
Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Canadian Slavonic Papers

Revue Canadienne des Slavistes

ISSN: 0008-5006 (Print) 2375-2475 (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rcsp20

# Book Reviews

**Alexandra Popoff, Serhy Yekelchyk, David Goldfrank, Andriy Zayarnyuk, Robert Collis, Kazimiera J. Cottam, Alla Nedashkivska, Irina Astashkevich, Maxim Tarnawsky, Max Bergholz, Brian Horowitz, Sharon A. Kowalsky, Christopher Ely, Alexander M. Martin, Ralph Lindheim, Gerald M. Easter, Gunter Schaarschmidt, Eugene Miakinkov, George Chuchman, Nadine Thielemann, George Thomas, George Cummins, Zarema Kumakhova, Céline Marangé, Christopher Burton, Vera Tolz, Megan Swift, Kevin Kain, George Soroka, Alison Rowley, Seth Graham, J.-Guy Lalande, Jan Raska, Katharine Hodgson, John Stanley, Harold Schefski, Geneviève Cloutier, Barbara Henry, Andrew Demshuk, Martina Björklund, Gerhard Schildberg-Schroth, Zina Gimpelevich, Andrew Dombrowski, N.G.O. Pereira, Lasha Tchantouridzé, Karen Gammelgaard, John Dingley, Sarah Clovis Bishop, Yuri Leving, Laurie Bernstein, Lynne Viola, Annie Gérin, Ljiljana Šarić, Tristan Landry, Victor Taki, Julia Vaingurt, Leonard Friesen, Donald J. Raleigh & M. Mark Stolarik**

**To cite this article:** Alexandra Popoff, Serhy Yekelchyk, David Goldfrank, Andriy Zayarnyuk, Robert Collis, Kazimiera J. Cottam, Alla Nedashkivska, Irina Astashkevich, Maxim Tarnawsky, Max Bergholz, Brian Horowitz, Sharon A. Kowalsky, Christopher Ely, Alexander M. Martin, Ralph Lindheim, Gerald M. Easter, Gunter Schaarschmidt, Eugene Miakinkov, George Chuchman, Nadine Thielemann, George Thomas, George Cummins, Zarema Kumakhova, Céline Marangé, Christopher Burton, Vera Tolz, Megan Swift, Kevin Kain, George Soroka, Alison Rowley, Seth Graham, J.-Guy Lalande, Jan Raska, Katharine Hodgson, John Stanley, Harold Schefski, Geneviève Cloutier, Barbara Henry, Andrew Demshuk, Martina Björklund, Gerhard Schildberg-Schroth, Zina Gimpelevich, Andrew Dombrowski, N.G.O. Pereira, Lasha Tchantouridzé, Karen Gammelgaard, John Dingley, Sarah Clovis Bishop, Yuri Leving, Laurie Bernstein, Lynne Viola, Annie Gérin, Ljiljana Šarić, Tristan Landry, Victor Taki, Julia Vaingurt, Leonard Friesen, Donald J. Raleigh & M. Mark Stolarik (2011) Book Reviews, Canadian Slavonic Papers, 53:2-4, 575-661, DOI: 10.1080/00085006.2011.11092691

**To link to this article:** https://doi.org/10.1080/00085006.2011.11092691

**Judith E. Kalb.** ***Russia's Rome: Imperial Visions, Messianic Dreams, 1890–1940***. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2008. xiv, 299 pp. Illustrations. Notes. Index. $29.95, paper.

"Russians have claimed Roman origins for centuries," writes Judith Kalb in the first book-length study of Russian modernist writings on ancient Rome (p. 4). Russia's self-identification with the great empire of antiquity is a cultural phenomenon, and Kalb examines "the process of identifying with, rejecting, emulating, and longing for Rome—that the Russian modernists who wrote about Rome both described and embodied" (p. 6).

Russia had its stake in Rome, having received its religion and alphabet from Byzantium, the Eastern part of the Empire. After the fall of Constantinople in 1453, the centre of Orthodox Christendom shifted to Moscow, and the notion of Russia as Byzantium's spiritual heir became prevalent. The concept of Moscow as the Third Rome was first formulated in the monk Filofei's epistle to Vasilii III. "For two Romes have fallen, but the Third [i.e., Moscow] stands, and a Fourth shall not be" (p. 15). The doctrine became a political and religious symbol for the expansionist-minded Muscovite state.

The first Russian monarch to adopt the title "tsar" (from the Latin *caesar*), Ivan III married a niece of the last Byzantine emperor and added Byzantium's double-headed eagle to the Russian coat of arms. But because Russia missed the Renaissance and the classical period, the West considered it a backward nation. Even the great nineteenth-century Russian novelists "ran the risk of being viewed as barbarians by Western Europeans" (p. 8). As a result, "Russians sought affirmation through sometimes exaggerated claims of equality" (p. 9).

Peter I, the first Russian Emperor, had modelled his new northern capital on Rome. The "Bronze Horseman" statue of Peter I, erected by Catherine II in Petersburg, emulated the bronze monument to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius in Rome. Catherine II encouraged writers to assert Rome as a model for the Russian empire. Under Nicholas II, the weakened Russian monarchy continued to promote the idea of Moscow as the Third Rome.

The Eternal City lured Russia's leading painters and writers, supplying ideas and themes. Alexander Pushkin read the Roman historian Tacitus when composing *Boris Godunov*. Dostoevsky's vision of Russia's special destiny, expressed in his 1880 Pushkin Speech, had influenced philosopher Vladimir Solov'ev to declare "that the power of Russia as the Third Rome lay in Russia's selfless ability to synthesize East and West" (p. 17). In turn, Solov'ev's ideas influenced the early twentieth-century writers, especially the Symbolists.

Russian modernist writers explored the theme in a variety of genres—and Kalb focuses on the "underappreciated" works by Dmitrii Merezhkovskii, Valerii Briusov, Alexander Blok, Viacheslav Ivanov, and Mikhail Kuzmin. (Mikhail Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita* is an exception and is only briefly reviewed.) Merezhkovskii created "a Symbolist Rome" in his trilogy *Christ and Anti-Christ* (p. 35). His trilogy became "the blueprint" (p. 34) for other Symbolists and particularly, for Valerii Briusov who gave it "one of the first places in Russian literature" (p. 76) and who later developed the theme in his "Roman novels."

Blok's least known work and the author's favourite, his essay "Catiline," laid the foundation for his famous poem "The Twelve." His essay makes a connection between the Roman events and the 1917 Russian Revolution. Lucius Sergius Catiline, a Roman politician of the 1st century BC, who conspired to overthrow the Roman Republic and aristocratic Senate, had committed atrocities. Unlike the ancient historians and more like

Ibsen who in the light of the 1848 revolutions in Europe had described Catiline as "almost Christ-like," Blok glorifies the nobility of his goals and refers to Catiline as a "Roman Bolshevik" (p. 109).

A "professedly apolitical" Mikhail Kuzmin was also inspired by Roman history to contemplate contemporary events. In 1924, soon after Lenin's death, Kuzmin wrote the play *The Death of Nero*. Kuzmin's drama is "the tale of Rome's notorious first-century emperor Nero, clearly presented as a precursor to both Lenin and Stalin" (p. 162). In it Kuzmin's Rome is simultaneously the capital of the Roman Empire during Nero's lifetime and the twentieth-century setting for the literary exploits of a contemporary writer, Pavel Lukin.

Kuzmin's little-known play throws fresh light on Bulgakov's novel *The Master and Margarita* where events unfold in both the ancient and the modern worlds. "And as in Kuzmin's work, Bulgakov's two time periods are linked through the figure of a Russian artist, who writes during the modern period about the ancient one" (p. 188). In Kalb's view, the contrast between the Roman Judea and the Soviet Moscow in Bulgakov's novel "parodies the notion of Russia as a messianic Third Rome" (p. 191).

Kalb examines the modernist writings to determine whether the Third Rome term has "been used to support pre-existing notions of Russian national identity, or to reflect its disappearance" (p. 197). Joseph Brodsky used it ironically when in his 1986 essay, "Flight from Byzantium," he explained his visit to Istanbul thus: "After all, I spent thirty-two years in what is known as the Third Rome, about a year and a half in the First. Consequently, I needed the Second, if only for my collection" (p. 205).

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russian writers treated the Third Rome concept with darker irony than Brodsky, as in the 1991 newspaper article with the subtitle "Musings on the Ruins of an Empire." In Victor Pelevin's 1994 novel, *The Life of Insects*, two human beings in the form of insects discuss their country's changed fortune: "Well, if we write Third Rome in Russian, *Trety Rim*, and then turn the word for 'Rome' backward, we get *Trety Mir*, third World" (p. 196).

The term has also been used "on the level of kitsch to provide Russian flavor to a diverse variety of enterprises" (p. 198). Kalb's examples include Yalta's Third Rome Casino and an obscure publishing house, Third Rome, which produces automobile-related texts.

Spelling of Russian names remains a frustrating area for Western scholarship, and Kalb's impressive study is not free from occasional inconsistencies. Kalb uses the Library of Congress transliteration system and accepted anglicizations of well-known Russian names. But the spelling of such names in the study is irregular: e.g., Trotsky and Tolstoi, Brodsky and Dostoevskii.

Alexandra Popoff, *University of Saskatchewan*

**Serhii Plokhy. *Ukraine and Russia: Representations of the Past.*** Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008. xx, 392 pp. Bibliography. Index. $77.00, cloth.

Few collections of occasional papers possess such an internal coherence as Serhii Plokhy's book. In part, this is due to the author's excellent work on updating and editing older texts, as well as the lengthy introduction linking them together. On a more fundamental level, however, this is evidence of continuity in the author's research interests. Plokhy is well known for his solid work on Cossacks and religion, as well as on the making of Ukrainian

national historiography. These themes all run through this book, although here they are more often addressed indirectly, through their later historical representations.

The author offers a subtle and sophisticated reading of what he calls "the Ukrainian-Russian historiographic entanglement" (p. ix). Rather than being an account of the struggle by Ukrainian history writers against Russian narrative hegemony, it is a story of negotiation, co-operation, and the undermining of dominant concepts from within. As Plokhy shows convincingly, since the late eighteenth century Ukrainian authors helped shape the Russian imperial identity by promoting a vision of the two peoples' common origins. Together with the Cossack myth, this concept was instrumental in the Ukrainian elite's quest for status as part of the Russian nobility. One of the best articles in the first section of the book applies this general model to explain an apparent paradox: How the anonymous author of the *History of the Rus' People* could have become the forefather of Ukrainian national historiography if he objected to the term "Ukraine" as a foreign invention and sought to ease the integration of the Cossack officer class into the imperial hierarchy.

The next section, which explores the rise of a Ukrainian national paradigm in history writing, focuses on interpretations of the Cossack period and, in particular, on the work of Mykhailo Hrushevsky. It is especially interesting to see how this patriarch of Ukrainian historians was not immune to the pressures of the political moment in his evaluation of Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky's role as a national leader. In 1898 the historian believed that Khmelnytsky had failed to represent all of Ukraine and fought instead for the autonomy of the Cossack elite; in 1917 Hrushevsky presented him as the leader of the entire Ukrainian nation; and in 1929–1931 he reverted to his original position (pp. 93–95).

The theme of modern Ukraine's Cossack heritage is carried over into the next section, which focuses on post-Soviet historical debates. Particularly noteworthy here is Plokhy's careful, critical evaluation of an influential book by Ukrainian historian Natalia Yakovenko, who questions the dominant interpretation of the Cossacks as nation-builders by stressing that Khmelnytsky's armies also looted the possessions of Orthodox churches and Ruthenian burghers. While equally critical of the simplifications found in mainstream Ukrainian historical scholarship, Plokhy cautions against overestimating the alleged religious indifference of the rebels.

A chapter entitled "Beyond Nationality" stands out among the texts in the book's last section, "The Search for a New History." This chapter was apparently written especially for the collection under review (although it has also been published separately in the journal *Ab Imperio*), and it ties together a number of theoretical suggestions appearing at one point or another in the text. In this chapter Plokhy finally states clearly that the "national paradigm" of Ukrainian history is unsatisfactory in that it sidelines the social and cultural history of ethnic Ukrainians, not to mention the study of minorities and Ukraine's regions. Hrushevsky himself focused on the Cossacks while neglecting other aspects of the early modern period; he also "reduced the history of the nineteenth century to that of the Ukrainian liberation movement" (pp. 288–289). After reviewing the benefits in the Ukrainian case of multinational and transnational history, Plokhy concludes that the most promising approach to Ukrainian history might be to study it as a cultural borderland and contact zone. This is indeed a very good suggestion, except for the unfortunate term "civilizational" borderland (pp. 293 and 300) and the use of the over-studied Cossacks as an example of crossing cultural boundaries (p. 294). Ukraine "between East and West" is a somewhat tired mode of conceptualization, in Ukraine as well as in the West, but Plokhy is definitely onto something here in his search for the "deghettoization of Ukrainian history"

(p. 300). His own work on the Cossacks, early modern national identities, and Hrushevsky is a fine example of going beyond the "national paradigm" while tackling topics that are central to the nationalist canon.

Serhy Yekelchyk, *University of Victoria*

**Claudia R. Jensen.** ***Musical Cultures in Seventeenth-Century Russia.*** Russian Music Studies. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2009. xii, 359 pp. Illustrations. Score extracts. Appendix. Bibliography. Index. $45.00, cloth.

Music, in contrast to literature and the plastic arts, has been the least accessible and familiar of this cultural triad within Russia's pre-modern history. So we should be especially grateful to Claudia R. Jensen, Indiana University Press, and its wonderful Russian Music Studies series for the informative, lively, ASEEES 2009 University of Southern California Book Prize Literary and Cultural Studies-winning volume under review here. With broad erudition and deep knowledge of her subject, and an eye for the theatrical as well as the requisite polyphonic ear, Jensen takes us inside the musical world of Russia's 'long' seventeenth century, starting with the end of the 1580s. Granted, the reader who can transfer scores to keyboard or plucked string instruments, not to say initiates in music theory and adepts of sight-hearing, can learn from this book in ways that others cannot. But the author presents much food for thought for the musically illiterate as well.

Jensen's brief introduction sets the scene by commencing with a vivid description of the Greek and Russian musical roles in Patriarch Hieremias's (Jeremiah) mission to Moscow in 1589, where he willy nilly elevated Moscow's Metropolitan Germogen to the same rank. Four substantive chapters of modest length on distinct musical cultures follow. In the cleverly entitled chapter 1, "The True False Dmitry and the Death of Music in Moscow," Jensen shows how "music [...] was a potent shorthand for both foreign culture and *skomorokh* decadence" (p. 24) in the campaign against the pretender, both when he was on the throne and subsequently. The next chapter, "'Wondrous Singers and Exceptional Voices': Singers and Singing in Muscovy," presents the interface of liturgical, semi-liturgical, non-liturgical religious, and secular singing, chiefly professional and polyphonic, which occurred in a variety of venues, including religious drama and oratory. Two of Patriarch Nikon's new monasteries, Iverskii and Novo-Ierusalimskii, emerge as transmitters of European imports (Novodevichii's women might deserve a bit more treatment here), while the contrast between "Avvakum's distress" (p. 47) and Simeon Polotskii's cultural activism illustrates the tensions and the dynamism provoked by new styles. Chapter 3 "'Sweet and Harmonious Singing': Domestic Singers and Domestic Singing," discusses not only the various classes of professional singers, but also such specifically popular forms as verses of repentance and Polish-language adaptations of the Psalms. "Tavern and Wedding: The Instrumental Traditions at the Muscovite Court," constituting the following chapter, dispenses with misconceptions concerning any mid-century absolute disappearance of *skomorokhi* and their instruments, and shows, rather, how these traditions blended with the new imports to create festive instrumental music.

The much longer fifth and sixth chapters are mini-studies: "Nikolai Diletskii: Language and Imagery in Muscovite Music Theory" and "The Muscovite Court Theater." Due to his originality and lucidity, the Western Rus-born and -trained Diletskii cuts a most interesting figure in the development of not only East Slavic, but European music theory. This is due not merely to his grounding in formal rhetoric as then understood, but also to the Moscow recension manuscript of his *Grammatika musikiiskago peniia* (1679), which

contains, by thirty-two years, the earliest known sketch of the widely employed enharmonic circle, here in clockwise fifths, to depict the essential relationship among the twelve keys (p. 140). Jensen's treatment of the court theatre is as grounded in texts as is her handling of Muscovite music theory, but the musical cues in the plays, even supplemented by the reports of Reutenfels and others leave much to the author's sleuthing and imagination. Still the end result is a musically informed survey of the repertoire of Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich's short-lived odeum, which, Jensen hypothesizes, foreshadowed some of the Petrine and post-Petrine developments. With another clever twist at the end, Jensen's epilogue surveys the exotic, theatrical, and operatic representation of Russia in seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century Europe, where Boris Godunov and the first False Dmitry constituted by far the most popular theme.

The overall portée of Jensen's monograph should prompt us all to revisit the role of music, not only in early Russia, but also in the transmission of Western culture and modes of thinking to the Eastern Slavs. And one need not reproach Jensen's decision not to include a chapter on the standard liturgical music chanted in churches and monasteries, since the same series has just published Nikolai Findeizen's 1928 classic, which Miloš Velimirović and Jensen translated and annotated as *History of Music in Russia from Antiquity to the 1800* (2 vols., 2008). The ninth chapter of this work, which we can consider a companion to Jensen's own, fills that gap, also with a lovely period illustration of a singing class from Diletskii's *Grammatika* (p. 228).

Treating such a fascinating subject, Claudia Jensen has given us a well-crafted, delightful book, so once more we thank her. Too bad no CD comes with it.

David Goldfrank, *Georgetown University*

**Marlène Laruelle, ed. *Russian Nationalism and the National Reassertion of Russia.*** New York: Routledge, 2009. xvi, 275 pp. Figures. Tables. Index. $160, cloth. $39.95, paper.

Since 2000 we have witnessed a remarkable transformation of Russia and indeed tectonic shifts in the Russian cultural landscape. Analytical frameworks for understanding post-Soviet Russia that were developed and applied in the 1990s are no longer adequate. The collection under review responds to this challenge by mapping out the complex field of contemporary Russian nationalism.

As Marlène Laruelle points out, far from being limited to marginal groups on the right and left, nationalism has become a wide "social, cultural, and political field" integral to the emerging social consensus and dominant political language (p. 2). In her opening article, she emphasizes the presence of Russian nationalism in the Soviet Union as a tolerated, to an extent even selectively accepted, ideology. Various nationalist trends appeared in the public sphere and crystallized during *perestroika*. The major strands were the radical ethnic nationalists exemplified by *Pamyat*, and the defenders of the Soviet Union and/or Soviet socialism who promoted a great-state patriotism. However, there was no clear-cut division between the two and in the 1990s they incorporated elements of each other's ideology. Instead of looking for ideological differences among the Russian nationalists, Laruelle proposes "circles" that would distinguish between nationalist groups according to their proximity to the centre of political power. Thus, Vladislav Surkov and Vladimir Putin would belong to the first circle of those formulating official nationalism, while various short-lived marginal parties and skinhead groups would belong to the last. Laruelle also believes that in the last two decades ethnic and imperial or statist perspectives have been

conflating. Although the official ideology seems to be statist, it also includes strong elements of ethnic nationalism.

Veljko Vujačić's contribution grapples with the partial rehabilitation of Stalinism in Putin's Russia. According to Vujačić, Stalin created a template for the Russian identity that blended ethnic nationalism with Soviet civic patriotism and socialism. But there was another important, and often overlooked, element in Stalinism: "an unbridgeable chasm between the Soviet state and the Russian nation" (p. 68), the result of mass terror and collectivization. This chasm remains one of the most serious problems in Russian nation-building, and will not be helped by the incorporation of the Stalinism into the Russian national narrative.

Andreas Umland in turn analyzes the differences between Russian and Western interpretations of fascism and then debates the applicability of the terms "fascist" and "Nazi" to some Russian ultra-nationalist groups. While it is true that the Russian extreme right is understudied, hardly "Nazi," and in many ways "fascist," it is not entirely clear how this connects with the conceptualizations of fascism in Russia and in the West. It also seems that Umland overestimates "Western" consensus about the concept.

Alexander Verkhovsky claims that Russian nationalism today is almost exclusively ethnic and that civic or imperial nationalism is fading away. He also believes that a nationalist xenophobic majority has formed in Russian society. Even though radical nationalism is at the moment in opposition and checked by the moderate nationalism of the official ruling block, Verkhovsky foresees a strong possibility of a shift towards the former. His prediction is based on the theory that the ruling elite in the post-Soviet period has tended to assimilate and articulate, with some delay, the attitudes and sentiments of the masses.

Wayne Allensworth discusses Alexander Dugin and his "Eurasianism," which he sees as a constitutive national myth. This myth, however, has very little chance of becoming a dominant state ideology. Borrowing from a number of Russian and non-Russian sources, Dugin has created an eclectic and dynamic right-wing ideology which cannot be easily reconciled with other strands of Russian nationalism. To characterize this ideology as simply "nationalist" has little analytic value. Victor Shinerlman analyzes yet another concept that not only has currency on the Russian right but has entered school curricula since 1994. "Civilization" to a large extent has replaced the Marxist "formation" as a tool for structuring historical narratives in the Russian educational system. The Russian version of the "civilizational" approach is exclusivist; it emphasizes boundaries between civilizations and blends with the biological approaches to ethnicity as represented by Lev Gumilev.

While many authors in the collection claim that nationalism has been on the rise in Russian society, Anastassia Leonova and Mikhail A. Alexseev contribute with two sociological studies of xenophobic attitudes. On the basis of previous polls, Leonova traces changes in the so-called "xenophobia index" from 1994 to 2006. She shows a significant increase in xenophobic attitudes and their spread through all socio-demographic groups. She concludes that such an increase signifies a profound trend of projecting society's tensions and uncertainty upon some imagined "other." At the same time she seems to underemphasize the abating of xenophobic attitudes since their peak in 2002 and the fact that throughout the period under study they remained in the same range of "moderately xenophobic." Alexseev looks at regional variations of anti-migrant hostility by analyzing the perceived numbers of migrants belonging to various ethnic groups. He shows that the perceived number of Chechens and Chinese was systematically higher than for any other group in all surveyed regions. The exaggeration of the scale was higher for the new

immigrant groups and much higher in the Moscow region as opposed to Moscow-city, even though migrants' actual presence is much higher in the latter.

In the final section of the book, Andrei P. Tsygankov shows that hard-line nationalism has been consistently failing to influence Russian foreign policy. Analyzing responses to the Kosovo crisis (1990), September 11th, and the Orange Revolution (2004), he attributes a crucial role in resisting hardliners' options to the Russian leadership, while arguing that the West could have been more open and engaging towards Russia. Beth Admiral analyzes the contradictory relationships between Putin's state and the Russian Orthodox Church. On the one hand, the model of religious freedom and separation from the state is being implemented, but, on the other, the Russian Orthodox Church is used to promote national unity and reinforce Russian influences abroad. Admiral concludes that we have witnessed an attempt to manage religion that is similar to the managing of the state and formal democracy. The collection concludes with Valerie Sperling's essay on militarism and anti-militarism in post-Soviet Russia. Sperling chronicles attempts to make military patriotism a mainstay of the new state ideology as well as efforts to inculcate younger generations of Russians.

To conclude, Laruelle has put together an impressive book, problematizing the very notion of Russian nationalism and providing many insights into a rapidly changing society that draws on its past while also constantly redrawing it. Even though many propositions in the book remain contestable, it will be of great value for anyone interested in the Russian past and present.

Andriy Zayarnyuk, *University of Winnipeg*

**Marcus D. Levitt. *Early Modern Letters: Texts and Contexts*.** Studies in Russian and Slavic Literatures, Cultures and History. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2009. viii, 437 pp. Index. $59.00, cloth.

In 1768 the Abbé Chappe d'Auteroche published *Voyage en Sibérie*, which scathingly dismissed the Russian character. According to the Frenchman, the moistness of Russia's marshy lowlands and the climate obstructed the flow of its inhabitants' "nervous juices." In response a livid Catherine the Great penned her *Antidote* (1770), in which, as Levitt notes, the Empress denied the notion of Russia's total barbarism before Peter the Great and defended Russia's "ancient ways," whilst also lauding the country's contemporary high secular culture (p. 353).

In a sense, this stimulating collection of essays is framed around a close analysis of Catherine's vision of Russian culture as a unique synthesis of Orthodox traditions and Western European Enlightenment ideals. More specifically, Levitt focuses on the half-century between the 1740s and the 1790s, when the Russian intellectual elite actively endeavoured to build on (or even reconfigure) the foundations of a civilized culture laid out by Peter the Great. In this sense the title of Levitt's collection of essays—*Early Modern Russian Letters: Texts and Contexts*—is rather vague, as it does not highlight the cohesion of the work in terms of either timeframe or thematic unity.

The non-specific nature of the title may well be a result of the two-part structure of the collection. Thus, the first part of Levitt's work (comprising thirteen chapters) is devoted to Aleksandr Petrovich Sumarokov (1717–1777), who aspired to be the founder of a new, modern literature in Russia, and the literary process of his time. The second part of the collection (amounting to eight chapters) focuses on the theme of visuality and orthodoxy in eighteenth-century Russian culture.

Yet, whilst the two parts of Levitt's work serve as separate collections in their own right, the dominant theme throughout centres on the notion of "Enlightenment Orthodoxy." In the preface to the second part of his work Levitt explains "that eighteenth-century Russian culture was faith-based and far more permeated by religious traditions than is usually recognized" (p. 267). In regards to literary Classicism, Levitt offers the term "Slaveno-rossiiskii literature" (p. 278) as a means of describing the genre's debt to the religious ideals and Baroque poetics of eminent seventeenth and early eighteenth-century theologians, such as Simeon Polotskii (1629–1680) and Feofan Prokopovich (1681–1736). Thus, as Levitt highlights in chapter 6, on Sumarokov's drama "The Hermit," the writer acknowledged Prokopovich as the culmination of an Enlightenment Latinizing tradition that flourished at the Kyiv Mohyla Academy after its foundation by Petr Mogila in 1632. Indeed, Sumarokov praised Mogila as being "first to open the path to learning for the Russian people" (p. 113). Furthermore, in chapter 8 (on John Locke's reception in Russia), Levitt notes that Sumarokov's view of the God-given conscience inscribed in nature was shared by the leading Russian Orthodox enlightenment theologians of his day, such as Platon Levshin (1737–1812).

A particularly innovative aspect of Levitt's study of visuality and orthodoxy is his use of Martin Jay's theory of "occularcentrism" (as articulated in *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-Century French Thought* [Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1994]) in order to stress a preoccupation with sight in eighteenth-century Russian culture. Levitt persuasively argues that this vision-oriented culture was not simply a Western import, but had deep roots in traditional Orthodox theology and particularly in the veneration of icons (p. 296).

This thesis is articulated by Levitt's carrying out an in-depth study (see chapters 14–16) of how Mikhail Lomonosov (1711–1765) embraced the physico-theological tradition; namely, the idea that the existence of God and the rational structure of the universe may be demonstrated by the self-evidence of the visible world. According to Levitt, Lomonosov drew on a mixture of patristic (Basil the Great and John of Damascus), classical (Cicero), and modern (William Derham) sources in his literary and scientific works in order to illustrate the notion of God's existence by simply observing the world. Moreover, Levitt rightly asserts that Lomonosov rejected the older Baroque handling of the image, as epitomized in the works of Polotskii, which promoted an emblematic and allegorical interpretation of the book of the world that was concealed from the unlearned.

However, whilst Levitt convincingly demonstrates Lomonosov's debt to the physico-theological tradition, I would argue that it is too simplistic to argue, as he does, that "in eighteenth-century Russia the ideas of 'physico-theology' were universally accepted" (p. 297). In this regard, it could be beneficial to view Lomonosov as an advocate of exoteric observations, which championed empirical science and the physico-theological tradition. Yet, at the same time, one should not dismiss the esoteric elements in Russian thought in the eighteenth-century (Christian theosophical thought, astrological symbolism, alchemy, kabbalah, and so on), which continued the emblematic and allegorical heritage bequeathed by the likes of Polotskii and Stefan Iavorskii.

The first part of the collection of essays, devoted to Sumarokov, provides the reader with a rich source of biographical information and fresh insights into one of the outstanding figures in eighteenth-century Russia. By undertaking a close textual analysis of a number of works by Sumarokov, Levitt emphasizes the key role the writer played in demarcating the parameters of various artistic and linguistic disciplines in Russia, including ballet, poetry, and orthography. Levitt also ruminates on the wider issues of the legal and artistic status of the writer in Catherine the Great's Russia.

Although the second part of *Early Modern Russian Letters* concentrates on expounding an "occularcentric" interpretation of eighteenth-century Russian culture, Levitt also writes two fascinating gender-based chapters on two outstanding women writers in the Catherinian era. In chapter 18, for example, the author undertakes an excellent study of Princess E. S. Urusova's *Polion* (1774), demonstrating how the Russian noblewoman engaged with J-J. Rousseau and the wider European debate on the place of gender in Enlightenment culture. The following chapter then examines the manner in which Princess E. R. Dashkova (1743–1810) promoted herself as virtuous in her famed memoirs.

Whilst some overlap of material is evident in the second part of the collection (particularly with regard to Cicero's citation of Aristotle), this is largely to be expected in a collection of separate essays that advance similar themes. In overall terms, this highly readable and engaging collection of essays is a welcome addition to scholarship on eighteenth-century Russian culture. In short, anyone wishing to look beyond Chappe d'Auteroche's denigration of the inferior nervous juices of Russians would do well to read Levitt's penetrative analysis of the rich and complex dynamic of Russian elite culture between the 1740s and the 1790s.

Robert Collis, *The University of Sheffield*

**Anna Timofeyeva-Yegorova.** ***Red Sky, Black Death: A Soviet Woman Pilot's Memoir of the Eastern Front***. M. Ponomareva and K. Green, trans. K. Green, ed. Bloomington: Slavica Publishers, 2009. xxi, 213 pp. Illustrations. $29.95, paper.

This memoir was first published by Voyenizdat in 1983 as A. A. Timofeyeva-Yegorova, *Derzhis', sestrenka!* [Hang in, Little Sister] and also appeared in a revised version as T.41 *'Schwartze Tod'* in 2005. The 2009 English version under review includes added explanatory comments and photographs.

In her foreward to the 2009 edition, Amy Goodpaster Strebe explains that prior to World War II women's access to flight training and aviation careers in the USSR was limited. After the war, Soviet airwomen's substantial contribution to victory was denied by Soviet military authorities.

It was Marina Raskova, a pioneering woman navigator, who persuaded Stalin in 1941 to form three women's regiments (wings) which became known officially as the 125th M. M. Raskova Borisov Guards Dive Bomber Aviation Regiment, the 46th Taman Guards Night Bomber Aviation Regiment, and the 586th Fighter Aviation Regiment. However, some women served in the Soviet Air Force outside of these special regiments. Among them was Anna Yegorova.

After graduating from a rural high school, Yegorova went to Moscow to enroll in the Metrostroi Training School, attending four theoretical and four practical classes per day, so as to become a steel fitter. Injured in an underground accident, she spent two weeks recuperating in Botinskaia Hospital. After working briefly in the editorial offices of *Labour*, a Moscow newspaper, she resumed working underground while also training as a pilot at Metrostroi Aeroclub.

While attending the Ulyanovsk Flying School, Yegorova learned that her brother Vasya, who had been employed in Moscow, had been arrested as an 'enemy of the people.' This resulted in her expulsion from the school. Later on, while working as an accountant in Smolensk, she taught young boys to fly gliders. She also trained to fly at the Smolensk aeroclub. Subsequently, Yegorova became an instructor at the Kalinin aeroclub and was

eventually assigned the sole female spot in the Navigation Department at the Kherson Flying School.

After Germany attacked the USSR in June 1941, Yegorova volunteered for service at the front and initially carried out dangerous missions in her defenceless, plywood Po-2. Soon she was awarded the Order of the Red Banner for her outstanding performance. Repeated requests to transfer her to a women's regiment were ignored by her superiors. Her ambition was to fly the IL-2, the "flying tank," a formidable ground attack aircraft no woman had flown before. It was equipped with two cannons, two machine guns, two guided missile batteries and bombs. In the fall of 1942, Yegorova's wish was granted and she was transferred to the 805th Attack Aviation Regiment.

Yegorova's first exposure to air combat in an IL-2 took place over Taman Peninsula. Soon afterwards she was decorated with a silver medal "For Bravery" for destroying an enemy transport ship. Trained in Stavropol as a staff navigator, in effect she became the Regimental Deputy Navigator. After her IL-2 was replaced with a new two-seater version and her first (male) tail-gunner was wounded, an armourer named Dusia Nazarkina volunteered to replace him. This was the second case of an all-female IL-2 aircrew at the time.

Shot down over Poland's Magnushev Bridgehead in August 1944, the severely wounded Yegorova was incarcerated in the Küstrin (Kostrzyn) POW camp, where hundreds of allied fellow prisoners took an interest in her recovery. It took a long time for her to regain her health and overcome persecution by Soviet authorities. Aware that her boyfriend had been killed in action, she married Col. V. A. Timofeyev, the commander of her 197th Attack Aviation Division, who was twenty years her senior.

Yegorova's memoirs, including personal information and stories about her comrades-in-arms, are both compassionate and interesting. The English translation of them adds a useful chronology of events from 1917 to September 1945 and lengthy explanatory footnotes. However, the frequent misspellings of geographical and proper names are distressing. Here are some examples: Ostashkovo instead of Ostashkov, Eudocie instead of Evdokiia, and Eugenie instead of Evgeniia. An officer in charge of flying training is not a "superintendent." The repeated usage of the words "Fascist," "Fascism," "Hitlerites," and "motherland" in the English translation (instead of the more appropriate "enemy" and "homeland") is annoying. "Artillerist" is an unacceptable rendering in English; the general reader may not guess that "the Imperialist War" was a reference to World War I. Finally, the use of "repressed" with reference to Soviet punitive labour camps is inappropriate.

