

A Bundle of Disparate Interests: Research Fields and Sub-Disciplines in the Present-Day Russian Anthropology*

Sergei V. Sokolovskiy

Abstract: The article presents an overview of the current state of various anthropological sub-disciplines and specializations within Russian anthropology. The co-citation analysis documents the existence of three largest categories of researchers that constitute the core of this national tradition of anthropological research: political anthropologists, ethno-folklorists, and regionalists, with further fragmentation into special interest schools teams and research domains, including such specializations as urban, linguistic, legal, medical, economic, and visual anthropologies, anthropology of religion, sport, technology, professions, etc. Each of these domains is briefly characterized in terms of their chronology, existing centres and journals, other publication activities, and leading authors.

Keywords: Russian anthropology, anthropological research domains, history of anthropology, regional studies, research traditions

Names are often misleading, the names of the disciplines doubly so. What went by the name of anthropology in Russia just a few years ago (and is still going on beyond its capitals and large universities) often needs elaborate comments and long explanations for our colleagues elsewhere. In gross terms, the predominant occupations of Russian (socio-cultural) anthropologists cum ethnologists might be roughly grouped into two large and mutually independent (in terms of research activities, journals, reading audiences, and mutual citations, or, better, the lack of

* The article has been prepared with institutional support by the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, Russian Acad. Sci., no. 177-2018-0005.

the latter) domains. The *first* and more populous area is the study of the so-called nationalities policy with its perpetual issues, such as nation-building, ‘inter-ethnic relations’, ‘ethnic conflicts’, minorities’ and indigenous peoples’ rights, the policies of ethnic categorization and ethnic groups recognition, identity politics, multiculturalism and tolerance. The *second*, less directly influenced by political whims and fashions is the old Russian tradition of anthropological research that is centred on what has been elsewhere known as ethnology proper, with its own conventional objects – folklore, mythology, traditions, customs and rituals (all under generic name of ‘traditional culture studies’), and with its recent interest in more fluid and flimsy urban ways and lifestyles. There are also physical or bio-anthropology and archaeology, but they are not viewed as parts of Russian anthropology: most former ‘ethnographers-turned-cultural/social anthropologists’ consider these specializations as separate disciplines, albeit often sharing the same administrative and financial resources as ‘anthropology proper’ (on the rare exceptions, see below)¹.

There is yet one more fairly large and mixed group of researchers, working at anthropological institutions and research centres across the country, who by their training and current preoccupations could be more suitably described as historians, sociologists, political scientists, philosophers, linguists, demographers, biologists, geographers, geneticists, etc. The subject-matter of their research projects influenced by loyalty to the disciplines they have been trained in, on the one hand, and their research positions within anthropological departments, on the other, turn them into ‘human bridges’ that both facilitate interdisciplinary endeavours and fragment what has gone so far under the name of Russian anthropology into more and more specialized research fields. This third category is defined against the first two as not-specializing in their respective domains, and thus do not constitute a separate and homogeneous area of research interests, but more an artefact of classification, a diverse assembly of interdisciplinary research, associated with various anthropological centres.

As particular research projects operate in specific timeframes and locations, so most of the experts within the three categories listed above practice simultaneously some *regional* and (especially in the case of historians cum anthropologists)

¹ As I argued elsewhere (Sokolovskiy 2014: 179) both domains and their research agendas have been for a long time linked with imperial and nationalist ideologies: the more anti-communitarian nationalities policy research with its various historical projects of nation-building (the predecessor to the current Russian nation was Soviet people project); and folkloristic ethnology with its roots in romantic nationalism of the XIX c. and the ideology of *narodnik* or populist movement, that continues to sponsor various local nationalisms, including Russian in its ethnic dimension.

historical period specializations that criss-cross the divides among ‘political anthropologists’, ‘folklorists’ and ‘inter-disciplinary scholars’, occasionally bringing them together in joint research of a particular locus, in regional ethnography (and less frequently – regional history) departments and in regional specialized publications.

Fragmentation and differentiation of research agendas and interests within each of the two main divisions of Russian anthropology had their own pace and chronology, that roughly coincided only in periods of societal crises or major political turmoil and/or administrative changes. The oldest specializations, among them folklore studies, the study of ethnic history and ethnogenesis, physical and legal anthropology, and archaeology with special emphasis on ethnic groups’ origins, inherited from the 19th century, were reformed according to the dogmas of the Marxist social theory in the period of 1930–50s, which due to the needs of the war effort and post-war reconstruction (including new political borders demarcation) saw also the beginnings of two new subdisciplines within Soviet *etnografia*: ethnic demography and ethnic cartography.

The second wave of differentiation started during the late 1960s and continued through the 1970s to mid-1980s, when a number of hybrid sub-disciplines were institutionalized as research departments at the Institute of Ethnography, a part of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (further IE AS²; now the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, IEA RAS), the main research institution that co-ordinated ethnographic research throughout the country and had a number of branches across it, including its Leningrad branch that now constitutes an autonomous anthropological research centre, the famous *Kunstkamera*. Among the new sub-disciplines were ethno-sociology, ethnic ecology, and ethnic psychology – specializations for which it would be hard to find analogues elsewhere, for they were based on a peculiar version of ethnic group conceptualization that came to be known as the Soviet theory of *ethnos* (for details, see: Banks 1996: 17–23; Bromley and Kozlov 1989; Chichlo 1984, 1985; Dragadze 1980a; 1980b; 1990; 1995; Gellner 1988; Skalník 1986; 1988).

The third wave of fragmentation of the discipline’s research subject occurred at the end of 1980s and beginning of 1990s, with institutionalization of such ‘ethno-prefixed’ sub-disciplines as ‘ethnoconflictology’ (a sort of applied political anthropology with a focus on the study of ‘inter-ethnic conflicts’), ethno-gender

² The Institute changed its name in 1991; prior to 1992 it consisted of two large branches in Moscow and St. Petersburg; in 1992 *Kunstkamera* (St. Petersburg’s branch of the institute) became an independent institution of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Peter the Great Museum of Anthropology and Ethnology

studies (gender relations studied, again, within particular ethnic groups and at the intersection of ethnic and gender identities), as well as such less idiosyncratic disciplines as urban, visual, medical and economic anthropology.

Today, when Russian anthropologists start to turn their attention to research of science, technology, sport, tourism, state administration, business organizations, media, fashion, body, dreams, emotions, digital technologies etc., we witness the fourth wave of research domains differentiation, producing small groups of scholars, specializing in STS, media, business, cognitive, and sensorial anthropology.

It might be worth noting, that due to the over-centralized character of the Soviet academy, the emergence of new research domains and sub-disciplines roughly coincided with major administrative changes at the main centre of ethnographic research – the IE AS, each new director of which came with his own ambitious theoretical innovations that dictated changes, sometimes quite radical, in research agenda of the whole discipline³. The other two most important factors that contributed to the development and change of research agendas and the growing scope of the discipline's subject were progressive 'etatisation' (with its

³ Sergey Tolstov (1907–1976) became the director of IE AN in 1942 and organized archaeological research of the ancient Khorezm oasis; he established the department of ethno-archaeology at the IE AS. Besides, as a member of the communist party, he initiated the turn to contemporaneity in ethnographic research (ethnography was viewed at the time as a predominantly historical discipline).

