Geert-Hinrich Ahrens. *Diplomacy on the Edge, Containment of Ethnic Conflict and the Minorities Working Group of the Conferences on Yugoslavia*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Baltimore, Maryland: The John Hopkins University Press, 2007. 672 pp. Maps. Table. Notes. Bibliography. Index. $69.00, cloth.

Geert-Hinrich Ahrens is a senior German diplomat who participated in several of the international mediations that accompanied the dissolution of Yugoslavia and the wars of Yugoslav succession that took place in the 1990s. In fact, the narrative of his book covers the Western Balkans up to 2004. In addition to analyzing in great detail the diplomatic activities of various international actors such as the European Community (EC), the International Conference on the former Yugoslavia (ICFY), the United Nations (UN) and many others, the author also provides an historical background to help the reader to understand the Yugoslav crisis of the 1990s. As Ahrens writes, the book “is a hybrid between a memoir and a scholarly work” (p. xiii). I consider Ahrens’s book one of the best analyses of diplomatic activities undertaken by the international community following Yugoslavia’s meltdown. The book is a primary source, a gold mine for historians and political scientists. It contains excerpts and notes taken by Ahrens during numerous diplomatic negotiations he participated in. Ahrens was well equipped to undertake the writing of this ambitious book. The author belongs to the small group of German professional diplomats who acquired linguistic skills and knowledge of Yugoslavia well before political and military conflicts tore Yugoslavia apart. Ahrens worked in the 1970s in Belgrade, as a cultural attaché at the German Embassy (p. 511), and travelled extensively not only in Yugoslavia but in Southeastern Europe as well. Thus, when Ahrens arrived in Zagreb in July 1991 at the beginning of the Serbo-Croatian war as a European Community monitor, he was in a position to inform the German government and the high echelons of the EC about the nature of the conflict in Croatia.

The book is divided into six parts consisting of twenty-nine chapters. It concentrates on the years 1991 to 1996, but also gives a survey of major developments in the region from 1996 to 2004.

Ahrens first analyzes international mediation within the framework of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY). Parts Two to Five cover international mediations in Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Kosovo and Macedonia. Part Six and the conclusion are dedicated to the appraisal of the international intervention in the former Yugoslavia. This section of the book also provides some theoretical reflections on international interventions in the internal conflicts of sovereign states in post-cold-war international politics. As the subtitle of Ahrens’s book indicates, the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia were of an “ethnic nature” (p. 4). Conscious that this qualification could be criticized as reductionist, Ahrens writes, “With regard to the nature of the conflict, the term ‘ethnic’ takes priority” (p. 5). In my own writing on the same subject I have put the “ethnic” dimension of the Yugoslav conflicts in the third place, behind the territorial (border issues) and political aspects of the conflict. In the introduction to his book, Ahrens proposes a useful classification of the Yugoslav Conflicts into two groups. The first group is identified as the intra-Slavic conflict (p. 3). It concerns Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Montenegrins and Bosnians who between 1991 and 2008 opposed each other, politically and soon militarily. The result of the intra-Slavic conflicts was the creation of six successor states of Yugoslavia. The second group of conflicts opposed Albanians, in Kosovo, Macedonia and Southern Serbia with Serbs and Macedonians in their respective states.
The other aspect of the book indicated in the subtitle concerns “containment” of the Yugoslav conflicts by the international community. Ahrens rightly acknowledges that the international community from 1992 to 1996 was not able to solve the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia. It managed and contained them so they would not spill over into neighbouring countries. As an insider in the international negotiations Ahrens sheds light on the mediocrity of international *Realpolitik* and its wheeling and dealing, in the first place with Slobodan Milošević during the Yugoslav wars.

While reading this book I spotted a few minor mistakes and typing errors. On page 10, the author mentioned the “Papuča” Mountains in Croatia, but he probably means the “Papuk” Mountain. On pages 34 and 467 the author refers to the Second Congress of AVNOJ being held in November 1944. Instead, the Congress was held in 1943.

Ahrens’s book reflects excellent scholarship and deserves a broad readership in the field of international relations.

Renéo Lukic, *Université Laval*

**Philip Cavendish. Soviet Mainstream Cinematography: The Silent Era.** London: UCL Arts and Humanities, 2007. ix, 184 pp. Illustrations. Bibliography. Index. $30.00, paper.

In *Soviet Mainstream Cinematography: The Silent Era*, Philip Cavendish provocatively explores the innovative camera work that prevailed in 1920s Soviet cinema. A welcome shift from the usual approaches to the period and its films, Cavendish’s study delves into the intersection of experimental and mainstream cinema and the role that cinematographic technique played in some of the period’s more popular films. Cavendish refrains from focusing on the famous avant-garde films of the early Soviet era and from dwelling solely on Soviet cinema’s revolutionary use of montage, like so many other scholars have done. He opts instead to analyze how groundbreaking cinematography infused mainstream cinema of the 1920s. And rather than simply surveying the era’s directors, Cavendish offers valuable insight into the work of a handful of cameramen and their collaboration with some of the more well-known filmmakers from the period. Expanding on seminal scholarship by Denise Youngblood devoted to mainstream Soviet cinema of the 1920s and on more technical analysis of silent cinema by Barry Salt, Cavendish has produced an invaluable study that highlights early Soviet filming techniques while offering illuminating discussion of films often ignored in scholarship on the era.

*Soviet Mainstream Cinematography: The Silent Era*, which consists of a broad introduction, two detailed chapters, and a conclusion that links the analysis to cinema of the Stalinist period, focuses primarily on “the creative relationship between the director and cameraman” (p. 6). Cavendish explores the camera work in a diverse range of Soviet films from the 1920s, from Iakov Protazanov’s *Aelita, Queen of Mars* [*Aelita*] (1924), to Iurii Zheliabuzhskii’s *The Cigarette Girl from Mosselprom* [*Papirosnitsa ot Mosselprom*] (1924), to Konstantin Eggert and Vladimir Gardin’s proto-gothic *Bear’s Wedding* [*Medvezh’ia svad’ba*] (1926), to Fridrick Ermler’s *Remnants of an Empire* [*Oblomok imperii*] (1929). Delving into a variety of cinematographic techniques such as lighting and contrast, soft focus, constructivist-inspired urban imagery full of dynamism, iris shots, and detailed panoramas of the rural landscape, Cavendish highlights the visual aesthetics that proved so essential to the beauty, power, and efficacy of early Soviet mainstream cinema.

In chapter 1, Cavendish discusses the work of the era’s most celebrated cameramen (or *kinooperatory* as they were called in Russian), including Aleksandr Levitskii (who shot Lev Kuleshov’s *The Extraordinary Adventures of Mr. West in the Land of the Bolsheviks*)
[Neobychaynie prikliucheniiia mistera Vesta v strane bol'shevikov] [1924] and Gardin’s *The Cross and the Mauser* [Krest i mauzer] [1925], Konstantin Kuznetsov (cameraman on Kuleshov’s *Down by Law* [Po zakonu] [1926]), and Grigorii Gibor (who shot Abram Room’s *Bed and Sofa* [Tret’ia meshchanskaiia] [1927]). As analysis of work by these and other cameramen shows, innovative experimental techniques bolstered the plot-driven action and vivid emotional tones in mainstream cinema.

In chapter 2, Cavendish argues convincingly that, contrary to commonly held opinion, filmmakers who made their name prior to the Russian Revolution, such as Protazanov and Gardin, did at times incorporate a groundbreaking cinematographic aesthetic into their respective, post-Revolution films, as did cameramen like Louis Forestier and Petr Ermolov, who likewise worked on both sides of the 1917 Revolution. Cavendish perhaps overstates the prominence of this post-Revolutionary creativity in the work of the “old guard” (p. 17), as many called this older generation of filmmakers, but the author’s desire to challenge widely held views on 1920s Soviet cinema proves provocative as well as quite revealing. And in his fine conclusion, Cavendish explains that while the cameramen who thrived in the 1920s enjoyed some artistic freedom in the early Stalinist years due to the technical nature of cinematography, their aesthetic vision lost much of its relevance with the advent of sound, as filmmakers began to privilege new audio technology over cinematography.

*Soviet Mainstream Cinematography: The Silent Era*, it should be noted, does contain several minor flaws. By dispensing with any chronological order as he jumps from film to film, Cavendish falls short of providing a comprehensive, broadly accessible overview of how mainstream camera techniques developed in the 1920s. Moreover, the frame-stills included at the end of the monograph lack the quality, number, and placement to do proper justice to the fine, detailed analysis found throughout the study. Nevertheless, *Soviet Mainstream Cinematography: The Silent Era* explores 1920s Soviet camera work in an extremely compelling fashion, as Cavendish engagingly opens up this rich early era of cinema to reevaluation and further appreciation.

Tim Harte, *Bryn Mawr College*

**Sigrun Bielfeldt. Selbst oder Natur: Schellings Anfang in Rußland.** Arbeiten und Texte zur Slavistik. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2008. 459 pp. Appendix. Bibliography. Index. €39.80, paper.

When D. M. Vellanskii, a Russian medical student, travelled to Jena and Würzburg between 1802 and 1804, a new moment was inaugurated in Russian history: the reception of F. W. J. Schelling’s philosophy and with it the first articulation of philosophical Idealism in Russia, indeed, the very “beginning of Russian philosophy” (p. 14). These, at least, are the claims advanced by Sigrun Bielfeldt in her monograph on Schelling in Russia.

In Schelling, Vellanskii believed he had found a powerful set of claims for the autonomy of reason. His treatise, entitled *Prolusion to Medicine as a Fundamental Science* and published in Russian in 1805, was the first to place the call for autonomy on systematic, philosophical grounds. It was time to liberate “reasoned knowledge” from tutelage, because reason had “come of age” and was, indeed could only be, self-sufficient (p. 83). This verbiage will inevitably call to mind Kant’s definition of “Enlightenment” as “man’s release from his self-incurred tutelage” and “tutelage” as “man’s inability to use his understanding without the guidance of another.” As Bielfeldt insists, however, it was to Schelling, not to Kant, that Vellanskii owed his conception of the autonomy of reason.
More importantly, she demonstrates that it was Schelling, not Kant, who defined Russian Idealism as it gained new adherents in the early nineteenth century.

Bielfeldt is an exacting scholar. The book’s weighty middle chapter (chapter 3) explains in great detail how Schelling came to be the philosopher Vellanskii first encountered in 1802, including the precise nature of Schelling’s disagreements with Kant and Jacobi about the limits of reason. By 1804, when his System der gesammten Philosophie und der Naturphilosophie insbesondere appeared, Schelling was prepared to advance a conception of reason capable of absolute cognition of nature by positing the unity of spirit and nature as two inseparable parts of an organic whole. Bielfeldt’s is by far the most systematic account of German Idealism available in the literature on the development of Idealism in Russia, and will thus be of great value to intellectual historians.

This account also allows her to expose its limits in chapter 4, where she describes the intellectual preconditions for the reception of Idealism in Russia. A microscopic analysis of the writings of Nikolai Karamzin, for example, allows her to demonstrate that he read the foreword to the second edition of Kant’s Critique of Pure Reason, but that may be where he stopped, for Karamzin was entirely unresponsive to its contents. Karamzin’s unwillingness to engage the Kantian critique of reason would allow him to throw Kant “into the same pot” as Moses Mendelssohn, rejecting both as “rationalists” (p. 203). He preferred the “philosophy of feeling” he found in Lavater.

Such moments simultaneously breed appreciation and despair: appreciation for the kind of philosophical training required to bring Idealism to Russia, and despair that this appears to have remained beyond the reach of Russia’s most erudite writers in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. As Bielfeldt herself is forced to confess, Vellanskii’s Prolusion itself is filled with sentences that are obscure, even “remarkably paradoxical” (p. 236), his language encumbered by the lack of availability of appropriate nouns and adjectives to render philosophical terminology into Russian. The book includes a translation of Vellanskii’s Prolusion in an appendix, and the text pales in comparison to Bielfeldt’s highly sophisticated descriptions of it. This raises the question of what value there may be in devoting such concentrated attention to the reception of western philosophy in Russia during this period, even when it comes to a pioneer like Vellanskii. Bielfeldt avoids direct answers to such questions as: How far did the influence of Vellanskii’s Prolusion actually extend? How widely was it read? Instead, she argues that we should pay attention to the Prolusion because it was the first effort to fully articulate certain ideas that remained characteristic of Russian philosophy throughout the nineteenth century. Most important was the suspicious attitude toward the self so widespread among members of the Russian intelligentsia. On the basis of Schelling’s philosophy, Vellanskii would argue that the individuality of the self is an impediment to, rather than the condition of, all knowledge. Individuals would only attain truth when they became conscious of their place as free subjects connected to a freely developing natural world. A second characteristic of Russian philosophy was its emphasis on the transformational nature of knowledge, the view that “knowledge and action are essentially the same” (p. 92). Vellanskii may not have been the “father” of these ideas and may not have been responsible for their spread in Russia. Nevertheless, it is important to appreciate that they found articulation in Russia at the very first moment that philosophy struck root there.

Victoria Frede, University of California, Berkeley
Gary B. Cohen and Franz A. J. Szabo, eds. *Embodiments of Power: Building Baroque Cities in Europe*. Austrian and Habsburg Studies, 10. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2008. xviii, 283 pp. Illustrations. Bibliography. List of Illustrations. Index. $90.00, cloth.

The ten essays in this volume are selected papers from the conference “Embodiments of Power,” which was held in Minneapolis in 2007 and organized by the Center for Austrian Studies at the University of Minnesota and the Wirth Institute for Austrian and Central European Studies at the University of Alberta. Their authors are an international group, representing the United States, Germany, Austria, Poland, and the Czech Republic. The papers treat the interplay of the economic, social, and political forces which effected the transformation of many of the major cities of Western and Central Europe from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries. In doing so the authors demonstrate how cities as disparate as Madrid, Prague, Wroclaw, and Dresden were given the Baroque architectural face that we see in them today.

In his study “Embodiments of Power? Baroque Architecture in the Former Habsburg Residences of Graz and Innsbruck,” Mark Hengert discusses how the interests of the monarchs, the Roman Catholic Church, the aristocracy, and the burghers all combined in the development of the urban structure of the aforementioned cities from the late sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries.

Innsbruck was a city dominated by two essential features: geography and the fact that the prince/archbishops of the city dominated over other factors and factions. In her wittily named contribution “Baroque Comes for the Archbishops: Wolf Dietrich von Reitenau, Johann Ernst Count Thun, and Their Ideals of ‘Modern Art’ and Architecture,” Roswitha Juffinger demonstrates how von Reitenau and Thun used their power and the city’s topography to refashion Innsbruck into a “modern” Italian influenced city.

As we know, the so-called defenestration of Prague signaled the start of an extended conflict between the Catholic Habsburgs and their Protestant Czech subjects that culminated in the defeat at the latter at White Mountain (Bílá Hora) outside the city and that led to the re-Catholicization of the city and large sections of Bohemia and Moravia. In “Religious Art and the Formation of a Catholic Identity in Baroque Prague,” Howard Louthan argues that this reconquest resulted in the appearance, on a large scale, of Catholic art that depicted important native Bohemian elements.

Jiří Pešek, in his “Prague, Wrocław, and Vienna: Center and Periphery in Transformation of Baroque Culture,” ignores the traditional negative assessment of the development of Czech culture because of the defeat at White Mountain and proposes: “I would rather deal with the question of how the position of a metropolis like Prague among the central European capitals is to be determined” (p. 81). He finds that there is no hierarchy of dependence among the three imperial cities. Vienna grew as the imperial capital, and, while many Bohemian nobles built palaces there, these nobles did not neglect to build in Prague. Wrocław continued to have economic significance while fading in political importance.

In “Representation of the Court and Burghers in the Baroque Cities of the High Road: Kraków, Wrocław, Dresden in a Historical Comparison,” Jan Harasimowicz demonstrates that while all three cities were heavily influenced by German culture in the Middle Ages, cultural and religious shifts (the Reformation) affected their development differently. Wrocław and Kraków maintain much of their medieval architectural base until the
eighteenth century, but Dresden’s Wettin dynasty rulers transformed their capital, refashioning Dresden into a showplace of Baroque art.

The title of Barbara Marx’s contribution, “From Protestant Fortress to Baroque Apotheosis: Dresden from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Centuries,” summarizes her meticulously documented study in a nutshell. The author traces the rise of Dresden as a Protestant military and spiritual Festung of restrained taste from the sixteenth century under the Ernestine dynasty and then charts its transformation into a “Baroque Apotheosis” under the Wettins, especially under August II. On his election to the Polish throne August II initially hoped to make Dresden the capital of his united realm. With this goal in mind he launched the rebuilding of the city in the more lavish Baroque style, with the resulting appearance we see today.

In “A Tale of Two Cities: Nuremberg and Munich,” Jeffrey Chipps Smith contrasts the fate of two cities over the course of two centuries. Nuremberg, which saw a flowering of art and architecture supported in large part by the Emperor and the Roman Catholic Church, underwent a political, economic and architectural decline with the adoption of Protestantism and as a result of the Thirty Years War. Munich, on the other hand, became the seat of the powerful Wittelsbach Dynasty, and was the staunchest Roman Catholic principality in Southern Germany. This symbiotic combination of two powerful factors affected the artistic and architectural development of the city in the seventeenth century and later.

In “Searching for the New Constantine: Early Modern Rome as a Spanish Imperial City,” Thomas Dandelet considers the source of the rebuilding of Rome after its sack by Emperor Charles V in 1527—the Kings of Spain and Spanish nobility. Fuelled by the influx of wealth from the New World and their Counter-reformation Catholic zeal, the Spanish King and nobles not only poured millions of ducats into the papal treasury, they also built sumptuous residences in the Eternal City, and even took up residence there. Given this evidence, Dandelet argues that one could and should consider Rome of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries a Spanish Imperial city.

“The Zodiac in the Streets: Inscribing ‘Buon Governo’ in Baroque Naples” by John A. Marino is based on an irony of history that often escapes us—that Southern Italy with its capital Naples was Spanish-ruled from 1503 to 1707. Marino chronicles how, in order to maintain their rule over this area, the Spanish viceroys and their attendant entourages integrated themselves into the popular Neapolitan processions and festivities, which accompanied the many religious holy days observed in the city. Visual elements in this process included emblematic art depicting the political virtues that the Spaniards wished to propagate and the construction of objects associated with feasts and processions.

In “A Setting for Royal Authority: The Reshaping of Madrid, Sixteenth-Eighteenth Centuries,” David Ringrose charts the role of the Spanish Monarchs of the period in making an impressive royal and imperial capital out of a previously underdeveloped provincial Castilian metropolitan centre. Working together with the major social elements of the city, they refashioned the city to reflect the power, wealth, and might of the Spanish crown.

Illustrations from various contemporary printed books and archival sources accompany each of these meticulously documented studies and an extensive if not exhaustive bibliography accompanies the whole. The study of urban architecture and development has long interested scholars of various disciplines. The studies in this volume will interest primarily those who are now investigating the visible connections between the transformation of urban landscape and political power.

Peter A. Rolland, University of Alberta
Leonard G. Friesen. *Rural Revolutions in Southern Ukraine: Peasants, Nobles, and Colonists, 1774–1905*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 2008. viii, 325 pp. Maps. Bibliography. Index. $39.95, cloth.

Leonard Friesen offers some valuable new insights into economic development and social relations in New Russia (today southern Ukraine). However, in the end this study is not fully convincing in its big arguments, and it is sometimes dated and unsatisfactory in its details.

Friesen identifies a three-part dynamic in New Russian development: before the Great Reforms, New Russia enjoyed a land surplus that resulted in extensive, inefficient agricultural practices; the Great Reforms redistributed land, encouraging peasants to introduce land repartition and continue pre-reform agricultural practices, with the side-effect of reducing labour supplies for nobles and colonists; finally, a cycle of rising and falling international grain markets pushed nobles and colonists to engross large areas of prime agricultural land and rapidly introduce modern, labour-saving technologies. As a result, in little over a generation New Russian peasants went from land surpluses to land shortages, while in their midst nobles and colonists emerged as wealthy proprietors of large-scale commercial agricultural estates. The consequence, at least in some cases, was political radicalization. Yet, as Friesen shows, where the transition to modern commercial agriculture started early and was gradual, social relations were often amicable, and he argues that even after the revolution of 1905 New Russia teetered between “peasant adaptation or peasant revolution” (p. 252). He speculates that, without World War I, it may well have tipped toward peaceful adaptation.

One has the perplexing sense that *Rural Revolution* sat too long on a shelf between its writing and its publication. Where Friesen relies on otherwise-unused archival sources—e.g., in his excellent section on serfs—he provides some striking insights; but where his main sources are secondary, he is fifteen years out-of-date. These fifteen years saw a flood of new studies informed by post-Soviet archival access, including a significant body of work by Ukrainian and German scholars. Friesen’s inattention to this scholarship is a serious shortcoming.

The question of land surpluses, so central to Friesen’s argument, is particularly problematic. Friesen treats all land as though it were equal, broadly comparing New Russia’s population density to European Russia’s, in order to demonstrate a supposed New Russian surplus. In fact, large swathes of New Russia were semi-arid, and soil quality, particularly close to the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov, was often poor. Environmental constraints meant that, for many of the state peasants who made up the majority of New Russia’s population, land shortages had already emerged in the early 1830s and were clearly recognized by the Ministry of State Domains (MGI) in the late 1830s. Friesen places great emphasis on the introduction of land repartition by state peasants after the Great Reforms as a way to explain later tensions, but as I have elsewhere documented, the MGI began imposing land repartition, with peasant co-operation, in the 1830s. This raises serious doubts about Friesen’s account of post-Great-Reform economic and social dynamics in New Russia.

Land distribution is just one of many examples where Friesen is not up-to-date with current scholarship. His contention that the Russian state’s aim was “a methodical and complete integration of this borderland into the Empire” (p. 25) is at odds with much recent scholarship on the Russian Empire. He says nothing about religion, despite recent scholarship suggesting that it provided an important point of contact between diverse ethnic
groups, and that it became a major concern for the increasingly xenophobic Russian state in the late nineteenth century. Friesen likewise ignores the virulent anti-Semitism that characterized parts of New Russia by 1900 and played a role in exacerbating social and political tensions.

The shortcomings of *Rural Revolutions* outweigh its merits, and this is unfortunate. Much of the attention that New Russia has received from historians in recent years has focused on its various ethno-cultural and ethno-religious minorities, and Friesen’s efforts to place serfs and state peasants back in the picture are welcome. While his conclusions about the relationship between the Great Reforms, land distribution, modernization, and peasant radicalization are sometimes questionable, his account of the national and international economic forces at play in the post-Reform period is valuable. Friesen’s work will have to be treated with caution as it is fit into the growing body of scholarship on New Russia, but it should not be altogether ignored.

John Staples, *SUNY Fredonia*

**Janusz Korek.** *Paradoksy paryskiej “Kultury”: Styl i tradycje myślenia politycznego.* Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Śląskiego w Katowicach, nr. 2655. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2008. 550 pp. Bibliography. Index. PLN 75, cloth.

It may seem surprising to see a book of 550 pages devoted to a monthly political-literary journal published by a handful of Polish émigrés based in Paris. But *Kultura*, the journal in question, was much more than that. Even though illegal, between 1947 and 1989 it was smuggled into communist Poland where it was the most influential and widely read uncensored publication, one that provided “the foretaste of a different reality and a different Poland” to Poles like the author Janusz Korek himself (p. 18). Even more impressively *Kultura* successfully performed two at least partly contradictory functions. On the one hand, it provided a forum in which a diverse array of Polish political thinkers of various stripes was able to air their views. At the very same time, however, the journal’s “inner circle,” led by Jerzy Giedroyc, pushed its own, in some ways radically new, conception of Polish identity and politics. It is not an exaggeration to say that *Kultura* redefined many Poles’ conceptions of their country’s place in Europe and its proper relations with the peoples of Ukraine, Belarus, and Lithuania.

Korek’s book stands out among a plethora of Polish language publications dealing with *Kultura* for two reasons, both of which should make it particularly relevant and accessible to non-specialists. In the first place, Korek correctly notes that the existing works on *Kultura* too often focus on particular aspects or periods of its history and, as a result, fail to appreciate either its full complexity or the dynamic development of its political theory. The author addresses this charge by offering a sustained critical reading of over 400 issues of *Kultura*, covering the years from 1947–1980. The second problem with the existing literature, according to Korek, is its tendency to focus on the minute detail of *Kultura*’s editors’ personal correspondence and interaction, at the expense of a broader, contextualized, and theoretically grounded analysis of the political thought presented in its pages. As a result, specific political conceptions (such as the idea of a Polish-German rapprochement or the famous “renouncement” of Polish claims to Vilnius and Lviv, both of which were floated in *Kultura* as early as the 1950s when they were still anathema to most Poles) are too often described in detail but left uncontextualized, either in terms of the international context in which they arose or the intellectual, political, and philosophical commitments which motivated their creators.
Korek’s work succeeds in presenting Kultura in a broader perspective. The book is divided into six sections, the first five of which are organized chronologically, dealing with distinct periods of Kultura’s intellectual and political evolution. For each period, the author describes the major projects or conceptions articulated in the journal and provides the multiple contexts (international, East European, Polish émigré, and Polish) without which the former cannot be adequately understood. These chapters will probably be invaluable for specialists studying specific aspects of Polish political thought. However, Kultura’s frequent intellectual and political reversals leave the reader guessing as to what philosophical principles or ideological commitments ultimately motivated the journal’s editors. To cite just one example, Korek does not really tell us whether Kultura’s “renouncement” of Polish claims to L’viv was ultimately motivated by tactical considerations, philosophical principles, or some mixture of the two. In fact, he constantly stresses the intellectual and political flexibility of the journal’s editorial circle, and seems to take delight in keeping the reader in suspense as to their underlying motives.

This suspense is broken only in the final section of the book, which offers a systematic analysis of Kultura’s political theory over its entire period of existence. And while this part of the work is perhaps most interesting for the non-specialist reader, it is in some ways the least satisfying. Korek traces the intellectual roots of Kultura to the interwar period, and juxtaposes the journal’s political line with the Polish traditions of romanticism, Józef Piłsudski’s leftist statism, socialism, National Democratic nationalism, and conservatism. This discussion, however, is somewhat hamstrung by insufficient attention to the nuances of the aforementioned political ideologies. For example, Korek overestimates the impact of National Democratic ideology on the founders of Kultura (pp. 437–442), and thus underestimates their intellectual debt to the Piłsudskiite tradition which, like Kultura itself, represented a seemingly contradictory mix of leftist and conservative elements. In fact, while Korek is at pains to portray Kultura’s contribution to Polish political and intellectual life as representing an entirely new quality (p. 15), in his own presentation what leaps out at the reader is the continuities with the political thought (if not always the practice) of Piłsudski and his followers. Hence, while Kultura may have indeed transformed Polish politics and national identity it was also—and this point is not stressed nearly enough—rooted in a quintessentially Polish political tradition.

However, while one may disagree with certain aspects of Korek’s presentation and interpretation of Kultura’s intellectual genealogy, his work not only opens up this interesting, and until now neglected question, but also presents an important and much needed comprehensive and diachronic analysis of the journal’s political thought. Let us hope that it will serve to bring this important question out of academic isolation and ignite further debate regarding the place of Kultura in the realm of political theory.

Paul Bryczynski, University of Michigan

Paul Kubicek. The History of Ukraine. The Greenwood Histories of the Modern Nations. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2008. xvi, 199 pp. Chronology. Maps. Figures. Glossary of names. Bibliographical essay. Index. $45.00, cloth.

In The History of Ukraine, Paul Kubicek takes on the daunting task of covering roughly thirteen centuries of Ukrainian history in just 180 pages. The book contains ten concise chapters, as well as a chronology, bibliographical essay, and biographical sketches of key leaders. The book is part of the Greenwood Histories of the Modern Nations series, the goal
of which is to publish succinct national histories that reflect the momentous changes in the world since the 1960s, when the last series of this kind was published. Chapters 1 and 2 describe Kievan Rus' and the Polish-Lithuanian period respectively. Chapters 4 and 5 discuss Ukraine under the Russian Empire and western Ukraine under the Habsburg Empire. The next three chapters trace the rise of Ukrainian nationalism after the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian and Russian Empires, industrial transformation during the Soviet period, and the drive for Ukrainian independence spawned by Mikhail Gorbachev’s reform programme in the late 1980s. The final two chapters outline the political and economic struggles in post-Soviet Ukraine under Leonid Kravchuk and Leonid Kuchma (1991–2004) and the Orange Revolution led by Viktor Yushchenko and Yulia Tymoshenko.