Kazimiera J. Cottam, Ph.D., *Ottawa*

**Larissa M. L. Zaleska Onyshkevych and Maria G. Rewakowicz, eds. *Contemporary Ukraine on the Cultural Map of Europe.*** Armonk and London: M.E. Sharpe, 2009. 504 pp. Tables. Figures. Maps. Index. $94.95, cloth.

Larissa M. L. Zaleska Onyshkevych and Maria G. Rewakowicz have brought together a very interesting and informative collection by 25 authors specializing in various aspects of Ukrainian studies. Throughout the volume, the contributors tackle the question of Ukraine's place on a cultural, and not only cultural, map of Europe after Independence. The authors employ a number of methodologies and approaches, thereby making a mosaic of views on Ukraine's constant struggle with national or Ukrainian, European or Western, Russian or even nostalgically Soviet orientations. Zaleska Onyshkevych and Rewakowicz have structured the contributions into three well-connected sections. Section I incorporates

studies on history, politics, and religion, while Section II deals with the literary scene of contemporary Ukraine. Section III addresses some linguistic issues as well as questions of the media, arts, and music. A collection of maps of Europe, dating back to the sixteenth century, is a nice addition since it provides historical context for the discussion of Ukraine's presence in Europe.

Zaleska Onyshkevych and Rewakowicz begin the compilation with an informative and accessible overview of the volume's objectives, namely to discuss Ukraine's European cultural connections in the post-Independence years, in order to better understand "the complexities deeply ingrained in the social fabric of Ukrainian society" (p. xiv). Their introduction sets out the questions for consideration and highlights the main issues addressed by the contributors. This prologue is detailed, strong and provides an excellent context for uniting the diverse topics explored in the volume.

The first part of the book, "Mapping the Nation: History, Politics, and Religion," has nine essays. Roman Szporluk's paper focuses on Ukraine's contemporary politics with respect to Europe. Concentrating on the political geography of Ukraine and the East-West divide from a cultural-anthropological perspective, Mykola Riabchuk then addresses the voting patterns and political behaviour of Ukrainians. Giulia Lami shows how Europe, specifically Italy and the Italian press, has reacted to the political situation in Ukraine. The next three chapters deal with religion: specifically, how religion is used as a tool of social engineering, particularly during the pre-presidential campaigns (Oxana Pachlovska); a discussion of the Ukrainian religious landscape (Andrew Sorokowski); and an analysis of missionaries and their activities in Ukraine in the 1990s (Catherine Wanner). The analysis of sociopolitical and economic values follows, beginning with empirical investigations of opinion poll data and its importance in the country's development (Elehie Skoczylas). The mandate of the volume is notably highlighted in Myroslava Antonovych's article, which examines the Council of Europe's resolutions and the former communist countries' practices with respect to communist abuses of human rights. Part I ends with an insightful article on gender myths in Ukraine, which examines the fabrication of social gender stereotypes by the media up until the Orange revolution (Marian Rubchak).

Section II, "Reflecting Identities: The Literary Paradigm," also has nine chapters. It deals with the Ukrainian literary scene after Independence. Maria Zubrytska leads the reader into a discussion of literary developments, issues of Ukrainian national identity, and its transformations. Zaleska Onyshkevych presents a far-reaching study of Ukrainian drama. She alludes to a European-Russian cultural polarity evident in Ukrainian-language plays, concluding that Ukraine is still in the process of making choices: West, Russia, or one's own native or Ukrainian identity. Michael M. Naydan's study of Ukrainian avant-garde poetry focuses on works by the Bu-Ba-Bu generation of writers who serve as cultural ambassadors of Ukraine to the rest of the world. Then Ola Hnatiuk writes about the nativist discourse in the 1990s and how the debates about cultural identity resembled those at the turn of the 20th century. [The drawback of this article is that for someone not familiar with the context, the time references are often unclear. Statements such as "at that point" (p. 204), "in that time period" (p. 205), and several others, create ambiguity throughout the article.] Lydia Stefanowska offers a cultural analysis of the discourse of nostalgia in Galicia in the 1990s, focusing on works by journalists and artists. Marko R. Stech studies four novels, thereby detailing the new post-Soviet self-image of Ukrainians. Marko Pavlyshyn discusses works by Yuri Andrukhovych and Yuri Izdryk situating their oeuvre within an overview of literary movements in Ukraine of the 1990s. Maxim Tarnawsky studies the presentation of social decay in works of Serhii Zhadan and Anatolii Dnistrovy, noting

changes in the landscape of contemporary Ukrainian literature. Rewakowicz, with a thorough and richly informative analysis, tackles the topic of women's literary discourse in post-Soviet Ukraine, concluding with a discussion on the struggle between Europe and Ukraine that women writers and literary critics face.

The final part of the book, "Manifesting Culture: Language, Media, and the Arts," expands the discussion of Ukraine's orientations further and delves into an array of fields, including linguistics, political science and media studies, anthropology, cultural and literary studies, fine arts, and musicology. The current controversy surrounding the Ukrainian language standard opens this part of the collection (Serhii Vakulenko). An interesting article on the so-called Galician variant of Ukrainian and various perceptions of it follows (Michael Moser). Laada Bilaniuk's astute study of assessments of language quality by Ukrainians links the results with processes of reshaping a linguistic marketplace. The author also shows how quality of language plays a role in ideological discussions and how citizens evaluate the purity of the language. Yuri Shevchuk, although stressing Ukraine's absence from world film history, moves well beyond film to a broader discussion of world cultural history. Questions of national and supranational identity of Ukraine, as well as how media reflects the changes and conflicts in collective categories of identity, are soundly presented by Marta Dyczok. An engaging study of the rhetoric of popular Ukrainian singer Ruslana Lyzhychko is then offered by Pavlyshyn. The article builds on the discussion of Ukrainian participation in the European cultural space and Ruslana's participation in the Eurovision contest in particular. Myroslav Shkandrij's interest is in contemporary Ukrainian art and how its works manifest debates and tensions with respect to Ukraine's position towards Europe. The last article is by Virko Baley, who studies various developments in Ukrainian music within a global, rather than simply a European context.

As can be expected in an edited collection, the articles vary in scholarly merit. It would have been beneficial to the reader if each section of the book had started with an editor's introduction, contextualizing the chapters and underscoring the main issues tackled by the contributors. A list of suggested readings on the topics would also be welcome. Finally, the volume would have benefitted from a concluding chapter that summarized the findings and raised questions for future investigation.

Nevertheless, tremendous effort went into preparing this serious publication. The professionalism of the editors is evident throughout. Logically compiled, the volume offers a montage of perspectives on Ukraine's orientations following Independence and will no doubt serve as an important source for anyone interested in contemporary Ukraine. It is sure to attract scholars of Ukrainian and East European studies as well as more generally students of history, political science, international relations, anthropology, sociology, religious studies, women's studies, literature, culture, linguistics, fine arts, and music.

In light of ongoing political changes in Ukraine, the reader may well ask "what is next?" Therefore, a subsequent volume, if not yet planned, would be most welcome.

Alla Nedashkivska, *University of Alberta*

**Eliyana R. Adler.** ***In Her Hands. The Education of Jewish Girls in Tsarist Russia***. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2010. 196 pp. Index. Bibliography. Notes. Illustrations. $44.95, cloth.

This book by Eliyana R. Adler covers an area of East European Jewish studies that has been overlooked despite being right in front of any observer's eyes. The problem of Jewish education in the Russian Empire in the nineteenth century has been widely discussed in the

historiography for many years, but the education of girls has always been missing from the spotlight. Adler's book fills this unfortunate gap and thus is invaluable. *In Her Hands* demonstrates its author's thorough study of most, if not all, available sources, including those from the archives and libraries of Russia, Ukraine, Lithuania, and the United States. Such a broad study of the materials enables Adler to produce an extremely complete analysis of the development of the education of Jewish girls in the Russian Empire in the nineteenth century. She supplements her quantitative analysis with qualitative examples drawn from personal memoirs and fictional writing. The structure of the book is largely chronological, but within the chapters the material is organized thematically: the first part, "Education," consists of five chapters and deals with the background, emergence, establishment, and development of the schools for girls; while the second part, "Transformation," consists of three chapters and continues to study the evolution of the girls' schools, their impact on Jewish women, and on the Jewish community in Russia in general.

The author reasonably argues that female education was crucial to the growth and development of the community, because girls grow up to become mothers and to guide the education of their children. The traditional Jewish way of life did not offer women much more than instruction of the younger generations by the older, and the Russian Jewish community entered the nineteenth century with newly established structures to educate its girls. The schools emerged in the first half of the nineteenth century along with new secular Jewish schools for boys, and were, the author argues, part of the same process of Haskalah development in the Russian Empire that was somewhat supported by the Russian government as a way to educate and integrate the Jewish community. Roughly speaking, state-supported Jewish secular education was a by-product of a number of misconceptions and misunderstandings by the Russian government concerning the nature and scope of Haskalah in Russia and of the Jewish community in general. The secular schools for boys did not become very popular while the schools for girls proved to be a viable alternative for educators. As the history of the Jewish schools unfolds in the book, one can see that the development of the new schools for girls was very often a lucky coincidence: not only the state-supported secular Jewish schools (until the 1870s anyway) but the Jewish community as a whole was more willing to let their daughters receive some education while, with boys, parents seemed to be more reluctant to abandon the traditional educational scheme, which just did not exist for girls. The case is similar with the teachers for the new schools: as author shows, many of them changed their focus from boys' education to that of girls.

The book provides a most complete and engaging analysis of all sides of the girls' Jewish schools, including the curriculum and social life. Adler argues that while the number of lucky paradoxes might have sparked the development of education for Jewish girls, it relied strongly on the development of new forces within the Jewish community and, in about thirty years, it grew into a significant factor that contributed to a metamorphosis that shaped the Russian Jewish community on the edge of the twentieth century. At this time, Jewish women became more educated and entered into institutions of higher education, as well as actively participated in politics, the arts, and other spheres of life.

While some of the parts of the book might appear to be on the descriptive side, overall Adler successfully argues that (in her own words) "Modern, formal, and Russian education was rapidly becoming the norm for Jewish women" (p. 122)—at least that was the type of education that evolved in a community with no sustainable alternative.

Irina Astashkevich, *Brandeis University*

***The Essential Poetry of Bohdan Ihor Antonych: Ecstasies and Elegies*. Michael M. Naydan, trans.** Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2010. (Distributed in Canada by Scholarly Book Services, Inc.) 180 pp. $43.50, cloth.

This handsome hardcover volume presents ninety-six of Bohdan Ihor Antonych's poems in English translations by Michael Naydan. It contains only the translations—adding the Ukrainian texts on facing pages would, no doubt, have made this a very large and expensive book. The volume also includes a biographical sketch of the author by the translator and a substantial essay on Antonych by the leading specialist on his poetry, Lidia Stefanowska. The essay is boisterously entitled "Between Creation and the Apocalypse: The Poetry of Bohdan Ihor Antonych" and its argument is somewhat repetitive and embellished for dramatic effect. Nevertheless, Stefanowska gives readers good value for their invested effort. Antonych is not an easy poet to comprehend and the essay emphasizes the key features of his poetry: a modernist technique and a metaphysical subject. Stefanowska also devotes considerable energy to correcting some common misreadings of Antonych's subject and style. In particular, she emphasizes his indebtedness to Polish modernist models. Her ideas are certainly important, but the English-language reader experiencing Antonych for the first time in this collection will gain little from these scholarly emendations.

The translations in this volume represent a reasonable sample of Antonych's poetry with selections from each of Antonych's six collections and from the uncollected works. Short works predominate both in Antonych's oeuvre as a whole and among these translations, but there are also a few longer works here to reflect the different genres and forms the poet used. Naydan has arranged the volume chronologically, by collections, except that the weaker works from Antonych's first, somewhat juvenile, collection appear at the end of the volume, where they appropriately attract less attention. To the degree that Antonych's poetry can be grouped into any thematic patterns, Naydan has been faithful to the original, offering a mix of ruminations about nature, poetry, society, religion, creativity, love, death, and folk traditions. All this is as it should be in a serious anthology of poetic translations and Naydan deserves enormous credit for his efforts. He is today the most prolific translator of Ukrainian poetry into English. For this unrewarding task he deserves both recognition and praise.

The sincerest praise, however, recognizes both the scope of an accomplishment and its limits. Naydan has another book of translations of Antonych's works. He translated the entire collection *The Grand Harmony*. Four poems from that collection are included in this volume. In reviewing that earlier publication, I noted the difficulty of translating Antonych's very rhythmic and mellifluous verse into English. The same difficulty is found here too. Naydan does his best to render Antonych's images and meanings without necessarily trying to reproduce the very palpable and ubiquitous rhythmic and sonorous music of Antonych's verse. This is not fundamentally a fault; it is a fact. No translator can capture the full gamut of another poet's enterprise and Naydan's focus on images and meaning is a reasonable choice, particularly in view of the academic status of the presumed audience (and translator). Antonych's seemingly simple verses about nature and God, about colours, feelings, and creative urges are particularly known for the difficulty they present to the reader who wishes to assemble them into a rational argument. Naydan has given the English-language reader a good chance of experiencing the same confusion.

But poetry is not just sense, and even the sense of poetry is not just in the meanings of words. The drawn-out iambic hexameter, the alliterative patterns, and the rhetorically parallel phrases in Antonych's well-known "Pisnia pro neznyshchennist' materii" [Song

About the Indestructibility of Matter], are all indispensable to an understanding of the poem. Like Tychyna, but with less musicality and a simpler rhythm, Antonych utilizes the harmonies and orchestrations of sound in poetry to amplify, elaborate, and clarify the images he constructs. For any translator to capture that quality, he or she must share some of the essential poetic sensibility of the original poet. On this score, between Antonych and Naydan there is a substantial gap. Naydan as a poet is a craftsman of plain speech, of the ordinary expression. His poetical sensibility relies on the flavour of colloquial speech. Not so Antonych, whose seeming simple phrases are saturated with poetic allusions, metaphors, and poeticality. "Рослинних рік підноситься зелена повінь" sounds very different from "A green flood of plant life rivers rises."

A good measure of Naydan's success in translating Antonych can be gained by comparing his new translations in this collection of twenty-seven poems that had previously been translated by Mark Rudman and Paul Nemser with Bohdan Boychuk in a collection of Antonych's poetry entitled *Square of Angels* (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1977). Those earlier translations make a greater effort to reproduce the musicality of Antonych's verses, but they too often fall short of the mark. "The flood of green rivers rises" is hardly closer to the original than Naydan. Antonych deserves to be translated into English and readers will certainly be grateful to Naydan for his painstaking effort. But these translations will never replace the originals for their delightful, often whimsical sonority or for the complexity with which they express meaning through imagery and sound.

Maxim Tarnawsky, *University of Toronto*

**Judith Armatta.** ***Twilight of Impunity. The War Crimes Trial of Slobodan Milosevic.*** Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2010. xxix, 545 pp. Illustrations. Bibliography. Index. $39.95, cloth.

The trial of Slobodan Milošević at the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) was a watershed event, the first time that a former head of state was tried in an international court of law. In *Twilight of Impunity. The War Crimes Trial of Slobodan Milosevic*, the lawyer, journalist and human-rights advocate Judith Armatta offers a fascinating reconstruction of the over four-year-long trial, which ended without a verdict after Milošević died at the Hague on 11 March 2006. Having sat in the courtroom each day during the trial, Armatta passionately conveys the drama of the proceedings, arguing that the trial "institutionalized the principle of accountability for crimes against humanity, war crimes, and genocide" (p. 2). As such, it should be seen as a crucial marker on the road towards the "twilight of impunity."

The bulk of the book is devoted to describing the courtroom proceedings. In clear language Armatta explains how the prosecution laid out its large case (sixty-six charges), identifying Milošević as the central actor in a "joint criminal enterprise" that planned and executed a series of violent conflicts in the region. The author notes that Milošević considered the court to be illegitimate and thus "his purpose in participating at all was to use it as a forum to advance his political agenda, which only coincidentally and occasionally included defending himself against the charges" (p. 21). Choosing to defend himself without legal counsel, Milošević sought to use the court as a platform to establish his own view of his role in the events of the 1990s in the region as historically correct. According to Armatta, "the court's decision to permit Milosevic to represent himself was likely made to encourage him to participate in the trial rather than sit silently throughout, a stance which would have made the proceedings resemble a show trial" (p. 7).

Yet this decision allowed Milošević to frequently hijack the court for his own purposes; in effect, he wasted enormous amounts of time while presenting little information that was helpful to his defence. Armatta does a fine job illuminating the prosecution's frequently unsuccessful attempts to ask the court to take action to resist his manipulations, which included presenting potentially fraudulent documents, scripting the testimony of his witnesses, and withholding crucial contemporaneous military documents that the prosecution requested. But what remains insufficiently explained is why the court so often refused to take a firmer hand with Milošević, such as appointing him legal counsel (which it eventually did, but far too late according to Armatta). In the author's opinion, the court wanted to appear fair to the accused and it hoped he would eventually participate in the trial (p. 152). However, more analysis of the broader political context in which the ICTY operated, especially the pressure it was under from influential states, would have been useful in order to more adequately account for its sometimes inexplicably lenient treatment of Milošević and Serbia. For example, the court granted Serbia confidentiality in 2003 for documents it handed over to the ICTY from the "Supreme Defense Council," items that directly tied Serb forces and Milošević to violence in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Several other smaller weaknesses hinder Armatta's interesting book. First, the author chooses not to use South Slavic diacritics, and thus misspells Milošević's name throughout, as well as most other words written in Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian. This decision, she explains, was taken for "simplicity," yet she still places proper diacritics on the handful of French words and phrases used. Why not afford the same level of respect to the languages of those her book is about? Second, she chooses to use the word Kosova instead of Kosovo "out of respect for its status as an independent state" (p. xvii). Given the still unresolved status of this part of Europe [i.e., Kosova is not a UN member state], such a decision is politically-charged and, when discussing the region's history, often anachronistic (e.g., "Kosova" was not used in official documents while the communists were in power).

Still, Armatta has produced a valuable book that will be of interest to specialists on the former Yugoslavia, and especially to anyone with interests in international justice and human rights. For those who do not wish to read the ICTY courtroom transcripts, the book provides fascinating testimony from many of the key players in the events that unfolded during the 1990s, such as Ante Marković, Stjepan Mesić, Borisav Jović, Milan Babić, Miroslav Deronjić, and Lord Paddy Ashdown, to cite only a handful. The author also offers powerful testimony from survivors of mass violence, including eye-opening details about their surreal exchanges with Milošević when he cross-examined them. Despite its analytical limitations, Armatta's book deserves a wide readership of those seeking to better understand the attempt to bring to justice the people responsible for the violence in the former Yugoslavia.

Max Bergholz, *Concordia University*

**Eugene M. Avrutin.** ***Jews and the Imperial State: Identification Politics in Tsarist Russia.*** Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2010. xv, 232 pp. Index. $39.95, cloth.

There is no doubt about it—studies on Jewish life in Imperial Russia are "in." Here is another fine book that enriches and contributes to a rapidly growing body of knowledge. The author uses a great deal of rare archival documents to support his central thesis: from the 1830s on, the government wanted to gain control of its Jewish subjects through the act of naming people, identifying, and documenting them. For Russia, this meant the use of so-

called metrical books into which were recorded important dates, such as one's birth, marriage, and death.

For the Jews, the responsibility for updating the metrical books rested with the so-called crown rabbi (*kazennyi ravvin*). However, there were inherent problems since sometimes Jews could not manage to record births and deaths properly. The crown rabbi might not be available in their village (the community had to pay the rabbi's salary and therefore only towns and cities could afford them), or Jews might purposely modify or altogether ignore recording information. In some cases, Jews had incorrect information entered into the books in order to rig the system. Avrutin demonstrates how the use of bribes, false passports, and paradoxically recourse to the legal system were employed by Jews to advance their interests.

What makes this book really worth reading is the many personal vignettes that Avrutin has transcribed from Russian archives. One reads about a rare individual in the 1890s who petitioned for a name that sounded more Jewish because his children were being teased by their Jewish schoolmates in Vilna. However, most petitions requested Russian-sounding names. Avrutin tells about converts who claimed that their name made people think they were Jewish, when they were actually Christian. The object in most cases was to counter a negative economic impact. In connection with naming, Avrutin draws our attention to the fact that Jewish identity was far broader and more complicated in Tsarist Russia than we may have imagined. Although converts to Christianity were not numerous, there were enough to create a whole series of legal and administrative problems that challenged the parameters of official identification.

Such is the book's positive side. On the negative ledger, the main drawback is that, although Avrutin has acquired a trove of new and rare materials, he does not challenge the reigning interpretation that the policy of selective integration under Alexander II was superseded by a reactionary policy under the last two tsars. That policy included the so-called May Laws, quotas on Jewish access to Russian educational institutions, and the prosecution of the twentieth century's most famous blood libel trial, the Beilis Affair. Many historians are still baffled about why the government from 1882 until the end of Tsarism would pursue a policy toward the Jews that damaged their image worldwide and was economically harmful to the state. Thus, the book ramifies paradigms already in use.

This is a strong work by a genuine professional who has a superlative grasp of the secondary literature in the field. The writing is accessible, despite some infelicitous translations (*iuridicheskoe litso* would translate better as "legal institution" than "juridical personality"), and the research is impeccable. I advise interested parties to read this important study.

Brian Horowitz, *Tulane University*

**Frances L. Bernstein, Christopher Burton, and Dan Healey, eds. *Soviet Medicine: Culture, Practice, and Science*.** DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2010. x, 294 pp. Index. $42.00, cloth.

The twelve articles in *Soviet Medicine* seek to integrate the study of medicine and science into broader discussions of Soviet social and cultural history, offering fresh insights into the nature of the Soviet project. The editors specifically see medicine as part of the "civilizing" project of the Soviet state as it attempted to bring modernity to the far reaches of the empire. To this end, *Soviet Medicine* addresses the efforts of doctors and scientists to transform Soviet society, and the limitations that lack of resources and central state

priorities placed on their activities. Covering the broad period from the Russian revolutions to the late Soviet era and addressing a diverse array of specific topics, these articles expose the relationships among medical professionals, the Soviet state, and the populations they served.

The volume's focus on the Soviet "civilizing" mission serves to orient the story of Soviet medicine away from the centre and on to the periphery, reflecting recent trends in Soviet historiography to broaden the scope of investigation beyond the capital cities. Several authors explicitly engage with the role that medical professionals played in promoting new Soviet standards of behaviour. Dmitry Mikhel's contribution about fighting the plague in southeastern Russia, for instance, argues that early Soviet doctors understood disease among nomadic peoples as a product of their culture, stressing the importance of lifestyle transformation (i.e., settlement) to improve the health of the local population. Likewise, Susan Solomon's examination of the work of German doctor and ethnopathologist Max Kuczynski on the Kirgiz steppe illustrates the complex relationship between "civilization" and disease. Kuczynski found that as nomads settled in towns, their changing lifestyles contributed to shifts in disease patterns that may have undermined the positive value Soviet authorities placed on "civilization." Sexual maturity and age of sexual consent also became a way for Soviet medical authorities to define proper "civilized" behaviour, often based on preconceived ideas about race, ethnicity, and gender that undermined principles of revolutionary equality and removed agency from individuals, according to Dan Healey's contribution. Similarly, several authors explore centre-periphery relations in terms of disease control and environmental regulation. Veniamin Zima discusses illnesses that resulted from the 1946–1947 famine as state-created and examines the ways Soviet authorities sought to alter peasants' food storage and consumption practices. Michael David highlights the initiative of local health officials in promoting and implementing a successful tuberculosis vaccination program. Donald Filtzer writes horrifyingly about industrial pollution and water supply, arguing that the priorities of the Stalinist system doomed urban populations to toxic water, while Christopher Burton highlights the efforts of communal hygiene officials to define acceptable limits for industrial pollutants and thus accommodate science and health to the demands of industrialization.

Another theme addressed in many of the volume's articles is the professionalization of Soviet medicine and its practitioners' authority as experts. Irina Sirotkina suggests that Soviet psychiatrists supported the centralization of their specialization, and their new status as state experts, as a way to enhance their authority, although at the expense of democracy and independence within their profession. Similarly, Frances Bernstein finds that Soviet doctors wanted external regulation and limits on their authority when it came to issues of doctor/patient confidentiality in the treatment of venereal disease. Marina Sorokina likewise discusses medical professionals' willingness to abdicate their authority, finding that forensic experts complied with Soviet state priorities and objectives, and willingly falsified evidence to suit state demands in their reports on the Katyn massacre during World War II. In contrast, however, Mie Nakachi's study of abortion during the postwar period suggests that in some cases doctors ignored state directives, instead seeking to fulfill state priorities for increased birthrates by emphasizing the needs of women's reproductive health. Finally, Catriona Kelly assesses Soviet pediatric medical care through extensive oral history interviews, finding that, in contrast to other professions, physicians generally maintained a nurturing, caring authority and respect among the population.

Taken together, the articles in *Soviet Medicine* provide a good starting point to raising awareness of the important contribution medicine and science made to the Soviet project,

the processes of negotiation between professionals and the state, and the need to integrate medicine into the study of Soviet social history. Unfortunately, while some of the essays stand out for their clear arguments and compelling assessments, most lack rigorous analysis. Although they cover interesting topics that could enhance our understanding of the nature of the Soviet project, the articles generally tend to be descriptive and inconclusive. This lack of analysis undermines the significance and importance of the authors' research. Nevertheless, the diversity of topics in the volume suggests many possibilities for further investigation. The volume should be of interest to graduate students and scholars of Soviet social history, medicine, and science.

Sharon A. Kowalsky, *Texas A&M University-Commerce*

**David Cooper.** ***Creating the Nation: Identity and Aesthetics in Early Nineteenth-Century Russia and Bohemia.*** Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2010. vii, 347 pp. Notes. Works Cited. Index. $42.00, cloth.

David L. Cooper's comparative study of the literary origins of Czech and Russian national identity is an illuminating work, not only because of its impressively broad, cross-cultural analysis, but even more because its fine-grained exploration of the separate Czech and Russian contexts ventures deeply into the complex details of its two interrelated subjects. The book's claim that literature and literary criticism were of paramount importance in the construction of national identity pushes a step too far, but any reader should come away with a clear understanding that "creating the nation" was a central concern for the early 19th-century writers, critics, and translators so lavishly discussed here.

Focused on the era of Europe's literary transition from neo-classicism to romanticism, *Creating the Nation* downplays these traditional literary concerns, emphasizing instead the shift in Russian and Czech from literary cosmopolitanism to literary nationalism. Fortunately, Cooper refuses to shy away from the complexities of these subjects: he examines literary figures from the widely known to the relatively obscure, only rarely pausing to bring non-specialists up to speed. The book is steeped in the kind of technical detail that might well prompt even a literature scholar to open up a manual on versification from time to time. But Cooper's decision to favour poetical thick description, rather than make concessions to the uninitiated, is a wise choice. It enables him to open up to the attentive reader a lively view of a distinct time and place, many of the special concerns and anxieties of which have been covered over and forgotten.

The book's exploration of this unfamiliar terrain is all the more impressive given its comparative context and the author's need for an extensive knowledge of both the Russian and Czech languages and cultures of two centuries ago. It is less convincing, however, with respect to its contention that literature itself went a long way toward inventing national traditions. Cooper argues that "the modern crisis in literary values motivated the development of modern national identities as much as any other social, political, or religious crisis that has been examined in the field of nationalism studies." Although the reader gets a sense of the weighty import of literary issues in this period, the book lacks the historical context to substantiate this point. This is a monograph in literary studies with powerful interdisciplinary implications, but it is not the sort of interdisciplinary text capable of making arguments about society, politics, or religion. Because it remains aloof from other aspects of national identity construction that arose at the same time or earlier—such as interest in folk culture, national character, and history—any sense of the comparative importance of language and literature cannot be adequately explored here.

What is unquestionably demonstrated is that nationality gradually became an essential concern for Russian and Czech writers and critics, it did so at a relatively early date, and the shift toward national identity in literature began to necessitate a rethinking of the national audience, which in turn helped encourage a rethinking of the nation itself. At a minimum, then, this study makes an excellent starting point from which to ask more direct questions about the relative importance of literature in the process of national identity construction.

*Creating the Nation* should also play a role in relocating Eastern European literature closer to the centre of European and global literary studies. The book's emphasis on the significance of translation and the creation of literary languages has remarkable resonance with post-colonial efforts to develop new literary traditions in languages that have yet to develop large bodies of work. Kenyan novelist Ngugi wa Thiong'o's recent adoption of Kikuyu over English recalls the defiant struggle of certain Czech writers around the turn of the 19th century to transform Czech into a language of literature that had the capacity to outshine German. In showing, moreover, how the move to a national literature, both in Russian and Czech, encouraged a rethinking of the national audience, Cooper raises new questions about issues in education and politics. The implication of literary affairs in other spheres of interest sets the stage for innovative commentary on such historical figures as Sergei Uvarov and Pavel Pestel, whose relationships to literature are rarely discussed. At these points, Cooper's monograph seems to be laying the groundwork for the kind of study that would situate the role of literature within the context of Russian and Czech national identity construction. For its thorough discussion of the development of nationality in literature, as well as its clear demonstration that this process was critically important, *Creating the Nation*, at once painstakingly comparative and philosophically searching, contributes broadly to the field of Slavic Studies.

Christopher Ely, *Florida Atlantic University*

**Simon Dixon, ed. *Personality and Place in Russian History: Essays in Memory of Lindsey Hughes*.** London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 2010. 435 pp. Index. $20.00, paper.

Lindsey Hughes, who died in 2007 in the prime of life and at the peak of her career, was a highly regarded historian of 17th–18th century Russia and a leader among a close-knit community of scholars. The volume under review represents those colleagues' tribute to her memory. "Personality and place" may seem a nebulous theme for a sprawling collection of nineteen essays that range from the 16th to the early 20th century, but the contributors, inspired by the centrality of these concepts in Hughes's own work, manage to use "personality" and "place" to give coherence to what are otherwise quite disparate topics.

Simon Dixon opens the volume with an essay on Hughes herself. He locates her in the time and place that formed her, the England of the 1950s–1970s, and explains how her agenda as a researcher developed out of an early interest in architectural history and biography, i.e., "places" and the "personalities" that inhabited them. This focus on people situated in physical spaces provides the framework for the essays in the volume.

The personalities and places that the authors discuss range from the symbolic to the concrete. On the symbolic side, three chapters study cultural representations: Sergei Bogatyrev's "personalities" are images of Ivan the Terrible and his heir Fedor Ivanovich that adorned early modern artillery; Simon Franklin's "place" is the image representing

Moscow, Russia, and all of divine creation on the frontispiece of the 1663 Moscow Bible; and Robin Aizlewood approaches "place" through the notion of disorientation in Russian literature. At the spectrum's opposite end, focusing entirely on concrete places, three chapters are histories of buildings: Anthony Cross writes about the British embassy in St. Petersburg; Roger Bartlett, on the imperial estate at Ropsha; and a previously unpublished chapter by Lindsey Hughes discusses the Cathedral of SS. Peter and Paul in the Peter-Paul Fortress. In these texts, the buildings themselves—their architectural and artistic features, the events that transpired in them, their evolving fate over the century—occupy centre stage.

In other essays, spaces are important for the social dynamics they facilitate. Maria di Salvo revisits the history of Moscow's "German Quarter" to explore, on the basis of rarely used sources, the role that the Italian diaspora played among the larger foreign community. Paul Keenan uses the mid-18th century development of St. Petersburg's Summer Gardens—who was admitted, under what conditions, for what purposes—as a window onto the history of upper-class sociability. Wendy Rosslyn looks at the travels of Russian noblewomen to understand how their spatial location affected their social interactions and sense of self. Finally, Robert Service analyzes the experience of Marxist émigrés among the Russian diaspora in pre-1917 London: they kept aloof from local society (including the British Marxists) and treated London purely as a place to bide their time while awaiting the revolution in Russia, thereby missing a chance to gain first-hand knowledge of the capitalist order that loomed so large in their political theories.

"Personality" and "place" are in perfect balance in the contributions by David Moon and Peter Waldron on Russians' encounter with their empire. Moon's theme is the geographic expeditions organized by the Academy of Sciences in the 18th century, and how academicians reared in Central or Northern Europe responded to the exotic natural environment of the steppe. Waldron writes about the 19th-century explorer Nikolai Przheval'skii, who escaped the drudgery of a mediocre provincial military career by making himself both a leading Asian explorer and Russia's top spokesman for imperialism in Asia.

Last but not least, a quartet of essays gives centre stage to personality, albeit one grounded in a particular place: Gary Marker's study of the opposing interpretations of Mazepa given by two influential fellow Ukrainians, Feofan Prokopovych and the Cossack Hetman Pylyp Orlyk; Elise Wirtschafter's essay on the role of Father Platon (Levshin) at the court of Catherine II as a representative of a distinctively Russian religious Enlightenment; Patrick O'Meara's study of General Pavel Kiselev in the early 1820s, when he was stationed in Tul'chin and therefore in perilously close contact with the leaders of the Decembrist Southern Society; and Simon Dixon's essay on the career of the rabble-rousing cleric Father Iliodor in early 20th-century Tsaritsyn.

The personalities represented here are mostly nobles, clerics, and Western expatriates, and the places are ones that such people would have frequented. One could imagine other kinds of "personalities" and "places" that would also deserve study. A tilt toward the elites, while easily explained by the nature of the available sources, provides a lopsided view of history. One hopes that future historians will draw inspiration from the excellent scholarship in this volume and broaden our knowledge to include other personalities and places of which we as yet know little.