Julian Bromley (1921–1990) replaced Tolstov in 1966 and soon afterwards consolidated the views of his predecessors (particularly of Sergey Shirokogoroff and Nikolai Mogilianskiy) and colleagues (in particular Pavel Kushner, Sergey Tokarev, Nikolay Cheboksarov, and Viktor Kozlov) into what would be later known as the Soviet theory of ethnos. Ethnos theory viewed as the foundation of Soviet ethnographic research had greatly contributed to the 'ethnicization' of the discipline's subject matter, and each new interdisciplinary endeavor or alliance of thus understood ethnography with neighbouring research fields and new departments at the institute received prefix 'ethno-' to underline their preoccupation with 'everything ethnic' (e.g. ethno-ecology, ethno-sociology, ethno-history, etc.). Valery Tishkov (1941) was elected as the director of IA AN in 1989 and put much energy into polemics with the ethnos theory, advocating instead less primordialist concepts of ethnicity and ethnic identification; his other main contributions to broadening the subject of anthropology were ethnic conflicts studies (*etnokonfliktologiya*) and applied research of 'inter-ethnic' relations in close co-operation with various state institutions (in 1992 he held the office of the Minister for Nationalities Affairs). His tenure of office ended in 2015. The next director (2015–2018) was Marina Martynova who specialized in Balkan ethnography. Elections of the new director are scheduled for May 2019.

After 1990s with the appearance of a score of the new anthropological research centers, departments, chairs, and journals (not all of them surviving for long) the centralized character of the discipline gave way to more pluralist, uneven and less predictable development in terms of overall research agenda and sub-discipline specialization.

pernicious ‘governmentality’) among anthropologists, specialising in nationalities policy research, expressed in proliferation of applied research either controlled by the state institutions or motivated by the state interests, on the one hand, and the quirks and whims of academic fashion, on the other, shifting their attention from visual to medical anthropology, or from gender research to STS.

In what follows, I shall try to outline the specifics of some of the recently emerged research domains and sub-disciplines within that broad field of social and cultural research in Russia, that is practiced by those who call themselves anthropologists or ethnologists, and who are either employees at various anthropological institutions and university centres, or freelancers. The main sources for this undertaking are insider information⁴, and the recently formed, but powerful academic information database e-library.ru (comprising now over 28 million publications by more than 900 thousand authors, among them 10 thousand historians and 4.5 thousand sociologists – degrees that Russian anthropologists often get after completion PhD dissertation), as well as anthropological websites in Runet.

As noted above, the leading specializations in Russian anthropological research, the two large loosely grouped autonomous domains, are not easily mapped onto disciplinary divisions and boundaries in other national traditions. Russian “political anthropology” in terms of its current research foci tends to transgress standard understanding of this field and could be more correctly labelled as applied research in nationalities policy, often done in close co-operation with federal and regional authorities. The second domain, “ethnographic folklore studies”, admittedly closer to traditional anthropology’s concerns, are of special interest for our colleagues in Western universities, but not so much for anthropologists, as for Slavists and, sometimes, for scholars in cultural studies. This mismatch between what is commonly understood as anthropological concerns in the rest of the world (former Soviet bloc countries are notable exceptions), on the one hand, and the research interests of Russian ‘ethnographers-turned-anthropologists’, on the other, creates the inimitable and eclectic character of the

⁴ I am working for thirty five years as research anthropologist at IEA RAS (I started my anthropological career at this institution back in 1983 as a post-graduate, but spent several years before in field population genetics and bio-anthropological research in Western Siberia). Another source of my familiarity with the current situation in Russian anthropology is my current position as the editor-in-chief of *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie*, that I have held for two consecutive terms (with one year off in-between), starting in 2004, having served before that as an editorial board member. Still another source is my involvement in associations and events taking place in Russian anthropology, including its bi-annual congresses, as well as my own academic research and lecturing. Communication with colleagues across the country from Vladivostok to Moscow and from Saint-Petersburg to Krasnodar is yet another invaluable source for the feel of the discipline’s pulse.

Russian discipline and produces confusion in our contacts with colleagues from abroad. As a result, anthropologists from Russia are more often and in greater numbers seen at ASN, CESS, or ASEEEES, that is, with political scientists', regional specialists', and Slavists fora, than at anthropological congresses such as AAA or EASA.

Political Anthropology *a la russe*

Russian brand of political anthropology, more known locally as *etnopolitologia*, continues from its inception in early 1990s to suffer from, according to an apt phrase by one of its leaders, "a lack of discipline" (Tishkov 1994: 91). A motley combination of disparate methods drawn *ad hoc* from a number of neighbouring disciplines, such as political sociology, human geography, social demography, conflict studies, history of nationalist movements, empire studies, etc., and propelled mainly by the vicissitudes of political fashion and ever-changing federal and regional political elites interests, it has never reached either a coherent methodology, or even a definable and conclusive set of research objects. Drifting from one applied project to another, changing regional emphasis from Chechnya to Tatarstan, and from South Ossetia to Crimea, and its topical focus from ethnic conflicts to ethnic group voting behaviour, or from population census to education reform, its practitioners have never considered a coherent agenda or theoretical consistency. The area's boundaries in sociological terms are defined more by the vagaries of government research tenders and the state apparatus of social science knowledge, than by its own dynamics, which is expected to progress due to methodological refinement or theoretical debates.

Admittedly, there were theoretical debates between the so-called 'primordialists' and 'constructivists', or rather adherents to Yulian Bromley's or Lev Gumilev's versions of ethnos theory, on the one hand, and 'western-oriented' proponents of ethnicity in 1980s and 1990s, on the other, but these discussions subsided by the end of the 2000s with inconclusive results (although rumour was, that 'constructivists' took the upper hand). The results of the attempt to organize a similar discussion on the concepts of nation and nationalism with its evident political application to the case of the Russian nation (Tishkov 1998; Tishkov and Shnirelman 2007; Tishkov and Filippova 2016) are yet to be seen. Systems-theory and/or information-theory approaches that were in vogue during the nascent days of Soviet ethnos theory (*cf.*: Arutyunov 1989: 19-41; Pimenov 1977) and that might had suited theoretical needs of the whole enterprise (*cf.*: Avksentiev 1996) were dropped, together with the concept of ethnos, except in tangential cases of ethnic conflicts conceptualization.

The tangled roots of *etnopolitologia*, disguising prevalent political myths under social sciences jargon, brought a plethora of publications, the subject of which remains elusive: e.g. in a paper with a simple enough heading “Ethnic Conflict in N-sk”, published in one of a score of Russian anthropological journals, one might find either a sketch of an ethnic composition of urban population with a focus on migrants, or an analysis of identity dynamics of a certain social group, or an outline of electoral behaviour of its citizens, or a subculture study, or a report on a strife over regional budget, or a combination of several topics just listed.

Soviet version of *political anthropology*, although called somewhat quizzically *etnopotestarnaia etnografia* (from Latin *potestas* – power), suited the label of this anthropological discipline much better than its current successor *etnopolitologia*, but as often happens with sweeping generalizations of such vast fields as *etnopolitologia* in Russia⁵, there are noteworthy exceptions that one might appropriately define as ‘political anthropology proper’. Among them, the work in quantitative history of state-building in pre-industrial societies by Nikolay Kradin and Andrey Korotayev (*cf.*: Korotayev 2004; Grinin et al 2004), on the history of political anthropology by Viktor Bocharov (*cf.*: Bocharov and Tishkov 2001), and Africanist studies by Vladimir Popov (2001) and Dmitry Bondarenko (2001), with such eminent predecessors as Dmitry Olderogge, Lev Kubbel, Abram Pershitz, Olga Tomanovskaia and Yulia Zotova. Much of this research could be perceived as classic social anthropology with its traditional attention to kinship terminology, social structure and cross-cultural comparisons. But they remain a tiny portion of the voluminous *etnopolitologia*’s print production. Most of the courses read today at various anthropology departments across the country include more often readings on the mundane objects of *etnopolitologia*, including ethnos, ethnicity theories, and ethnic conflicts, but rarely a course on political anthropology proper.

