³ His loyalty was above all to the Russian nation, seen as multi-ethnic in nature and as moving toward cultural unification within the borders of the Russian state.²⁴

Rozen’s career as the creator of modern Russian Oriental Studies as a firmly institutionalized discipline with its own research profile and a solid international reputation began with a scandal. At the time, the “Rozen affair” shook the Academy of Sciences almost as much as the scandal connected with the failure of the academy in 1880 to elect to its ranks Russia’s most eminent

²¹ Ibid., 26–28.

²² Bartol’d, “Vostok i russkaia nauka,” 544–45.

²³ On Grigor’ev’s views, see N. I. Veselovskii, *Vasilii Vasil’evich Grigor’ev po ego pis’mam i trudam, 1816–1881* (St. Petersburg: A. Transhel’, 1887).

²⁴ N. I. Veselovskii, “Baron V. R. Rozen,” *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia* (hereafter *ZhMNP*), ser. 14, no. 4, otd. 4 (1908): 170, 178, and 186.

chemist, Dmitrii Mendeleev. In fact, the two affairs had similar causes—both were the manifestations of the “nationalization” or “Russification” of the Imperial Academy of Sciences. The Mendeleev affair is mentioned in every history of academia in Russia. The Rozen affair is less well known, but it was an episode of a comparable importance.

Rozen was elected an adjunct member of the Academy of Sciences in 1879 only to resign from it in 1882 because of the conflict with the academy’s leadership over the goals of Russian Oriental Studies and of the academy in general. Because of the deaths of the Orientalists F. A. Shifner, J. A. B. Dorn, and M. F. Brosset soon after his election, Rozen became the only representative of the discipline at the institution. He began campaigning for the reinvigoration of Oriental Studies at the academy. He suggested that at the least the academy should replace the deceased scholars with Orientalists and that those elected should have some interest in “Russia’s Orient.” Developing Grigor’ev’s views, Rozen insisted that

priority should be given to those branches of Orientalism where ... for historical and geographical reasons Russian scholars can and should be ahead of all others. I have in mind such areas of Oriental Studies as the languages of Russia’s natives (*inorodtsy*), Oriental numismatics, Russia’s relations with the Orient in different periods of its history, and so on.²⁵

Rozen’s arguments failed to have an effect on the academicians in charge of nominating candidates for election. Not only did they disagree with Rozen’s view that “Russia’s Orient” should be a research priority, but they also suggested that the deceased Orientalists did not necessarily have to be replaced by specialists in Oriental Studies. In protest Rozen resigned from the academy in 1882. He agreed to be re-elected in 1890, when his demands *de facto* had been fulfilled. From 1893 to 1902, Rozen was dean of the Faculty of Oriental Languages at St. Petersburg University; and from 1885 to his death in 1908, he headed Russia’s main learned society in Oriental Studies, the Oriental Department of the Russian Archaeological Society.²⁶

A historian of Russian Oriental Studies, Nikolai Veselovskii, writing in 1908 described Rozen’s clash with the academy’s leadership in 1882 as part of a battle, begun in the 1860s, between the “German” (i.e., non-nationalist, cosmopolitan) and “Russian” parties in the academy.²⁷ Later scholars tended to view this labeling as a reference to the ethnic origin of participating academics, because this is how the battle was presented in the Russian popular

²⁵ I. Iu. Krachkovskii, ed., *Pamiati akademika V. R. Rozena* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk, 1947), 124.

²⁶ Veselovskii, “Baron V. R. Rozen,” 178; and Krachkovskii, ed., *Pamiati akademika V. R. Rozena*, 117–18, 120–31. See also PO ARAN f. 1, op. 1a, d. 130, ll. 12, 26 ob.–27.

²⁷ Veselovskii, “Baron V. R. Rozen,” 178.

press at the time.²⁸ In fact, the names of the “parties” referred to particular views about research agendas, rather than to the ethnic origins of their members. Academics were divided over whether nationalism (i.e., a focus on the scholar’s own country) should shape research priorities. Ethnic origin was not necessarily an indicator of belonging to a particular “party.” Rozen, after all, had little Russian blood.

Already in the 1880s, Rozen as a professor at St. Petersburg University developed a clear strategy for shaping Russian Oriental Studies according to his vision. He put forward the following research agenda and plan of action:

- (1) to study Russia’s own Orient, particularly Muslim communities within Russia;
- (2) to study the areas (*uzly*) of cultural, political, and economic interaction among peoples of different ethnic origins, languages, and religions.²⁹ His own specific interests were the Arabic influence on Byzantium and “Eastern elements” in Christianity. In these areas his research was pioneering;
- (3) to establish a community of scholars sharing the same vision;
- (4) to create a “national communication space” in Oriental Studies in Russia;
- (5) to achieve a greater recognition of Russian Oriental Studies in Europe; and
- (6) to ensure the acceptance of Russian as one of the languages of international communication among Orientalists.

It is the last two priorities to which we will now turn our attention.

Nationalization and Internationalization: Symbiotic and Conflicting Trends

In 1886, Rozen—as the recently appointed head of the Oriental Department of the Russian Archaeological Society—established its periodical, *Zapiski Vostochnogo otdeleniia Russkogo arkheologicheskogo obshchestva*. The periodical, which became Rozen’s main preoccupation until his death in 1908, was expected to address a number of far-reaching goals: to create a communication space for scholarship in Oriental Studies in the Russian language; to acquaint Russian scholars with the works of their foreign counterparts; to promote the profile of Russian scholarship abroad; and to facilitate foreign scholars’ learning of Russian.

²⁸ See, for instance, Alexander Vucinich, *Empire of Knowledge: The Academy of Sciences of the USSR (1917–1970)* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 51.

²⁹ See N. I. Marr, “Baron V. R. Rozen i khrist’ianskii Vostok,” in *Pamiaty Barona Viktora Romanovicha Rozena, Prilozhenie k XVIII tomu ZVORAO* (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Imperatorskoi akademii nauk, 1909), 13.

The goals set by Rozen were in no way unique. They represented the two main trends in European scholarship at the time—"nationalization" and "internationalization." "Nationalization," above all, was reflected in the emergence of the (nation-)state as a structuring unit and a funding agent of scholarship and science. It was also manifested in a belief that scholarship should contribute to nation-building (through offering scientific definitions of a nation and a justification of the historical presence of a nation on a particular territory, thereby helping to forge close links among members of the national communities and individuals' loyalty to these communities). There was a discussion about specific national approaches to scholarship and science, with terms such as *deutsche Wissenschaft*, *rusaskaia nauka*, and so on, becoming popular in the second half of the 19th century. Central to these efforts at nationalization was a growing use of national languages within the emerging academic communication space at national levels.

At the same time, interaction between scientists/scholars at the international level increased, as reflected in greater international travel and study abroad; the establishment of international congresses in various academic fields; the publication of journals with contributions by scholars from different countries writing in their own national languages; the publication of bibliographies to cover works in a particular discipline produced internationally; and internationally managed research projects. Scholars themselves talked about the emerging "international scientific interaction" (*mezhdunarodnoe nauchnoe obshchenie*) and contrasted it with the uncoordinated activities (*razobshchenie*) of isolated individual scholars in the past.³⁰ Simultaneously, international competition increased, while international recognition of "nationally" produced research began to be seen as a mark of the nation's international prestige. One of the signs of this international recognition became visible in the willingness of the international community of scholars to read works in a particular national language. In terms of time frame, Russia was largely in line in these developments with its European counterparts, and in particular with its main model—the German academic community.