Alexander M. Martin, *University of Notre Dame*

**Joseph Frank.** ***Between Religion and Rationality: Essays in Russian Literature and Culture.*** Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010. vi, 312 pp. Index. $60.00, cloth. $29.95, paper.

Joseph Frank's collection of essays offers us introductions to some translated works of Russian literature, occasional essays on Dostoevsky and some of the writers he inspired or aroused as well as on one troublesome feature of his life and works, namely, his anti-Semitism, with which readers and critics must grapple. Also included are book reviews of biographies of major Russian writers and critics, of a study of Russian conservative thinkers, and of a major study of the cultural history of Russia. To conclude, Frank presents a longish summary of and commentary on Vladimir Nabokov's *Lectures on Literature*, a volume of his lecture notes on famous European literary classics of the 19th and 20th centuries. The writers discussed are Austen, Dickens, Flaubert, Stevenson, Proust, Kafka, and Joyce.

The specialist in Russian literature and culture may not find in Frank's collection much that he or she does not already know—though the general reader is well served—but it is the manner in which the material is presented that should be noted, praised, and, if possible, emulated. Both the writing of the essays, their clarity as well as their generosity of tone, and their shape are flawless and impressive. They have much to teach us all in the frankness and yet courtesy of their critical responses to other scholars and literary theorists, in the compactness with which complex issues are introduced and complicated periods of Russian literary history summarized, in the astuteness of insights into the literary works identified for emphasis and analysis, and in the value placed and found in the historical, social, and ideological contexts, in which the writers were situated and their works generated.

Some of the essays should be singled out. Frank begins with three introductions to works by Dostoevsky. The first draws readers closer to his first novel, *Poor Folk*, and his genre-bending *Notes from the House of the Dead*. Especially striking in Frank's treatment is his ability to make clear the ways in which these writings, at one and the same time, are in and of the era in which they were written, but also point ahead to the more complex works that were to follow. *Poor Folk* catalogues the struggle to maintain one's dignity, sensitivity, and one's very humanity in the midst of the urban blight, grinding poverty, and social injustice exposed in the writings of the "natural school" championed by Belinsky. Yet at the same time its hero anticipates the morally troubled heroes of later novels whose insights into the dark realm of reality collide with their idealistic hopes and beliefs. *Notes from the House of the Dead* appears to be a simple, haphazard documentary account of Russian criminals and outcasts, a quasi-journalistic glance into the lives and minds of a group of mostly peasant convicts beneath which lies a solid and subtle structure disclosing one of Dostoevsky's true strengths as a writer. What is revealed about these convicts is not pretty; the appalling horror of their crimes and their filthy and degraded lives in prison are enumerated. And yet, their criminal acts, so often inspired by protest against the unbearable oppression they suffer, are not justified by them but recognized as violations of their Orthodox faith, which they revere, and its moral code, according to which they judge and condemn themselves.

In his introduction to *The Idiot*, Frank speaks of the many difficulties the author had to contend with while writing the novel, including a number of changes in the overall plan, changes so radically different from his original intention that work on the novel became more difficult as he progressed. The basic problem was his hero, transformed from a passionate, proud, violent, and dominating presence into Prince Myshkin, the perfectly

beautiful, pure, saintly epileptic and *iurodivyi*, who lacks all the attributes of a conventional hero and therefore complicates rather than simplifies the lives of all he encounters, especially the two women he loves who demand that he choose between them. Instead, Myshkin attempts to reconcile two radically different kinds of love, and his failure honestly and compellingly discloses the failure of cherished Christian ideas and values.

In the last of his introductions, the one devoted to *Demons*, Frank discusses how the novel grew in complexity as well as relevance as the social and political layers present in the theme of generational conflict were added to the original intention to put forward a serious and sober religious message. But as the satiric image of provincial Russia with its society easily seduced by chic radical views became firmer and as the figures of the liberals and "progressive" forces were undermined, so did the image of the man to become the novel's hero, Stavrogin, alter: his stature grew as his personality deepened and darkened, with his charismatic and repellent traits exhibited in his interactions with other characters. In fact, Stavrogin's ability to attract and influence others to extreme action reflects on the metaphysical level the power of the leader of the revolutionary cell, Pyotr Verkhovensky, to control his adherents and induce them to commit a crime, to convince them that their sacred cause demands a victim.

Perhaps the best essay in the collection is "Dostoevsky and Evil." It opens with a description of a panel on which Frank appeared with J. M. Coetzee and Mario Vargas Llosa. Coetzee argued that a writer's depiction of evil actions unleashed by the malevolent, diabolical forces in human beings was revolting and obscene, that the depiction of evil should be voluntarily curbed before it either sickens the reader or, even more disturbing, before it weakens and ultimately tempts the reader. Vargas Llosa responded very simply and weakly that one cannot predict the effect of the presentation of evil thoughts and acts upon the reader. Some works may disturb readers and lead them to commit evil; but other readers may be disgusted. The outcome depends on the reader rather than the writer. But Frank asked rightly if the author should be relieved of all responsibility for the impact of his work on readers and if the writer must curb or censor himself as Coetzee suggested. Here Dostoevsky seems to offer a productive resolution of the issue by depicting both the evil thoughts and actions dreamed or enacted by his characters and, at the same time, the horrified reaction to these very same deeds or dreams or impulses by the moral awareness still left to them or by the voice of conscience not yet stilled in them.

One of the longer essays in the collection is a summary and appreciation of Orlando Figes's *Natasha's Dance: A Cultural History of Russia*, which, except for the too inclusive title, Frank praises for the vigour of its writing, the "unprecedented use […] of private lives to illustrate his themes" (p. 89) as well as its treatment of culture as something more than a collection of artifacts. Rather, culture in Figes's view is the spectrum of ideas and attitudes centred in every facet of national life, the spectrum that gives birth to the artifacts. And Figes emphasizes, with Frank's approval, the dialectic at the heart of Russia's culture, the tension, often creative but at times stultifying, between foreign and native—the West and Russia or the East and Russia—between the temptation of innovation and the comfort of tradition, between rational, progressive secular thought and the country's spiritual, Christian heritage.

Other writers (Chekhov, Tertz), critics (Mirsky and Ginzburg), and novels (*War and Peace*, *Oblomov*, *Summer in Baden-Baden*) are discussed in the light of the general theme announced in the title of Frank's collection and explored in detail in the Figes section. Almost as interesting is a minor motif, a Jewish motif running through most of the essays built on many references to Jewish friends and acquaintances of the Russian authors,

Jewish critics and scholars, and Jewish writers, all of whom contributed to a culture that too often dismissed them or diminished their impact.

Ralph Lindheim, *University of Toronto*

**Timothy Frye. *Building States and Markets After Communism: The Perils of Polarized Democracy.*** New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 312 pp. References. Index. $90.00, cloth. $27.99, paper.

Since the publication of his first monograph, *Brokers and Bureaucrats*, Timothy Frye has distinguished himself as one of today's leading scholars on post-communist political economy. His work is notable for a fine blend of Rochester-rationalism and Columbia-contextualism, which is on full display in his new book, *Building States and Markets After Communism*. Frye sets out to explain the variant economic trajectories observable across post-communist Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. His findings point the finger at political constraints as the principal cause. More specifically, his argument is that levels of domestic political polarization best explain divergent levels of economic policy and institutional reform.

The first half of the book sorts out the conceptual and theoretical issues, and provides a region-wide statistical profile of domestic political indicators (e.g., regime-type, political polarization, left-wing partisanship) and economic reform indicators (e.g., pace and scope of policy change, institutional-legal support, income inequality). Frye offers an astute comparative-analytical discussion, backed up with an impressive data-rich presentation, complemented by a running dialogue with the relevant scholarly literature. The quantitative findings show a strong correlation between political polarization and economic reform. The second half of the book investigates four focused case studies, which lead the reader through a more detailed discussion of the political logic of post-communist economic reform. The cases include: polarized autocratic Russia—inconsistent and uneven economic reform; polarized democratic Bulgaria—delayed but significant economic reform; robustly democratic Poland—rapid and comprehensive economic reform; and relentlessly autocratic Uzbekistan—dawdling and limited economic reform. The qualitative findings do a good job of reinforcing the main argument. The conclusions hook up again with the larger theoretical question of politics and economic reform. The findings lead Frye to suggest that democracy is indeed more conducive to economic reform than dictatorship, but with conditions concerning the quality of democracy, most notable of which is the level of polarization.

The book is quite well done, so the reservations that I will now raise are not meant to diminish its superb quality. First, as an alternative political explanation, "contestation" might be a more useful causal variable than "polarization." Take Poland, please; the most rapid and comprehensive policy changes came about during the first few months of the transition (likewise in Russia), during a brief phase that Leszek Balcerowicz called "extraordinary politics," defined not as "robust democracy" but as a political void, when political opposition was not yet organized and mobilized to challenge the reforms. Once democracy kicked in, the pace and scope of reform was stalled. Second, the study would have benefitted from more discussion of the causes of polarization. To be fair, there is an interesting chapter that links political polarization with the historic timing of national identity formation. But this macro-social discussion seems a bit disconnected from the micro-political timing of on-again-off-again economic reforms. Perhaps, a bit more about the actors in the policy process could have bridged this gap. Finally, an admirable feature

of the scholarly review is the refrain from discouraging words. Nonetheless, the debates over economic reform were among the most polarizing within the community of post-communist academics and policy advocates. The early discussions of reform were dominated by the assumptions of a neoliberal economics, which proved inadequately equipped to account for political constraints and socio-cultural influences. On page one, Frye essentially glosses over this controversy by using a Jeffrey Sachs quotation as his point of departure: "The hardest part of the transformation, in fact, will not be the economics at all, but the politics." Well said, but I assume that this is the same Sachs who also said: "Many economic problems solve themselves, markets spring up as soon as central planning bureaucrats vacate the playing field." (See *Poland's Jump to a Market Economy*, 1993, p. xiii).

In sum, Tim Frye's *Building States and Markets After Communism* is a first-rate research project, with valuable findings for comparative political in general and post-communist studies in particular. Political economists will surely profit by familiarizing themselves with the comprehensive empirical analysis and compelling theoretical argument. The book is ideal for graduate-level study in a variety of thematic courses as well.

Gerald M. Easter, *Boston College*

**Björn Hansen and Jasmina Grković-Major, eds. *Diachronic Slavonic Syntax: Gradual Changes in Focus.*** Wiener Slawistischer Almanach, Sonderband 74. Munich, Berlin and Vienna: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2010. 208 pp. €35.90, cloth.

Most of the seventeen papers in this volume were presented at a conference with the same title held at the University of Regensburg in December 2008. Three of the papers are in German, the rest in English. The papers include applications of recent developments in linguistic theory to the diachronic study of Slavic syntax, as well as corpus-oriented approaches. Specific languages discussed include Russian (five papers), Czech (three papers), Lower Sorbian, Old Church Slavonic, Polish, and Ruthenian (one paper each). The remaining five papers are devoted to the historical-comparative or typological-contrastive study either of the Slavic languages in general or specifically of West Slavic languages. Here I shall briefly outline the main thesis of each paper and the specific theoretical frameworks adopted by the authors.

Among the papers discussing Russian, three are based on grammaticalization theory: Jan Ivar Bjørnflaten describes how indeclinable verbal adverbs came to be formed, focusing on a period between the late 16th and mid-17th centuries when the verbal adjectives from which they develop were in the process of losing grammatical agreement; Hakyung Jung traces the development of the North Russian *be*-perfect from an originally passive construction to an active construction via a process of feature reduction in the *u* + genitive component; and Marija Lazar deals with the placement of the reflexive pronoun in Russian business writing of the 12th–15th centuries, showing that the grammaticalization of the postverbal enclitic *sja* took place at different times in different regions. Using a construction-grammar framework, Björn Hansen examines the development of Russian modal constructions with *moč'* "to be able to" into the epistemic sentence adverbs *možet* and *možet byt'* "maybe" that are no longer inflected and cannot be negated. The paper by Alexander Krasovitsky, Matthew Baerman *et al*. uses a corpus-based approach to demonstrate that, in the development of Russian, conjoined NPs and NPs with numerals

lower than five have increasingly favoured semantic agreement, while NPs with the numerals five and higher and non-numerical NPs block the spread of semantic agreement.

The three papers dealing with Czech (more precisely Old Czech) each employ a different theoretical framework. Mojmír Dočekal uses a formal theory known as lambda-based categorial semantics (we owe this term to Professor Anita Steube of Leipzig University) to demonstrate that both Old Church Slavonic and Old Czech are strict negative concord languages, although the occurrence of *n*-words without verbal negation in OCS remains unresolved. Mirjam Fried uses a construction-grammar approach to show the process of feature reduction in the transition of an Old Czech present active participle to an adjective-like modifier. The theory of Distributed Morphology is the framework used by Petr Karlík to describe how Old Czech functionally delimited the meanings of four suffixes to express the modal meaning of Latin adjectives in *–bilis*.

Hauke Bartles uses a corpus-based approach in examining where to draw the line between changes in the system and changes in language use in Lower Sorbian. He considers the following issues: competing passive constructions involving *wordowaś* (German *werden* in the passive) vs. the aorist forms of *byś* "to be"; the lexical items *paršona* "person" (German *Person*) vs. *wósoba* "person"; and the relative pronoun *kót(a)ryž* vs. *kenž* "who, which."

Another corpus-based paper is the one on Old Church Slavonic by Hanne Eckhoff and Dag Haug, who postulate that a fully annotated and aligned parallel corpus of OCS and Greek can provide answers to the vexing question of whether features indigenous to Slavic can be distinguished, given the strength of Greek influence.

Krzysztof Migdalski, using a generative framework, proposes that while auxiliary affixation is an ongoing process in Polish, auxiliary cliticization on clause-initial elements is a separate process inherited from Common Slavic.

In a quantitative study of relativizers in the Ruthenian literary language, Achim Rabus finds that the pronoun *kotoryj*, common in the 17th century, abruptly gave way to several different forms, such as *iže, kotryj,* and *jakyj*, in the 18th century.

The remaining five papers deal with diachrony in the Slavic languages in general. Jasmina Grković-Major discusses the drift of Indo-European toward an accusative language, a process which was inherited by Common Slavic and which underlay the development of syntactic transitivity as well as formal inter-sentence cohesion in the Slavic languages. Julia McAnallen investigates the syntax of predicative possession and concludes that distinct language contact situations facilitated the expansion of the Late Common Slavic construction *u* + genitive in the northeast (Russian) and of the *mít* "to have" + direct object construction in the northwest (Czech). In his paper on West Slavic, Gilbert Rappaport proposes that the "covert grammaticalization" (p. 178) of the category "masculine personal" ("virile") resulted from a chronological overlap in the changes which saw genitive endings spread to animate accusatives and accusative plural endings spread to the nominative. Radoslav Večerka describes how several syntactic developments in the Slavic languages are governed by a combination of the grammaticalization process, the tendency towards firmer syntactic organization, and tensions between form and meaning. Basing her study on the theory of drift, Ljuba Veselinova finds that the development of standard negation in the Slavic languages shows more or less uniform results, while there is considerable variation in the development of existential and non-verbal negation.

The style and grammar of several of the English-language contributions would have benefitted from further editing, for there are many troublesome errors. To give just two examples, double negation is used in one paper: "The form [...] does not change [...] with neither number nor gender" (p. 20) instead of "either number or gender." In another paper

"also" is used instead of "although," giving that sentence a surely unintended meaning (p. 128).

The individual papers in the volume draw on nine different theoretical frameworks and all make an original contribution, some to well-known questions in the field, others to less well-known ones. The questions raised and the provisional answers offered to many of them mean that researchers in Slavic historical linguistics as well as in general linguistics will find much in this book that can serve as a stimulus for their own investigations.

Gunter Schaarschmidt, *University of Victoria*

**Robin Higham and Frederick W. Kagan, eds. *The Military History of the Soviet Union*.** New York: Palgrave, 2010. vii, 336 pp. Maps. Index. $30.00, paper.

The present work is the second collaboration between Robin Higham and Frederick Kagan who have previously edited *The Military History of Tsarist Russia*. Put together the two books carefully blend new archival research and secondary sources, and readily augment other recent works by David Stone, David Glantz, Roger Reese, Bruce Menning, and others. This volume features seventeen chapters, more or less in chronological order, by thirteen distinguished scholars of history, political science, and strategic studies. Despite the scope and range of topics covered, the narrative is held together by several important themes that run through the essays. As the editors point out, there are a number of defining forces that have shaped the Soviet military. In many cases geography conspired against the Russian army and navy. This was coupled with the often antagonistic relationship between the military and the Communist party, and the perennial struggle of the latter to impose itself on the former. Finally, there is the connection between the inherent economic inconsistencies of the Soviet regime and the inability of its armed forces to pursue long-term, technological, and expensive innovations. Other important themes include reform and reaction within the military establishment, and breaks and continuities between the Imperial, Soviet, and post-1991 militaries.

The volume is divided into two parts. The first part examines the Soviet military up to 1945. In the introductory chapter the editors review some of the themes of the previous volume and introduce a sampling of the major issues in the military history of the Soviet Union. In the next three chapters David Stone and Robert Ponichtera deftly cover the painful birth of the Red Army and its doctrine through the Civil War and the Russo-Polish War. Stone's discussion concerning the role of ideology and pragmatism in shaping early Soviet military doctrine is of special interest. In chapter 5, Stone covers the industrialization of the Red Army, explains why the army did not stand up to Stalin and collectivization, and suggests four reasons for the failures of the Red Army between 1928 and 1941. The next chapter is about the development of Soviet operational art and is arguably among the best in the volume. Through lucid and interesting analysis, Kagan rightly concludes that "[i]n the interwar years Soviet theory far outstripped Soviet practice and Soviet capabilities" (p. 91). Chapter 7 examines the battles and engagements in Spanish Civil War, skirmishes with the Japanese in the Far-East, the quick Polish campaign, and the disastrous war with Finland. Chapters 8 and 9 are masterful narrations of the Great Patriotic War by John Erickson and Frederick Kagan. Erickson documents the Soviet calamities up to 1942 and Kagan analyzes the recovery of the operational art by the Red Army from 1943 onwards. Next, Mark O'Neill provides a well written examination of the Soviet Air Force and Christopher Lovett contributes a synopsis of the Soviet Navy up to 1945, though he bypasses any discussion of early Soviet naval thought.

The second part of the book is dedicated to the post-1945 period. In chapter 12 Steven Zagola supplies a well-balanced analysis of the Soviet nuclear forces, with particular attention to the economic side of maintaining such a demanding infrastructure. He concludes that Soviet Union reached parity with the United States only for a brief time in the 1970s, and thereafter the Soviet economy could hardly absorb the mounting costs of the Cold War competition. The following chapter by Mark O'Neill splendidly recounts the Cold War confrontations on land between 1945 and 1981. In chapter 14 Christopher Lovett examines the Soviet Navy during the Cold War. The debates between submariners and carrier enthusiasts are especially illuminating, and should help to explain why the Soviet Union never developed a powerful carrier fleet. In the next chapter, Scott McMichael furnishes an excellent summary of the Soviet-Afghan war. In chapter 16 Stephen Blank writes about the Soviet army in civil disturbances. Even though thoughtfully written, readers new to the subject might find it difficult to follow the author as he guides them through a complicated maze of institutional forces that range from the MVD and VGK to the KGB, OMON, and OPNAZ. In the concluding chapter, William Odom presents a sophisticated analysis of the role of professionalism in the Soviet/Russian army and the importance of separation of the military and the state for healthy political development. His verdict is unsurprising: "either maintenance of tradition combined with economic and political stagnation, or a political, military, and economic transformation and the promise of prosperity" (p. 316).

As in the previous volume, almost all of the chapters furnish readers with topics for further research, which should be helpful to both undergraduate students and general readers. Instructors looking to supplement their lectures with brief, but thoughtful, summaries of major events in Soviet military history should find this neat collection of essays handy as well. All chapters also offer useful conclusions and bibliographies of recommended readings.

The volume is not without problems, however. To begin with, there is no map for the period up to 1930, leaving the confusing era of the civil war to the geographic strengths of the reader. Another weakness is the lack of discussion about the involvement of women in military matters, which was rather unique to the Soviet Union, especially during the Second World War. A more serious dilemma has to do with the amount of knowledge the editors presume from the readership. For example, while the discussions of Soviet military thought by Frederick Kagan and the role of the army in the twilight of the Soviet Union by Stephen Blank are extremely insightful, readers with little background in the subjects might find them terse and confusing. There is also a fair number of misprints. These, nonetheless, are minor problems in what is, otherwise, a very readable and practical book.

Eugene Miakinkov, *University of Alberta*

**Pauline Jones Luong and Erica Weinthal.** ***Oil Is Not a Curse: Ownership Structure and Institutions in Soviet Successor States.*** Cambridge Studies in Comparative Politics. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 425 pp. Maps. Works cited. Index. $29.99, paper.

In this book, Pauline Jones Luong and Erika Weinthal make a major contribution to the large "resource curse" literature that has evolved to explain a condition whereby mineral-rich countries almost always experience greater problems in both economic and political development, stability, and long-run sustainability, than countries poorly-endowed with natural resources. Besides poor economic performance, the widely observed negative

consequences of resource wealth, petroleum in particular, include "[…] unbalanced growth, impoverished populations, weak states, and authoritarian regimes" (p. 1).

In chapter 1, the authors provide a review of this literature, indicating that many diverse explanations have become part of the "established resource curse thesis" (p. 3), but also argue that various critics, who have contended that these notions either do not recognize or do not properly emphasize the role of institutions in explaining the resource curse, are off the mark. According to the authors, both proponents and critics assume that in mineral-rich countries these institutions are weak, absent, or stagnant and so incapable of constraining the governing elites from relying excessively on the mineral sector and engaging in wasteful spending, as well as of building strong fiscal regimes that regulate the ability of the state to tax, spend, and invest wisely. They argue this amounts to assuming that all mineral-rich states will become rentier states (reliant exclusively on generation of resource revenues in their governing fiscal systems), unable to respond with effective stabilization policies when resource prices fall and resource "booms" become resource "busts."

Jones Luong and Weinthal pose a series of questions that challenges this consensus and propose to address them based on the experience of five petroleum-rich newly independent states of the former Soviet Union—Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Russia, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. They unveil the argument that even though, like all the other Soviet successor states, these five petroleum-rich states inherited weak institutions, their experience suggests that "even those mineral-rich states not inheriting strong institutions can nonetheless build them"(p. 4). The authors further argue that their study of the divergent development of the fiscal regimes in these successor states from early 1990s to 2005 supports their "contention that institutions in mineral-rich states are not a product of their wealth per se, but rather ownership structure" (p. 4).

The remainder of chapter 1 focuses on these alternative hypotheses and maps out a quantitative framework for testing and analysis of the evidence on the experience of, not only these petroleum-rich post-Soviet countries, but also of a larger global database of petroleum-rich countries, and over a period from the beginning of the twentieth century. At the core of this framework is the classification of ownership and control of resource wealth into four distinct categories. Jones Luong and Weinthal posit that these correspond to possible resource development strategies that create differing transactions costs and societal expectations, which either constrain or foster the development of institutions, namely weak or strong fiscal regimes in particular.

In chapter 2, Jones Luong and Weinthal discuss fiscal regimes in greater detail and explain their rationale for labelling fiscal regime institutions into "weak," "strong," or "hybrid" as part of the framework of their analysis. In chapter 3, they focus on the two polar opposites out of the four forms of ownership structure they defined previously. They develop and argue a theory as to how as a consequence of three causal mechanisms (transactions costs, societal expectations, and power relations), the most common form, $S_1$ [state ownership with control], fosters "weak" fiscal regimes, while the least common form, P1 [private domestic ownership], fosters "strong" fiscal regimes.

In the next chapter, case studies of Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan are presented as evidence of $S_1$ ownership structures fostering weak fiscal regimes, while in chapter 5, the case study of Russia is put forward as evidence of $P_1$ ownership structure fostering strong fiscal regimes. In chapter 6, Jones Luong and Weinthal address the complexities of the outcomes of the other two forms of ownership classification: $S_2$ [state ownership without control] and $P_2$ [private foreign ownership]. They infer that both of these forms involve

foreign/international aspects influencing the three causal mechanisms (not the least power relations), and result in at best less than optimal "hybrid" fiscal regimes, as evidenced by the experiences of Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan, that are described in chapters 7 and 8, respectively. In the course of these five chapters, the authors provide some fascinating detailed information on, and insights into, not only the politics, but also the history, political economy, economic geography, public finance, and the petroleum sectors of these post-Soviet countries that may interest general readers and researchers in related fields.

In chapter 9, Jones Luong and Weinthal develop an empirical analysis of a single equation econometric model that tests the hypothesis that the structure of petroleum resource ownership (based on their four distinct category classification) can be explained using a pooled cross-sectional and time series dataset of observed or constructed variables for 50 petroleum-rich countries over more than the last 100 years. The results of this analysis seem somewhat inconclusive, but are not essential to the central claim of the book. Moreover, in the final chapter, the authors conclude strongly, with arguments that the "resource curse" is a myth.

George Chuchman, *University of Manitoba*

**Beatrix Kreß.** ***Kooperation und Konflikt. Äußerungsstrukturen in Konflikten und Konfliktlösungen auf der Grundlage russischer und tschechischer literarischer Texte.*** Specimina Philologiae Slavicae, 156. Munich and Berlin: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2010. 653 pp. €48.00, cloth.

The book under review is a slightly revised PhD dissertation by Beatrix Kreß which was defended at the Goethe University in Frankfurt am Main in 2007. It is a comprehensive study of conflict communication based on the analysis of literary dialogues from Czech and Russian prose and drama. As analyses of conflict communication in Slavic communication cultures are rare, Kreß's work definitely fills a gap.

The first part of the book covers the concept of conflict, which is discussed from several disciplinary viewpoints, and the methodology of dialogue analysis. In attempting to define the genre of conflict communication, Kreß considers different criteria such as situation, structure, and motives. In her view, the essence of conflict communication lies in interlocutors' divergent aims and is manifested verbally in the sequence *claim—counter-claim*. Interlocutors suspend co-operation to different degrees so that conflict communication is "marked" with regard to co-operation (p. 116). Kreß distinguishes four concepts of co-operation which may be violated in conflict talk. An orientation towards co-operation$_1$ is characterized by the search for a solution or a compromise. Kreß's definition of co-operation$_2$ is based on Grice's co-operative principle and links rationality and efficiency to ethical norms. Co-operation$_3$ captures the minimal co-operation necessary to maintain a focused interaction. Here, a violation of the regular turn-taking mechanism can occur. Co-operation$_4$ affects the interpersonal level of communication. Kreß focuses on the concept of *face* introduced by Goffman and reinterpreted as *face wants* in socio-psychological pragmatics (pp. 143–175). She sees reciprocal maintenance of face as a fourth form of co-operation that can be violated in conflict (174f.), although violations of this kind strongly affect the relationship.

Kreß argues that varying degrees of co-operation correspond to different ethno-categories of conflict talk: the mode of conflict can range from escalation (dissent mode) to de-escalation (co-operative mode). These modes represent subgenres of conflict communication, and a verbal conflict can move along this continuum as it progresses (pp. 183–189).

The second chapter of the first part of the book is devoted to the methodology used to analyze sequences of actions, tactics and strategies in conflict communication. Kreß advocates an approach rooted in speech act theory, which relies on the concept of perlocution to introduce the perspective and reactions of a recipient or interlocutor. She discusses in detail concepts such as illocution, perlocution, and indirect speech acts, and their further elaborations in linguistic pragmatics (pp. 191–232). The method is applied to show which strategies achieve effects associated with the secondary intention or perlocution that characterizes a dissenting or co-operative mode (escalation or de-escalation) and to determine which verbal means accomplish them (p. 244). With the term *strategy* Kreß refers to all means employed by a speaker in order to achieve an intention. The notion of *tactics* refers to ways in which speakers react to recipients' actions and reactions and adapt their plans in order to reach their strategic aim.

In the remainder of the first part she presents the corpus (pp. 247–267). The conflict episodes analyzed are taken from twentieth-century Czech and Russian prose and drama. As the use of literary dialogue in discourse analysis is contested, she also offers a short discussion of the pros and cons of this kind of data (pp. 250–256).

The second part of the book presents the empirical analysis of the data and is devoted to describing tactics and strategies typical of the co-operative and escalating modes of conflict. The first chapter is divided into sections which analyze speech actions that can provoke, manifest, and continue a conflict. Each section indicates the kind of co-operation involved. Frequently, assertive speech actions start a conflict by making explicit otherwise implicit positions (pp. 271–331). The conflict is typically revealed in the second turn, in a dissenting reaction to the preceding turn, when a speaker refuses to give the favoured reaction that would close a minimal sequence. The speech actions which actually start the conflict breach co-operation$_1$, and, depending on the degree of rejection expressed, they can also affect co-operation$_3$ or co-operation$_4$ (pp. 332–401).

In the second chapter Kreß presents conflict strategies which have different effects on the mode of co-operation and describes the verbal, interactional, and pragmatic means they rely on. For example, she discusses reformulations in conflict talk (pp. 415–443), strategies relying on meta-communicative means (pp. 524–550), and the competitive and often even persuasive use of pragmatic particles in dissensions (pp. 444–471). One section is devoted to strategies for negotiating co-operation$_2$ and especially the personal credibility associated with Grice's maxim of quality, which may also affect co-operation$_4$ (pp. 472–498); another section discusses vocative speech actions as indicators of the interlocutors' relationship and the effect they have on co-operation$_3$ and co-operation$_4$ (pp. 499–523).

In the last chapter, Kreß sketches possible courses of conflict talk, using four example dialogues to show how the cumulative use of certain strategies influences levels of co-operation, each level being typical of different genres of conflict communication (pp. 551–565). In the remainder of the chapter the author presents possible endings of conflict talk and admits that solutions are rare (pp. 566–582): speakers in her data make concessions in one regard (e.g., co-operation$_4$) in order to 'win' in another.

Kreß's study is probably the first book-length analysis of conflict communication in Slavic languages. It is very comprehensive: the author rarely omits details, especially related to the basic concepts, but instead applies an interdisciplinary introductory approach almost every time. Discourse analysis in Slavic linguistics frequently relies on data from literary dialogues. Kreß mainly relies on such data, too, as it is difficult to make recordings of conflict talk. She acknowledges that this choice of data may have an impact on the strategies observed. It would, of course, be interesting to learn more about conflict talk in

real-life conversations, on the basis of authentic data from speakers of Russian, Czech, and other Slavic languages, and in this regard Kreß's analysis can serve as a point of departure and a *tertium comparationis*.

Nadine Thielemann, *University of Hamburg*

**Grit Labocki.** ***Höflichkeitskonventionen im Wandel: Eine pragmatische Untersuchung anhand von Begrüssungsdialogen im Russischen vom Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts bis zum Ende des II. Weltkrieges.*** Specimina Philologiae Slavicae, 160. Munich and Berlin: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2010. 388 pp. Appendix. €38.00, paper.

This dissertation submitted to the University of Frankfurt sets out to examine changes in the formulae for expressing politeness in Russian during the first forty-five years of the twentieth century. This time-span encompasses radical socio-political changes such as few languages have had to deal with: the 1905 Revolution, the October Revolution, the NEP period, full-blown Stalinism, and the Great Patriotic War. In broad outline, the effects of these changes on the speech etiquette of Russians are well known. Labocki points out, however, that much of the research has focused on changes in the linguistic behaviour of urban, educated Russians rather than that of the untutored rural population, which was heir to older, indigenous forms of politeness rather than the formulae introduced on French and German models which operated in the standard language.

Labocki hopes to supply a corrective to received ideas about politeness forms in Russian during this period by studying their use in representative narrative prose and drama. While on the face of it this seems like a promising idea, it presents the author with a set of challenging—and in some cases insurmountable—problems. In the first place, even if we suppose that authors intend to present a faithful replica of actual speech, how do we know whether they have succeeded in doing so? Labocki herself admits that the products of Socialist Realism, which make up a good part of her material, are especially problematic in this regard, because the tenets of Socialist Realism include the intention to provide an exemplum of ideal Socialist behaviour rather than an uncritical picture of what actually occurs. The problem is further compounded by the use of literary examples from novels referring back to earlier stages in Russian history to illustrate usage of the past. For example, Labocki uses Sholokhov's *Tikhii Don* (begun in 1925) in her corpus of works from the period before 1917, even though Sholokhov was only twelve at the time of the October Revolution.

Labocki has collected from her corpus some 600 examples of greeting dialogues which demonstrate politeness conventions. Chapter 5 of her book (pp. 143–355) is devoted to a detailed analysis of a selected number of these examples. There is no satisfactory explanation as to what criteria were used for choosing these particular examples. Nevertheless, each example is put into context and the motivation for the politeness convention used is scrupulously described using the theoretical framework developed in chapter 4 (pp. 111–141). She divides her corpus into three distinct periods: before 1917, 1917 to the end of the 1920s, and the early 1930s to the end of the Second World War. This periodization is based on external events. How it matches up with changes in politeness forms is not altogether clear from Labocki's very brief conclusion (pp. 353–355). Some general trends are discernible, however: the endurance of *zdravstvui(te)* as the most widespread form of greeting while many others simply withered away; the continuing use of name and patronymic as the most favoured polite address form except in the military, where *tovarishch* plus the functional title was the norm; and the gradual disappearance of religion-based greetings. None of these can be justifiably claimed as an earth-shattering

revelation. Nor do they shed light on the justification for Labocki's periodization. A special disappointment here is that Labocki offers no insight into changes in T/V pronominal use. This is all the more surprising given that she criticizes the widespread view provided by the secondary literature that reciprocal V usage is universal in distant relationships, reciprocal T usage in close relationships, and calls for more empirical research in this area (pp. 56–59).

