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Chapter Four
Rozhkov's Interpretation of the Social, Political and Psychological Structures of Kiev Rus'
Rozhkov's account of society, politics and the psychology of Kiev Rus' was based on solid empirical foundations. But it was also a product of his theoretical presuppositions. For Rozhkov, the primitive hunter-gatherer economy of Kiev Rus' provided the basis for the political structure, the legal system and the psychology of its inhabitants. Rozhkov's account of Kiev Rus' can only be understood in the context of his attempt to prove, firstly, that this initial phase of Russian history was more backward than many of his contemporaries believed and, secondly, that it could not have been otherwise given the economic basis on which it was built.

At the conclusion of his examination of the economic nature of Kiev Rus', Rozhkov confirmed that his sociological theory was based on empirical evidence and that it had universal applicability. On the basis of having studied only the first period of Russian history, he concluded that of the five social processes—natural, economic, social, political and psychological—the most fundamental of all was the economic process.\(^1\) According to Rozhkov, the "economic process is the simplest process because to explain it there is no need to study social, political or psychological phenomena".\(^2\) The economic process constituted the first link in the chain of phenomena that shaped society.

---

2. Ibid.
How did Rozhkov explain that the social, political and psychological structures of Kiev Rus' were determined by its economic structures? Rozhkov wrote:

the social structure, that is the division of society into economic classes and juridical estates [sosloviia], is formed as a result of the combined influence of the four groups of economic phenomena: the relative significance of the various branches of economic labour, the forms of landownership, the forms of production and the distribution of economic goods.3

According to his theory, the economic conditions that prevailed in Kiev Rus' gave rise to a specific social structure. In concrete historical terms, Rozhkov believed that under the combined influence of the predominance of hunting and gathering and cattle-breeding, the free exploitation of land, the family form of enterprise and the near equal distribution of economic goods, a society was created that consisted predominantly of free peasants or smerdy. It was Rozhkov's contention that almost the entire population of Kiev Rus' consisted of smerdy and this made Kiev Rus' society homogeneous [odnorodnoe].4

Rozhkov emphasised the empirical basis of his theory when he wrote that his conclusions about classes and estates "resulted directly from data [dannykh] already well-known to us".5 Furthermore, he contended

3 N.A. Rozhkov, Obzor' russkoi istorii s sotsiologicheskoi tochki zreniia, Chast' vtoroi, Vypusk' vtoroi (Moscow, 1905), p. 151.  
4 Ibid., p. 64.  
5 Ibid., pp. 43-44.
that these conclusions are "fully confirmed by the observations that are made of the meaning behind the various sorts of social terms that are met in the sources".\footnote{Ibid.} In accordance with this view, Rozhkov examined the most important primary sources dealing with the Kiev Rus' period. As anyone who is familiar with the sources would know, Rozhkov correctly identified the term "smerd" as being the most important social term in the primary sources. He then went on to ask the question: "What was a *smerd* in the Kiev Rus' period of Russian history?".\footnote{Ibid., p. 44.} His answer was:

Two of our fundamental sources give us a fairly definite and clear indication. *Russkaia Pravda* testifies that according to occupation, the smerd was an apiarist and stock-breeder. It refers to the smerd's horse and to *borti*. *Nachal'naia Letopis',* with its well-known story about the convention of princes at Lake Dolobskoe, adds to these characteristics by showing that in the XII century agriculture became one of the usual occupations of smerdy.\footnote{Ibid.}

Rozhkov argued that a smerd was a free individual [svobodnyi chelovek] who lived as a hunter and gatherer.\footnote{Ibid. See also: N.A. Rozhkov *Russkaia istoriia v sravnitel'no-istoricheskom osveshchenii (Osnovy sotsial'noi dinamiki)*, Vol. 1 (Petrograd-Moscow, 1918), p. 47.} Furthermore, Rozhkov argued that the smerd represented not only the largest section of Kiev Rus' society but also its most important one. The social classes that developed later in the Kiev Rus' period did so on the
basis of the economic activities of the smerd.\textsuperscript{10} Rozhkov argued that a “more or less visible division of labour” began to develop in Kiev Rus' only when “foreign trade appeared” in the eighth century and increased in the eleventh century with the arrival of the Varangians.\textsuperscript{11}

Foreign trade brought about a sharp division between “those who possessed useful and real economic goods” and “those who possessed money capital \textit{[denezhnyi kapital]}”.\textsuperscript{12} In other words, it produced a sharp division between the mass of smerdy and the merchants and boyars. Before the appearance of foreign trade, the bulk of the population was engaged in the same economic activity, namely hunting and gathering, and therefore there was very little class differentiation. Although Rozhkov considered the development of economic classes important, it did not play a significant role until the second half of the Kiev Rus’ period.

Rozhkov argued that classes developed as a direct result of foreign trade which was of secondary importance for much of the Kievan period.\textsuperscript{13} When foreign trade developed, it did so as the “exclusive preoccupation of the upper layers of the population”.\textsuperscript{14}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{10} Rozhkov, \textit{Obzor}, Chast' II, Vypusk II, p. 62. \\
\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Ibid}. \\
\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Ibid}. \\
\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Ibid}. \\
\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 43. See also: N. A. Rozhkov, \textit{Gorod i derevnia v russkoj istorii. (Kratkii ocherk ekonomicheskoj istorii rossii)} (Petrograd, fourth edition, 1918), p. 12.
\end{flushright}
However, he believed that the number of people involved in foreign trade was small and that the upper layers were not particularly influential.\textsuperscript{15} The notion that the "upper layers of society" were not "especially influential" may strike the reader as odd. Rozhkov, however, provided two reasons to explain why he believed the upper layers were not particularly influential. Firstly, he considered that while the upper class did extract tribute from the bulk of the population, it was not overly burdensome. Secondly, Rozhkov considered that Kiev Rus' was a society which in general was characterised by remarkable homogeneity and mobility.

According to Rozhkov, the upper class had not yet formed a closed society and it was relatively simple for individual smerdy to join its lower ranks. They could migrate to the towns to become traders or join the princely retinues.\textsuperscript{16} For Rozhkov, Kiev Rus' was characterised by remarkable social mobility. To prove this point, he devoted a great deal of effort in countering the notion that Kiev Rus' was a sophisticated society with firmly entrenched juridical divisions, that is, estates. For Rozhkov, estates existed only in embryonic form and represented no real barrier to social mobility.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{15} Rozhkov, \textit{Obzor}, Chast' II, Vypusk II, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 57.
\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Ibid.}
It is worth noting that Rozhkov's argument that smerdy constituted a single group of free individuals was at odds with the definitions put forward by most pre-revolutionary historians. Rozhkov's argument also differed from that put forward by Kliuchevskii. Kliuchevskii believed that all princely land was state land. Since smerdy lived only on state land, he called them state peasants. Rozhkov's belief that the term "smerd" referred to free people came to be supported by later historians including Grekov. However, where Rozhkov's interpretation differs from all others is in his assertion that the term "smerd" referred to a single, homogenous section of society that was hunter-gatherer in nature.