One key theme of the book is the long absence, and then slow development of, national consciousness in Ukraine (a word meaning “on the edge” or “borderland”). Historically caught between empires—the Russian Empire, Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and Austro-Hungarian Empire—the inhabitants of this territory did not even refer to themselves as “Ukrainians” until the 1800s. Instead they were “Little Russians,” “Ruthenians,” or “Rusyns” (p. xi). Overwhelmingly uneducated peasants living in rural villages, the Ukrainians were for centuries denied access to political or economic power. In western Ukraine, primary education was wholly in Polish until 1818, and higher education available only in Polish or German. In eastern Ukraine, Russian was compulsory; in fact, in 1876 all literature published in Ukrainian was banned within the Russian Empire (p. 67). While the end of World War I helped create independent states for the Poles, Czechs, and Slovaks, President Woodrow Wilson’s principle of national self-determination was not applied to the Ukrainian lands. Nevertheless, the collapse of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires in 1917–1918 stimulated the creation of several political groups that aspired toward Ukrainian independence. On 17 March 1917, Ukrainian activists formed the Central Rada (“council” in Ukrainian), which fought with Bolsheviks in Kyiv against the non-communist Provisional Government. Having won, they formed the Ukrainian People’s Republic on November 20, as an autonomous unit within a future communist federation of nationalities. Likewise in Vienna in 1929 the militant Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) was formed. However, as Kubicek explains, it failed to gain the support of the Greek Catholic Church because of its use of violence against Polish officials. When Nikita Khrushchev became Soviet First Secretary in 1953—he had also been chief of the Ukrainian Communist party in 1938—Ukrainian intellectuals (later known as the shetsydesiatnyky or “sixtiers”) called for less party control over the creative professions and greater reverence for Ukrainian culture. The poet Ivan Drach deemed the atmosphere in Ukraine even more repressive than in Russia: “In Moscow they clip your nails, but in Kiev they cut your fingers off” (p. 124). The intelligentsia also condemned the lack of Ukrainian-language schools and publications. As Kubicek points out, a common joke at the time was: “You could teach a Jew to speak Ukrainian in no time, a Russian in two or three years. But for an ambitious Ukrainian, it would take forever” (p. 124). By the early 1980s, however, Ukrainians were the “largest ethnic group among all Soviet political prisoners, including the Russians” (p. 115). Finally, in 1990, the Ukrainians issued a declaration of sovereignty and the following 24 August 1991 declared their independence.

A second theme Kubicek emphasizes throughout the book is the polarization between western and eastern Ukraine, which he argues stems from historical realities. Much of western Ukraine was formerly part of Poland and the Habsburg Empire (Galicia, Transcarpathia, Bukovyna). These territories were added to the rest of Soviet Ukraine only as a result of World War II. “Having avoided Russian and later Soviet rule, its residents
were more prone to develop a distinct Ukrainian identity,” he writes. Austrian authorities were more lenient, having recognized literary Ukrainian in 1893. While in Kyiv and areas east of the Dniipro River, Ukrainian publications were banned, Galicia had “more than 2,500 Ukrainian-language elementary schools” and seventy Ukrainian-language journals (p. 71). Kubicek notes that this polarization has persisted even in the post-Soviet period, where most of the national-democratic activity has centred in western Ukraine and in the capital, Kyiv. Citizens there tend to favour economic reforms and closer relations with the West. In the 1994 presidential elections, for example, while Kuchma won 75.2% on the western bank of the Dniipro, Kravchuk, with his advocacy of pro-Russian and anti-Western policies, won 70.3% of the vote on the eastern bank (p. 155).

While Kubicek has succeeded in his goal of “detailing the main contours of Ukrainian history,” he covers some areas better than others. Just three paragraphs are devoted to the 1950s and four paragraphs to the 1960s, for example. Although he acknowledges the ethnic Russians in the east—Ukraine’s largest minority—he neglects other minorities like the Roma, Crimean Tatars, and Hungarians in the Transcarpathian oblast. Moreover, while the Habsburg rulers might have been “more lenient” toward its minorities—including the Ruthenians (Ukrainians)—than the Russian tsars, these minorities were still unhappy. Emigration statistics at the turn of the twentieth century show that most of those who fled the Habsburg Empire were the non-Hungarian minorities like the Ruthenians, Slovaks, and so on. The author also relies solely on English-language secondary sources. In short, the book provides a basic introduction to Ukrainian history and politics, but researchers should also consult the definitive studies by historians like Paul Robert Magocsi and Orest Subtelny, as well as recent historiographical inquiries like A Laboratory of Transnational History (2009), edited by Georgiy Kasianov and Philipp Ther.

Johanna Granville, Texas A & M University

Jennifer Presto. Beyond the Flesh: Alexander Blok, Zinaida Gippius, and the Symbolist Sublimation of Sex. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2008. 334 pp. Illustrations. $60.00, cloth.

The University of Wisconsin Press should be congratulated on publishing a succession of thought-provoking studies devoted to Russian modernism, including Olga Matich’s Erotic Utopia (2005) and Otto Boele’s Erotic Nihilism in Late Imperial Russia (2009). In her book Matich devoted four chapters to Blok and Gippius, making one think that it would be difficult to say anything new about them in the decades to come. And yet Jennifer Presto manages to shed new light on the two cultural icons. Presto’s book was in the making for nearly fifteen years, and this enormous amount of work shows in her sensitive and nuanced readings of the poets’ lives and in her unfailing attention to detail. Beyond the Flesh is divided into two parts, each centring on one poet and his/her cultural milieu. Although Blok and Gippius knew each other well and Blok continued to loom large for Gippius long after his premature death in 1921, their literary and human paths were instructively different. “They each in their own way organized their poetic careers around the denial of sexuality and the body, a denial that manifested itself in a tendency to implicitly identify at times with the gender of the other: Blok with the feminine and the maternal and Gippius with the masculine and the dandified” (p. 241). Beyond the Flesh is as much about the symbolists’ strategies of sublimating sex and creativity in general as it is about what it took each of these poets at any moment to be able to acquire
and preserve one’s own voice and to be productive, original, and in tune with one’s inner development.

Students of Blok know that he repeatedly identified himself with a child (dítia dobra i sveta), yet his self-identification both with a child and a mother figure has never before received such a consistent and believable explication as it does in Presto’s book. Chapter 3 offers a very convincing reading of Blok’s reproductive fantasies in the wake of the death of his wife’s child in 1909. The child lived a few days and shortly after that the Bloks left for Italy, the trip, which assuaged Blok’s “growing sense of disharmony” (p. 71) and put an end to a perplexingly dry spell. Blok who, unlike many other poets, such as Akhmatova, Tsvetaeva, Mandelstam, and Pasternak, rarely suffered from writer’s block, found such periods of silence particularly unsettling and difficult to cope with. Presto sees Blok’s trip to Italy and ensuing Italian poems as his “attempts to work out his complicated relationship to the issue of motherhood, an issue that had been too real for him in the previous year. […]” Not only does [Blok] implicate the mother figure in violence, neglect, or wrongdoing in the poems ‘Siena’ and ‘Florence’, but in other poems, such as those about Venice, he presents the city as a watery grave where the poet-child is doomed either to death or to an impossible birth” (p. 104). After 1910 Blok’s anti-procreative streak also manifested itself in his rather virulent attacks on acmeists, whom Blok saw both as emerging poetic rivals and as purveyors of bourgeois family values. Presto’s book is full of similar delicate touches and parallels, such as her bringing together the beginning of Blok’s work on his long poem “Retribution” in 1910 and his concurrent attempt to renovate his family estate in Shakhmatovo. I was amused to learn that Blok was reading Anna Karenina prior to the birth of his wife’s child and was comparing himself to two mutually exclusive fathers in Tolstoy’s novel—Konstantin Levin and Aleksei Vronskii. Like many symbolists, Blok tried hard to live what he preached and to preach what he lived. Many of Presto’s insightful conclusions are based on her profound knowledge of Blok’s essays, diaries, and correspondence.

The book’s part on Zinaida Gippius is another treasure trove. As Presto demonstrates, Gippius’s well-publicized quirks and antics were not quirks after all, because the choices that Gippius and other female writers had to make were deeply rooted in contemporary culture and male-dominated cultural criticism. For example, the literary critic Kornei Chukovskii saw female creativity either as a form of “fabrication” or “verbal promiscuity” (slovobludie), while Freud aligned it with “the inherently onanistic activity of the plaiting and weaving of the pubic hair” (pp. 139–141). The latter, according to Freud, resulted from women’s desire “to compensate [for their] genital deficiency” (p. 141). It is not surprising that Gippius found such concepts as “female creativity” and “women’s art” “absurd,” insisted on signing her poetry with an unmarked genderless signature “Z. Gippius” and refused to form alliances with other female poets on the basis of gender (p. 143).

How should we reconcile Gippius’s asexual poetic persona with her provocatively and decidedly feminine appearance that she cultivated in “real” life as the hostess of a famous literary salon, an appearance made up of wigs, elaborate hairdos, exquisite shawls and furs together with impossible and sometimes tasteless outfits? To answer this question, Presto ingeniously draws on and expands Luce Irigaray’s concept of female mimicry or mimétisme. Presto writes:

Gippius mimicked “the feminine style and posture assigned to her” by fashioning herself in an ultrafeminine manner in the salon for all her critics and contemporaries to see and by playfully acknowledging that she wrote in a style consonant with her provocatively feminine salon demeanor. Though she persisted in masking her gender in her verse, she developed an entire critical vocabulary that centered on feminine fashion and style (p. 146).
One of my favorite chapters is “The Dandy’s Gaze,” which includes Presto’s brilliant analysis of Gippius’s poem “The Kiss.” The guise that Gippius explored to perfection was the dandified speaker who is “neither completely heterosexual nor completely homosexual but something in between” (p. 177). “In adopting the style or stance of the dandy, Gippius does not so much normalize or heterosexualize lesbian relationships as complicate them” (p. 184).

In her research, Presto relies on a variety of sources; most impressive is her detailed knowledge of primary texts. She readily sees “sex” (pol) in “na-pol-nennyi” and “gender” (rod) in “rot” and “pri-rod-a” in a revealing metaphor that Gippius uses to describe her writing style as a manifestation of her “foul nature—a mouth filled with pins” (p. 146). One can rarely say about a book that draws heavily on close readings of a great number of obscure symbolist texts that it is jargon-free, lucid, and enlightening. But this is truly the case with Presto’s book. None of Presto’s readings appears far-fetched or contrived to illustrate her overarching ideas. Her interpretations are admirably nuanced, evincing the almost inexhaustible patience of maternal care that Blok was craving but couldn’t find during his lifetime. I believe that even non-specialists and advanced undergraduate students will enjoy this book.

Galina S. Rylkova, University of Florida

Alexander Pushkin. Eugene Onegin: A Novel in Verse. Henry M. Hoyt, trans. Indianapolis, Indiana: Dog Ear, 2008. 192 pp. Appendices. $14.95, paper.

The noble goal of garnering for Pushkin the acclaim, reverence and readership that have largely eluded him in the West no doubt attracts translators. Nabokov’s warning that the task of translating Pushkin’s Eugene Onegin while preserving both form and content was “mathematically impossible” has been largely ignored, and in recent years new translations of his novel in verse continue to appear (e.g., Mitchell 2008), following the better known ones by Arndt (1963), Nabokov (1964), Johnston (1977), Falen (1995), and Hofstadter (1999).

The latest verse translation of Eugene Onegin by Henry M. Hoyt, a retired lawyer, is the product of decades of largely independent work on the part of a non-specialist. It is obviously a competent translation, and a labour of love. In a brief introduction, Mr. Hoyt outlines a personal context for his translation, highlighting the fact that he did have one source and guide in his work—Vladimir Nabokov. Indeed, 186 lines of Hoyt’s translation coincide exactly with Nabokov’s version. Hoyt divides these echoes into cases where he deliberately consulted Nabokov’s text and changed his own to fit it, and cases where he arrived at Nabokov’s wording independently, claiming that the latter significantly outnumber the former (63% to 37% of the identical lines). Although it is clear that Hoyt’s translation fails to escape the shadow cast by his illustrious predecessor, his version is not a Nabokovian artifact. It is a highly readable text, written in a contemporary literary language not indulging either in an obsolete (Duetsch, Elton) or in an obviously colloquial (Hofstadter) idiom.

What convinces a translator that his approach to Pushkin’s notoriously untranslatable novel in verse will succeed where others have failed? Hoyt’s innovation—and it does seem to be an innovation, at least among published English translations of the work—is to preserve the metre of the original, but not its rhyme. This procedure does, as Hoyt claims, bring his version closer to the literal sense of Pushkin’s words than do rhymed translations by Charles Johnston, James Falen et al., but whether it serves what Hoyt calls “the spirit of
the original” (p. vii) is another matter. Occasional infelicities and convolutions in Hoyt’s text make it sound every bit as odd and artificial as a rhymed translation, only without the meager consolation of rhyme. Furthermore, leaving aside the thorny but significant question of iambic tetrameter’s varying importance in the poetic traditions of source and target language, what Hoyt fails to realize (or, at any rate, to address in his introductory notes) is that there is a crucial difference between metre and rhythm. His version may reproduce the nominal metrical scheme of the original, but it does not, of course, recreate Pushkin’s realization of that scheme (i.e., the actual pattern of stressed and unstressed syllables in each line), and so his method seems strangely arbitrary.

According to Hoyt, with his translation, he not only aims at giving full justice to one of the most popular literary works in Russia, but also to attract a wide readership to it. If that is the case, he would have done better to borrow from Nabokov’s commentary rather than from his translation: Hoyt’s version lacks any explanatory notes besides those provided by Pushkin himself. While the incorporation of a five-page appendix on the Cyrillic alphabet and Russian phonetics suggests a beginning audience, it is hard to imagine a sincere Anglophone student of Russian literature poring over this brief and occasionally flawed appendix in order to fathom through the phonemes of Pushkin’s masterpiece without having the slightest idea of what they mean. A more helpful addendum would have been appropriate in this case, the more so that reliable sources of information are abundant, and so are good examples to follow.

In sum, this new bilingual edition of Eugene Onegin will undoubtedly find its readers, and Hoyt’s competent work will definitely inspire further explorations into the possibilities of translating Pushkin’s masterpiece.

James McGavran and Natalia Olshanskaya, Kenyon College

Leonid Smilovitsky. Jews in Turov: The History of a Shtetl in Mozyr’s Polesye Region. Jerusalem: Tel Aviv University, 2008. 848 pp. Bibliography. Illustrations. Maps. Tables. Appendices. Index of names. Geographical index. $65.00, cloth.

Jews in Turov: The History of a Shtetl in Mozyr’s Polesye Region is written in Russian except for the bilingual introduction (Russian/English) and the table of contents. The present reviewer is generally careful with superlatives such as “encyclopaedic,” “epic,” and “impressive”; however, in relation to this monograph, they seem to be appropriate due to the solid archival materials pertaining to multidisciplinary subjects. Indeed, the disciplines enclosed in this study range from Jewish and Belarusian studies to history, political and social sciences, ethnography, religion, education, anthropology, psychology, linguistics, emigration, fishing, and many more. While writing his monograph, Smilovitsky obtained and utilized data from twenty-one state archives, among them, Belarusian, Russian (seven each), four Israeli, two US, and one Ukrainian. In addition, the author included a good number of memoirs and extensive correspondence with many generations of Belarusian Jews originating from and/or rooted in Turov and environs.

The monograph is well-structured. Besides the introductory chapter mentioned above, it offers four full chapters with unequal numbers of subchapters. Chapter 1, “Our Roots,” exposes fifteen subjects with comprehensive subtitles. It contains over 230 pages and thematically ranges from “Legends of Olden Times” to causalities and consequences of Jewish pre-revolutionary emigration from the Belarusian Polesye region. Chapter 2, “Between the World Wars” (close to 340 pages), covers fourteen extensive topics, from the Pogroms of 1918–1921 to early Soviet repressions. Chapter 3, “The Soviet-German War” (67 pages), has two subchapters with telling subtitles: “Evacuation and Flight” and “Front,
Partisans, Destruction of the Community.” Chapter 4, “Return to Peaceful Life, Restoration of Town” (33 pages), is followed by a comprehensive conclusion, thirty-six pages of supplement, a list of illustrations, dictionaries of terms and abbreviations, a five-part bibliography, and name and geographical indexes.

The wealth of the material resides in its novelty, most of which is presented to the reader for the first time. The author’s attempt to start from a microcosm of the Turov region and to create a macrocosm of Jewish Belarusian life is mostly successful, since Smilovitsky is bringing together aspects of a Jewish community life that is replicated across Eastern Europe. *Jews in Turov* is a solid academic study, written with tremendous knowledge and understanding of the subject matter. Smilovitsky’s monograph outshines many recent works on related topics. Among them is a collection of documentary and essays, *Kniga Pogromov. Pogromy na Ukrainе, v Belorussii i Evropeiskoi chastii Rossii vo vremia grazhdanskoi voiny, 1918–1922* (Moskva: ROSSPEN, 2007) and Alexander Solzhenitsyn’s *Dvesti let vnestе* (2 vols. Moskva: Russkii put’, 2001–2002.) These studies share similar omissions and oversights based on their dismissal of the unique living history of Belarusians of different faiths. The outstanding feature of Smilovitsky’s book is that, unlike these two studies (and many others), *Jews in Turov* does not isolate Jews from Belarusians of different faiths but convincingly shows the working relationships and everyday interactions of various Belarusian Christians, Muslims (Tatars), Lithuanians, Poles, Ukrainians, Russians, and their mutual communal and individual economic and cultural dependence. The depth of insights and unbiased narration of *Jews in Turov* strengthens its documentary, individual, and collective data, where the author not only raises many questions but makes a successful attempt to clarify some of their complexities. His research encompasses everyday community life, values, the army and arms, professional divisions, flora and fauna, the food and clothing of Christian and Jewish Belarusians, social strata, women’s roles and positions, behaviour during menstrual cycle and after giving a birth, and much more.

Smilovitsky’s discourse concentrates on detailed analyses of the following: (a) Why has the unique relationship of Belarusian Christians and Jews ended? (b) Why and how were these relationships unique in the first place? (c) How did the Soviets manage to divide these two groups in approximately the first forty years after the Bolsheviks came to power? After all, the Russian tsars and Polish magnates had not succeeded for centuries. (d) Why were the Jewish pogroms (civil war) in Polesye more forceful than others in Belarus? (e) Why were the Nazis and their collaborators particularly successful in exterminating Jews in this area? (f) Why are both Christian and Jewish Belarusians, despite some later bad history, so nostalgic about their common past?

Though Smilovitsky mentions the glorious days of the Belarusian Polesye region as the fifteenth, the sixteenth, and the first half of the seventeenth centuries, his discourse concentrates mainly on the very end of the eighteenth century, and is particularly detailed on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The only slight stylistic shortcoming of the work that makes the present reviewer cringe is Smilovitsky’s frequent Russification of Belarusian words. A telling example is on page 42, though the reader finds the same throughout the entire monograph: “Боры называли шчырыми” (instead of шчырымі). However, this is an insignificant quibble compared to the immense academic and non-academic value of Leonid Smilovitsky’s *Jews in Turov: History of a Shtetl in Mozyr’s Polesye Region*. In sum, the volume is highly recommended for researchers, libraries, and the general public.

Zina Gimpelevich, *University of Waterloo*
Mark D. Steinberg and Catherine Wanner, eds. *Religion, Morality, and Community in Post-Soviet Societies*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2008. xii, 350 pp. Figures. Index. Further reading. $45.50, cloth. $17.50, paper.

The spiritual dimension of post-Soviet change continues to be a rewarding topic for analysis. This volume offers rich essays on past and present religious landscapes, discussing a wide range of religious communities—from dispersed mountain Jews and repressed pious Muslims to assertive Moscow-based U.S. Protestants and disgruntled Russian Orthodox clergy. The central theme is “crisis” or, more precisely, the changing role and position of religion in contexts of ideological collapse and societal fragmentation. In the introduction the editors use the concepts of morality, community, and pluralism to unravel this complex issue. They suggest, as others have done before them, that the disorder and corruption which accompanied “the fall” generated a demand for new moral registers on personal as well as societal levels. Linked to the issue of morality are the communal aspects of religion. Although the Durkheimian idea of a single moral community may be unattainable, it is often through face-to-face interactions that members of religious groupings achieve a sense of belonging and purpose. The wide range of old and new religious groups that are active in many post-Soviet societies precludes, however, a convenient match between religion and larger societal formations such as the nation. Indeed, the pluralism characteristic of the post-Soviet era poses new challenges to civic life.

The editors have not been entirely successful in integrating the different approaches of the contributing anthropologists, historians, and political scientists. For example, Scott M. Kenworthy’s exploration of moral action in pre-revolutionary Russia and Irina Papkova’s study of state-church relationships in the 1910s sit uneasily in the volume. It is not that these fascinating and well-documented chapters are unrelated to the central themes, but with all other chapters addressing contemporary, the result is that the volume feels a bit incoherent at times.

The six subsequent ethnographic chapters are each interesting in their own right. Jarrett Zigon’s “moral portrait” of a middle-aged Russian woman conveys the point that moral behaviour is always fraught with inconsistencies, and he thoughtfully discusses the unavoidable but analytically interesting discrepancies between thought and action. If Zigon focuses on a single individual, Melissa L. Caldwell discusses how morality is acted out by North Americans who are involved in faith-based charities in Moscow. One of the interesting points she makes is that despite the public animosity between the Orthodox Church and Protestant missions, there appears to be more room for co-operation below the surface. Sascha Goluboff looks at the mourning practices of mountain Jews in Azerbaijan, comparing how these unfold in very different sites. While rituals in the village serve to strengthen local kinship ties, online expressions of mourning reach out to the transnational Jewish community. Katherine Metzo’s account of Buriat shamans rallies against the received wisdom that shamanism is dying out. Instead, she documents its revival in recent decades, suggesting that shamanism provides an important antidote to modernity by attending to the wholeness of persons and linking them to the larger (and perhaps multiple) world.

Arguably the strongest chapter is “Old Belief between Society and Culture” by Douglas Rogers, which combines the virtues of close-up ethnography and solid historiography. The chapter centres on the question of why a “priestless” Old Believer community in the Urals became a “priestly” one after the Soviet state had collapsed. By
attending to the internal dynamics of the community and their engagement with the wider world, Rogers shows how Soviet and post-Soviet experiences triggered the reorganization of the Old Believer community, thereby testifying to the fact that thinking along the binaries of continuity and discontinuity is rather unhelpful when it comes to religion. Ironically, the new religious freedoms of the 1990s produced a less democratic church, a process that was characterized by “rapid religious hierarchicalization and masculinization” (p. 116).

Several of the previously discussed chapters touch on the issue of pluralism, but only the last three texts analyze it more systematically. Russell Zanca addresses the restrictive religious policies of the Uzbek government. Here Muslim piety movements and faith-based business associations are treated with the utmost suspicion, and their participants are likely to be labelled and treated as terrorists. Zanca warns that state repression may trigger the kind of militancy it sets out to combat, and may already have damaged the social contract beyond repair. Zoe Knox’s chapter likewise focuses on issues of religious freedom, but now in Russia. She documents the unfair treatment of Catholics and Jehovah’s Witnesses, who are generally seen as a threat to the Orthodox Church and the Russian nation. Unfortunately her conclusion merely measures the Russian situation against an ideal notion of the ultimate free religious market. This approach also bespeaks the policy implications presented in the Afterword. Here, the editors sing the mantra of “religious freedom,” stressing its importance for the development of a vibrant civil society and a functioning democracy. The vices of religious repression are obvious and objections to governments for whom “all religions are equal but some are more equal than others” (p. 317) are understandable, but this narrow focus overlooks that “freedom” may generate its own inequalities.

These critical notes aside, this book has much to offer for the student of post-Soviet religion. By documenting and analyzing people’s engagement with competing and overlapping moral registers in a changing world, the volume illuminates the processes through which religion repositioned itself after socialism. As such it makes a valuable contribution to a now rapidly expanding field of scholarly expertise.

Mathijs Pelkmans, London School of Economics

Val Vinokur. *The Trace of Judaism: Dostoevsky, Babel, Mandelstam, Levinas*. Northwestern University Press Studies in Russian Literature and Theory. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2008. xii, 190 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. $24.95, paper.

We find traces where the full figure is effaced, faded, fragmented, defaced, partly remembered or reconfigured, yet still recognizable. Vinokur’s study retraces lines of descent and development, drawing out continuity and correspondences, despite more evident difference. In *The Trace of Judaism: Dostoevsky, Babel, Mandelstam, Levinas*, Vinokur seeks to elucidate “covert affinities”—not neat affiliations, but rather messy, complicated, contingent Jewish-Christian, ethical-aesthetic symbioses that turn “difference and opposition (elective antipathies)” into “potential sources of mutual survival and enrichment” in the works of these writers (p. 14). Vinokur recovers in Dostoevsky’s dialogic form the hidden figure of Talmudic discourse, in Babel’s prosaic depravity a responsible Russian Orthodox and Jewish ethics of defilement, in Mandelstam’s deconstructive poetics (responding to a variable “Judaic chaos” [pp. 14, 116–119, 122,
a re-constructive, re-humanizing commitment and community (corresponding to "Judaic cares" [pp. 14, 128]), and in Levinas’s intersubjective ethics ghostly dialogues with Dostoevsky.

While Vinokur takes as point of departure Levinas’s deference for and direct references to Dostoevsky’s and Celan’s work (for which Mandelstam’s serves as immediate predecessor), his compelling arguments concerning these writers’ ethical-aesthetic negotiations are contingent rather on incisive reading between the lines of conventional comparative criticism. That is, his alternately corrective, revisionary, and re-focused interpretations depend on a provocative re-location of each writer’s ethical stance in digressive aesthetic dimensions of their work. The peculiar aesthetic originality of these writers comprises an ethical response to complex cultural circumstances. It derives from and develops in the course of continued negotiations with complex cultural origins. Rather than immediate influences, actual or intertextual confrontations between these writers, conventionally contextualized constructions of cultural identity, or controversial cultural conflicts, Vinokur investigates intersections in a Bakhtinian “Great Time.” He moves beyond the debate about Dostoevsky’s actual or alleged anti-Semitism. While he attends to historical contexts and contingencies (Babel’s and Mandelstam’s respective relations to Jewish communities, for instance) and to affiliations (Levinas’s reading of Dostoevsky, etc.), Vinokur is most interested in layering critical lenses in such a way that Levinas’s ethical nonreciprocity might provide new insight into Dostoevsky’s dialogic aesthetics and vice versa.

Through incisive, critically-engaged readings of Dostoevsky’s representation of the ethical limits of aesthetic response in *The Idiot*, *Demons*, and *The Brothers Karamazov*, Vinokur makes a compelling case for a peculiarly Judaic as well as Christian conscience in Dostoevsky’s representation of Russian consciousness. Reaching beyond Bakhtin’s reading of Dostoevsky, Vinokur contends that death (the limit of failed communion) and dialogic form (corresponding to a Talmudic chattiness) ground radical ethical as well as aesthetic realization of the relation between self and other. Dostoevsky’s dialogism has the practical rabbinical cast of Levinas’s ethics, in which one is forced not only to confront the other face-to-face, but also to choose between others. Levinas’s aesthetic expression of ethics is conversely marked by Dostoevskian compassion. His Talmudic concern with justice reflects a Dostoevskian necessity for fleshing out “idea-feelings” and “incorporates Dostoevsky’s aesthetic and moral (Christian) insights as well as his secular skepticism” (p. 59).

If Vinokur offers new insights on widely studied texts and problematics of Russian literature in his introduction and critically-informed, comparative reading of Dostoevsky and Levinas, subsequent chapters not only offer new paradigms for reading Babel, Mandelstam, and Levinas, but re-grounded readings, demonstrating (and requiring from his readers) a deeper immersion in each writer’s *oeuvre*. Vinokur is not writing for an audience unfamiliar with these writers. But his digging for particular traces in some lesser-known but here contextualized texts and his comparative redefinition of critical terms makes this a compellingly focused survey for younger scholars as well as a more significant contribution for specialists working on any of these writers and/or larger questions of Jewish-Russian cultural/literary studies.

Measuring both Dostoevsky’s aesthetic-ethical interest in debasement and Babel’s aesthetic and cultural distanciation from Dostoevsky, Vinokur illuminates a Judaic ethics of defilement rendering writer, witness, reader complicit and responsible in Babel’s writing. Levinas’s work provides a lens through which Vinokur can focus on Babel’s concern with the ethics of witness, problematized paradoxically through prosaic wit. Levinas’s turn from
a prosaic ethics to an ethical poetics provides a framework for Vinokur’s insightful reading of Mandelstam’s developing aesthetics as shifting response to a disordered reality. This response is increasingly contingent on a Judaic ethics or “compassion” (p. 123), invoking community and “free choice” (p. 128) in the context of displacement and diaspora, more than a classically-ordered and “lyrically free” (p. 123) world culture. But more than a corrective reading, Vinokur’s offers a revisionary understanding of the complex relation between Judaic, Christian, and classical cultures for Mandelstam—who interpolates “classical dramatic terms (masks, Dionysian intoxication)” and “staples of Jewish consciousness (melancholy, irony, world weariness)” (p. 122)—as for Levinas—for whom a “‘Jewish’ discomfort with the idea of incarnation, central to Christian thought, draws partly on Greek skepticism, [...] while his critique of Greek ontology [...] and ‘language of intelligibility’” involves an “alternative Judeo-Christian approach to truth” (pp. 8–9). Similarly, Vinokur investigates how Levinas’s critique of poetics is cast in and contingent on highly poetic language. Aesthetics thus precedes ethics.

Vinokur’s own language is marked by poetic turns, often marked by Judaic traces, reframing aesthetic-ethical aspects of and affinities between writers. Thus, “it is possible that, like Balaam, Dostoevsky blesses what he means to curse” (p. 34). Each of these writers constructs a complex ethical stance in an aesthetic sphere marked by multiple and sometimes contradictory cultural memories—polyphony, which, were it not for the repression of some voices, might seem cacophony. But Vinokur’s study investigates literary (as opposed to theological, philosophical, or political) discourse as a domain in which “human incoherence” can be rendered “comprehensible,” in which “an inherently approximate and imperfect justice” can be faced—confronted in the fleshed-out, face-to-face encounters of the novel, in dialogic and debased prosaic narrative, and in poetic concern.

Sharon Lubkemann Allen, SUNY Brockport

Jay Bergman. Meeting the Demands of Reason: The Life and Thought of Andrei Sakharov. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2009. 480 pp. Illustrations. Bibliography. Index. $39.95, cloth.