Much of the original theoretical foundation in this field—as in sociolinguistics and pragmatics generally—was provided by British and American scholars (e.g., Brown and Levinson, Brown and Gilman, Comrie, Ervin-Tripp, Goffman, Grice, Lakoff, Leech). Apart from Friedrich and Jachnow, German Slavists were slow to exploit the potential of this research. Fortunately, English-speaking Slavists were well served in this area by the work of Comrie, Corbett, Nakhimovsky and Stone. This is just as well since, as Labocki notes (p. 141), there is a marked absence of empirically based research by Russian scholars, the literature being dominated by normative works which are written primarily as a guide to foreign speakers and which, furthermore, take no account of the Anglo-American theoretical foundations in the field. However, in the last two decades there has been a radical transformation of German-language scholarship, spearheaded by the excellent work of Tilman Berger and Renate Rathmayr. Perhaps it is because my expectations of another contribution to German scholarship in this field were so high that—despite all its indisputable merits as a discussion of many well chosen literary examples—I found this work so profoundly disappointing.

George Thomas, *McMaster University*

**Mark Richard Lauersdorf.** ***The Morphology of 16th-Century Slovak Administrative-Legal Texts and the Question of Diglossia in Pre-Codification Slovakia.*** Slavistische Beiträge, 473. Munich and Berlin: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2010. 293 pp. Maps. Tables. Index of cited forms. Bibliography. €34.00, paper.

Written Slovak was first codified in the 18th century by Anton Bernolák, who used generalized West Slovak as a basis. In the fervour of the nationalist movement of the following century, Ľudovít Štúr made a triumphantly successful second attempt at codification, this time with Central Slovak as the base interdialect. Literary Slovak was born. The sociolinguistics and language of the days of Bernolák and Štúr have been well studied, but the status of written Slovak in earlier centuries is not fully documented or understood. From the dawn of written texts in the Slovak area in the 10th century, Latin, German, and finally Czech served as the medium of discourse in letters and legal communications. In the 15th century Czech became fixed as the norm for written expression. It was, Mark Richard Lauersdorf tells us, a classic example of literary diglossia in Ferguson's 1959 formulation.

What was the nature of the diglossia in the 16th century? Did the written language in time reveal a hybridization of the two varieties and a blurring of their boundaries? When did stable, unique interdialectal Slovak forms first start appearing, and what was the range of their appearance across the region? Pauliny called the written language of this time *kultúrna slovenčina*, dependent on Czech for syntax, but with Slovak more and more asserting itself, to the point that diglossia was turning into something else. But what?

In this book Lauersdorf, author of a 1996 monograph on Slovak phonology in the 16th century, presents a very detailed study of 16th-century legal texts, 152 in all, many of them brief city council letters, selected from the four geographical areas: Moravian, West,

Central and East Slovakia (MSk, WSk, CSk, ESk). He subjects these texts to a meticulous quantitative analysis of nine desinential features: 1st sg. non-past of I, II, III class verbs, inst. sg. of masc. and neut. nouns, dat. pl. of masc. and neut. nouns, instr. pl. of masc. and neut. nouns, loc. pl. of masc. and neut. nouns, gen.-dat.-loc. sg. of fem. hard-stem adjectives, loc. sg. of masc. and neut. hard-stem adjectives, dat.-loc. of 2nd sg. and refl. pronouns, 1st sg. pres. of the verb 'to be.'

The presentation is impressive in its accuracy and detail. Historical development and regional dialects are discussed for each feature. Results are presented and analyzed by generalized patternings, e.g., endings predominantly following Czech or Polish norms, those which point to a Slovak regional (inter)dialect, and those which show no pattern. Each region is compared to the others in its aggregate patterns. The maps and compressed tabular presentations on pp. 160–166 are *tours de force* of statistical visuals, with four degrees of shading, including hatching. Aberrant forms that skew the numbers are given careful attention. The form *lidem* is taken as an instance of lexical patterning based on Czech (pp. 150–151). The frequent modals and auxiliaries *budu*, *mohu*, and *chci/chcu* (p. 121) are similarly attributable to Czech literary influence, it seems to me, and the dat. pl. *bratrzym* (pp. 126/151) could be identified as the Czech collective pl. *bratřím*.

There is a paucity of data in these texts, even as they represent four main dialect areas and encompass most of the 16th century. The troubling inclusion of MSk and the border Kopaničářské dialects muddies the waters. The expected MSk mix of III class 1st sg. *i* (Czech norm) and *u* (dialect) yields *u*/*i* in these texts in alternation with *m*. Slovak *m* occurs in MSk speech only in the far eastern area, with the exception of Kopanice, where it is common, but that is not the distribution in these texts! Where geographical and political borders come together, our linguistic expectations are likely to be disappointed (the Kopanice, a Czech zone, were settled by Slovak immigrants). We might expect MSk to render the gen.-dat.-loc. fem. adj. ending by *ej*, but two-thirds of the forms have *e.* There is a parity of these two forms in WSk, and a predominance of *ej* in CSk and ESk. Lauersdorf interprets these data as representing a "progressive shift" from west to east (p. 136), but that seems to me an illusion created by the wild MSk (and Kopaničářské) forms. In the end he discards MSk data from his tabulations on the grounds that they are too strongly reflective of Czech norms (p. 180).

The conclusion to be drawn from the three Slovak regions seems from the data to be inevitable. The texts show no consistent normalizations, but instead a tension between the competing "high" and "low" source varieties in three directions: written Czech, developing Slovak, and, in ESk, Polish. The hybrid that results is consistent with one of Ferguson's resolutions of diglossia: the "high" variety assimilates some of the features of the "low" and it is this hybrid that serves as the written medium (p. 186).

This book is a slow read, but the completeness of the appendices rewards in the end. It is excellent for its meticulous accuracy and fairness of analysis.

George Cummins, *Tulane University*

**Nikolay Leskov.** ***The Cathedral Clergy: A Chronicle.*** Margaret Winchell, trans. Bloomington: Slavica Publishers, 2010. xxxix, 353 pp. Translator's introduction. Pronunciation guide to personal names. Notes. $29.95, paper.

Though considered the most Russian of all Russian writers, Nikolay Leskov did not command the same respect and popularity as Tolstoy and Dostoevsky, because the criticism of the day did not embrace his ideological views. He was rediscovered at the

beginning of the twentieth century by formalists. Igor Severianin calls him "the overlooked Russian genius" (*Stikhotvoreniia i poemy 1918–1941* [Moskva: Sovremennik, 1990] 105). Marina Tsvetaeva says that of "all Russian writers, he is my favourite, he is a native force, a native source," his prose is "a force greater than magic—it is sanctity" (*Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh,* vol. 6 [Moskva: Ellis Lak, 1995] 388).

In the Soviet period Leskov was mainly known as the author of *Lefty*, *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk,* and *The Enchanted Pilgrim*. Though *The Cathedral Clergy* [Soboriane, 1872] was considered Leskov's major work, and beyond the scope of all but a few scholars, it was not known to the broad Soviet readership. Only now are Russian readers (re)discovering Leskov. The interest in Leskov is not accidental; it coincided with the resurgent interest in Russian religion and the revival of national pride as a counter-reaction to post-Soviet cultural decline.

In *The Cathedral Clergy* Leskov, focusing on the lives of three clergymen, portrays an imaginary small-town microcosm of 19th-century Russia that is wrought with battles between the old and the new. Leskov's forte lies not only in the fact that he amasses many spectra of life; he also shows this life through angles never employed before: through the journal of a priest, which reads like a sermon and a confession; through church sermons; through endearing dialogues between a husband and wife; through fights between political foes, as well as physical scuffles; and through narratives within a narrative, such as the dwarf Nikolay's stories or Akhilla's emotional written and oral accounts of events. All this is done with verbal exuberance and sometimes excessiveness, undermining and merging genres and styles. This is what makes Leskov the most Russian of all Russian writers and why he is tremendously difficult to translate.

First and foremost it should be noted that *The Cathedral Clergy* is a work of love, respect, and professionalism. Winchell shows great deference to the original text, providing a thorough and exact translation in which she captures puns, mistakes in speech (Varnava's agitated speech), and nuances of meaning. The conscientiousness of the translator should be commended when one considers the challenges of finding equivalents to Russian religious terminology (church hierarchy, forms of address, church practices), civil hierarchy, articles of everyday life that are no longer in use, archaic forms and words, dialectal usage, and Ukrainian and Polish words. In this respect, the English text reads more easily than the original (one researcher offers that words not explained in the footnotes or commentaries will not be understood by 89% percent of Russian readers).

Still, the unique feature of this translation is that it captures the sentence structure of the original. At first it creates a foreign, alienated feeling in the reader, but after a few pages one becomes used to long sentences and Leskov's heavy usage of participial and gerundial constructions. This odd syntax creates a linguistic sphere with its own rhythm and charm that helps the reader appreciate a new cultural dimension and delve into the magic world of the Russian fairy tale that unfolds before him.

Another noteworthy element of the work, which stems from the translator's effort to respect the original text and the reader, is the rendering of Russian names. All the names, patronymics, and forms of endearment are preserved. The list of characters is very helpful. However, it is not clear why Akhilla was rendered in the translation as Achilles. The Russified version of the Greek name (Akhilla—Gavrila) used by Leskov, captures the character's larger-than-life personality at the same time that it evokes Russian legendary heroes (such as Il'ia Muromets) and reflects the earthiness and humour of this endearing personage.

The Russian text of *The Cathedral Clergy* is heavily annotated with historical and cultural notes. The translator expands this list. The notes are extremely helpful and user-friendly. Still, I also would have included linguistic explanations of some characters' names. Like Gogol, Leskov uses "telling" names, and explanations can help the English reader with untranslatable names, as well as the linguistic excursions that reflect this cultural mentality.

Many scholars note that Leskov's method lies in penetrating into the character through his "speech behaviour," thus revealing the character through his speech style. In this work, we encounter many styles that represent multicultural character of Russia of that time. The translator does her best to follow the original, interlacing the discourse with archaic words and speech patterns that are particular to characters. An obvious difficulty arises from the fact that even the English language of the 19th century is more unified than the Russian language and does not allow for as many dialectal and style deviations. Despite Winchell's impressive efforts, characters' speech patterns in this translation are not as diverse and idiosyncratic as they are in the original.

Aleksandr Gordon, Russian actor and director, has said that *The Cathedral Clergy*, along with *War and Peace*, can be called therapeutic, because such works draw you into their own world with its own laws, and the reader accepts these laws and relates to the events that take place there. Moreover, the authors by nature were kind people, and their works do not leave you with fears and troubles. They lift your spirit. I believe that thanks to this translation *The Cathedral Clergy* will have an uplifting effect on the English reader as well.

Zarema Kumakhova, *Michigan State University*

**Leonid Livak.** ***Russian Émigrés in the Intellectual and Literary Life of Inter-War France: A Bibliographical Essay.*** Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010. 542 pp. Bibliography. Appendices. Primary sources. Secondary sources. Index. $125.00, cloth.

After being forced to leave their home country, many Russian émigré intellectuals, while facing the hardships and torments of exile, succeeded in making a name for themselves in their host country. During the highly politicized period between the Russian Revolution and the outbreak of World War II, many of these intellectuals established a fruitful dialogue with their French counterparts, assuming visible roles in journalism, culture, literature, and philosophy. Leonid Livak's book, conceived as a reference source on two decades of continuous relations between Russian émigrés and French intelligentsia, wholly fulfills its promise, offering us not only an abundant and comprehensive bibliography, but an insightful essay on the fate and influence of Russia Abroad in inter-bellum France. The 450-page bibliography presents books, memoirs, pamphlets, and especially articles, published *in French* by—and on—numerous Russian-speaking émigrés involved in literary and intellectual activities. It honours those passed on to posterity as well as those fallen into oblivion. If one may regret that there is no short biographic mention of the writers included in the book, nor reference to their numerous writings in Russian and to publications dealing with theatre, music, and visual arts, this bibliography compiles nonetheless an astounding wealth of information: it is a major contribution to the knowledge of Russia Abroad at its apogee and to the study of the process of cultural exchanges at large.

The book begins with an introduction whose purpose is to revive "exilic studies" (p. 4). According to Livak, the study of Russia Abroad has long suffered from two political biases. First, Soviet propaganda disregarded and banished émigrés' writings; second,

émigré writers tended to tarnish their pre-war experience due to the postwar popularity of the Soviet Union in France, their sense of political isolation reinforcing their tendency to cling to the "traditional Russian model of artists and intellectuals as prophets and martyrs" (p. 5). The introduction is followed by a short essay, which describes the émigrés' entry on the French literary scene and discusses their commerce with Russian editors and French intelligentsia. While examining their success and setbacks, Livak delineates four distinct periods. Although thoughtfully contextualized, his periodization of the émigrés' "francophone activity" could have been enhanced had it taken into consideration their productivity in Russian. Interestingly, Livak highlights the crucial role played by Russian translators and publishers, such as Jacques Shiffrin and Boris de Schloezer, in promoting émigré and Soviet literature in France and in developing two publishing houses, which enjoy the greatest fame today as Gallimard collections, more precisely the sumptuous La Pléiade, the self-proclaimed pantheon of French letters, and the sulfurous NRF, the temple of French thought at its best or worst. In sum, Livak's essay complements his own groundbreaking books and edited volumes on Russian émigré literature and French modernism. It renews and enriches earlier studies, such as Gleb Struve's seminal book, entitled *Russkaia literatura v izgnanii* (1956), which did not raise the question of French-Russian mutual influence, and René Guerra's scattered memories and Hélène Ménégaldo's brief survey, which are more anecdotal.

Most importantly, this rich bibliographic essay serves as a foundation for future scholarly inquiry not only on the relations between French and Russian-émigré intellectuals in France, but also on the cultural and political life of Russia Abroad and on the situation in the former Russian empire during the same period. Some little explored and promising topics particularly stand out. Further research could be undertaken on the collaboration between Russian and French Jews through the publication of the bilingual review *Tribune Juive* and other initiatives, more particularly on their efforts to bring attention to the conditions and threats for the Jews in Eastern Europe. Other research could be done on the dialogue between several Russian Orthodox theologians and religious philosophers, on the one hand, and, on the other, the main figures of the French movement of Catholic renewal. To challenge the common preconceptions of Russian émigrés as fierce political conservatives, one could explore the dialogue between Jewish and Christian liberal émigré thinkers or the influence of Russian-speaking activists on the French left. Of particular interest seems to be the role of former Mensheviks, such as Léon Blum's adviser Orest Rozenfeld, in defining the French Socialist party's positions towards the Soviet Union and the Stalinist regime. To conclude, one needs to pay tribute to Leonid Livak's colossal and thorough undertaking: by reflecting many political, intellectual, religious, and aesthetic trends of Russia Abroad and interwar France, this bibliographic essay paves the way for future research on a wide range of critical issues and fascinating topics.

Céline Marangé, *Columbia University*

**Stephen Lovell. *The Shadow of War: Russia and the USSR, 1941 to the Present.*** The Blackwell History of Russia. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2010. xviii, 370 pp. Illustrations. Index. $114.95, cloth. $31.64, paper.

Wiley-Blackwell chose well with Stephen Lovell as the author for their final volume in a three-part survey of Russian history. Lovell had already shown as a young scholar a flair for writing history broadly, both over the longer duration with his study of the dacha, and synthetically with a previous short guide to Soviet history. He turns phrases very finely,

and the elegance of his prose is matched by common sense. While frequently writing on the long duration, he shuns *longue durèe* explanations in favour of historical contingency. The result is supple, incisive history.

As a prospective textbook, *The Shadow of War* innovates in several ways. In the 1990s, and possibly earlier, some undergraduate teaching in Russian History was re-framed around 1861 instead of 1917. At the same time there was a flurry of new textbooks and surveys, yet nearly all of them treated the Soviet period as discrete. As it was possible to do so for the first time this was understandable, but out of step with the shifts in teaching. The Wiley-Blackwell series is back in step but pushes beyond as well: with Lovell's book a second break point, 1941, has been added to the first (actually 1855 for this series) and post-Soviet history has been integrated into the broader narrative.

*The Shadow of War* is built around a half-year leave when Lovell read much of the recent British and North American scholarship on later Soviet history. Working outwards from three edited collections published in 2006, the author reviewed most of the dissertations from which the chapters in these books evolved, but much else besides, including non-historical scholarship on the Soviet collapse and post-Soviet life. English-language research from the 1990s and post-Soviet Russian scholarship is not covered as thoroughly but, in fairness, both are overshadowed by the quality and quantity of English-language scholarship over the last decade. The reading and synthesis that Lovell has accomplished in a short time is anyway prodigious.

The book is structured synchronously with a choice of chapters that reflects the foci of post-1991 scholarship on the late Soviet and post-Soviet years: public and private spheres, relations between centre and periphery, and the shift from isolationism to globalization, among others. Analytically, older concepts are still present but overshadowed by newer ideas that Lovell also brings from recent scholarship. One of the key explanatory concepts of post-1941 Soviet history must be modernization, but here it is framed as "attenuated." Lovell argues that Soviet governance was patrimonial as much as bureaucratic although, problematically, on one occasion he implies that interwar Soviet governance was not bureaucratic at all (p. 177) in the Weberian sense that it lacked any transparency.

That World War II was a turning point in Soviet history is unchallenged and probably unchallengeable. Lovell first dispenses with the easy arguments for this before turning, in the rest of the book, to somewhat more difficult justifications of its periodization. As an example, one of his themes is rising nationalism, especially amongst ethnic Russians. Its importance during the war and the breakup of the USSR is obvious but what about the interim? Lovell argues that the broader cultural modernization of the postwar years fuelled national feeling but also for the role of nationalism as a reservoir for other discontents.

With the integration of the post-Soviet years into the older narrative Lovell's unusual juxtaposition of qualities as a scholar is clearest. It is commonly assumed that Russia *has* failed as a liberal democracy, largely due to the reassertion of an authoritarian culture reaching back to Muscovy. Lovell emphasizes instead the immediate socio-economic trauma of the 1990s; that, pragmatically, given the tenor of post-1941 history, liberal democracy was not the goal of post-Soviet change in Russia anyway; but he also eschews Russian exceptionalism. The book culminates in his observation both that the failure of Russian liberal democracy in the 1990s should be no surprise but also that this does not rule out such a development several decades into the future.

Because it faithfully conveys the nuances of the recent scholarship and due to its synchronous organization, *The Shadow of War* is too challenging to assign for an introductory or survey course. There are relatively few "facts" and "events" in this textbook, and the many ideas and interpretations, one of its best features, may confuse

students also needing a book that is more chronological than thematic in organization. However, *The Shadow of War* would work very well in senior undergraduate or graduate courses with students already familiar with the basic narrative of Soviet history.

Christopher Burton, *The University of Lethbridge*

**Olga Maiorova.** ***From the Shadow of Empire. Defining the Russian Nation Through Cultural Mythology, 1855–1870.*** Studies of the Harriman Institute, Columbia University. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2010. Illustrations. Bibliography. Index. $29.95, paper.

On the basis of the innovative reading of a wide range of literary works, journalistic treatises and writings by historians, Olga Maiorova tells a fascinating story of how, in the period of the Great Reforms, leading Russian intellectuals of different political persuasions—from Mikhail Katkov to Lev Tolstoy—elaborated novel perceptions of the Russians as a nation by recasting existing historical mythologies. The study convincingly argues that the Crimean war triggered not only major political transformations in Russia, but also significant changes in the understandings of Russianness, which, in fact, are still exerting their influence today. By reinterpreting historical myths and legends about the foundation of the Russian state, stories of the Russian people's spiritual birth through the adoption of Christianity, and by exploiting memories of war and legends about Cossack independence, Russian intellectuals attempted to shape the future of their country and to urge the monarchy to change traditional imperial policies. Maiorova demonstrates more clearly than it has been done before how and why it was precisely in the late 1850s and the 1860s that the Russian people began to replace the dynastic monarchy as the agent of history in the writings of leading Russian intellectuals who made a first systematic attempt symbolically to plunk the Russian nation "from the shadow of empire," usually without questioning the empire's very existence.

Maiorova demonstrates why historical narratives, literary works, and essays published in "thick journals" became such important sites of national politics in the 1860s at the time when Russia was "learning to read," yet its educated milieu continued to be deprived of the possibilities for meaningful political participation. This peculiar setting in which modern Russian nationalism was taking shape had a long-lasting and, in Maiorova's view, unfortunate, consequence. Pondering possible ways for empowering the Russian people, the members of the intellectual elite considered by Maiorova rejected the adoption of Western political institutions in Russia, searching instead for authentic historical models. They noticed that historically this empowerment often came during times of war, moments which threatened the very existence of the Russian state. And thus, unwittingly, during the Great Reforms, the cult of war became a key feature of Russian nationalism. In Maiorova's view, the aggressive character of Russian nationalism of the beginning of the twentieth century was already encoded in the national imagery of the 1860s.

While acknowledging that wars tended to be the site of national myth-making across Europe, Maiorova postulates that the war cult occupied an even more crucial position in Russia than elsewhere. Here, it seems to me, we find one of the few shortcomings of this book. Any case for Russia's specificity, particularly when we consider intellectual discourses of the nineteenth century, could be made convincingly only if some explicit consideration is given to comparable trends elsewhere in Europe, with the citation of sufficient evidence. In this particular instance, it should be fully considered that, in the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries, in response to social upheavals and dislocation

produced by rapid economic and social transformations, growing international insecurities within Europe, as well as the emergence of the new aggressive forms of colonialism, nationalisms across Europe as a whole became considerably more xenophobic and violent than in earlier epochs.

In addition to introducing a more systematic comparison with similar developments in other European societies, this, in many ways excellent, study would have also benefitted from looking at a broader spectrum of the Russian intellectual elite. Apart from history, two other fields of scholarship began playing a crucial role in the fashioning of new perceptions of Russia's self in the period of the Great Reforms. These were Orientology and ethnography, whose representatives redefined the relationship between the Russians and the empire's non-European minorities and between Russia and the 'East.' This important component in the construction of Russian national narratives is not given due consideration by Maiorova. Some of the visions articulated within these two disciplines were inclusive and celebratory of Russia's multiculturalism, while others started to show influences of racial theories, which would later feed the imagination of the extreme right in the last decades of the tsarist regime. The consideration of the innovative trends in these two fields of scholarship would have allowed Maiorova to draw more illuminating conclusions about the impact of the developments of the 1860s on the future trajectories of Russian nationalism. Intellectual dynamics during the reigns of the last two Russian tsars were more multi-dimensional than the concluding chapter in Maiorova's book would make us believe. Alongside increasingly aggressive, xenophobic ethnic Russian nationalism, from the 1880s we find the emergence across Europe, including Russia, of new transnational discourses of the origins of "European civilization" and a resurgent interest in the role of the "East" in the origins of European cultures. Within this pan-European setting new ways of celebrating Russia's multi-ethnicity and multiculturalism were articulated in the 1880s and the 1890s. We also find the beginnings of this trend in the 1860s. The appreciation of the existence of these discourses about multiculturalism reinterpreted since the late 1860s as the key national, rather than only imperial, specificity of Russia, alongside a growingly exclusive ethnic Russian nationalism, on which Maiorova focuses, would help explain the great intellectual complexity of the period which we are used to calling the "Silver Age."

Vera Tolz, *University of Manchester*

**Olga Matich, ed. *Petersburg/*Petersburg: *Novel and City, 1900–1921*.** Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2010. xi, 352 pp. Illustrations. Index. $34.95, paper.

This innovative collection of essays from Olga Matich and ten young colleagues offers an exciting approach to research and pedagogy focusing on St. Petersburg. Like the mirror-image title that refers to intersections between the city and the eponymous modernist novel by Andrei Bely, this new work foregrounds connection and collaboration between text and city, word and image, book and website, teacher and student. It is a valuable resource for anyone teaching or writing about St. Petersburg.

*Petersburg/*Petersburg includes two parts. The first is comprised of three essays offering new readings of Andrei Bely's *Petersburg*: "as a detective novel, as an exploration in disgust and as a painterly avant-garde text" (p. 6). The second presents nine essays on a wealth of topics (from architecture to abattoir) dealing with St. Petersburg and modernist art and aesthetics. *Petersburg/*Petersburg takes as its starting point the notion that both the city and Bely's novel are "spatial structures" (p. 8), making particularly fruitful an approach to the text as a modernist painting that problematizes perspective (p. 10), or to the

city and text as an instance of cultural geography (p. 21). Linked to this "traditional" research is a virtual Part Three, the website <http://petersburg.berkeley.edu/index.html>, which matches each essay of Part Two with well-designed webpages that visually explore each theme. Taken together, this combination of written and visual research successfully explores the scholarly gap surrounding the "nexus of modernity and modernism" (p. 5), and creates a suggestive pedagogical platform.

The webpages linked to the essays of Part Two vary significantly in terms of depth, although they are uniformly well-researched and professionally designed. Alyson Tapp's essay, "The Streetcar Prattle of Life: Reading and Riding St. Petersburg's Trams" (pp. 123–148), is accompanied by "Tramvai" webpages devoted to three pre-revolutionary tram routes in St. Petersburg, period photographs and illustrations of stops along the route, and texts devoted to modernist writers, artists, and poets (Mandelstam, Blok, Gippius, Shklovsky, Nabokov *et al*.) who inscribed those spaces into their work.

Alexis Peri and Christine Evans's essay, "How Terrorists Learned to Map: Plotting in *Petersburg* and Boris Savinkov's *Recollections of a Terrorist* and *The Pale Horse*" (pp. 149–173), is linked to the webpage "Visions of Terror," which maps the route of notoriously hated Minister of the Interior von Plehve on the occasion of his assassination.

Cameron Wiggins's "The Enchanted Masquerade: Alexander Blok's *The Puppet Show* from the Stage to the Streets" (pp. 174–193) has webpages of the same name, where you can enter "The Play" (at Komissarzhevskaia's theatre, directed by Meyerhold, 1906), or "The Masquerade" (the premiere of the play, held during a masquerade party at the home of actress Vera Ivanova).

Ulla Hakanen's "Panoramas from Above and Street from Below: the Petersburg of Vyacheslav Ivanov and Mikhail Kuzmin" (pp. 194–216) is twinned with the webpages "The Tower," about the neighbourhood, interior and architecture of "The Tower," also known as the neoclassical "the House of I. I. Dernov."

Lucas Stratton's "The Button and the Barricade: Bridges in Paris and St. Petersburg" (pp. 217–237) is linked to the webpages "The French in St. Petersburg," an exploration of architectural and cultural crossovers between St. Petersburg and Paris.

Olga Matich's "28 Nevsky Prospect, The Sewing Machine, the Seamstress and Narrative" (pp. 238–261) includes a web-stroll down Nevsky Prospect, with stops at places of architectural and cultural interest, including the House of Singer ("Nevsky Prospect"), as well as an investigation into the cultural contributions of the Singer Sewing Company to modernist St. Petersburg ("The Singer Sewing Machine").

Mieke Erley's "Meat in Russia's Modernist Imagination" (pp. 262–282) is linked to the webpages "Anatomizing Modernity," which map the journey of St. Petersburg's cattle from point of entry (Nikolaevsky Station) to abattoir to delicatessen (Aux Gourmets on Nevsky Prospect).

Polina Barskova's "The Fluid Margins: Flaneurs of the Karpovka River" (pp. 283–304) is accompanied by the webpages "Karpovka, the Unquiet Little River of St. Petersburg Modernism," which look at the outskirts of the city where mansions met slums and industrial quarters, and where many emblematic figures of St. Petersburg modernism lived and worked, including artist Dmitrii Mitrokhin, actress Maria Savina, and art nouveau furniture makers of the Mel'tser family.

Victoria Smolkin-Rothrock's "The Voices of Silence: The Death and Funeral of Alexander Blok" (pp. 305–325) is accompanied by the webpages "The Funeral of Alexander Blok, a Black Page in Russian Poetry," which follow Blok's 1921 funeral procession with eyewitness reports from pallbearers Evgeny Zamyatin and Andrei Bely.

An additional webpage includes Stiliana Milkova's "Postcards from Petersburg: the City Through Tourists' Eyes."

Although readers and viewers will find their own favourites amidst this wealth of Petersburg modernia, special mention should be given to Hakanen's fascinating exploration of the neighbourhood, architecture, and artistic culture surrounding Vyacheslav Ivanov's famous "Tower," as well as Erley's investigation of meat and modernism.

Megan Swift, *University of Victoria*

**David B. Miller.** ***Saint Sergius of Radonezh, His Trinity Monastery, and the Formation of the Russian Identity*****.** DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2010. x, 244 pp. Bibliography. Illustrations. Index. Tables. $38.00, cloth.

This ambitious book investigates the cult of Sergius of Radonezh, the memorial culture that developed around his Trinity Monastery, and the nexus of relationships spawned between the foundation and the outside world. Broad in scope and thick in detail, Miller's work covers the three centuries between Sergius's birth in 1322 and 1605, the entire geographical space of the Muscovite state, as well as wide cross-sections of Russian society, including women. The author synthesizes careful cultural analyses of hagiography, iconography, and religious rituals as well as painstaking studies of Trinity's property records with a thorough engagement of the literature on Russia and Europe by scholars ranging from Philippe Aries and Benedict Anderson to Max Weber.

Miller contends that Sergius's cult and Muscovite Russian national consciousness developed together and became inseparable. The memorial culture at Trinity, which involved exchanges of material gifts in return for prayers, created a "horizontal community of venerators" bound by common moral, economic, and social ties that were dynamitic and durable. More specifically, contact with Trinity's economic life bonded elites socially, transformed the monastery into an "economic engine," and promoted secular literacy.

The book has two major parts. The first traces the construction of Sergius's image. It begins by exploring the deeds of the "historical Sergius," including his adoption of cenobitic monasticism and his negotiation of the politics of his day, which led his contemporaries to regard him as a paragon of moral courage. Miller traces the development of the cult at Trinity by dissecting the initial promotions of Sergius's sanctity by Nikon and Epifanii the Wise and their subsequent development by Pakhomii the Serb. The author argues that Pakhomii, and not Epifanii, created Sergius's all-important image as an intercessor for Rus and thus his recognition as "national saint." In the last section of the first part, the author considers the appropriation and transformation of Sergius's cult by Muscovite bookmen, the creation of myths about Muscovite Russian identity, and the concurrent advent of princely patronage of Trinity.

The book's second part documents Trinity's emergence as the premier "sacred centre" in the Muscovite state. At its heart lies a database, compiled by the author from property records, including Trinity's donation book, lists of those to be prayed for (*sinodiks*), feast books, burial records, and, most importantly, private charters. This mass of information contains over 4,000 entries annotated by date, name of donor, nature of grants and their locations, and nature of services requested from Trinity. These statistics are divided into eleven chronological periods and are presented in three statistical tables. The data serves as the primary evidence of Miller's contentions concerning the monastery's ever expanding connections with the secular world and its impact on the formation of Russian identity. The author starts by explaining why the culture of gifts for prayers originated and became

institutionalized by looking at patrons' spiritual and social motivations for giving. Next, he profiles the brotherhood's social and geographical composition, organization, lifestyle, and governance, and shows that the monastery's leadership consistently came from the families of landowning benefactors. Revealing the gendered aspect of the Sergius's cult, Miller demonstrates the relationships between women and Trinity, as well as the male-female relationships within family constructs and in the context of the monastery's memorial culture. Finally, the author examines burial at Trinity, revealing that the monastery became the most prestigious place for nobles to hold funerals and bury their dead, and that the rituals affirmed family identities and reflected social hierarchies. Although Miller based his idea that contact with Trinity spurred the development of secular literacy on the investigation of property records, it appears only in the book's conclusion and does not receive the same high level of analysis as the aforementioned features of the monastery's memory culture, which are clearly charted across time, space, and social position.

The book contains thirteen black and white illustrations. Unfortunately, several of the images are of poor quality and a couple are barely discernable. Miller offers incisive analysis of Andrei Rublev's "Old Testament Trinity" and icons of Sergius, but the connections between other pictures and the author's contentions are often not apparent.

In sum, Miller's richly textured analysis of Sergius's cult and Trinity's complex interactions with Russian society is an impressive achievement. The book adds new dimensions to the recent wave of specialized works devoted to the saint and his monastery by Pierre Gonneau, Boris Kloss, Scott Kenworthy, and M. S. Cherkasova. It deserves the attention of those interested in Russian religious culture, national identity, the history of images, and issues of gender and death.

Kevin Kain, *University of Wisconsin-Green Bay*

**Donnacha Ó Beacháin and Abel Polese, eds. *The Colour Revolutions in the Former Soviet Republics: Successes and Failures.*** Routledge Contemporary Russia and Eastern Europe Series, 23. New York: Routledge, 2010. xvii, 248 pp. $140.00, cloth.

The editors of this relatively slim volume set an ambitious task before themselves; it could hardly have been otherwise, given that the compilation relies on fourteen authors cumulatively charged with analyzing not only the so-called "colour revolutions" that took place in Georgia, Ukraine, and Kyrgyzstan during the first half of the previous decade, but also examining the countries of the former Soviet Union wherein regime change was not effected during a commensurate timeframe. Animated by the puzzle of why mass protests centred around alleged electoral malfeasance succeeded in bringing down governments in some contexts but not in others (or why they did not occur in the first place), *The Colour Revolutions* examines all the Soviet successor polities except for the Baltic states.

Ó Beacháin and Polese focus on the period 2003–2006, justifying bookending this project in such narrow fashion by arguing that these years represented the flowering of a hitherto unprecedented level of protest activity and transnational involvement throughout the region, the sheer density of events allowing for tracing not only the dissemination and evolution of protest repertoires, but also for concurrently examining elite learning effects. The explanation is not necessarily objectionable; scholarly work inevitably demands both practical and conceptual compromises. Nonetheless, these temporal constraints, while not adhered to with perfect fidelity by contributing authors, are analytically confining. This is especially obvious in those instances where regime replacements did not occur in the designated span of time. Similarly, readers curious about the relationship between earlier

events and subsequent developments, such as the protests that engulfed Moldova in 2009 or the mobilization against Kurmanbek Bakiyev in 2007 and 2009, will be disappointed by the condensed focus. (Although it should be pointed out that the introduction and conclusion do a commendable job of contextualizing case studies in a more diffuse frame.)