Endemic ‘lack of discipline’ in the studies of ethnic politics has its roots in the current administrative arrangement of the Russian academy and of its research funding. With what came to be perceived as the ‘threat of colour revolutions’, Western research grant agencies were made to leave the country or to drop their most effective research grant programs⁶. Academic research became again almost

⁵ There are several hundred anthropologists, out of approximately one thousand-strong Russian anthropological community, who regularly publish on topics related to this field.

⁶ The Eurasia Foundation ended its research programs support in Russia in 2004; Heritage Foundation left Russia in April 2010; USAID at the end of 2012; Open Society Foundation (part of the Soros foundation network) left the country in 2013; in January 2014 Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies followed suit; in July 2015 they have been followed by the Moscow office of J. and K. MacArthur Foundation. There is a couple of research granting agencies with western funding that continue to operate in Russia (among them

exclusively government or state-sponsored, as it had been in the USSR. The difference is that back in Soviet planned economy times an individual scholar got her research support from her own institution, now when research is supported by grant agencies, much depends upon their policies and procedures. Most of the Russian anthropological research institutions do not have any special fundraising units, and researchers have to procure grants themselves, but this is a minor, although time-consuming, problem. The real problem is the non-transparency and conflict of interests, reigning at many of the Russian granting agencies, whose councils are not elected, but appointed by members of the Russian Academy of Sciences and its research institutes directors (often the same persons), whose protégés (staff members of the same institutes) during the selection procedures (far from anonymous, as nobody tries to conceal the applicant's name) closely follow the 'advices', given by their seniors. The result is that from one year to the next the lists of the winners have the same names (bosses included) with slight variations of research topics, getting more stale and sterile with every year passing. The standards of double-blind peer-review or transparent procedures of expert board formation have never taken root in all of the major state-sponsored research granting agencies; bureaucracy is fond of controlling finance and proficient in channelling it in 'appropriate' directions.

Ethno-prefixed Subdisciplines

The focus on applied research in nationalities policy, that formed the core of Soviet ethnographic studies during the post-war period, gave birth to a plethora of 'ethno-prefixed' sub-disciplines and contributed both to modernisation of Russian *etnografia*, and to the emergence of multiple alliances with neighbouring social sciences and humanities. Among the offspring of such alliances were ethno-demography, ethnic geography (ethnic groups geography and ethnic migrations mapping), ethno-statistics (categorization of population and its applications to population census programmes). At a later stage these pragmatically driven set of sub-disciplines were supplemented by several more academically oriented research specialisations, such as ethnic ecology, ethnic sociology, and ethnic psychology, all of which were believed to be specialized bodies of knowledge that could contribute to a better understanding of ethnic processes and throw light on the most fundamental theoretical object of Soviet *etnografia* – *etnos*.

New Eurasia Foundation and Moscow Carnegie Centre), but they are engaged either as a social development or political counselling agencies and do not play any active role in academic research either in social sciences or in humanities.

Ethnic Sociology

A close kin of *etnopolitologia* was the so-called *ethno-sociology*, the child of Yulian Bromley's attempt at the end of 1960s at Russian *etnografia*'s modernization, when he invited Yurik Arutyunian and Ovsey Shkaratan, two sociologists from Leningrad, to open new sociological department at IE AN. Today when the heyday of this discipline is over, and there are no large-scale ethno-sociological 'expeditions', typical for the period of 1966–1986 (for sub-discipline's history and a list of collective fieldwork ventures see: Komarova 2016: 306–311; Drobizheva 2001), the initially productive alliance between *etnologia* and sociology in this particular area of ethnic groups sociology dried up to a trickle of publications, devoted for the most part to documenting its history, rather than to the results of contemporary research, which shifted to ethno-political concerns (the study of nationalist activism, ethnic elites research, etc.), which could be better assessed as a part of political sociology, rather than anthropology.

Ethnic Conflicts Research

Yet one more off-shoot of ethno-political and ethno-sociological research with a brand name of *etnokonfliktologia* (ethnic conflicts research) had been initiated in early 1990s by a small group of ethnologists and sociologists, situated mainly at the two academic institutes (IEA RAN, and the Institute of Sociology RAN) in Moscow. With proliferation of violent conflicts and separatist movements in late 1980s and early 1990s, this kind of research specialization quickly spread into various research centres across the country. Back in Soviet times there were no conflict studies, except of family conflicts by social psychologists and psychotherapists, hence Russian ethnologists and anthropologists had to devise conceptual schemes and theories from scratch, or to borrow them from other research traditions, combining vocabularies of demography, geography, social psychology, sociology, political sciences, and history. The results were, in terms of academic research, often discouraging, but their activities as knowledge brokers and raw data providers paid well. On more positive side, the 'ethnic' conflicts⁷ research brought better familiarity with political theory, including current theories of federalism, of separatist movements and conflict dynamics, migration research, conflict monitoring and early warning systems, etc. However, if one asks what makes one think that these preoccupations still might be perceived as anthropology (or,

⁷ I have to use quotation marks for 'ethnic' as most conflicts thus described were not ethnic by origin, by motives or even by ethnicity of the warring opponents, but were perceived and portrayed as such due to prevailing primordialist ideology both among scholars and ruling elites.

for that matter, ethnology), one would be forced to admit that they are mainly institutional (this type of research proliferate at anthropological research centres) and administrative factors, among them a long tradition of government use of academic research with corresponding demand, only reinforced by the state funding, for the research to be of applied type. Both methodology, and prevailing theoretical approach of this sub-discipline belong to political sciences and sociology of ethnic relations, and although most of the scholars from this community work at anthropological institutes and centres, their university specialties vary widely, and the community includes former geographers, sociologists, demographers, psychologists, historians, linguists, but very rarely those, who had been trained as ethnologists or anthropologists. Hence, the prevalent research methods are surveys, formal interviewing, discourse analysis and archival research; field research and participant observation remaining a rare exception.

Ethnic Psychology

The attempts to found ethnic psychology roughly coincided with the establishment of ethno-sociological departments in late 1970s and early 1980s, but with comparably fewer numbers of psychologists in the country, they were never on a par with ethno-sociologists and often joined them in on-going research projects. The first attempts to find the constituent subject that would anchor the sub-discipline as a separate field were awkward. The old romantic idea with strong Herderian flavour that every 'ethnos' should have distinct 'psychological make-up' dangerously bordered with racialism, if not subtle academic ethno-racism. Subsequent readjustments and corrections of research focus as the study of ethnic stereotyping and intolerance in 1990s and re-naming of *ethnopsikhologia* in line with similar research traditions elsewhere into cross-cultural psychology in the 2000s slightly corrected the drawbacks of its false start, but this happened at the time when preoccupation with *etnos* as the main object of *etnologia* were past, and most of 'ethno-prefixed' sub-discipline communities declined in numbers or 'migrated' from anthropological research centres either to university departments of its kin disciplines (e.g. to political science and psychology departments in cases of *etnopolitologia* and *ethnopsikhologia*, respectively), or to the main institutes of the Russian Academy of Sciences (as in the case of ethno-sociologists some of whom left IEA for the Institute of Sociology). The preoccupation with everything ethnic in its early formative period has not been entirely overcome till the present day, with the result that the re-christened sub-discipline never fitted its 'cross-cultural' prefix, as it continues to focus rather on 'cross-ethnic' comparison. The ethnic culture assumptions remain so deeply entrenched, that the rich heritage of multiple inter-dependencies between culture and psychology,

exemplified in the works by Lev Vygodskiy and Aleksandr Luria, have never found its expression in the works of *ethnopsikhologia* practitioners.