Jay Bergman has given us an impressively-researched and sympathetic portrait of one of the twentieth century’s most important figures. Bergman firmly roots his narrative in Russian historiography. His extensive primary source base includes Andrei Sakharov’s memoirs and articles, Soviet press reports, and the writings of other dissidents, such as Alexander Solzhenitsyn. Bergman offers valuable insight into the inner workings of the dissident movement. He finds that, although a spirit of collaboration and mutual support predominated, philosophical differences between the main players were significant. He juxtaposes Solzhenitsyn’s view that Russia took a wrong turn when it modernized according to the Western model with Sakharov’s embrace of the Enlightenment values of individual dignity and universal human rights. It is clear that Bergman shares Sakharov’s appreciation for the intellectual and moral power of the Enlightenment. The lead title of the book, Meeting the Demands of Reason, comes from Sakharov’s Nobel Peace Prize lecture in 1975.

In the early chapters, Bergman seeks out the source of Sakharov’s later dissidence. He discovers a protective parental cocoon that distanced young Andrei from the brutality of Stalinization in the 1920s and 1930s. He also credits the intellectual freedom granted to the
Soviet scientific elite. The scientists who developed Soviet thermonuclear weapons were allowed to read Orwell’s *1984*, for example. Sakharov made the leap from scientist to political philosopher by concluding that if the physical world could be explained through rational laws, human society should be, too.

Bergman’s later chapters offer a necessary counterpoint to the recent re-writings of the Cold War that minimize the oppressive characteristics of the Soviet regime, in particular its anti-Semitism. Indeed, Sakharov took on the persecution of Soviet Jews, especially those blocked from leaving the country (the *refuseniks*), as one of his main causes due to the sheer numbers of people who were affected and his strong belief that the freedom to choose “place of residence” is a universal human right. Bergman draws parallels between the nineteenth-century intelligentsia’s championing of the peasants’ cause with the twentieth-century dissident concern with the treatment of Soviet Jews, stating that just as the intelligentsia “[…] saw in the plight of the Russian peasant a metaphor for what repulsed them about tsarist autocracy in general, Sakharov in the late 1960s and 1970s singled out Soviet Jews for what their persecution revealed about the Soviet Union and socialism” (p. 17).

Despite a clear admiration for his subject, Bergman does seek out inconsistencies in the application of Sakharov’s moral principles. He comes close to accusing Sakharov and his second wife, Elena Bonner, of crossing the line when they went on a hunger strike to secure a visa for Bonner’s future daughter-in-law, Liza Alekseeva in 1981 (pp. 296–301). Other identified weaknesses in Sakharov’s character include his emotional distance from his first wife, Klavdia, and his subsequent lack of contact with his three children from that marriage.

Although Sakharov emerges as a clear hero in Bergman’s narrative, in places Bergman’s inflamed rhetoric detracts from his otherwise convincing analysis. Several examples include his reference to the “cunning and sinister intelligence” of Iurii Andropov (p. 205) and the “customary cruelty and petty sadism” of the KGB (p. 255). Bergman convincingly shows Sakharov to be “the conscience of perestroika” and credits him with inspiring Mikhail Gorbachev’s reforms. The fact that the majority of Soviet subjects went from condemning Sakharov in the 1970s to cheering him in the late 1980s reveals the appeal that a man of integrity could have at this time in history. That this same message was largely forgotten by 2000, when an opinion survey showed that two-thirds of Russians believed that either communism or a dictatorship would be better than the existing system (p. 407) was for Bergman a further confirmation that the “ethical liberalism” Sakharov advocated was unlikely to take root in Russia. It can also be argued that the moral frailty of humanity knows no national boundaries. Bergman suggests that Sakharov should be placed beside Mohandas Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. as one of the great moral leaders of the twentieth century. This reviewer is inclined to agree.

Bergman’s compelling biography is highly recommended to students and scholars of modern Russian history and intellectual history. Historians of science will likely find Gennady Gorelik’s *The World of Sakharov* (2005), which includes extensive background on the Soviet scientific establishment and interviews with those who knew Sakharov personally, more useful for their research agendas.

Tracy Nichols Busch, *Ferris State University*
With *Massenmord und Lagerhaft*, Rolf Binner (who passed away in 2008), Bernd Bonwetsch and Marc Junge have produced the most exhaustive treatise on Joseph Stalin’s Great Terror available in any Western language. For several years, the authors led a Russian-Ukrainian-German research project that focused on the consequences of the infamous NKVD People’s Commissar Order 00447 of 30 July 1937. Its results have been published in a number of Russian- and German-language books during the last few years. *Massenmord und Lagerhaft* combines 231 documents translated from Russian into German with a systematic investigation of the Terror from the moment of the preparation of Order 00447 to Viacheslav Molotov and Stalin’s decree of 17 November 1938 ending the “mass operations,” and its aftermath. The research conducted for the book amounts to an utterly comprehensive investigation of the relevant extant files in central and provincial Russian and Ukrainian archives.

In their introduction, the authors explain that they particularly concentrated in their perusal of the materials on the question of whether or not the mass operations were purposeful and controlled, or a random, chaotic process. In the seven chapters that follow, they take the reader systematically through the unfolding of the massacre perpetrated in response to Order 00447. Each chapter first evaluates the evidence regarding a key component of this campaign, followed by a series of documents illustrating the point. One chapter assesses the scope of the rehabilitation process that was initiated in late 1938, concluding that it was negligible. Finally, a lengthy table assesses the extent of this part of the Terror in terms of arrests and sentences in every administrative territory of the Soviet Union.

In terms of the responsibility for the campaigns, meanwhile, the evidence presented seems unequivocal. They were initiated on the order of Stalin and the Politburo, and while their magnitude increased partially because of the zeal of NKVD officials (beginning with People’s Commissar Nikolai Ezhov) throughout the Soviet Union, this overfulfillment of the plans was wholly egged on by the Boss and his cronies. Once Stalin and company deemed the cull sufficient, they halted the “mass” operations and blamed their subalterns for any excesses that had occurred (and even then they condemned only a few instances of overzealous vigour).

The authors are otherwise cautious in their conclusions, especially in terms of explaining the rulers’ intentions behind the operations. Nevertheless, they seem to side with the proponents of the “prophylactic” hypothesis, first suggested by the Soviet refugees “Beck and Godin” (Konstantin Shteppa and Fritz Houtermans) more than half a century ago. Molotov, in his old age, confirmed to Feliks Chuev that the Terror had primarily been a pre-emptive strike: the Soviet Union could not tolerate residents who nurtured a covert hostility to the regime, for they might turn against the regime in an acute crisis such as (what seemed to be) the inevitable war that the country faced in the near future. Thus, not only former “kulaks,” White Army soldiers, tsarist bureaucrats, Socialist Revolutionaries, Mensheviks, Dashnaks, Borotbists, (recidivist) criminals, or religious leaders were arrested, but other mass campaigns in 1937 and 1938 gutted the Polish, Latvian, Estonian, Finnish, Korean and German diasporas (thought to be teeming with spies), and eliminated virtually all surviving (former) “Rightists” and Trotskyites. Although the numbers, as the authors
admit, will never be fully comprehensive, in a mere eighteen months a total of 1.6 million people was arrested (almost all of whom were convicted), with well-nigh 700,000 people executed. Of these, half were killed within the parameters of Order 00447.

But the book does not merely provide the contours of the operation and its chilling statistics. There are some breath-taking moments of microhistory in it. The case of Kalinin province blacksmith Pavel Ivanovich Ts. illustrates how at the local level the Terror’s dragnet swept away the last defiant dissenter. Meanwhile, the horrendous torture-and-execution practices of the NKVD branch in Vologda province seem to epitomize the depravity that took hold of the security organs’ personnel in the process.

I do have one minor quibble with the book. The authors are only eclectically in dialogue with others who have written on the Terror, especially in English. Indeed, any mention is missing of Hiroaki Kuromiya’s *Voices of the Dead* or Pavel Polyan’s *Against Their Will*, even though those works complement *Massenmord und Lagerhaft* in illuminating the “national operations” that were conducted next to the “anti-kulak” campaign. Both Polyan’s and Nikolai F. Bugai’s Russian-language works have some pertinent things to say about the Terror, even if they are more concerned with the wartime and postwar deportations of the “punished peoples.” Perhaps, though, this deficiency can be overcome by having *Massenmord und Lagerhaft* translated into English. For now, for anyone who tries to understand the odious history of the Great Terror and knows German, reading this book is required fare.

Kees Boterbloem, University of South Florida

Robert Edelman. *Spartak Moscow: A History of the People’s Team in the Worker’s State*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009. 368 pp. Illustrations. Appendices. Notes. Index. $35.00, cloth.

Although much work remains to be done, in recent years, scholars have fruitfully utilized the lens of popular culture and leisure for analyzing both the institutions of the Soviet system and the lived experience of the population. Robert Edelman makes a signal contribution to this field in his monograph on one of the most popular Soviet soccer teams, Spartak Moscow. Renowned for his scholarship on Soviet sports, the author traces the history of Spartak in the twentieth century and advances intriguing analyses about Soviet society as a whole.

Edelman focuses on the four Starostin brothers, the key sport organizers behind the team. The Starostins, having already created a successful soccer team during the entrepreneurial New Economic Policy era, managed to leverage their deal-making skills to establish the Spartak soccer club in 1935, with patronage from the Komsomol leadership and the wealthy trade union Promkooperatsiia. Their main competition came from the police-sponsored Dinamo Moscow soccer club. While Spartak emphasized an entertaining style of play and a looser discipline on the field and off, Dinamo embodied the public values of its patrons: victory through disciplined organization on the field, and upstanding, disciplined off-the-field behaviour. Spartak enjoyed some of its greatest sport triumphs during the Great Purges, despite backroom efforts by the increasingly powerful police against Spartak. Only after the most important Spartak patrons were purged did Lavrentii Beria manage to jail the Starostins in 1942, resulting in a decade-long slump for Spartak. It only began to recover in the early 1950s. However, the “thaw” proved crucial to enabling Spartak to reach its previous heights, as the rehabilitated Starostins helped lead the club back to the top, though Spartak gradually lost prominence in the late 1960s.
The author’s central thesis is that Spartak enabled its overwhelmingly working-class fans to distance themselves from the “structures of force” represented by Dinamo, and thereby provided a way of “demonstrating dissatisfaction with the authorities” (p. 2). Edelman is careful in putting forth his claims, noting that while soccer games provided sites for “dangerous acts,” such sites were limited and ephemeral (p. 99). Neither did they create “massive support for […] regime change” (p. 2). Nonetheless, he makes the case that the fact that from the mid-1930s onward “a majority of Moscow laboring males favored Spartak undermines the view that acceptance of the regime was strong and universal among Soviet workers” (p. 135). He bases his evidence on demonstrations of higher attendance at Spartak than Dinamo games, several memoirs published by intellectuals after 1991, and indications of rowdiness among Spartak supporters. Thus, Edelman locates himself squarely on one side of the historiographical debate over the resistance paradigm, those highlighting “dissent, disorganization, and grumbling,” approvingly citing work by Sarah Davies, Sheila Fitzpatrick, and Lynne Viola (p. 97).

Yet his evidence that Spartak afforded its working-class fans a “choice that established in a limited but still meaningful way their independence from the regime” might not convince readers more sceptically inclined toward this approach to examining Soviet reality (p. 124). Edelman lacks the appropriate sources for teasing out the extent to which the club’s popularity sprang from politically neutral origins, such as the club’s excellence on the field, as opposed to its rivalry with Dinamo. Even were we to accept that a portion of Spartak’s fan base rooted for this club as a means of opposing the police, many scholars will hesitate over Edelman’s conflation of the police with the Party-state as a whole. For a club sponsored by the Komsomol, Party, and trade unions, and with the Starostins vocal members of the sports administration, the idea that rooting for Spartak could be widely perceived as “a safe way to resist” by working-class fans appears questionable (p. 134). Indeed, in a memoir Edelman cites extensively, a Spartak fan recalls that he and his friends “thought Spartak great, Dinamo terrible, and Stalin an OK Joe”; this assessment is not indicative of what Edelman called independence from the regime (p. 125). It would be more convincing to claim that Spartak occupied one pole of the broader spectrum of Soviet culture, oriented toward liberalism and spontaneity, against the discipline and conservatism represented by Dinamo. This would also connect better to another of Edelman’s claims, one strongly supported by the evidence: that the contest between Spartak and Dinamo reflected a struggle between two competing, but fully Soviet, masculinities and body cultures.

Despite these criticisms, Edelman’s book is a fascinating, insightful, well-written, and seriously fun read. Unfortunately, space limitations prevent me from elaborating on other themes, from Spartak’s involvement in international competitions, to backroom political interventions. This work should be read by anyone interested in a fascinating Soviet case study of sports history and more broadly history of popular culture; due to its engaging content, thoughtful analysis, clear, articulate writing style, and affordability, it would be an excellent assignment for graduate and advanced undergraduate courses.

Gleb Tsipursky, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Kristen Ghodsee. *Muslim Lives in Eastern Europe: Gender, Ethnicity, and the Transformation of Islam in Postsocialist Bulgaria.* Princeton Studies in Muslim Politics. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009. xvi, 252 pp. Illustrations. Tables. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Index. $65.00, cloth. $24.95, paper.

Kristen Ghodsee’s second book reveals the same interest in the social and personal facets of Bulgaria’s postsocialist transition that defined her first work, *The Red Riviera: Gender, Tourism and Postsocialism on the Black Sea* (2005). *Muslim Lives in Eastern Europe* is a riveting ethnographic study of Pomaks (Bulgarian-speaking Muslims) residing in the formerly bustling southern towns of Madan and Rudozem. During the socialist years the local mines employed more than 20,000 men, bringing wealth and secular modernity to this traditionally agricultural and poor Muslim region. Once touted as symbols of socialism’s success, in the last decade these communities have attracted negative national press for their unexpected embrace of “orthodox” (mostly Saudi-inspired) Islam. Ghodsee’s aim is to explain the appeal of foreign, often radical Islam in secular Eastern Europe without resorting to platitudinal references to anti-Western sentiments.

Her subjects are the Pomak men and women who had to piece their lives back together after the implosion of the socialist project. For them, socialism begot mixed blessings. On the one side, it brought an unprecedented mobility to the area. Miners were some of the best paid workers in socialist Bulgaria. Their high wages and new needs attracted schools, kindergartens, apartment buildings, cinemas, sports facilities and cultural institutions. All of these promoted an “atheist worldview” (p. 62) that altered the status of local women, who received education and gained employment and financial independence as teachers, nurses and white-collar workers. These changes were accepted, Ghodsee argues, because traditional male dominance was preserved through the higher pay and social status of male miners. The improvement in quality of life was so marked that Pomaks even reconciled with the authorities’ attack on their religious identity. A renaming campaign in the late 1960s and early 1970s (which acquired international notoriety in 1984–1985 when it targeted Bulgarian Turks) forced them to adopt Christian names and erase their Muslim past (chapter 1).

Like many other Bulgarians, the Pomaks of Madan never expected to mourn socialism when it collapsed in 1989. Yet the stories of their lives reveal the calamity the transition to capitalism wrought in small settlements that relied exclusively on a single industry (chapter 3). Over the course of the 1990s, the miners saw a dramatic loss of status, income and ultimately jobs, leaving the communities with 40% unemployment by 1999. They found no understanding and support from national political and religious institutions. No organization came to their defence, not even the Movement for Rights and Freedoms, Bulgaria’s third largest party that speaks for the country’s Turkish minority (chapter 2). The national Muslim leadership remained similarly distant, split and quibbling over property and power (chapter 4).

It is in this context—of Pomak social, ethnic and religious identity in flux—that Ghodsee locates the infiltration of a foreign Islam dismissive of indigenous Muslim customs. Islamic NGOs (supported by donors from Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait), international fellowships for students, and newly erected mosques and schools provided much needed help to the citizens of Madan and Rudozem. Not everyone welcomes the central role Madan’s new mosque (with a capacity of 1600) has come to play in this town of 7,000 or the trend to ascribe Arabic rather than Bulgarian ethnic roots to the Pomaks. Many frown upon the spreading “Arab style” of women’s clothing or the push to limit their role to the home. Ghodsee captures communities in transition, in which secular mores and
radical religiosity, Bulgarian and Arabic greetings, mini-skirts and veils, idiosyncratic and “orthodox” Islam coexist uncomfortably (chapters 5 and 6).

The future of these Pomak communities is unclear, yet powerful factors favour the spread of “orthodox” Islam in Bulgaria’s former mining centre: collapse of industry, disruption of gender roles due to miners’ unemployment and women assuming the breadwinner’s role, and general disillusionment with Bulgarian-style capitalism and democracy. The imported Islam, with its criticism of individualism and crass materialism, resonates with many Pomaks brought up in the socialist values of social justice and communal well-being. “In a world turned upside down,” Ghodsee concludes, “in a social milieu where criminals, liars, cheats, and thugs have been the greatest beneficiaries of the new system, Islam provides moral guidance” (pp. 198–199).

Muslim Lives in Eastern Europe illustrates the power of good ethnography to take a local story and make it speak to broader issues. Ghodsee shows that sweeping statements about the global spread of Islam obscure the local specificities of its appeal. She makes the compelling argument that in Bulgaria “orthodox” Islam grafted onto a worldview conditioned by decades of socialist rule, and in the process became “Marx-icized” (p. 200).

In the end, her subjects reveal the continued impact of the Eastern European socialist experiment two decades and a generation after its structural demise. Their stories, masterfully told in this volume and positioned in a national and global context, will appeal to a wide circle of scholars and students of Eastern Europe, communism, transition and gender studies, and religious fundamentalism.

Irina Gigova, College of Charleston

Boris B. Gorshkov. Russia’s Factory Children: State, Society, and Law, 1800–1917. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009. 216 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Photographs. $60.00, cloth. $25.95, paper.

With Russia’s Factory Children, the first study of child labour in Russia by a western scholar, Boris Gorshkov has made a noteworthy contribution to Russian labour history. Gorshkov argues that the deleterious effects on the growing numbers of child factory workers in industrializing Russia led to a transformation in attitudes toward child labour and efforts toward protective legislation, which in turn laid the basis for subsequent social legislation in Russia. Gorshkov’s analysis brings fresh insight to other important themes in the history of late imperial Russia, including the development of a public sphere, the functioning of the autocracy, and Russia’s place in the broader context of European industrialization. This clearly written book demonstrates a comprehensive grasp of the sources: official and legal documents, records of commissions and debates, the periodical press, contemporary views and studies of labour, as well as secondary works. Despite the often frustrating gaps in statistical evidence, the author has provided a number of useful tables which shed light on questions of the number, percentage, ages, and industries of the children who worked in Russia’s factories. A half dozen telling photographs complement the volume.

The work is divided into four chapters. In chapter 1, Gorshkov describes child labour in the premodern village, as well as in state and manorial factories, in the first half of the nineteenth century. His anthropological insights create a fascinating picture of Russian childhood. Countering the well-known views of Philippe Aries, Gorshkov argues that Russian peasants had distinct views on childhood as a life stage. Child labour, rather than
driven solely by the impoverishment of the family economy, was seen as a form of education, apprenticeship, and preparation for adult life. This benign perception of child labour, held by the government as well as society, began to change with the rapid mechanization of industry, massive labour demand, and the employment of children in factories, beginning in the 1850s and continuing after the period of the Great Reforms. This is the topic of chapter 2. The author has combed the documentary evidence for statistical information in an effort to determine the number of child workers and the nature of work, illustrating the analysis with contrasting examples of child labour in workplaces ranging from bast-matting factories to textile mills. Dangerous and unhealthy working conditions soon led to concern on the part of government officials and others who raised the need for special legislation to govern the employment of child workers. Chapter 3 focuses on the public debates and legal efforts of the 1860s and 1870s, in which government-appointed bodies, such as the Finance Ministry’s Shtakel’berg commissions, and organizations such as the Committee for Technical Education of the Russian Technical Society drafted legislation that was in general vigorously and successfully opposed by bodies representing Russia’s entrepreneurs, such as the Manufacturing Council’s Moscow Section. In Gorshkov’s reading, these debates show the business community “in a two-way dialogue with the autocratic government” (p. 127); the council “provided a Habermasian ‘public sphere’ for Russian entrepreneurs” (p. 109). Finally, in 1882, these debates resulted in the first child labour protection law, limiting employment, mandating education, and creating a factory inspectorate. Of course, there were major gaps in coverage and enforceability, but Gorshkov emphasizes that all subsequent labour legislation stemmed from this first effort. Chapter 4 goes on to trace child labour and legislation up to 1917. Gorshkov finds definite improvement in the conditions of child workers, culminating in the Factory Law Code of 1913, “entirely unnoticed in the historical literature” (p. 143). The progress of labour legislation, Gorshkov finds, “conformed to the general European pattern” (p. 144); in his view this “renders problematic the notion of Russian ‘backwardness’” (p. 145).

Gorshkov has managed in this concise book to add a new dimension to the history of Russian labour, as well as contributing to current debates about the role of the state, the growth of civil society, and the perception of childhood. Unfortunately, as the author laments, the voices of the child workers themselves are largely missing. Closer study of memoirs of adult workers might help fill this lacuna. Scholars now await follow-up studies with more detail on child workers in various industries. Gorshkov’s impressive book provides the basic tools and necessary framework for further investigation.

Deborah Pearl, Santa Rosa, California

Leonid Heller et Anne Coldefy-Faucard (dir.). Exotismes dans la culture russe. Lausanne: Revue Études de Lettres n° 283 (2009). 351 p. 26 CHF, édition brochée.

Dans son avant-propos à cet ouvrage collectif, Leonid Heller fait état de l’absence de travaux généraux ou de synthèse cherchant à évaluer « le poids de différents exotismes dans la formation et le fonctionnement de la culture russe », une absence a priori étonnante dans un contexte où, ailleurs dans le monde, la vague des études post-coloniales a entraîné avec elle un intérêt renouvelé pour la question de l’exotisme (et pour des concepts parents comme celui d’orientalisme) dans les sciences humaines. « Contribuer à changer cette situation dans le domaine littéraire », voilà donc ce que le professeur Heller identifie comme étant le « premier objectif » de ce recueil, fruit d’une collaboration entre l’Université de Lausanne et l’Université de Voronèje.
Constitué en partie de travaux présentés lors d’un colloque international s’étant tenu en juin 2008 avec le concours du Centre franco-russe de recherche en sciences humaines et sociales de Moscou, Exotismes dans la culture russe se veut un ouvrage interdisciplinaire, faisant place à des contributions relevant du domaine de la linguistique, de l’histoire, de l’histoire de l’art, avec toutefois une nette prédominance des études littéraires. Outre l’avant-propos, on y compte vingt articles classés selon l’ordre chronologique du sujet examiné ainsi qu’une synthèse de Leonid Heller, placée en fin de volume, qui tente d’ordonner les définitions de l’exotisme et de classifier ses manifestations.

La difficulté de parler d’exotisme dans la culture russe est sans doute ce qui ressort le plus à la lecture de ces articles, qui permettent d’expliquer ce phénomène de différentes façons. Particulièrement intéressante à ce titre est la contribution de Michail Maiatsky: « Comme dans le ventre de sa marâtre. Essai sur l’auto-exotisation » (p. 295–316). L’auteur y met en relief ce qui peut être vu comme l’une des principales causes du manque d’intérêt pour la question de l’exotisme en tant que mode de rapport à l’Autre chez les Russes et les russisants, soit la tendance des Russes à se considérer d’abord eux-mêmes comme sujets exotiques. Cette attitude perdureraient depuis l’époque où la classe dirigeante possait sur la culture de son propre peuple un regard étranger, alors qu’aujourd’hui, « la triade [...] “samovar, matriochka, balalaïka” vient à l’esprit de chaque Russe dès qu’il a le moindre besoin de “paraître” aux “autres” » (p. 307). Cette thèse de l’auto-exotisation se voit étayée par d’autres articles du recueil, notamment celui d’Hélène Mélat sur la prose postsoviétique (p. 241–252), qui arrive à la conclusion que l’Autre y est essentiellement un instrument annexé à la contemplation de soi dans un contexte où la Russie est à la recherche de sa propre image. Plusieurs analyses d’œuvres ou de corpus d’auteurs vont dans la même direction: le texte d’Evgueni Kozioûra sur Nikolai Kliouev et le regard qu’il pose sur sa culture du Nord (p. 143–156), celui d’Anastasia Forquenot de La Fortelle sur la prose contemporaine russe (qui s’attarde principalement sur le roman Un Russophone de Denis Goutsko, p. 253–263) et les articles sur l’exotisme chez Tchekhov, chez Vroubel (l’article de Boris Czerny, p. 85–102, et celui de Fanny Mossière, p. 103–124), mettent tous davantage l’accent sur l’auto-exotisation que sur l’exotisme à proprement parler dans les œuvres étudiées.

Il va de soi que la Russie, à cheval sur deux continents, ne peut qu’avoir un rapport ambigu à l’exotisme, puisqu’elle est elle-même dans la position d’objet exotique (aux yeux des Européens et parfois des Russes eux-mêmes) en même temps qu’elle peut révéler le rôle de sujet « exotisant » (à l’égard de l’Asie principalement). Les conquêtes impérialistes de l’époque tsariste sont venues quant à elles renforcer le caractère « exotique » du territoire russe en même temps qu’elles se sont accompagnées d’un certain effort de « déexotisation » de l’Autre devenu « nôtre ». C’est ce dont rendent compte à leur manière l’article de Daria Chemelina sur les fortifications en Sibérie au 18e siècle, résultat d’une synthèse des traditions nationales et des principes de fortification urbaniste européen (p. 9–20), et celui de Svetlana Gorshenina sur la construction des représentations du Turkestan russe dans les premières expositions « coloniales » russes (p. 69–84). L’article d’Andrei Dobritsyn sur les sources occidentales des fables orientales de Viazemski et chez Pouchkine (p. 37–58) nous rappelle quant à lui que les sources de l’exotisme, dans la littérature russe, sont souvent européennes.

À l’époque soviétique, le défaut d’exotisme dans la culture russe s’explique en partie par la répression de celui-ci dans le discours internationaliste officiel, mais aussi par le fait que l’exotisme, compris comme synonyme de l’Autre, de l’ailleurs, est devenu tabou car il évoque la fuite vers un monde perçu comme meilleur. La contribution d’Anne Coldefy-
Faucard (p. 217–226) en rend compte en suivant l’évolution de l’œuvre de Boris Pjlniak, grand voyageur et écrivain des contrées lointaines chez qui, dans les années trente, des régions comme le Grand Nord ou le Tadjikistan sont passées du statut de régions exotiques à celui de zones de colonisation où l’altérité doit être anéantie. On peut mettre en parallèle cette analyse et celle que fait Edouard Nadtotchi du roman soviétique pour enfants Le Cahier de classe et la Schwambranie, de Lev Kassil (p. 227–240), où des enfants construisent un monde imaginaire et utopique, la Schwambranie, qui n’a toutefois plus lieu d’exister lorsque s’instaure le règne de « l’utopie victorieuse ».

Chose étonnante, outre quelques références à l’incontournable essai d’Edward Said sur l’orientalisme, les auteurs des articles de ce recueil empruntent assez peu au discours des études post-coloniales, qui aurait pu être davantage mis à contribution dans un tel contexte. On peut également reprocher au projet d’ensemble de s’éparpiller un peu en étant fondé autour d’une acception trop vaste du concept d’exotisme, qui se trouve abordé de manière superficielle par certains auteurs. On referme le livre en faisant le constat, inévitable compte tenu de l’ampleur du travail à faire, que le sujet est loin d’être épuisé. Leonid Heller, dans son avant-propos, nous avait toutefois déjà assurés du fait que « le projet continue ». Nous pouvons donc nous attendre à ce que de nouveaux travaux viennent poursuivre la recherche extrêmement pertinente amorcée dans cet ouvrage.

Geneviève Cloutier, Université du Québec à Montréal

Tova Höjdestrand. Needed by Nobody: Homelessness and Humanness in Post-Socialist Russia. Culture and Society After Socialism. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2009. xii, 231 pp. Illustrations. Notes. Bibliography. Index. $59.95, cloth. $22.95, paper.

In this sensitive and highly readable ethnography, anthropologist Tova Höjdestrand explores the lives—and deaths—of St. Petersburg’s homeless in the post-Soviet era. Her skilled interviews and participant observation vividly describe the world of train stations, attics, squares, streets, and temporary apartments through which the city’s new homeless move. Through brief excursions into her interlocutors’ life histories, Höjdestrand shows how these spaces are intimately connected to a range of other Soviet and Russian spaces—labour camps, jails, orphanages, and the provincial cities and former Soviet republics from which many of them have come. A portrait of a specifically Russian homeless experience emerges, one that is defined as much by the loss of connections and relationships on the way to being “needed by nobody” (nikomu ne nuzhen) as it is by whether one actually has a roof over one’s head.

The book begins at the widest scale, with an analysis of the exclusionary techniques of Soviet and post-Soviet state power—most notably the propiska system of internal passports and registrations. Subsequent chapters provide detailed ethnography of the ways in which St. Petersburg’s homeless make their way through city spaces, from soup kitchens to train stations to shelters and stairways. In these spaces, the homeless we meet look for work, drink and fight with the police, swap stories and strategies and clothes, fall in and out of love, and, in general, struggle to maintain all manner of connections—to be needed by somebody. Mostly, they fail. The final chapters in this narrative, unsurprisingly but still wrenchingly, chart the dissolution of tie after tie, connection after connection, nascent community after nascent community, until we learn that most of the homeless people introduced in the book died or are presumed to have died not long after the author’s primary fieldwork.
This book makes a strong contribution to the anthropology of postsocialisms by exploring a range of now-familiar concepts in a new and very different context. Concepts of the Russian soul (душа), communities defined by insiders and outsiders (свои/чужие), communal drinking sessions, and the significance of sociability (общение) all feature prominently. But, rather than facilitating “getting by” in rough and uncertain postsocialist times, as they do in so many other studies, these familiar cultural forms and social tactics work only provisionally and incompletely, or not at all. Höjdestrand shows that, in the transience of homeless life, and in the ever more circumscribed and confining spaces of St. Petersburg, there is usually no time and increasingly no place to form the connections that might replace families and older friends as they fade away.