Among the volume's stated objectives is to examine not just domestic factors, but the transnational interconnections evinced between activists throughout the region. This represents but one characteristic of what is seen as a nascent form of protest movement, defined by its non-violent and mass-based nature, reliance on civil society organizations, exposure to outside donors and epistemic communities, and extensive utilization of new communicative technologies. Critically, Ó Beacháin and Polese highlight that opposition in this vein revolves around the opportunity structures presented by disputed national-level electoral contests, which they argue constitute junctures when domestic and foreign attention is heightened in its focus on the state.

A decided strength of this book is that it examines not only instances wherein electoral revolutions succeeded, but also those where mobilization efforts were quelled or failed to materialize altogether. Aside from side-stepping the hobgoblin of selecting on the dependent variable, this provides a more comprehensive backdrop against which to assess under what conditions diffusion and demonstration effects play a pivotal role versus when they are epiphenomenal or removed entirely from the causal chain. Encouraging cross-country comparison, the editors formulate a five-point evaluative criteria (pp. 7–9) that aids in avoiding conceptual unruliness among cases and provides a metric by which to evaluate outcomes: 1) degree to which states and elites were hostile to liberal/democratic precepts prior to the commencement of protests; 2) size and unity of the opposition; 3) role of external actors and how domestic elites reacted to foreign overtures; 4) extent and influence of civil society; 5) willingness/ability of people to organize and protest.

As should be clear from the above, the country studies emphasize not only state-level variables, but also wider regional forces and how these facilitate or hinder electoral revolutions. (Mark Beissinger's notion of "modular" political phenomena is cited by no fewer than a third of the contributors.) Encouragingly, although Western governments and supranational organizations figure prominently in the analyses, attention is also paid to the role earlier democratizers such as Poland have played in fostering political change across the post-Soviet landscape. Equally important, the "other side" of the equation is also considered. For all that Western powers can apply leverage to woo refractory states in a democratic direction, normative efforts may be counterbalanced by the exigencies of *realpolitik* or the competing ambitions of muscular regional powers (e.g., Russia, China). International non-governmental organizations such as the Belgrade-based *Otpor!*, which played a seminal role in the Serbian "Bulldozer Revolution" of 2000 and has since made a cottage industry of training political activists, are likewise allocated due scrutiny.

Consequently, while grounded in the particularities of the former Soviet Union's experiences, many of the issues grappled with herein have a direct bearing on general theoretical questions, addressing such perennial hot-topic issues as the effectiveness of exogenous democracy promotion, the power of learning by example, and the significance of mass-based protest strategies as opposed to elite pacting for enacting political transformations.

Potential readers, however, should be aware this is an expressly qualitative effort, the physical format of which, though admirable for its breadth of coverage, truncates detailed inquiry. Most country profiles come in at under twenty pages, inclusive of notes and references. And as is probably unavoidable in a finished product the result of so many hands, a degree of unevenness related to both the clarity and comprehensiveness of analysis

is occasionally discernible between chapters, though the vast majority of them are incisive and cogent.

In conclusion, if the volume is approached as a succinct overview of a very complicated series of events (and non-events) in the post-Soviet space, it is eminently readable and provides a much-needed summary of recent political developments. Seen in such a light, this becomes an edifying collection of country studies that has much to recommend it.

George Soroka, *Harvard University*

**Tamara Petkevich.** ***Memoir of a Gulag Actress*****.** Y. Klots and R. Ufberg, trans. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2010. xiv, 481 pp. Glossary. Index. $35.00, cloth.

Spanning four decades Tamara Petkevich's memoirs offer a gripping account of the Gulag and the long-term effects it had on those who survived their sentences. The book is skillfully divided into thirteen chapters, each of which ends with a dramatic episode in the author's life.

The story begins with a chapter describing Petkevich's childhood. Her father joined the Bolshevik party in 1918 and, in the 1920s, worked for the Gold Trust. He was later sent as an activist to organize the collectivization of agriculture in some particularly recalcitrant regions. Petkevich argues that his experiences then, as well as his earlier exposure to the brutal fighting of the Civil War, marked him and made him abusive towards his family. Despite her father's behaviour, Petkevich loved him, a fact which became clear to her when he was arrested in November 1937.

Chapter 2 opens with Petkevich considering leaving school early as the family needs money and resisting pressure from the Komsomol to denounce her father. As she waits in line outside a Leningrad prison for news of him, Petkevich meets Erik, the man who will become her first husband. After a brief stint in the English Department at the Institute of Foreign Languages, where she gathers a close circle of friends, Petkevich leaves for Frunze to marry Erik, who has been exiled there with his family. Her unhappiness with that decision, as well as the hostile reception she receives from Erik's family, is outlined in the following chapter. It also deals with the deaths of Petkevich's mother and sister from starvation in besieged Leningrad.

Petkevich's own arrest is described in chapter 4. She is confused by the preposterous questions posed by her NKVD interrogators, although it does become clear that she has been under surveillance for a number of years and that one of her close friends is an informant. In a first, but certainly not last, instance Petkevich is saved by her extremely good looks. Her investigator claims to fall in love with her, sends her packages in jail, and tries to improve her conditions of imprisonment. The chapter ends with her being sentenced to seven years in the Gulag; Erik receives a ten-year sentence at the same time.

The following chapter outlines her first experiences in labour camp. Two features mark her narrative as different from many other survivor memoirs: she includes a vivid description of a gang rape (p. 174) and she makes no effort to form relationships with her fellow prisoners. Friendships with others do not sustain her at this point, and nor does her marriage; she discovers that her husband is living with the female director of his camp's medical unit. The chapter ends with Petkevich tearing up Erik's letters as she prepares to be transported to a northern camp.

At her new camp, Petkevich falls ill. She begins a sexual relationship with the doctor who treats her but, while she feels indebted to him for her survival, she does not love him.

Two significant changes occur, however: work with a theatre ensemble collective (TEC) and motherhood. Both shape the rest of Petkevich's life, and hence the remainder of the book. The first offers her work that she enjoys, a kind of surrogate family constructed from fellow TEC members, and eventually a loving relationship with Kolya (whom she considers her husband). Motherhood, on the other hand, gives Petkevich both joy and terrible heartache. In light of a new decree that says children born in the Gulag must be sent to free orphanages once they reach one year of age, Petkevich allows her son Yuri's father to take the child. He eventually raises the boy with his mistress. As the book shows in detail, the pair go to great lengths to thwart Petkevich's efforts to remain part of the child's life or to regain custody of him once she is released. Petkevich struggles to fit into Yuri's life since the child loves the parents who stole him away from her. Ultimately, in a story that must have been common to many Gulag survivors, Petkevich is not able to get Yuri back and the two never bridge the distance that separates them.

As the final chapters of the book also reveal, the Gulag continues to impinge upon all aspects of Petkevich's life after her release. She struggles for years to find jobs and housing. She is fired from at least one position because her desire to maintain contact with her friends in the TEC (both those still in camps and those who have been freed) and her relationship with Kolya make her suspect. Difficult reunions with her surviving younger sister, as well as with the friends from her teenage years, do not offer much emotional solace either. Kolya, who might have been exposed to radiation in a German concentration camp, dies from tuberculosis of the throat glands before he is released from the Soviet Gulag. Petkevich is able to claim his body and arrange for its burial. Over the next two decades, Petkevich settles into a relationship with another former TEC member and eventually moves back to Leningrad. The book ends with her visiting Kolya's grave after twenty-two years. Although Petkevich finds the camps that once dominated the landscape are now deserted, her book proves that their impact cannot be erased as easily. Moreover, the story of her life, with its haunting tale of opportunities and relationships spoiled by the touch of the Gulag, stays with the reader for a long time as well.

Alison Rowley, *Concordia University*

**Hilary Pilkington, Elena Omel'chenko, and Al'bina Garifzianova. *Russia's Skinheads: Exploring and Rethinking Subcultural Lives*.** Routledge Contemporary Russia and Eastern Europe Series. London and NY: Routledge, 2010. 304 pp. Illustrations. Index. Bibliography. $150.00, cloth.

This is a thorough and sensitive ethnographic study of a community of self-identified skinheads in the north-western Russian city of Vorkuta by a team of three sociologists. Hilary Pilkington, Elena Omel'chenko, and Al'bina Garifzianova share the writing, as they shared the fieldwork, undertaken mostly in 2006 and 2007. The collaborative approach works well in both instances. The shared writing, especially, gives the book the feel of being a conversation (albeit a professionally sophisticated one) among three co-researchers. For this reason and others, *Russia's Skinheads* is valuable not only for its careful examination of the under-studied world of the Russian ultra-nationalist youth subculture, but also for what it has to say about the theory and practice of contemporary urban ethnology more generally, especially collaborative fieldwork.

In chapter 1, the introduction, Pilkington gives a brief history of skinhead (a noun which, I learned from this book, qualifies as an "ism" without the suffix *ism*) from its origins in 1960s England. She also stakes out clearly defined theoretical territory, situating

the authors' stance within the field of subcultural studies, especially the work of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at Birmingham University. Crucial to the book's approach in this regard is a shift (or expansion) of emphasis from "global" influences on the formation of subcultures—politics, economics, world affairs, and such—to local factors. The authors "propose that subcultural choices be understood within broader cultural strategies whose development is shaped by territorial, class, gender and ethnic locations, available opportunities, access to informational resources and individual cultural interests" (p. 75), and define their approach as "one that considers both the global, or universal, factors driving the increasingly widespread appeal to subcultural resources among young people and the particular, local characteristics of subcultural solidarity" (p. 76).

The subsequent chapters deal directly, and self-reflexively, with the fieldwork done by the authors. The second chapter establishes the geographical and historical context in which the youths observed have grown up and live: the city of Vorkuta, defined largely by its extreme climate and its history as a frontier mining settlement and "island" in the Gulag archipelago. Chapter 3 introduces the respondents, their general worldviews and life situations, and especially the evolving relationships among them. The schism that occurred in the group over issues of loyalty and authority is a compelling narrative in its own right, but also allows Omel'chenko (the author of the chapter) to offer some more general conclusions about the role of trust and camaraderie among youth groups, in particular groups based substantially on a shared ideological commitment. Chapter 4 continues the focus on the local in the formation of the Vorkuta skinhead community, examining the cultural preferences and practices of the main group, including music and sports. These two chapters in particular make the book a useful contribution to the study of contemporary Russian youth in general, especially youth living outside the over-examined confines of Moscow and St. Petersburg.

The middle four (of twelve) chapters deal with the ideology and ideologically inspired activities of skinheads in Vorkuta, partially in the larger context of the Russian ultra-nationalist and (Russian and global) white-supremacist (including fascist) movements. As such, these chapters would likely be of most interest to students and scholars of skinheads more generally, as well as to those wishing to learn more about anti-Semitic and other racist beliefs among contemporary Russian youth. Chapter 5, in particular, goes into some detail to position the Vorkuta youths within the larger phenomenon of post-Soviet Russian right-wing extremism, and also to situate them relative to one another among the group's clearly varied approaches to skinhead ideas. Chapter 6 builds on the previous chapter by examining how the skinheads consciously seek to act out their ideas (such action being, in their eyes, a key difference between skinheads and "everyday racists"). Here Pilkington examines the xenophobia of the group in word and deed, cataloguing racist and other xenophobic statements by respondents and describing their advocacy and use of violence against or intimidation of non-Russians. The final two chapters of the section examine skinhead performativity and the role of masculinity and "homosociality" in the group's activities.

The book concludes with four chapters detailing the challenges presented by doing collaborative fieldwork, as well as the personal (emotional and physical) risk to which scholars expose themselves when attempting to study an avowedly aggressive and xenophobic subculture from the inside. Overall this book offers something of interest to specialists and non-specialists alike: it is impeccably well-informed theoretically and methodologically, but also engagingly and sensitively written, with a sense of narrative. As

such, it represents a valuable model for future ethnographic studies of youth culture, and by no means only in Russia.

Seth Graham, *University College London*

**Philip Pomper. *Lenin's Brother: The Origins of the October Revolution*.** New York: W. W. Norton, 2010. xxvi, 276 pp. Illustrations. Notes. Select bibliography. Index. $24.95, cloth.

This well-written and absorbing monograph tells the story of a small group of students at St. Petersburg University who called themselves the "Terrorist Faction of the People's Will." Their attempt to kill Tsar Alexander III on 1 March 1887—a symbolic date, since it marked the sixth anniversary of the successful assassination of his father, Alexander II, by the People's Will—failed miserably. The bomb throwers were rounded up by the police before they could carry out their plan. Subsequently, five of them, including Alexander Ulyanov—Lenin's older brother—were found guilty by a closed Senate tribunal and hanged on 8 May 1887.

Who was, then, this new recruit to the cause of revolutionary terror? Alexander Ulyanov was not the most obvious candidate for this high-stakes game. He was a shy, sensitive, ascetic, and introverted young man who graduated from the Simbirsk gymnasium with the gold medal in May 1883. He inherited from his parents a remarkable work ethic and an acute sense of duty to his homeland. A serious student for whom books and laboratory assuaged a profound love of learning and an enthusiast, like his father, of the natural sciences (zoology, in particular)—an interest he later pursued at St. Petersburg University—he read extensively the writings of D. Pisarev and P. Lavrov, as well as the novels of F. Dostoevsky. His conversion to terrorism, Pomper argues, came in November 1886, in the wake of a police intervention that blocked access to the Volkovo Cemetery to demonstrators who wanted to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the death of the literary critic Nikolai Dobrolyubov. Though Ulyanov admired Marxism, "he did not think that an ethical revolutionary could idly sit by while capitalism did its work" (p. 145). Actually, like so many young men and women of his generation, he embraced populism wholeheartedly. As a *narodnik*, he naturally believed that, once enlightened, the vast majority of peasants would bring socialism to Russia—an objective, though, that could be achieved only through terrorism. Indeed, Ulyanov argued more than once that it was ethical to be a terrorist—a reasoning that satisfied his emotional need to help victims of the autocracy and, more importantly, to give history a decisive push. The problem—and their youthful naïveté prevented these terrorists from becoming aware of such a harsh reality—is that history provides very few examples of a liberal constitution extracted by means of dynamite. Nor did they really understand the fundamental incompatibility (or is it rather immorality?) between the willingness to kill others and, at the same time, to sacrifice their own lives for a noble revolutionary ideal. Nevertheless, Ulyanov firmly believed that history would not condemn those who, like him, acted according to their convictions and their consciences; *au contraire*, for such an idealist, martyrdom for the cause became an axiom of revolutionary morality.

Pomper does a fine job of introducing the general context within which these careless, reckless, and suicidal youths operated—from the different ideologies (nihilism, populism, Marxism, and small-deeds liberalism) that influenced the Russian revolutionary movement in the second half of the nineteenth century to Alexander III's reactionary regime, exemplified by the new university charter of 1884 that tightened state control over

institutions of higher learning. Arguably, his most interesting chapter—"Plotters"—is the one where he gives short, but vivid biographical sketches of the main conspirators (S. Nikonov, P. Shevyrev, J. Lukashevich, and V. Osipanov) and, simultaneously, ventures boldly into the psychodynamics of terrorist groups. My only quibble is Pomper's somewhat gratuitous assertion that Lenin, the other and much more famous member of the Ulyanov family, was "the most important revolutionary of the twentieth century" (p. xxiii). More convincing, it seems, is the link that the author establishes between the tragic ending of his brother at the hands of the tsarist authorities and Lenin's passionate desire to avenge his premature death.

J.-Guy Lalande, *St. Francis Xavier University*

**Anna Porter.** ***The Ghosts of Europe: Journeys Through Central Europe's Troubled Past and Uncertain Future*****.** Toronto: Douglas & McIntyre, 2010. 310 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. $34.95, cloth.

In *The Ghosts of Europe*, Anna Porter presents a comprehensive overview of twentieth-century Central European history through the lens of a Hungarian émigré returning "home" after having settled in Canada in 1969.

Porter argues that between 1946 and 1989, Western historians, journalists, and politicians tended to ignore the region when discussing Europe. With the rise of communist satellite states in the late 1940s, these lands behind the Iron Curtain were dismissed, creating what she describes as an "unfathomable chasm" and a dichotomy of "us" and "them" (p. 1). After having experimented with old and new judiciaries, "shock therapy," economic reform, and changes to social programs, Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, and Hungarians came to the conclusion that they were not, in fact, part of the East; instead they embraced a new geopolitical identity—that of Central Europeans. With the fall of communism in 1989, these nationalities co-opted what Porter identifies as a new vocabulary: open society, civil society, restructuring, and a return to Europe (p. 4). She convincingly argues that the region was successful in reforming its stagnant economies and implementing its own democratic institutions, while ameliorating the standard of living of its citizens. This initial post-communist achievement came with a "price tag," however, as a significant portion of the new economic and political power-players "emerged from the old *nomenklatura*," meaning they were the communist-era elites and their heirs (p. 5).

Porter effectively illustrates that the Marxist notions of "peaceful coexistence" between the area's ethnolingual groups and a common front against Western society aided in suppressing historical rivalries between Central Europe's nation-states. With communism's demise, old inter-ethnic rivalries again demonstrated that the region was "a messenger not only of freedom and tolerance but also of hatred and intolerance" (p. 7). One example that permeates each nation's collective historical memory is the Holocaust. Under communism, Central Europeans were not permitted to properly examine their role in the mass extermination of millions of Jews, Slavs, Roma, and others. Communist ideology viewed the victims of Auschwitz and other death camps not as Jews, but rather as Germans, Poles, Hungarians, or French (p. 6). After 1989, each nation-state was forced to come to terms with its role in the Second World War. The concept of "collective guilt" remains a controversial one as old inter-ethnic rivalries remain intact. Porter argues that resentment of what the Jews endured during the Holocaust continues to incite differing views on the "Jews' place in the order of suffering" since each nation wishes to identify and measure its own victimization on the same level (p. 6). In visiting, for example, the House of Terror

Museum in Budapest, Porter notes that of the museum's twenty rooms, only two and half recount stories of the fascist Arrow Cross's tenure at the helm of Hungary (1944–1945) (p. 217). According to Porter, Hungarians today have yet to fully confront their part in the Holocaust.

In June 2008, the Senate of the Czech Republic adopted the Prague Declaration on European Conscience and Communism. This document states that "societies that neglect the past have no future" (p. 133). The Declaration acknowledges that many of perpetrators of communist crimes have yet to be held accountable. During four decades of communist rule in Central Europe, many Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, and Poles took part in clandestine activities; sometimes they were co-opted by each state's security apparatus, while in other instances, they were willing collaborators. Porter illustrates that for every opponent of the communist system who was willing to be black-listed, thousands more remained silent. Most members of the communist-era judiciary, who sentenced resisters to prison, were still sitting after 1989. What the Prague Declaration failed to address is how punishment and compensation for communist-era crimes will be administered (p. 133).

Although Porter divides her book into individual chapters—one for each of the aforementioned nation-states—she concludes her work with a chapter dedicated to "Outcasts, Émigrés, and Exiles." Intellectuals are an important example of the dichotomy between passive complicity and direct opposition to communism. Porter gives short biographical accounts of some of the region's prominent writers and poets including Václav Havel and Adam Michnik, both of whom did not leave home despite imprisonment and the banning of their works. Others, such as Czesław Miłosz and Imre Kertész, elected to return, while Milan Kundera and Josef Škvorecky never came back to their homelands. Porter shows that intellectuals were often "easy victims of their Communist regimes' uniform way of thinking" (p. 269). They had to decide whether to flee oppression or become artists whose works followed the tenets of socialist realism.

Porter concludes her monograph by yearning for a Central Europe that will one day find its "moral responsibility to society," while also embracing historical memory and collective guilt in order to shape a future region with a moral foundation (p. 277). *The Ghosts of Europe* is an accessible and well-written monograph that will serve enthusiasts of Central European history and academic scholars alike.

Jan Raska, *University of Waterloo*

**Kirill Postoutenko. *Soviet Culture: Codes and Messages.*** Die Welt der Slaven, 41. München and Berlin: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2010. 166 pp. €38.00, cloth.

This volume is a collection of eleven essays which range across an intriguing array of subjects, including post-revolutionary representations of time and money, the performance of power in the rhetoric of Hitler, Stalin, and Roosevelt, and Maiakovskii's arguments with Georgii Shengeli over versification. The essays are written in English, German, and Russian, implying a reader who shares the author's linguistic, as well as intellectual flexibility.

The author acknowledges the diversity of the volume's contents in his preface, but argues persuasively for the application of poetic analysis to non-literary texts, including political discourse, and so to extend the field of poetics, overcoming "the indifference of political and historical studies to communicative reality" (p. 2). This bringing together of politics and poetics is reflected in the author's focus on official and highly politicized Soviet culture. While it is clear that the volume is designed to span the poetics of politics,

and the politics of poetics (p. 1), it is less clear precisely how communication theory has been used to provide a link between the various essays, as is stated at the start of the preface. The reader is left wanting to know more about how the essays relate to one another, and to the volume's title.

The essays do, however, fall into particular groups, beginning with two explorations of political discourse in totalitarian societies: the first produces interesting information about group social identities in Russia, Germany, and Switzerland between 1900 and 1950, based on the use of first-person pronouns in book titles; the second analyzes the rhetoric of Hitler, Stalin, and Roosevelt, and newspaper reports of their activities, to show how performance of leadership is expressed by and in relation to each one. This is followed by three essays on money and two on time with a focus on how these were conceptualized and represented in Soviet culture. The frame of reference here is extremely wide, taking in Plato, sixteenth-century German Anabaptist revolutionaries, and the art of René Magritte. The concluding four essays deal with literary texts by Maksim Gor'kii, Vladimir Maiakovskii, and Nikolai Agnivtsev, though the theme of money is central to the essay on Gor'kii and crops up again in the essay entitled "Maiakovskii Against Futurism." Of these four, the account of the polemics between Maiakovskii and Georgii Shengeli is the most convincingly argued, presented as a twentieth-century reprise of eighteenth-century disputes between Trediakovskii and Lomonosov.

This collection offers a stimulating set of essays in which the author shows he is at home exploring the non-literary uses of literary codes and demonstrating the political resonance within literary texts. There are, however, some distracting errors in some of the essays published in English, and evidence elsewhere that the proofs were not checked as thoroughly as they deserved to be. On occasion, it can feel as though the mass of minute detail that has been accumulated through painstaking research risks overwhelming the reader, particularly if s/he is unfamiliar with the material under discussion. These reservations aside, it is a volume which raises interesting questions and identifies productive areas for further investigation.

Katharine Hodgson, *University of Exeter*

**Anita Prażmowska. *Poland: A Modern History*.** New York and London: I.B. Tauris, 2010. xii, 306 pp. Illustrations. Bibliography. Index. $55.00, cloth.

Anita Prażmowska is among the most distinguished historians of Poland in the English-speaking world, a professor of international history at the London School of Economics, and a specialist on twentieth-century Poland. The term "modern" can cover a vast period, but Prażmowska begins with 1900 and ends with Poland's admission to the European Union in 2003. The book's structure is chronological and its periodization is typical, but her analysis is far from orthodox: Prażmowska challenges our assumptions and undermines myths. This critique is not piecemeal, for it arises from the tension between nationalism and democracy that no Polish leader in the twentieth century was able to resolve and which the author uses as her axis in discussing the twentieth century. This approach forces the author to confront many established beliefs. She points out that the Second Republic failed not because of the 1921 constitution or its parliamentary form of government, but because the largest party—Dmowski's National Democrats—had no interest in democracy while Piłsudski was openly contemptuous of democratic politics. The cult of Piłsudski may be in full bloom in today's Poland, but Prażmowska considers his rule to have been a "squalid dictatorship," typical of interwar Eastern Europe and unable to meet the challenge of

building a modern state. By 1939, Poland was held in the grip of corrupt militarists with no distinct political beliefs, notable only for their anti-Semitism and the mismanagement that left Poland unprepared for World War II. After the Second Republic fell, no one considered returning to the Piłsudski constitution.

In her discussion of People's Poland, Prażmowska also singles out the communists' aim to modernize Poland's economy and social structure. Although she does not flinch from viewing the Polish communist government as imposed by Moscow, she also demonstrates how sensitive Moscow was to the Polish situation, not only in 1956, but also in 1970 and even 1981 while underlining Gorbachev's importance in 1989. It has long been recognized that Poland was different from other communist states, but Prażmowska details how, after 1956, Poland was distinguished by its state-supported—but not collectivized—agriculture, a restive working class, a distinct private sector, an imposing Roman Catholic Church, and continuous contact with the West. The decades of communist rule are not only marked by Polish difference, but also by the party's internal decay and increasing irrelevance to Polish life. The author cleverly links Solidarity's rise to earlier demands for workers' management of factories. After 1989, the discussion is based on a government-by-government analysis and it may be difficult for some readers to see the larger patterns of issues. Throughout the volume, politics take up most of the author's attention, but she also discusses economic developments and social life. Cultural and educational developments are neglected while intellectual life is discussed only in relation to politics, but the Roman Catholic Church's role is well described and she does not shy away from noting the strength of anti-Semitism over the century.

A second edition might address some infelicities in this challenging synthesis. The author frequently puts the cart before the horse. For instance, she discusses the second partition (1793) before noting the constitution of 3 May 1791. As a result of this practice, the short discussion of the November Uprising of 1830 is confusing as are the events of 1905. Prażmowska is clearly most comfortable in the twentieth century for the few errors are in the background. Russia did not "claim" Białystok in 1807 (p. 11), rather Napoleon pushed the district on Alexander I. Nor did Polish citizens enjoy the same rights as other Russian subjects after 1905 for St. Petersburg never implemented the 1903 criminal code in its Polish provinces. There are small errors that could also be corrected in a second edition: Chopin's first name is not "Frederik" (p. 15) and Galicia won autonomy from Vienna by 1868 (not 1860 on p. 34). The maps also need revision.

Today's democratic Third Republic rests on a long, complex history. Its remarkable success since 1989 as well as the challenges it continues to face have their roots in the conflict between nationalism and democracy that Prażmowska outlines for the twentieth century. This synthesis reflects her broad expertise and leads to a stimulating analysis of twentieth-century Poland. This volume serves as a worthy replacement of Mieczysław Dziewanowski's long outmoded *Poland in the Twentieth Century* (New York, 1977) and will be useful not only for general readers, but also as an aid in stimulating undergraduates and supporting professors as they explore Poland's development.

John Stanley, *Toronto*

**Robert Reid and Joe Andrew, eds. *Turgenev: Art, Ideology and Legacy*.** Studies in Slavic Literature and Poetics, 56. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010. xii, 343 pp. Illustrations. $108.00, paper.

A fascinating, new portrait of Ivan Turgenev emerges from the collection of sixteen essays by twenty authors recently published under the title *Turgenev: Art, Ideology and Legacy*. Thoughtfully divided into the three sections identified in its title, the volume is prefaced by Robert Reid's introductory article, which addresses these results of a 2006 conference on the writer at Oxford, UK. An umbrella theme of virtually all the essays contained in this work is an attempt to place Turgenev on equal footing with his two giant rivals Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky, who often have overshadowed him on the world stage of great Russian writers.

To achieve this goal, Greta Slobin's "Turgenev Finds a Home in Russia and Abroad," which probably should have been transferred from the Ideology section to the Legacy one, persuasively demonstrates that Turgenev more than his rivals became a model for the great émigré writers of the next generation (Siren/Nabokov, Remizov, and Bunin), who, like Turgenev, lived a major portion of their lives abroad but never lost contact with the motherland or the mother tongue. Slobin further argues that it is no coincidence that Bunin received the first Nobel Prize for a Russian writer precisely on the fiftieth (jubilee) anniversary of Turgenev's death (1933).

Also in the Legacy section one can find two enlightening articles (Otto Boele's "After Death, the Movie 1915—Ivan Turgenev, Evgenii Bauer and the Aesthetics of Morbidity" and Rachel Morley's "Performing Femininity in an Age of Change: Evgenii Bauer, Ivan Turgenev and the Legend of Evlaliia Kadmina"), which connect Turgenev's mystical final work *Klara Milich* (1883) with the symbolist cinema of pioneer filmmaker Evgenii Bauer. In different ways, Boele and Morley show that the filmmaker and the writer shared the tendency to depict the powerful woman figure dominating her inept male counterpart. While Morley emphasizes Bauer's use of the close-up device that brings the female into the central position of the film, Boele transforms Klara into a new Tatyana (Pushkin), by having her write a letter to Aratov and stealing the major role from him just as Tatyana does from Onegin.

The Legacy section is further enriched by two essays that treat the idea of literary influence. Justin Weir ("Turgenev as Institution: *Sketches from a Hunter's Album* in Tolstoy's Early Aesthetics") suggests that even though Tolstoy thought the sketches were the best thing Turgenev ever wrote, he still rejected Turgenev's device of "framing" for his own stories. Kevin Windle and Rosh Ireland ("Turgenev's Antipodean Echoes: Robert Dessaix and his Russian Mentor") show that Turgenev's voice reached all the way to Australia, a cultural backwater for Dessaix. Dessaix's move from there to the United Kingdom announces a parallel with Turgenev's move from his origins in the cultural wasteland of Russia to his circulating among the writers of France and Germany.

The Legacy section concludes with two works. Henrietta Mondry's "A Wrong Kind of Love—A Teacher of Sex on a Teacher of Love: Vasilii Rozanov on Turgenev and Viardot" revisits that mysterious relationship between Turgenev and opera Singer Pauline Viardot, as seen through the eyes of the unorthodox critic Vasilii Rozanov. At first Rozanov respected Turgenev as one whose example taught us how to love amorously but then Rozanov decided that this liaison was no more than a platonic relationship which caused the critic to lose his respect for the writer as a model lover. Olga Soboleva and Pogos Saiadian, in their essay "Ivan Sergeev, *Fathers and Sons*: The Phenomenon of the

Nouveau-Russian Novel," study the classic novel as a rewritten modern work, hoping that the contemporary version will ultimately draw the reader back to the canonical text.

Among the works of the Ideology section, Elena Katz fills a void in Turgenev studies by addressing the topic of "Turgenev and the Jewish Question." She decides that the writer was primarily a "bystander" on this topic, despite the fact that in one story, "The End of Chertopkhanov," he actually individualizes a Jewish character and retreats from the ethnic stereotypes that were so common in the works of Gogol and Dostoyevsky.

Richard Freeborn's article "No Smoke Without a Bit of Fire" calls into question the notion that Turgenev was weak in character. Quite the contrary, his late novel *Smoke* provides a courageous attack on the Russian nobility's way of life, advocating the lifestyle of Western Europe. Similarly, Kathryn Ambrose, in "Turgenev's Representation of the 'New People,'" proposes that the writer's overwhelming pessimism—and not his lack of courage—was responsible for the unsatisfactory way that Bazarov turned out.

Finally, the essays grouped into the Art section focus primarily on the idea of the writer's poetics. In "Hidden Spaces in Turgenev's Short Prose: What They Conceal and What They Show" Irene Masing-Delic analyzes the style of Turgenev's often neglected early stories (such as "Three Encounters," "Faust," and others), exploring their stylistic complexity and modernity and thus disputing the accepted view that his style was simple and a product of his time. Steven Brett Shaklan, in "'So Many Foreign and Useless Words!': Ivan Turgenev's Poetics of Negation," seeks to connect Turgenev's narrative to the Sentimental and Romantic literary tradition, underscoring the author's own added touch of an individualized narrator or ironic manipulation of the text. In "Turgenev-*Bricoleur:* Observations on the World of Turgenev's *Sketches from a Hunter's Album*," Joost Van Baak sees the opposition of culture and nature at the heart of Turgenev's stylistics. Levi Strauss's principle of "bricolage" is related to culture but it simply does not fit when applied to nature. Sander Brouwer, in "First Love, but not First Lover: Turgenev's Poetics of Unoriginality," introduces the reader to an epilogue to "First Love" that is present in the German and French editions of the work but that is absent in the Russian version. He shows how the epilogue creates ambiguities, to which Turgenev did not wish to subject his Russian reader. In "Speak Softly and Carry a Big Stick: The Language of Things in *Fathers and Sons*," Erica Siegel shows that insignificant things are the most significant component of the novel, and she specifically cites Pavel Petrovich's walking cane, which becomes a symbol of a violent exchange about to occur between Bazarov and Arkadii's uncle. Finally, in "The Description of the Appearance of Characters in Turgenev's Novels (in particular *Fathers and Sons*)," Willem G. Weststeijn demonstrates how devices such as repetition and contrast help shape a narrative strategy that Turgenev employs for many purposes.

In summary, *Turgenev: Art, Ideology and Legacy* presents an impressive view of Turgenev from the twenty-first century. Instead of old-fashioned, he comes off as modern to the core. Moreover, he can compete with his rivals Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky in many areas of evaluation, and his love for Viardot prefigures the complexity of contemporary human relationships. This tome affirms that Turgenev will go forward with us into the future and will no longer be perceived as a writer stuck in the Victorian past.

Harold Schefski, *California State University-Long Beach*

**Serge Rolet.** ***Léonide Andréïev : l'angoisse à l'œuvre. Dix-huit études.*** Préface de Jean-Claude Lanne. Specimina Slavica Lugdunensia, 3. Lyon : Centre d'études slaves André Lirondelle, Université Jean Moulin Lyon 3, 2010. vii, 292 p. Illustrations. Bibliographie. Index nominum. 20.00 €, livre broché.