Ethnic Ecology

Ethnic ecology (*etnoekologia*) emerged as a distinct sub-discipline in early 1980s and is taught now mostly at geography departments at a university level. It coalesced from several research strands during 1970s, although much of its research of, for example, types of traditional subsistence economy, predated the institutionalisation of this specialisation by several decades. Among its various precursors were Waldemar Bogoraz, who had suggested detailed typology of culture, including its subsistence components, which he categorized in his famous *The Chukchee* in large groupings of ‘habitat’ and ‘habitation’ (1904: 12–16; 169–183); Sergey Tolstov, who provided a list of subsistence types of pre-historic societies in his “Essays on Early Islam” (1932: 31–32); and Maxim Levin, who analysed the historical succession of subsistence types among peoples of the Russian Arctic (1947).

The concept of the so-called economic-cultural types (*kulturno-khoziaistvennyi tip*), to a large degree influenced by the Julian Steward’s ideas of cultural ecology (1955), was elaborated by Boris Andrianov and Nikolay Chebokсарov (1972). Later, these typological insights were developed by Lev Gumilev (1967, 1971) and especially by Valery Alekseev (1975, 1984), who suggested the closely related concepts of *anthropocenosis* and *anthropogeocenosis*, respectively.

Other theoretical strands that contributed to the development of applied human ecology were studies of ethnic groups adaptation to various climatic and geochemical conditions, both bio-anthropological (Tatyana Alekseyeva and her colleagues at the Moscow Institute for Anthropology, a bio-anthropological research centre of the Moscow State University), and medical (pursued mainly at the Institute of Clinical and Experimental Medicine, Novosibirsk).

Yet one more important concept of subsistence system (*systema zhizneobespechenia*) formed a distinct research focus within human and cultural ecology (Sergey Arutiunov and his colleagues) and applied cosmic biomedicine (Vlail Kaznacheev, Siberian Dept. of the Academy of Medical Sciences of the USSR).

The ethnographic sub-discipline got its present name in 1981, when Viktor Kozlov, Soviet ethno-demographer and ethno-geographer, headed the newly formed ethnic ecology department at IE AN, that was an outgrowth of a joint Soviet-American project for the study of human aging and longevity, initiated in 1977⁸. Ecology at the time was a highly fashionable discipline, exerting its influence

⁸ The joint research venture was initiated by the American side, represented by Research Institute for the Study of Man (RISM) and its director Dr. Vera D. Rubin (1911–1985),

on social sciences and humanities⁹, and Yulian Bromley, who was a full member of the Academy of Sciences, wanted that the institute he directed was on the cutting edge of contemporary research in human and social sciences. Although the department still exists at IEA RAN, very few scholars now practice ethnic ecology in the form its founders have devised it.

Ethno-Gender Studies

The latest among 'ethno-prefixed' sub-disciplines, 'ethno-gender studies' (*etno-gendernye issledovaniya*), was institutionalized at IEA RAS as a research group in 1992 (in 1997 this group received the status of a department). Russian sociologists and sexologist Igor Kon acted as its informal leader in its starting years. The group under his leadership initiated gender studies in Russia, covering the broad range of feminist theory, masculinity, LGBT issues, family studies, etc. The prefix 'ethno-' served as a sort of cover, explaining why the group was a part of IEA RAN. In 2006, Natalia Pushkareva, a specialist in medieval history, headed the sector and changed its research priorities by channeling them into women's history.

There are several other gender research centers in Russia with inter-disciplinary agenda, but their members do not usually associate themselves with ethnology and do not need to style their discipline as having to do with anything 'ethnic'; neither do they specialize in history, as it was characteristic of Soviet *etnografia* (ethnology) that was considered a sub-discipline of history, or a 'historical science'.

Most of 'ethno-prefixed' disciplines, the heritage of 1980s, moored to the concept of ethnos, are now either marginalised and survive in academic periphery, or slowly dissolve along with primordialist views on ethnic phenomena and attempts at positivist theory-building.

who studied anthropology at Columbia University under Ruth Benedict, Margaret Mead and Julian Steward. An active team member was another student of Ruth Benedict, and also a RISM senior fellow Sula Benet (1903-1982). Both Rubin and Benet were of Eastern European Jewish origin, born in Moscow and Warsaw, respectively; both studied cannabis and its effects on human health.

⁹ In early 1980s a number of books by leading ecologists were translated into Russian and published by publishing house "Progress", among them "Précis d'Ecologie" by Roger Dajoz (Russian translation published in 1975); "Energy Basis for Man and Nature" by Howard and Elisabeth Odum (translation publ. in 1978); "Communities and Ecosystems" by Robert Whitaker (translation published in 1980); "Evolutionary Ecology" by Eric Pianka (translation published in 1981), "Introduction to Population Biology and Evolution" by Otto and Dorothy Solbrig (translation published in 1982), and others.

Folklore Studies and ‘Adjectival’ Anthropologies

Folklore studies

There is a view that folklore studies constitute the core of Russian *etnografia* and should be considered as ethnology proper, compared to other more recent offshoots and ‘deviations’ of anthropological research. Historically and even sociologically (in terms of the number of people involved and overall number of, etc.), to analyse dialectal linguistic stocks, morphology, grammar, etc., on the one side, and ethnographic or anthropological folklore studies with a focus on ritual, customs, material culture, contemporary urban folklore (e.g., Anthropology Department at the European University in St. Petersburg; Russian Studies Department at IEA RAS), on the other.

Figures in table lines reflect the number of citations of papers, published in anthropological journals, indicated in the head of the table; figures in columns reflect the numbers of citations of this journal materials in other journals, indicated in the first column of the table.

1. *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie* [Ethnographic Review]; 2. *Vostok* [Orient];
3. *Arkheologia, etnografia i antropologia Evrazii* [Archaeology, Ethnology & Anthropology* of Eurasia]; 4. *Vestnik Instituta istorii, arkheologii i etnografii* (Makhachkala) [Herald of the Institute of History, Archaeology, and Ethnography (Daghestan)]; 5. *Vestnik antropologii, arkheologii i etnografii* (Tyumen’) [Herald of Anthropology*, Archaeology, and Ethnography, Tyumen];
6. *Voprosy antropologii* [Issues of anthropology*]; 7. *Ab Imperio* (Kazan’);
8. *Vestnik Evrazii* [Herald of Eurasia]; 9. *Vostochnaia kolleksiia* [Oriental Collection]; 10. *Zhurnal sotsiologii i sotsialnoi antropologii* [Journal of sociology and social anthropology]; 11. *Lichnost’. Kul’tura. Obschestvo* [Person. Culture. Society]; 12. *Mir Rossii. Sotsiologia. Etnologia* [Universe of Russia. Sociology. Ethnology]; 13. *Diaspory* [Diasporas]; 14. *Etnopanorama* [Ethno-Panorama];
15. *Chelovek* [Man]; 16. *Gumanitarnye nauki v Sibiri* [Humanities in Siberia];
17. *Slavianovedenie* [Slavic Studies]; 18. *Traditsionnaia kul’tura* [Traditional Culture]; 19. *Zhivaia starina* [Antiquity Alive]; 20. *Antropologicheskii forum* [Forum For Anthropology].