In most European countries, the first learned societies, including those in Oriental Studies, were set up in the 1820s. From the 1840s on, the rhetoric of nation-building began to penetrate scholarly and scientific discourse. For instance, a competition with France so central in the formation of German national identity began to have an impact on the views and actions of leading German scientists and scholars.³¹ The key advances in "nationalization" and "internationalization" were made both in Russia and elsewhere between the

³⁰ Rostovtsev, "Mezhdunarodnoe nauchnoe obshchenie," 74–81.

³¹ For a comprehensive discussion of these developments in German academia, see Constantin Goschler, *Rudolf Virchow, Mediziner—Anthropologe—Politiker* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2002).

1860s and 1914.³² A discussion about the use of Russian in scientific publications started in the early 1850s and became particularly heated in the 1860s.³³ The debate was explicitly linked to the issue of nation-building and was influenced by the conflicting trends of nationalization and internationalization in science and scholarship. The advocates of using Russian argued that it would create a “national community of academics” that would advance Russian science and scholarship internationally. Others, however, continued to argue that, because foreign scholars often knew little Russian, its use by academics served little purpose. Thus many academic works continued to be published in Russia in foreign languages until 1917.

At the turn of the 20th century, Russian scholars were very concerned about the standing of their areas of research in the international arena. Statements were regularly made by scholars about Russia’s scientific inferiority compared to Western Europe, including in those areas where Russian scholarship should have had an advantage (e.g., in the study of non-Russian peoples in the eastern borderlands of the empire).³⁴ Whereas in Germany, a belief in “German science” (*deutsche Wissenschaft*) and “the German way of thinking” (*deutsche Denken*) became widespread in the 1860s and 1870s, confident references to a specifically *russkaia nauka* dated only to the first decade of the 20th century.³⁵ It was widely perceived that pride of place in achieving the creation of “Russian scholarship in Oriental Studies” belonged to Rozen, with *Zapiski* being his main tool. Simultaneously, his role in the “internationalization” of Russian scholarship of the “Orient” was equally central. The two trends co-existed in a symbiotic relationship. From our standpoint, this relationship appears highly contradictory, but from Rozen’s point of view these trends developed in logical and harmonious interaction.

On graduation from St. Petersburg University’s Faculty of Oriental Languages in 1870, Rozen was offered a stipend to “prepare for the assumption of a chair in Arabic.” He declined the offer, going instead to Europe to attend classes of famous Arabists and to work with medieval Arabic manuscripts in major European capitals. He was most impressed with teaching methods in German universities, where the curricula seemed to him better structured than those he had experienced in St. Petersburg. The work with major archival collections and contacts with leading Orientalists

³² Crawford et al., eds., *Denationalizing Science*, 12–13. On developments in Russia, see Nathaniel Knight, “Science, Empire, and Nationality: Ethnography in the Russian Geographical Society, 1845–1855,” in *Imperial Russia: New Histories for the Empire*, ed. Jane Burbank and David L. Ransel (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998), 108–41.

³³ On this debate, see V. M. Orel, ed., *Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk: 275 let sluzheniia Rossii* (Moscow: Nauka, 1999), 322–46.

³⁴ Bartol’d, “Istoriia izuchenii Vostoka,” 467; N. Ia. Marr, “K voprosu o zadachakh armiano-vedeniia,” *ZhMNP*, 2 July/324 (1899): 243–44.

³⁵ Rostovtsev, “Mezhdunarodnoe nauchnoe obshchenie,” 77.

also made a big impact on him. This experience convinced Rozen that all graduates of the Oriental Faculty with academic ambitions should follow his example. In 1876, when already a professor at St. Petersburg, he required his students to go abroad as part of their preparation for their master's theses.³⁶ As Rozen's influence grew (he became dean in 1893), he began to insist that this requirement should be extended to all graduates of the faculty. Rozen was concerned that in some branches of Oriental Studies (e.g. Sinology), young scholars in Russia were particularly uninterested in maintaining close contacts with their foreign colleagues. Thus he began campaigning in support of sending all graduates in Chinese studies to Europe as an essential part of their preparation for academic work. In December 1887, while Ol'denburg was working abroad preparing for his master's degree, Rozen wrote to him:

A. O. Ivanovskii defended his dissertation, in my view, not very successfully.³⁷ It is simply a tragedy that our young Sinologists hardly ever go abroad and remain isolated [*samobytnye*]. I cannot speak to him about it, because [Academician V. P.] Vasil'ev's authority undermines my arguments. A friend would be a different matter. I hope that when you come back you will have some impact on Ivanovskii in terms of the "Europeanization" of his scientific approach.³⁸

(In fact, Ivanovskii did go abroad while working on his master's thesis, but this "abroad" was China, not Europe.) In contrast, Rozen was impressed that the Sinologist Dmitrii Pozdnev went to study in Europe in 1893–94. "It is a good sign that a graduate of the Chinese department has a desire to work in the West," Rozen observed.³⁹ Ol'denburg, who met Pozdnev in Paris, thus replied to Rozen: "I think that Ivanovskii (if put a bit under control) and he [Pozdnev] could very well achieve a transformation toward the new European (in the good sense of the word) Chinese department."⁴⁰

Rozen also used *Zapiski* as a tool for making scholars working in Russia familiar with the latest developments in European scholarship. The central feature of the journal was its bibliographical and book review sections. Rozen wrote many reviews himself, including reports on books outside his specialty. According to Veselovskii, the editorship of *Zapiski*, the compilation of

³⁶ Veselovskii, "Baron V. R. Rozen," 172.

³⁷ A. O. Ivanovskii (1863–1903) was a Sinologist, a student of Academician Vasilii P. Vasil'ev (1818–1900), and a friend of Ol'denburg.

³⁸ "Perepiska V. R. Rozena i S. F. Ol'denburga (1887–1907)," in *Neizvestnye stranitsy otechestvennogo vostokovedeniia*, ed. V. V. Naumkin et al. (Moscow: Vostochnaia literatura, 2004), 215.