Today, not all researchers would agree with Rozhkov's belief that all smerdy had the same economic and social status. Hitherto, many researchers have preferred to give more than one definition of the term "smerd" and have agreed that it is impossible to discover a single definition for it. As S.V. Lushkov correctly pointed out, the term smerd "is one of the

---

19 V.O. Kliuchevskii, "Istorii soslovii v rossii", in V.O. Kliuchevskii, Sochinenia v deviaty toimakh (Moscow: Mysl', 1989), Vol. VI, pp. 262-263;
20 Grekov, op.cit., pp. 286-299.
21 See, for example, I.A. Froianov, Kievskaiia rus': Ocherki sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi istorii (Leningrad, 1974), pp. 113-125.
most difficult and involved questions to resolve". Yet, as two very recent studies of Kiev Rus’ show, a generalised definition of smerd, like the one put forward by Rozhkov, is not unreasonable. However, what is of importance to us is that Rozhkov’s definition of smerd is consistent with his theory that Kiev Rus’ was a primitive and simple society.

Rozhkov believed that the social structure of Kiev Rus’ was determined by the predominance of a hunter-gatherer economy. He maintained that a primitive economy could only give rise to a primitive social structure, that is, a social structure that lacks diversification. Rozhkov held this idea to be so true that he enshrined it in his second law of social dynamics. As will be shown in chapter six, this law stated that the society of any country in the first period of its historical development is characterised by a “lack of organisation and an absence of classes and estates”. Given that Kiev Rus’ was the first stage in Russian history, it had to be a simple society.


Chapter Four: The Society of Kiev Rus’

If as Rozhkov believed Kievan society was “homogeneous for a long time and only later in the period was it subjected to dismemberment and then into classes rather than estates”, then how was society organised?25 Rozhkov argued that the basic social unit of ancient Russia was the family [sem’ia] which had evolved from the “clan way of life” [rodovoi byt].26 Arguing on the basis of the primary sources, Rozhkov contended that, during the first period of their existence, the Russian Slavs preserved a tribal organisation.27 Each tribe was divided into clans. Rozhkov believed that the term “clan” [rod] referred to a community of families related by blood.28 These clans lived together, worked together, shared property and were ruled by a clan elder. Over time, clans came to claim a particular area in which they conducted their hunting and gathering. According to Rozhkov, the term verv’ was used in Russkaia Pravda to denote the community of families that comprised a territorial unit.29 This view is by no means odd and has been corroborated in the more recent work of Froianov.30

25 Ibid., pp. 63-64.
26 Ibid., pp. 48-49.
27 This view is similar to that put forward by Froianov. See: Froianov, op.cit., pp. 19-25.
Smerdy were free to move from place to place and were independent. They had their own tools, occupied parcels of land and worked for the clan. Nothing was bought from others, everything was produced by the clan.

Unlike Rozhkov, Kliuchevskii believed that land was not free. Smerdy could not occupy any parcel of land because "a system of princely ownership of Russian lands existed at the time". Furthermore, Kliuchevskii argued that since all princely land was state land, the smerd was therefore a "state peasant" [gosudarstvennyi krest'ianin]. According to Kliuchevskii, smerdy had lost their economic independence and became dependent on the big landowners who enslaved them. He was of the opinion that already in the Kievan period smerdy had begun to fulfil various obligations of the feudal state. Of course, this aspect of Kliuchevskii's view was favourably accepted by the bulk of Soviet historians who considered Kiev Rus' to be a fully-fledged feudal society. Rozhkov, on the other hand, was severely criticised by Soviet historians for holding the view that Kievan society was pre-feudal and therefore more backward.

Rozhkov believed that the more developed a society, the more its legal system recognised individuals and individual rights. A mark of Kievan backwardness was the emphasis placed by the Kiev Rus' legal on collectivities such as the guild or verv'. Determined to prove the extent of ancient Russia's backwardness, Rozhkov thoroughly scrutinised the documentary evidence, especially the evidence contained in Russkaia Pravda and Nachal'naia Letopis. Rozhkov argued that these important documents testified to the backward and homogenous nature of Kiev Rus' society.35 According to Rozhkov, in Russkaia Pravda the importance of the guild or verv' rather than the individual smerd was emphasised in the judicial process. For example, when the body of a murdered person was found within the territory of the verv' and the verv' refused to search for the unknown murderer, the verv' paid a so-called dikaia vira, that is a bloodwite [vira] paid by the members of the verv collectively. A dikaia vira was also paid if a murder was committed unintentionally in a brawl or at a feast or when property was damaged within the territory of the verv' and the verv' refused to investigate the crime.36 In the last incident, the verv'  

35 A reader familiar with the sources and with Rozhkov's work is struck by the fact that Froianov does not acknowledge or did not consult Rozhkov's research. Froianov interprets the sources in a similar fashion to Rozhkov. For example, both historians examine the very complex notion of the verv' and the family to prove their theories that Kievan Rus' was a pre-feudal society. 
also paid a fine directly to the prince [prodazha] and compensated the victim.37

Rozhkov believed that the judicial importance of the verv' was "almost exclusively limited to an obligation to participate in the investigations, an obligation which the verv' could buy off".38 He argued that since Kiev Rus' lacked a well-defined legal structure which compelled smerdy to take part in the judicial process, there was obviously no need for formal rights to protect them. He believed that the members of the verv' had a moral obligation to help each other because they were related. Rozhkov's Kiev Rus' society was founded on cooperation and trust. In his opinion, this was a simple society which had no need for elaborate laws to protect "the corporate political rights [korporativnyia politicheskiia prava] of the smerdy".39

That Rozhkov believed Kievan society was underdeveloped in terms of its social divisions can also be seen from his interpretation of the rights that he claimed smerdy possessed with regard to ownership of property. In his opinion, any right that the smerd had to own chattel or movable property [dvizhimoe imushchestvo] and realty [nedvizhimoe imushchestvo]

37 Rozhkov, Obzor, Chast' I, p. 49.
38 Ibid.
39 Ibid. Following Kliuchevskii, Rozhkov claimed that he had "to distinguish between personal and corporative rights [lichnyia i korporativnyia prava]. Corporative rights are those rights that belong to the juridical person [lisso iuridichesko], to the corporation rather than each individual", p. 44. By corporation Rozhkov essentially means the clan.
was a right that “belonged not to the individual but to the family unit”. As Rozhkov wrote, it was a “corporate civil right” [*korporativnoe grazhdanskoе pravo*]. In other words, ownership was not an individual right but a right that belonged to the group of people that comprised the family community which was based on blood relationship.