This ethnography presents a limit case—a crucial, if outlying, point at which to reflect upon a wide range of other work in and beyond the anthropology of postsocialisms. There are both similarities and differences, Höjdestrand’s ethnography reminds us, between fretting about the status of one’s connections and relationships and actually losing all of them, between discourses of loss and actually ending up with nothing at all, between worrying about being alone and actually finding oneself needed by nobody. The similarities are those of cultural form and social interaction; the differences are those between life and death.

Douglas Rogers, Yale University

Georgiy Kasianov and Philipp Ther. *A Laboratory of Transnational History. Ukraine and Recent Ukrainian Historiography*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2009. 318 pp. Index of names. Index of places. $40.00, cloth. $24.95, paper.

How do you write a history of a country that for centuries was split between several empires, lacked both an uninterrupted tradition of statehood and an established high culture with a standardized language, and was inhabited by several ethnic groups (the dominant one, the “little Russians” or “Ruthenians,” being mostly illiterate peasants who were concentrated in rural areas and who left no written records for wide swaths of time and lacked any national consciousness until World War I)? How does one write about the history of these people who, even when they became literate, were forbidden to publish literature in Ukrainian (within the Russian Empire), and when Ukrainian history did not even exist as a field of study in universities? The answer, according to an international consortium of historians, is to write “transnational history,” which they generally define as the study of relations between cultures and societies, focusing on “agents of cultural exchange” (pp. 3, 86). The purpose of this book, *A Laboratory of Transnational History*, edited by Georgiy Kasianov (Institute of Ukrainian History of Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Kyiv) and Philipp Ther (European University Institute, Florence), is to contemplate alternative, more accurate, ways of interpreting Ukrainian history, by eschewing “linear and longue durée causal explanations, as well as teleology,” and “speculating freely about conjunctures and contingencies, disruptions, and episodes of ‘lack of history’” (p. 2). The book is divided into two sections. The first, titled “National versus Transnational History” contains four essays by Kasianov, Ther, Mark von Hagen, and Andreas Kappeler. The second section, “Ukrainian History Rewritten,” consists of six essays by Natalia Yakovenko, Oleksiy Tolochko, John-Paul Himka, Yaroslav Hrytsak, Roman Szporluk, Alexei Miller, and Oksana Ostapchuk. The essays in the first section fit together well. In the first chapter, Kasianov establishes the basic principles of nationalized
Ukrainian history, which he explains evolved in two stages. The first began in the mid-nineteenth century, culminating in Mykhailo Hrushevsky’s *History of Ukraine-Rus’*. Although supplanted by the Soviet paradigm of Ukrainian history, which denied autonomy to events in so-called “southern Russia,” the Hrushevsky version was further nurtured by the Western diaspora and popularized by books such as Orest Subtelny’s *Ukraine: A History* and Paul Robert Magocsi’s *A History of Ukraine* (p. 39). The second stage, which began in the late 1980s, continues to the present under state sponsorship. As Kasianov points out, this traditional, nationalized history is both ethnocentric and teleological. Characterized by a tendency to “sovereignize” national history, it generally “ignores the presence of other ethnoses or nations in what was actually a common space and time” (p. 17). In his essay, Kappeler explains that recent historical surveys “combine the history of the Ukrainian people with that of the present day territory of the Ukrainian state” (p. 59). Moreover, the premise of many Ukrainian historical studies written today is that “the Ukrainian nation and state arose naturally and were ‘objectively determined’ or programmed” (pp. 16–17). Centring mainly on Stalin’s crimes and national traumas, the national paradigm exaggerates Ukrainian victimhood and lionizes individuals and groups like Bohdan Khmelnytsky, Ivan Mazepa, Stepan Bandera, Symon Petliura, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), and the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) (pp. 7, 9). The implicit equation of the famine of 1932–1933 (“Holodomor”) with the Holocaust is a key element in Ukrainian national martyrology (pp. 9, 59).

To some extent, every country needs a nationalized history much like an individual person needs a *raison d'être* or positive self-image to survive. As several authors mention, the major European states went through this stage of “nationalization” back in the nineteenth century. As Roman Szporluk points out, many observers predicted that Ukraine would split up after 1991 the way Yugoslavia had (p. 272). Thus, the construction of a Ukrainian past, the invention of a national tradition, was “one of the main elements of Ukrainian nation-building” and legitimization, Kappeler acknowledges (p. 56). Hrytsak goes still further, opining that Ukrainian historians cling to the national paradigm for fear the “nation-building project may fail” (p. 237). Since Ukrainian history was not even a field of study in universities for several decades, historians are now “taking up the missed opportunity” to “deconstruct Soviet myths,” Hrytsak and Kappeler note (pp. 237, 58). Indeed, according to Ther, nationalized history is both easier to write than transnational history and attracts more media attention (p. 84).

The essays in the second section are more diverse. Yakovenko believes names for Ukraine were debated as early as the sixteenth century. Miller and Ostapchuk’s essay focuses on the Latin and Cyrillic alphabets in Ukrainian discourse. Tolochko calls for the study of anthropological processes, such as Ukrainian pilgrimages and the networking of the Ukrainian gentry (szlachta) to describe the space that was Ukraine in the early nineteenth century. Hrytsak shows how traditional theories of nationalism do not always apply to contemporary Ukraine. Szporluk provides an historical overview of the evolution of Ukraine’s disparate regions as once part of other empires. Himka’s essay in the second section of the book lucidly illustrates the hyperbolized martyrology currently in vogue. He pinpoints the ways in which the documentary film, “Between Hitler and Stalin: Ukraine in World War II—The Untold Story,” takes “rhetorical and visual liberties” to intensify the sense of Ukrainian victimhood during World War II. While the film proudly claims that “seven million Ukrainians fought against Hitler in the Red Army,” it omits to note that the same Ukrainians helped to implement the Red Army’s “scorched-earth policy and even participated in the NKVD’s massacres” (p. 220). Monks, shown forcibly disrobed, actually represented the Russian Patriarchal Church, not—as the viewer is led to believe—the...
Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, which was hostile to monks (p. 215). While the film points out that Ukrainians were also killed at famous sites of the Jewish Holocaust like Babyn Yar, it attempts to “assimilate non-Ukrainians” to various Ukrainian body counts. Katsyn Forest, for example, is mentioned, although documents of the Soviet Ministry of Internal Affairs confirm that 97 percent of the victims there were Poles (p. 218). The narrator informs viewers that during the Soviet occupation of western Ukraine in 1939–1941, ten thousand people were executed and over half a million were deported to Siberia. The viewer is led to believe that these victims were all Ukrainians, but in fact most of them were Poles (p. 217). The film also omits to mention the anti-Semitic views of many Ukrainians and glosses over the issue of Ukrainian collaboration with the Nazis. Symon Petliura is only praised for leading the struggle for independence after the Bolshevik Revolution; viewers do not hear about the anti-Jewish pogroms committed by his troops (p. 219). Likewise, the film describes the UPA’s battles against the Germans and Russians, but ignores its massacre of Polish citizens in Volhynia (p. 219).

Himka decries “blood-soaked heritages” that obstruct a realistic examination of the past. Ukraine’s uniqueness and the rapid globalization of the twenty-first century make this type of nationalized “us versus them” history anachronistic. A new group of “modernist” historians have begun to seek ways of transcending the linear, narrowly ethnic and teleological model of Ukrainian history (p. 4). As Miller and Ostapchuk observe, the location of Ukraine (meaning “borderland”) at the “junction of two civilizational and cultural/linguistic areas—Slavia Latina, and Slavia Orthodoxa—determined the fundamentally ‘open’ character of Ukrainian culture as a whole” (p. 170). Because it was ruled for such a long time by empires and states populated by more educated and articulate Poles, Russians, Jews, and Austrians, Ukraine’s history cannot be written within a national framework. The country is composed of distinct regions with very different histories (e.g., Galicia, Trans-Carpathian Ukraine, Bukovina). Likewise, Kappeler argues, the many “competing or even exclusive national narratives” and collective memories pertaining to the history of Ukraine need to be reconciled. For example, while Ukrainians view Bohdan Khmelnytsky (Hetman of the Zaporizhian Host) as a hero for liberating them from the rule of the Polish Catholic nobility, Poles see him and the Cossack revolt he led (1648–1654) as the annihilator of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Meanwhile, East European Jews construe him as the perpetrator of their first great persecution (p. 52).

In short, A Laboratory of Transnational History is a welcome contribution to the literature on Ukrainian historiography and to the debate about modernity versus tradition. As Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger argued in The Invention of Tradition (1983), traditions are not always inherited intact from the past, but instead created in the present. Other discerning monographs include David Marples’s Heroes and Villains: Creating National History in Contemporary Ukraine (2008); Serhiy Plokhy’s Unmaking Imperial Russia: Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the Writing of Ukrainian History (2005); and Stephen Velychenko’s National History as Cultural Process (1992). Nevertheless, every book has its flaws. This book sorely lacks a conclusion to compare and tie together the ten disparate essays. Despite its shortcomings, however, this would be an excellent book to assign in university courses to encourage students to question what they read in standard texts on Ukrainian history.

Johanna Granville, Texas A & M University
In this insightful study, Sharon Kowalsky examines changing notions of female crime in the pre- and post-revolutionary eras. She begins with the story of young Nastia E., a former peasant living in Moscow who sliced off her husband’s penis in 1923 and was acquitted on grounds of temporary insanity. Soviet criminologists attributed Nastia’s act to her rural backwardness, infertility, jealousy, and a flare-up of venereal disease. Indeed, views of female offenders were refracted through assumptions about women’s “traditional isolation in the domestic sphere” (p. 79), reproductive cycles, maternal instinct distorted or gone wrong, and errant sexuality. Kowalsky traces these notions to the duelling schools of nineteenth-century anthropological and sociological criminology. Not surprisingly, explanations that emphasized social factors held more sway in the Imperial Russian context, given widespread poverty and dissatisfaction with the autocratic state. Yet despite a rejection of biology as a cause of criminal behaviour, essentialist notions about female offenders persisted well into the 1920s. If, as in Nastia’s case, Soviet women could be driven to distraction by problems relating to their gender and class, then, as Kowalsky astutely points out, the revolutionary project as a whole remained in jeopardy.

Kowalsky maps a gendered “geography of crime” (p. 117), showing how Soviet criminologists distinguished between (male) urban offences marked by planning and sophistication, and (female) rural ones associated with backwardness and spontaneity. Kowalsky’s discussion of infanticide ascribed to female ignorance and biology, and remnants of “the ‘old’ way of life” (p. 163) illustrates this confluence of geography and gender. Even when women killed their newborns in the city, the crime was linked to their peasant roots; true proletariki would do no such thing. Observers had to face the fact that despite the law that ended illegitimacy and policies ostensibly providing women with education, child support, alimony, and access to abortion, some mothers still found reasons to kill their babies. Soviet jurists and criminologists approached this reality in good paternalistic mode, treating women accused of infanticide and many other female offenders with a compassion and leniency rarely extended to men. But there was a steep price to pay: female criminals in particular and women in general remained saddled with an image that left them as primitive creatures ill-suited to Bolshevik-style enlightenment and socialism.

Kowalsky also chronicles the institutionalization of early Soviet criminology, showing how specialists’ professional interests dovetailed conveniently with state concerns over apparently skyrocketing crime rates. According to Kowalsky, scholars and specialists from the pre-revolutionary era carved a place for themselves in the bolshevized state, yet they also faced challenges particular to their expertise in crime. In the mid-1920s, regional institutes sprang up devoted to the study of crime, with the field remaining broad enough to incorporate sociological and psychological approaches to crime and criminals. But as Kowalsky points out, the same situation that ensured state sponsorship from four separate commissariats in 1925 for a State Institute for the Study of Crime and the Criminal ultimately guaranteed the demise of criminology’s independence. The regime’s worries about the causes of crime and the fate of criminals, in addition to its general centralizing tendencies and a narrowing conception of crime as stemming from social class, spelled an end to autonomous approaches by the end of the decade. In her conclusion, Kowalsky emphasizes the earlier criminologists’ failure of vision. Stuck in their characterization of women as backward and rural, they missed both the socioeconomic difficulties faced by
women under the New Economic Policy and the attempts that women actually made to board the revolutionary bandwagon.

Curiously, in spite of the fact that most Russian households looked nothing like Western bourgeois models, tsarist- and Soviet-era criminologists often turned to what they perceived as women’s domestic isolation as one explanation for female crime. Kowalsky, however, fails to remark on this additional blind spot of her subjects. The book also contains too much repetition, a consequence both of inattentive editing and a thematic, as opposed to chronological structure. But these are quibbles with Kowalsky’s keen analysis and far-reaching scholarship. Deviant Women, blessedly jargon-free, is a vital contribution to studies of gender in the early Soviet era, to our knowledge about historical continuity between pre- and post-revolutionary Russia, and to the history of criminology in general.

Laurie Bernstein, Rutgers University, Camden

**Ronald LeBlanc. Slavic Sins of the Flesh: Food, Sex, and Carnal Appetite in Nineteenth-Century Russian Fiction.** Durham, New Hampshire: University of New Hampshire Press, 2009. ix, 338 pp. Bibliography. Index. $50.00, cloth.

In this book, Ronald LeBlanc takes on a daunting yet familiar task—comparing the two giants of nineteenth-century Russian literature, Dostoevsky and Tolstoy. He explores the contrasting depiction of food and eating in their works, illuminating the connections between these alimentary motifs and the authors’ treatment of sex and desire. This unique “gastrosexual” approach sheds new light not only on the two writers, but also on more general shifts in Russian thought and literature since the mid-nineteenth century.

In the introduction, LeBlanc sets out the central opposition that structures the book. In matters of food and sex, Dostoevsky emphasizes the carnivorous nature of man; “eating and sexual intercourse are both portrayed as acts of violence, aggression, and domination.” Tolstoy, on the other hand, focuses on man’s hedonistic nature; “eating and sex are […] understood as acts of libidinal enjoyment, delight, and indulgence” (p. 3). LeBlanc returns to this opposition throughout the book, framing it as a paradigm of power (Dostoevsky) versus a paradigm of pleasure (Tolstoy). He argues that both of these approaches depart from the nostalgic treatment given food by earlier writers such as Gogol, Goncharov, and Kvitka-Osnovyanenko. Such “oral regression” is no longer possible for Dostoevsky and Tolstoy, who must confront the rapidly modernizing world around them, a consumer-driven world defined by many in predatory Darwinian terms.

In chapter 2, LeBlanc describes the various contexts, both biographical and societal, which influenced Dostoevsky’s carnivorous model. Profoundly affected by his experience of tyranny as a prisoner and in exile, Dostoevsky also reacted strongly against the materialist and scientific solutions emerging in post-emancipation Russia. This reaction finds expression in his literary works through the use of masticatory and predatory images (particularly spiders) and the creation of male characters who seek to devour their victims. The only way Dostoevsky saw to avoid this fall into cannibalism was to follow the specifically Russian Orthodox path of Christian brotherhood and love which “liberates rather than ‘devours’ human beings” (p. 89). Depictions of food and eating which are imbued with this sense of Christian charity invert the carnivorous model and invoke a sense of commensalism (LeBlanc cites as examples Grushenka’s gift of an onion to Alyosha and Dr. Herzenstube’s gift of nuts to Mitya in The Brothers Karamazov).
Chapter 3 traces the changing depiction of food and eating in Tolstoy’s work, marked, not surprisingly, by his spiritual crisis in the late 1870s. After struggling with his own appetites as a youth, Tolstoy provides a model of restraint and self-control in Natasha and Pierre in *War and Peace*. This “ethos of moderation” (p. 114) reaches its height in *Anna Karenina*, which clearly juxtaposes the hedonistic characters of Anna, Vronsky, and Stiva Oblonsky to Levin and Kitty. It is not until his *Confession* (1879), however, that Tolstoy moves from a model of moderation to one of abstinence. LeBlanc argues that Tolstoy’s own turn to vegetarianism was about self-abnegation rather than a concern for animal welfare. Tolstoy, who claimed a causal link between eating meat and increased sexual desire, viewed fasting as the first step toward the moral improvement of man. His attempts to live a life free of animalistic desire, however, were thwarted by his sense of guilt and continued passions, both sexual and gastronomic.

In the book’s final chapter, LeBlanc sets out the literary legacies of Dostoevskian “bestiality” (zverstvo) and Tolstoyan “animality” (zhivotnost’). LeBlanc discusses two divergent responses to Tolstoy’s call for abstinence: Artsybashev’s *Sanin* (1907) and Tarasov-Rodionov’s *Chocolate* (1922). The pre-revolutionary *Sanin* endorses bodily pleasure and desire but does not embrace the cruelty or violence of Dostoevsky’s carnivorous hero. In *Chocolate*, Tarasov-Rodionov, like Tolstoy, links sexual and gastronomical danger to promote a message of asceticism—in this case a socialist realist asceticism widely supported in the 1920s. Dostoevsky’s predatory language finds a new home in depictions of the revolution, civil war, and early Soviet society (Pilnyak, Olesha), but is made obsolete by Socialist Realism. His cannibalistic metaphors reemerge in post-Soviet literature (Pelevin, Sorokin). LeBlanc provides his most compelling analysis in his discussion of Lev Gumilyovsky’s *Dog Alley* (1925–1926), which transforms Dostoevskian predatory imagery (spider imagery, in particular) into a Tolstoyan trope: “human sexuality in *Dog Alley* turns out to be not only an ensnaring, devouring desire, but an intoxicating and addictive one as well” (p. 215). Here, and in the book’s conclusion, LeBlanc demonstrates the convergence of his “polar opposition.” Despite their different depictions of the carnal appetite, both Dostoevsky and Tolstoy insist on the spiritual uniqueness of man—on his non-animal nature. They both believe that carnality is inherently sinful, albeit in different ways. They both express “pre-modern” anxieties about the forces of modernization in late nineteenth-century Russia.

LeBlanc’s insightful readings of Dostoevsky and Tolstoy are meticulously researched and expressed in wonderfully lucid prose. He is at his best when he applies his model of power versus pleasure to previous and subsequent works, an approach which is by no means exhausted in this volume.

Sarah Bishop, *Williamette University*

*Bruce A. McClelland. Slayers and Their Vampires: A Cultural History of Killing the Dead. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 2009 (© 2006). xviii, 260 pp. Index. Bibliography. Illustrations. Maps. $19.95, paper.*

Bruce McClelland’s monograph, now published in paperback, is a fascinating read for both specialists and fans of vampire folklore and fiction alike. Following in the footsteps of Jan L. Perkowski, McClelland’s mentor and academic advisor, he turns our attention yet again to the Slavic vampire. McClelland traces the manner in which this folkloric entity, who historically never rose above any other Slavic mythological daemon or spirit, achieved such enormous mass appeal when transported to the West European and later North American
literary and pop cultures, becoming probably the most exotic and alluring incarnation of evil today (p. 87). What makes McClelland’s monograph significantly different from the works of other vampirologists (such as Perkowski, whose omnibus Vampire Lore was published by Slavica in 2006) is the fact that he does not limit his interest to vampires alone, but considers the vampire slayer who, together with the concept of the vampire, “migrated” from Slavic into Germanic and later Romance lands, where he finally received his embodiment as Abraham Van Helsing in Bram Stoker’s 1897 novel Dracula. McClelland argues quite persuasively that the slayer and the vampire, while presently situated far apart on the scale of good and evil, originally were not too different from each other. His research on South Slavic (especially Bulgarian) demonology shows that the vampire’s mortal enemy may actually represent his mirror image because it possesses some of the vampire’s typical characteristics and hence a capacity to become a vampire. McClelland further studies the vampire-slayer pair with regards to their shared connection to the world of the dead (p. 14) and, as a result, detects in them traces of an ancient shamanic figure (see pp. 6 and 120).

Slayers and Their Vampires consists of a preface, ten chapters and an appendix. The latter is devoted completely to the linguistic exploration of the etymology of the Old Slavic term vampir upir’, which first appeared in written form around the eleventh century. As McClelland’s analysis asserts, it was unlikely that it originally had any links to the supernatural realm. Rather the scholar sees in it a reference to pagan groups: “the word vampire was a pejorative name for a group or a member of a group whose rituals or behavior were offensive to early Orthodox Christians” (p. 191). The meaning of the term was later extended also to include members of various heretical sects and Jews—traditional enemies of the church (pp. 31, 34).

The appendix is also connected thematically with the historical chapters 3 and 4, both of which are linked by the subtitle “A Thousand Years of the Vampire.” The two chapters investigate various processes out of which this Slavic folkloric entity emerged as well as the elements that over the years formed the underlying structure of the vampire motif. McClelland, for instance, notes that the blood sacrifice and feasting elements of Slavic paganism became ingrained into the concept of a vampire, hence the reference to blood drinking (pp. 36–41, 43, 64–66). Moreover, anathemas, which Orthodox theologians laid upon heretics and pagans over time, helped form the image of the vampire as an outsider, a cursed evil encroaching upon society (p. 49). Such a severe attack, exercised by the Church, led to the fact that the “unorthodox” behaviour and beliefs of the pagan groups, including heretic sects and Jews, were transferred from the sphere of something odd and “unnatural” to the sphere of “supernatural” (p. 51). Consequently, the meaning, associated with the term vampire, shifted “from a perverse violator of taboos (child sacrifice, incest) to a supernatural demon who rises from the dead and attacks the living and who tends to function as a scapegoat during inexplicable adversity” (p. 52). McClelland also researches many ritual elements that surfaced in vampire lore with time, especially as it assumed the function of a scapegoat or even a sacrificial victim in Balkan rural communities.

Chapter 5 examines the vampire’s movement from Slavic folklore to West European Gothic fiction. Drawing on Marxist theory, McClelland observes a change in the social status that the vampire acquired in the West: it shifted away from a lowly dead peasant (often of marginal status in life), a characteristic it retained in Balkan folklore, and became associated with a corrupt aristocracy, turning into a symbol of the “social parasite” (pp. 80, 148). Moreover, as the Slavic concept of the vampire entered the Western world, it clashed with the concept of the witch, which enjoyed high popularity due to the notorious
Inquisition and witch trials. As a result, the vampire acquired some of the witch’s
caracteristics, in particular the notion that vampires can themselves create other vampires,
previously unattested in Slavic folklore (p. 90). Furthermore, because the vampire enters
Western Europe at the height of Rationalism and the Enlightenment, a movement
categorized by its attacks on all things supernatural, it “changes from a demonic being in
an agrarian folklore system into something that was now […] a metaphor” (p. 90).

Chapters 6, 7, and 8 shift our attention from the vampire to the slayer. McClelland
discusses different types of slayers in South Slavic folklore (sâbotnik [a person born on
Saturday or the Unclean Days], vampirdžia [an offspring of the union between a woman
and a vampire], glog [the same as vampirdžia, but this creature also uses tools made from
black hawthorn, called glog in Bulgarian, hence the name for the slayer]). As mentioned at
the beginning of this review, McClelland’s hypothesis is that the vampire and its slayer are
intimately related to each other and most probably reenact a mythological struggle between
the good (order) and the evil (chaos) from the pre-Christian era. The slayer functions as a
shamanic figure, summoned to eradicate evil, which comes from the world of the dead and
threatens to destroy peace in the rural community (p. 105). What is interesting, however, is
that McClelland’s research shows that the focus in the folk narratives is not so much on the
struggle per se, but rather on the result, i.e., the destruction of the vampire, the outcome of
which is never doubted. In other words, while the vampire is feared for its destructive
nocturnal visits and attacks, he is certain to lose, and sometimes is portrayed as being
stupid and gullible. As a result, the slayer does not always need to kill it, but can simply
identify his enemy among the recently deceased; hence, another term for the slayer,
McClelland proposes, is a seer (p. 113). Thus, the vampire concept in the Balkans
functioned as a mechanism for handling village accusations, for explaining various
cataclysms and bringing justice and order by means of its destruction—a principle, which
was lost, when the concept appeared in the Western world for the first time during the
outburst of the vampire epidemics in the Balkans in the 18th century (pp. 127–128). The
Western officials, nurtured by the premises of the Enlightenment and Rationalism,
attempted to explain this phenomenon away, as a result of which it moved from the realm
of folklore to the purely imaginative and became a major source of inspiration for the
Gothic and Romantic literati and artists.

As McClelland demonstrates in his final chapters, under the literary transformation,
vampires gained new characteristics, which would have been unrecognizable to their
Balkan progenitors (p. 148). The creature becomes sophisticated, alienated, exotic (firmly
associated with the East), and erotic, acquiring also a higher social status and some
features, previously associated only with werewolves and witches, such as fangs or an
infectious nature (pp. 148–149). It finally becomes more criminal, more violent, and begins
to represent a global antihuman threat, the ultimate evil—a feature by which Western pop
culture knows it today. As such, it requires an equal match in the persona of a slayer, who
also progresses from the unnamed seer in the Balkan lore to the distinct personality of Van
Helsing from Stoker’s Dracula, and eventually to Buffy the Vampire Slayer. Such a
transformation completes the process of eliminating any ambiguity about the righteousness
of the destroyer of evil, thus shifting the vampire to the axes of ultimate evil and the slayer
to its opposite end, the ultimate good.

McClelland’s monograph traces a thousand-year history of the vampire and its
doppelganger and destroyer—the slayer, but the direction of his research moves solely
from East to West, in other words, from Slavic lore and rural agricultural settings to
Western literary and industrial society. What would be interesting to trace is the manner in
which the concept of the vampire comes back to the very Slavic society from which it
originally hailed, during the periods of Romanticism, Modernism and, of course, the contemporary post-Modern epoch. Does its image remain the same, based purely on the original lore, or does it change under Western influence? Does the intelligentsia of the Russian or Austro-Hungarian Empires, when producing Romantic fiction, for instance, borrow in any way from the Western image of the vampire? We know for a fact that in the Russian Empire, for example, the fascination with the Gothic movement produced a number of emulators (see Vadim Vatsuro, Goticheskii roman v Rossii [Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2002]). Moreover, some sources show that the reading public knew the Western demonological concepts even better than the original Slavic ones. (For instance, in his Malorossiiskiia i chervonorusskiia dumy i pesni, Platon A. Lukashevich includes the French translation for such demonic beings as vampires and werewolves [Sankt peterburg [sic]: V tipografii Eduarda Prats i Ko, 1836, p. 100]). Therefore, such a possible “secondary” borrowing from the Western Gothic imagination of the very demonological being that originally came from Slavic lands may represent a fruitful direction for subsequent research into the development of the vampire motif, and I hope that McClelland or his followers will turn their erudite knowledge to these questions.

Svitlana Krys, University of Alberta

Thomas Olander and Jenny Helena Larsson, eds. Stressing the Past: Papers on Baltic and Slavic Accentology. Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, 35. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2009. vii, 192 pp. €40.00 / $54.00, cloth.

The enthusiasm generated by the First International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology (Zagreb 2005) inspired the organizers and participants to make these workshops an annual event, and the present collection contains revised versions of sixteen papers presented at the second workshop (Copenhagen 2006). (The third workshop was held in Leiden in 2007, the fourth in Scheibbs in 2008, the fifth in Opava in 2009, and the sixth in Vilnius in 2010.) Slavic historical accentology can be considered a young field, not quite fifty years old at the time of the Copenhagen conference if one counts from the rebirth of the discipline that was brought about by the publication in 1957 of Christian Stang’s revolutionary Slavonic Accentuation. Scientific revolutions free scholars from old assumptions and stimulate new research, and it is exciting to see the lively and truly international cohort of contributors to the present volume, representing Croatia (1), the Czech Republic (1), Denmark (3), Germany (1), Japan (1), Lithuania (1), the Netherlands (4), Russia (3), Slovenia (1), and the United States (1). The volume presents its contents in alphabetical order of the authors’ names, but it seems more useful to discuss the articles here according to their subject matter, divided for convenience, if somewhat coarsely, into four categories.

The first contribution, Rainer Eckert’s “Zum 40. Todestag des russischen Sprachforschers Dr. V. M. Illič-Svityc” (pp. 1–6), is a personal and intellectual reflection on the work of Vladislav Markovich Illich-Svitych, whose work on Slavic historical accentology from the late 1950s until his death in an accident in 1966 can be considered the starting point for what has come to be known as the Moscow School of Accentology. Eckert divides Illich-Svitych’s work into three overlapping periods: an early first period devoted to Slavic problems; a second devoted to Balto-Slavic accentology (1958–1963); and a third devoted to Nostratic studies (until 1966). Illich-Svitych’s principal publications are listed in footnotes to the article and are discussed, albeit not at length, in the text.
The inherently comparative nature of Baltic and Slavic historical accentology means that studies that concentrate on one or the other of these subfamilies inevitably refer to a common Balto-Slavic historical context. It is nonetheless possible to subcategorize the contributions: five focus on historical processes shared by Baltic and Slavic, three concentrate on Baltic problems, and seven concentrate on Slavic ones.