³⁹ Ibid., 271.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 276.

bibliographies, and the writing of book reviews took up most of Rozen's time, preventing him from undertaking any major research projects after 1886.⁴¹

With equal enthusiasm Rozen launched a campaign of integrating Russian Oriental Studies into the pan-European community of Orientalists. Several steps were taken to achieve this goal. First, *Zapiski* was designed in such a way that no Orientalist could afford to ignore it. The main means used to achieve this end was the publication in every issue of important primary sources (i.e., original ancient texts and epigraphic material). Rozen made a great effort to ensure that scholars from Russia used *Zapiski* as a vehicle for the first editions of important manuscripts.⁴² Copies of *Zapiski* were regularly sent to important European libraries, often in exchange for West European publications to be deposited in libraries in St. Petersburg. In addition, arrangements were made to ensure that surveys of the content of *Zapiski* were published in leading Western Orientalist journals (e.g., *Journal asiatique* and *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*).⁴³ In 1894, in a letter to Rozen, Ol'denburg assessed the standing of *Zapiski* in Europe: "It [*Zapiski*] chopped a window onto the West. By designing it in this way, you have managed to demonstrate that Orientalism in Russia has its own distinct profile, something that, compared to Western [scholarship], has its own life and is an equal partner to Western Orientalism."⁴⁴

Trips abroad by Rozen and his disciplines were used to promote Russian scholarship. When Ol'denburg went to Europe to collect material for his master's thesis, Rozen told him to publicize Nikolai Petrovskii's discovery of rare manuscripts in Kashgar and Dmitrii Klements's discovery of Uighur and runic inscriptions in eastern Turkestan.⁴⁵ While in Europe, Ol'denburg contacted Western scholars on a regular basis to inform them of relevant Russian publications.⁴⁶ Participation by Russians in collective projects organized by Western scholars and initiation of such projects by Russian scholars were also seen as a way of raising the international profile of Russian scholarship.⁴⁷ The best-known Russian-initiated international project in that period was *Bibliotheca Buddhica*, the collection of northern Sanskrit Buddhist texts, which Ol'denburg conceived in 1894. Printed in St. Petersburg and Leipzig, the series, in Ol'denburg's view, was bound to achieve "our full integration into the European community."⁴⁸ According

⁴¹ Veselovskii, "Baron V. R. Rozen," 182.

⁴² "Perepiska V. R. Rozena i S. F. Ol'denburga," 229 and 293.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 219, 277.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 283.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 207.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 215, 217, and 299.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 311 and 327.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 297 and 298.

to Ol'denburg's plan, scholars from Russia would write introductions to the selected texts in Russian. The general introduction to the series was to be written in Russian and in English. "This would have introduced Russian as a language of equal standing" in scholarly communication.⁴⁹ A campaign to make Russian a language that would be read widely by European scholars was thus an important part of the broader program of integrating Russian scholarship into the European academic community and of raising its profile abroad. Indeed, the correspondence between Rozen and Ol'denburg leaves the impression that for Rozen the politics of language was a key undertaking.

When, in the 1850s, Grigor'ev began publishing his works in Russian, his argument was that the best Russian works would be translated into foreign languages anyway.⁵⁰ Since the launch of *Zapiski* in 1886, Rozen, a native German speaker with an excellent command of written French and Latin, used only Russian to publish his works. His goal was, however, more ambitious than Grigor'ev's. He wanted to make European scholars learn Russian in order to read Russian scholarship. This was, of course, an uphill struggle that Rozen nevertheless pursued obsessively. The issue occupies a central place in his correspondence with Ol'denburg, who fully subscribed to his mentor's position. Thus, in 1893, Ol'denburg informed Rozen that members of the Deutsche morgenländische Gesellschaft had complained to him about the inaccessibility of the Russian language and proposed that a "translation office" be set up at the Slavic Department in Vienna to undertake regular translations of the best Russian Orientalist works into German. Rozen refused to share Ol'denburg's enthusiasm about this initiative. He replied to Ol'denburg: "It is useful that you attended a meeting of German Orientalists.... I hope you bravely defended the principle of using Russian. Let them set up a bureau in Vienna. It is not a subject of our concern."⁵¹

Rozen's view of young scholars was strongly influenced by what he perceived to be their attitude to his insistence that they should publish their works above all in Russian and in the Russian language. He originally suspected the future eminent Indologist, Fedor Sherbatskoi, of lack of enthusiasm for this (Rozen's) position on language and harbored negative feelings toward Sherbatskoi as a result.⁵² The publication by young Russian scholars of their works in foreign journals was noted with disapproval. Thus Ol'denburg wrote to Rozen in 1894: "Have you noticed that Pozdneev Junior published a review of 'U-tai' by Pokotilov in English in the London journal. [This is] a bad sign. He should be set on the right path [*nado by nastavit' ego na put'*]."⁵³

⁴⁹ Ibid., 298.

⁵⁰ Veselovskii, *Vasilii Vasil'evich Grigor'ev*, 97.

⁵¹ "Perepiska V. R. Rozena i S. F. Ol'denburga," 252.

⁵² Ibid., 279.

⁵³ Ibid., 290.

Ol'denburg regularly reported to Rozen about his efforts to convince Western Orientalists to learn Russian and offered examples of his successes in this regard. In the 1890s, he regularly made statements along the following lines: "As far as I can judge, the Russian language is making major progress in the West. Even here [in Paris], amid stubborn French arrogance, [scholars] are diligently learning Russian,"⁵⁴ or "Russian language can definitely claim success among Orientalists" abroad.⁵⁵ On this point, the views of other observers varied. In his obituary of Rozen, Marr complained that "the Russian language is an obstacle to normal dissemination [of information] within the pan-European scholarly community" and gave examples of how Rozen's own works failed to have a sufficient impact because they were published in Russian.⁵⁶ In contrast, in his article about the creation of the pan-European scholarly community at the turn of the 20th century, the eminent scholar Mikhail Rostovtsev observed in 1916:

A group of languages of international communication has emerged and is expanding. In addition to French, German, and English, it also includes Italian. We Russians have successfully waged a struggle for the inclusion of Russian in this group of essential [*obshcheobiazatel'nye*] languages of scholarship.⁵⁷

According to Rostovtsev, the main area where the Russian language began to play such a role was Oriental Studies.

The Interaction between Imperial and National Discourses

The tension between the "internationalization" and the "nationalization" of science and scholarship not only played out in the area of language politics but also resulted in the appearance of contradictory and competing discourses in academic Oriental Studies. The key manifestations of the institutionalized international collaboration were international expeditions and congresses of Orientalists.⁵⁸ The congresses, in particular, produced and reinforced certain common attitudes and a distinct imperial discourse, which to a large extent fitted Edward Said's model of European Orientalism. These attitudes and discourse were, however, undermined and modified by the internal dynamics and agendas of national academic communities.

The second half of the 19th century saw a proliferation of well-organized international expeditions to various sites in the "East" and the creation of research institutes, particularly in the Middle East (Egypt and Palestine),

⁵⁴ Ibid., 276.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 279.

⁵⁶ Marr, "Baron V. R. Rozen i khrist'ianskii Vostok," 25.

⁵⁷ Rostovtsev, "Mezhdunarodnoe nauchnoe obshchenie," 75.