Avec *Léonide Andréïev : l'angoisse à l'œuvre*, Serge Rolet signe le premier ouvrage en langue française sur cet écrivain qui fut considéré, en son temps, comme l'un des plus importants de Russie. Comment expliquer cette reconnaissance tardive d'Andréïev dans l'univers des slavistes français? Dès l'étude inaugurale, « L'Âge d'argent et ses repoussoirs », qui est peut-être aussi la plus intéressante des dix-huit qui composent ce volume, Rolet propose une piste de réponse à cette question. Tombé en disgrâce dans son pays après la révolution bolchévique, guère plus apprécié dans les milieux de l'émigration, Andréïev aurait en outre eu le malheur de se faire reléguer rétrospectivement dans la catégorie des « repoussoirs » de l'Âge d'argent, avec les autres prosateurs ainsi que, de manière générale, tous les auteurs qui, au début du vingtième siècle, « ont eu le tort de ne pas appartenir au courant symboliste » (p. 13). En effet, nous explique Rolet, si les symbolistes ont tenté de s'approprier l'Âge d'argent en rangeant promptement ceux qui ne faisaient pas partie de leur groupe dans le « sac » peu prestigieux de l'utilitarisme esthétique et de l'héritage populiste, les universitaires et historiens de la littérature non soviétiques ont complété leur travail en reprenant, « comme si elle s'imposait d'elle-même », leur vision qui n'avait pourtant « rien de neutre » (p. 17), et en traitant les Gorki, Andréïev et Bounine comme autant d'auteurs qui seraient passés à côté de l'histoire. À sa manière, ce livre qui, comme l'explique Jean-Claude Lanne dans sa préface, tâche de restituer à Andréïev la place qui était la sienne dans le paysage de l'Âge d'argent, a donc le mérite de proposer une autre lecture de l'histoire littéraire de cette période extraordinairement riche.

L'ouvrage de Rolet est composé d'études écrites entre 1989 et 2007, souvent en vue de colloques dont la thématique se reflète dans les sujets traités. Si, dans l'intérêt de l'unité d'ensemble de l'ouvrage, on peut remettre en question la décision de l'auteur de n'avoir modifié ces études que sur des points de détail, sans avoir éliminé toutes les redites et les références désormais hors contexte aux colloques pour lesquels elles ont été rédigées, on doit reconnaître que, dans la diversité des sujets abordés, ce livre offre une bonne introduction à l'œuvre d'Andréïev. Les cinq premières études ne portent pas spécifiquement sur l'écrivain, mais peuvent aider à remettre son œuvre en contexte en abordant notamment, outre la question de la composition du paysage littéraire à l'Âge d'argent, celles de l'héritage du populisme et des échos de la pensée nietzschéenne dans la prose de cette époque. Les autres études, qui abordent plus spécifiquement le travail d'Andréïev, se concentrent essentiellement sur les récits de la période allant de 1898 à 1908. « Bargamote et Garaska », « Le rire rouge », « Il en fut ainsi », « Éléazar » et « Judas Iscariote », qui furent écrits à cette époque, font tous l'objet d'articles séparés. Rolet s'arrête également sur le théâtre d'Andréïev, auquel sont consacrées deux études. La correspondance de l'écrivain avec Gorki, son journal et ses œuvres iconographiques sont aussi examinés brièvement.

Parmi les thèmes qui traversent le livre, revenant dans différentes études, celui des rapports qu'entretenait Andréïev avec son ami Maxime Gorki, auteur à qui Serge Rolet a déjà consacré une monographie, ressort tout particulièrement. L'étude numéro 14, intitulée « Qui est le Judas de Léonide Andréïev? », vient par exemple apporter un éclairage intéressant sur le récit « Judas Iscariote » en proposant de lire celui-ci en parallèle avec la

correspondance entre Andréïev et Gorki. À la lumière de cette correspondance, tout porte à croire, selon l'analyse qu'en fait Rolet, que ce texte qui porte sur la relation trouble entre Judas et le Christ résulte d'une tentative, de la part d'Andréïev, de transposer dans le récit sacré l'histoire de sa propre relation, tout aussi complexe et inégale, « faite d'affinités et de malentendus » (p. 195), avec son charismatique collègue.

Étant donné le rôle inaugural de cet ouvrage, on peut regretter que l'auteur n'ait pas jugé bon de faire précéder ses dix-huit études d'une introduction substantielle retraçant le parcours d'Andréïev et l'histoire de sa réception. Néanmoins, le choix de Rolet de se pencher sur cet auteur méconnu dans le monde francophone mérite d'être salué, et constitue un apport indéniable à la slavistique française.

Geneviève Cloutier, *Université du Québec à Montréal*

**Gabriella Safran. *Wandering Soul:* The Dybbuk*'s Creator, S. An-sky*.** Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2010. 353 pp. Illustrations. Notes. Index. $29.95, cloth.

It was the rare Russian-Jewish intellectual of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries who lived only one life, or had only one name. Gifted individuals like Moyshe-Leyb Lilienblum (1843–1910), Ahad Ha'Am (1856–1927), or Abraham Cahan (1860–1951) were creative writers, political agitators, journalists, and public advocates (and occasionally severe critics) of the Jewish people, in two or three languages and at least as many countries. But Sholem An-sky (1863–1920), arguably, outdid them all. An-sky's lasting fame owes to *Der dibek, oder tsvishn tsvey veltn* [The Dybbuk, or Between Two Worlds, 1914–1919], his drama of a young Hasidic woman's possession by the spirit of her dead beloved. But An-sky was also known by half a dozen personal and professional names, and was a gifted prose writer in Russian and Yiddish, a journalist, ethnographer, wartime aid worker, Socialist Revolutionary, and member of the Petrograd City Duma and Constituent Assembly. He was remarkably adept in all of these capacities; too adept, perhaps, to settle on any one. An-sky's many roles, peregrinations, and searching redefinitions of what it meant to be a responsible intellectual and artist in this period are elucidated in Gabriella Safran's outstanding biography, *Wandering Soul*. The first of its kind in any language, Safran's study is the standard against which all others will be judged. Lucid, engaging, prodigious in its collection and analysis of widely-scattered sources in Russian, Yiddish, Hebrew, and French, the book is accessible to the lay reader and abundantly rewarding for scholars of Russian-Jewish culture and history. It is an essential source for the study of An-sky's life and work.

The two illuminate each other, and one of the great pleasures of this book is the brilliant insights its biographical perspective offers on familiar texts like *Der dibek*, or the satirical Haskole spy-story *Pod maskoi* [Behind a Mask, 1909], which An-sky translated into Yiddish as *Unter a maske*. Taking as given that An-sky, like every Jewish subject of the Russian empire, lived "between two worlds," Safran explores instead the ventriloquism and shape-shifting of *der dibek*: An-sky himself. He had a protean capacity to integrate himself into wildly disparate worlds as both observer and participant. There is Donetsk coal basin An-sky, admiring the ethnic Russian and Ukrainian miners and quietly recording their songs and stories. There is illegal-resident-in-Petersburg An-sky, staking his claim in Russian literary and revolutionary circles. There is exile-in-Paris An-sky, assisting the Populist theorist Pyotr Lavrov (1823–1900) and marvelling at the malignant power of the press during the Dreyfus trials. There is An-sky the political animal: long-time Socialist Revolutionary, late sympathizer with Zionism, and an endangered representative of the city

of Mogilev to the Constituent Assembly, violently disbanded by the Bolsheviks in 1918. And, of course, there is An-sky the Yiddish writer and ethnographer of the Jews of the Pale of Settlement, whose measurelessly rich folk traditions became the object of An-sky's most concerted and fruitful attentions.

Safran isolates several consistent themes in An-sky's life and work: the dangerous, destabilizing, utterly thrilling and ultimately defining nature of "the word," and the access it offers to other worlds and other selves; the redemptive power of intellectual and artistic work, which is never divorced from the turbulent life that gives rise to it; and, above all, what Safran calls the revolutionary potential of the past.

This last is not simply the familiar quest to locate proto-socialist elements in the Russian peasant's communal structures (although this interested An-sky), but in An-sky's belief that folk culture could become the basis for a modern, revolutionary culture. The specific details of *how* this would work are sketchy—they always are for utopian revolutionary programs. But the direct result of An-sky's belief in the continuing importance of a folk culture often written off as embarrassing and atavistic was his spearheading Jewish ethnographic expeditions to the Pale of Settlement and Polish Galicia in 1912 and 1913. These netted a collection of thousands of songs, stories, material objects, and photographs of a Jewish people and culture that would shortly be put under grave threat in the First World War, and all but obliterated in the Second. What An-sky and his team saved—and which he himself continued to collect as best he could, until his death in 1920—could not, of course, stay death or time, which "destroys everything, wears days and centuries into dust, separates, narrows, diminishes, gnaws away, until it turns everything into nothingness" (p. 288). But in Gabriella Safran's superb biography, An-sky is himself marvelously and briefly returned to us with all of his energy, complexity, and enduring faith in the capacity of the word to restore and to renew.

Barbara Henry, *University of Washington*

**Annemarie H. Sammartino. *The Impossible Border: Germany and the East, 1914–1922*.** Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2010. xiv, 232 pp. Illustrations. Maps. Bibliography. Index. $39.95, cloth.

Teaching the years 1918–1922 can be far more challenging than the Great War itself. Much like 1945–1949, the fallout after 1918 involved migrations, border shifts, revolutions, and regime changes which transformed Central and Eastern Europe on a weekly basis. To keep students from confusion, instructors can be tempted to simplify the period by summarizing the Sparticist revolution and Kapp *Putsch* before moving on to the rise of Nazism. Sammartino offers a new way to make sense of the era: she centres her narrative on Weimar's contentious eastern border and the massive migrations crossing it. With rare eloquence, she shows how evolving German dreams of eastward expansion and fears of the shrunken interwar frontier's permeability prompted "both *völkisch* nationalists and communists" to seek "to forge a new relationship among the state, its citizens, and its frontiers" (p. 16). Extremists' frustrations at their own failure to realize utopian schemes in the East, as well as continued immigration by ethnic and political refugees, radicalized notions about borders and belonging which steadily destabilized the Republic. Only by comprehending German conceptions about eastern frontiers and peoples can one begin to understand how and why, after suffering devastating losses in the First World War, Germans chose to go to war again.

While specialists might skim over the contextual narrative in the introduction and first chapter, students and non-specialists will find it invaluable. After discussing the rise of nationalism, increasing state control of migration, German ethnic definitions of citizenship, and wartime colonization plans for the East, Sammartino emphasizes the context of displacement in which her story takes place: "over 1 million former German citizens from France and Poland, tens of thousands of ethnic Germans and *Ostjuden* (Eastern European Jews), and hundreds of thousands of Russians found their way to German soil. Meanwhile tens of thousands of Germans dreamed of leaving what they viewed as the morally and financially bankrupt German state for new settlements in the Baltics and the heart of Soviet Russia" (p. 2). The conjunction of postwar upheaval and a truncated state with limited resources prompted a "crisis of sovereignty," in which war, defeat, revolution, and population mobility were understood in tandem, rather than in isolation to one another. The remaining chapters assess specific migrations as case studies. Here the findings are as valuable for the specialist as they are for the student.

While contributing to the growing literature on post-1918 nationality conflict and contested identity [Struve/Ther, eds., *Die Grenzen der Nationen* (2002); Struve, ed., *Oberschlesien nach dem ersten Weltkrieg* (2003)], in many respects this book serves as a sequel to Vejas Liulevicius's *War Land on the Eastern Front* (2000). Much as Liulevicius built on the work of Fritz Fischer to examine how German soldiers perceived Eastern Europe during World War I, Sammartino builds on Liulevicius to analyze what happened to "war land" after the war. In her second and third chapters, she reveals that vainglorious German schemes for the East continued despite truncated and contracting frontiers after Versailles. In Livonia and Courland, German *Freikorps* soldiers planned to assume Latvian citizenship and build an ascendant German state. In the USSR, German socialists arrived to build a communist paradise. Whether on the far right or far left, both groups felt frustration with defeated Germany and placed their utopian hopes in the East. Both returned home embittered, unable to pin their hopes on anything at all, ultimately destabilizing the relationship between nation, state, and territory.

Later chapters explore how eastern refugees prompted debates about inclusion and exclusion in the nation. Hundreds of thousands of ethnic Germans from Poland encouraged the *völkisch* idea that national membership transcended the boundaries of the Republic. They became "living symbols of the injustices meted out by Versailles and the suffering of the German nation as a whole," benefitted from social aid and citizenship, and became rallying points for irredentism (pp. 96–97). Non-German immigrants (especially *Ostjuden*) were treated poorly and exhibited as proof that Weimar could not control its frontiers. Parliamentary debates on citizenship tied into the migrations and made citizenship policy "a battleground on which German officials debated the meaning of the German nation" (p. 161).

*The Impossible Border* has achieved an often impossible balance: it is both useful for specialists and accessible for general readers. However, while the book's attention rightly remained on the East, Alsace-Lorraine and Schleswig might have received more than cursory notice. How did German perceptions of other borderlands compare? What did it mean for the "impossible border" when the 1925 Locarno treaties recognized Germany's western losses but not those in the East? Such examples could have strengthened the author's desire to showcase the East as the most important arena for the interwar German crisis of sovereignty. Sammartino also might have discussed whether her findings apply to other interwar states. It is hard not to think about the case of Poland when she outlines the German crisis of sovereignty: "What people belonged to a nation? Who belonged to a state? How were boundaries determined? And what was the relationship of a state to those

of a different ideological persuasion or national identification within its frontiers?" (p. 3) These critiques do not undercut Sammartino's argument—they point to its potential for broader applicability and importance. In the end, this book restores to prominence nationalities questions at a pivotal moment and the displaced humanity for whom the Great War continued long after 1918.

Andrew Demshuk, *University of Alabama-Birmingham*

**Gudrun Schilk. *Der Pfad. Narrative Perspektivierung aus textlinguistischer Sicht.*** Arbeiten und Texte zur Slavistik, 89. Munich and Berlin: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2010. 222 pp. Bibliography. €30.00, paper.

The book comprises a doctoral dissertation from Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Germany. The main objective of the study is to determine how the unfolding of a text is influenced by changes in narrative perspective (*Perspektivwechsel*), which are seen as pathways through the narrative network. This objective is inspired by the concept of *path* as suggested in Mieke Bal's narratological analysis. The major part of the book is devoted to a catalogue of characteristics that are of importance for the composition of narrative texts. They are illustrated by examples from some thirty-five short stories, mainly by Nabokov and Pelevin, and also by Bunin.

The catalogue of characteristics is situated within a framework based on Wolf Schmid's model of narrative, which comprises four levels, viz. events (*Geschehen*), story (*Geschichte*), narrative (*Erzählung*), and presentation (*Präsentation*). Three processes lead from level to level: choice (*Auswahl*) leads from events to story; composition (*Komposition*) from story to narrative; and verbalization (*Verbalisierung*) from narrative to presentation. These processes involve five parameters of perspectivization: perceptive, ideological, spatial, temporal, and linguistic. The resulting narrative text is seen as consisting of a character text (*die Personenrede*, p. 53ff.) and a narrator text (*die Erzählerrede*, p. 67ff.), with additional mixed types termed *Textinterferenz* (p. 165ff.)

In Schilk's study, Schmid's model is modified and amplified by ideas taken from various other models and theories, e.g., a sixth psychological parameter of perspectivization (Uspensky), a single spatio-temporal parameter instead of separate spatial and temporal parameters (Bakhtin), and the functions of language (Jakobson). Graphical features (chapters, paragraphs, and signs of omission) are also treated as means of indicating changes in narrative perspective (p. 34ff.). The book ends with a chapter on framing (connections between the beginning and the end of a story [p. 186ff.]) and different types of pathways through stories from the title onwards (p. 193ff.). These pathways are termed "narrative text *parcours*" (*Erzähltextparcours*). Three types are named and commented upon briefly, viz. reliable path-signing (*zuverlässige Pfadweisung*, p. 194ff.), deceptive path-signing (*trügerische Pfadweisung*, p. 198ff.) and a path into the uncertain (*Pfad ins Ungewisse*, p. 202).

Although the author undertakes to demonstrate how all the chosen characteristics have a bearing on changes of narrative perspective by referring to the short stories of Nabokov, Pelevin, and Bunin, it is precisely this empirical endeavour that makes reading the book an arduous task. Schilk's eclectic approach, seen already in her compilation of the catalogue of characteristics, comes to the fore even more strongly in her analysis, which is limited to isolated passages from the stories, first one, then another. How the individual results of analysis relate to the concept of path—one of the main questions of the book—is either mentioned only in passing or not commented upon at all. This omission must be

emphasized in view of the author's stated aim of comparing the stories with one another in order to identify literary-historical properties related to their different narrative structures (pp. 14–15).

Another problem concerns the way in which concepts from text linguistics are used in the analysis. Terms such as cohesion and coherence which relate to the level of micro-structure are mentioned occasionally, while aspects of macro-structure are not even considered. Of course, these areas raise thorny questions for all text linguists and narratologists, and it is a challenge for a doctoral dissertation to present more than a mere repetition of well-known concepts.

Additionally, it must be asked how the author can be sure that her view of the texts coincides with that of the reader to whom she refers. The dissertation offers no reflections on the problem of the text receiver or addressee. No matter how sophisticated the preceding analysis might have been, simply referring to a certain structure does not make it legitimate to posit a certain textual function as an objective fact; consider the dispute about Iser's concept of *der implizite Leser*. Perhaps the dissertation would have succeeded better in this crucial respect if Jakobson's poetic function had been taken for what it is: a foundation for the literary narrative text as a whole, and not a single textual surface-phenomenon which manifests itself here and there, as it is understood by the author (pp. 108–109).

The dissertation is at its best when using a single analytical framework on the level of narrative micro-structure. However, when all the aspects of literary theory which it names but does not explicitly link with its analytical framework are taken into consideration, what it really shows is that understanding the nature of the literary text, viewed as a text *parcours* (a term not to be forgotten!), remains a challenge for narrative scholarship.

Martina Björklund and Gerhard Schildberg-Schroth, *Åbo Akademi University*

**Timothy Snyder.** ***Bloodlands: Europe Between Hitler and Stalin*****.** New York: Basic Books, 2010. xix, 524 pp. Bibliography. Notes. Index. US $29.95/Cdn 35.95, cloth.

Western literature on Hitler and Stalin frequently puts these two mass murderers on the same footing and equates their social philosophies. *Bloodlands: Europe Between Hitler and Stalin* differs significantly from this approach. Snyder meticulously documents how hate directed at races (Hitler) and classes (Stalin) brought Europe to its most painful period. He shows that even though the methods of the two men were often similar, their targets were different. Starvation, gassing, labour camp exploitation, social and national cleansing, forced migrations, and other forms of killing were fully utilized by Nazis and Stalinists in the name of their utopian "victories" over a period of twelve years. Snyder also examines the temporary success of Hitler and Stalin beyond their personal power struggles: the economies of both countries prospered for a little while when both dictators singlehandedly determined who would prosper and who would go hungry or die.

Snyder's monograph contains a clearly narrated text which, together with his competent scholarly apparatuses (in particular, a vast, relevant bibliography), makes this an excellent work. His research includes personal and public documents, eyewitness accounts as well as literary and cultural examples. Each chapter is well structured. The narration provides an unbroken tale about an individual seed of hate artfully planted by Hitler and Stalin and how it was nurtured by their followers, in addition to bystanders around the world. Indeed, Hitler's single, initial action—assigning responsibility for Germany's misfortune to the entire German-Jewish community—served his purpose amazingly well. The Nazi propaganda machine added the world-wide Jewish population to the country's

own Jews, naming all of them as culpable for German suffering. A terrifying German majority chose to believe this dangerous model of dehumanization. At the same time, Stalin utilized the concept of cleansing by implementing his own murderous policies towards the Soviet people. The Stalinist regime stigmatized "capitalists" and well-to-do farmers (*kulaks*). Here, too, the policies were supported by a startling majority. Both historical phenomena have been carefully described as a prelude to the main point of the monograph: Snyder's analysis of the fate of fourteen million Europeans civilians.

These millions who were massacred, mostly by the Nazis and to a lesser extent by the Soviets, have been given collective and individual voices in Snyder's study. The dead were caught by the Nazi and Stalinist regimes in the Bloodlands of the Baltic States, Belarus, central Poland, western Russia, Hungary, Romania, and Ukraine. Most were native to these lands; they were children, women, the elderly, and the infirm. The events that took their lives are examined in terms of political origin, structure, and the individual actions of Nazism and Stalinism. The material is broken into chronological periods: the five years of the regimes' establishment (1933–1938); the dictatorships of Hitler and Stalin, during the joint occupation of Poland, the western parts of Belarus and Ukraine (1939–1941); World War II (1939–1945); and the Soviet-German War (1941–1945). These chapters are academically sound, historically correct, and philosophically innovative.

A valuable contribution of this monograph is the author's fresh interpretation and application of facts, as he balances the personal and collective responsibility of anyone actively or passively involved in actions that were taken in the Bloodlands. Snyder warns of the dangers in falsifying information in order to prove one's "righteousness." He argues that no one has a monopoly in a disaster except the murdered victims, for the reason that "The dead are remembered, but the dead do not remember" (p. 402). Snyder's work strongly denies any unconfirmed claims for either victory or victimhood. In these terms, figures of one to two million civilian Germans killed during the World War II and/or postwar exile, deportations, and other Allied actions are bluntly rejected as unfounded and exaggerated. Certainly, any distortion brings only disservice to the sufferers, and history has a tendency to fire back at fabrications. The recent example of the doubling and tripling of the victims of the Ukrainian *Holodomor* is as telling as the Belarusian exaggeration of the number of people murdered by Nazis (one third of its population instead of the real number of one fifth). Snyder knowingly puts Belarus back on the European map during World War II in a separate chapter and by underlining the following: "Belarus was the center of Soviet-Nazi confrontation, and no country endured more hardship under German occupation" (p. 404). Other victims included the primarily nomadic Kazakhs who lost half their population during Soviet collectivization. Once again, the sober account of the Soviet-imposed famine against the Kazakh nation is argued with an understanding of local history, socioeconomics, and the aims of Stalinism. The same respectful treatment is given to the *Holodomor* in Ukraine.

Snyder also deliberates on the fate of the Jews in Europe, in particular Germany and the Bloodlands right before, during, and after World War II, because 5.4 million Jews were among the victims of the Nazis. The author considers the "Final Solution" to be the only fully realized plan of Hitler's utopian/dystopian economic and racial plans. Snyder underlines that the 165,000 German Jews, who were hunted by Hitler, were not just annihilated by the people they shared culture and language with but, more importantly, served as convenient scapegoats, and set a precedent for the escalating violence meted out to Slavic peoples and other Europeans. In addition, the fixing of a tally for the murdered

Jews encouraged other groups to exaggerate the numbers of their dead in a pseudo-patriotic attempt to attract attention to their own victimhood.

In the concluding chapter, "Humanity," the author examines a "disproportion of theory to knowledge" due to the fact that "Europe's epoch of mass killing" is presently both "over-theorized and misunderstood" (p. 383). Thus, his work is a successful attempt to correct many points. Snyder utilizes later findings and revelations, arguing against the identical treatment of Hitler's and Stalin's regimes by such authoritative scholars and cultural icons as V. Grossman, H. Arendt, and T. Todorov. Snyder also proposes that individuals and their respective nations study Stalinism and Nazism separately to discover their specific ways of dehumanizing European civilization. For example, he considers Auschwitz to be a telling but overused symbol of "evil" and its "banality" because we know the story of Nazi concentration camps from survivors. The tale of the fourteen million victims from the Bloodlands is a different matter, according to the author. Recognizing this could be a first step in understanding hate for what it is: a perfect tool in the hands of individuals like Hitler, Stalin, and their followers.

Snyder's work fully demonstrates his ability to simultaneously pierce the reader's intellect and soul. His research and fundamental rethinking of key issues is a powerful warning against many faults of the past, from dictatorship to the power of hate and to generalizations about "otherness." Therefore the book is highly recommended to both academics and members of the general public.

Zina Gimpelevich, *University of Waterloo*

**Klaus Steinke and Xhelal Ylli. *Die slavischen Minderheiten in Albanien (SMA) 3. Teil: Gora*.** Slavistische Beiträge, 474. Munich and Berlin: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2010. 260 pp. €32.00, paper.

This is the third volume of the series *Die slavischen Minderheiten in Albanien (SMA)*. The first two volumes treated the dialects of the Prespa region of southeastern Albania and the dialects of the Golo Brdo region north of Lake Ohrid, and this volume deals with the part of the region of Gora that is located in Albania. The region of Gora itself is a larger entity, divided between Kosovo and Albania. Previous studies have focused on the part of Gora located in Kosovo; this book is the first study of comparable length and depth of the dialect spoken in Albania. The population of the region is primarily composed of Muslims who speak a variety of Slavic transitional between Serbian and Macedonian. The fieldwork underlying this book took place in several phases between 2002 and 2009.

Approximately the first thirty pages of the book are devoted to an overview of the history of Gora and include a section on the demographic structure of the population (1.1), as well as a detailed section dealing with ethnic identity and religion in Gora (1.2). This is particularly valuable since the ethnic identity of Slavic-speaking Muslims is a sensitive topic; Steinke and Ylli provide a balanced overview of these issues. Particularly notable in this regard is the abundance of unadapted quotations from their consultants explaining their views on the Islamization of Gora and surviving Christian cultural practices (p. 24), their use of endonyms like *goranski* and *našinski* (pp. 26–27), and the ultimate origin of the Slavic population of Gora (pp. 31–32).

Section 1.4 of the book contains a structural description of the dialect of Gora, starting with an overview of previous linguistic research (pp. 37–42), followed by detailed presentations of the phonology (pp. 43–67) and morphology (pp. 68–166). The phonology section provides a thorough overview of the historical changes in segmental phonology that

have taken place in Gora, and the morphology section likewise provides a thorough formal description of every significant morphological category in the dialect. Each point in the description is illustrated by copious data; even in the phonology section, relevant pieces of data are provided in a full context with the consultant indicated.

Section 2 of the book (pp. 167–223) is entirely composed of texts from each of the nine villages studied. Background information for each village is provided, as well as basic information about the consultants. The topic matter of the texts varies, with a particular focus on local history and material culture. Forty-two of the texts are also provided in .mp3 format on an accompanying compact disc. The sound files are extremely useful, although the recordings themselves are somewhat quiet, necessitating headphones or dedicated speakers.

Throughout the book, attention is paid to Albanian influence on the Slavic dialect of Gora. In all transcribed examples, Albanian words are clearly indicated. This is very helpful for researchers working on code-switching and lexical borrowing. A glossary of Albanian words that occur in the Gora data is given (pp. 225–230), which is of crucial importance for making the data accessible to an audience trained in Slavic linguistics.

This volume is a valuable resource for any researcher studying Balkan linguistics. It is the first description of its kind of a dialect that is of unique interest to researchers due to its geographical location and grammatical features. The book would be valuable for this reason alone, but it should also be mentioned that the authors do a particularly commendable job of providing ample data to illustrate every point made in the grammatical outline and providing thorough background information about the consultants and sources.

Andrew Dombrowski, *University of Chicago*

**Nicholas S. Terras. *Russian Intellectual and Cultural History from the Ninth to the Twenty-First Century.*** Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2010. v, 432 pp. Illustrations. Bibliography. Index. $129.95, cloth.

The scope of this book is very ambitious, both in regard to the time period and the topics surveyed. But the coverage is superficial and marred by numerous errors. Professor Nicholas S. Terras provides brief summaries of the physical and geographic settings, the religious background (with emphasis on the "symphony" between the Orthodox Church and the state), and the foundations of tsarist autocracy. A large part of the book is devoted to a literary/cultural survey that includes synopses of the life and works of Pushkin, Lermontov, Belinsky, Gogol, Goncharov, Turgenev, Dostoevsky, and Tolstoy, among others. The author interjects a number of entertaining anecdotal impressions as well as apercus of the Russian mind.

Unfortunately, there is nothing substantial in these pages that has not been said better and more completely elsewhere: specifically in Nicholas V. Riasanovsky's classic *A History of Russia* and James Billington's *The Icon and the Axe,* as well as in Orlando Figes's more recent *Natasha's Dance.* And it takes a certain insouciance to have one's undergraduate lecture notes published as a book. Even the great V. O. Kliuchevskii's *Kurs russkoi istorii* was published not at his initiative but at that of his students and other admirers, as was also the case with Martin Malia's *Comprendre la Revolution russe.*

Terras's stated purpose in writing this book is to explain to a North American audience how the major events in Russia's history contributed to the formation of the Russian view of the world (p. 2). He argues that Russia is a distinct civilization with its own non-Western path of development, but one no less dedicated to universal principles of

truth and justice (p. 5). In his view, Russian Orthodoxy accounts for the key difference with the West and is superior because of its emphasis upon compassion and charity. This is not a novel assertion; the Slavophiles, Dostoevsky, and Herzen all said more or less the same thing a century and a half ago.

Terras's discussion of the Soviet period ignores recent and even not so recent scholarship, notably the revisionist historiography that dominated Russian studies in North America from the 1960s onward. He oversimplifies complex issues such as the succession and success of Stalin, which he ascribes largely to the workings of Party discipline (p. 299); and he makes facile comparisons, such as between Lenin's and Stalin's rationalization for mass murders and Raskolnikov's "identical" (p. 210) act in *Crime and Punishment*.

While Terras's heavy—almost exclusive—reliance on English-language and secondary sources is not surprising, some of his choices are. For example, he makes extensive use of out-dated popular histories by Ian Grey, Henri Troyat, B. H. Sumner, and Robert and Suzanne Massie while omitting important recent scholarship. His bias for Canadian authors, while perhaps understandable, compounds the arbitrariness of his selections. Terras cites Riasanovsky's textbook often and at great length but ignores his monograph on Slavophilism. He writes about nineteenth-century Russian intellectual history without using what is arguably the best book on the subject in any language, Martin Malia's biography of Alexander Herzen. The only mention of the numerous and influential publications of Richard Pipes—certainly the leading conservative authority on Lenin and the 1917 Revolution—is his early book on Karamzin. There are many such anomalies.

In terms of the book's stated purpose and concerns, perhaps the most egregious error occurs in Terras's discussion of Official Nationality. Here he confounds the order of the doctrine's three pillars and puts Autocracy ahead of Orthodoxy (p. 237). It is the sort of mistake one might expect of a student, but not from someone writing a cultural history of Russia. Adding to the confusion, Terras calls the third pillar of Official Nationality "Populism" (rather than Nationality) "in the sense of support for ordinary people" (p. 237). That would come as quite a shock to S. S. Uvarov, the designer of the policy, as well as to its contemporary opponents. Nationality is better understood as an organic extension of Orthodoxy and Autocracy that encompassed the concept of Russian nationhood.

Finally, the price of the book is exorbitant, especially in light of the poor production quality.

N.G.O. Pereira, *Dalhousie University*

**Robert Bruce Ware and Enver Kisriev. *Dagestan: Russian Hegemony and Islamic Resistance in the North Caucasus.*** Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, 2010. 251 pp. Maps. Notes. Appendices. Index. $94.95, cloth. $34.95, paper.

When Imam Shamil was carted away from his homeland to St. Petersburg, the defeated leader of North Caucasus's anti-Russian resistance probably marvelled at the vastness of the Russian Empire and wondered why the sovereigns of that enormous land would try so hard, and shed so much blood, to dispossess him of control of a few remote mountainous villages. In 1859, it took no less than two months of travel to reach St. Petersburg from the mountains of the Caucasus. The travel time has shrunk considerably since then, but the political and cultural gap between Russia and Shamil's homeland is as vast today as ever.

Robert Bruce Ware and Enver Kisriev do an excellent job of analyzing Dagestan's politics and social order. Parallels with the 19th-century resistance are not explicitly made, but the reader will notice clear similarities between the current and past resistance

movements in the Caucasus. Some two centuries ago it was the Islamic Sufi Muridist movement that challenged both Russian imperial advances into the region, and the established social order in Dagestan, and elsewhere in North Caucasus. Today, it is Salafis or Wahhabis who perform the same role, with the Sufi establishment now being part of the Russian-sponsored social order.

Dagestan, the largest and the most populous of Russia's North Caucasian republics, is a fascinating universe of some fourteen (and many more according to some counts) micro-nations, most commonly identified both in Russia and the West as "ethnic groups." The current volume offers an excellent exploration of intricate relationships among these groups during last three decades or so, but it does not venture into theoretical explorations of what "ethnic" is and/or means. The authors have a good reason for this, as in the English-language social science literature "ethnic" and "ethnicity" could mean whatever individual authors want them to, while in the post-Soviet Russian analysis "ethnic group" is often located within a hierarchy of the historical evolution of national identity and economic modes of production, affixed somewhere around "nationalities" (*narodnost'*), and with "nations" occupying the highest rank.

Whether in the literature of both languages, "ethnic" carries rather unwelcome racist undertones. Contemporary Russian ethnic chauvinism certainly owes much to such perceptions of all things Dagestani (and Caucasian, in general). Ware and Kisriev do not explore the scandalous racial mistreatment and prejudice the peoples of Dagestan and other minorities have to endure in today's Russia. Radical Salafis are only happy to reciprocate this hatred that permeates all aspects of political life in the historically Islamic countries of North Caucasus. Dagestan, which enjoyed a measure of stability and democratic governance during the most difficult and tumultuous period of transition in the 1990s, has been slowly degenerating into a medieval mess of unceasing low-scale violence since 2004, when the Russian federal government took away political self-governance of its "autonomous" republics. Dagestan was one of Moscow's first targets in this campaign. For Makhachkala this process began in April 2000. Now the leaders of the "autonomous" republic are not elected locally through a rather unique process of political negotiations and compromise, but are appointed by Moscow.

Moscow's encroachment over Dagestan's nascent democratic institutions has produced potentially explosive and devastating effects for the micro-nations who in this country have co-existed peacefully for many centuries. Now Dagestan is divided among many semi-autonomous *jamaats* (or *djamaats*), *raions*, and feudal fiefdoms—all governed by local strongmen. Some of these entities have initiated shooting of "witches" (local women suspected of non-Islamic practices) and dogs (unclean animals), have proclaimed sharia (with justice dispensed by imams), and claim to be following Salafi guidelines of "true Islam." Others persecute Salafis and their sympathizers as Dagestan's worst enemies, and frequently abuse or even kill them. Corruption is rampant; terrorist attacks or attempts are common. Federal police and security services routinely kidnap, torture, and kill suspected "Wahhabis" (the common term for Salafi followers in Russia), and the Russian federal police itself is a regular target of all kinds of assaults by insurgents, terrorists, and common criminals.