Note: ‘anthropology*’ means here ‘physical anthropology’. The red lines in the upper-left and lower-right corners of the Table show the groups of journals with maximum of co-citations; the groupings reflect the divide between ‘political’ anthropologists and ‘folklorists’.

Table 1. Co-citation in Russian anthropologic journals (2012)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Σ
1 Etnograf. Obozrenie	367	21	0	0	12	11	14	12	8	17	0	0	13	5	0	0	0	5	38	13	536
2 Vostok	0	202	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	208
3 AFA Eurasia	58	0	203	0	29	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	12	0	341
4 Vestnik IIAE	48	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
5 Vestnik AAE	45	0	131	0	140	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	332
6 Voprosy antropologii*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
7 Ab Imperio	14	0	0	0	0	0	164	10	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206
8 Vestnik Evrazii	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	65	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
9 Vostochnaia Kolleksiia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
10 JSSA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	106	0	46	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	187
11 LKO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	196	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207
12 Mir Rossii	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
13 Diaspory 14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Etnopanorama	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
15 Chelovek	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	0	0	0	0	0	215
16 GNS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	0	0	11	0	135
17 Slavianovedenie	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	0	18	0	131
18 TK	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	97	8	269
19 Zhivaia starina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	141	8	185
20 Anthr. Forum	53	0	0	0	0	0	10	4	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	30	43	165
(Σ = 3 223 citations)	655	254	337	16	186	49	195	103	24	133	207	135	65	23	215	141	113	117	366	99	

Both sub-divisions have their own traditions in the long histories of linguistic and ethnographic research, and though sometimes overlap, remain distinct not only in perspectives and methods, but also institutionally, in terms of research networks and publications. ‘Linguistic’ folklorists tend to communicate more with linguistic anthropologists and dialectologists, whereas ‘ethnographic’ folklorists are often in urban anthropology or religion studies. The first publish their research in such journals as *Traditional Culture* (Traditsionnaia kul’tura), *Antiquities Alive* (Zhivaia starina), or *Slavic Studies* (Slavianovedcheskie issledovania), whereas the second tend to send their articles either to *Forum for Anthropology* (Antropologicheskii forum) or to *Ethnographic Review* (Etnograficeskoe obozrenie). The journal co-citation in 2012 is documented in *Table 1*, above. Folklore studies in this sense embrace much of urban and linguistic anthropology, and anthropology of religion, as well as parts of visual and medical anthropology.

Urban ethnography/anthropology

The broad research area of urban studies, sometimes designated as *urbanistika*, constitutes a separate domain of multidisciplinary research, where urban planners, architects, geographers, historians, sociologists, archaeologists and anthropologists interact. In anthropology (or to use the original term of the Soviet period, when urban studies emerged as a separate anthropological research field, *etnografia*), the study of urban population started back in the early 1950s with the demand to focus on contemporaneity and contemporary culture (versus previous exclusive focus on the past and tradition). The initial research focus was the culture and folklore of the urban working class. Peasant ethnography was to be supplemented by proletariat studies to include the whole of ‘working classes’ or ‘people’ (narod, etnos), the main subject of *etnografia*; other urban strata remained a peculiar blind spot for much of the Soviet period. *Etnografia* has established itself in Soviet academy from mid-1930s as a historical discipline, so the study of contemporary mores and ways looked at the time as a major innovation. As it often happens with innovations, the conceptual means and models were lacking, so the standard methods of rural peasant studies were extended for application to the new research objects. Predictably, the predominantly descriptive studies of the ‘working class culture’ had not brought any conceptual advance, but it made the focus on urban population strata in Soviet ethnographic research to seem an appropriate ethnographical enterprise and introduced comparatively modern-day traditions as legitimate objects for anthropological analysis.

Table 2. Urban anthropology publications in the journal *Sovetskaia etnografia/Etnograficheskoe obozrenie*, 1946–2017

<i>Period Topics</i>	1946–59	1960–69	1970–79	1980–89	1990–99	2000–09	2010–17	Σ
Culture, household, daily life and folklore of workers	15	19	11	2	1	0	1	49
City life ethnography and its research methods	0	8	8	10	2	6	12	46
Orientalist, Africanist and Americanist urban studies	4	3	9	0	1	0	1	18
Ethnic demography, ethno-sociology, ethnic ecology, and ethno-psychology of urban population	0	6	8	11	2	3	10	40
City history	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	9
Architecture and urban dwelling ethnography	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Bio-anthropology and population genetics of urban populations	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Subculture studies	0	0	0	1	0	18	8	29
<i>Total</i>	21	38	38	27	8	28	35	195

New research methods, including mass surveys and focus groups research came to sub-discipline with the rise of ethno-sociology in 1980s. A new focus of research emerged in 2000s, when urban youth subcultures attracted attention of the young generation of Russian anthropologists, who were influenced by the success of Birmingham youth culture studies. Subculture concept critique that followed brought a substantial decrease in the number of such studies. *Table 2* above summarises the topical changes in urban ethnographic research by 10-years periods as reflected in publications of the flagship Russian anthropological journal “*Etnograficheskoe obozrenie*”¹⁰.

Anthropology of religion

This is an old, vast and thriving research domain in Russian anthropology, converging with religion studies (*religiovedenie*), that often overlaps with regional specializations (e.g. most anthropologists, specializing in Caucasus, Volga or Central Asian studies contribute to the study of Islam; many ‘Siberianists’ pursue research of shamanism, folklorists often excel in the knowledge of Orthodox rites, etc.). The discipline is not institutionalized in current Russian anthropology, except for regular publications and occasional university courses. As research domain with a focus on rituals and customs, it continues to be the backbone of much field ethnography, and remains a subject that many Russian anthropologists could claim as their research specialization.

Linguistic anthropology

There are very few Russian anthropologists who could claim to pursue linguistic anthropology, and most of these few are linguists by training. It so happened, and linguistic diversity of the country’s population might be an explanatory factor here, that few anthropologists learn the language of the group they (initially) study, and in most cases when they know it, they know it either from childhood by being a so-called ‘native’ anthropologist, or by being a long-time resident of the region. Many regions of the country are multilingual, as its linguistic diversity (about 200 languages) outstrips the number of languages in any European country by degree. This creates an unusual background for the career choices of a young anthropologist: you can invest your time in learning the language and get stuck for much of your career with one (often quite small) group, or you specialize

¹⁰ The journal was established in 1889 under the same name, but later had been twice renamed (*Etnografia* in 1926, and *Soviet etnografia* in 1930). Its initial name was restored in 1992. It is the oldest and most influential anthropological academic publication in the country, with few rivals in terms of the number of research areas covered, the number of papers published yearly, and the geography of its contributors.

regionally by thorough acquaintance with history, geography, culture, archives etc. of a whole region that holds many diverse groups, traditional residents of the region, but you converse with them in Russian¹¹, perhaps with a few occasional phrases in their own languages. Hence most anthropology departments in the country do not demand from their students the knowledge of local languages (knowledge of English is considered more important for academic reading and publishing), and the few post-doc departments that do, have narrow regional focus.