⁵⁸ Other examples include publications of major reference works with contributions by scholars from different countries.

run by scholars from different European countries. An example particularly relevant for our case was the International Association for the Study of Central and East Asia. The proposal for the association was put forward by Russian delegates at the 12th International Congress of Orientalists in Rome in 1899. The rules were confirmed at the next congress in Hamburg in 1902, which established country-based branches of the association. The Russian Committee for the Study of Central and East Asia (RKSIVA) became the headquarters of the international association, whose key goals were the organization and facilitation of international expeditions to the region.⁵⁹ But while promoting collective international projects in the colonial world, as a result of which numerous archaeological objects and manuscripts were relocated to museums and libraries in Europe, European scholars were becoming increasingly possessive about what they regarded as their own “national heritage.” The study of this heritage was seen as, above all, the domain of academics from that particular country, which made it increasingly difficult for foreign scholars to conduct certain types of research there (particularly, archaeological expeditions). Thus the Russian Imperial Archaeological Commission was reluctant to allow foreign archaeologists to work in the Caucasus and Russian Central Asia on the grounds that potential findings in the region were Russia’s “national heritage.” It referred, with approval, to certain foreign governments that “adopted the strictest measures to ban export to other states of ancient objects obtained through planned excavations and accidental discoveries.” The governments that endorsed this approach “hardly allow foreigners to have such expeditions on their territories,” the commission’s report concluded.⁶⁰ “In relation to the Caucasus we must note that this region should be particularly guarded against foreigners, who have already managed to take away from there valuable objects.... As a result, foreign museums are richer than ours in terms of collections from the Caucasus.”⁶¹ According to the report, the same applied to Russian Central Asia.⁶²

International congresses, which became a standard feature in many disciplines in the second half of the 19th century, were the ultimate signs of professionalization (growth in importance of institutionally framed academic communities) as well as of the internationalization of scholarship. The role

⁵⁹ S. F. Ol’denburg, “Russkii komitet dlia izucheniiia srednei i vostochnoi Azii,” *ZhMNP*, part 349, no. 9 (1903): 44–47. A leading role in the organization of the expeditions was played by German, British, Russian, and, increasingly, Japanese scholars.

⁶⁰ *Arkhir Instituta istorii material’noi kul’tury Rossiiskoi akademii nauk*, St. Petersburg (IIMK) f. 1, 1887.69, l. 297. The document does not have a title; its likely date is March 1895.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, l., 297 ob.

⁶² *Ibid.*, l. 298 ob. In relation to Central Asia, political competition between Russia and Britain also added another obstacle to the organization of international expeditions, even though some did take place. On the impact of politics on the scholarship of Central Asia, see Vigasin et al., eds., *Istoriia otechestvennogo vostokovedeniia*, 105.

of the congresses as vehicles for the production of “colonial knowledge” and the reinforcement of imperialist discourses has been noted. Frederick Cooper and Anna Stoler have observed:

The production of colonial knowledge occurred not only within the bounds of nation-states and in relationship to their subject colonized populations but also transnationally, across imperial centers. To what extent—and by what means—did the knowledge of individual empires become collective imperial knowledge, shared among colonizing powers? Was there a language of domination, crossing the distinct metropolitan politics and linguistic barriers of French, English, Spanish, German, and Dutch? Should we be looking toward “modular” models of colonialisms, as Benedict Anderson has suggested for the origins of nationalism? How much did the international congresses accompanying the world and colonial expositions that proliferated throughout Europe in the late nineteenth century provide a site not only to construct and affirm shared notions of race and civility but also secure the relationship between the forming of a consensual notion of Homo Europeus and heightened feelings of national belonging at the same time?⁶³

We seek replies to these questions by looking at the international congresses of Orientalists, which began in 1873 and were held frequently until the beginning of World War I. Between 1873 and 1912, 16 congresses were held.⁶⁴ (The first postwar congress took place in 1928.) In the period under review, the congresses were convened in various major European cities, including St. Petersburg, with the sole exception of the 14th Congress, which took place in 1905 in Algeria.⁶⁵ The congresses were seen as key arenas for exchanging ideas and for establishing and maintaining personal ties between Orientalists.⁶⁶ The numbers of delegates ran into the hundreds. The majority were, of course, from European countries, with the German delegations claiming a substantial dominance. Isolated Egyptian, Chinese, and Japanese individuals were occasionally present.⁶⁷ Representatives from Russia attended most congresses, although in lower numbers than their counterparts from Germany, France, and Britain.

⁶³ Cooper and Stoler, *Tensions of Empire*, 13.

⁶⁴ For information on Russian participation in the congresses, see O. I. Aleksandrova et al., eds., *Mezhdunarodnye kongressy vostokovedov, 1873–1983* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1984).

⁶⁵ See Michael Heffernan, “The French Geographical Movement and the Forms of French Imperialism, 1870–1920,” in *Geography and Empire*, ed. Anne Godlewska and Neil Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), 92–114.

⁶⁶ The role of the congresses in academic exchange, however, began to be questioned in the first decade of the 20th century. See, for instance, F. Knauer, “XIII mezhdunarodnyi s’ezd orientalistov,” *ZhMNP*, part 356, no. 11, otd. 4 (1904): 17–18.

⁶⁷ For instance, 766 delegates attended the 13th Congress in Hamburg. Understandably, the German contingent was particularly large with 380 delegates, followed by 78 delegates from Britain. See *ibid.*, 3.

Detailed reports on the congresses appeared in specialized journals as well as in the Russian popular press.⁶⁸ Congress proceedings were also published. Thus even scholars who did not attend could learn about the speeches and reports made during these international gatherings. In reading proceedings of and press reports on the congresses, one concludes that they played an essential role in the formation and dissemination of the discourse of imperial domination and control as well as of “Orientalism” in Said’s sense.

Government officials from the host countries always attended the congresses. These officials made opening speeches marked by strong prejudices against Eastern cultures. As I show below, such prejudices were at the time already questioned and criticized by some influential academics. At the congresses, however, scholars politely listened to and applauded these speeches. Thus the governor of Algeria, who opened the 14th Congress of Orientalists in 1905, welcomed the audience: “You have come here to see what we have done with this country—a recent refuge of robbers torn apart by internal strife.”⁶⁹ “The East” was represented at the congresses as a masquerade ball or a museum. At the 14th Congress, “the Algerian governor ... arrived at the Consular Palace in a carriage surrounded by the spahis in their picturesque Oriental costumes.”⁷⁰ Most significant is that the first Congress of Orientalists in London established the practice of exhibiting representatives from colonies in the East as museum objects. Reflecting the division of the world into “civilizations” at different developmental levels, the ability of colonial subjects to interact in European languages and behave in a “civilized way” was seen as a visual justification of imperial conquests. At the Third Congress in St. Petersburg, Russian organizers decided to replicate the British example and argued that “nothing would make it [an exhibition at the congress] more distinguished and original than the presence at it of living representatives of the Asiatic nationalities who are part of the Russian tsardom. Apart from Russia, only Great Britain, if it wished, could have organized something similar.”⁷¹ A letter was thus sent to the governor-general of Turkestan requesting assistance with the supply of “suitable natives.” The letter argued:

At the most recent congress in London a significant number of natives of English India took part, both Muslims and Brahmans who could speak English well. These natives, sent to the congress by the order and with the financial assistance of the local viceroy, served to the delegates

⁶⁸ See Aleksandrova et al., eds., *Mezhdunarodnye kongressy vostokovedov*.

⁶⁹ A. Vasil’ev, “XIV mezhdunarodnyi kongress orientalistov v Alzhire,” *ZhMNP*, part 362, no. 12, ord. 4 (1905): 77.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 76.