In the general Balto-Slavic area, V. A. Dybo’s “Система порождения акцентных типов производных в балто-славянском праязыке” (pp. 21–45) surveys a series of results that emerge from the study of Baltic and Slavic accentual phenomena from the perspective of morphological accentual valences. As is typical of Dybo’s work, the analysis is richly supported by specific etymologies. Frederik Kortlandt’s “Accent Retraction and Tonogenesis” (pp. 75–82), building on his earlier study of Balto-Slavic stress retractions, reflects on several other contributions to the present volume in the light of tonal distinctions that are attributable to those retractions. Jens Elmegård Rasmussen’s “A Note on Slaaby-Larsen’s Law” (pp. 115–118) discusses apparent exceptions to the loss of accent in Balto-Slavic oxytone paradigms, which it attributes to syllable weight and, specifically, to consonant clusters. One exciting feature of this contribution is that it responds to a discussion on the Cybalist Yahoo group, demonstrating the extent to which influential Indo-European scholarship now takes place not only in refereed journals and at conferences, but also in electronic discussion groups. Toshihiro Shintani’s “On Winter’s Law in Balto-Slavic” (pp. 119–135) is a reprint of an important 1985 study that appeared first in a Danish working-papers volume, and therefore was not previously widely accessible; it concentrates on strengthening the case for Winter’s Law by explaining or refuting several apparent counter-examples. As the title suggests, Roman Sukač’s “Hirt’s Law and Optimality Theory” (pp. 137–144) examines Hirt’s Law—which dates to the late nineteenth century—within the framework of Optimality theory, building on Melissa Frazier’s 2006 master’s thesis on accent patterns in athematic nouns.

Three contributions concentrate primarily on Baltic problems. Adam Hyllested and Bernd Gliwa’s “Metatony in Lithuanian Internal Derivation” (pp. 47–52) argues that some of what had previously been considered examples of métatonie douce in Lithuanian may be subject to other explanations, and especially to internal Baltic derivational processes. Thomas Olander’s “The Accentuation of Old Prussian deiwos ‘god’” (pp. 83–92), relying on a theory of enclinomena advanced by Roman Jakobson (1963) and others, suggests that the absence of a macron in words like Old Prussian deiwos might be interpreted at least provisionally, as evidence for phonological lack of accent. Steven Young’s “Tone in Latvian Borrowings from Old Russian” (pp. 177–192) takes into account early contacts of Latvian specifically with Pskov-Polotsk “Krivichi” dialects, proposing correspondences between Russian stress and Latvian tone that describe relationships more complicated than those adduced previously by Jānis Endzelins and Tadeusz Lehr-Sławiński.

Slavic problems form the focus of seven contributions. Miguel Carrasquer Vidal’s “Slavic Verbal Accentuation – Notes on Origin and Development” (pp. 7–13) examines the relationships between Slavic and Indo-European conjugation types and relevant Balto-Slavic and Slavic sound laws, arriving at a proposed mapping from three original Indo-European accentual paradigms to three (differently distributed) Slavic ones. Rick Derksen’s “Slavic Evidence for Balto-Slavic Oxytona” (pp. 15–19) examines the chronology of stress retraction in the context of late Balto-Slavic oxytone neuter o-stem nouns. Mate Kapović’s “The Accent of Slavic *ja(z)/z* /’I’” (pp. 52–73) examines the titular question in the context of the evidence for Proto-Slavic doublets with and without –z. Irina S. Pekunova’s “О некоторых акцентуационных особенностях существительных а. н. с в старосербских памятниках” (pp. 93–100) organizes the evidence from two large accented old Štokavian
manuscripts into descriptive accentual classes as preparation for more detailed analysis in future work. Tijmen Pronk’s “The Accentuation of the Slavic n-Stems” (pp. 101–114) finds evidence of reflexes of all three accentual classes, identifying the opposition between mobile and non-mobile paradigms as an Indo-European inheritance. Matej Šekli’s “On Romance-Alpo-Slavic Substitutional Accentology: The Case of Pre-Slavic Masculine Substrate Place Names in Slovene” (pp. 145–160) examines Slovene dialect toponyms as evidence for the influence of Romance accentuation on Alpine Slavic. Alexandra Ter-Avanesova’s “The Accentuation of i-Verbs in Some Russian Dialects: An Innovation That Preserves an Archaism” (pp. 161–176) examines the generalization of root stress in present forms of accentual paradigm b words in both northern and southeastern dialects.

The book as a whole is attractively formatted, carefully edited, and priced so as to be affordable to individuals, and not only reference libraries. Its publication, and the international workshop series as a whole, testifies to the ongoing vitality of Balto-Slavic historical accentology, which continues to suggest both new solutions to existing problems and directions for future research.

David J. Birnbaum, University of Pittsburgh

Bertrand M. Patenaude. Trotsky. Downfall of a Revolutionary. New York: Harper, 2009. 370 pp. Illustrations. Sources and notes. Index. $35.99, cloth.

Robert Service. Trotsky. A Biography. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009. xxii, 600 pp. Illustrations. Maps. Notes. Select bibliography. Index. $35.00, cloth.

Robert Service has completed the remarkable accomplishment, shared only by the late Dmitri Volkogonov, of producing full-scale biographies of the three leading figures of early Soviet communism: Lenin, Stalin, and Trotsky. The final volume of Service’s trilogy was worth the effort, in the author’s estimation, because of its subject’s role in planning andsolidifying the October Revolution, thereby guaranteeing an impact on Russian and world history. The biographer’s interpretation of the man will, therefore, be linked to an evaluation of the socialist politics to which Trotsky dedicated his life. Service writes consciously as a ‘non-Trotskyist’ (advocates would no doubt claim anti-) and also one infers, as a non-Marxist. The relationship between father and son, for example, has an underlying political aspect or interpretation. David Bronstein represents the good of late imperial Russia: a hard-working frugal fellow who stood for “enlightenment, material progress and promotion through merit” (p. 19). The son destroyed such promise by using his undoubted literary and oratorical talents to manoeuvre for revolution, civil war and the establishment of a centralized, brutal dictatorship.

If Service has little to praise in Trotsky’s politics, the biography is not overly impressed with the central figure’s character. Trotsky was egotistical, vain, and incapable of empathizing with the plight of humans unknown to him. He engaged with others on his own terms; former friends and comrades were ditched as though they had never existed. Trotsky claimed bourgeois rights of freedom of expression only when it was to his advantage to do so. A strong family man himself, Service is appalled by the way Trotsky abandoned his wife and two daughters when he escaped Siberian exile in 1902, even if this flight was condoned by “revolutionary ethics.” These incidents are not only of relevance to establishing Trotsky’s true mettle; the character flaws are intimately linked to Trotsky’s
political rise and fall. Self-belief was crucial in executing and defending a revolution; arrogance was not an attribute to build a broad support base in the Communist Party.

In a review of my own *Trotsky*, the late Al Richardson remarked: “Perhaps it is not the wisest course to write biographies of people you don’t like.” However, Service cannot be dismissed, as Trotsky was apt to do to his rival Pavel Miliukov, as a bourgeois professor in the pay of capitalism. There is a clear exposition and subtle analysis of Trotsky’s ideas and vast intellectual output. Service has taken the time to read drafts of Trotsky’s oeuvre, most notably in the case of the autobiography, *My Life*. It is impressive that Service offers so many original readings of Trotsky’s major and minor writings. Most commentators accept that *Our Political Tasks* (1904), for example, was directed against Lenin’s authoritarianism and was in its way prophetic about what occurred post-1917. Service reminds us that the “prophecy” of 1904 was unintended, that when “ridiculing the Bolshevik leader as potential dictator, he put the word in inverted commas in order to signify that this was not a realistic possibility” (p. 82).

Service’s *Trotsky* will not please many a reader for its interpretation, but the author has a stated rationale and offers within this framework the fullest picture of the whole Trotsky drawn to date. The same cannot be said for Patenaude’s study, perhaps because the idea for the book came from the author’s agent (p. 307). The focus is upon Trotsky’s time in Mexico leading up to his assassination. There are also various diversions into early Soviet history scattered throughout the text. It recreates the atmosphere of Trotsky’s daily life and of characters within it in full and often witty detail. I am still in the dark though as to why it was written and for what audience. In comparison to Service it is weak on the assessment of Trotsky’s writings. Looking back to the 1920s Patenaude states that Trotsky “became Russia’s most influential literary critic and its most effective advocate of freedom in the arts.” *Literature and Revolution* (1923) is described as “one of his finest works” (p. 149). I have come across no evidence of Trotsky’s broader influence on how literature was taught, for example, in Soviet universities. Service is on much surer ground when he stresses the accidental nature of the book’s contents; not to mention the fact that it also set strict limits on cultural pluralism: “it was Trotsky who laid down the philosophical foundations for cultural Stalinism” (p. 318).

Writers on Trotsky’s life also have to grapple with the problem of how to source judgements for characters’ state of mind. This is why I shied away from personal matters, preferring to stick to a very political life. Service and Patenaude quote the most personal letter from Trotsky to Natalia, written when the two were estranged in the aftermath of Trotsky’s affair with Frida Kahlo. Trotsky assures Natalia that he desires to fuck her hard with prick and tongue. Having decided to include this juicy extract Service is rightly cautious: “What was he trying to do for himself and for her? How conscious was he of the possible impact of his words? And what was Natalya’s reaction?” (p. 450). Patenaude is unjustifiably certain that “For Natalia […] there was nothing to forgive in this unexpected outburst from ‘my intimate, old lover’. In fact this was just what she needed to hear.” (p. 70).

There is also the problem of evidence for the broader impact of Trotsky’s activities. I found this particularly difficult for the Civil War period. Service follows Geoffrey Swain in arguing for Trotsky’s vital contribution to Red victory. This case is supported, for example, with references to the positive impact of Trotsky’s propaganda on soldier morale that come from Trotsky or from within his entourage. In these ways Trotsky continues to exert an influence over even the most cautious and guarded of his biographers.

Ian D. Thatcher, *University of Ulster, Coleraine*
Neal Pease. *Rome’s Most Faithful Daughter: The Catholic Church and Independent Poland, 1914–1939*. Polish-American Studies Series. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2009. xx, 288 pp. Illustrations. Notes. Bibliography. Index. $49.95, cloth. $26.95, paper.

Only a few historians of Poland outside Poland pay attention to church-state relations during the interwar period. Neal Pease, a history professor at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and the author of a previous monograph on this period, demonstrates that reconciling the purposes of the church and state in inter-war Poland was more difficult than assumed by many outsiders. Pease regards church-state relations as functioning within a triangle and he discusses the role of each of the three parties—government, papacy, and bishops—in analyzing issues.

Pease admits that during the period between 1795 and 1918, the Roman Catholic Church played a secondary role, but this statement does not go far enough: the papacy and most of the Polish hierarchy were openly hostile to the various independence movements during this long period. Moreover, Poland had gone through industrialization, urbanization, and modernism, the same changes that had weakened all faith communities in Europe and North America; the Roman Catholic Church in Poland never fully came to terms with these economic and cultural shifts. The Polish intelligentsia, like its counterparts elsewhere, was sceptical of religion and quick to criticize the Church as an anachronism. During the decades of statelessness, the papacy attempted to maintain good relations with Poland’s enemies and all of the partitioning powers assumed a role in the appointment of Roman Catholic bishops, meaning that it was hardly Polish patriots who governed the dioceses. Neither the papacy nor the Roman Catholic hierarchy could truthfully claim to be friends of the national cause. To combat such perceptions, the Church regularly promoted the view that a Pole could only be true to Poland if true to Roman Catholicism, manipulating the equation *Polak = Katolik*.

Nevertheless, the papacy looked to newly independent Poland as one of the few positive elements to come out of the Versailles treaty system from which it had been excluded: within revived Poland’s boundaries, three quarters of the population had a religious loyalty to the papacy. Pope Benedict XV recognized Poland in March 1919 and Achille Ratti became the first papal nuncio in Warsaw since 1796. Italian diplomats, engaged in their own dispute with the papacy, thought of the Poles as “papists, the only ones in Europe nowadays” (p. 3). Ratti soon learned the absurdity of this proposition.

Ratti, who became Pope Pius XI between 1922 and 1938, was sometimes called the “Polish pope” because of the two years he had spent in Warsaw and his close relationship with Józef Piłsudski. As pope, he had little respect for the Polish bishops who looked for quarrels with the secular authorities rather than seeking common ground. It was clear that Piłsudski had no desire to separate church and state and was willing to go along with the papacy’s desire for a concordat, despite the advice of most of his advisors. Indeed, the 1925 concordat gave the papacy what it wanted and was used as a model for subsequent treaties between the Vatican and other states.

Although there were thirty-two clerics in the constituent assembly developing its constitution, the Polish bishops demonstrated hostility to the new republic. Bishop Adam Sapieha of Cracow accused Piłsudski of building “a socialist and Jewish Poland.” Indeed, Piłsudski was a casual Roman Catholic and no anti-Semite, while Dmowski himself was at best an agnostic who only returned to Roman Catholicism in the last moments of his life. Even the peasant leader, Wincenty Witos, personally devout, was regarded with suspicion, for the peasant parties sought to redistribute church estates. As a result, in a world where
devout Roman Catholics saw communism, Freemasonry, and the Jews threatening the true faith, the Endeks were favoured, finding supporters in such bishops as Sapieha and Armenian-rite Archbishop Teodorowicz in L'viv.

Never comfortable with liberal democracy, Pius XI had no difficulty coming to terms with the dictatorship that followed the 1926 coup d’état. Cardinal Kakowski issued a pastoral letter urging the faithful to remain calm, accepting the first step on the road to Polish democracy’s destruction. Although six of the eight prime ministers in Piłsudski’s regime were Freemasons and a minister for religious affairs, Stanisław Czerwiński, was a Freemason who had left the Church, Pius XI believed that as long as Piłsudski was in charge, the Church’s interests were safe. L'Osservatore Romano routinely lauded the Polish dictator as a victorious anti-Bolshevik while Piłsudski praised Pius XI as “a great friend” of Poland and promised never to permit any legislation inimical to church interests.

The national church faced huge problems: weak leadership, intellectual poverty, and diocesan reconstruction from the fragments of three empires. The Pope did not believe that the Polish bishops needed to create additional problems. When Sapieha and Teodorowicz were elected as right-wing candidates in the elections of November 1922, the pope ordered them to resign their seats. When the same bishops protested the concordat as too weak and sought to meet personally with the pope, he refused to receive them. He denied Teodorowicz and Sapieha the red hat of a cardinal that both desired. (After Pius XI’s death, Sapieha became a cardinal.).

Despite these views, the pope did not replace recalcitrants as Warsaw sought. Instead, he waited until sees were open and appointed replacements that were more comfortable with the Second Republic, most notably, the new primate of Poland, August Cardinal Hlond; Hlond did not favour the National Democrats and was able to tame the most difficult bishops, with papal support. By the end of this period, Pius XI’s policy of quiet replacement had produced a bishopric that accepted the Second Republic, but was divided from the lower clergy who still actively promoted National Democracy.

In his discussion, Pease focuses on the main elements of church-state relations over the inter-war period: the concordat negotiations; papal support for Piłsudski after the 1926 coup d’état; attitudes toward the Lithuanian and Ukrainian minorities (Pius XI refused to transfer either Jurgis Matulaitis-Matulevičius from Vilnius or Andrii Sheptyts’kyi from L’viv, but the Concordat required the loyalty of all clergy to the Polish state.); proselytization of Russia (The Vatican sought to use eastern Poland as its base for bringing Russia into the papal flock despite the opposition of the Polish bishops and the Polish government.); the tempest over burying Piłsudski on the Wawel (Sapieha initially refused but was pressured by the papacy to give in to the government’s wishes.); and the prelude to World War II. Pease is dispassionate in demonstrating how the church condemned the defamation of Polish Jewry, but never denounced the outrages that resulted, seeing them as “most regrettable excesses,” in Kakowski’s words.

Even before Pius XII became pope on the eve of World War II, the Vatican had sympathized with Germany’s territorial demands. Cardinal Gasperi, the Vatican Secretary of State responsible for foreign affairs in the early years of Pius XI’s reign, never accepted the boundaries in Silesia and Pomerania; his successor Pacelli urged border compromises for the sake of “European civilization.” Even after the occupation of Prague, Pius XI suggested to the Polish ambassador to the Vatican that “the Polish Corridor was not too high a price for pay for German friendship.” For the Vatican, the common enemy of Christian Europe was the USSR; all European states must co-operate with the Nazis to defend Christendom from Communism (a position promoted by Berlin’s propaganda in the final years of World War II). Cardinal Hlond echoed this position.
The Vatican issued only the most oblique forms of regret for Poland’s destruction. Radio Vatican initially broadcast reports of atrocities, but soon ceased. Pius XII never condemned the mass murder of apolitical Polish priests and nuns, although he knew of them by the winter of 1940, presumably a small price to pay for establishing a strong anti-Bolshevik front. When Poland was occupied in September 1939, Cardinal Hlond blamed the conquest on secularism and Free Masonry, not German bombers and Soviet tanks, from his safe domicile abroad.

Pease handles this complex narrative well, but makes certain assumptions that some readers will question. For example, he writes: “In Poland Catholicism bore no taint of association with foreign rule or of conflict with patriotic ideals” (p. 5). Yet Austria was a Roman Catholic power while the papacy and the bishops were hostile to Polish nationalism. Again, “[t]he prominence of the Church in Polish life existed naturally as a primary element and result of national history” (p. 74). (There was nothing “natural” about the role that the Roman Catholic Church fought hard to maintain, regardless of the cost to the nation.). Yet again, “[t]he government of Poland functioned as an unsteady, raucous parliamentary democracy that passed the baton of authority from one ineffectual cabinet to another” (p. 77). (Pease himself notes the effectiveness of Władysław Grabski’s government). He states, “Pilsudski was the padrone of Polish politics, not quite a dictator” (p. 78) who resorted “occasionally to repression,” comparing the Marshall to Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and Charles de Gaulle, but not to Juan Perón. Finally, “[i]f the Church of Poland could undo and reform any single aspect of its long history, the chances are it would want to take back most of what it said and did about the Jews before they perished” (p. 124), but what about the Church’s current, long-time inaction in confronting Radio Marija over its anti-Semitism?

Pease himself is too good an historian not to challenge such assumptions when he talks about the brutality of the 1930 “election” or the deep division in interwar Poland between those who saw the Church as defining national values and others who looked to secular patriotism to unite Poland’s disparate population. Indeed, the author acknowledges that papal Catholicism was a divisive, not a unifying, element in interwar Poland (p. 215), contrary to the official Church view. Pease concludes that the Roman Catholic Church achieved its goals in inter-war Poland and that Pilsudski kept his side of the bargain, but perhaps only because the Church’s aims usually did not clash with those of his government: the hierarchy did not get its way in their opposition to the Criminal Code of 1932 that decriminalised homosexual behaviour and loosened restrictions on abortion.

The Papacy and the Polish bishops had a difficult time demonstrating their patriotic credentials until 1939, but as a result of external forces the church became a moral guide to a nation under occupation between 1939 and 1989. This transformation is all the more amazing given Pease’s narrative, for it is clear that the church was not prepared for this more prominent role. Today nearly all Poles regard as normal the Roman Catholic Church’s prominent place in Polish public life.

Of course, there are quibbles. For example, the approach that Pease has adopted in citing cities and regions will please few. He claims to use the traditional English name when it exists, but he uses Kraków, not Cracow. He also uses “Danzig,” which is used in English only as long as the city was under German rule. It might have been easier to navigate this maze if the author had followed the general practice to use the current name, unless there is an English equivalent (in Poland’s case only Cracow and Warsaw). Pease’s spelling “Belorussian” is a Soviet anachronism. (The community prefers “Belarusan.”)
Unfortunately, the author consistently refers to the “Catholic” Church when it is clear that he is referring to only the Catholicism that owes allegiance to the pope in Rome. Between 1918 and 1939, the Polish Catholic Church, rejecting papal infallibility and allowing married priests, prospered in Poland as well as in North America. In addition, there are other Catholic churches throughout the world: Altkatholizismus in the German-speaking countries and Anglicanism in the English-speaking world.

Despite the care with which the author’s work is supported with evidence, Pease’s contention that more liberal abortion rules “never saw the light of day” (p.95) is not correct: the 1932 Criminal Code did permit abortion with fewer restrictions.

Despite these questions and concerns that are inevitably raised in trailblazing, Pease’s conclusion that the papacy and the Polish government were able to reach a modus vivendi despite numerous challenges that arose in the interwar period is sound. Although the author concludes his text by noting that his title must be “taken with a grain of salt,” I have no doubt that this monograph is set to become the standard work on the topic.

John Stanley, Toronto

Yohanan Petrovsky-Shtern. The Anti-Imperial Choice: The Making of the Ukrainian Jew. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009. xv, 344 pp. Notes. Selected bibliography. Index. Illustrations. $65.00, cloth.

Yohanan Petrovsky-Shtern’s *The Anti-Imperial Choice: The Making of the Ukrainian Jew* presents a fascinating study of five Jewish writers who chose the Ukrainian language in which to voice their literary muses. Each of the book’s five chapters surveys the literary output of one of these writers, asking why they chose to write in Ukrainian when so many other Jewish writers of Ukraine chose Russian, Yiddish or Hebrew in which to express themselves, and what this says about the nature of their dual Ukrainian and Jewish identities. Petrovsky-Shtern draws the intriguing conclusion that they chose Ukrainian as an anti-imperial statement. Their choice to identify with what Petrovsky-Shtern considers to be a colonial language certainly suggests an intriguing alternative to the conventional story of Jewish modernization and perhaps can even be considered a form of “anticolonialist resistance” (p. 16). At the very least, it adds a crucial dimension to the story of Eastern European Jewish literature and augments our appreciation of Ukrainian literature as a whole.

Petrovsky-Shtern’s first chapter, on Hryts’ko Kernerenko, demonstrates, through close readings of Kernerenko’s texts, how he drew from Judaic motifs to serve the Ukrainian cause with which he identified. Writing during the last decade of the nineteenth century and first decade of the twentieth, many of Kernerenko’s Jewish literary contemporaries were swept up with nationalist fervour, using their pens to revive the Hebrew language in an assertion of national identity, or seeking to publish in Yiddish to awaken the Jewish masses, or composing in Russian in the hopes of being admitted to the culture of Pushkin and Tolstoy. Kernerenko, by contrast, chose to identify with the Ukrainian peasants in whose midst he lived. His attachment to the land and sweeping picturesque evocations of its landscape echoes Heinrich Heine, who in an earlier generation also hoped for admission into the gentle world surrounding him. It is, indeed, striking how Kernerenko’s Ukraine is transformed into the Promised Land through poems invoking Psalms and Lamentations and the centuries-old Jewish longing for Zion. Kernerenko was, according to Petrovsky-Shtern “the first to move toward a Ukrainian-Jewish literary identity” (p. 59).

The book then turns to Ivan Kulyk, perhaps the best-known figure featured in the volume, more for his role as head of the Ukrainian People’s Commissariat of National
Minorities, though, than as a writer. Kulyk also served in Canada as the Ukrainian deputy consul on trade in the 1920s. Like many American and Canadian Jewish writers of the 1920s, Kulyk identified with the downtrodden, with First Nations and African-Americans, seeing them as stand-ins for his own people, both Jews and Ukrainians. Following the Soviet party line, in the 1930s Kulyk renounced his earlier sympathies with the colonized and instead embraced the empire, paying homage to Moscow. This shift, though, failed to save him from the purges; he was arrested in 1937 and was executed soon thereafter.

Raisa Troianker embraced the eroticism of the 1920s avant-garde, seeking emancipation both from what she regarded as the limits of Jewish tradition and the impositions imposed upon women. Petrovsky-Shtern finds a secret language of colour embedded in her poetry, which often uses yellows and blues, the Ukrainian national colours. Troianker embraced Ukrainian, he continues, in an effort to free both her voice and her body.

Leonid Pervomais'kyi is the subject of the penultimate chapter. Pervomais'kyi’s early writings, from the 1920s and 1930s, were inundated with violence and death, whether he was writing about anti-Jewish pogroms or the famine of the 1930s. Following the conventions of literary depictions of the shtetl, Pervomais'kyi portrayed the fictional Jewish town of Ladeniu as a dying structure, out of which the members can only seek a future in the collective farms. During World War II, as a volunteer in the Red Army, Pervomais'kyi turned to wartime themes, lionizing Red Army soldiers and mourning their losses. Petrovsky-Shtern argues that Pervomais'kyi, who had always seen himself as the voice of the victims of violence, wrote with a vengeance during the war, in particular for the victims of the Holocaust, daringly writing of Babi Yar in his “Vulytsia Mel'nykova.”

The final chapter turns to Moisei Fishbein, who began his writings in Soviet Ukraine and continued writing after his emigration to Israel. He found, however, that the Israeli public was largely uninterested in Ukrainian literature. In 2003, Fishbein returned to Ukraine, where he has put his energy into philanthropic causes and has been embraced by the Ukrainian government and public. His poetry has always reflected the feeling of diaspora and rootlessness that has permeated Fishbein’s own life.

_Petřcovský-Shtern_ argues that _Pervomais’kyi_, who had always seen himself as the voice of the victims of violence, wrote with a vengeance during the war, in particular for the victims of the Holocaust, daringly writing of Babi Yar in his “Vulytsia Mel’nykova.”

The _Anti-Imperial Choice: The Making of the Ukrainian Jew_ makes a significant contribution by presenting these lesser-known authors to English-reading audiences. Petrovsky-Shtern translates numerous snippets of their poetry throughout the volume, and hopefully his book will stimulate more complete translations. Throughout the text, Petrovsky-Shtern demonstrates his superior critical reading skills and his intimate knowledge of Ukrainian literature and its milieu. The “anti-imperial” framework Petrovsky-Shtern proposes suggests an intriguing and fruitful method of studying Jewish contributions to less-commonly read literatures. The book will be essential reading for both scholars of transnational Jewish literatures and of Ukrainian literature.

Jeffrey Veidlinger, Indiana University, Bloomington

Anna Plishkova. _Language and National Identity: Rusyns South of Carpathians_. Patricia A. Krafcik, trans. East European Monographs, 748. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009. xix, 230 pp. Bio-bibliographic intro by P. R. Magocsi. Maps. Bibliography. Illustrations. $55.00, cloth.

This book is an expanded translation of a monograph published in Slovak in 2007 by Anna Plishkova, Director of the Institute of Rusyn Language and Culture at Prešov University.
Published under the auspices of the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Centre, the present work deals with the language question as it relates to Carpatho-Rusyn national identity in eastern Slovakia (p. 7). Apart from the translator’s preface and the author’s foreword and introduction, the book contains two chapters: chapter 1, “The Literary Language as an Instrument of Rusyn National Identity,” offers an historical synopsis of the Rusyn language question from the 17th century onward. Chapter 2 investigates the functional domains of the Rusyn literary language in modern Slovakia. The book concludes with a bibliography (which, incidentally, omits a recent monograph by Elaine Rusinko, Literature and Identity in Subcarpathian Rus’ (2003)) as well as numerous illustrations of major publications in Rusyn (beginning with the title page of the 1596 Slavonic Grammar by Lavrentii Zyzanii [sic]).

The work opens with a laudatory biography of Anna Plishkova penned by Paul Robert Magocsi, who has deemed it necessary to contextualize a gradual transformation of Plishkova into one of the leaders of the Carpatho-Rusyns following the Velvet Revolution of 1989. Magocsi lists thirty-two works published by Plishkova since 1996, emphasizing the fact that she is the first to have written and defended a doctoral dissertation in the Rusyn language (p. xiii). Despite the author’s impressive credentials, the book’s coverage of the Rusyn language question leaves Plishkova open to charges of biased selection and incompetence in the field of linguistics. For example, the introduction is replete with truisms like “from a linguistic point of view, all languages are equally valuable” (p. 6) and misconceptions like the “psycholinguistic question” [sic] whether the Rusyn dialects possess a level of dignity sufficient to constitute the basis for a distinct literary language (p. 10). Ignoring dialectal evidence like that contained in the Atlas of the Ukrainian Language (1984–2001) and in Vasyl Latta’s Atlas of the Ukrainian Dialects of East Slovakia (1991), Plishkova appears incognizant of the pan-Ukrainian foundations of the Rusyn dialects. Citing twelve dialectal features that have served as the basis for the codification of an independent Rusyn literary language (pp. 22–23), Plishkova apparently remains unaware that at least six of these are attested in southeast Ukrainian.

The author struggles to distinguish between a dialect (vernacular) and a literary language as they relate to ethnic (national) identity. One wonders why, in discussing the “Church Slavonic base of the Rusyn language” (dialect? vernacular? written language?), the author mentions Lavrentii Zyzanii and Kyryl Stavrovets’kyi (p. 15) and not, say, Pamvo Berynda—all three were among the creators of the mainstream Ruthenian (Belarusian-Ukrainian) literary culture and ethno-religious identity. At the same time, Meletii Smotryts’kyi is anachronistically dubbed a “Ukrainian writer” (p. 16). Speaking of the Church Slavonic used by Ioanykii [sic] Bazylovych, Plishkova mentions a certain “southern-Rus’ redaction” of this language (p. 18) without elaborating on the name or provenance of this recension. Such inaccuracies and non sequiturs are bound to shake the reader’s confidence.

More reliable than the first chapter is chapter 2, which provides statistics and data about the use of Rusyn after its codification in Slovakia in 1995. According to the author, the intensity of communication in Rusyn is in decline today, although the introduction of Rusyn-language teaching may improve this situation in many functional domains (p. 94). Speaking of Rusyn in the religious field, Plishkova praises the role played by the Carpatho-Rusyn faithful and by clergy from the Circle of Rusyn Greek Catholic Priests in opposing the denationalization of the Rusyn population (p. 128). While extolling the latest translations of liturgical and catechetical texts, Plishkova dismisses their quality as well as the quality of those translations produced by Orthodox Reverend Sydor, who, as recent
studies have demonstrated, has actually forged a hereditary hybrid (jazychie) of Transcarpathian features intermingled with Church Slavonic, Russian, and Ukrainian.