Ware and Kisriev argue that Dagestan has been committed to the membership in the Russian Federation, and unlike other autonomous entities within Russia, most notably Chechnya, has not embarked on a drive of violent or peaceful secession from Russia. Dagestan's eager participation in the federal elections and equally keen zeal to rig the local vote to help Dagestani-friendly officials in Moscow confirm this fact. This certainly was

true until President Putin initiated "re-centralization" policies, and has been the case for the Dagestani elite ever since the collapse of the Soviet Union. However, this loyalty may be due to Moscow's heavy subsidies of Dagestan—around 80 percent of local economy depends on federal subsidies. The chief benefactors of them are local mini-oligarchs, who in their persons combine both economic and political levers of control. The number of government officials has doubled since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, and the elites are never shy about displaying luxury while the majority of Dagestani residents struggle with chronic poverty and near economic collapse.

Such a disparity is bound to drive a greater wedge in Dagestani society, this time not necessarily following historical *jamaat* lines. Rather, the growing discrepancy between "haves" and "have nots" very much helps the cause of the local Salafis, who loudly and successfully deplore the excesses of the rich, and corrupting policies of "the infidels." The Salafis, who are always intimate with religious and political demagoguery, are gaining presence and influence in Dagestan (and elsewhere in North Caucasus). They are the biggest single threat to both Dagestan's unity, its culture and traditions, and Moscow's control of the region.

Ware and Kisriev demonstrate intricate knowledge and great insight into the political, cultural, and religious rivalries of Dagestan. The book is not without errors, but these happily deal with locales outside of its subject matter—for instance, the authors mistakenly include Abkhazia and South Ossetia into the geopolitical realm of North Caucasus, and claim that Georgians (and Armenians) have been historically privileged by Russian power in the Caucasus. This is a strange claim, considering the fact that Georgians (and Chechens) have fought the hardest to undermine Russian power in the region. A couple of pages could have used more copy-editing, but overall the volume is well-written and argued. This book is highly recommended for both the students of the Caucasus and Russian politics, as well as a general audience and scholars from other fields, except those specializing in "ethnic politics," lest they be further confused and baffled by the rich ethno-linguistic landscape of Dagestan.

Lasha Tchantouridzé, *Norwich University*

**Claudia Woldt.** ***Sprache als Wert – Werte in der Sprache. Untersuchungen zu Bewertungen von Sprache allgemein und Komposita im Besonderen in der tschechischen Sprachgeschichte.*** Munich and Berlin: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2010. 621 pp. Tables. Notes. Bibliography. Appendices. Index. €48.00, cloth.

The Czech language abounds with topics that invite evaluations from linguists. The many inflectional variants, the co-existence of varieties, and the tradition of linguistic engineering are some of the topics that Czech linguists evaluate, perhaps unconsciously at times, in works about their mother tongue.

The main merit of Claudia Woldt's book *Language as Value – Values in Language* (originally a dissertation written at the Technical University of Dresden) is that the author draws attention to such evaluations and develops and applies a methodology for analyzing them. Her methodology is introduced in chapter 1, where she discusses and defines central terms such as *value*, *linguistic evaluation*, *evaluative actions*, and *evaluative means*. In addition to lexical means of evaluation (adjectives, adverbs, nouns, and verbs), she rightly includes metaphors and stylistic means. This thorough and well-organized chapter is relevant to all scholars interested in linguistic evaluation. Chapter 2 presents detailed analyses of Czech language criticism—that is to say, of efforts to evaluate language (or parts of it) and/or of efforts to change it. The central notions addressed are purism,

language culture, and standard language. These notions correspond with the periods under scrutiny: the National Revival (ca. 1790–1850), the interwar period, and the period after 1990. To analyze evaluations in these periods, Woldt compiles a corpus of texts from linguistic monographs, journals, advisory works for the general public, dictionaries, and grammars. In chapter 3 she focuses on how linguists evaluate Czech compounds, a sound choice for close analysis. The focus on compounds continues in chapter 4, where she analyzes evaluative compounds in recent dictionaries and in the Czech National Corpus. This short chapter differs from the preceding chapters in that its focus concerns word-formation proper, rather than linguists' metalinguistic activities.

In the conclusion Woldt sums up a set of interesting findings based on her meticulous analyses. One significant conclusion is that the object of evaluation changes. For the revivalists and the interwar purists, the object of evaluation is the Czech language in general; for the interwar functional and structural linguists of the Prague Linguistic Circle and for modern-day linguists, the object of evaluation is the standard language, though they increasingly direct their attention towards non-standard varieties also. In modern works, Woldt concludes, linguistic evaluation hardly ever occurs. It is the interwar purists who most frequently engage in linguistic evaluation, while the two linguistic giants of the Revival, Josef Dobrovský and Josef Jungmann, evaluate only infrequently. On the subject of compounds, Woldt documents that negative evaluation begins and largely ends with the purists. Linguists today evaluate compounds only in advisory works for the general public.

Woldt further documents a profound difference between the values advocated by revivalists and purists on the one hand, and those advocated by adherents of the Prague School and modern-day linguists on the other. She sums up their respective values as "rational according to values" and "rational according to purpose." Their means differ, too. For example, revivalists and purists use metaphors related to nature, humankind, spirituality, and music, whereas members of the Prague School and modern-day linguists prefer constructivist metaphors. Although differences exist between the value hierarchies of these last two groups, they are minor compared with the differences separating them from the revivalists and the purists. One of the few constants in Czech linguistic evaluation is that in all periods hybrid compounds (such as *autoškola* and *kávomlýnek)* are among the most frequent targets of evaluation.

The book includes thirty-one informative tables, an appendix with samples of texts, and a second appendix that lists the evaluative means applied in analysis. The useful index of topics might have been supplemented by an index of persons mentioned in the book.

One criticism of the book might be that it portrays linguistic evaluation as something exterior to language, something that linguists do in their professional writings; it does not portray linguistic evaluation as an everyday activity of language users (Roman Jakobson's "meta-linguistic function"). Only a few contributions by what Woldt terms "linguistic laymen" (two contributors to the contemporary Czech language debate) are included in the analyses, and they are explicitly excluded from the conclusion. Summaries in English and Czech might have further increased the usefulness of this truly original and stimulating book.

Karen Gammelgaard, *University of Oslo*

**Robert Zangenfeind.** ***Das Bedeutung-Text-Modell: Wörterbuch und Grammatik einer integralen Sprachbeschreibung.*** Slavistische Beiträge, 471. Munich and Berlin: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2010. 190 pp. Indices. Abbreviations. Glossary. Bibliography. €24.00, paper.

This book represents the first part of Zangenfeind's doctoral dissertation, which was written at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Munich under the guidance of Professor Ulrich Schweier and defended there in 2009. The work is inspired by and indeed based four-square on the principles and theories of the Moscow Semantic School, especially on the contributions of Igor' Aleksandrovich Mel'chuk and Iurii Derenikovich Apresian. (Strangely, Aleksandr Konstantinovich Zholkovskii, equally as important as Mel'chuk and Apresian in the foundation of the School, is not singled out for any special attention by Zangenfeind.) The Moscow Semantic School was established in the 1960s and became influential in the Soviet Union, but its significance waned with the departure of Mel'chuk for Canada in 1976 and Zholkovskii for the USA in 1979. It came into being following work done by a group of gifted Soviet linguists on machine translation, and the close link with computer analysis of language has been maintained up to the present day. Its principal theory is the Meaning-Text Theory (MTT), which is based on the notion that language expresses meaning by texts. Central to the MTT is the view that the lexicon is all-important and that semantic issues are of more importance than syntax. It is only when one has a complete description of a lexeme's properties and combinatorial possibilities that one can claim to know what that particular lexeme really means. It was in large measure the perceived deficiencies of traditional dictionaries, especially with respect to machine translation, that provided the impulse for the compilation of a much more complete dictionary under the editorship of Mel'chuk and Zholkovskii; a prototype—*Tolkovo-kombinatornyi slovar' sovremennogo russkogo iazyka* [An Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary of Modern Russian]—finally saw the light of day in 1984. Although the influence of the Moscow Semantic School is not what it once was, there are still many MTT enthusiasts around the world, who publish papers and hold conferences.

This, then, is the backdrop against which Zangenfeind sets his book, and it is the author's hope that his publication might resurrect, at least to some degree, the stature of the Moscow Semantic School by making its theories accessible to a wider audience, albeit in this case only to an audience able to read German.

The book comprises five chapters and various additional materials. Right at the end come three very useful sections: a glossary of the main terms relating to MTT, an index of key words, and an excellent bibliography.

Chapter 2 is devoted to dictionaries within the MTT framework. Here Zangenfeind explains that to achieve a complete entry for a lexeme, one must examine that lexeme from ten discrete points of view, called "zones," which range from the usual information found in traditional dictionaries through stylistic and semantic considerations, and on to idiomatic and encyclopedic information. It is clearly a mammoth task to compile such a dictionary, for just one entry takes a huge amount of time to complete, if indeed it ever can be deemed to be complete.

Chapter 3 is given over to grammar. Right at the beginning of the chapter (p. 90), Zangenfeind explains that the MTT grammar owes a lot to the French linguist Lucien Tesnière, and especially to his Dependency Grammar. Zangenfeind guides the reader carefully through its intricacies, but it is difficult material to follow and will take more than one reading to get to grips with.

Having discussed applications of the MTT in chapter 4, Zangenfeind ends his book with these words: "In conclusion I would like to hope that my depiction of the MTT and its

applicability to the German language will prove to be a useful contribution in bringing the MTT to the attention of a wider audience" (p. 166).

I can say that Zangenfeind has achieved his objective with this well-researched and scholarly book. The MTT is not for the faint of heart, but Zangenfeind's book will help encourage those hesitant to tackle so daunting a task.

John Dingley, *York University / University of Victoria*

**Birgit Beumers, ed. *Directory of World Cinema: Russia*.** Directory of World Cinema, 4. Bristol and Chicago: Intellect, 2011. 333 pp. Illustrations. $25.00, paper.

This volume is part of a larger project, The World Cinema Directory, which aims to provide an academic, peer-reviewed database for students and professors of film. Ultimately, the Directory plans to cover twenty-one different regions and to provide new printed volumes on each region every two years. In addition to the books, a free, updatable pre-print database is available online. The overall format for each printed volume is the same: a few introductory articles, including a feature on the "film of the year"; a few short pieces on key directors; several dozen film reviews grouped by genre; a list of recommended reading; a list of online resources; a "test your knowledge" quiz; and notes on the contributors.

As editor Birgit Beumers notes in her introduction to the Russia volume, categorizing Russian films by genre is an unusual approach, largely due to the influence of the Soviet film elite who privileged auteur films over genre cinema. In her excellent introductory essay, "What does *zhanr* mean in Russian," Dawn Seckler sets out the traditional conflict between auteur and genre cinema in Russo-Soviet film, tracing its beginnings as far back as the 1920s. Traditionally, the low-brow, commercial, and thus Western, nature of genre cinema has been juxtaposed to the high-brow, aesthetic nature of auteur cinema. Seckler argues that the privileging of auteur cinema is also fundamentally grounded in a resistance to Stalinist demands for genre. "The conventional narratives articulated via a socialist realist framework functioned as a type of censorship" and a "mechanism of political suppression" (p. 30). When such restrictions were lifted in the Thaw period, and ultimately eliminated after 1985, the "creative intelligentsia" embraced auteur cinema. In recent years, genre cinema has led to the economic revitalization of the film industry in Russia, but still remains largely ignored by Russian film critics who have yet to produce much in the way of genre scholarship.

Western scholars, however, have paid considerable attention to the question of genre in Russian cinema, and many of them are well represented in this volume, particularly in the introductions to the generic categories by which the film reviews are organized. Each of these introductory pieces traces the nature and significance of a particular genre over the course of the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries: Stephen M. Norris writes on Historical Film; Denise J. Youngblood on War Film; David Gillespie on Comedy and Musical Comedy; Otto Boele on Melodrama; Stephen Hutchings on Literary Adaptation; Seth Graham on Biopic; David MacFadyen on Action/Red Western; Alexander Prokhorov on Children's Films; Birgit Beumers on Animation; Jeremy Hicks on Documentary. Of course, several films cross generic boundaries and make multiple appearances; for example, *Chapaev* is mentioned in the sections on Historical, War, and Action Films. Rather than simply duplicating information, however, the authors provide different takes on the film based on their generic approach.

After each genre introduction, ten to fifteen representative films are presented in the form of film reviews. A brief paragraph-long plot synopsis is followed by a somewhat longer (300- to 600-word) critique of the film, which highlights the work's historical or filmic significance. Alongside the synopses and critiques, standard information about the film, including its country of origin, language, studio, director, screenplay, cinematographer, composer, duration, genre, cast, and year, is printed. The synopses are invariably clear and direct, and provide excellent reference points for students and teachers. The critiques do not attempt to be comprehensive, but instead highlight the interests of the individual reviewers. Read together, they demonstrate a multitude of possible approaches to Russian film.

While the film reviews and the genre descriptions form the heart of the volume, the directory also includes brief biographies of six central film directors: Evgenii Bauer (Mariya Boston); Sergei Eisenstein (Joan Neuberger); Dziga Vertov (Jeremy Hicks); Andrei Tarkovskii (Robert Bird); Nikita Mikhalkov (Birgit Beumers); and Aleksandr Sokurov (Robert Bird). These two-page essays provide basic biographical information, highlight central works, and place the individual directors in the larger context of Russian and world cinema. The authors do a remarkable job of providing coherent pictures of complicated figures in a very small space.

In addition to Seckler's essay, the volume's introductory section includes the "Film of the Year" feature (Mark Lipovetsky and Birgit Beumers), for which Vasilii Sigarev's *Wolfy* (2009) was selected; excerpts from a 2009 interview with Sigarev and Iana Troianova; a historical account of film production in Russia (Beumers); and a description of the Kinotavr film festival (Nancy Condee and Beumers). Each piece provides interesting information, but they do not fit together well, and their audiences are distinct. While Seckler's essay provides the necessary cultural context for a more general reader, the history of the Russian and Soviet film industry provides a vast number of names and dates without a larger context. Similarly, more attention to the overall significance of the Kinotavr festival and *Wolfy*'s place in contemporary Russian cinema would be helpful. The choice of *Wolfy* as film of the year is somewhat puzzling; while certainly an important film, it is not available with English subtitles, or even readily accessible in Russian through legal means. In a volume addressed to an English-language audience (the recommended reading is limited to English-language books), it is unfortunate that the featured film is largely unavailable.

The most frustrating and most easily remedied aspect of the volume, true of the series as a whole, is the lack of an index. In order to find a film review, readers must flip through each chronologically-ordered genre section. In order to take full advantage of this valuable volume, students and teachers need the ability to see quickly what films are reviewed and where.

Sarah Clovis Bishop, *Willamette University*

**Evgeny Dobrenko and Marina Balina, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Twentieth-Century Russian Literature.*** Cambridge Companions to Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. xxiv, 328 pp. Index. $29.99, paper.

*The Cambridge Companion to Twentieth-Century Russian Literature* is a welcome new addition to the *Cambridge Companions to Literature* series. For Evgeny Dobrenko (University of Sheffield) and Marina Balina (Illinois Wesleyan University) this is yet another result of a fruitful long-term scholarly collaboration—they earlier co-edited *Endquote: Sots-art Literature and Soviet Grand Style* (2000) and *Petrified Utopia:*

*Happiness Soviet Style* (2009). As the editors rightly assert in their introductory article, "the twentieth century [in Russian history] was an era of unprecedented, radical transformations—changes in social systems, political regimes, and economic structures" (p. xxii). Any serious attempt to justly reflect even a fraction of what has happened in the Russian literary process during that turbulent century in a single-volume compendium would present, beyond doubt, challenges to any compiler. The experience and knowledge of many fine contributors to the collection under review, however, seem to have made this near impossible task an obvious success.

*The Cambridge Companion to Twentieth-Century Russian Literature* opens with a useful chronology, covering the years 1893–2006. Since numerous attempts to succinctly present major hallmarks in the evolution of Russian and Soviet literatures have been made in the past, any observer will naturally pay more attention to the latest additions in this chronological table. With this in mind, the current reviewer found the coverage of post-Soviet literary history extremely well-balanced and, at the same time, nuanced enough: from the year of establishment of the leading journal *New Literary Review* (1992) and the publication of Vladimir Sorokin's *Roman* (1994) the authors' awareness extends to the foundation of the National Bestseller prize (2000) and attacks of the pro-Putin youth group "Moving Together" against the writers Sorokin and Pelevin two years later. In short, the chronology offers a broad contextual picture of the final decade of twentieth-century Russian literature and the socio-political events around it.

Fifteen chapters in this collection cover such diverse topics as poetry, prose, theatre, film, and literary policies and institutions in Russia and the former Soviet Union. Three separate articles deal with Russian poetry of three periods—the Silver Age, Revolution, and "Poetry after 1930." One wishes that the last chapter by Stephanie Sandler, a definite authority on the subject, was divided into at least two entries in order to allow equal attention to various developments of the ensuing seven decades (one such promising and understudied topic, only touched upon, is the poetry of the Russian diaspora of the last quarter of the twentieth century—Lev Losev, Dmitrii Bobyshev, Vladimir Gandelsman, as well as the generation of contemporary poets born in the 1960s and 1970s). Five articles in the volume are devoted to prose: works written between Symbolism and Realism; during the Bolshevik Revolution; and after Stalin. These chapters are complemented by two studies in genre, focusing on the Russian utopias and epic novels of the Soviet period. One essay in the collection specifically traces the transitory period of the post-Soviet literature from Realism to Postmodernism (Mark Lipovetsky) and another looks at Russian literature in exile, with a particularly fascinating comparative analysis of Nabokov's and Brodsky's linguistic versions of exile (David Bethea and Siggy Frank).

Finally, readers of *The Cambridge Companion to Twentieth-Century Russian Literature* will welcome Julian Graffy's overview of the screen adaptations of literature. Indeed, Russian cinema—itself as old as the span of the period under study—has witnessed a boom of screen versions of classic Russian novels, especially at the end of the millennium (*The Master and Margarita*, *The Idiot*, *A Hero of Our Time*, and *Doctor Zhivago*, to name just a few). Still, the limitations of a short survey chapter prevent the author from going into much detail when discussing the symbiotic relationship of literature and cinema, "these adversaries and allies" (p. 248), and for a reader it is an obvious pity.

Each chapter in the volume concludes with further reading suggestions; this feature will prove helpful to students as well as those interested in getting the real taste of Russian literature of the past century after trying this mouthwatering appetizer.

Yuri Leving, *Dalhousie University*

**Barbara Alpern Engel.** ***Breaking the Ties That Bound: The Politics of Marital Status in Late Imperial Russia*****.** Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011. xi, 282 pp. Illustrations. Appendices. Index. $39.95, cloth.

In *Breaking the Ties That Bound*, Barbara Engel reveals how unhappy wives' turn-of-the-twentieth-century petitions for marital separation impelled some of the autocracy's staunchest adherents, officials in the Imperial Chancellery, to act in ways that essentially undercut Russia's patriarchal order. Empowered to grant exceptions to the law that gave husbands control over their wives' internal passports, Chancellery personnel investigated petitioners' accounts of physical and emotional abuse, endorsing what amounted to—under certain circumstances—a woman's right to personal autonomy. As university-educated men influenced by ideas touting companionate marriages, officials in the Chancellery tended to be sympathetic to narratives that positioned some women as worthy of paternalistic solicitude. When Chancellery director Dmitrii Sipiagin, just three years prior to a stint as Minister of Internal Affairs that would be cut short by Socialist Revolutionary terrorism in 1902, argued that a peasant woman might grow "alienated" (p. 265) not only from village life but her husband, he signaled that times had changed indeed. As Engel ably shows, the Chancellery, navigating around the laws prohibiting divorce until a March 1914 ruling gave women control of their passports, proved a better bet than the liberal courts.

Engel attributes changing attitudes toward marriage to a variety of phenomena. Overall, patriarchal norms were breaking down in response to industrialization and urbanization, late nineteenth-century feminist and legal challenges, and the increasing popularity of "ideals of romantic choice" (p. 78). A sense that "despotism" (p. 57) marked patriarchal families was spreading not only among the nobility and intelligentsia but among merchants and members of the lower estates. Simultaneously, the shift toward wealth based on capital, rather than land, was eroding married women's earlier power over their property. Wives in well-heeled families, less likely to control cash dowries and excluded from the male culture of business and entrepreneurship, found themselves at their husbands' economic mercy.

Against this backdrop Engel examines the Chancellery's and its investigative teams' responses to women's petitions. Although she provides ample evidence that the cult of domesticity migrated to Russia, she also finds that officials did not judge women on how they fulfilled private-sphere expectations. More relevant to the Chancellery was male behaviour, seen increasingly through a lens that focused on self-restraint in the household. Officials expected upper-class men to check their violent impulses but perceived lower-class husbands as crossing the line only when they beat their wives "without cause" (p. 121). Yet officials changed these views too, becoming less disposed to blame female peasants and townswomen for their husbands' abuse. As for women's behaviour, initially considering female extramarital relations a threat to both private and public order, the Chancellery withheld passports from women deemed promiscuous. But by the mid 1890s, "officials became more inclined to discount a woman's postmarital sexual liaison […] if the liaison was monogamous or had subsequently ended" (p. 228). When it came to child custody, the Chancellery proved less amenable to "Western conceptions of appropriately gendered spheres" (p. 238) than members of Russia's judiciary. Although they were still susceptible to notions of a sexual double standard and prone to judge mothers more harshly for perceived moral transgressions, officials nevertheless flouted patriarchal traditions by displaying a "surprisingly progressive" (p. 235) willingness to place children with their mothers.

Engel detects a change in women's own attitudes as well. For example, expressions about the value of labour abounded in petitions across class lines. Sensitively parsing the petitioners' language, Engel reveals how women in Russia affirmed "self-hood and subjectivity" (p. 133) when they articulated their desire for economic independence. Engel also attests to women's growing invocation of their "right to love" (p. 201), a concept echoed in witness and police testimonies, and even in Chancellery decisions.

Since the 1970s Engel's work has helped shape our understanding of women, class, and gender in Russian history. *Breaking the Ties That Bound* is a superb addition to her impressive bibliography in the way it deepens our vision of state and society in the late Imperial period. Engel's reading of Chancellery petitions is nuanced and sensitive, grounded both in recent Russian and Western scholarship, and always with reference to comparative studies of Europe and the United States. Surprisingly absent in the petitions on which she focuses are references to same-sex relations; whether this reflects Engel's editorial decision, her petitioners' and Chancellery's investigators' blindness to homosexuality, or a strategic rhetorical silence is unclear. But this does not in any way detract from Engel's excellent book and its revelation that ideas central to the urbanizing and industrializing world affected not just the intelligentsia but other social groups and even the intelligentsia's enemies.

Laurie Bernstein, *Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey-Camden*

**Jehanne M. Gheith and Katherine R. Jolluck. *Gulag Voices: Oral Histories of Soviet Incarceration and Exile.*** Studies in Oral History. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. xix, 256 pp. Maps. Illustrations. Index. $30.00, paper. $90.00, cloth.

Although the "Gulag" is traditionally associated with Soviet labour camps, it was, in fact, far greater in scope, additionally encompassing special (later labour) settlements, labour colonies, and prisons. There is a wealth of memoir literature on the labour camps, written almost exclusively by members of the intelligentsia. Far more rare are voices from the other islands of the Gulag and from the ordinary people who constituted the majority of its population.

*Gulag Voices* represents the rare exception. Editors Jehanne Gheith and Katherine Jolluck, both experts in the field, make use of a more expanded definition of the Gulag as well as giving voice to survivors from whom we have heard very little in the past. This book consists mainly of interviews, but also includes a series of letters and of written life histories. Testimony comes from forced labourers in the Perm region, people who were subject to internal exile, the children of "enemies," and Polish women who endured Soviet exile during World War II. The editors contextualize the interviews within an introduction that offers both historical background and a discussion of oral history methodology and issues.

Many of the subjects interviewed were elderly people. Their tales are heartrending and at times painful to read. (I question whether Tsivirko should have been interviewed to start with. Problems of age and memory make for a rather forced interview.) The most poignant stories come from those who lost their parents to the Gulag and suffered the long consequences of "enemy origins" in the Soviet Union. The accounts offered in this volume provide a good, though terribly sad, corrective to the intelligentsia memoirs with which we are more familiar. They are, of course, far from representative of the entire Gulag population (not an aim of the volume's editors), but all the same offer a different look at the Gulag.

The editors have presented very useful commentary and annotation for the interviews and other documents produced here. Scholars Cathy Frierson, Emily Johnson, and Robert Latypov also participated in the interview process and/or annotation of the volume. Issues of memory and the pros and cons of oral history are detailed, often specifically in connection with particular interviews or parts of interviews. Although this commentary is very useful, at times I would have preferred simply to read the interviews with less authorial intervention which can limit interpretive possibilities. The editors have done an excellent job of presenting general biographies to assist readers in understanding the interviews.

The editors have translated the interviews and other documents into clear and flowing English, not always an easy task given the many colloquialisms contained in these witnesses' testimony. Although hardly enjoyable given the topic, the book is a "good read" for general audiences and will be an extremely valuable contribution in undergraduate classrooms.

Lynne Viola, *University of Toronto*

**Graeme Gill. *Symbols and Legitimacy in Soviet Politics.*** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. vi, 356 pp. Bibliography. Index. $96.95, cloth.

With an ambitious scope that spans from the regime's birth in 1917 to its fall in 1991, Graeme Gill proposes, in *Symbols and Legitimacy in Soviet Politics,* an analysis of Soviet culture and politics that draws on Foucauldian theories of discourse, power, and governmentality. The aim of the book is to map out the Soviet metanarrative, that is to say the "body of discourse which presents a simplified form of the ideology and which is the vehicle of communication between the Regime and those who live under it." (p. 3)

For Gill, studying the Soviet metanarrative is crucial to the understanding of Soviet culture and politics. Indeed, it was the backbone of the acculturation process and of the reconstruction that occurred in the years following the Revolution. It also remained central, explicitly or implicitly, in subsequent debates and arguments in society at large as well as in political circles, serving policy making and the introduction of new ideas. Finally, as Gill argues, "the growing incoherence of the metanarrative was the logical precursor of the collapse of the Regime" (p. 282).

The Soviet metanarrative, constituted by myths that provide a basic narrative structure and coherence to the Soviet regime, can be traced through various symbols that served to express it and anchor it in the daily life of citizens. This study organizes these symbols into four major categories: language, visual arts, physical environment, and rituals. According to Gill, language was the most important vehicle of symbolic representation. It was the principal and most explicit form through which ideas and concepts represented the ideology, and were projected in the public realm. This involved a particular use of the official press, as well as the creation of new words (including a plethora of acronyms), the transformation of the meaning of old words, and the reiteration of certain speech forms by writers and speakers. The function of visual arts as symbols is contiguous to that of language. While "high art" practices did not become close reflections of official discourse until the 1930s (with the instauration of Socialist Realism as a governing doctrine), other forms served the objectives of mediating between the government and the population from the outset. For example, widely disseminated posters and illustrated journals that could reach both the literate and the illiterate, developed striking imagery that condensed in a few strokes concepts of class, identity, socialist duty, and so on. The transformation of the physical environment, mainly (but not exclusively) in urban settings, also played a role in

creating a symbol-rich environment that could contribute to moulding people's outlooks and values; housing, streetscapes, public decorations, as well as specific infrastructure such as the electrification of the country, the construction of the Moscow Metro, and the establishment of public parks became important ideational sites for the metanarrative. Finally, through their participation in private and public ritual, Soviet citizens enacted symbolic behaviour, which they integrated by repetition, reaffirming their membership in the community.

The approach taken by Gill is nuanced. Avoiding the fiction of an all-powerful totalitarian state, the book takes into account the various constituencies affected by the metanarrative, as well as the different values and knowledge levels they may use to interpret its symbols. It also considers the heteroglossic nature of symbols as well as dynamism in the metanarrative, within which myths and symbols changed over time.

While the coverage of the book is extremely wide-ranging, its main value resides in the first chapter, "Ideology, metanarrative and myth," where Gill defines all the terms that structure his argument: ideology, metanarrative, myth, symbol, teleology, and so on. It constitutes a fantastic introduction for readers interested in broadening their historical/political understanding of the period, introducing issues of discourse, language, art, and culture. The following four chapters discuss the formation and transformations of the metanarrative focusing on different periods of Soviet history: "Chapter 2: The formation of the metanarrative, 1917–1929"; "Chapter 3: The Stalinist culture, 1929–1953"; "Chapter 4: An everyday vision, 1953–1986"; "Chapter 5: The vision implodes, 1985–1991." The sixth and final chapter discusses various modes of legitimation associated with six great Soviet myths that structured the Soviet metanarrative from 1917 to 1991. It argues that, in post-Stalinist society, increased incoherence and fragmentation of the metanarrative caused the erosion of legitimacy and commitment, becoming a central element in the decay of the regime.

*Symbols and Legitimacy in Soviet Politics* is a feat of comprehensiveness and clarity, which also means, on the flip side, that the discussion of symbols and other phenomena constitutive of the metanarrative can sometimes be superficial. But the major drawback to this publication, which expressly relies on symbols that exceed the linguistic realm, is that it is not illustrated at all. The short descriptions of artworks, urban spaces, and rituals provided by the author fall short of the understanding illustrations could have afforded readers. Was this the author's decision or that of the publisher? Either way, it is a rather unfortunate one.

Annie Gérin, *Université du Québec à Montréal*

**Marcin Grygiel and Laura A. Janda, eds. *Slavic Linguistics in a Cognitive Framework.*** Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2011. 327 pp. €54.00, cloth.

This volume is a collection of fourteen articles that follow a brief introduction (pp. 7–10) and are organized into three sections: Cognitive Approaches to Grammar (pp. 11–209), Cognitive Semantics (pp. 211–270), and Cognitive Discourse Analysis and Applied Linguistics (pp. 271–327). The papers apply various cognitive linguistics methods and deal entirely or partially with Slavic material. Presenting research in Slavic cognitive linguistics is a valuable contribution by the editors: only one such volume has previously been published in English, in Mouton de Gruyter's prestigious series Cognitive Linguistics Research (*Cognitive Paths into the Slavic Domain*, ed. Dagmar Divjak and Agata Kochańska, 2007).

Although Slavic cognitive linguists in Slavic countries and abroad are engaged in a broad range of research activities (see the Slavic Cognitive Linguistic Bibliography by Laura Janda and Ljiljana Šarić at http://www.hum.uit.no/lajanda/SlavCogn Bibliography_Sept2009.doc), much of this work has remained overlooked, especially studies published in Slavic languages in Slavic countries. The popularity of cognitive linguistics in these countries is uneven: although some countries have sizeable cognitive linguistics communities (e.g., Poland and Russia), some research communities are rather small (e.g., Croatia and Bulgaria). In addition, for individual Slavic languages it is very difficult to find more than a few researchers worldwide who deal with these languages in a cognitive framework (e.g., for Slovenian). In some Slavic countries, it seems that language barriers, however trivial they may be, have been an obstacle to popularizing cognitively oriented linguistic research. When it comes to the presence of individual Slavic languages in cognitive linguistics research, some Slavic languages have been dealt with more often than others in an international context. This is due to formal factors, such as which Slavic languages are most widely taught and studied. An advantage of this volume is that it will make work by cognitively oriented linguists dealing with Slavic more visible in an international context. Other positive aspects are that the volume presents not only works by well-known researchers who usually publish in English, but also works by some less well-known researchers, and that it includes contributions on less-studied Slavic languages.

The first and longest section of the volume, Cognitive Approaches to Grammar, contains eight studies. The succeeding sections are much shorter, containing three articles each. The topics dealt with in the first section include Russian aspect, modal constructions in Russian, Polish, and Serbian, cognitive morphology and case in Slovak, datives of empathy in Czech, the Russian instrumental, affirmation in Slavic, and possessive locatives in Macedonian.

Laura A. Janda's article "Completability and Russian Aspect" presents part of her wider-ranging work on Russian aspectual issues. She provides an instructive review of completability as a semantic notion that refers to a situation type typically leading to a result. She presents evidence for its validity in Russian and demonstrates the advantages that studying this parameter offers to linguistic theory and practice. Both this analysis (implicitly) and the analysis by Stephen Dickey, "Subjectification and the Russian Perfective," show the benefits that cross-Slavic analyses have or could have. Dickey's analysis is theoretically well-founded and presents part of his highly interesting research on Slavic aspect. Dagmar Divjak's study "Predicting Aspectual Choice in Modal Constructions: A Quest for the Holy Grail?" instructively illustrates the usage-based nature of cognitive linguistics: she uses quantitative corpus-linguistics methodology to examine the relation of aspect to deontic and epistemic modality in Russian, Polish, and Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian. Christoph Rosenbaum and Wolfgang Schulze ("Cognitive Morphology and the Architecture of Case in Slovak") contribute to research on Slavic case by focusing on Slovak, a less-studied Slavic language in the cognitive linguistics framework. Mirjam Fried's study "The Notion of Affectedness in Expressing Interpersonal Functions" uses real-language corpora examples in an examination of three types of Czech datives of empathy and demonstrates the benefits of Construction Grammar in studying Slavic case usage. Ekaterina Rakhilina and Elena Tribushinina ("The Russian Instrumental-of-Comparison: Constructional Approach") also explore case in Slavic from a constructional perspective: they contrast the instrumental of comparison in Russian and similative constructions with *kak*. An interesting finding of the study that opens horizons for comparative research is that Russian can grammatically encode shape. Marcin Grygiel's "Constructional Realizations of Affirmation in Slavic" follows a bottom-up approach to

affirmation and mainly explores Serbian (alongside other Slavic) examples of affirmative constructions from the perspective of Construction Grammar. The concluding analysis in this section is Liljana Mitkovska's "Possessive Locative Constructions in Macedonian." Mitkovska examines three types of external possessive constructions in Macedonian and contrasts them with possessive datives.