⁷¹ Grigor’ev, ed., *Trudy tret’ego mezhdunarodnogo s’ezda orientalistov*, xiv.

as a visual proof of the successful influence of Great Britain on the subject population of Hindustan.⁷²

The European press presented the congresses as an important tool in the larger Enlightenment endeavor to understand the world through observation and study. This intellectual knowledge was seen as the main source of European power. Indeed, the expression “knowledge is power” (*znanie—sila*) became a slogan of the day in 19th-century Europe, whereas metaphors of military conquest (*zavoevanie*) were applied to describe the ways in which this knowledge could be obtained.⁷³ The congresses also helped define the imagined geography of the “East.” In addition to focusing on North Africa, the Middle East, and East Asia, the congresses also supported the view of the “East” as a developmental category, which allowed the inclusion of research on American Indians and on Russia’s Finno-Ugric minorities within “European Russia” into the domain of Oriental Studies.⁷⁴

“Modular models” of imperialism articulated and reinforced at the turn of the 20th century emphasized the unity between colonial domains and the European metropolises and depicted imperial conquests “in the language of providential teleology.”⁷⁵ Indeed, not only did the Russian elites present Russia’s colonial domains as part of the pan-Russian political and cultural space, but also the French depicted Algeria as a “New France” that “almost merged” with the metropole.⁷⁶ The British imperial discourse was not averse to emphasizing a special unity between the colonies and the metropole. Similarly, the standard representation of Russia’s imperial expansion as a destiny determined by nature itself was very much in line with the concurrent representations of other empires as “the purpose of Providence.”⁷⁷

Individual scholars, however, were already questioning a good number of these representations and perceptions. Moreover, “modular models” of imperialism were challenged by various projects pursued by European intel-

⁷² Ibid., xv. See also Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv (RGIA) f. 954 (fond Kaufmana), op. 1, d. 67, l. 1.

⁷³ *Trudy chetvertogo arkhelogicheskogo s'ezda v Rossii* 1 (Kazan: Tipografiia Imperatorskogo universiteta, 1884), xxvi; Vasil'ev, “XIV mezhdunarodnyi kongress,” 77; “Ot redaktsii,” *Mir Islama* 1, 1 (1912): 15; M. V. Nikol'skii, “Motivirovannoe predlozhenie ob obrazovanii vostochnoi komissii,” *Drevnosti vostochnye* 1, 1 (1889): 6.

⁷⁴ “Doklad prof. F. Knauera ob afinskome mezhdunarodnom s'ezde vostokovedeniia v 1912 godu,” *Chteniiia v Istoricheskome obshchestve Nestora letopistsa*, kn. 24, no. 1, otd. 4 (1914), 5; G. S. Lebedev, *Istoriia otechestvennoi arkheologii* (St. Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Sankt-Peterburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 1992), 194–95.

⁷⁵ David N. Livingstone, “Climate’s Moral Economy: Science, Race, and Place in Post-Darwinian British and American Geography,” in *Geography and Empire*, ed. Godlewska and Smith, 136.

⁷⁶ Vasil'ev, “XIV mezhdunarodnyi kongress,” 71.

⁷⁷ Livingstone, “Climate’s Moral Economy,” 137.

lectuals aimed at incorporating the “East” into European identities.⁷⁸ These projects questioned the established geography of the “Orient,” criticized representations of the “peoples of the East” in “theatrical costumes,” and doubted the validity of the European sense of superiority. In Russia, the last of these projects had many manifestations. At its core lay Rozen’s vision of “Russian culture,” developed as a result of centuries of interaction between the peoples of the “East” and the “West,” and his insistence that this interaction should be the main focus of scholarly research.⁷⁹ By the 1890s, the interest in the interaction between the “East” and the “West” as a driving force of the formation of what was termed “Russian culture” began to dominate research, being promoted by, in addition to Rozen, such influential academics as the literary scholar Aleksandr Veselovskii (1838–1906) and the archaeologist and art historian Nikodim Kondakov (1844–1925).⁸⁰ While the acceptance of the multi-ethnicity of modern national cultures and the vision of mixing rather than racial purity as a positive feature were not at all unique to Russia,⁸¹ these ideas in the Russian context suited nation-building purposes particularly well.⁸² As mentioned above, the brightest representatives of Russian Oriental Studies of the first decades of the 20th century were Rozen’s disciples, who saw themselves as belonging to “a new school of Oriental Studies in Russia,” of which Rozen was “the creator.”⁸³ As described by Bartol’d, one of the distinct features of this school was the questioning and modification of the above-described Orientalizing discourse promoted at international congresses.

In 1900, Bartol’d claimed that seeing the “East” in “theatrical costumes” was now a thing of the past.⁸⁴ Whereas Marr, known for his criticism of West European scholarship from the early stages of his career, tended to present this development as particularly manifested in Russian scholarship led by

⁷⁸ On this subject, see, in particular, John MacKenzie, *Orientalism: History, Theory, and the Arts* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995). Marchand, “German Orientalism and the Decline of the West” focuses specifically on the period since 1880 as the time of major changes in the perception and representation of the Orient in Europe. She provides evidence of how, in this period, influential German Orientalists challenged Eurocentric versions of history, fighting “occidental traditions with ‘oriental’ truths,” 470.

⁷⁹ Marr, “Baron V. R. Rozen i khrist’ianskii Vostok,” 13, 15, 17, and 23.

⁸⁰ Tolz, “Imperialism, Nationalism, and Ethnic Diversity,” 133–34.

⁸¹ See, for instance, Diaz-Andreu and Champion, eds., *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*, 57, 166–84; and Goshler, *Rudolf Virchow, Mediziner—Anthropologe—Politiker*. Theodor Lindner’s multi-volume *Weltgeschichte seit der Völkerwanderung* (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1901–17) became the first attempt to present “world history” not solely as the history of Europe but with the incorporation of a discussion of “Eastern” societies.

⁸² See Lebedev, *Istoriia otechestvennoi arkheologii*, 362, 409; Vigin et al., eds., *Istoriia otechestvennogo vostokovedeniia*, 33.

⁸³ PO ARAN f. 68, op. 1, d. 13, l. 16.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, l. 9.

Rozen, Bartol'd admitted that Rozen was only developing a trend visible in European, particularly in German and Austrian Oriental Studies since the mid-19th century.⁸⁵ As described by Alfred von Kremer (1828–89), an Austrian scholar of Islam whose work influenced Rozen, this new scholarship aimed at overcoming the tendency to perceive as universal ideas that, in fact, amounted to “prejudices ... professed exclusively by a small faction of humanity” (i.e., Europeans).⁸⁶ Inspired by Rozen's belief in the need to question the prejudices of European scholars studying the “Orient,” in 1905 Bartol'd began reading a university course on the historiography of Oriental Studies in Europe and Russia. First published as a book in 1911, the course aimed “among other things, at dispelling various myths about the East in Russia and Europe.” In Bartol'd's writings, many European scholars were criticized for their “biased views and prejudices” in a manner not entirely dissimilar to Said's critique of European Orientalism.⁸⁷

Geographical definitions of the “Orient” dominant in the academic community, but already questioned earlier by such scholars as the Sinologist Vasilii Vasil'ev,⁸⁸ were subjected to critical scrutiny by Bartol'd. In editorial comments to the first issue of the journal *Mir Islama*, the scholar observed:

The Near East, with the inclusion of Egypt, which is usually meant in Western Europe when [people] speak about the “East,” in reality, despite frequent military clashes, constitutes one cultural–historical whole with Europe; and together they constitute the “West” in relation to more eastern cultural states such as India and China. From the very beginning, the culture of the Near East and southeastern Europe shared the same origins in the ancient culture of Egypt and Babylon; later, political and cultural superiority shifted back and forth between the Europeans and the peoples of the Near East, but in all those times the role of the West (in its broad term) remained the same in relation to the countries of the Far East.⁸⁹

⁸⁵ Ibid., I. 9; Marr, “K voprosu o zadachakh armianovedeniia,” 246.