In view of the above-mentioned inconsistencies as well as the poor translations of certain linguistic terms (for example, “simple language” instead of ‘common language’ for, I presume, prostaia mova and/or prostyi iazyk [p. 15]), Plishkova’s book can hardly be recommended to a serious reader or even a novice in the field. Nevertheless, one may with some reservation make use of chapter 2 alone, which contains data that shed light on the status of Rusyn in education and several other functional domains. Although her book is disappointing overall, one trusts that Plishkova has the insight to write a well-balanced and objective book on Rusyn in the future.

Andrii Danylenko, Pace University

Tijmen Pronk. The Slovene Dialect of Egg and Potschach in the Gailtal, Austria. Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, 36. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2009. x, 334 pp. List of abbreviations. Maps. Appendices. Index. Bibliography. €70.00 / $98.00, cloth.

Tijmen Pronk’s monograph deals with the sub-dialect of Egg on the western edge of the Carinthian dialect base and is thus a valuable contribution to Slovene dialectology and to Slavic historical linguistics. It is a detailed synchronic description of the phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexicon of a region on the periphery of the Slovene speech territory. This region is separated from other Slovene dialects by the Karawanken range. The sub-dialect in question is known to have a rich synchronic vowel system and has very likely preserved significant prosodic archaisms of value to historical reconstruction.

One should note that although Pronk’s study is termed a synchronic dialect description, it is closer to a snapshot of the dialect of the oldest living generation. His study is based on some sixty hours of audio recordings made largely of one elderly female informant who was born in 1923. Pronk used this informant’s family and one other informant to confirm her reliability. From the perspective of the historical linguist, this woman represents an archaic system and is therefore the best type of informant. I do not mention this fact as a criticism of Pronk’s work, as his method is widely accepted and provides essential data. I mention this fact only because, for a synchronic description, one would be interested in knowing more about generational differences in the phonology of the region, including differences in the tonemic distinctions.

Pronk provides a clear description of the phonology of the region with multiple examples. He discusses all phonemic vocalic distinctions, including tone as well as the phonetics of vowels and consonants. The chapters on morphology are preceded by a discussion of morphophonemic alternations in consonants and vowels in nominal, verbal, and adjectival inflection as well as an examination of internal and external sandhi. The largest portion of the monograph is devoted to nominal and verbal morphology (chapters 4 and 5, respectively). Pronk describes nominal and verbal classes in great detail, including over 600 verbs in the material. He also touches on verbal aspect and prefixation as well as other forms of verb derivation.

The study contains a brief discussion of syntax and semantics, which focuses primarily on ways in which the dialect differs from the standard language. Chapter 7 consists of eighteen pages of dialect texts. The final chapter of the book is an examination of the history of accentual developments in the Gailtal. Pronk particularly emphasizes the status of the circumflex (also known as the falling tone). His discussion of the data
incorporates one of the questions of Slovene accentology that is not yet fully answered. It is generally understood that all Slovene dialects underwent a process known as circumflex advancement, by which the Common Slavic falling tone advanced one syllable to the right. Yet there are peripheral dialects in the west (western Carinthian) and the east of the Slovene speech territory for which the situation is unclear. Either advancement did not take place, or advancement was followed by later retraction. Both of these positions have been put forward along with detailed hierarchies for the circumstances under which advancement and retraction are likely to take place. Pronk discusses the work of other scholars as well as his own dialect material and argues convincingly that advancement took place in all environments in the Gailtal—probably in Resia as well—followed by retraction or analogy to produce the synchronic forms. He also proposes a reformulation of some of the mechanisms of circumflex advancement and comments on the relative chronology of the development of the neo-circumflex and the advancement of the original circumflex.

Pronk’s thorough study of Egg and Potschach in the Gailtal, Austria, is a superb dialect description that provides useful material for Slovene dialectology and will also be of interest to scholars concerned with Balto-Slavic accentology.

Grant H. Lundberg, Brigham Young University

Katrin Schlund. Genese und Gebrauch von Höflichkeitsformeln im Serbischen und Deutschen: ein funktionales Modell der Höflichkeit und seine Anwendung. Slavistische Beiträge, 470. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2009. 260 pp. Appendices. €32.00, paper.

This Heidelberg thesis sets out to describe the linguistic means used to express politeness in German and Serbian. I must admit that on opening the book my expectations were not high. After all, many of the typical features of politeness, e.g., T/V verbal desinences, forms of address, have already been dealt with quite extensively. I also questioned why precisely German and Serbian—two language communities not especially noted as stereotypical paragons of politeness—had been chosen as the objects of the comparison. Was this another instance of a student looking round for a subject and deciding to compare one’s own language with the language one was studying? I wondered. All these negative preconceptions have been confounded by this intelligently written and increasingly absorbing book. In the space available I will try to convey why, ultimately, I found it such a rewarding read.

Between the theoretical introduction and the conclusion, the book divides neatly into two parts—the first (pp. 51–128) on the presentation of empirical data on the politeness forms themselves (corresponding to the “Gebrauch” of the title) and the second (pp. 129–57) on the possible origin of these forms (“Genese”). While very different in their approach and presentation, both parts stress the interconnectedness of language and culture and in particular the cultural determinants which underlie language usage. That is why becoming acculturated means acquiring the norms which govern linguistic usage in a given culture. I well remember being rebuked by a Russian friend back in the 1960s for saying please and thank you too much. It took some time before I realized that Russian Daj sol’ might be translated into English as ‘Would you mind passing the salt, please?’ rather than just ‘Pass the salt’—about as long as it took me to recognize that in Russia it was quite appropriate to pick the lint off your interlocutor’s clothes during a conversation. It reminds us too that politeness is learned behaviour, as any parent inculcating the moral imperatives of please and thank you will confirm. So, just what are the learned behaviours which manifest themselves in German and Serbian usage and how are they different?
The empirical part of the book, which attempts to answer this last question, is further divided into two sections. The first (pp. 57–89) deals with observed interactions between strangers in natural contexts (markets, shops, restaurants, bars, cafes, public offices). These interchanges, transcribed together with detailed information on place and time, the age and sex of the participants and their accompanying actions, are presented in full in an appendix (pp. 183–235). With respect to nominal forms of address (pp. 61–65), these reveal a number of key differences. Not only do Serbs use an extraordinary number of address forms but these include relation words like sine ‘son’, čerko ‘daughter’, seko ‘sister’ as well as such familiar expressions as lepotice ‘beauty’, komšija ‘neighbour’, zlato ‘gold’. In German, on the other hand, such relational and endearing forms are absent as are the once popular gnädige Frau, etc. Indeed, one of the main features of address in modern German is its complete absence. Schlund explains this distinction in terms of two different models of politeness: solidarity politeness on the Serbian side, distance politeness on the German. This distinction holds for T/V pronoun use. German is characterized by reciprocal V usage by people of all ages— asymmetrical T/V use being limited to interactions between adults and children. In Serbian, symmetrical T usage is the norm among the younger generation, symmetrical V among those over 30–40. Across the age divide, younger people tend to give V and receive T, but in more formal situations both parties may give and receive T. When it comes to making requests, Serbs generally favour the use of the imperative. The abruptness of such requests can be softened by employing the perfective aspect—the precise opposite of the situation in Russian, incidentally. Another widespread usage is to put the request in the form of a question with the indicative future (e.g., daćeš mi? ‘will you give me?’); the use of the conditional (e.g., ja bih jednu kafu sa mlekom ‘I would like a coffee with milk’ with ellipsis of the verb ‘to wish’) is very rare in Serbian. In German, in contrast, the equivalent of the latter is the most preferred option (e.g., ich hätte gern ‘I would like’) together with the use of the indicative present (e.g., ich bekomme ‘I get’). In German requests for goods and services are almost never couched in the imperative. Indeed, even when requests for action are addressed in the imperative, they are usually softened by a particle such as mal.

Another essential difference is between German bitte and Serbian molim te/vas ‘please’. The German word for ‘please’ is used routinely, whereas molim te/vas is not employed so much for politeness but in order to intensify the request. Schlund also points to the fact that the Serbian verb must be used with its object ‘you’. She suggests that there is an underlying grammatical difference here: molim remains a verb form, whereas German bitte has been lexicalized, thereby losing its verbal function. Comparisons with other pro-drop languages like Czech and Polish with prosím and prosię, respectively, as lexicalized forms but without the second person pronoun object, might suggest that this explanation is ill-founded. Schlund counters that the Czech and Polish forms are the result of contact with German. I find this explanation unconvincing. I also wonder why the author ignores the existence of Croatian of a free-standing, lexicalized molim ‘please’. Indeed, I am perplexed why more Croatian material has not entered into the comparison. I suspect that there is an important isogloss here between Serbian and Croatian, which would actually strengthen Schlund’s general explanation for the differences in politeness between Serbian and German.

Schlund also devised a questionnaire (pp. 253–260) in German and Serbian to elicit attitudes about politeness in the two speech communities. Surveyed were people with knowledge of both communities, the majority of them female university students. Bearing in mind that women are recognized as being more polite than men and that university
students tend to represent modern, urban values, the profile of respondents is irredeemably flawed as a cross-section of the respective communities. The responses reveal that Serbs and Germans both view German society as more polite and Germans as more reserved. The survey also asked respondents to rank the various options for formulating requests in the two languages. Serbian respondents gave highest rank to the use of the conditional followed by the formula involving a question posed in the future tense. The German respondents ranked the past subjunctive highest followed by the formula with the present indicative and the imperative dead last.

The search for the source of politeness as a European concept is heavily based on Elias’s theories about the development of a civilized European society main (N. Elias, Über den Prozess der Zivilisation. Soziogenetische und psychogenetische Untersuchungen. 3 vols. Bern, 1969). The argument runs as follows: as society grew more complex and was governed first by feudal relations and the need to coexist in close, urban settings, and as individuals became more dependent on each other for goods and services, the need arose for civilized relations between people. The social cement for these civilized relations was politeness, which established distance between people. Hence in Europe distance politeness came to be regarded as politeness tout court. It spread out from France, first in urban and courtly centres, then more broadly. Another major factor governing social relations in Europe was the institution in the Catholic West of the one-generational, nuclear family as against the large clan system. This change privileged a distance model over a solidarity model of human relations. On this basis it is easy to see why the expression of politeness is so different in Serbian and German. For example, the use of relational words like sine, seko, čerko in Serbian fits well with the retention of elements of a traditional patrilineal Balkan society. It also explains the many parallels between Russian and Serbian usage and the contrasts with languages like Czech and Polish. Basing herself on the work of Renate Rathmayr, a prolific writer on address and politeness in Russian, Schlund also explores the possible influence of socialism on politeness in Serbian society. I find this explanation less plausible, and surely it would require at least some investigation of German in the former German Democratic Republic, which is not mentioned at all in this study. Schlund also addresses the impact of the Milošević era and the Balkan Wars. This leads her to examine the sharply divergent paradigms governing self-identity—Balkanization and Europeanization—in an increasingly polarized Serbian society. This, I believe, is worth exploring further. For example, comparisons with Bosnian and Croatian attitudes and practice would seem to offer much promise.

This book deserves an extensive readership—not only among linguists and cultural historians, but among all social scientists interested in central and (south)eastern Europe. It commends itself further for its clear writing style and the absence of the jargon and verbiage which is the blight of so much post-modern work on cultural studies. That its medium is German, a language notorious for the expression of unnecessary scholarly pedantry, is a pleasant surprise. If this is a new trend in German academic writing, then it deserves the special attention of historians of discourse analysis.

George Thomas, McMaster University
Valeria Sobol. *Febris Erotica: Lovesickness in the Russian Literary Imagination.* Literary Conjugations. Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 2009. xx, 300 pp. Illustration. Notes. Bibliography. Index. $60.00, cloth. $30.00, paper.

Can one really die of love? The question is asked in Nikolai Chernyshevsky’s *What Is to Be Done? (Chto delat’?)* ([1863]) about a mysterious illness that the physiologist Kirsanov diagnoses as lovesickness. In *Febris Erotica* Valeria Sobol inquires not whether the cliché about romantic love’s destructive power holds true, but “what assumptions about human nature gave legitimacy to the topos, so it could be reproduced over the centuries” (p. ix). She especially wants to know what gave the trope such prominence in Russian literature of the nineteenth century, and looks for that answer not only in literature, but in the mutual influence of the language and cultural traditions of science, medicine, philosophy, and social attitudes towards passionate love.

Her introduction grounds the study in the association between love and illness through the Hippocratic theory of humours, the Platonic philosophy of Eros, and Aristotelian psychology and physiology of passion. Among the ancient and medieval poets, Sappho, Ovid, Plutarch, and Chaucer are some of those cited who describe the symptoms of love using the terminology of the science of their time.

Sobol introduces the Russian context by discussing early Russian exemplars of the topos of lovesickness. In particular, the seventeenth-century *The Tale of Savva Grudtsyn (Povest’ o Savve Grudtsyne)* typifies the medieval Russian worldview, where erotic passion is the result of supernatural intervention (of magic or the devil), which requires no physiological basis. With the Petrine reforms, however, Russian memoirs begin to evince the adaptation of the Western love code with its concept of lovesickness.

The bulk of the study proceeds in three sections: “Anatomy,” “Diagnostics,” and “Therapy.” The first considers the mind-body problem in Russian Sentimentalism. The second reviews the typical diagnostic situation of lovesickness as treated in two Russian novels of the 1840s: Aleksandr Herzen’s *Who Is to Blame? (Kto vinovat?)* ([1847]) and Ivan Goncharov’s *An Ordinary Story (Obyknovennaiia istoriia)* ([1847]). Each takes its stand between the receding Romantic worldview and the analytical orientation of the early positivist era. The friction is “personified in a controversy between a young, naïve, idealist hero and an older materialist-minded skeptic,” where the latter “reduces the spiritual malady of love to a mere physical disorder” (pp. 71–72). Herzen uses the medicalization of Romantic sensibility “to settle scores with the Romantic idealist worldview and its dualistic model of the human being” (p. 73). What is at stake for Goncharov is the very battle for modernity: lovesickness embodies all that is wrong with Romanticism, especially its resistance to the ideas of reason and progress (pp. 106–108).

Finally, “Therapy” is concerned with how Chernyshevsky and Tolstoy weigh in on the controversies over human nature and positivist science. By de-medicalizing lovesickness, Chernyshevsky emphasizes the social, rather than physiological, nature of issues related to women’s roles in society. Tolstoy’s take on the problem—which Sobol calls “shamesickness”—is expounded primarily in *Anna Karenina* (1875–1877). The author “explodes the Western topos from within” by challenging modern assumptions about romantic love as the foundation for family happiness (p. 188). In particular, Kitty Sheherbatskaia’s self-diagnosis of lovesickness is a misdiagnosis; the origin of her malady is not so much unrequited love as shame over rejecting a worthy candidate for her hand for a less worthy one (pp. 171–172).
One of the greatest contributions Sobol makes is her attention to the mutual influence of the languages of science and literature. Referring frequently to figures who debated psychology versus physiology and popularized the medical discourse of the day (Iurkevich, Sechenov, Kavelin, Bernard and others), she advances not only the study of love in Russian literature, but the links between Russia’s “accursed questions” (prokliatye voprosy) and its “maladies of the soul” (dushevnye bolezni). The hybrid discourse she investigates is the critical factor, since “a cliché is put to different uses depending on each epoch’s cultural preoccupations and each work’s individual complex of ideas and concerns” (p. 148).

There are few demerits of Febris Erotica worthy of mention, but one is possibly that the theme of lovesickness could have been studied over a wider range of texts. The most glaring omission is Turgenev, whose Diary of a Superfluous Man (Dnevnik lishnego cheloveka [1850]) and Fathers and Children (Ottsy i deti [1862]) are given only cursory mention. It might have made a revealing case study, for example, to examine the curious twist on lovesickness presented in Bazarov, the archnihilist, who nevertheless exhibits the signs of the gloomy and lovelorn romantic when he falls in love with Mme Odintsova. Bazarov’s fatal illness contracted at the operating table could even be seen figuratively as a clinical extension of the lovesickness topos.

Lonny Harrison, University of Texas-Arlington

Andrei N. Sobolev, ed. Malyi dialektologicheskii atlas balkanskih iazykov. Seriia leksicheskaia. Tom III: Zhivotnovodstvo. Studien zum Südosteuropasprachatlas, 7. Munich and St. Petersburg: Otto Sagner and Nauka, 2009. 658 pp. 185 maps. Index of maps. €22.00, paper.

The present volume is the third of those devoted specifically to lexicon in the larger project titled Malyi dialektologicheskii atlas balkanskih iazykov (‘Small dialect atlas of the Balkan languages’). The focus here is on terminology related to the tending of small livestock (sheep and goats). Volume I in the series presented lexicon related to spiritual culture (dukhovnaia kul’tura), and Volume II presented lexicon under the heading “Man, Family” (Chelovek, Sem’ia).

For the part of the project relevant to the current volume, a team of researchers went to twelve locations on the Balkan peninsula representing various dialects (Slavic in Otok [Croatia], Zavala [Montenegro], Kamenica [Serbia], Peštani [Macedonia], Gega, Gela, and Ravna [Bulgaria]; Albanian in Muhurr and Leshnjë [Albania]; Greek in Eratura and Kastelli [Greece]; and Arumanian in Krania/Turia [Greece]). From informants they solicited terms used there for various items, activities, and concepts related to the tending of sheep and goats. This volume (Volume III) reports their findings.

In a brief foreword (pp. 7–11) Sobolev discusses the importance of rearing livestock throughout the Balkans as well as similarities and differences in practices and social organization; he also outlines the way in which the data are presented in this volume and the linguistic and geographic identities of the dialects investigated. Thereafter the bulk of the book is devoted to presenting the collected data. Each of the first 185 lexical queries is accompanied by a map on the facing page (pp. 14–383). For these, the terms produced by informants for each location (if such terms were in fact found) are listed on the left-hand page, while on the facing page is a map on which some or all of the entries are shown graphically, highlighting patterns of similarities and differences among these dialects with regard to specific terms. Frequently added are notes providing, among other things, information on part of speech and etymology. The results of the remaining 270 queries are
presented with one page devoted to each query (pp. 384–653) without accompanying maps. The data are arranged by the following categories: “Small Horned Livestock” (pp. 14–41 and 384–394; cf. “crippled,” pp. 26–27), “Sheep” (pp. 42–171 and 395–542; cf. “placenta of small horned livestock,” p. 414), “Goats” (pp. 172–199 and 453–517; cf. “crop-earred,” pp. 180–181), “The Care of Livestock” (pp. 200–223 and 518–534; cf. “bedding in the sheep-fold for [the birthing of] sheep,” p. 521), “The Pasturage of Livestock” (pp. 224–305 and 535–596; cf. “hired shepherd,” pp. 254–255), “Enclosures” (pp. 306–315 and 597–609; cf. “summer enclosure for sheep,” p. 599), “Structures for the Managing of Livestock” (pp. 316–335 and 610–613; cf. “place for storing winter fodder in a barn, building,” pp. 320–321), “The Slaughtering of Livestock, the Parts of the Carcass, the Processing of the Carcass” (pp. 336–363 and 614–647; cf. “kid meat,” p. 623), and “Livestock Diseases and Murrain” (pp. 364–383 and 648–653; cf. “throat lump in livestock,” pp. 372–373). In some cases, the sought-after vocabulary was found in all twelve locations; in other cases, it was found in significantly fewer locations (i.e., no information was available, or there was no term for the item or concept in question, or perhaps the item or concept itself does not exist in one or more locations). On average, just over nine locations produced at least one relevant lexical item for a given query. The foreword and all commentary in this volume are in Russian. There are no concluding remarks, but the volume ends with an index of maps (pp. 654–658).

This book represents a rich source of very interesting data. The section in which maps accompany the lexical information is particularly helpful in drawing the reader’s attention to noteworthy dialectal distributions. On p. 27, for example, we see forms derived from one Turkish word throughout most of the region while other forms derived from a different Turkish word appear in the far eastern Ravna dialect; similarly, on p. 255 we find a given Turkish word that is used throughout the centre of the Balkans, but is missing from the east, northwest, and south.

With this volume Sobolev and his team of researchers have provided Balkanists a valuable fund of data, obviously gathered and organized with a great deal of careful planning and hard work. However, this volume should be of interest not only to Balkanists, but also to dialectologists and lexicologists generally.

John Leafgren, University of Arizona

Vladimir Solonari. Purifying the Nation. Population Exchange and Ethnic Cleansing in Nazi-Allied Romania. Baltimore and Washington, D.C.: Johns Hopkins University Press and Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2009. 488 pp. Illustrations. Maps. Notes. Bibliography. Index. $65.00, cloth.

Over the past decade several books have pushed against the “golden age” view of interwar Romania and have begun to ask tough questions about the relationship between the institutions, discourses, and practices developed after 1918 and through the country’s abysmal record during World War II. A synthesis of these various projects might be in order, but unfortunately this is not the book to successfully accomplish the task. Purifying the Nation. Population Exchange and Ethnic Cleansing in Nazi-Allied Romania has as its goal tying new research on population policies during World War II in Dobrogea, Transylvania, Bukovina, and Transnistria to the threads developed by other scholars in relation to science discourse, anti-Semitism, religious right-wing fanaticism, eugenics, the Holocaust, National Peasant Party politics, Carol II’s camarilla, and other topics, in order to
Somewhat misleadingly titled, the book spends almost a third of its analysis on events that predate Romania’s alignment with the Nazis. The reason for this, I surmise, is to drive home the author’s goal of demonstrating the importance of the developments described in chapters 1–5 for fully understanding the racist direction of Romanian population policies during the war. Unfortunately, Romania’s history is a messy clutter of different and often disconnected elements that simply do not fit in a linear narrative into a persuasive way.

The bulk of the analysis is focused, however, on population policies, events, and the biographies of major actors responsible for these developments during World War II. The author moves in somewhat chronological order to highlight the earliest attempts at constructing what Solonari views as the cornerstone of population policies during the war—ethnic purification according to biological racist ideologies. The initial “model” turns out to be southern Dobrogea, the first of Romania’s recent territorial acquisitions to be retroceded to its former master, Bulgaria. The author’s research on this area offers some of the most original parts of the book.

Solonari then discusses policies towards Transylvania, Bukovina, Bessarabia, and Transnistria, alongside descriptions of some of the most gruesome episodes in the war in terms of the cruelty shown by the Romanian authorities in the territories it controlled during part of the war, aided by vivid photographs. The author is careful here to differentiate between Bukovina and the other territories, as Jews in the former territory seemed to have received a slightly better treatment at the hands of the Romanian civil authorities at the beginning of the war. Solonari also describes policies towards the Roma as an important part of the larger picture of ethnic purification.

Overall, the analysis moves, somewhat inconsistently, between two levels—in-depth descriptions of events and policies, versus generalizations of what these events and regulations mean for understanding the broader framework of ethnic purification. It is on this latter level that Solonari’s analysis fails to deliver on his claims. The evidence offered is sometimes illustrative of his point, but at other times does not present the reader with convincing proof of the kind of singularity in pushing ethnic purification he wants us to see.

I was struck by the author’s contempt for many of the people he focuses on: Sabin Manuila is “paranoid” (p. 92); Carol II “incapable” of purposefulness (p. 24); Dimitrie Gusti “not an original thinker” and a “quintessential opportunist” (pp. 87 and 88). While understandable on a human level, especially when keeping in mind the anti-democratic and racist positions some of these people embraced, this does not make for good historical analysis. As I understand it, our discipline aims to tell stories about the past to render it intelligible to our audiences while making an honest effort to comprehend the motivations and meanings that the people we are studying had for their actions and words, all the while remaining self-reflexive about the ways in which our own personal lens shapes our reflections on the past. To write contemptuously about the past presumes a view of oneself as somewhat better situated to understand the events in question than the people who lived through them, and to be somehow superior to those people. This position is ethically problematic.

It is also a problem when it seems to lead an author towards damning unsubstantiated assertions and counterfactual history. What does it mean to say: “all of them [Romanian right-wingers] could have signed on to Crainic’s program of the ethnocratic state, even if with cosmetic changes”? (p. 32, my italics) It is my understanding that as historians all we provide a more comprehensive and clearer picture of links among these diverse facets of Romanian history. Though commendable for his ambitious goal, the author is unsuccessful in offering a nuanced and illuminating synthesis of these complicated stories.
can reflect on are events that actually happened: most Romanian right-wingers did not sign on to Nichifor Crainic’s program. The absence of a likely predicament can be an interesting question to engage, but the author is not interested in it. Instead, he remains intent on fitting varieties of nationalism, eugenicism, Orthodoxism, and other illiberal/anti-democratic movements into one narrative. Other instances of counterfactual historical interpretation also diminish the value of the author’s research and attempts at a new interpretation of Romania’s record during World War II. I am not sure what the statement “Antonescu could not but feel a deep sympathy to the Nazis’ ethos” (p. 123, my italics) means as historical analysis. Such a driven statement that pushes a singular agenda makes it difficult for the reader to consider it as serious scholarship.

The author’s insistence on a narrow interpretation of evidence is unfortunate. His research on population policies during World War II, especially with regard to Dobrogea, is rich, original, and deserves further analysis and nuance. It may be that, in fact, the time has not yet come for the synthesis promised by the author and historians of 1918–1945 Romania still need to try to understand discreet threads of political and intellectual discourse, as well as policy making and implementation, before we can launch into sketching a larger picture. Sometimes less is more, and in this case I was left wanting to know more about the population policies of World War II and what are the possible explanations for various divergences from stated policies than the author offers.

Maria Bucur, Indiana University

Alex Storozynski. The Peasant Prince: Thaddeus Kosciuszko and the Age of Revolution. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2009. xiv, 370 pp. Illustrations. Bibliography. Index. $29.95, cloth. $16.99, paper.

Tadeusz Kościuszko is among the foremost figures of the United States’ War for Independence as well as of the Polish radical Enlightenment, Leader (Naczelnik) of the 1794 Insurrection, and a moral guide for Poles. Yet there has been no recent biography in English that explores the numerous facets of this complex individual or the impact he made on two nations. Alex Storozynski is current president and executive director of the Kosciuszko Foundation and formerly connected to two New York City tabloids. Unfortunately, despite the author’s knowledge of English and Polish and his profession as a writer, this book does not provide a professional treatment of Kościuszko’s life, achievements, and legacy.

Of course, Storozynski faithfully recites the key elements of the Leader’s life, adding frequent references to sex (or its lack in Kościuszko’s case), but he has no framework for his narrative, only chronological episodes. There are signs of what could become such a framework—the Leader’s republicanism and radical Enlightenment beliefs—but these important features surface in the text as additional detail rather than the shapers of Kościuszko’s life and thought. For example, Kościuszko’s deism is clear; but Storozynski can only bear to write that the Leader “began to think more and more like a Deist” (p. 126). Kościuszko’s deism, anti-clericalism, and disdain for Roman Catholicism have long been difficult for certain elements in Polish politics. It seems that Storozynski shares this difficulty. Storozynski inserts his own political views again when he denounces the headaches of a “national bureaucracy” (p. 180). Most historians would identify the lack of an effective administration and a bureaucracy to staff it as one of the reasons for the Commonwealth’s disappearance.

Maria Bucur, Indiana University

Alex Storozynski. The Peasant Prince: Thaddeus Kosciuszko and the Age of Revolution. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2009. xiv, 370 pp. Illustrations. Bibliography. Index. $29.95, cloth. $16.99, paper.

Tadeusz Kościuszko is among the foremost figures of the United States’ War for Independence as well as of the Polish radical Enlightenment, Leader (Naczelnik) of the 1794 Insurrection, and a moral guide for Poles. Yet there has been no recent biography in English that explores the numerous facets of this complex individual or the impact he made on two nations. Alex Storozynski is current president and executive director of the Kosciuszko Foundation and formerly connected to two New York City tabloids. Unfortunately, despite the author’s knowledge of English and Polish and his profession as a writer, this book does not provide a professional treatment of Koś...
In his introduction, the author claims a deep familiarity with Polish history, but there are numerous faux pas: few would attribute the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth’s decline simply to “foreign meddling in legislative affairs” (p. 3) and the Hasidim never “dominated” Jewish society in Poland (p. 138). Storozynski bizarrely assumes that if Poland’s townspeople were given equal rights with the Polish nobility, “the Prussian middle class would have no reason to stay in Prussia” (p. 135). There are no “cold steppes” between Warsaw and St Petersburg (p. 211). Nor did Dąbrowski’s cavalry escape to Italy (p. 217); the general formed the Polish legions from Polish volunteers and released prisoners of war already in Italy. If Sobieski’s sword had been given to Kościuszko, on what did Dąbrowski give the oath to his troops in Lwowicz on 1 January 1807? It is not likely that many would regard the Cossacks as “tribesmen” (p. 138) and the author’s anti-Russian sentiments have gotten the better of him: Cossacks did not “plunder their way” (p. 266) through France in 1814. The Russian armies that crossed Europe in pursuit of Napoleon were noted for their disciplined conduct. The burning of the White House in 1813 is condemned, but there is no mention that it was carried out as revenge for the destruction of Upper Canada’s parliament. He notes that Polish serfdom was not as harsh as U.S. slavery, but nothing he cites bears out the assertion (and there is much he could have cited that would have demonstrated the contrary.)

Even more irritating is his anglicising Polish names. No one would argue with the author’s attempt to open up Polish history to those who do not know Polish culture, but this approach results in as many problems as it attempts to address. Jan Sobieski becomes “John Sobieski,” Hugo Kołłątaj becomes “Kollontay,” but consistency is difficult. Poland’s last king is called “Stanislaw,” rather than the English Stanislaus. Kościuszko’s father is called by the German form (“Ludwig”) of his Polish name Ludwik; Wiridiana turns into “Vera-Diana.” Sometimes the younger Potocki brother is “Ignatius” and sometimes “Ignacy.” The Vistula River is referred to as the “Wisla.” On p. 185, the peasant hero of the battle of Racławice is “Wojciech Bartosz,” but on p. 194 he is called “Bartosz Glowacki.” The author explains this shift by noting that the peasant became “Duke Glowacki” (p. 186). “Duke” is not a Polish title.