Linguistic field anthropology in Russia remains rather a linguistic than anthropological discipline with a focus on socio-linguistic research and with academic research centres, situated either at linguistic university departments (Novosibirsk, Tomsk and Chita universities), or at the institutes of Russian Academy, such as the Institute of Linguistics, RAS in Moscow and the Institute of Linguistic Studies, RAS in St. Petersburg, and European University in St. Petersburg. In 1960s–1980s there was a group for the study of onomastics (the study of proper names, including ethnonyms and toponymy) under the leadership of Vladimir Nikonov at IE AN, a specialization needed for ethnogenesis and ethnic migrations research, but with the decline of ethnic groups' origin studies, the group ceased to exist.

Visual anthropology

Although Soviet visual anthropology is often linked to Dziga Vertov and his documentary film theory of 1920s, most Russian visual anthropologists (aside from field photography and occasional shooting of rituals that had been considered as a mere instrumental 'fixation' of field materials, along with pencil drawings, diary writing, and audio recording) date their discipline's birth as summer 1987, when the first Soviet ethnographic film festival was held in Pärnu, Estonia (cf. Aleksandrov 2007: 9). It took about next ten years for Russian visual anthropology to mature, before the first Russian anthropological film festival took place in Salekhard, in August 1998¹². In 2002 Moscow International Visual Anthropology Festival was organized to become a bi-annual event. Now, besides the Centre for Visual Anthropology at Moscow State University, there are groups of enthusiasts at Saratov Technological University, as well as in Izhevsk (Udmurt Republic), Perm, Yekaterinburg, Novosibirsk, and St. Petersburg.

¹¹ According to the All-Russian population census of 2010 among 137 227 107 persons, who provided the answer on the question on ethnic group affiliation, 136 019 395, or 99.11% informed that they know Russian (http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/Documents/Vol4/pub-04-03.pdf).

¹² For details see the website of the Centre for Visual Anthropology at Moscow State University (http://visant.etos.ru/fest/rfaf_1.php#up).

Legal anthropology

The study of customs and customary law were inalienable parts of ethnological research in Russia since its formation in XVIII c. (for details, see: Vermeulen 2015). However, it was constituted as a distinct anthropological discipline only in mid-1990s, when anthropologists and jurists joined their efforts to establish *juridicheskaiia antropologia* as a set of teaching courses, summer schools, conferences and a series of publications, mainly in the form of conference proceedings (*cf.*: Benda-Beckmann and Finkler 1999), article and documentary collections and occasional monographs (*cf.*: Bocharov 2012), focussing mainly on indigenous peoples' or minority groups' rights or the study of Shari'a law and adats as forms of customary law. Russian anthropologists, specializing in these subjects, often act as consultants or experts in legislation process in cases that concern nationalities policy issues or at courts that deal with violations of indigenous and minority rights or with the cases of xenophobia and intolerance.

Medical anthropology

The discipline bearing this name has been for a long time considered a part of medical students curriculum, while Soviet ethnographers paid only occasional attention to the so-called traditional medicine and healing practices. This situation started to change in 1980s in the context of multidisciplinary aging and longevity studies (see section on ethnic ecology above), when ethnographers and physical anthropologists worked in close collaboration with geriatricians. During that period many of the standard issues and research topics a medical anthropologist usually grapple with, were studied in social hygiene, medical geography and the history of medicine. As a part of socio-cultural anthropology the discipline started its institutionalisation only in 2000s, when Valentina Kharitonova at IEA RAS initiated regular seminars and conferences, originally concentrating on traditional healing and shamanism research. Now medical anthropology is being taught and practiced at several university centres (besides Moscow, also in Saratov and Tomsk), but it remains quantitatively a relatively small community, if one compares it with USA, encompassing perhaps only several dozens of Russian anthropologists, who promote it and are actively involved in medical anthropological research projects.

Economic anthropology

One might credibly assert that economic anthropology does not exist as a separate discipline in Russian anthropology or, at best, it goes through its nascent period of institutionalization, although there are university courses and textbooks bearing the title. This is a paradox, as world-renowned economic anthropologists, such

as Alexander Chayanov, lived and worked in Russia. It is a double paradox, as presumably Marxist Soviet *etnografia* should have paid much more attention to ‘economic base’, production, exchange, and consumption research than it was the case. However, to state that there is no separate discipline under the name of “economic anthropology” in contemporary Russian academy is not equivalent to the statement that there is no anthropological research on economic issues. In fact the research of many issues that could be referred as ‘economic’ have been practiced by Soviet ethnographers throughout Soviet period, although such research was often dispersed in terms of intra-disciplinary arrangement of academic labour division. For example, the typology of the economic-cultural types (see the section on ethnic ecology above) demanded close knowledge of the economy of societies classified. Material culture studies contained much information on traditional economies. There was an animated discussion of economic formations and of the Marxist concept of Asiatic mode of production; the modes of production were part of the research agenda of the department of pre-historic societies (*sector pervobytnoi istorii*) that had been created at IE AN in 1967. Theoretical contributions to pre-industrial economies research, made by the staff members of that department (Abram Pershits, Anatoly Khazanov, Yuri Semyonov, Lev Kubbel, Vladimir Kabo, Viktor Shnirelman, Olga Artemova), as well as a series of translations into Russian of the works that became classical in economic anthropology (Henry Morgan, Marcel Mauss, Bronislaw Malinowski, Maurice Godelier, and Marshall Sahlins, among others) attest to the rich tradition of economic-anthropological research in the country. Attempts to the institutionalisation of the discipline continue (e.g. there was a baccalaureate course at the Moscow branch of the Higher School of Economics in 2012–2014, read by Nikolai Ssorin-Chaikov and Grigorii Yudin).

New Research Domains and Innovative Fields

Anthropology of professions and leisure

There were occasional publications (notably, in urban anthropology, when a certain subculture became a focus of research, but also in folklore studies, when ethnographers concentrated on folklore of, say, village smiths or herdsman) that could be viewed as precursors to the anthropology of professions. However, the rise of this sub-discipline is usually traced to the works of sociologists, based at the chair for social anthropology and social work of Saratov Technological University and at the Centre for Social Policy and Social Research (Saratov), who conducted a score of thematic conferences and summer schools, and published a series of article collections on anthropology of various professions, occupations, and trades that contained a plethora of case studies, covering fieldwork among taxi-drivers

and policemen, ballet dances and iron founders, cemetery workers and dentists, lawyers and healers (Romanov and Iarskaia-Smirnova 2005; 2007; 2011; 2012).

There is no neat division of labour among anthropologists who specialize in such fields as anthropology of business and organisations, science and technology, medicine, transport, youth sub-cultures, or tourism with those, who are involved in research on anthropology of professions and leisure. Not only all these fields of interest significantly overlap, there is a substantial commonality in methods and theories employed, as well as mingling and mixing of approaches and vocabularies used. Predictably, these new research fields involve younger scholars, and all the centres that pursue this kind of research are not the research institutes of the Academy of Sciences or old anthropological departments, but relatively new university centres (the already mentioned Saratov, European University in St. Petersburg, Tomsk University, and the Higher School of Economics with its branches in Moscow and St. Petersburg). The students are often trained as sociologists, coming to anthropology for their degree or postdoc specialisation.

Anthropology of the state

There is an emergent research field of anthropology of the state with small number of researchers, involving both anthropologists and historians that could be provisionally viewed as 'kin' to anthropology of organizations and institutions. The field is loosely institutionalized as a network of researchers, operating from Social Sciences and Humanities School of the Higher School of Economics in St. Petersburg and Anthropological Department of the European University in St. Petersburg (cf.: Abashin 2015; Ssorin-Chaikov 2003). Additionally, a Commission for Economic Anthropology has been recently created at the Russian Anthropological and Ethnological Association to encourage the development of this field. This approach is complemented by already mentioned comparative research in quantitative history of the state-building in pre-industrial societies (Korotayev 2004; Grinin et al 2006), relying mostly on archival sources interpretation and cross-tabulation of ethnographic traits analysis in the style of George Murdock. The leading journal, publishing research papers in this field is *Ab Imperio*.