⁸⁶ On the changing character of Oriental Studies in Europe, particularly Arabic Studies in Germany and Austria since the mid-19th century, see Rudi Paret, *The Study of Arabic and Islam at German Universities* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1968), 7–18. The quote from von Kremer is on 12. On the contribution of German Orientalist scholars to the questioning of “Eurocentric” approaches in scholarship in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, see also Marchand, “German Orientalism and the Decline of the West,” 456, 470.

⁸⁷ Bartol'd, “Istoriia izucheniia Vostoka,” 227. See also Charles Evans, “Vasilii Barthold: Orientalism in Russia?” *Russian History/Histoire russe* 26, 1 (1999): 25–44.

⁸⁸ V. V. Vasil'ev, *Religii Vostoka: Konfutsianstvo, buddizm i daoizm* (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Imperatorskoi akademii nauk, 1873), 8.

⁸⁹ *Mir Islama* 1, 1 (1912): 4.

In line with this perception, Rozen and later Marr were particularly interested in the role of the interaction of the “East” and the “West” in the origins of Christianity and in the impact of the “East” on the culture of the Byzantine empire, seen as a predecessor of the Russian empire.⁹⁰ Indeed, this is one of the areas where Russian scholars could claim that their research influenced the agenda of their counterparts in Western Europe. In the first decade of the 20th century, the leading German Byzantinist, Karl Krumbacher, began to champion this research agenda, giving Russian scholarship due credit.⁹¹

Important episodes in Russian history were reinterpreted by Russian Orientalist scholars in line with these perceptions. Most significantly, Bartol'd reinterpreted the Mongol invasion of Rus' in the 13th–15th centuries as a period beneficial rather than detrimental to Russia's development. He argued that the Mongols brought political stability rather than devastation to the societies they conquered. According to him, the Mongol period not only prepared Rus' for a political revival under Moscow's leadership but also facilitated its cultural development. He concluded: “In contrast to the prevailing view, even the impact of European culture on Rus' in the Mongol period was much greater than in the Kievan period.”⁹² Rather than seeing the Mongol invasion as an episode that led to the subsequent cultural backwardness of Rus'/Russia, Bartol'd argued that, in fact, the period simply revealed the existing backwardness of Rus', as it was unable to use the Mongol invasion to enrich its own culture with knowledge about and from the East.⁹³

At the same time, following his mentor Rozen, Bartol'd was an unwavering supporter of the superiority of “European methods of scholarship,” based on the so-called historico-philological tradition, and a believer in the superiority of these methods over other types of inquiry (for instance, those developed by Indian or Chinese scholars.)⁹⁴ The views of Ol'denburg and Marr on this issue were more ambiguous.

⁹⁰ Marr, “Baron V. R. Rozen i khrist'ianskii Vostok,” 15; N. I. Platonova, “Akademik Nikolai Iakovlevich Marr i Sankt-Peterburgskii universitet,” in *Znamenitie universiteta* (St. Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Sankt-Petersburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 2002), 156–78.

⁹¹ Rostovtsev, “Mezhdunarodnoe nauchnoe obshchenie,” 77; Knauer, “XIII mezhdunarodnyi s'ezd orientalistov,” 16–17; Vasil'ev, “XIV mezhdunarodnyi kongress orientalistov v Alzhire,” 87–88.

⁹² Bartol'd, “Istoriia izucheniia Vostoka,” 364.

⁹³ Ibid., 363–64. See also Bartol'd, “Vostok i russkaia nauka,” 534–45. Works by Bartol'd and other disciples of Rozen were used by ideologists of the Eurasian movement of the 1920s. See Riasanovsky, “Asia through Russian Eyes,” 29. Bartol'd's views were not necessarily shared by leading Western scholars. See V. V. Bartol'd, “Nauchnaia poezdka v Zapadnuuiu Evropu (18 iuliia 1924),” in his *Sochineniia*, 9: 564–72.

⁹⁴ Bartol'd, “Istoriia izucheniia Vostoka,” 324.

A talented and complex figure, Marr was influenced in his scholarly work by unsettled questions of his own identity.⁹⁵ Entering St. Petersburg University as a committed Georgian nationalist, he gradually accepted pan-Russian patriotism of Rozen's type. Simultaneously, he accepted his mentor's interest in the "areas of intensive cultural contacts between different peoples" and the perception of the vibrancy of such interaction as a source of progress.⁹⁶ Under Rozen's influence, Marr's research agenda evolved from the study of the origins of the Georgian language⁹⁷ to a multi-disciplinary study of the cultural unity of the Caucasus formed over a long period of time through interactions among different ethnic groups in the region.⁹⁸ The Caucasus, with its multi-ethnic and multi-linguistic variety within a single culturally unified community, was presented by Marr as a microcosm of and a model for Russia as a whole.⁹⁹

From his first visit to Europe in preparation for his master's thesis, Marr developed a rather negative view of West European scholarship.¹⁰⁰ Already at the defense of his dissertation in 1899 he complained about the unfounded "sense of superiority" on the part of West Europeans, reflected in the perception, "as widespread as it is erroneous," "of the stagnant nature of Eastern people."¹⁰¹ In turn, in 1896, Ol'denburg dwelled on the inability of the Europeans to understand "or even to attempt to understand" the life of people in Asia. In a sweeping generalization he concluded that at best most of them were only capable of drawing a picture "where individual features are absent." He continued: "Even those Europeans who live in Asia for a long time are happy to admit that the natives are 'a closed book to them.' Of course, unless one sees in a Chinese, Mongol, or Indian a human being, this book will never be opened."¹⁰² Both Marr and Ol'denburg believed that Russia, "as a neighbor of the East always knew and understood it well" and, therefore, had an advantage over West Europeans in studying it.¹⁰³

⁹⁵ For the best discussion of this issue, see Ia. V. Vasil'kov, "Tragediia akademika Marra," *Khrist'ianskii Vostok*, no. 2 (2001): 390–421.

⁹⁶ PO ARAN f. 800. op. 1, d. 942, ll. 1–2.

⁹⁷ It should be noted that Rozen strongly opposed Marr's linguistic work. See Vasil'kov, "Tragediia akademika Marra," 398.

⁹⁸ This approach had a positive impact on Marr's archaeological work but proved unproductive in linguistics (*ibid.*, 399–400).

⁹⁹ N. Ia. Marr, *Izbrannye raboty*, 1 (Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo GAIMK, 1933), 282.

¹⁰⁰ This worried Rozen and Ol'denburg, who tried to facilitate Marr's contacts with foreign scholars. See, for instance, "Perepiska V. R. Rozena i S. F. Ol'denburga," 277 and 283.