It is always a biographer’s temptation to impose his own personality and beliefs on his subject. Unfortunately, Storozynski has tried to mould Kościuszko’s beliefs to suit his own and it is a forced fit. The writing employs colloquialisms—Warsaw was a “party town” under Stanislaw August—that will date his works. Storozynski has ordered the vast material of Kościuszko’s life, but he has not shaped it. Given the factual errors, it should be used with caution. The gap identified by Storozynski in his introduction remains.

John Stanley, Toronto

Vladimir Tismaneanu, ed. Stalinism Revisited: The Establishment of Communist Regimes in East-Central Europe. Budapest and New York: Central European University Press, 2009. vii, 444 pp. Index. $45.00, cloth. $27.95, paper.

Stalinism Revisited is the product of a 2007 conference sponsored by the Romanian Cultural Institute in Washington. The volume, as did the conference, brings together a diverse array of scholars to consider Stalinism as an East European phenomenon. While those scholars sometimes seem to be talking past one another, the collective effort is a useful introduction to the state of the field.

The sixteen articles fall into three categories. Essays by volume editor Vladimir Tismaneanu, as well as Ken Jowitt, Mark Kramer, Alfred J. Rieber, Thomas W. Simons,
Jr., and Agnes Heller, offer overviews of the region or of Stalinism itself. Particularly valuable are the contributions by Kramer and Rieber. As we have come to expect, Mark Kramer simply dazzles the reader with his encyclopaedic knowledge of the shadowy politics at the summits of communist power. His methodical exploration of the consolidation of the Bloc contains some interesting ideas. In particular, he suggests that it was concern over continued guerrilla activity along the western edge of the Soviet Union and in the neighbouring states that led Stalin to decide, in 1946–1947, that coalition governments were not sufficiently reliable allies, and would have to be replaced by communist regimes (pp. 75–76). Alfred Rieber offers a cogent exploration of the concept of popular democracy. He argues that Stalin, while never articulating precisely what he meant by popular democracy, seemed to consider it the default option for the region, but that the weakness of the local communist parties and the insuperable distrust by the communists of their coalition partners doomed this path by 1948.

A second set of essays offers country studies of Stalinism. Some authors, unfortunately, ignore the opportunity to revisit Stalinism in the light of new scholarship. Thus János Rainer gestures briefly to Sheila Fitzpatrick’s work on Stalinism in the Soviet Union, agreeing that there are significant differences between Stalinisms and many “new questions pending” (p. 245), before casting this aside in favour of the much safer structural approach, in which differences merely reflect centre-periphery distinctions and the like. Other essays take the revisiting more seriously. John Connelly, in the best essay in the volume, demolishes the idea that East Germany was not really Stalinist. He uses insights from the study of the rest of the Bloc to show that East Germany must be understood principally in an East European context—and, indeed, as one of the most successful Stalinisms. He also considers why East Germany did not reform when other Stalinist regimes did, in the late 1950s, even though the open border should have made reform all the more urgent. Connelly argues that anti-fascist vigilance, and the fact that would-be reformers left the country or were expelled, made intransigence a more likely response than reform. Brad Abrams, in turn, shows clearly that the Czechoslovaks—and not just the communists themselves, but their non-communist coalition partners as well—helped to make their own Stalinist bed. Not surprisingly given the Czechoslovak timeline, he places the turn to Stalinist conformity later than do other authors, identifying the Tito-Stalin split of June 1948 as crucial. Ekaterina Nikova contributes a solid overview of Bulgarian Stalinism; an essay on Poland, however, the weakest in the volume, could have been written thirty-five years ago.

A final category comprises four essays on various aspects of Romanian Stalinism: the historical profession, armed resistance, propaganda, and “identity politics” under Gheorghiu-Dej. It is a pity that such archivally-focused work is not paralleled in other cases, yet the authors make some effort to offer comparisons. Their research collectively indicates some of the “new questions pending” that might be taken up by scholars of the rest of the region.

Many of this volume’s authors share the view of Stalinist consolidation in the region as contingent and not preordained; this welcome insight, which has been long in coming, accounts for much of the value of Stalinism Revisited. Where earlier scholarship often tried to fit each country into an assumed master plan, the best essays in this collection encourage the reader to recognize that Stalinist Eastern Europe was both a co-ordinated system and a collection of diverse societies, in which communism would find various ways of surviving, and even prospering, for two generations.

Padraic Kenney, Indiana University

Canadian Slavonic Papers/Revue canadienne des slavistes
Vol. LII, Nos. 3–4, September-December 2010
Pieter C. van Duin. *Central European Crossroads: Social Democracy and National Revolution in Bratislava (Pressburg), 1867–1921.* International Studies in Social History. New York: Berghahn Books, 2009. xii, 466 pp. Glossary. Notes. Bibliography. Index. $95.00, cloth.

In this book, the Flemish historian Pieter C. van Duin, who has worked and studied in both Leiden and Bratislava, sets out to describe the Social Democratic movement in Bratislava (Pressburg) during World War I. He claims that past historians of the labour movement have often ignored the “national” question, which, in East Central Europe, is crucial and, therefore, he aims to fill this void. The essence of the book is that the Social Democratic movement in Bratislava “was shaped by the contradictory dynamics of interethnic existence and cooperation on the one hand, and increasing tensions, fragmentation, and mutual alienation on the other” (p. 13).

To illustrate his point, van Duin looked at three Social Democratic movements in the future capital city of Slovakia before, especially during, and immediately after the Great War. He found that the Germans and Magyars, who initially outnumbered the Slovaks, dominated the movement in the period 1867–1918, largely because the Magyar Social Democrats agreed with their government’s policy of “Magyarization” (assimilation of all ethnic groups), and the Germans went along with it. However, once the Great War came to an end and Czechoslovakia emerged from the ruins of Austria-Hungary, it successfully claimed the multi-ethnic Pressburg (Bratislava as of 14 March 1919), and everything changed. The Slovak Social Democrats immediately joined their Czech cousins in the Czechoslovak Social Democratic Party, while the Germans, after much soul-searching, eventually joined the German Social Democratic Workers’ Party in Czechoslovakia in November 1920. The Magyars, meanwhile, established their own Magyar Social Democratic Party in December 1920. Despite Karl Marx’s theories of class solidarity, ethnicity triumphed among the Social Democrats in Czechoslovakia.

The author did extensive research in the Vienna State Archives and the Slovak National Archives (but not the Hungarian National Archives) and read newspapers and secondary sources in German, Slovak, Czech and English (but not in Magyar). He focuses his attention mainly on the German Social Democrats in Bratislava, arguing that this was “a neglected topic” (p. 16). Thus, he carefully traces the reaction of German Social Democrats to the pre-war Magyarization movement (they reluctantly supported it), to the Great War (initial support but later opposition to it), and to their annexation by Czechoslovakia (opposition to it, but not as vehement as that of the Magyars). In the process he revises the work of Slovak Marxist historians, and even some contemporary ones, who have tended to uncritically accept the memoirs of Vavro Šrobár, Czechoslovakia’s first Minister Plenipotentiary for the Administration of Slovakia in 1919. Van Duin characterizes the Germans of Pressburg (Bratislava) as “Janus-faced” (p. 402)—that is, they readily switched their ethnic allegiance between German and Magyar, depending upon the circumstances. Ironically, before 1918 they served as intermediaries between the Magyars and Slovaks, whom the former were trying to assimilate.

Van Duin concludes that the creation of Czechoslovakia in 1918 was a catastrophe for the Social Democratic movement because it split into its three ethnic components. As for the new Republic, the author characterized it as an “ethnocracy” (p. 384), that is, a democracy based upon domination by two ethnic groups, the Czechs and Slovaks, with various minorities subordinate to them. This did not bode well for the future.

While this is a very comprehensive treatment of Social Democracy in one particular location, it leaves something to be desired. The virtual day-to-day description of events in
Pressburg (Bratislava) during and immediately after the Great War is often tedious. So are the very long and needlessly detailed introductions to each chapter. A good editor might have reduced the length of this book by a hundred pages. Meanwhile, the almost total neglect of the substantial Jewish community in Pressburg (Bratislava), which the author puts at 11,000 out of a population of 81,772 in 1919 is puzzling. Did Pressburg’s (Bratislava’s) Jews play no role in the Social Democratic movement? This hardly seems possible.

M. Mark Stolarik, University of Ottawa

Claudia Verhoeven. *The Odd Man Karakozov: Imperial Russia, Modernity, and the Birth of Terrorism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009. xi, 231 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. $39.95, cloth.

The Odd Man Karakozov is an intelligently written, deeply thoughtful, and necessary reconsideration of terrorism in general and Russian terrorism in particular. By taking as its central subject Dmitrii Karakozov and his attempted assassination of Alexander II in 1866, the book not only provides a much-needed re-evaluation of the Karakozov case and the myths that surround it, but it also shows how Karakozov inaugurated in Russia the modern form of political violence that we have come to know as terrorism.

Claudia Verhoeven’s most important contribution to the history of terrorism is her insistence that terrorism is crucially linked to “modernity.” Assassination has a long history, but it is only the advent of a “historically conscious and politically sovereign subject” (p. 7) and the advancements in modern technology and mass communication that make modern terrorism. Modernity allows the assassin to do more than simply eliminate an unjust ruler or figure of authority, but helps him to attack an entire system as a whole. Interestingly, although she argues that the modernity of terrorism did not originate in the French Terror, it was the philosopher Albert Camus who argued precisely that modernity was born with the execution of Louis XVI; previous Kings had been killed, but never before had the throne been left “empty.” This may add to Verhoeven’s insight into Karakozov’s desire for “nothing”—for that quintessentially modern place to build the foundations of a new social order afresh, on the ruins of the old.

Some of the most fascinating passages in the book carefully deconstruct what was previously “known” about the Karakozov case: his relationship to the supposedly diabolical, clandestine terrorist group known as “Hell” or Osip Komisarov’s valiant “saving” of the Tsar’s life. There is an intriguing discussion on the possible influence of Karakozov on Fyodor Dostoevsky’s writing of *Crime and Punishment*. In every instance, sources are scrupulously and originally interrogated to provide layers of interesting new interpretations.

One of the intriguing omissions of the book is a discussion of how the Karakozov myth developed within the Russian revolutionary community, especially among later revolutionary terrorists. It is intriguing because these later terrorists actually confirm her point: they saw Karakozov as “the first”—the originator of this modern form of political violence. Certainly, Sergei Nechaev was inspired by Karakozov’s act and the “myth” of Hell as an organization; and when Alexander Solovev attempted to assassinate the Tsar in 1879, everyone immediately compared him to Karakozov. Vera Zasulich, herself once considered a model of the perfect terrorist, pointed to Karakozov as the one who started it all. It was in the subsequent revolutionary narrative that the link was made between
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Karakozov and the “rigorist” Rakhmetov in Chernyshevskii’s *What Is to Be Done?* Indeed, though Verhoeven follows Andrew Drozd in attempting to rehabilitate *What Is to Be Done?*, as far more than a simple positivist-utilitarian quasi religious tract, almost all revolutionary readers of the novel (Chernyshevskii’s target audience) simply saw it as a “Bible” and believed that Karakozov had, in fact, imitated Rakhmetov in his actions and his strength of character. An analysis of the writings of revolutionaries in the 1870s might have provided a new perspective on the Karakozov case.

This aside, *Odd Man Karakozov* is essential reading for anyone who seeks a radically different and highly original perspective on Russian terrorism and its contribution to the history of terrorism as a whole. It is to be hoped that this book will open up a new vein of scholarship on this relatively neglected field of Russian history.

Ana Siljak, *Queen’s University*

**Vladislav Zubok. Zhivago’s Children: The Last Russian Intelligentsia.** Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009. 453 pp. Illustrations. Notes. Index. $35.00, cloth.

In his book Vladislav Zubok seeks to explain a particular period in the cultural and intellectual history of the Soviet Union by claiming membership for many of its most prominent figures in a social category that has acquired a multiplicity of meanings since the word for it was first used in Russia in the 1860s. That category is the intelligentsia, which in its original sense referred to alienated intellectuals who rejected the tsarist order in the name of timeless and universal moral principles. In the Soviet era, however, it became the official designation for a much larger segment of the population, namely, all those in the Soviet Union who engaged in intellectual labour for a living. Implicitly rejecting each of these definitions, Zubok applies the term to yet another group of people, those he calls “Zhivago’s children,” in tribute to the author of *Doctor Zhivago*, Boris Pasternak, whose funeral in 1960 was for a number of Soviet artists and intellectuals the moment at which, in Zubok’s account, their vague disquiet with the existing social and political order began to change into something more concrete and specific, most notably a recognition that what the Soviet Union needed most was human rights and a recognition of the sanctity of individual conscience. Thus, “Zhivago’s children” is really a short form for the *shestidesiatniki*, or the people of the 1960s, who carried on the non-conformism triggered by the Thaw that followed Stalin’s death in 1953, only to realize in the 1970s that their chances of convincing the authorities to accept their values and beliefs were minimal, if not entirely nonexistent. By then Zhivago’s children had largely relinquished to the so-called dissidents the task of changing the political and intellectual status quo in the Soviet Union, preferring instead to create for themselves an interior life in which “the muse was preferable to the risk of political radicalism” (p. 327).

There is much to admire in *Zhivago’s Children*. The author, who is fluent in English and Russian, has consulted a wide variety of sources, so that the notes at the back of the book—one wishes it also contained a bibliography—provide guidance for anyone wishing to learn more about persons and movements in Soviet politics and culture in the mid twentieth century. He also has the ability, much in evidence in the book, to comprehend what is most essential in the individuals he deals with and to provide a brief character sketch for many of them. He is also very good in explicating the collective ambivalence of Soviet Jews to their own persecution: while many of them viewed their dissent from existing intellectual and artistic norms as an escape from their faith, others saw it as the
fulfillment of their faith, while still others, such as Ilya Ehrenburg, calculated how much they could criticize official anti-Semitism without jeopardizing their careers or, in some cases, their lives.

For all its virtues, the book suffers from three notable defects. First, Zubok at times seems to allow into the intelligentsia he claims was coterminous with Zhivago’s children such a wide variety of cultural and intellectual figures, from the “Russian patriots” exemplified by the painter Ilya Glazunov to dissidents such as the Medvedev brothers, that the term becomes a catch-all category into which nearly everyone in the Soviet Union who was either idealistic or a non-conformist could be included. Second, Zubok at times commits the opposite error of limiting this intelligentsia excessively to those who wanted in the Soviet Union what he calls a “Moscow Spring” to accompany the socialist humanism embodied in the Prague Spring in Czechoslovakia in 1968. For the members of this much smaller intelligentsia, there was nothing wrong with socialism that could not be remediated by replacing a nomenklatura that had betrayed the noble principles of the October Revolution with one that would remain faithful to them. Finally, one could question whether the non-conformists of the Thaw generation or the shestidesiatniki who succeeded them should be considered an intelligentsia like the original one that emerged in tsarist Russia in the nineteenth century, only to be destroyed in Stalin’s Terror in the 1930s. Many of the persons whose ideas and activities Zubok believes qualifies them as intelligenty seem to this reviewer to have been insufficiently alienated from the political and social status quo to warrant this particular designation; even Aleksandr Tvardovskii, the longtime editor of Novyi mir and, as Zubok describes him, the most heroic of all the figures one encounters in the book, never rejected the Soviet system the way Alexander Herzen, Nikolai Chernyshevskii, and other members of the original intelligentsia did the tsarist one. Similarly, many of the figures Zubok considers intelligenty because their non-conformism bespoke a genuine alienation from the status quo failed to translate their alienation into an ethical rejection of this status quo in the name of timeless and universal human rights. Indeed, the evidence Zubok provides in support of his taxonomy seems to suggest that the real heirs to the prerevolutionary intelligentsia were the dissidents, whose political radicalism and open rejection of the moral legitimacy of the Soviet system sharply distinguished them from the shestidesiatniki and the other intellectuals who preceded them. That said, Zubok’s book contains significant insights about a critical period in the history of the Soviet Union. Among the best sections are those in which he distinguishes the shestidesiatniki from the New Left in the United States and Western Europe of the same decade. And as long as one takes with a grain of salt his notion of who, in the Soviet context, can properly be said to constitute an intelligentsia, one can learn a great deal from his book.

Jay Bergman, Central Connecticut State University

Elena A. Chebankova. Russia’s Federal Relations: Putin’s Reforms and Management of the Regions. BASEES/Routledge Series on Russian and East European Studies. Abingdon: Routledge, 2010. xx, 223 pp. Bibliography. Index. $140.00, cloth.

Elena Chebankova’s book is an exceptionally thorough review and assessment of the evolution of centre-periphery relations in the Russian Federation during the Putin years (2000–2008). The book begins with a chapter reviewing Russian political style and culture and the limitations they placed on the Putin-era reforms. This is part of a more general
focus on the interaction between federal structure and the processes of federalism. In the second chapter, the author provides a review of the characteristics of Russian federalism under President Yeltsin. She concludes that the Yeltsin-era model of federalism was unstable, heavily personalistic, allowed for serious threats to Russian territorial integrity, and was generally overly decentralized. Thus it failed to meet many of the norms of stable Western federations. The author also stresses that there were many regional officials, including a number of prominent governors, who felt that too much control had shifted to the regions under Yeltsin and thus supported some form of recentralization. While this is undoubtedly true, and often underreported, it does not outweigh the resistance of numerous regional leaders who were pleased with the level of autonomy they had obtained and were opposed to any significant recentralization. The third chapter then reveals the centre-periphery balance of power as it evolved in the Putin era. Although she notes the obvious gains by the centre during the Putin years, the author repeatedly cautions that there were significant policy areas in which the federal government failed to achieve its desired level of control. This, too, is undoubtedly true, and a useful cautionary note, but Chebankova sometimes gives the impression that the major recentralization resulted merely in a modest shift of power, which was not the case. Rather, the reforms have left the centre far more powerful, in a relatively shorter period of time, than most analysts would have imagined possible. Chapter 4 then provides an extremely thorough, and likely the best available to date, analysis of the changes in the functioning of the central institutions under President Putin. Here, Chebankova concedes that Putin came “very close to establishing an unequivocally monocentric power distribution and secured a certain stability in institutional interrelations” (p. 80). Contributing to this change was a number of structural innovations including the creation of new intergovernmental networks, new rules affecting Russian parties, and a weakening of bicameralism in Russia.

The fifth chapter is an excellent analysis of the effects of business interests on the evolution of Russian federalism and vice versa. One of the more interesting findings is that an unintended consequence of Putin’s crackdown on the oligarchs at the federal level, and the concurrent switch to appointed regional executives, has been an increasing attempt by businesses to protect their interests by gaining access to regional legislatures. The reforms have made these legislatures far more important than in previous years. Chapter 7 examines the Putin administration’s efforts to promote inter-regional integration. In general Chebankova demonstrates that the state has underperformed in its quest to create or subsume existing interregional structures. Similarly, while the promotion of mergers among Russia’s ethnically-defined, “nested” regions has removed some potential sources of conflict, it has also created a tremendous amount of ill-will, and has thus undermined the effort to placate a variety of ethnic and religious groups. In some instances, efforts aimed at preventing centrifugal tendencies may be having the opposite effect. Chapter 8 then concludes that although Putin’s reforms can be conceived of as a logical attempt to recentralize Russia after the excessive devolution of the Yeltsin era, the system that it established remains inherently unstable and only marginally more effective than the system it replaced. Moreover, it has not become more transparent in any meaningful way.

Thus, Chebankova’s assessment of the Putin reforms in Russian federal relations is generally more positive and nuanced than those of other experts, who often portray the reforms as the unmitigated destruction of Russian federalism. However, she clearly demonstrates that the reforms were neither completely successful, nor without serious side effects.

Daniel R. Kempton, Northern Illinois University
Jasmina Grković-Major and Milorad Radovanović, eds. *Teorija dijahronijske lingvistike i proučavanje slovenskih jezika / Theory of Diachronic Linguistics and the Study of Slavic Languages.* The Serbian Language in the Light of Current Linguistic Theory, 4. Belgrade: Srpska Akademija nauka i umetnosti, 2010. 278 pp. Abstracts. Individual summaries. Paper.

This work is the fourth volume in the series *The Serbian Language in the Light of Current Linguistic Theory* published by the Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences, the most prestigious publisher of linguistic works in Serbia. Whereas the first three volumes addressed cognitive linguistics, semantics, and ethnolinguistics, respectively, the present collection of papers focuses on diachronic linguistics. Unlike the first two volumes in the series, which are confined to Serbian, this and the previous volume have a broader perspective and encompass other Slavic languages.

The collection reviewed here consists of sixteen papers written in English, German, and various Slavic languages by Austrian, Belgian, Czech, German, Macedonian, Norwegian, Polish, Russian, and Serbian Slavists. The decision to organize the papers alphabetically by author (rather than thematically) was appropriate in view of their great diversity. Each paper includes an abstract in the language in which it is written and a summary in another language. The volume contains a short foreword with basic information about its contents.

The first paper, by Jan Ivar Bjørnflaten, is titled “Grammaticalization and Typological Change: The Plural Paradigm of Russian Substantives.” The next paper takes us to a completely different area, as Radoslav Večerk, a prominent Paleoslavist, discusses the origin of the Glagolitic script. The third paper, in which Jasmina Grković-Major addresses cognitive aspects of the development of transitivity, is an exemplary contribution to what this collection was envisaged to be, i.e., she investigates a concrete Slavic diachronic phenomenon using a major contemporary theoretical approach. Many other contributions to this volume deviate from this exemplar mainly by being insufficiently informed by contemporary theories of linguistics. The next paper is an analysis of Slavic historical phraseology by Rainer Eckert. The following contribution by Ilona Janyšková presents the methodology of eminent Czech etymologist Václav Machek. The next paper is an analysis of the interplay between diachronic etymology and dialectology drawn from experience with the ongoing Serbian etymological dictionary project undertaken by Aleksandar Loma. The paper by V. M. Mokienko provides another treatment of Slavic historical phraseology, but unlike Rainer Eckert’s contribution (see above), which is centred around a concrete phraseological nest, Mokienko’s paper is broader in scope, since the latter undertakes to systematize the field of Slavic historical phraseology by proposing seven possible directions for its development.

Iconicity in Old Serbian hypotaxis is the topic of Slobodan Pavlović’s contribution. The following contribution, by Johannes Reinhart, is devoted to the Old Serbian conjunction dě. Vanja Stanišić’s paper on Serbian-Albanian phonological relations is a contact-linguistic analysis, rather different in scope from most of the other, more historically-oriented papers. Marija Stefanović provides in her contribution a review of studies produced to date on animacy in Slavic linguistics. This is followed by yet another analysis of a concrete diachronic issue, viz., a semantic history of Slavic *mírъ* and *světъ* by S. M. Tolstaya.

The thirteenth paper in the collection is a short note by Zuzanna Topolińska on traditional Slavic terminology. The next two papers deal with Grammaticalization Theory:
Mirjam Fried analyzes the Czech modal particle jestli from the perspective of this theory, while Björn Hansen and Ana Drobnjaković view the theory as “a basis for the panchronic study of the Serbian language.” The volume concludes with Axel Holvoet’s paper “Reanalysis or Endemic Ambiguity? Infinitival Clauses with Overt Subjects in Slavonic and Baltic.”

While this fourth volume offers a number of interesting contributions to Slavic historical linguistics, and some papers do contribute to dialogue between linguistic theory and Slavic linguistics, one should note in fairness that its title is somewhat misleading: it is more like an issue of a journal than a thematically cohesive collection of papers. Given the papers’ limited implementation of linguistic theories, a more appropriate volume title might well have been Contributions to Slavic Diachronic Linguistics. This feature, however, does not detract from the high scholarly level of the majority of the sixteen papers. Indeed, the volume’s overall value is due primarily to several excellent contributions in particular.

Danko Šipka, Arizona State University

Fraser J. Harbutt. Yalta 1945: Europe and America at the Crossroads. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. xxx, 438 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. $38.00, paper.

Although the author modestly titled his book, Yalta 1945, in fact this is a study of inter-allied diplomacy during the Second World War. In this well-researched and thoughtful study, Fraser J. Harbutt attempts to put diplomacy into the framework of 1941–1945 and describe events as they might have seemed to contemporaries. He rightly argues that in order to understand the actions of historical actors, we should keep in mind not what happened afterwards, developments that the diplomats could not have foreseen, but what had in fact taken place before. He points out that our understanding of wartime diplomacy has been distorted by the Cold War.

The author’s central argument is that up to 1945 Stalin and Churchill pursued traditional diplomacy, based on spheres of influence. They often understood one another better than they understood the distant Americans, who had rarely paid attention to some of the complex European issues that so greatly occupied the attention of European statesmen. Yalta was a turning point in the sense that from this time on the United States came to be deeply engaged in Europe and the British came to identify themselves with American policies. The Cold War was born. No one at Yalta foresaw what kind of order would emerge and Stalin in February 1945 had no precise plans for establishing Soviet type regimes everywhere in Eastern Europe within a few years.

Harbutt is a diplomatic historian and therefore he takes it for granted that diplomats, conferences, and personal relations between leaders mattered a great deal. He argues that the Cold War was not inevitable. I by contrast tend to agree with Tony Judt in whose opinion Yalta had little significance (p. 280). What mattered was not diplomacy, but the progress of armies, the willingness of the high commands to sacrifice their soldiers for quick advance. The Cold War was over determined; the alliance could not have continued. Stalin was aware that his regime could not survive friendly relations and relatively open borders with the outside world. Domestic policies determined his foreign policy and there was nothing the West could do about this. It is evident from internal wartime Soviet documents that the Bolsheviks both feared and loathed their allies. This is not to say that Western policies were always intelligent, but ultimately that did not matter.
Harbutt finds much to criticize in the diplomacy of both Churchill and Roosevelt and is willing to give Stalin as a diplomat a higher grade. The most troublesome issue of inter-allied diplomacy was, of course, the future of Poland. The author is hostile to the Czech leader, Edvard Beneš for his agreements with Stalin, but has sympathy for the Polish cause; he is taken in by Polish nationalist myths about being betrayed. In reality, aside from landing on the continent in 1942 rather than in 1944 and occupying the country, there was absolutely nothing the Allies could have done. They had no means whatsoever of preventing the Soviet leaders to set up the kind of government they wished. In any case, losing territories to the east of the Curzon line was not a great historical injustice; there was no reason whatsoever why the Poles should suppress the nationalist urges of the Ukrainians rather than the Soviets. Stalin rightly understood that if the Poles, as opposed to, for example, the Czechs, were allowed to set up a democratically elected government, that government would be a bitterly hostile entity on their most exposed Western border. The personnel of the London Polish government were a continuation of the pre-war regime and the record of those politicians both in their foreign and domestic policies was reprehensible.

It was not Yalta, but the victorious advance of the Red Army that sealed the fate of Eastern Europe and thereby initiated the Cold War.

Peter Kenez, University of California, Santa Cruz

Mara Kozelsky. *Christianizing Crimea: Shaping Sacred Space in the Russian Empire and Beyond*. DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press, 2010. xiv, 270 pp. Illustrations. Notes. Bibliography. Index. $42.00, cloth.

To judge by recent and forthcoming dissertations, Mara Kozelsky’s book is but one of several expected English-language works on Crimea’s history during Russia’s imperial period. In this case the focus is on the peninsula’s religious landscapes. Using sources from Simferopol’, Odessa, and St. Petersburg, Kozelsky examines how the Orthodox Church in Russia deployed a set of cultural and institutional practices in the middle part of the nineteenth century to deepen Crimea’s historical connection to Orthodoxy, and to “encod[e] the peninsula with an Orthodox identity” (p. 9). Based in part on the proposition that Crimea had originally been Christian, this was a project of cultural reclamation, whereby the peninsula would return to its Christian roots after several centuries of Islamic predominance. The result is an engaging analysis of religious ideologies and practices of empire, but one that at points oversteps its evidentiary base and leaves important questions unresolved.

Kozelsky begins from the proposition that the empire’s confessional system placed distinct limits on possibilities for mission and conversion in Crimea, one of Russia’s most religiously diverse regions. This circumstance compelled ecclesiastical figures and their allies to promote the peninsula’s Christianizing in a different way—by establishing and reclaiming sacred space rather than converting souls. Building on the philhellenism and exotic orientalism of the late eighteenth century, churchmen and others employed archaeological excavations and chronicles to demonstrate that Kherson, on the mainland near the peninsula, had been the original site of Prince Vladimir’s conversion, thus making Crimea “the cradle of Russian Christianity.” Even more central to this Christianizing process was the project of Archbishop Innokentii (Borisov), approved by the Holy Synod in 1850, to restore a series of holy places, most notably monasteries, in order to create a “Russian Athos” as a native alternative to the original Greek complex. Kozelsky contends
that these monasteries “staked a Christian claim to contested or shared terrain, and increased the number of Christians residing in and visiting Crimea” (p. 105), mostly at the expense of Muslims. The Crimean War accelerated this process. Sermonized by Innokentii and others in largely religious terms, the war cast profound doubts on Tatar loyalty and induced their mass exodus after the war. The Crimean conflict thus cleared the way for even more overt Christian claims to the peninsula, symbolized by Tauride province’s receipt of its own Orthodox bishopric in 1860. Churchmen, having participated directly in the war effort and having thereby secured renown for courage and bravery, now became the chief architects of Crimea’s reconstruction. For Kozelsky, these developments signalled “an end to religious toleration” (p. 149) in the tradition of Catherine II.