The Cognitive Semantics section of the book opens with Mario Brdar and Rita Brdar-Szabó's article "Not Seeing Trees for Wood: A Case Study of Metonymy-Induced Polysemy in Germanic and Slavic Languages," which explores important theoretical questions of lexical typology. The two remaining contributions in this section focus on Serbian proverbs (Diana Prodanović-Stankić: "Metaphors and Metonymies in Serbian Proverbs Containing Names of Animals") and prepositional and case constructions with emotion nouns from a comparative perspective (Agnieszka Bedkowska-Kopczyk: "Emotions as Causes of Human Behavior in Polish and Slovene").

In the last section of the book, the opening article by Andrej A. Kibrik ("Cognitive Discourse Analysis: Local Discourse Structure") proposes a cognitively oriented analysis of Russian spoken discourse in which linguistic phenomena are explained in terms of cognitive processes such as on-line production and self-monitoring. Piotr Twardzisz's article "Metaphorical Expressions in Legal Language: Evidence from Polish" bases its observations on Lakoff and Johnson's findings in *Metaphors We Live By* (1980). The last rather brief article by Danko Šipka, "Metaphor Validation in Polysemous Structures: A Case Study of Serbo-Croatian Bilingual Dictionaries," examines metaphorical extensions in nonstandard vocabulary and tests the theoretical apparatus presented in Steen's *Finding Metaphor in Grammar and Usage* (2007).

The array of topics outlined in this brief overview indicates the wealth of information that phenomena in Slavic languages can offer to cognitive linguistics research. The contributions in this volume vary in quality regarding clear and exhaustive presentation of theoretical frameworks, grounding the analyses of material in these frameworks, and paying sufficient attention to relevant previous research. However, each contribution is valuable, and the volume will certainly be met with interest by readers because it will inspire future research, promote comparative analyses, and popularize Slavic cognitive linguistics.

What some readers will miss in this volume as a whole is consistency. A more comprehensive introduction could have shown more explicitly the connections that undoubtedly exist among some of the contributions. In addition, the choice of papers included in the volume should have been better explained. As it is, it seems rather random. Nonetheless, the selection illustrates the wide range of topics represented in research in cognitive linguistics and Slavic languages, and it outlines many questions for further investigation.

Ljiljana Šarić, *University of Oslo*

**Irina Karlson.** ***Poiski Rusi nevidimoi. Kitezhskaia legenda v russkoi kul'ture, 1843–1940.*** Slavica gothoburgensia, 10. Acta universitatis gothoburgensis. Kållered (Suède): Intellecta Infolog Göteberg AB, 2011. 392 pp. Résumé en anglais. Bibliographie. 220.00 SEK, livre broché.

Ce livre, adapté d'une thèse de doctorat soutenue en 2009, porte sur la légende de la ville de Kitezh, engloutie (selon la version la plus courante, enterrée ou rendue invisible selon d'autres) au XIII$^{e}$ siècle, pour échapper à l'invasion tatare. La légende attira longtemps

nombre de pèlerins. On racontait qu'à la fin de juin on pouvait entendre sonner les cloches de la cité sous le lac Svetloyar. L'auteur examine les origines de cette légende, ses premières traces écrites, mais également la place que celle-ci occupe dans la culture russe, notamment au XIX$^{e}$ siècle quand crut l'intérêt pour la culture populaire, mais aussi pour les croyances et pratiques religieuses passées. Cet intérêt coïncidait avec la quête d'une « nouvelle conscience religieuse » et d'une union spirituelle entre l'intelligentsia et le peuple. Empruntant largement à la sémiotique russe, aux travaux de Meletinsky, ainsi qu'à ceux de l'école de Tartu, Karlson considère cette légende dans son rapport aux textes et aux divers contextes, afin de nous éclairer sur sa « fonction » dans la culture russe (p. 41).

L'ouvrage se divise en trois parties. Dans la première, l'auteur nous présente les premiers textes faisant mention de la légende, comment ils finirent par être recomposés sous forme de chronique, de même que l'inscription idéologique de cette chronique dont Karlson déduit que ses auteurs se rattachaient à une branche sectaire des vieux croyants, soit les « vagabonds » (*stranniki*). C'est d'ailleurs ces accents sectaires qui séduiront plus tard l'intelligentsia russe. Cette dernière fera de Kitezh la légende d'un refuge invisible des vrais croyants. Karlson examine ensuite les appropriations du mythe par Rimsky-Korsakov, qui a métamorphosé la légende originelle en lui ajoutant un nouveau protagoniste, Fevroniia, censée incarner une sainte Russie, et un ensemble de motifs et de thèmes associés à ce personnage. Puis Karlson passe en revue les récits (ethnographiques ou mystiques) des intellectuels ayant fait le voyage à Kitezh et qui eurent un impact sur la mémoire collective. Un fait particulièrement intéressant — et qui aurait mérité un traitement plus approfondi — est la réappropriation de la légende de Kitezh pendant la Première Guerre mondiale, notamment quand, en 1916, le théâtre Bolchoï choisit de présenter l'opéra de Rimsky-Korsakov (p. 133–134).

La deuxième section est en partie consacrée au projet de livre inachevé du symboliste André Bély et qui devait s'intituler *La ville invisible*. Karlson explore l'inspiration probable qu'a exercé sur Bély la légende de Kitezh, mais aussi les raisons (biographiques) pour lesquelles ce livre ne vit finalement pas le jour. Karlson examine ensuite la légende ayant entouré la ville de Saint-Pétersbourg dès sa fondation et qui trouve son origine dans la prophétie faite par de vieux croyants annonçant sa destruction par les eaux. L'auteur compare cette légende à celle de Kitezh, pour enfin conclure que les deux légendes sont liées à l'idée de la fin d'une ère.

La dernière section focalise sur la période après 1917, quand la légende cesse d'avoir une fonction métaphorique et se transforme en un mythe poétique à part entière. Karlson examine l'œuvre du poète Kliuev, chez qui la légende apocalyptique acquiert la valeur d'un paradis faisant écho à un certain idéal de la Russie folklorique. Le dernier chapitre consiste en une rétrospective de divers poètes (dont Khlebnikov, Tsvetaeva et Akhmatova) ayant abordé la légende de Kitezh. Rejetée en tant qu'incarnation du passé, la légende survit comme promesse d'un monde meilleur et cet archétype devient même un havre au milieu du chaos de la Révolution et plus tard du stalinisme.

En résumé, l'ouvrage d'Irina Karlson est une monographie exhaustive et savamment documentée qui fait le tour d'un mythe littéraire. Certains historiens éprouveront cependant des difficultés à valider son approche comme étant propre à faire de l'histoire, lui reprochant notamment d'éclipser la réalité historique et culturelle au profit d'une analyse détaillée (et pas toujours convaincante, on doit bien le dire) de la fonction comme telle du mythe, comme c'est le cas dans le chapitre consacré à l'opéra de Rimsky-Korsakov, où l'on finit par s'éloigner aussi bien de la légende comme telle que du contexte historico-culturel dans lequel elle est censée s'inscrire. En fait, on pourrait discuter amplement à savoir s'il n'aurait pas été préférable pour l'auteur d'inscrire sa démarche sous le signe de l'approche

des lieux de mémoire (inspirée de l'ouvrage du même nom dirigé par Pierre Nora), qui consiste à prélever un échantillon stratigraphique où chaque strate correspond à un investissement d'un lieu par la mémoire à une époque et dans un contexte donné. C'est au fond ce que fait Karlsohn, qui nous présente les investissements successifs de sens dont a été l'objet la légende de Kitezh, depuis ses premières appropriations par l'intelligentsia russe au XIX$^{e}$ siècle, jusqu'en 1940. Mais force est de respecter les choix méthodologiques de l'auteur, qui sont eux aussi à inscrire dans un contexte culturel précis.

Tristan Landry, *Université de Sherbrooke*

**Michael Kemper and Stephan Conermann, eds. *The Heritage of Soviet Oriental Studies.*** Routledge Contemporary Russia and Eastern Europe Series, 25. London: Routledge, 2011. 352 pp. Index. $150.00, cloth.

The present volume brings together twenty scholars from the West and the post-Soviet space with the goal of providing an "integrating view on Soviet Oriental studies" (p. 1). The latter is understood in the double sense of presenting these studies as a single discipline and relating them to the on-going discussion of Orientalism. Against the prevailing perception of Soviet Orientology as hopelessly isolated and ideologized, the editors and contributors to the volume argue that it fits rather well Edward Said's view of Western Orientalism as peculiar nexus of knowledge and power. At the same time, Soviet Oriental studies had a number of important peculiarities and legacies that make them a subject worthy of investigation. The volume is divided into two parts, of which the first, including nine articles, traces the evolution of Oriental and Islamic studies in Moscow and Leningrad/St. Petersburg. The seven articles of the second part of the volume examine Oriental studies in the republics of the former Soviet Union and two provincial centres of the Russian Federation.

The objective set by the editors is quite timely: after *Kritika* broke new ground by organizing a discussion on pre-revolutionary Russian Orientalism ten years ago, it was only logical to ask similar questions about its Soviet successor. Although the volume focuses on the Soviet period, several articles briefly discuss pre-1917 developments, while David Schimmelpenninck van der Oye's piece is devoted entirely to the peculiarities of imperial Orientology. These included, among other things, the division of labour between the more academically oriented Oriental studies of St. Petersburg versus the more practical profile of the Kazan and the Moscow schools, the desire of the government to impose advisory functions upon Orientalist scholars and their resistance to this pressure in the name of scientific objectivity.

The most important pre-revolutionary legacy was of course the Orientalists themselves. Similar to other "bourgeois experts" during the early Soviet decades, pre-revolutionary Orientalist scholars went through hardships and travails, which are discussed by Mikhail Rodionov and several other contributors. Still, Soviet terror was mixed with opportunity, as Michael Kemper notes in the introductory chapter. In the context of Soviet nationalities policy, Orientalists were supposed to produce the ideologically correct historical narratives for the "titular nationalities" of the Eastern republics of the USSR. This phenomenon is discussed in detail in Aifa-Alua Auezova's chapter on Kazakh historiography of the 1920s and 1930s and receives some attention from other contributors to the second part of the volume.

While Orientology had a special role in the Soviet nationality policy, the latter in turn influenced the Oriental scholars in a number of ways. First, there occurred a significant

nativization of Oriental studies in comparison with the pre-1917 period.The number of indigenous scholars from the Eastern borderlands (traditionally high in Imperial Russia) became even higher under the Soviets. Second, nativization policies determined the distribution of centres of Oriental studies. Alongside Moscow and St. Petersburg/Leningrad, these were created in Tashkent, Baku, Tbilisi, Dushanbe, and Yerevan (which were all the capitals of "Eastern" union republics), but not in Kazan or Makhachkala (which were and continue to be the capitals of the autonomous Tatar and Dagestan republics within the RSFSR/Russian Federation), despite important pre-revolutionary traditions and/or strong local initiative.

The Soviet encounter with Islam was another major conditioning factor for the development of Soviet Oriental studies. In a highly interesting contribution, Vladimir Bobrovnikov addresses the relations between Soviet Orientology and anti-religious propaganda. In particular, he demonstrates that academic orientalists tried to stay out of the activities of the League of the Militant Godless (and later the Knowledge Society), where the main role was taken by the graduates of the Marxist Orientalist schools created after 1917. In their treatment of Islam, the latter combined a Marxian sociological approach with the anti-Islamic discursive strategies of pre-revolutionary Orthodox propagandists.

This dogmatic perception started to change under the impact of the Islamic revival of the 1970s and the attendant geopolitical complications. The articles of Mikhail Roshchin, Anna R. Paterson, Hannah Jensen, and Michael Kemper describe how around 1980, the Soviet Orientalist community was called to provide a more systematic expert advice on the contemporary Middle East. Under the guidance of the Director of Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences and the future Russian minister of Foreign Affairs Evgenii Primakov, Soviet Orientalists abandoned their earlier treatment of Islam as a "remnant of feudalism." Instead, they started viewing Islam as having no fixed essence and being a form that could be filled in with either "progressive" or "reactionary" content. Scholars of contemporary Afghanistan will be particularly interested to read Paterson's piece on the Soviet Afghan studies in the light of the present-day developments. The author challenges many received notions.

The reader of this volume may feel the lack of a more precise definition of its subject-matter. Even if in practice the disciplinary boundaries of Russian/Soviet Orientalism were much more blurred than those of its Western counterparts, one still wonders what does the semi-esoteric pursuits of a Kyrgyz *kraieved* (a scholar of things local) as discussed by Till Mostowlansky have to do with Oriental studies (a question that has to be addressed to the editors more than to the author of the article)? By way of criticism, one can also mention the heterogeneity of the contributions to the volume. These are vastly different in both length and genre. At times, research articles turn into bibliographical notes, as in the case of Stanislav M. Prosorov's piece on the Leningrad/St. Petersburg School of Scientific Islamology, or personal recollections, into which Mirkasym A. Usmanov and Amri R. Shihsaidov veer in their respective contributions on the Oriental studies in Kazan and Dagestan.

The apparent difference of style between some of the post-Soviet contributors to the volume and their Western counterparts illustrates well Michael Kemper's thesis that "the identity of (post) Soviet Orientology developed in isolation from the West and thus ignored until present day much of the critique that Western orientalist studies had learned to cope with over the last thirty years" (p. 21). In a certain sense, the volume can be seen as a collection of both secondary and primary sources, since its authors include both scholars of Soviet Oriental studies and the objects of their research, i.e., the practitioners of these studies. This becomes especially evident if one compares the discussions of the role of

Orientalists in the (post)-Soviet nation-building in former Soviet republics. Lisa Yountchi, Till Mostowlansky and Altay Goyushovet discuss this process as external observers in, respectively, Tadjikistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Azerbaijan. By contrast, Mirkasym Usmanov's description of the Orientalist studies in Kazan was written by someone, who apparently shared the contemporary Tatar nation-building agenda. Thus, Michael Kemper's thesis about extreme politicization of Orientalist knowledge during the Soviet period is equally applicable to the post-Soviet period and represents, in fact, a major legacy of Soviet Oriental studies.

Victor Taki, *University of Alberta*

**Mark Lipovetsky and Valentina Brougher, eds. *50 Writers: An Anthology of 20th-century Russian Short Stories.*** Cultural Syllabus Series. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2011. 800 pp. $29.00, paper.

The narrator of a story by Sergei Dovlatov, included in this volume and entitled "My Older Cousin," remarks upon a point of disagreement between the eponymous character and himself: "I remember his entries in his student diary: 'The most important thing both in a book and in a woman is not form but content…' Even now, after a countless number of life's disappointments, this guideline seems somewhat boring to me. And, as before, I like only beautiful women" (pp. 525–526). The present volume subscribes to neither of these points of view; rather, it teeters somewhere in between. That is to say, its goal seems to be two-fold: to show the full range of formal mastery and versatility in Russian twentieth-century writing but also to select such stories whose collective content presents the large-scale panorama of Russia's brutal history of the past century and the experiences of its people as they strove to navigate unscathed through its thorny terrains. For the most part, the volume masterfully succeeds in doing both.

The encyclopedic quality of this 800-page volume, its clearly intended universality, is easily explained by a simple fact: there is a dearth of anthologies to choose from. In fact, until now all teachers of 20th-century Russian literature in the English-speaking world had to content themselves with choosing from the list of one book: Clarence Brown's adequate but slightly outdated compilation, *The Portable Twentieth-Century Russian Reader*, originally put together in 1985. The organizers of the current volume must have been aware of this lack as what they have created is a versatile textbook that can be used in a variety of courses on Russian twentieth-century literature and culture. For teachers interested in the aesthetic aspect of literature, the book offers the breadth of artistic styles, approaches, and subject matters, while for those whose primary interest in literature lies in its documentation of history, no significant event of the century has been left unmentioned, all social classes and registers, from aristocrats to *zeks* (a slang term for prisoners), are represented, and characters from all walks of life, from peasants to prostitutes, pop in to say hello.

Certain continuities in Russian history become excruciatingly evident, as, perusing the volume, readers encounter story after story of horrible suffering and oppression as well as those of defiance and liberation. The past century was a bloody one, and most stories faithfully reflect upon the human factor amidst the cataclysmic events. And yet, some beautiful gems that have only a tangential relation to the pre-Soviet, Soviet, and post-Soviet political actualities, have found their way into the volume and allow the reader to resurface for a breath of air. One such pleasantly surprising story (which could be subject to a

tendentious reading, but does not need to be) is Vasily Aksenov's "Victory" about a chance encounter between a professional chess player and an unintelligent chess enthusiast.

In general, the stories are handpicked to feature the very best while simultaneously striving to be representative of each writer's body of work. Ivan Bunin's melancholy salaciousness in "Tanya" is recognizable, the everyday world of Liudmila Petrushevskaya is, as usual, uncompromisingly terrifying in "Never," the accusatory yet kindly voice of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn in "The Young" is familiar, the overpowering stench of Vladimir Sorokin's writing is distinct in "Passing Through," and Sergei Dovlatov's perfect pitch is as always resonant in "My Older Cousin." This is not to say that the material selected is predictable. Mikhail Zoshchenko's feuilletons are almost always ambiguous, but "The Female Fish" is surprising in its brave sympathy for the priest; and "Family Man" from Mikhail Sholokhov, a socialist realist writer often accused of hypocrisy and the evasion of facts, shocks with its ambivalence. Thus, while this anthology is probably intended to be an introductory textbook to twentieth-century Russian literature, it also holds many surprises for a reader well versed in Russian culture.

The editors' objective to create a textbook is also evident in abundant, solicitous annotations that are sometimes extremely helpful, while at other times are a little overbearing. For example, the endnotes for Vladimir Makanin's breathtaking "Surrealism in a Proletarian District" reference the Russian approach to buying eggs, the geographic location of the city of Tambov, the explication of the reference to a particular type of meat, and the meaning of the term "psychological displacement." The latter is provided apparently with an assumption, shared by many educators, that readers will know nothing about anything at all. And since it is quite likely that in any classroom a student with such a level of knowledge will appear, this teacher, for one, is thankful for all the hard work that went into the making of the copious commentary.

Possibly, it is this spirit of gentle concern and shepherding of the reader that explains a certain blandness of translation, especially apparent in the stories whose authors resort to non-normative language. Voices of the stories written in the form of *skaz*, like Aleksei Remizov's "The Little Devil," reach the reader somewhat muffled, while stories using contemporary slang are purified to an almost comical effect. For example, in Viktor Pelevin's spectacular story "A Short History of Paint-ball in Moscow," the piquant *otymet'* (in the street parlance meaning literally "to have a sexual act with" and figuratively "to show one's superiority over") is translated with the chaste and inaccurate "reprimand," while the clunky and elucidatory "gang members" is offered as a translation for the first word in the title of a popular song "Bratva, ne streliaite drug v druga" [Homies, Don't Shoot Each Other!]. It's hard to imagine that a song with the title "Gang Members, Don't Shoot Each Other!" which in the process of translation got transformed from a friendly, heartfelt appeal to an official-sounding admonition, will find popularity with any audience, not to mention actual gang members.

Nonetheless, despite the inconsistencies in translation (that will probably be removed in the second edition), this much-needed and long-awaited anthology is a wonderful treat and an indispensable source of material for teachers, students, and aficionados of Russian literature alike.

Julia Vaingurt, *University of Illinois at Chicago*

**Tracy McDonald.** ***Face to the Village. The Riazan Countryside Under Soviet Rule, 1921–1930.*** Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011. xvii, 422 pp. Map. Illustrations. Appendix. Glossary. Notes. Bibliography. Index. $75.00, cloth.

Tracy McDonald identifies two principal meanings for "Face to the Village" as she begins her strong study of the Riazan countryside from 1921 to 1930. On the one hand, she refers to Zinoviev's appeal—made in July of 1924—for the fledgling Soviet centre to turn its attention to the Soviet countryside in a manner that had previously been lacking. And on the other, the title reflects McDonald's own desire to give Soviet villagers their due—to name them—and to come to terms with their own experience from the so-called NEP years to the onset of collectivization.

McDonald's choice of the Riazan countryside is an inspired one as it allows her to combine both centre and periphery in a single investigation, for how else can one regard a region that was but a few hundred kilometres from Moscow, yet long deemed a rural backwater?

McDonald sets out her argument in her first section where she pays particular attention to those institutions (the police, the courts, and local soviets) which served as liminal points for peasants and the young Soviet State. She argues in each case that the local face of Soviet *vlast'* (a term she effectively introduces on pp. 16–18) was clearly evident and effectively engaged in the Riazan countryside for much of the 1920s. Nor should this surprise as the principal agents of that very *vlast'* were themselves villagers for much of that time; even the police were embedded into the local community (pp. 60–61), and almost always acted accordingly. In perhaps her most succinct statement on the subject, McDonald concludes "I am not sure how to draw the line between peasants and state officials" (p. 85). It is a bold statement, yet one that McDonald's work as a whole substantiates.

And therein lay the rub, for the centre did not at all like what it saw when it decided after 1924 to turn its face to the village. Two particularly disturbing findings stood out: First, the centre soon concluded from its various investigations that local Soviet *vlast'* was indeed intimately interconnected with the populace of the Riazan countryside. And although this may have been deemed ideal in certain settings, it was hardly the case here given the second finding. For the centre also soon decided that the Soviet countryside remained dangerously "uncivilized" (p. 208); a world in which wealthy *kulaks* continued to hold sway over their poorer counterparts despite the great hopes that had flowed out of the October revolution.

McDonald peels back layer upon layer of this realization in Parts Two and Three of her study, and although the detail sometimes threatens to overwhelm the reader, it never quite does so thanks to skillful editing and clear, concise chapter introductions and conclusions. Thus we are able to follow, variously, the struggles over taxation, the management of forest resources, banditry, hooliganism, and vigilante justice. In every instance McDonald demonstrates how the centre's reading of its plenipotentiaries became increasingly ominous after 1926. Such a reading coincided with an increasingly negative assessment by Moscow of trends amongst the Riazan peasants. McDonald's study ends with an uprising against forced collectivization and dekulakization by peasants from Pitelino District in February of 1930. Although tantalizingly brief, this chapter shows McDonald at her best as she identifies and evaluates the strongly divergent explanations provided by the centre and the district's inhabitants themselves of what had actually happened.

In many ways McDonald's work is solidly in line with a recent historiography that has stressed Moscow's obsession with The Modern Project and its corresponding preference for centralized over localized knowledge, its growing suspicion of its own peasantry in the course of the 1920s, and even in McDonald's identification of the peasant ability to "speak Bolshevik" (p. 128). But it is McDonald's ability to situate this larger discussion within the specificity of the Riazan countryside for the 1920s that is her greatest strength. Such a focus allows her to reveal the stunning complexity of Riazan *vlast'* and society at this time.

McDonald's source base is impressive, and includes government investigations, secret police reports, peasant correspondences and petitions, contemporary ethnographic studies, and oral history. She clearly communicates a strong sense of specific place and time. There may be readers who find the occasionally voluminous amount of information almost obscures the points being made; others may not find the sections summarizing the imperial context in the first half of the book to be all that useful. And other readers may hope for more detail on the onset of the collectivization process itself.

But none of this takes away from an impressive achievement and an excellent addition to early Soviet historiography. *Face to the Village* is also a marvelously produced book, and in every way to McDonald's considerable credit.

Leonard Friesen, *Wilfrid Laurier University*

**Paola Messana.** ***Soviet Communal Living: An Oral History of the Kommunalka*****.** Palgrave Studies in Oral History. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. xvi, 168 pp. Appendices. Notes. $80.00, cloth.

Fear was the great equalizer in Soviet society. Yet another was the communal flat, the *kommunalka*, a form of misguided ideological violence the state inflicted upon its subjects in forcing families of all possible configurations to inhabit single rooms and to share kitchen and bathroom facilities (if they existed) with families occupying other rooms. "The kommunalka became a true obsession for me, and I wanted to tell the story, chronologically, of the history of a country that haunted the twentieth century from the October Revolution to the collapse of the USSR and to today's Russia, through the narratives of the inhabitants of communal apartments" (p. 3), explains acclaimed journalist Paola Messana in the introduction to her oral history of Soviet communal living.

Her obsession paid off. Relying on Russian friends, human rights organizations, and a want ad she placed in two widely circulating newspapers in 1993 to find her subjects, Messana produced a modest book that packs a lot of punch. The volume comprises thirty short interviews; Messana conducted twenty-eight of them between 1992 and 1995 and the remaining few in 2008, mostly in Moscow and St. Petersburg. The reader hears the voices of "formers" (members of the tsarist elite disenfranchised under Soviet power), of members of the intelligentsia, of ordinary Soviet citizens, and even of a few foreigners. Despite the serendipitous way in which Messana identified individuals to interview, she managed to assemble a compelling collection of stories. Especially memorable for me are her interviews with one of the greats of Soviet cinematography, director Grigorii Chukhrai, who modestly detailed how he wrote the script of his internationally celebrated film, "The Ballad of a Soldier," in the bathroom of his communal flat at night, and the son of writer Yuri Daniel, whose arrest and trial in 1965–1966 helped provoke the emergence of a dissident movement in the Soviet Union. Messana points out that she left the stories as they are, except for one thing: settling old scores, her mostly anonymous interviewees all too readily revealed the identities of their neighbours who betrayed them, tormented them, or

otherwise violated their living space. "In these cases it was I who preferred to draw the veil of anonymity over the informer" (p. 4), explained Messana.

Poignant and visceral, the narratives capture a full array of human experiences and emotions of people living in unspeakably grim conditions ordinary for the majority of Soviet citizens until the Brezhnev years. The interviewees make their living arrangements the focus of their reminiscences or else as the stage on which they introduce us to the cast of characters with whom they lived and bickered, reminding us how even the seemingly horrific became ordinary and "normal." The narratives take us inside the communal flats teeming not only with filth, grime, sickening odours, rats, betrayal, fear, the scourge of alcoholism, weariness, and distrust between individuals, social classes, and people of different nationalities, but also with the indubitable, if muted, power of the human spirit to survive and to celebrate life. Aware of Messana's otherness, some of those who shared their stories spoke in terms of invidious comparison. For instance, daughter of Ivars Smilga, a famous Latvian Bolshevik executed during Stalin's purges, for whom smells remained fundamental, shared: "But the worst are clothes and shoes, you Westerners could not understand because you don't wear shoes until they are bursting from all seams, basically never changing your socks" (p. 85).

Messana allows the narratives to speak for themselves, but this approach represents one of the book's two shortcomings. A brief foreword by Vasily Rudich, formerly associate professor of Classics and History at Yale University, offers the only historical frame for Messana's succession of stories, perceptively suggesting points that Messana—or a collaborator—should have addressed. For instance, the obvious embellishment of some memories will strike the specialist's eyes.

The publisher needs to take responsibility for the book's other limitation: careless proofreading. Misspellings, missing words, inconsistency in usage (e.g., the reader encounters three renderings of the surname of bard poet Vladimir Vysotskii in a three-page account), and obvious factual errors left uncorrected mar this work. Messana—and her readers—deserve better.

Donald J. Raleigh, *University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill*

**Vladimir Tismaneanu, ed. *Promises of 1968: Crisis, Illusion, and Utopia*.** Budapest and New York: Central European University Press, 2011. ix, 449 pp. Contributors. Index. $55.00, cloth.

These are the proceedings of a 2008 conference held in Washington, DC, on the 40th anniversary of a pivotal year. The conference was co-sponsored by the University of Maryland and the Romanian Cultural Institute. Eighteen scholars from various disciplines presented papers under three headings. Vladimir Tismaneanu, the conference organizer and a professor of political science at the University of Maryland, also wrote the volume's introduction. In it he not only summarized all the contributions, but also reminded us that 1968 was a "transnational movement of revolt against the status quo beyond the East-West divide" (p. 1) which, ironically, led to liberalism reasserting itself in a revival of democracy in the West and to the eventual disintegration of communism in the East.

In the first section, under the rubric "Memory and Theory," seven scholars reflected either on their experiences of 1968 or else on various theories of what happened in that eventful year and its legacy. Martin Palouš, a former Chartist and Ambassador of the Czech Republic to the USA, paid homage to the late Jan Patočka, a philosopher at Charles University in Prague who, during the "Consolidation" of Czechoslovakia after the Warsaw

Pact invasion of 1968, formulated Charter 77's demands for respect for human rights. Irena Grudzinska Gross, one of the demonstrators against the Gomułka regime in 1968 Poland, reminded us that student demonstrators, in both East and West, used Marxist language in their anti-authoritarian revolt and were largely led by Jewish intellectuals (those of us who came of age in the 1960s will not forget the student Abbie Hoffman versus Judge Julius Hoffman during the trial of the "Chicago Eight"). Dick Howard, a professor of philosophy at SUNY and a former student of Marxist philosophy in Paris in 1968, grew disillusioned by the student protests and the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia and concluded that communism could not be reformed and opted instead for democracy based upon individual freedom. Jeffrey C. Isaac, on the other hand, who is now a professor of political science at Indiana University, was taught in the 1970s by the former radicals of the 1960s and claims that they opened his mind to new ideas. Jan-Werner Müller, a professor of politics at Princeton, focused on the contribution of Herbert Marcuse to the spread of "libertarian socialism" (p. 90). Aurelian Craiutu, a political scientist at Indiana University, detailed how, on the other hand, the French-Jewish intellectual Raymond Aaron condemned the rebellious French students of 1968 by accusing them of a "collective delirium" (p. 116). Finally, Karol Edward Soltan, a professor of political science at the University of Maryland characterized the 1960s as "an idealistic revolt against realism" which stressed human dignity (p. 138).

In Part II, on the "Lessons and Legacies of 1968," Agnes Heller, a philosopher and political scientist at the New School in New York, concluded that the main legacy of 1968 was that, "Starting with the 1970's, most intellectuals of the former New Left, together with their sympathizers, became liberals both in the West and in the East" (p. 165). The political activist and analyst Jiri Pehe, on the other hand, noted that Czechs and Slovaks do not wish to discuss the Prague Spring because it was a communist movement that failed. He regards this as a mistake, because it was part of a world-wide movement. Bradley Abrams, an historian at Columbia University, concluded that the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 led to the abandonment of Marxism by critical Marxist intellectuals who then had to find a new language for society. Some turned to terrorism, others to Maoism or Trotskyism, and the third group to civil society. The latter ultimately triumphed. The Romanian philosopher Tereza-Brîndusa Palade added that the "political religion" of Marxism failed in 1968 and was subsequently "de-radicalized" (p. 209). Nick Miller, an historian at Boise State University, observed that in 1968 Yugoslavia Serb students in Beograd revolted against the bureaucratization of society, while Croatian and Albanian students demanded more home-rule. Ultimately, "national identity won out over other forms of identity" (p. 238). Finally, Christian Vasile, a researcher at the Romanian Academy of Sciences, pointed out that in 1968 no reforms took place in his country because Nicolae Ceauşescu was "a sly Antonín Novotný" (p. 252), who seduced Romanian intellectuals with his nationalism.

In Part III, "Case Studies of Transformation," five scholars looked at how 1968 transformed various countries. Vladimir Tismaneanu and Bogdan Iacob, a graduate student at the Central European University in Budapest, pointed out how Nicolae Ceauşescu cynically denounced the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia while he played the nationalist card in order to consolidate his own Stalinist rule in Romania. Mark Kramer, of Harvard University, presented a lengthy analysis of the Prague Spring, putting it into its European context, and into Soviet geo-political concerns. He concluded that, while the Soviet Union stationed 80,000 troops in post-invasion of Czechoslovakia, along with nuclear warheads in order to bolster its position vis-à-vis NATO, it lost the support of the Czechoslovak People's Army, which was demoralized by the invasion. Jeffrey Herf, an

historian at the University of Maryland, looked at the rise of terrorism in West Germany. He pointed out that the failed Tet Offensive of January-February, 1968 in Viet Nam, led to some members of the New Left being radicalized against capitalism, with 34 innocent people subsequently being murdered by the Red Army Faction in West Germany between 1971 and 1993. The late Victor Zaslavsky, of the Free University in Rome, explained how the Italian Communist Party condemned itself to extinction by initially denouncing the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia but, upon seeing its financial subsidies from Moscow shrinking, eventually reversed itself. Finally, Catalin Avramescu, a political scientist at the University of Bucharest, described how Charles De Gaulle's visit to Romania in 1968 was much ado about nothing.

In the book's conclusion, Charles S. Maier, an historian at Harvard University, opined that the 1960s were a reaction to the previous decades by young people who rejected the discipline of their elders. 1968 was also a repudiation of the Yalta Agreement of 1944 by which the USA and the Soviet Union tried to control the world. The rebels of 1968 felt alienated by their societies and sought self-fulfilment in various ways.

These papers are a good introduction to 1968 in Europe. Because of the background of the conference organizers, they are a bit heavy on political science and on Romanian subjects. Despite Mark Kramer's excellent summary of the Prague Spring, this reviewer would have liked to have seen more on Czechoslovakia in 1968. For instance, one of the few reforms of the Prague Spring to have survived the Warsaw Pact invasion was the federalization of Czechoslovakia. The Preamble to the 1968 Constitution of the Czechoslovak Federation made possible the peaceful breakup of that country in 1993. Furthermore, the Slovak origin of Alexander Dubček and his successor Gustáv Husák also played a role in their actions in 1968 and beyond. But these are minor omissions in an important book on a fateful year.

M. Mark Stolarik, *University of Ottawa*