¹⁰¹ Marr, "K voprosu o zadachakh armianovedeniia," 246.

¹⁰² *ZVORAO*, no. 9 (1896): 304.

¹⁰³ This position was rejected in Bartol'd, "Istoriia izuchenii Vostoka," 482.

In the course of World War I, anti-Western (particularly anti-German) tendencies significantly increased among Russian intellectuals. A general anti-German atmosphere in Russia was exacerbated by the fact that Russian scholars felt betrayed by various anti-Russian propaganda statements disseminated in Germany, under which famous German scholars put their signatures.¹⁰⁴ In this period one can see a significant radicalization of Marr's and Ol'denburg's views, with Marr, for instance, speaking about "plots" (*proiski*) in the West against Russia and Ol'denburg presenting archaeological methods of Western, particularly German, scholars as a manifestation of the barbarism of Western imperialism, which was preoccupied solely with enriching museums in Europe with objects from the "East."¹⁰⁵ Both scholars contrasted this approach with the work of Russian scholarship, which they alleged displayed a greater respect for the traditions and needs of people in the "East."¹⁰⁶ These positions of Marr and Ol'denburg were not Russia-specific. The accusation of pursuing utilitarian aims in archaeological digs had been perceived as reputation-damaging across Europe since the turn of the 20th century. Therefore, scholars attempted to depict their own activities as aimed at altruistically preserving artifacts for future generations.¹⁰⁷ In turn, during World War I, in response to the Entente's reports about atrocities committed by the German army, Germany mounted an anti-colonial propaganda campaign aimed at using "Pan-Islamism and jihad as weapons" against England, France, and Russia.¹⁰⁸ In the course of this campaign the Entente states were presented as anti-Islamic and Germany as a "true friend of Islam" and a liberator of the Orient. Leading German academics actively participated in this campaign.¹⁰⁹

Thus the post-1917 attacks by Marr and Ol'denburg on "bourgeois scholarship" and its juxtaposition to Soviet scholarship about the "East" with its own distinct profile were not simply a manifestation of political

¹⁰⁴ Rostovtsev, "Mezhdunarodnoe nauchnoe obshchenie," 76–77; Suzanne L. Marchand, *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 235, 236.

¹⁰⁵ N. Ia. Marr, "Kavkazskii kul'turnyi mir i Armeniia," *ZhMNP*, part 57, no. 6 (1915): 327.

¹⁰⁶ S. F. Ol'denburg, "Ekspeditsiia D. A. Klements'a v Turfan v 1898," *Izvestiia Vostochnogo otdela Russkogo geograficheskogo obshchestva* 45 (1917): 111. See also N. D. D'iakonova, *Materialy pervoi Turkestanskoi ekspeditsii akademika S. F. Ol'denburga, 1909–1910* (Moscow: Vostochnaia literatura, 1995), 5–10.

¹⁰⁷ Marchand, *Down from Olympus*, 192.

¹⁰⁸ Gottfried Hagen, "German Heralds of Holy War: Orientalists and Applied Oriental Studies," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa, and the Middle East* 24, 2 (2004): 149.

¹⁰⁹ Hagen, "German Heralds of Holy War," 154–55; and Marchand, *Down from Olympus*, 237.

opportunism. To some extent they represented a further development of the views that had been forming among scholars both in Russia and elsewhere in Europe since the early 20th century and became radicalized in the course of World War I as a result of wounded national pride and doubts about the moral values of "European civilization."

In the 1920s, while Marr was transforming his "Japhetic theory" into the "New Theory of Language," lambasting bourgeois linguistics, Ol'denburg outlined new foundations for Soviet Oriental Studies that were supposed to be different from those of European scholarship rooted in the imperialist exploitation of the East. The key criticism repeated extensively by Ol'denburg in the very first years of the Soviet period was that a "Western person [*zapadnyi chelovek*] understands the East poorly, because he is solely preoccupied with the achievements of his own civilization and is therefore blind to the great and exciting culture of the East."¹¹⁰ The further development of Ol'denburg's views was reflected in a series of articles he wrote between 1927 and 1931. His arguments were as follows.

"The entire history of the relationship between East and West, from the Greeks in antiquity through the time of the Crusaders, during the Middle Ages and leading to modern and contemporary times" was marked by "attempts [on the part of the West] to enslave the East," "depriving the East of its own voice" (*besslovesnyi*).¹¹¹ This goal "naturally" was "reflected in studies of the East. The very existence of the term "Oriental Studies" (*vostokovedenie*) was the reflection of these attitudes, as there was no comparable discipline of "Occidental studies" (*zapadnovedenie*). Ol'denburg argued that it was curious that "until now no one even posed a question of how legitimate it is to segregate the study of the East into a separate discipline." Moreover, this separation of the study of the "East" and the "West" reinforced the perception that the "East" and the "West" were two different worlds. This perception both influenced Europe's colonial policies in the East and was reinforced by those policies."¹¹²

Because of this isolation of the discipline of Oriental Studies, "economic" and "political" developments in the "East" were studied poorly and so was the contemporary situation of non-European societies. Instead, scholars tended to focus on the past and were interested in religious and linguistic issues.¹¹³ Finally, many European scholars believed that true

¹¹⁰ S. F. Ol'denburg, "Predislovie k katalogu izdatel'stva 'Vsemirnaia literatura,'" *Literatura Vostoka* 2 (1919): 6.

¹¹¹ S. F. Ol'denburg, "Sovetskoe vostokovedenie," *Front nauki i tekhniki*, nos. 7/8 (1931): 65.

¹¹² S. F. Ol'denburg, "Vostokovedenie v Akademii nauk na novykh putiakh," *Vestnik Akademii nauk*, no. 2 (1931): 9–10.

¹¹³ Ol'denburg, "Sovetskoe vostokovedenie," 64; Ol'denburg, "Vostokovedenie v Akademii nauk," 11.

scholarship did not exist in the East. "These scholars therefore paid little attention to the Eastern scholarly tradition, [this tradition's] interpretation of evidence—contrasting to it, as the only correct [approach], Western interpretations based on Western methods of research." In contrast, Ol'denburg believed that it was necessary to acknowledge that "any cultured people, regardless of whether they are Western or Eastern, have their own understanding of their cultures, which has to be taken into account and often even as a guide by those who have the ambition to study these cultures in a scholarly way."¹¹⁴ Ol'denburg suggested that "Oriental Studies as a distinct discipline has become absolute," "because for us there is no distinction between the East and the West," and its individual parts "should be integrated into the general disciplines of economics, history, linguistics, literary studies, and so on."¹¹⁵

This critique is strikingly similar to the key arguments against Western "Orientalism" as articulated by Edward Said.¹¹⁶ Said noted his debt to Michel Foucault's notion of discourse, which, of course, is not present in Ol'denburg's work. Yet the influence of Foucault on Said's conceptual framework is, in fact, rather superficial. What Foucault calls "discourse" presupposes the presence of the "modern state forms, modern institutional grids, objectified economic productions, [and] modern forms of rationalized planning" that arose between the 16th and the 18th centuries.¹¹⁷ According to Foucault, "discourse" has to be studied within the context of a particular historical, political, social, and economic framework. Such a historically specific analysis of discourse is largely absent from Said's work. Instead, Said's conceptual framework—not only a few specific arguments—remains close to Ol'denburg's. Both authors believe that "(a) there is a unified European/Western identity which is at the origin of history and has shaped this history through its thoughts; [and] (b) this seamless and unified history of European identity and thought runs from Ancient Greece to our own time, through a specific set of beliefs and values which remain eternally the same." Both authors essentialize "the West" to a considerable degree.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ From a 1927 report, quoted in I. Iu. Krachkovskii, "S. F. Ol'denburg kak istorik vostokovedeniia," *Izbrannye sochineniia*, vol. 5 (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1958), 364.