Kozelsky’s account is in many ways compelling, and she nicely deploys a range of sources in making her case. Her intriguing focus on the Christianization of space rather than people nicely reinforces Valerie Kivelson’s similar thesis for seventeenth-century Siberia in *Cartographies of Tsardom* (though Kozelsky does not note this connection). She is also attentive to the ethnic diversity within Orthodoxy and highlights the crucial role played in the processes she discusses—especially in the early stages—by Orthodox immigrants from the Balkans. In these and several other respects, Kozelsky’s book is an admirable accomplishment.

Yet the book is marred by several problems as well. At points, Kozelsky makes questionable assertions that merit more elaboration. Is it accurate, for example, to declare that “the Russian Empire promoted cultural autonomy” (p. 4) or that under Nicholas I “religion became synonymous with identity” (p. 5)? At other points, the text is centred too much on Archbishop Innokentii and his sermons, speeches, and letters, thus crowding out other considerations. Kozelsky rightly treats the Crimean War as crucial in the processes she discusses, but her analysis of the situation after the conflict dissipates quickly and does not provide enough evidence to sustain the proposition that the church maintained a “monopoly over Crimean identity until the revolution” (p. 173). Along the same lines, her contention that Catherine’s religious toleration was abandoned in the post-war period seems an overstatement and is belied by evidence that she herself provides subsequently. The larger problem has to do with endings: the last major chapter lacks a chronological and conceptual endpoint, while a somewhat rambling epilogue on religious affairs in Crimea over the past two decades departs too much from the book’s central themes and offers a poor substitute for a proper conclusion.

In short, Kozelsky deftly handles an important cluster of issues in the religious history of Crimea, especially in the reign of Nicholas I. But the implications of these developments for the post-war period—and thus the fate of toleration in Crimea and the religious identity of the peninsula—still await their historian.

Paul W. Werth, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Arnold McMillin. *Writing in a Cold Climate: Belarusian Literature from the 1970s to the Present Day*. Publications of the Modern Humanities Research Association, 18. London: Maney Publishing (for MHRA), 2010. xxi, 1129 pp. Bibliography. Index. $150.00, cloth.

The imposing size of this tome invites the expectation of a literary anthology, with exemplary selections introduced by incisive commentary. But this is more an anthology of Professor McMillin’s prodigious scholarship on this era in Belarusian literature, sections of which have been published variously and can be found online. His grand project is to
“present […] a picture of a little-known and unjustly neglected literature” (p. xvii), and the visual metaphor is apt. The book is very like a photo tour or travel aide highlighting the draws of a foreign literary landscape to convince outsiders to visit, or at least enjoy from a distance. Authors are introduced (their names as chapter subheadings) with brief biographical profiles and surveys of their work, situating them in historical, regional, and literary context, then examined in poetry or prose excerpts as detail shots of a larger canvas, highlighting emblematic characters and thematic continuities or shifts, with quick appraisals of their place in the literary canon. Prose excerpts are all translated, while poetry appears in the original language with translations in footnotes. The balance tilts heavily toward poetry, which “has always predominated over prose in modern Belarusian literature” (p. 133), through oral traditions arising in response to suppression of national language from tsarist to Soviet times. As a broad, accessible introductory reference work on Belarusian literature for the last thirty-five years, the book maps a vital period of revival and change in national literature, inviting further exploration.

The book progresses generationally, the three opening chapters profiling older prose (chapter 1) and poetry (chapter 3) writers whose work spans the last Soviet years to the present, surrounding a deeper profile of Ryhor Baradulin as the foremost poet of the day (chapter 2), noted for his historical awareness, natural and national spirituality, and “evergreen” (p. 130) youthfulness. The variety of the older generation’s writing resists generalization, but romanticism of nature and village are common themes, as is the shock of the Chernobyl disaster. The bulk of the book is devoted to the new dynamism of perestroika and post-Soviet times. Chapter 4 discusses the prominent members of the Tutejšyja, or Natives, a short-lived circle (c. 1987–1988) of provocative young Turks from the Writers’ Union whose eponymous anthology “was a watershed event in the development or rebirth of Belarusian literature” (p. 273). Adam Hłobus and Anatol Sys, whose backers formed two hostile camps within the circle, are each the subject of longer examinations (chapters 6 and 7, respectively): Hłobus as a postmodern provocateur given to narcissism and eroticism; Sys as a gifted, tragic nationalist poet who drank himself to an early grave. Chapter 5 is an omnibus survey of major contemporaries outside this circle, ranging in subjects from squalid to spiritual, and in forms from “cruel ballads” to social-protest prose to bard rock music.

The subtle, edgy humour of Uladzimir Niaklajeŭ (chapter 8) stands him at ironic distance from his country (as does his residence in Helsinki), in contrast to Uladzimir Arloŭ (chapter 9), pioneer in historical fiction and non-fiction, and numerous contemporaries (chapter 10) all mining the past from medieval to recent times to reclaim lost national identity. A perfunctory survey of drama for the entire period (chapter 11), a look at the rise of provincial literature since 1990 (chapter 12), and the complex, philosophical poetry of Aleš Razanaŭ (chapter 13) add to the panorama. Starting in the mid-1990s, the funky avant-garde circle Bum-Bam-Lit (chapter 14) brought performance art into literature, some of its members dubbing themselves “Africans” outside the norms of traditional literature and state-controlled publishers. Their more conventional contemporaries (chapter 15) in prose range from postmodernism to fantasy, while the poets are sorted rather blandly as “dark” and “brighter” along with some avant-garde and supposedly post-postmodern representatives. A final chapter profiles the translator, scholar, and intellectual poet Andrej Chadanovič, something of a mentor to the youngest generation, and four young talents in whom McMillin sees promise for the future.

The bibliography is extensive; the text typically addresses existing scholarship without lengthy discussion. Only personal names have been indexed; some distinctive literary
genres and terms might have been helpful to include. In the introduction McMillin hints at regret over omitting some authors while including others. The Belarusians I asked to look at the book (two students and a visiting scholar) identified several omissions, but the number dropped significantly when those who had emigrated or who write only in Russian were not counted. The ambitious breadth and scope of this work make it a monumental achievement.

Stephen M. Woodburn, Southwestern College, Kansas

Paul D. Morris. Vladimir Nabokov: Poetry and the Lyric Voice. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010. xxv, 447 pp. Bibliography. Index. $75.00, cloth.

Like other recent monographic contributions to the field of Nabokov studies (cf. the latest works by Stephen H. Blackwell, Gavriel Shapiro and Eric Naiman), Paul D. Morris’s expansive study seeks to view the writer’s oeuvre from a new angle. In this instance it is provided by the author’s interest in Nabokov’s poetry and the poetic element discernible in his celebrated prose and undervalued theatre.

Morris sees “Nabokov’s poetic and lyric sensibility” as a “vast sun” illuminating “everything he wrote” (p. 318). Guided by this notion, he proposes “to effect the shift in critical perception necessary to (re-)discover the place of poetry” in Nabokov’s writing (p. xvi), obscured as this place appears to be by “critical myopia” (p. 43). Morris summarizes the reception of Nabokov’s poetry, concludes that it is still “unexamined as a coherent body” and proceeds to read it “according to intrinsic principles of assessment” (p. 89). It is here where Morris’s claims to originality lie: this study is “the first book-length discussion of Nabokov’s poetry” (p. xxii); the attention given to what he terms Nabokov’s “lyric sensibility” allows Morris to see “the formal and thematic integrity of Nabokov’s writing” (p. 11). Chapter 3, however, is the only section of the book to deal exclusively with the poetry. There Morris outlines its major themes (see especially pp. 114–184) and focuses on a number of Russian and English texts to trace the evolution of Nabokov’s verse. Armed with the insight obtained from his contemplation of the poetry, Morris demonstrates its importance to our understanding of Nabokov’s drama (chapter 4), short stories (chapter 5) and The Gift (chapter 6). He finally focuses on Pale Fire, where different strains in Nabokov’s art converge in the unity of a narrative poem at the core of that genre-transcending novel (chapter 7).

Morris succeeds in building a strong case for lyricism as one of the most salient tenets of Nabokov’s poetics. Especially perceptive is Morris’s explication of Nabokov’s lyric sensibility in his drama, starting with such early, little-studied experiments as The Wanderers, Death, The Grand-dad, The Tragedy of Mr. Morn, The Pole, The Man from the USSR, and moving on to such complex mature works as The Event and The Waltz Invention. This line of analysis results in informative reflections and juxtapositions. In his examination of Pale Fire, for example, Morris draws a convincing parallel between Kinbote and Gonville from Death (see p. 346), effectively underlining the integrity of Nabokov’s oeuvre. Most valuable are the pages devoted to Nabokov’s separate poems, both deservedly well-known (“An Evening of Russian Poetry,” “Evening on a Vacant Lot,” “Fame,” “The Ballad of Longwood Glen,” and others) and far less popular pieces (“In a crystal ball we were enclosed,” “On Golgotha,” etc.). Readers will find useful Morris’s analysis of the poems embedded in The Gift (see pp. 300–306).

Morris underscores the dearth of critical responses to Nabokov’s poetry informed by “an appropriate conceptual approach, or language, with which to address” it (see p. 57), and
seeks to counter this insufficiency by evaluating Nabokov’s poetic enterprise “in its own terms” (p. 55). Although unquestionably beneficial with regard to the poetic juvenilia traditionally ignored by critics and scholars, such a strategy is not without its limitations when it concerns the works distinguished by what Nabokov termed his “belatedly discovered robust style.” One might claim that such a well-known hallmark of Nabokov’s artistic individuality as his mastery of subtle intertextual parallels manifests itself in a particularly condensed form in his poetry, as his maturing and mature verse becomes endowed with deliberate echoing of his paragons, as well as the subjects of his parody. It therefore seems an omission that no mention is made of the purposefully Gumilevian poem “Skital’tsy” (1924, with its ironic follow-up of 1972, “Kak liubil ia stikhi Gumileva!”) and that Nabokov’s most ambitious Russian venture into epic poetry, his Pushkinian University Poem, merits only a parenthetical reference in an endnote (Georgy Ivanov’s symptomatic attack on it is likewise left out from Morris’s survey of Nabokov’s critical reception).

One must feel sympathetic to the plight of a scholar faced with the daunting task of selecting representative works from a vast body of material. Morris readily acknowledges the “incompleteness,” or “superficiality,” of his “critical project” (see pp. xxiv, 201). Nonetheless, it is difficult to reconcile Morris’s aspiration toward comprehensiveness with the omission of a number of texts essential to our understanding of the individuality of Nabokov’s stance both as a poet (his self-proclaimed insistence on the “principle of making a short poem contain a plot and tell a story”) and thinker (the evolution of Nabokov’s metaphysical outlook is particularly apparent in his movement away from the naiveté of his early poems employing traditional Christian symbolism and imagery). One is surprised not to encounter on the pages of a study aiming to underscore the intrinsic value of Nabokov’s verse such a pinnacle of the Nabokovian “plot-centered” poetry as “The Mother” (1925), especially when one takes into account its reprisal of a Christian motif initially formulated in “On Golgotha” (1921). The latter, less significant, work is discussed at length in connection with Morris’s examination of the spiritual component of Nabokov’s poetry (pp. 176–184). Such a major work as “Rasstrel” (“Byvaiut nochi, tol'ko liagu…” 1928) is mentioned only once in passing, while “Lilith” (1928), another significant work of the same period, has been foregone altogether.

A “comprehensive reading of Nabokov’s poetry” (p. xxiv) would have profited from a more attentive treatment of its formal aspects. Morris contends that Nabokov’s “poetic writing does not bear significant evidence of a sustained attempt to implement Belyi’s theories” (p. 398, n. 18). The validity of this observation is complicated by Nabokov’s admissions that his views on poetics were shaped by Andrei Bely’s thoughts on the subject, and clashes with the fact that some of his poems were composed to illustrate Bely’s views on prosody. In his magisterial study of Nabokov’s versification, Gerald S. Smith has demonstrated that on the formal plane Nabokov’s Russian poetry conformed to the tendencies characteristic of “other émigré poets […] with the […] exception of Tsvetaeva.” Morris’s reflection on Smith’s conclusions show that a productive discussion of this aspect of Nabokov’s legacy is likely to be continued.

Morris’s book closes an entire phase in the analysis of Nabokov’s published verse and paves the way for future investigations in an area in which a considerable amount of archival research has yet to be conducted. In this respect, it should be considered a turning point.

Stanislav Shvabrin, Princeton University
This textbook is designed primarily for intermediate-high learners of Ukrainian. Its goal is to build proficiency in all four language skills (reading, speaking, writing, and listening), to enhance the student’s knowledge of contemporary Ukrainian culture and society, and to develop critical-thinking skills through communication.

Well organized and user-friendly, the book contains nine thematic units. The contents are in English and Ukrainian. Selected topics target a student’s everyday life. Each unit consists of two parts. The author has sought to enable instructors to use units selectively: both parts of each unit may be covered, or the course may be structured around only one of the parts, depending on which is appropriate for a given university setting. In general, the units are structured according to ACTFL guidelines: to achieve an advanced level of proficiency, students must master certain grammatical structures and develop commensurate communicative skills. Each unit includes activities characterized by a task-oriented approach. Pre-reading activities are intended to aid students in “brainstorming” about the content of a specific text. Post-reading activities are structured around the linguistic aspects of each text (relevant grammatical structures, syntactic patterns, fixed expressions, slang, etc.) and serve to reinforce the thematic vocabulary appearing in it.

Part I of each unit contains a variety of main reading elements (dialogues, interviews, and/or authentic texts) that introduce the topic in addition to fill-in-the gap exercises, writing assignments, conversational activities, and discussion questions that facilitate the extraction of necessary information from the text. Supplementary reading and a list of new vocabulary are also included in Part I. Part II is structured around specific readings, which consist of authentic texts (some of which have been modified) that were originally written for Ukrainian readers. These texts are thematically related to the topics discussed in Part I and are accompanied by exercises and activities designed to develop reading comprehension and writing skills and to practice speaking. A section titled “Vocabulary II” completes Part II of each unit.

There are almost no typographical errors, and the inaccuracies are few. The inaccuracies include such items as traces of surzhyk: везіння should be коли поталанить/пощастить ‘luck’ (p. 9) and сходити should be піти на ‘go’ (p. 154), while рекламний буклет should simply be рекламка ‘flyer’ (p. 154). More significant, perhaps, is the author’s assertion in the “Introduction” that students using this textbook will be able to learn “real” Ukrainian (p. xvii) “as it is spoken and as it appears in print in most publications” (p. xx). For some Ukrainian speakers, however, “real” Ukrainian might actually be surzhyk. For others, it might be standard (i.e., literary) Ukrainian, which is spoken today by Ukrainian intellectuals—both in Ukraine and in diaspora—or by elderly people residing mainly in rural Ukraine, i.e., the very Ukrainian in which thousands of literary works of the Ukrainian Renaissance are written. The latter represents a linguistic heritage of which those born in Soviet Ukraine were deprived and which remains unknown to the majority of Ukrainians educated in Ukraine before the collapse of the Soviet Union. Having examined Nedashkivska’s textbook, I conclude that what she considers “real” Ukrainian is actually a linguistic standard based on the “Orthographic Conventions prevalent in Ukraine today” (pp. xx and 311–312). Nevertheless, this strikes me as a generalization with which I cannot agree, since even if certain conventions are prevalent, they cannot necessarily be taken for granted. The author might have avoided this
generalization by acknowledging the fact that many or most textbooks used in Ukrainian schools and universities—especially those dealing with language and literature—tend to use the Kharkiv Orthographic Standard (KhOS) either in whole or in part. Moreover, the KhOS better reflects the norms of Ukrainian’s natural evolution than do the Orthographic Conventions, which are the result of Soviet language manipulation (i.e., a conscious effort to minimize visually the linguistic difference between Ukrainian and Russian). Thus, by means of the letter ґ, one can distinguish orthographically between the words ґніт ‘wick’ and ґніт ‘oppression’. Compared to Russian, which tends towards case reduction, Ukrainian exhibits greater flexibility in case assignment, as can be seen in the Ukrainian prepositional case of words of foreign origin—в кіні ‘in the cinema’, в пальті ‘in a coat’, в Торонті ‘in Toronto’. One might also argue that the tendency of many borrowed nouns in Ukrainian to take a canonically feminine vocalic desinence—кляса ‘class, grade’, помідора ‘tomato’, апельсина ‘orange’, etc.—contributes to syllabicity and thereby increases the melodicity of Ukrainian (when taken together with mobile accent, case variation and other alternations). In sum, the sociolinguistic question of what constitutes “real” Ukrainian could have been treated in more detail and without bias, as it has been in some other textbooks.

All things considered, Ukrainian Through Its Living Culture is an efficient tool for those eager to master Ukrainian. Undoubtedly, those of us who have faced a shortage of Ukrainian textbooks have looked forward for some time to such a publication.

Rostyslav Bilous, University of Toronto

Matthew Rendle. Defenders of the Motherland: The Tsarist Elite in Revolutionary Russia. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. xii, 274 pp. Maps. Bibliography. Index. $99.00, cloth.

Matthew Rendle’s important study fills significant gaps in our understanding of revolutionary politics and society in 1917 and contributes to broader discussions about the nature of early twentieth-century Russian society. Rendle stresses the heterogeneity of the late Tsarist elite by focusing on noble landowners and military officers. He shows that members of the elite drew their incomes from a variety of sources, devoted their lives to a variety of professions, and held a wide range of political viewpoints. Rendle argues that between 1905 and 1917 the Tsarist elite moved cautiously towards socially inclusive forms of “professional” organization (based upon property ownership, professional associations, and so on), rather than socially-exclusive estate (soslovie) organization. During the war, their common concern for the “good of the motherland” escalated elite frustrations with the government of Nicholas II. While their calls for a change of course fell far short of endorsing revolution, the elite would not raise a hand to defend Romanov rule in February 1917.

Rendle’s analysis of elite groups in 1917 demolishes stereotypes of nobles as reactionary monarchists who played no significant role in the revolution and remained distant from revolutionary politics. He attributes the February Revolution’s success largely to the elites’ support. Most nobles, landowners, and officers greeted this as a political—not a social—revolution, and no elite group publically advocated a return to tsarism. Instead, elites viewed themselves as participants in the new polity and expected to take a leading role in the new order. Rendle argues that popular conceptions of democracy, however,
excluded elite participation, so that elite efforts to find a place at the revolution’s table actually reinforced popular fears of looming counter-revolution.

Rendle conceptualizes 1917’s political order as “more corporatist than democratic”: interest groups (generally “class”-based) formed organizations and associations (including the soviets) that vied for influence and representation on state and quasi-state agencies. Revolutionary politics involved a common repertoire of strategies to broaden a group’s base and extend its influence, including, for example, holding conferences and congresses, publishing newspapers, sending emissaries to lobby the state and conducting educational work in the provinces. “Non-party” professional unions and associations of landowners, homeowners, and officers employed these methods to participate in the public sphere, to defend professional interests and promote a particular vision of the revolution. In thematic chapters on nobles, landowners, and officers in March-August 1917, Rendle painstakingly delineates various union and group programmes, practical and grass-roots organizational activities, and attempts to form unified national unions to lobby the Provisional Government and influence the revolution’s direction.

Rendle highlights the social and political heterogeneity of noble, homeowners’, landowners’, and officers’ unions in 1917, but shows that they shared common expectations. All agreed that the government must mobilize society and revitalize the military towards victory in the war (which also involved strengthening discipline in the military), consolidate and defend law and order (and in particular, protect individual property rights), and preserve the unitary Russian state. In summer 1917 a familiar litany of developments (the June offensive’s collapse, Viktor Chernov’s policies as Agriculture Minister, the escalation of agrarian disorders, the radicalization of the soviets, and a growing perception of anarchy) fed elite concerns that the Provisional Government was leading Russia towards disaster. At the same time, steps to shore up military discipline and quell rural unrest taken in July and August by Kerensky’s government, which found itself caught between protecting state interests and satisfying popular aspirations, heightened popular fear of a resurgent Far Right. Elite groups, though, did not endorse counter-revolution. Instead, they publically defined themselves as “defenders of the motherland” and equated their own programmes and interests with the transcendent interests of the state.

In August, elites generally agreed that Russia needed strong government, but shared no consensus on how to achieve this goal. Kornilov was the darling of the newly energized conservative movement, but only a handful of officers supported his “revolt.” Rendle argues that elite ambivalence doomed Kornilov to failure, but that popular perceptions of elite complicity effectively undid their efforts to influence the revolution’s direction.

Rendle’s discussion of the elites’ fate after October 1917 characterizes the Bolsheviks as inherently violent exterminationists, but notes that Lenin recognized the utility of expert bureaucrats, generals, industrial managers and technicians. Again, Rendle emphasizes the variety of paths taken by members of the old elite: some emigrated, some remained and struggled to survive; some joined the Whites in hope of defeating anarchy and preserving the Russian state; some sought accommodation with the Bolsheviks as the embodiment of strong government.

Rendle concludes that the Tsarist elite essentially pursued “bourgeois liberal” goals in 1917, which undermines stock characterizations of early twentieth-century Russian nobles as reactionary opponents of modern society and democratic political reform. *Defenders of the Motherland* is the product of deep archival research and wide reading of the contemporary press, and should be required reading for serious students of revolutionary Russia.

Michael C. Hickey, *Bloomsburg University*
Sinikukka Saari. *Promoting Democracy and Human Rights in Russia*. London and New York: Routledge, 2010. xiv, 175 pp. Bibliography. Index. $130.00, cloth.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, significant efforts have been made to promote the development of democracy and human rights in the former Soviet states. This book is a study of the efforts made by the European Union, the Council of Europe and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe to encourage democracy and human rights in Russia. Sinikukka Saari focuses on three particular aspects of this question—the institution of a human rights ombudsman, abolition of the death penalty, and free and fair elections—and argues that successful promotion requires the adoption by the Russians of Western norms on these issues. She concludes that the outcome has been decidedly mixed. The norms surrounding the ombudsman have been implemented in Russia successfully in the sense that official discourse on the institution, its practical functioning and its legislative underpinning all comply with European standards. Success has been more limited with regard to the other two. While the death penalty has not actually been enforced for some time, something she attributes to European influence, it is still on the books and much of the discourse surrounding it remains supportive of its retention. With regard to free and fair elections, the European bodies have largely failed in that there has been actual regression in this respect since the first post-Soviet election in 1993: the deficient (in democratic terms) conduct of elections has become institutionalized, legislative changes in 2006–2007 actually made elections less democratic, and leading Russian figures have publicly rejected the norms of free and fair elections as understood in the West as being inappropriate for Russia.

Saari’s discussion of this is competent, straightforward, and relatively unproblematic, even if at times the English expression could have done with some attention by a native speaker. Perhaps more controversial is her argument that one of the reasons for the failure in regard to free and fair elections is that the Europeans tried to play politics. She argues that during the 1990s the Europeans saw Yeltsin as the democratic hope and, believing that it was more important to support him against his opponents than it was to criticize deficiencies in electoral performance, they sought to bolster his position by overlooking the clear problems that existed in the conduct of the elections that decade. However after Putin came to power and they realized that the president was not necessarily the hope of democracy that Yeltsin had been thought to be, and particularly when the liberal political forces they supported were eliminated from the State Duma, they began to criticize the conduct of the elections. But it was too late. Having accepted fraud and the abuse of administrative power in the 1990s, their criticism of it in the 2000s opened them up both to charges of hypocrisy and to Russian challenge of the very content of the norms relating to elections. Thus not only were they not successful in Russia, but they actually created a situation in which their own norms began to be eroded. In this sense, as Saari points out, in the sort of relationship that exists when one side seeks to transfer norms into another side, that process of transfer can work both ways. The Europeans, therefore, by playing politics, not only undercut the chances of success in Russia, but have also weakened the norms of free and fair elections more generally.

This is a good argument, with much to recommend it. However it is too limited. The actions of the Europeans were political not only in the sense that they tried to play politics within the Russian political arena by pulling their criticism of Yeltsin in order to strengthen him against the communists in particular, but also in that the very act of trying to import democratic and human rights norms into another country is a political act. The programme
as a whole was political in nature, and unless this is recognized and accepted by putative
sender and receiver of norms alike, it is unlikely to be successful. By trying to ignore this
political aspect and acting as though what was being done was a purely technocratic
transfer of norms, the Europeans were not well placed to handle the problems that came up,
especially in the 2000s. Thus while Saari is correct to say a more successful approach
would be to realistically and honestly evaluate developments in Russia, pursue firm and
consistent policies toward Russia, and seek greater engagement with the Russian people,
without recognition of the essentially political nature of the exercise it will be bound to fail.
Notwithstanding this, if you want to understand the course of European attempts to
introduce these human rights norms into Russia, this book provides an excellent
introduction.

Graeme Gill, University of Sydney

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, ed. *Voices from the Gulag*. Kenneth Lantz, trans. Evanston,
Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2010. xxv, 414 pp. Notes. $29.95, paper.

After the publication of *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* in the journal *Novyi mir* in
1962, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn started receiving a flow of Gulag memoirs; he recorded
much of their data in *The Gulag Archipelago*. Some authors may have hoped that he would
use his influence to help them publish their testimony. In the Soviet Union of the
"stagnation period" Solzhenitsyn’s power to promote such publications was severely
limited. The year 2001, however, saw the publication of the collection of Gulag memoirs
that he had put together. This collection has now come out in English translation by
Kenneth Lantz.

The English version is equipped with the translator’s historical introduction about the
Soviet labour-camp system and annotations explaining the camp realia and the historical
events alluded to, yet neither this version nor the original include any explanations by
Solzhenitsyn himself: we are not told who the authors of the memoirs were, when the texts
were written, how or when they reached the editor, on what principle they were selected, or
whether they have been shortened or presented in full. It is as if Solzhenitsyn wished to
direct our attention away from the tellers and to the told. Indeed, most of these individual
accounts add non-redundant details to the existing representations of the Soviet camps,
especially about locations less known in the canonical Gulag corpus. Moreover, the
narratives contain counterexamples to the periodization of tendencies in the life of the
camps: in the multimillion population of the Archipelago, exceptions were perhaps more
typical than rules. On the other hand, the memoirs tend to present as typical the events that
some of the Gulag fiction dramatizes as more or less extraordinary (e.g., the shooting of
prisoners under the fake pretext of escape attempt—cf. Shalamov’s “Berries”).

The collection suggests that the high mortality rate in the camps was largely caused by
the callous negligence of the authorities and sometimes, especially in isolated camps, by
the near-cannibalistic profit-seeking arbitrary rule: for instance, new warm clothing issues
to prisoners assigned to work in the frost could be suddenly confiscated and sold on the
black market. Some of the camps described in the book are like overcrowded dug-out
oubliettes, where prisoners, on starvation rations and without sanitary facilities, are
practically left to die out until someone recollects the existence of this potential work force.
Though the memoirs reconfirm the exploitation of the Gulag inmates as a slave-labour
resource, they also suggest a covert, tacit, perhaps unconscious agenda of extermination.
Echoes of Babi Yar are unmistakable in the following passage of the striking memoir “The
Fate of a Sailor” by A. P. Butskovsky. The setting is Cape Nevelskoy, in the region where a tunnel to Sakhalin was to be built in secret under the Tatar Straight; the project was discontinued after Stalin’s death. Then, one day, “we were taken into a small ravine with cliffs on either side; they set up machine guns on the heights and aimed them at us. I don’t know what they had in mind for us, but in any case they kept us here a very long time. Our guards fell back much farther than they normally did. We didn’t do any work that day. They might even have been checking how they could bury us after an execution” (p. 199). Apparently, someone higher up sensed the change in the direction of the wind and did not sanction the massacre.

The author of the opening text, V. M. Lazarev, mentions that he is sixty at the time of composition (p. 4), which means that his memoir was written in the 1960s; on the other hand, the memoir of N. R. Kopylov ends with the reference to the Stone of Solovki in Moscow (p. 244), a Gulag memorial in the Lubianskaia Square, thus suggesting that the memoir was completed no earlier than in 1990. Texts placed towards the end of the book tend to belong to such “belated” testimonies.

The last memoir of the collection includes scenes from the period of strikes and rebellions in Kazakhstan camps in 1954. Referring to Solzhenitsyn’s representation of prisoner resistance in Kengir and Ekibastuz in The Gulag Archipelago, the author, A. I. Kropochkin, supplements the story by recalling what happened slightly later in Dzhezkazgan, the site of the deadly lead mines. But he does so from the perspective of Russian prisoners (“Moskals”) who were regarded as “Reds,” whose terms were relatively short and whom the camp rebellion placed at the risk of being killed by the Ukrainians (“Banderists” p. 395). The author records his rejoicing when tanks surrounded the camp, and the strike ended. By contrast, in Solzhenitsyn’s representation of the period it was the authorities who tried (in vain, he thought) to incite national enmity among the prisoners, and the people who were murdered by fellow inmates in advance of the strikes were stool-pigeons, actual or suspected. The contradictions between the two narratives are left for the readers to interpret.

While delineating the murderous conditions in which the majority of camp inmates were held, the memoirists in this collection also tend to focus on their own feats of survival, mainly owing to special technical skills that gave them access to qualified jobs or to artistic talents that allowed them to be used as performers. Between the told and the telling many other things were apparently lived down, blocked from memory, reconceptualized, worked through. The Russian title of the book is Pozhivshi v Gulage—“Having Lived in the Gulag,” with the ironically modest “Having Lived” rather than the more dramatic “having survived.” In most memoirs there are obvious gaps between different stages of the authors’ experience. The urgency of publishing such testimonies may have passed, and yet, clearly, on the subject of the Gulag a great deal has still remained untold.

Leona Toker, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem