The posthumous appearance of this volume has inspired me to meditate (perhaps not very profoundly) on a number of issues concerning historiographic “schools” and scholarly legacies, exemplified in the career of this distinguished historian of pre-modern Russia who died in 2008 a few days short of her 94th birthday. Among her teachers when she embarked on her serious training as a historian on returning in 1944 from spending the earlier war years in Central Asia were some of the most eminent pre-modern Russia specialists, among them S. V. Bakhruhshin, K. V. Bazilevich, M. N. Tikhomirov, and B. B. Kafengauz, who were living links to the pre-Revolution traditions of Russian historical scholarship. Most of those who had a direct link to these scholars of the mid-20th century are themselves now gone. Instead it is the generation of Golikova’s own students from her long career in teaching at Moscow University, accomplished scholars in their own right, who have been responsible for honoring her with two celebratory volumes (in 1994 and 2004) and who undertook the work of systematizing her Nachlass and preparing the present volume.

While her several monographs and documentary collections have been used and cited by historians outside of Russia, one senses (I base this on a somewhat cursory search), that her work never was fully appreciated there, and her passing went unnoticed. If that judgment is accurate, it might perhaps be explained by the fact that in the circumstances of carving out a successful career in the high Soviet period, a historian like Golikova might excel at exhaustive archival research but not be able to stand back from the material and interpret it wisely. Bob Crumney noted as much decades ago when reviewing a collection in which she had an article on one of her early areas of expertise, the Astrakhan’ rebellion of 1705-6. Throughout her career, Golikova seems to have worked strictly within the confines of Russian and Soviet scholarly traditions, even as her students who edited and wrote for this volume now are in a position of actively participating in the wider world of scholarship on Russia.

The publication of this book is a reminder to those of my generation about the dangers of leaving for too late in life work on major projects that one may not live to complete. Over the years, Golikova’s interests broadened beyond a focus on urban and social history in the Volga region. She planned a major, three-volume study of the privileged merchant class in Muscovy; its first volume appeared in 1998 when she was already 84 (Privilegirovannye kupecheskie korporatsii Rossiî XVI-pervoi chetverti XVIII v., t. 1. Moskva: Pamiatniki...
istoricheskoi mysli. 524 pp.). That book stands as the most comprehensive source of information on the membership of the gosti and gostinnaia sotnia, the results of her extensive archival research substantially correcting earlier studies and revealing a good many members of these “corporations” who previously had not been identified. Of course Western scholars would note her failure to cite the work of Paul Bushkovitch and especially Sam Baron, which, in any event, she has superseded within the boundaries of the task she set. In the book, she provides details about family histories and a diachronic treatment of the growth and eventual decline of these privileged corporations. She is explicit about the methodological challenges posed by nature of Russian onomastics and the often fragmentary state of what has been preserved in the archives. The research materials in her own archive, which might still be of value to scholars, include her comprehensive card file on each and every one of the gosti, at least a partial equivalent for the more numerous members of the gostinnaia sotnia, the next lower echelon of the elite merchants, and extensive copies and excerpts from charters of privileges and other relevant archival documents.

The present volume is the publication of as much of her planned volume 2 as she had drafted (or completed in previously published articles). Her plan was to examine in detail the legal status of the two privileged corporations, but she managed to complete only the first two of four parts of the study, on the legal position of the groups in the social context of Muscovy and on their property rights. She never got to the subject of “political rights in the social sphere” and “rights in the sphere of civic activity.” In addition to unpublished draft material, the editors have included here the final versions of the author’s texts that appeared as articles in Russkii gorod, vyp. 9 (1990) and in Torgovlia i predprinimatel’stvo v feodal’noi Rossii (1994), a volume published to honor her and containing both her work and that of some of her students.

The second major section of the new book concerns the service obligations expected of the privileged merchants, which have often been treated primarily as an undesirable burden placed on them but which Golikova argues brought them as well substantial benefits. Rather than treat the subject simply chronologically, she divides the obligations into various categories—involvement in minting money, collection of customs duties, involvement in the sable treasury (though she never completed the material pertaining to their service relating to Siberia).

Unfortunately she left nothing from the projected third volume, which was to include an examination of the “world view” of the merchants and explore aspects of their domestic lives.

In addition to Golikova’s own work, the present volume contains an essay by N. V. Kozlova on the way the work was “reconstructed,” V. N. Zakharov’s essay on the historiographic significance of Golikova’s scholarship, and a very warm general appreciation of her as a scholar, teacher and person by Kozlova and I. E. Trishkan (concluding, “Schastliv tot, komu dovelos’ vstretil’ ee na svoem zhiznennom puti...”—p. 290). Appendices contain variants to some sections of the published texts, an inventory of Golikova’s archive, and a bibliography
of her published scholarship. The book is supplied with indexes of personal and geographic names.