¹¹⁵ Ol'denburg, "Sovetskoe vostokovedenie," 66.

¹¹⁶ Said's work has a distinct dimension that is absent from Ol'denburg's writings. Said treated Orientalism as a literary phenomenon and applied the techniques of literary criticism to studying it.

¹¹⁷ Aijaz Ahmad, "Between Orientalism and Historicism: Anthropological Knowledge of India," *Studies in History* 7, 1 (1991): 145–46.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*

Said was not familiar with the Russian scholars' works, but there is a direct link between Said and his Russian predecessors. In writing his critique of European Orientalism, Said relied heavily on the works of several Arab authors who in the early 1960s initiated a major critique of Western Oriental Studies from a perspective that was at the same time Marxist and post-colonial nationalist.¹¹⁹ The publication that first set out particularly clearly what became major charges against Western Orientalists in Said's work and in the works influenced by his arguments was "Orientalism in Crisis" (1963), an article by a Marxist sociologist from Egypt, Anwar Abdel-Malek.¹²⁰ In Abdel-Malek's view, Western Oriental Studies was inseparably linked to Europe's desire to dominate the East and to modern Western imperialism. Eurocentrism and racism turned "the Orient and Orientals" into "'objects' of study, stamped with an otherness," thus representing "the Orient" as always "passive, non-participating," silent. European Oriental Studies focused on the past and "[t]his past itself was studied in its cultural aspects—notably the language and religion—detached from social evolution." Indeed, in terms of conceptions and methodological approaches Oriental Studies was an outdated discipline compared to other branches of humanities and social sciences. "The scientific work of the scholars of different Oriental countries was passed over in silence." Last but not least, Westerners plundered Eastern societies of their cultural treasures which were now stored in museums and libraries in the West.

One of the reasons for this similarity between Abdel-Malek's arguments and those of Ol'denburg is direct borrowing. The first footnote in Abdel-Malek's article includes a reference to the entry "Vostokovedenie" (Oriental Studies) in the 1951 edition of *Bol'shaia sovetskaia entsiklopediia* (Great Soviet Encyclopedia), which summarized Ol'denburg's above-mentioned critique of European Oriental Studies.¹²¹ But the borrowing was not, of course, mechanical. The criticism of Western scholarship by Ol'denburg and Marr, on the one hand, and by Abdel-Malek, other left-wing Arab intellectuals, and Said, on the other, were articulated as part of these authors' search for national identity in which comparisons with the

¹¹⁹ Edward Said, "Orientalism Reconsidered," in *Literature, Politics, and Theory*, ed. Francis Baker, Peter Hulme, Margaret Iversen, and Diana Loxley (London: Methuen, 1986), 214–15, acknowledged that "At bottom, what I said in *Orientalism*, had been said before me by" A. L. Tibawi, Abdullah Laroui, Anwar Abdel-Malek, Talal Asad, S. H. Alatas, Frantz Fanon, Aimé Césaire, K. M. Panikkar, and Romila Thapar.

¹²⁰ Anwar Abdel-Malek, "Orientalism in Crisis," *Diogenes*, no. 44 (1963): 104–40. For the examples of the utilization of Abdel-Malek's arguments by Said, see *Orientalism*, 96–97, 105, 108, and 325.

¹²¹ "Vostokovedenie, (inache orientalistika)," in *Bol'shaia sovetskaia entsiklopediia*, vol. 9 (Moscow: Sovetskaia entsiklopediia, 1951), 193–202, particularly 193–96. Abdel-Malek also referred to the French edition of Bartol'd's "Istoriia izucheniia Vostoka," 130.

West and conscious or unconscious need of its approbation were central.¹²² Another common ground among these authors is to be found in Marxism. Marx's analysis of the "hegemony of power possessing minorities" over disadvantaged majorities and his emphasis on the importance of economic processes informed the works of Abdel-Malek and other recent authors and were taken up by Ol'denburg and Marr, even though it is debatable how well these Russian scholars knew Marx and sympathized with Marxism.

Locating these scholars' criticism of Western Oriental Studies in the context of their search for national identity constructed in opposition to "the West" does not imply that there is nothing worthwhile in their criticism. Instead, the point that can be made here is as follows. The fact that Russia was the first society in the 19th century attempting to modernize in competition with a more economically and politically advanced Western Europe, as Isaiah Berlin showed in his essay on the Russian populist movement, led Russian intellectuals "to acute insights into moral, social, and aesthetic problems" whose "central importance" was finally realized by their counterparts in the West only in the second half of the 20th century.¹²³

Conclusion

Through the efforts of Baron Rozen and his disciples, Russian Oriental Studies became closely integrated into the European scholarly community at the turn of the 20th century. The discipline was shaped by the pan-European trends of "nationalization" and "internationalization" of scholarship and influenced by ideologies of nationalism and of imperialism. These trends coexisted in a symbiotic relationship, whose contradictory nature did not seem to bother scholars at the time. All the talk about specifically "Russian scholarship" notwithstanding, until the beginning of World War I Russian academics had little doubt that their work was part of a pan-European endeavor and that the methods of European scholarship, particularly classical philology, were superior to other modes of intellectual inquiry. It was during the war, as its horrors led to doubts about the nature of "European civilization" that, reflecting general political and intellectual developments both in Russia and in Europe, some Orientalist scholars began to focus on the alleged differences between their own scholarship and works by their colleagues abroad. Among Russian intellectuals, this sense of Europe as "Other" intensified after 1917. The 1920s were also marked by attempts by the new Soviet government to forge an image of the Soviet state as anti-imperial. It is in this intellectual and political context that

¹²² Said readily acknowledged the link between his critique of European Orientalism and the issue of his own identity. See Said, *Orientalism*, 25–28 and 338.

¹²³ For an excellent analysis of Berlin's views, see Aileen Kelly, *Toward Another Shore: Russian Thinkers between Necessity and Chance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 23; Isaiah Berlin, *Russian Thinkers* (London: Hogarth, 1978), 210–37.

such scholars as Ol'denburg and Marr articulated a sustained critique of Western Oriental Studies and began to claim that Russian scholars were in the process of creating a different, morally superior type of scholarship. Paradoxically, their views (although without a clear attribution) had a particularly significant impact on shaping a new agenda of scholarship in the West in the second half of the 20th century.

School of Languages, Linguistics, and Cultures
University of Manchester
Oxford Road
Manchester M13 9PL
United Kingdom
vera.tolz@manchester.ac.uk