Once the clan moved into and occupied a certain territory, individual families freely chose the portion of territory they wanted to use and claimed that parcel of land as theirs while they occupied it. Accordingly, the rules and laws that existed to protect this way of life protected the rights of the family rather than the individual. Rozhkov argued that because the rights of the individual were not considered important, Kiev Rus’ must have been a simple and homogeneous society.

The extent to which Rozhkov believed that Kiev Rus’ was an unsophisticated and primitive society with very little class conflict can best be illustrated by his claim that the prince’s retinue or druzhina did not have “any special, individual or corporate political rights”. In fact Rozhkov contended that the prince’s retinue had not as yet become a separate, individual class with its

---

41 *Ibid*.
own needs and interests. Rozhkov admitted that the prince's retinue began to acquire some special civil rights. Nonetheless, there were few of these special civil rights and they were mostly restricted to the senior members of the retinue. Only in the late Kievan period did special civil rights for the princely retinue become apparent. For example, according to the primary sources a double bloodwite was demanded for the murder of a boiar or kniazhii muzh in the twelfth century.

Rozhkov concluded that for most of the Kiev Rus' period the special privileges of estates were, at best, at an embryonic stage and therefore were not developed politically. As Rozhkov wrote:

It is not possible to deny the existence of an embryonic estate system in ancient Russia. But, firstly, there were very few of these embryos; secondly, some of them developed late, and thirdly, and this was especially important in this case, there were no judicial barriers preventing people from transferring from one condition to another. Every smerd, if he wanted to and was in a position to do so, could move to a town to be involved with trade and even join the princely retinue and become one of its elder members [starshii druzhinnik] or boiarin.

---

46 Rozhkov, Obzor, Chast' I, p. 56.
47 Ibid., p. 55.
49 Ibid., p. 57.
In Rozhkov's opinion, such remarkable social mobility existed because of the absence of judicial barriers. Among the examples cited by Rozhkov was the story of Ian Usmoshvets', the son of a smerd who rose to become part of Prince Vladimir's retinue because of his efforts in the war against the Pechenegs. Rozhkov was quick to point out that the story confirmed that no judicial impediments existed to prevent the transition from smerd to a member of the upper class.50

At the end of his historical analysis of the structure of Kiev Rus' society, Rozhkov provided a sociological outline which he believed explained the historical development of Kiev Rus'. Extending his chain of cause and effect, Rozhkov provided the following sequence of events:

Under the combined influence of the predominance of hunting and gathering and cattle-breeding, free land usage, domestic forms of production and an equal distribution of economic goods between the various families, the predominant class of smerdy was formed. It was the main, oldest and most stable social phenomenon of the period. Later, with the appearance of foreign trade, landownership, private [vladel'cheskie] forms of production and, of course, the concentration of money capital in the hands of the trading minority, there developed classes of boyars and merchants. The number of kholopy and zakupy also increased. However, these later forms of

50 Ibid.
social phenomena were less characteristic of the period.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 64-65.}

In Rozhkov's sociological hierarchy, political phenomena followed social phenomena. Rozhkov pointed out that because a cause always precedes the effect it gives rise to, it was impossible to consider political phenomena causes of economic and social phenomena. Politics came into existence after the economic and social character of Kiev Rus' had been established.\footnote{Ibid.} Consequently, Rozhkov contended that political phenomena, like social phenomena, were only passive consequences of economic phenomena. The political structure of Kiev Rus' was determined by the combined influence of economic and social factors. Rozhkov argued that the political conditions of Kiev Rus' were so primitive that they had very little influence on the economy or social structure of the country.\footnote{Ibid., p. 97.}

Rozhkov began his study of the political system of Kiev Rus' with a definition of "state". He wrote:

According to the modern theory of constitutional law \textit{gosudarstvennoe pravo}, the state \textit{gosudarstvo} is a union \textit{soiuz} based on power which is not derived from blood relationship \textit{krovnago rodstva} or ancestral elders \textit{rodovogo stareishinstva}. Thus, power \textit{vlast'} or supremacy \textit{gospodstvo} must be a necessary criterion of any state,
regardless of whether it is ancient or modern.54

However, Rozhkov believed that there were other criteria that distinguished a modern lawful state [sovremennoe pravovoe gosudarstvo], the “highest political form which a civilised European West developed”.55

For Rozhkov, the model for his “modern lawful state” was the liberal political systems that prevailed in Britain and France. This was the highest achievement of human political development and constituted the end to which all other societies with their more backward political systems were being drawn. Rozhkov was particularly fond of quoting the British utilitarian writers, such as John Stuart Mill, who had recognised the importance of representative government as a goal for human politics. For Rozhkov, backward political states were ruled by the “private interests” of the ruler while modern political states were under the sway of the “general good”.

That is not to claim that Kievan rulers concerned themselves only with their own enrichment. They were obliged to serve the common good to some extent; otherwise they risked losing their power through the unrest of a dissatisfied population. For Rozhkov, what was characteristic of backward societies, like Kiev

54 Ibid., p. 65.
55 Ibid.
Rus', was a lack of solidarity among the ruled, who therefore constituted a minimal threat to the ruler. Given that situation, the ruler was under much less pressure to further the common good than would be the case in a more developed society. In the case of Kiev Rus', the ruler served the common good in two basic ways — meeting the external defence needs of the Kievan population and bringing 'law and order' to a Kievan population that might otherwise have descended into internecine bloodletting.

According to Rozhkov, the Kievan princes lacked the administration necessary to make Kiev Rus' subject to a truly autocratic government. What characterised Kiev Rus' was really the absence of government because that power which the prince wielded was directed towards mostly private goals and the princes had little interest in imposing a more thoroughgoing rule upon the Kievan population.

Rozhkov listed three criteria that he believed defined a modern lawful state. Firstly, power belongs to society as a whole and not one individual. In other words, "the modern lawful state is a social union and not individual rule [lichnoe gospodstvo]. Secondly, a "lawful state aims at the realisation of the common good [obshchee blago] and not individual interests". Thirdly, institutions are recognised as means of administration. Unlike many contemporary Marxists, Rozhkov did not view the state simple as an instrument
of the ruling class; nor did he dwell on instances of class struggle.\textsuperscript{56}

Having briefly defined what he meant by the state, Rozhkov then declared that Kiev Rus' was not only the "first period of Russian history" but it was also the period in which the Russian state was born. Rozhkov argued that in order to comprehend the political development of ancient Russia, the researcher is obliged to examine in detail: "how the concept of power [\textit{subject vlasti}] and the aim of a governmental union were understood in the Kiev Rus' period and how the means of administration [\textit{sredstva upravleniia}] were organised at the time".\textsuperscript{57}

When Rozhkov asked the question: "what sort of social union existed in our history before the formation of that Varangian principality which appeared in Rus', as is usually thought, with the arrival of Riurik?", he was acutely aware of the complexity of the question and the diversity of opinions that had been expressed on this subject.\textsuperscript{58} With his usual thoroughness, Rozhkov analysed the five most influential responses to this question.\textsuperscript{59}


\textsuperscript{57} Rozhkov, \textit{Obzor}, Chast' I, p. 66.

\textsuperscript{58} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{59} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 66- 70. According to Rozhkov, there were five schools of thought. There was J.P.G. Ewers' theory that the "clan way of life" [\textit{rodovoi byt}] was the dominant social organisation in ancient Russia. This view was supported by S.M. Soloviev in his \textit{magnum opus}, \textit{The History of Russia from Ancient Times}. Another school of
It was Rozhkov’s belief that a state did not exist before the arrival of the three Varangian princes, Riurik, Sineus and Truvor in 862. He maintained that in a tribal system power was based on blood relationships or degrees of consanguinity. In order for a state to evolve from a tribal way of life, power must be recognised by society as a whole and must not be based on blood relationships.

Like Kliuchevskii before him, Rozhkov claimed that The Primary Chronicle provides irrefutable proof that a Russian state arose after the arrival of the three Varangian princes and that this state developed from the tribal way of life that already existed in the area. Rozhkov then depicted how he believed Kiev Rus’ came to be politically. He argued that Slavs settled in separate river settlements along the shores of rivers. Out of these primitive settlements, vervi were formed. As the size of the population increased, so did the sizes of

thought was expressed by the Slavophile historian K. Aksakov who believed that a family communal way of life [smeino-obshchinnyi byt] existed in ancient Russia. A third group of researchers put forward the view that ancient Russia was characterised by a zadruzhno-communal [zadruzhno- obshchinnyi byt] way of life. Kliuchevskii was the main proponent of the fourth theory cited by Rozhkov that explained the type of social organisation that existed in ancient Russia. Kliuchevskii believed that the town-district [gorodskaisa oblast] was the major political organisation in ancient Russia. He claimed that these so-called town-districts or areas of trade that developed around major trading towns such as Kiev, Chernigov and Smolensk, were the forerunners of the Kievan state. The fifth and final theory that Rozhkov examined was developed by the Ukrainian scholar M. Grushevsky [Hrushevsky] and by the Russian historian P.V. Golubovskii. These authors, among others, believed that a tribal principality [kniazhество plemennoe] existed before a Varangian principality came into being. See also: Rozhkov, Russkaia istoria , Vol. 1, p. 84.

60 Ibid., p. 70.
61 Ibid. See also: G. Vernadsky, Medieval Russian Laws, p. 95.
vervi and this led to greater contact and improved relations between them. Eventually, these larger vervi became tribes [plemena] with a veche, a prince and elected elders at the head of each tribe. As far as Rozhkov was concerned, tribal principalities appeared "partly as protection against foreign dangers but mostly as a result of the need to prevent internal discords between vervi".  

Rozhkov wrote that at the beginning of the ninth century there existed several major tribes. These independent tribes "were in no condition to withstand foreign dangers". Consequently, the northern tribes were conquered by the Varangians and the southern tribes were conquered by the Khazars. The result was the formation of the Varangian principality and the birth of the Russian state. As Rozhkov wrote: "the Varangian princes no longer derived their power from blood relationship. Their power was obtained through conquest and, as such, the Varangian principality may be regarded as a state". According to Rozhkov "the Russian state, in the form of the Varangian principality, was formed as a result of Varangian or Norman conquest of the various tribal principalities of the eastern Slavs in the IX century, which occurred under the influence of the need for internal security and foreign defence". He added that while some tribes preserved their tribal  

---

62 Ibid.  
63 Ibid.  
64 Ibid., p. 71.  
65 Ibid., p. 72-73.
independence, they were required to pay tribute and to participate in militias. In Rozhkov's opinion, tribal principalities gave way to Varangian principalities and they eventually combined to form the Grand Principality of Kiev.

In terms of Rozhkov's use of the primary sources to explain the rise of the Russian state, he owed much to the work of Kliuchevik. However, in terms of the theory that he used to explain this development, Rozhkov was also influenced by the views put forward by the Austrian sociologist Ludwig Gumplowicz. In 1899, Gumplowicz elaborated his views on the state in his very influential work *SozialPhilosophie im Umriss*. Aspects of his well-known conquest theory [*Ueberlagerungstheorie*] were expressed as early as 1875 in his important book *Rasse und Staat*. Gumplowicz put forward the view that the state was a social phenomenon that developed according to natural laws. The first phase of the development of the state, in Gumplowicz's opinion, was the subjugation of one social group by another and the establishment of a sovereign minority in control. He wrote: "The sovereign class required compulsory acquiescence of a subject class. Its objectives were defence against attacks, increase of power and territory. The superior class also sought to

make profitable use of the subject classes".67 According to Gumplowicz, states have only developed when one group has subjugated another for economic interests.68

Rozhkov took Gumplowicz's theory as the starting point and added several dimensions to it. He believed it was necessary to examine the "purpose of a state" [tsel' gosudarstvennago soiuza] and the "concept of power" [sub"ekt vlasti].69 Rozhkov believed that in order to exist a state had to meet certain demands from society. After all, the state is "a social union and its existence relies upon the majority of the population".70 Understood in this light, when Rozhkov posed the question: "What was the actual purpose [tsel'] of the Russian state in its earliest form, that is, from the IX to the end of the XII century?", he provided the following answer:

We saw that the Russian state appeared and developed because it met two pressing needs of society: the need for foreign defence against foreigners and the need for...

69 These categories have been judged important in the work of more recent writers. See: H.J.M. Claessen and P. Skalniık, "The Early State: Theories and Hypotheses" in H.J.M. Claessen and P. Skalniık (eds.), The Early State (The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 1978), pp. 12 and 18. See also: B. Bosanquet, The Philosophical Theory of the State (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., first edition, 1899, reprinted 1965). This work is interesting because it too deals with the debates current at the turn of the century and helps shed light on some of the ideas that Rozhkov was discussing.
70 Rozhkov, Obzor, Chast' I, p. 91.
the removal of internal discord. The military activity of the princes and princely justice just had to satisfy these urgent needs. Without doubt, these needs were satisfied to a certain extent. Consequently, also to a certain degree, the common good [obshchoe blago] was achieved otherwise the very existence of the state would not have been possible.\textsuperscript{71}

At the basis of Rozhkov's historical interpretation was his belief that because the Kievan state was in its first period of development, it lacked administrative organisation. Its rulers had a very rudimentary understanding of what government and power were all about. Their interest was in personal enrichment, attained through war and taxation. Consequently, power was understood as something that belonged to individuals and not to society as a whole.

Rozhkov argued that the Kievan state came into being because, to a certain degree, it met the common interests of the people. However, he asserted that it was relatively easy for the newly-born Kievan state to

\textsuperscript{71} Ibid., pp. 90-91. It is worth pointing out that Kliuchevskii used the term "common interest" in his discussion of the formation of the Kievan Principality. See: V.O. Kliuchevskii, Kurs russkoi istorii, Chast' 1 in Kliuchevskii, Sochinenia v deviatyi tomakh, Vol. 1, pp. 156-159. Rozhkov's notion that the state meets the common good of its people may have been influenced by Kliuchevskii's idea of the state being created by the common interest of the people. However, in an article entitled "A Scientific World View and History", which was published early in 1903, Rozhkov provides evidence that this notion developed from his examination of the epistemological problem of moral values. More specifically, Rozhkov was criticising the idealism of Kantian ethics by adopting a "critical positivist" position. See: N.A. Rozhkov, "Nauchnoe mirosozertsanie i istoriya", Nauchnoe Slovo, No. 1, 1903, pp. 105-112. See also: N.A. Rozhkov, "Znachenie i sud'by noveishego idealizma v rossi", Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii, Bk. LXVII, Moscow, March-April 1903, pp. 314-333.
satisfy the needs of society because there was very little social cohesion.72 This meant that society lacked an understanding of the notion of the common good and had very little idea about central government and its responsibilities. Consequently, as Rozhkov put it, "the immediate purpose of governmental activity turned out to be personal, private interests rather than the common good of society".73 In place of the development of common social interests and needs, what existed was the interests of a small group of people. As Rozhkov put it:

The military activity of princes was directed not so much at warding off enemy attacks as at countering domestic wars, which had as their narrow objectives the individual wealth of the princes, increasing their estate [vladenie] and the acquisition of more land for the princes descended from the House of Riurik. Often, even foreign undertakings had as their aim the personal profit of the princes.74

Rozhkov argued that the primitive government that began to develop after the calling of the Varangians had three elements: the veche, the kniaz' and the boiarskaia duma. The veche (a word derived from the same root as soviet) or the town assembly was comprised of all the free people in the district, that is, "not only of townspeople but also of smerdy or peasants and of countryfolk".75 At important veche meetings, the prince

72 Rozhkov, Obzor, Chast' I, p. 91.
73 Ibid.
74 Ibid.
75 Ibid., p. 73.
and his druzhiny would also be present. Anyone could attend the gatherings but the right to vote was reserved for the heads of families. Rozhkov argued that it was extremely difficult to make political decisions and to establish laws because a stable political structure did not exist in the Kievan period. He also pointed out there was no such thing as universal suffrage and any democratic representation was, at best, rudimentary.76

Rozhkov believed that the role of the veche was rather vague. He analysed the primary sources and found evidence in them to show the influence of the veche. The veche, for example, participated in the election and dismissal of princes. At the same time, however, Rozhkov warned that the influence and power of the veche should not be exaggerated. Rozhkov claimed that: “Of the fifty princes that occupied the Kievan throne up to the Tartar invasion, only fourteen were chosen by the veche.”77 While the veche did have some important functions, the fact that it did not have a formal constitution or a definite jurisdiction meant that its power was limited. As far as Rozhkov was concerned, the veche was only an institution [uchrezhdenie] in the most primitive sense of the word.78

According to Rozhkov, the second political force in ancient Russia was the prince or the kniaž'. Although he believed that there were two major theories about the

76 Ibid., p. 74.
77 Ibid., p. 75.
78 Ibid., p. 76.
order of princely succession in the Kiev Rus' period, Rozhkov claimed that the primary sources demonstrated that princely succession at that time rested on "unstable, constantly oscillating and mutually contradictory foundations". Rozhkov argued that the political power that the prince had was limited, that his legislative power was rather primitive and relied upon the support of his court.

Rozhkov claimed that according to the primary sources, the chief duties of the prince included the administration of justice, military defence and trade. He affirmed that these duties cannot be seen as "regular, stable or organised". On the contrary, Rozhkov maintained that the legislative work of the prince was a "rare occurrence" because the boiarskaia duma, or noble council, took part in all major decisions. The prince seldom acted alone. Despite the many and various references in the code of laws, as enshrined in Russkaia Pravda, to the role of the prince in settling legal matters, Rozhkov put forward the argument that "it was impossible to call the judicial power of the prince all-

79 Ibid., p. 79.
80 Ibid., p. 80
81 Ibid., p. 81.
82 The word boiar referred to a category of noblemen usually of high rank and the word duma is derived from the Russian word meaning to think and, by extension, advice or counsel. Hence, boiarskaia duma means noble council.
embracing, organised and stable". He also argued that the administrative work [administrativnaia deiatel'nost'] of the prince "had very little significance and was reduced to nominating officials in the various clans [rody] who ran the government".

In Rozhkov's opinion, the most important activity that the prince performed was the collection of taxes [sbor nalogov]. The main source of state revenue came from direct taxes or tribute [dan'] imposed on the people by the Kievan princes. Rozhkov believed that the determination with which the prince collected his revenue and carried out his financial matters was explained by the fact that prince saw this as his most important task. In fact, Rozhkov argued that the government was so poorly developed that there were no other duties for princes to perform.

