



Title	<REVIEW>ROSHIA, TOO NO KOKKA TO SHAKAI [STATE AND SOCIETY IN RUSSIA AND EAST EUROPE], By Shigeto Toriyama, Tokyo : Kobun-sha, 1985,vii, 412,xxvi pp., Map., 4,500
Author(s)	KURYUZAWA, Takeo
Citation	Acta Slavica Iaponica, 4, 146-147
Issue Date	1986
Doc URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2115/7958
Type	bulletin (article)
File Information	KJ00000034111.pdf



[Instructions for use](#)

REVIEWS

ROSHIA, TŌŌ NO KOKKA TO SHAKAI [STATE AND SOCIETY IN RUSSIA AND EAST EUROPE]. By *Shigeto Toriyama*. Tokyo : Kōbun-sha, 1985. vii, 412, xxvi pp. Map. ¥4,500.

The author of this monumental volume is well known to Japanese readers because of his active contributions for many years to the study of Russian and East European history in Japan. Since the publication of *Russia and Europe* in 1949, the author produced a number of books and papers. The range of his research is very wide periodically, as well as thematically. He wrote about "Serfdom and Feudalism in the Kievan period," while on the other hand investigated the process of recovery of Soviet economy in the first stage of its existence. He treated such thinkers as N.Ia. Danilevskii, I.V. Kireevskii, and P.L. Lavrov, examined the destiny of peasants and their village communes, discussed the relationship between autocracy and the national assembly (*zemskii sobor*), commented on the problem of aristocracy and bureaucracy in the 18th century and considered the economic situation in the 19th century. Moreover, his study is not restricted to Russian history: he showed no less interest in Hungary, Bohemia and par excellence Poland.

The wide range of his study is also evident in this newly published volume. It contains eleven essays. All of those, except a newly written one, have been already published in various journals and periodicals for the past twenty years. It consists of six parts.

The first part is the introduction to the whole work. In the first chapter the author takes a general view on the development of the Muscovite state and the Russian empire (from the 15th to the 19th century). The second chapter deals with East Europe in the transition period of the 14th to the 16th centuries. The author, referring to a Hungarian scholar E. Niederhauser, argues that the historical development of East European, especially East Central European countries in the Middle Ages could be compared with that of West European countries, but that from the end of the Middle Ages East Europe changed its course, forming a different type of society in the early modern age.

In the second part the author criticizes the tendency to emphasize the uniqueness of the Muscovite political system in comparison with that of West European countries. Taking up the national assembly (*zemskii sobor*) and other institutions in chapters 3 and 4, the author comes to the conclusion that they were not so much of different nature from those of West Europe as is generally asserted.

Part three is assigned for two of the most important questions in Russian peasant history—serfdom and village communes. In chapter five, the author examines critically B. D. Grekov's theory on the enserfment of the Muscovite peasantry. The author's opinions are quite noteworthy. It was under the influence of S. F. Platonov and from non-Marxist point of view that Grekov built his theory on the problem. In his later works Grekov reasserted it without any substantial modifications, only using Marxist phraseology. His theory was accepted by most scholars, but he himself did not pay attention to the

fact that they accepted it only in a modified form, influenced by N.S. Chaev's thesis. Chapter six is an attempt to explain why in the noble and ecclesiastical estates the practice of land-redistribution began to take firm root for a relatively short period from the late seventeenth to the mid-eighteenth century. According to Toriyama it is not because of the shortage of land in peasant's hands, but of the excessiveness of their burden and obligations to the landlords and to the state, and because peasant communes were obligated to redistribute quite often both burden and tenure among their members.

Part four treats the reigns of two great monarchs in the 18th century— Peter I and Catherine II. Chapter seven considers the historical significance of Peter's reform. The author, stressing the continuity of Russia before and after Peter, insists that his reform be understood in the context of the formation of early modern Europe. Chapter eight aims to clarify the motives and backgrounds of the provincial reform of 1775. The author reexamines the views of several scholars on the problem of how Catherine's reform was connected with Pugachev's rebellion, Legislative Commission of 1767–68, Peter III's Manifesto of February 18, 1762, and Elizabeth's Legislative Commission.

Part five (chapter nine) discusses the theory of the so-called "Juridical school", which has certain influence even upon Soviet historians. The author, focusing upon P. N. Miliukov's *Outlines of Russian Cultural History*, tries to make clear how Miliukov inherited, modified, and developed the basic points of views of such founders of the school, as S. M. Solov'ev, K. D. Kavelin and B. N. Chicherin. According to the author, among those scholars Miliukov inherited from Chicherin most, who had attached much importance to the role of the Norman and the Tartar conquests in the formation of the Russian state.

Part six deals with some aspects of Polish constitutional history before "the Partition." Chapter ten is a study of the significance of the confederations (Konfederacja) in the Polish constitution from the end of the Middle Ages up to the 18th century and the last chapter is an attempt to sketch the history of Polish-Lithuanian unions, ranging from the union of Krewo (1385) to that of Mielnik (1501). The author especially puts emphasis on the attitude of the Lithuanian magnates towards the unions.

The method the author adopts to deal with such various themes is what we might call a historiographical one. He carefully analyzes preceding studies on the topic, compares opinions of leading scholars, clarifies problematics in the main trend of historiography and attempts to form his own judgement, which is not only sound but also suggestive for the further development of the study. He is always critical to commonly accepted views (his criticism is obvious even in a general survey like chapter one) and strives for new interpretations. In such a way he, as a pioneer of the study of Russian and East European history in Japan, has set a good example to the following generation.

Needless to say, he has not done everything perfectly. Rather he has made only the first step, and further steps must be taken. Especially each problem must be investigated more concretely in full detail. Since the 1950s it has become easier to obtain historical sources in this field in Japan, and now there are almost no published sources which we can not obtain. The task of grappling with those sources still awaits us.

Takeo KURYUZAWA

Otaru University of Commerce