Anthropology of science and technology

This is a new research area in Russia (with diverse strands and a motley set of scholars) that has not yet gained the status of an anthropological sub-discipline or any institutionalisation beyond occasional university course or article collection. There are notable exceptions in terms of sustainable research networks that coalesced around such topics as the anthropology of the academy (Komarova

2008; 2010; 2013), or STS and ANT in anthropological research (Sokolovskiy 2015; 2016; 2018). However, most of publications in this area discuss the history of various sciences and disciplines, scholars' biographies, or institutional histories, as well as the history of particular ideas or technologies, or philosophical issues that might be relevant to the discussion of scientific theories, methods and their implementation. There is a special institute among academic institutions in Russian Academy of Sciences, that conduct and co-ordinate research in the field of history of science and technology and publishes several journals and series collections¹³.

Sensory anthropology, body and movement studies

This is an emerging and promising new area for anthropological research in Russia, drawing anthropologists' attention to other channels of perception besides the auditory and visual, and to kinaesthetics (in case of the latter, previously only dance studies were among the objects of ethnographer's attention). Now, there appeared a number of publications on the anthropology of smell, taste, and touch (*cf.*: Pirogovskaya 2015; Vainstein 2003).

Conclusion

A very substantial part of what is going on under the umbrella terms of *etnologia* or *antropologia* in Russia is in fact applied political and sociological research, a highly ideologized government-sponsored sphere of dealing with issues of legislation consultancy, nationalities policy, 'ethnic situation' monitoring and so-called 'ethnic conflicts' (or alleged 'threats' of such conflicts), accompanied and supported by specific political discourse. In a way, albeit indirect, all these preoccupations reflect the current situation in the country, when various informal networks, including territorial local clans, ethnic groups, university 'brotherhoods', or plain criminal gangs infiltrate much of economy, politics and even academy and compete and conflict over scarce resources, be it an administrative post, an economic advantage, or a research grant.

There is, however, another faction, or rather a set of various collectives and networks within Russian anthropological community, who specialise in what I termed here 'adjectival anthropologies' and 'new research domains', which much better suit the name of anthropology and are better integrated in current discipline's agenda especially when looked from an international perspective.

¹³ Among them quarterly journal of the Russian Academy of Sciences "Voprosy estestvoznaniia i tekhniki" (Natural Sciences and Technology Research; <http://vietmag.org/?lang=en>).

The two communities, although often sharing the same administrative resources, rarely collaborate. They rely on different research methods; they have different explanatory frameworks in terms of their theoretical sympathies, conceptual glossaries, or peer and authority structures. They also publish their papers in different periodicals and do not cite each other's work. Nowadays anthropology of almost any national tradition is fragmented into many sub-disciplines and specialised research fields. This is also the case of Russian anthropology, but unlike the situation in many other traditions, Russian anthropological community is also split into two 'camps', not necessarily warring with each other, but definitely looking to different directions and projecting quite distinctive 'futures' of the discipline. The research agenda of political anthropologists in Russia is closely bound with the current tasks of the nation state and might be viewed as a version of academic or methodological nationalism. I have argued elsewhere (Sokolovskiy 2014) that the second largest group, the folklorists, involved in 'traditional culture' research, are prone to another version of nationalism that might be viewed as academic historicism, as their findings are often used by all sorts of local nationalists to boost their claims either to the status of first inhabitants of some region, or to some kind of ancient and noble roots that put their communities well above the rest. Both strands of academic inquiry produce research of somewhat parochial variety, although there is a number of emerging anthropological research fields, that are still quite new for Russian anthropological tradition and that are capable to significantly transform its research agenda.

References

- Abashin, Sergei. 2015. *Sovetskii kishlak*. Moscow: NLO [Soviet *kishlak*].
- Aleksandrov, Evgenii. 2007 "Vместo retsenzii. V poiskakh predmeta vizualnoi antropologii." *Antropologicheskii Forum*, 7: 9–20 ["In Lieu of a Review: In Search of the Subject of Visual Anthropology"].
- Arutiunov, Sergei. 1989. *Narody i kul'tury: razvitie i vzaimodeistvie*. Moscow: Nauka [*Peoples and Cultures: Their Development and Interaction*].
- Avksentiev, Viktor. 1996. "Etnicheskii konflikt kak vid sotsialnogo konflikta." *Sotsialnyi konflikt* 4: 33–51 ["Ethnic Conflict as a Type of Social Conflict"].
- Banks, Marcus. 1996. *Ethnicity: Anthropological Constructions*. London: Routledge.
- Benda-Beckmann, Keebet, and Harald W. Finkler, eds. 1999. *Papers of the XIth International Congress "Folk Law and Legal Pluralism: Societies in Transformation"* (Moscow, August 18–22, 1997). Toronto: Commission on Folk Law and Legal Pluralism.
- Bocharov, Viktor. 2012. *Nepisanyi zakon: antropologia prava*. St. Petersburg: AIK [Unwritten Law: Legal Anthropology].
- Bocharov, Viktor, and Valery Tishkov. 2001. *Antropologia nasilia*. St. Petersburg: Nauka [*The Anthropology of Violence*].

- Bogoraz, Waldemar. 1904. *The Chukchee. Pt. I. Material Culture*. New York: G.E. Steichert & Co.
- Bondarenko, Dmitry. 2001. *Doimperskii Benin*. Moscow: Institute of Africa [Pre-Imperial Benin].
- Bromley, Julian, and Viktor Kozlov. 1989. "The Theory of Ethnos and Ethnic Processes in Soviet Social Sciences." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 31, 3: 425–438.
- Chichlo, Boris. 1984. "L'ethnographie soviétique est-elle une anthropologie?" In *Histoire de l'anthropologie, XVIe - XIXe siècles*, edited by Britta Rupp-Eisenreich. Paris: Klincksieck: 247–258.
- . 1985. "Trente années d'anthropologie (etnografia) soviétique." *Revue des Etudes slaves*, 57, 2: 309–324.
- Gumilev, Lev. 1967. "Ob antropogennom faktore landshaftoobrazovania." *Vestnik Leningradskogo universiteta*, 24, 4: 102–112 [On the Anthropogenic Factor of Landscape Formation].
- . 1971. "Ethnos – sostoyanie i process." *Vestnik Leningradskogo universiteta* 12, 2: 86–95 [Ethnos: a state and a process].
- Dragadze, Tamara. 1980a. "Soviet Ethnos Theory." *RAIN*. 38 (June): P. 3–4.
- . 1980b. "The place of ethnos theory in Soviet anthropology." In *Soviet and Western Anthropology*, edited by Ernest Gellner. London: Duckworth: 161–170.
- . 1990. "Some Changes in Perspectives on Ethnicity Theory in the 1980s: A Brief Sketch." *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique*, 31, 2–3: 205–212.
- . 1995. "Politics and Anthropology in Russia." *Anthropology Today*, 11, 4: 1–3.
- Drobizheva, Leokadia. 2001. Interview taken by Gennadii Batygin. Retrieved from <http://www.nir.ru/socio/scipubl/sj/sj4-01drob.html>.
- Gellner, Ernest. 1988. *State and Society in Soviet Thought*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Grinin, Leonid, Robert Carneiro, Dmitry Bondarenko, Nikolay Kradin, and Andrey Korotayev, eds. 2004. *The Early State, Its Alternatives and Analogues*. Volgograd: Publishing house 'Uchitel'.
- Khazanov, Anatoly. 1990. "The Ethnic Situation in the Soviet Union as Reflected in Soviet Anthropology." *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique*, 31, 2–3: 213–222.
- Komarova, Galina. 2011. "Otechestvennaia etnografia i etnosotsiologia : opyt mezhdisciplinarnoi integratsii." In *Fenomen identichnosti v sovremennom gumanitarnom znanii*. Moscow : Nauka: : 273–297. ["Russian Ethnography and Ethno-Sociology: The Practice of Inter-Disciplinary Integration." In *Identity Phenomenon in Contemporary Humanitarian Knowledge*]
- , ed. 2008–2013. *Antropologia akademicheskoi zhizni*. Vol 1. Moscow, 2008; Vol 2. 2010; Vol 3. 2013. [The Anthropology of Academic Life].
- Korotayev, Andrey. 2004. *World Religions and Social Evolution of the Old World Oikumene Civilizations: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Levin, Maksim. 1947. "K probleme istoricheskogo sootnoshenia khoziastvenno-kulturnykh tipov Severnoi Azii." *Kratkie soobshchenia Instituta etnografii AN SSSR*, 2: 84–86 [On the Problem of Historical Relationship of Economic-Cultural Types in Northern Asia].

- Mirskii, Georgiy. 1997. *On Ruins of Empire: Ethnicity and Nationalism in the Former Soviet Union*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- Motyl, Alexander, ed. 1992. *Thinking Theoretically about Soviet Nationalities: History and Comparison in the Study of the USSR*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Olcott, Martha. 1995. "Soviet Nationality Studies between Past and Future." In *Beyond Soviet Studies*, edited by Daniel Orlovsky. Washington, D.C.: The Woodrow Wilson Center Press: 135–148.
- Pimenov, Vladimir. 1977. *Udmurty: opyt komponentnogo analiza etnosa*. Leningrad: Nauka [The Udmurt: An Essay on the Component Theory of Ethnos].
- Pirogovskaya, Maria. 2015. "Smells as miasma, symptoms, and evidence: on the problem of everyday life becoming scientized in late XIXth century Russia." *New Literary Review*, 135, 5: 146–159.
- Plotkin, Vladimir. 1990. "Dual Models, Totalizing Ideology and Soviet Ethnography." *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique*, 31, 2–3: 235–242.
- Plotkin, Vladimir and Jovan E. Howe. 1985. "The unknown tradition: continuity and innovation in Soviet ethnography." *Dialectical anthropology*, 9, 1–4: 257–312.
- Popov, Vladimir. 2001. *Etnografia Afriki*. Parts I-II. St. Petersburg: Kunstkamera [*The Ethnography of Africa*].
- Romanov Pavel and Elena Yarskaia-Smirnova. 2005. *Antropologia professii*. Saratov: CSPGI [The Anthropology of Professions].
- . 2007. *Professii. doc. Sotsialnye transformatsii professionalizma*. Saratov: CSPGI [Professions.doc. Social Transformations of Professionalism].
- . 2011. *Antropologia professii, ili postoronnim vkhod razreshen*. Saratov: CSPGI [Anthropology of Professions, or Not only for Personnel].
- . 2012. *Antropologia professii: granitsy zaniatosti v epokhu nestabilnosti*. Moscow: Variant [Anthropology of professions: occupational boundaries in turbulent times].
- Roy, Olivier. 1990. "Afghanistan: Modèles Anthropologiques et Pacification." *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique*, 31, 2–3: 405–412.
- Sadomskaya, Natalya. 1990. "Soviet Anthropology and Contemporary Rituals." *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique*, 31, 2–3: 245–254.
- Shimkin, Demitri. 1990. "Siberian Ethnography: A Current Assessment." *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique*, 31, 2–3: 317–326.
- Shnirelman, Viktor. 1992. "The Emergence of a Food-Producing Economy in the Steppe and Forest- Steppe Zone of Eastern Europe." *The Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 20, 1–2: 123–143.
- Skalniĭ, Peter. 1981. "Community: struggle for a key concept in Soviet ethnography." *Dialectical anthropology*, 6, 2: 183–191.
- . 1986. Towards an understanding of Soviet *ethnos* theory *South African Journal of Ethnology*, 9: 157–166.
- . 1988 "Union Soviétique – Afrique du sud: les 'théories' de l'*ethnos*." *Cahiers d'Études africaines*, 28, 2: 157–176.
- . 1990. "Soviet *Ethnographiia* and the National(ities) Question." *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique*, 31, 2–3: 183–192.

- Slezkine, Yury. 1991. "The Fall of Soviet Ethnography, 1928–38." *Current Anthropology*, 32, 4: 476–484.
- . "The USSR as a Communal Apartment, or How a Socialist State Promoted Ethnic Particularism." *Slavic Review*, 53, 2: 414–452.
- Sokolovskiy, Sergei. 2014. *Zerkala i otrazhenia ili esche raz o situatsii v rossiiskoi antropologii*. *Antropologicheskii Forum*, 20: 143–188 [Mirrors and Reflections or Once More on the Situation in Russian Anthropology].
- , ed. 2015. *Innovatsii v antropologii*. Moscow: IEA RAS.
- , ed. 2016. *Rossiiskaia antropologia i "ontologicheskii povorot."* Tomsk: University Press [Russian Anthropology and the "Ontological Turn"].
- , ed. 2018. *Tekhnologii i telesnost'*. Moscow: IEA RAS [Technologies and Corporeality].
- Ssorin-Chaikov, Nikolay. 2003. *The Social Life of the State in Subarctic Siberia*. Stanford: Univ. press.
- Steward, Julian. 1955. *Theory of Culture Change: The Methodology of Multilinear Evolution*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Tishkov Valery. 1992. "The Crisis in Soviet Ethnography." *Current Anthropology*, 33, 4: 371–382.
- . 1994. "Post-Soviet Ethnography. Not a Crisis by Something More Serious." *Anthropology & Archeology of Eurasia*, 33, 3: 87–92.
- . 1996. *Ethnicity, Nationalism, and Conflict in and after the Soviet Union: The Mind Aflame*. London: Sage.
- . 1998. "Zabyt' o natsii." *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie*. 5: 3–26 ["Forget the Nation"].
- , and Viktor Shnirelman, eds. 2007. *Natsionalizm v mirovoi istorii*. Moscow: Nauka. [Nationalism in World History].
- , and Elena E. Filippova, eds. 2016. *Kul'turnaia slozhnost' sovremennykh natsii*. Moscow: ROSSPEN [Cultural Complexity of Contemporary Nations].
- Tolstov, Sergei. 1932. "Ocherki pervonachalnogo islama." *Sovetskaia Etnografia* 2: 24–82 [Essays on Early Islam].
- Vainshtein, Olga. 2003. *Aromaty i zapakhi v kul'ture*. Vols. 1–2. Moscow: NLO. [Aromas and Smells in Culture].
- Vermeulen, Han F. 2015. *Before Boas. The Genesis of Ethnography and Ethnology in the German Enlightenment*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Vitebsky, Piers. 1990. "Centralized Decentralization: The Ethnography of Remote Reindeer Herders under Perestroika." *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique* 31, 2–3: 345–356.

Sergei V. Sokolovskiy
SokolovskiSerg@gmail.com

Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology,
Russian Academy of Science, Moscow