Rozhkov came to the general conclusion that Kievan princes had limited and poorly developed power. The order of princely succession and the relationship between princes, for example, were not properly established and therefore unstable. Princes were motivated by crude financial reasons. On the other hand, the limited ability of princes to project their power had the consequence that while "princes displayed a much more active and established political role than the veche, autocratic power [kniazheskaia vlast'] was not an

83 Rozhkov, Obzor, Chast' 1, p. 81.  
84 Ibid.
institution [uchrezhdenie] in the true sense of the word".85

Rozhkov reaffirmed the political backwardness of Kievan society by arguing that the boiarskaia duma, "the counsel of older druzhiniki attached to the prince",86 was much less powerful than the prince partly because its organisation was so much weaker. In Rozhkov's opinion, the boiarskaia duma was not "an organised and coherent institution [organizovannoe, pravil'noe uchrezhdenie] because it did not have a stable personnel and it was not an established government department".87 He argued that this was particularly the case in the eleventh and twelfth centuries when the composition of the boiarskaia duma changed because the prince began to appoint the boiary he wanted. By so doing, the prince increased his power and the process of consultation between the prince and his boiary was little more than a formality because the prince selected his advisers depending on the situation and the problem that was being resolved. As Rozhkov wrote:

It is apparent from the evidence that is available on the affairs of the veche and the prince that any of the many important questions concerning the government could have been resolved without any participation from the prince's advisers, that is, his boiary.88

85 Ibid., p. 83.
86 Ibid.
87 Ibid., p. 84.
88 Ibid.
Rozhkov concluded his examination of the political phenomena of Kiev Rus by relating his historical analysis to his sociological theory. He declared that the political system of Kiev Rus was shaped by the economic conditions as well as the social and political forces that prevailed at the time. As he wrote, in order to explain the backwardness of the political system of the Kiev Rus period, it is necessary to examine the economic organisation as well as the social and political influences that existed at the time. In terms of his sociological theory, Rozhkov believed that a primitive political structure existed because a primitive economic way of life prevailed. He wrote:

The absence of order, harmony and coherence [poriadka, stroinosti i sviaznosti] in economic life led to a lack of organisation in the political structure. Subsequently, a natural economy, a family form of enterprise and an absence of an organic economic link between the producers of economic goods and the foreign market created a mechanical mixture of economies rather than a single chemical union, that is, a tight internally-linked cohesion of independent economic units. The family was the most important social unit and each individual was tied to the family rather than to society as a whole. That is why the political structure of the time lacked coherence [otlichalsia bezsviaznost'iu], had a weak understanding of the principle of the common good and was ruled by individuals rather than by society as a whole. Without these economic conditions which influenced society directly, it would have been

89 Ibid., p. 96.
impossible to explain the history of the Russian state in the Kievan period.\textsuperscript{90}

Although almost a century has passed since Rozhkov wrote about the political character of Kiev Rus', his interpretation is still valid. If anything, the basic interpretation that Rozhkov provided has recently gained support. For instance, arguing that Kiev Rus' was a prefeudal society, Froianov claimed that everyone played a significant role in the politics of Kiev Rus' because classes had not yet formed.\textsuperscript{91} For this reason also, the veche represented everyone. Froianov argued that while the veche included elite members of society and these figures often ran the meetings, they could not control them.\textsuperscript{92} The decisions of the veche covered all significant areas of politics, war and peace, succession, finances, appointments to leading positions and so forth, but these decisions were made by the people in general.\textsuperscript{93} Few modern researchers would disagree with Rozhkov in his emphasis upon the need to establish the precise relationship between rulers and ruled in Kiev Rus'. As Martin put it in concluding her discussion of the princes and politics of Kiev Rus': "Fulfillment of its domestic and foreign tasks depended, however, on the dynasty's relationship with the society it governed".\textsuperscript{94}

\textsuperscript{90} Ibid., p. 97.
\textsuperscript{91} Froianov, Kievskaia Rus': Ocherki sotsial'no-politicheskoi istorii, op.cit., p. 149.
\textsuperscript{92} Ibid., p. 184.
\textsuperscript{93} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{94} Martin, op.cit., p. 56.
Psychological phenomena comprised the fifth and last category in Rozhkov's classification of social phenomena. It was Rozhkov's belief that the material basis of society acted on the mental aspects of society. In more advanced societies, the reverse was also possible, that is, psychological phenomena influenced the economic, social and political aspects of society. The extremely complex task before Rozhkov was to demonstrate that the material and the mental aspects of society were linked and that this linkage could be scientifically demonstrated.

In his classification of historical phenomena (see Figure 5.1), Rozhkov believed that psychological factors were the most complex of all factors that shape society. Rozhkov argued that as long as it can be demonstrated that economics, society and politics influence psychology, a scientific historical theory has been established. Human society becomes more understandable and clearer if the researcher investigates for each period the economic, social, political and psychological conditions and tendencies that characterise and dominate it.

To explore human motivation, Rozhkov felt that he had to develop his own study of psychology. Rozhkov began with an analysis of human nature, that is, with a study of the various components that comprise the psychology of the individual. He believed that a

---

95 Rozhkov, Obzor, Chast' I, pp. 103-104.
knowledge of the individual was necessary if a knowledge of society was to be achieved. He argued that an understanding of the individual can be gained using J.S. Mill's theory of ethology [*etologiia*] or the study of human character. Rozhkov believed that while it is impossible to comprehend the character of each and every individual, it was feasible to construct a classification of the most important and common character types that exist in every society.

Ethology, as Mill conceived it, was a completely deductive science. It is not like psychology which is "a science of observation and experiment". Ethology is the science which determines the kind of character produced in conformity to the laws of psychology by any set of circumstances, physical and moral. Rozhkov compared the relationship of ethology and psychology to that of history and sociology. Ethology and history provided the empirical evidence used by psychologists and sociologists to formulate the laws that explain human society.

In 1843 J.S. Mill wrote that a model of ethology had "still to be created". As the reader will recall,

Rozhkov, between 1900 and 1903, produced what he considered to be such a model of ethology. Rozhkov employed six basic psychological types: ethical \([\text{eticheskii}]\), aesthetical \([\text{esteticheskii}]\), individualistic \([\text{individualisticheskii}]\), egoistical \([\text{egoisticheskii}]\), analytical-emotional \([\text{analiticheski-emotsional'nyi}]\) and purely analytical \([\text{chistoanaliticheskii}]\).\(^{102}\) Of the psychological types described by Rozhkov, egoists and individualists predominated for much of Russia’s history. Egoists were simple self-interested \([\text{korystoliubie}]\) types. Rozhkov described individualists as a more complex type that included the features of egoists as well as an intricate mix of self-esteem \([\text{samouvazhenie}]\), pride \([\text{samoliubie}]\), ambition \([\text{chestoliubie}]\) and some simpler egotistical features.\(^{103}\)

It must not be forgotten that psychology only became “an experimental science during the closing decades of the nineteenth century”.\(^{104}\) Rozhkov’s classification of psychological types, although inspired by a multitude of writers, was original. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to examine in any detail Rozhkov’s vast work in this area.\(^{105}\) Instead, a brief analysis will

---

\(^{102}\) Rozhkov, \textit{Obzor}, Chast’ I, pp. 144-160. In \textit{Istoricheskie i sotsiologicheskie ocherki}, Rozhkov claimed that there were five fundamental psychological types: egoistical, individualistic, aesthetical, ethical and analytical. He believed a sixth type existed but it was a mix of two of the fundamental types, namely, of ethical individualists. See: Rozhkov, \textit{Istoricheskie i sotsiologicheskie ocherki}, Vol. 1, pp. 164-259, esp. p. 257.

\(^{103}\) Rozhkov, \textit{Obzor}, Chast’ I, p. 150.


\(^{105}\) See, for example: N.A. Rozhkov, “Eticheskie i esteticheskie kharaktery”, \textit{Obrazovanie}, No. 10, 1900, pp. 1-24; “Eticheskii
be made of how Rozhkov used his theory of psychological phenomena to explain Kievan society.

Rozhkov does not explain why he formulated six psychological types but he confidently asserted that these were the basic and main types needed to explain the ethology of past and present Russian societies.\(^{106}\) He argued that the six fundamental types of character are found throughout Russia’s history except in the Kievian period when psychological types had not yet formed.\(^{107}\) As with all other facets of society, he argued that psychological types evolved from backward and primitive forms to more complicated and advanced forms. Rozhkov was also convinced that each predominant psychological type was a bearer of new cultural values. With these two premises in mind, Rozhkov proceeded to describe the psychological evolution of Russia.

In accordance with his sociological theory, changes in a society’s psychological composition reflected changes that took place in the evolution of the economy.\(^{108}\) According to Rozhkov, the culture of Kiev

---

\(^{106}\) Rozhkov, Obzor, Chast’ I, p. 160. These six psychological types differed slightly from the basic psychological types that he outlined in several journal articles between 1900 and 1903 and which he subsequently republished in 1906. See: Rozhkov, Istoricheskie i sotsiologicheskie ocherki, Vol. 1, p. 257.

\(^{107}\) Ibid., pp. 162-164.

\(^{108}\) Ibid., p. 165.
Rus was primitive in the extreme. He argued that the little culture that existed was borrowed from more culturally advanced peoples (see Figure 4.3). In the second and third periods, egoists predominated though the balance of the six psychological types did vary. Rozhkov argued that because of Russia’s backwardness, egoists began to appear in Russia from the thirteenth century onwards and then only among the ruling elite (see Figure 4.3).

Rozhkov believed that between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries, that is, with the rise of a money economy in Russia, many different types of characters developed. These characters began to appear from among the mass of the population. However, he believed that egoists still comprised the predominant psychological type even though their influence had been reduced by the growing number of other psychological types (see Figure 4.3). Their supremacy was expressed in what Rozhkov called “the predominance of religious formalism” in religious affairs and in the supremacy of traditional social values.

By the nineteenth century, a variety of well-defined psychological types or characters could be found

110 Ibid., p. 171. See also: N.A. Rozhkov, Osnovnye zakony razvitiia obshchestvennykh iavlenii (Kratkii ocherk sotsiologii) (Moscow, 1907), p. 80.
111 Rozhkov, Osnovnye zakony, p. 82.
112 Ibid.
113 Rozhkov, Istoricheskie i sotsiologicheskie ocherki, Vol. 1, pp. 233-238.
at all levels of Russian society. In Rozhkov's opinion, the areas of religious art, literature and science had been revitalised with the growth of money economies worldwide. Rozhkov believed that individualists were at the forefront of the tremendous cultural changes that took place particularly in the fourth period of Russia's historical development (see Figure 4.3). Rozhkov argued that individualists, including ethical individualists, were brave, energetic and immensely gifted people. They undertook original work in all spheres of cultural and spiritual life, that is, in religion, art, literature and science.

Rozhkov also argued that each psychological type had a particular social significance. He believed that ethical and aesthetical characters were weak social forces. Ethical types were too concerned with questions of "duty" [dolg] and conscience [sovest'] to worry about changing society. Aesthetical types were mainly creative people who were preoccupied with their artistic work. Ethical individualists played a larger, more significant role in society, while egoistical and individualistic characters played the most significant role in society. Egoistical and individualistic characters

114 Rozhkov, Osnovnye zakony, p. 82.
115 Ibid., pp. 82-83.
117 Rozhkov, Obzor, Chast' I, p. 144.
118 Ibid., p. 147.
possessed very strong wills and therefore necessarily made their mark on society.\textsuperscript{119}

As Nechkina pointed out, when Rozhkov came to the point of linking his theory of psychological types to historical data he resorted to using expressions such as “consequently” or “it follows from this that...” placed between the psychological descriptions and the historical data.\textsuperscript{120} Such a technique can hardly be labelled scientific. His psychological types were far too vague and left so much room for different explanations that they cannot be used as the basis from which to establish the sort of laws that Rozhkov wanted. His model of psychological types could not produce the results needed to justify the detailed and concrete claims of his theory.

Rozhkov wrote:

to determine the particular characteristics of any society from the point of view of psychological character, it is necessary, first of all, to look for the characteristics in an individual who would be considered typical for his period. This individual should also possess noticeable innate characteristics which have been sufficiently developed by the sum of all

\textsuperscript{119} Rozhkov, \textit{Istoricheskie i sotsiologicheskie ocherki}, Vol. 1, pp. 185-259.

the educational and social influences which existed at the time.\(^{121}\)

He asserted that Vladimir Monomakh was precisely such a person for the Kiev Rus period. He was also probably the only individual of the Kievan period about whom many vivid reminiscences had been written. According to Rozhkov, Vladimir’s rich and varied personality is revealed in his testament [*Pouchenie*] as well as in the Russian epic songs [*byliny*] that have survived through the ages.\(^{122}\)

Examining the available primary documents of the period, Rozhkov tried to determine which psychological type applied to Vladimir Monomakh. At first it would seem, according to Rozhkov, that Monomakh was “a real ethical character” for whom the moral ideal was the most important thing in life.\(^{123}\) Vladimir is described in one of the chronicles of the period as a “good sufferer for the Russian land”, as a man who constantly defended Russia against the Cumans (Polovtsi) and established peace by eliminating princely internecine wars.\(^{124}\) In reality, Vladimir spent half his life in alliance with the Cumans and Rozhkov pointed this out in his examination of Vladimir’s testament.

Rozhkov warned against accepting such panegyric without criticism and showed that there were other

\(^{122}\) Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia*, p. 18.
\(^{124}\) *Ibid.*
very good reasons for Vladimir's actions. For instance, Vladimir stood to gain much power and glory from his political activities. In dealing sternly with the Cumans, Vladimir was not only consolidating his influence in the Pereiaslavskaja region but he was extending it into the surrounding principalities as well. As the chronicles describe, so great was his popularity and influence that upon the death of Sviatopolk in 1113, Vladimir was literally swept into power by popular revolt. There can be little doubt, claimed Rozhkov, that Vladimir’s actions were often motivated by “personal and dynastic interests”. As such, Vladimir cannot be type-cast as simply an ethical character.

Rozhkov argued that Vladimir Monomakh possessed traits that were characteristic of other psychological types. For example, he showed signs of simple and complex egoistical feelings. Rozhkov claimed that from the documents we know that Vladimir was cruel at times. In his testament we find Vladimir relating, for the benefit of his sons, how on occasion he raided the town of Minsk and left there “neither slave nor beast”. In other words, Vladimir could confiscate or destroy the personal property of a vanquished rival without remorse. As Rybakov put it, Vladimir “was

125 Ibid., p. 161
127 Rozhkov, Obzor, Chast’ I, p. 161.
128 Ibid.
129 Ibid. See also: Vernadsky, Kievan Russia, p. 59.
undoubtedly ambitious and was completely unscrupulous in achieving supreme power”.\textsuperscript{130}

Rozhkov claimed that when Vladimir Monomakh wrote a letter to Prince Oleg Sviatoslavich gently reproaching him for not trying to find a peaceful solution to the war between them, his actions can be explained more in terms of Vladimir’s skill as a fine organiser and brilliant military leader than as a religious man or pacifist.\textsuperscript{131} Rozhkov claimed that Vladimir was not sincere when he wrote to Prince Oleg Sviatoslavich declaring that “to forgive and to show mercy is the law by which a Christian lives”.\textsuperscript{132} Vladimir knew he had in effect lost the campaign against Oleg at the end of the eleventh century and by expressing such pious thoughts he was obviously trying to win people over to his side.\textsuperscript{133} Rozhkov argued that Vladimir’s behaviour and actions were not simply motivated by what he called an “ethical nature”.

According to Rozhkov, Vladimir Monomakh “had the beginnings [zapodyshi] of kind feelings and high-principled motives”.\textsuperscript{134} However, Rozhkov also claimed that it was “possible to observe rudimentary, incoherent and confused evil inclinations [durnye zadatki]” in Vladimir.\textsuperscript{135} Rozhkov concluded that such a mixture of

\textsuperscript{130} Rybakov, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 240.
\textsuperscript{131} Rozhkov, \textit{Obzor}, Chast’ I, p. 162.
\textsuperscript{132} \textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{133} \textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{134} \textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{135} \textit{Ibid.}
poorly developed feelings and motives did not comprise a character or type \textit{per se}. In Rozhkov's opinion, such a melange of emotions merely signified "a loose and poorly prepared soil for the development of a whole series of different characters. It was unorganised material, primitive chaos, a mechanical, incoherent mixture of the most diversified emotional characteristics that existed only in embryonic form".\textsuperscript{136}

As Vladimir Monomakh represented "the highest degree of psychological development" in the Kievan period, Rozhkov declared that the sort of "psychological disorganisation" that Vladimir manifested must have been more noticeable in those individuals who were less developed psychologically.\textsuperscript{137} In fact, Rozhkov asserted that "this conclusion frees us from having to characterise other historical figures of the period being studied and gives us the possibility to point out the mental (especially the volitional) disorganisation of ancient Russian society".\textsuperscript{138} Given that psychological phenomena were linked to all the other phenomena that comprised the social whole, Rozhkov believed that it was possible to explain why ancient Russian society lacked fully developed characters or psychological types and was therefore "psychologically disorganised". He wrote that the backwardness of Kiev Rus' "determined the spiritual condition of society, making Kiev Rus as

\textsuperscript{136} \textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{137} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 162-163.
\textsuperscript{138} \textit{Ibid.}
amorphous, formless and lacking in structure in its psychological relations as it was in its economic, social and political relations".139

Rozhkov believed that a society's spiritual condition or culture comprised its moral concepts, its religious beliefs, its art, its literature and its scientific and philosophical ideas. He also believed that a society's spiritual culture was determined by all the other phenomena that preceded it in the hierarchy of social classification. In other words, a society's spiritual culture was determined by the combined action of natural, economic, social and political phenomena. It was, Rozhkov claimed, the last product of the prevailing economic conditions. Rozhkov expressed this idea very clearly in his concluding remarks on the spiritual life of ancient Russia. He wrote:

The absence of organisation and cohesion is a general feature of all the processes of the community [obshchezhitie] which developed in the Kievan period. The spiritual condition of society is influenced by physical history [material'naia istoriia] as a whole and not its separate economic, social and political components. The amorphous, formless and disjointed nature of society's spiritual condition was the same as that which characterised the economic, social and political relations.140

Rozhkov believed that the study of psychological phenomena was of the utmost importance. He was

139 Ibid., p. 164.
140 Ibid., pp. 163-164. See also his very long chain of causes and effects on pages 164-165.
particularly interested in the psychology of social groups and how economic phenomena shaped this psychology. When I.K. Dodonov pointed out the influence of Gumplovicz’s theory of collective psychology on Rozhkov, he overestimated this influence. Rozhkov was attracted to Gumplovicz’s notion that the chief concern of sociology ought to be the group and not the individual. Rozhkov also liked Gumplovicz’s idea that the individual was a product of a group and, as such, could represent that group. However, in an article entitled “The Psychological School in Sociology”, Rozhkov criticised Gumplovicz’s general approach for not giving it an economic rationale.

Although psychology occupied the next to highest rank in the classification of the sciences, that is, directly following sociology, Rozhkov believed that psychological studies were not as well-advanced as economic, social and political studies of society. Rozhkov believed that because so little work had been done in the field of psychological history in his lifetime, this was a science that would develop in the future. He maintained that his theory of psychological types, even if it was at a very early stage, was an important step towards the establishment of such a science.


Rozhkov’s study of psychological types reflected the best and the worst in his writing. Rozhkov synthesised information made available in distinct disciplines, relating new findings in psychology to his marriage of history and sociology. His ideas were boldly put and suggestive of new directions for research yet never convincing. Rozhkov presented a great deal of empirical evidence but a gulf remained between these facts and the theory of psychology that he presented. As Volobuev argued, despite all its weaknesses, Rozhkov’s attempt to create a model of the socio-psychological evolution of society “must come to occupy a prominent place in the historiography of social psychology”.143

---