The first volume of Schlegel’s two-volume work on Russian verbal aspect is conceived as a textbook and provides the theoretical bases that underlie the practical language exercises contained in the companion volume. It begins with an indispensable index of numerous terminological abbreviations as well as explanations of signs and symbols to which the reader or language learner must constantly refer, if only to justify their role as graphic explanations of the complex relations described in the work. Unfortunately, the abbreviations and explications are arranged topically rather than alphabetically and are grouped by theoretical concept. The abbreviations—both German and Russian—reflect a very broad spectrum of concepts common to both traditional aspectology (e.g., terminativity/aterminativity, perfective/imperfective aspect, Aktionsarten, and so on) and the particular theory propounded here, including: differential semantic traits; temporal and aspectual reference points; “event,” “speech,” and “reference” as understood in the framework of Reichenbach’s temporal logic; and “state of affairs” (aktionale Situation), i.e., actions, states, and events. Terminativity (telicity) also plays an important role in the application of graphic symbols alongside such concepts as “duration” (Dauer), “iterativity”/“repetition” (Wiederholung), “sequence of actions” (Handlungskette), “parallelism of actions” (Parallelität von Handlungen), “incidence” (Inzidenz), etc. An appendix, which brings together the definitions of the principal aspectological concepts (pp. 307–313), also serves as a doubtless necessary aid to users of this work.

The textbook is intended primarily for use at the university level. Given the complexity of the grammatical category of aspect, the book’s stated goal is to provide—by means of a “multimodal and multidimensional approach”—a theory with sufficient “explanatory force” for practical language use (p. 17). As presented in chapter 2 (pp. 21–34), the basic mechanisms of aspect use are understood as interactions between verbs and the context(s) in which they occur, verbs being defined basically by actionality (lexical aspect) and “terminativity” (i.e., telicity), with context(s) similarly classified according to “terminativity.” The aspectual system is viewed as a projection of the temporal system onto individual time intervals (p. 31), a kind of temporal microsystem whereby any given action is situated relative to an “aspectual reference point,” i.e., a point in time to which the speaker refers or at which the speaker mentally situates her/himself (this stands in contrast to tense, whereby any given action is situated relative to the moment of speech).

Chapter 3 is devoted to the formal expression of the category of aspect in Russian (pp. 35–98), including Aktionsarten (both in the narrow sense of lexical derivation and in the broader sense of lexical semantics) as well as correlative pairs of verbs of motion and their delineation vis-à-vis aspectual pairs per se. While recognizing as “true” aspectual pairs those whose imperfective members are derived through stem suffixation, Schlegel also acknowledges so-called “functional aspectual pairs” like pisat’/napisat’ “write,” which are formed “pleonastically” by means of a semantically redundant verbal prefix (an appropriate view from the standpoint of both theory and actual language use; see summarizing table, p. 98).

The remaining chapters are devoted to the functions of the verbal aspects and the uses made of them, beginning with a broad range of meanings in the indicative mood (pp. 99–
and an extraordinarily painstaking differentiation among them based on general and particular meanings of the aspects and on isolated and correlatively associated as well as polytemporal (iterative, durative, or potential) actions and abstractly obtaining states. Schlegel goes on to discuss instances of aspectual synonymy and neutralization and the special considerations surrounding negation. The contextual “indicators” that Schlegel provides (pp. 178–180) are no doubt of great practical value in using the language, as are his simplified “basic rules” for aspect use (pp. 191–204). The two algorithms that follow are meant to encapsulate these simplified rules in addition to his complex overall description of aspect in the indicative mood. Schlegel then proceeds to discuss aspect use in the imperative and conditional/subjunctive moods as well as the infinitive (both as subject and as complement; pp. 208–261). The ensuing chapters—on situational types and textual varieties as well as interactions between aspectuality (qua functional semantic category), temporality, and modality—conclude the textual portion of Schegel’s monograph. This is topped off with a bibliography (pp. 317–326) together with a reference to the index of didactic-methodological titles found at the end of volume 2.

Volume 2 contains the work’s practically-oriented language material and is designed so that it can be used independently of volume 1; for this reason the individual chapters of volume 2 are introduced by “guidelines to theoretically orient” the reader. A virtual requirement for using this volume is the extensive appendix on pp. 215–218, which consists of a glossary of terms denoting derivational processes and specific meanings of the aspects (including various overviews and algorithms) as well as a “thesaurus” of aspect-related terms. The exercises themselves are divided into sixteen “complexes,” which contain additional subdivisions dealing with concrete indicative and non-indicative uses of the aspects. Each subdivision begins with the necessary theoretical information, followed by various types of exercises, including German-Russian translation exercises and instructions for the user her/himself to provide appropriate theoretical explanations of given aspectual phenomena. A key to the exercises is provided at the end of each “complex”; besides being an ineluctable necessity for users pursuing independent study, the answer keys also serve as a teaching aid.

Indeed, it goes without saying that Schlegel’s target audience here includes language learners and instructors alike. Nevertheless, in view of the complexity of the material presented, it is doubtful whether students will be able to work their way through this book without first receiving some formal introduction to independent language study. As far as university-level foreign-language instruction is concerned, linguistically attuned native- and non-native-speaker instructors may come away from both volumes having significantly enhanced their own theoretical understanding of verbal aspect and may, in an appropriate classroom setting, supplement the book’s exercises with instructional material of their own. On the whole, however, any didactic use of Schlegel’s work will probably be confined to Slavic Studies at the college or university level; even there, using this work will entail a considerable expenditure of time—an expenditure which will, admittedly, be rewarded with the attainment of a more profound understanding of Russian (and Slavic) verbal aspect than that made possible by conventional grammars and other instructional media.

The two volumes reviewed here represent the culmination of a four-volume cycle produced by Schlegel. The two earlier volumes were also published in the “Specimina Philologiae Slavicae” series and concentrate on the two theoretical concepts that play a pivotal role in the volumes under review, viz., terminativity (published in 1999 as vol. 124) and the aspectual reference point (published in 2000 as vol. 130). The complete cycle not only makes an important contribution to understanding and mastering aspect in Russian, but, with appropriate modifications, can also be transferred to other Slavic languages.
Indeed, Schlegel’s work may additionally provide a basis for typological research beyond the Slavic language family alone, in the broader field of general aspectology.

Walter Breu, University of Constance (Konstanz, Germany)\(^1\)

Irina Paert. *Old Believers, Religious Dissent and Gender in Russia, 1760–1850.* Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2003. xi, 257 pp.

This excellent book explores questions of gender, sexuality, marriage, and family among priestless Old Believers (especially the Theodosians and Pomorians of Moscow) in late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth-century Russia. Interest in gender and sexuality in Russian history has been, with a few notable exceptions, relatively (and regrettably) scarce. Meticulously researched, intricately argued, and clearly written (albeit with perhaps a little too much repetition), Paert’s study makes an original and exciting contribution that begins to redress these lacunae. It also adds to the growing field of religious history (both as lived faith and as state/Synod policies); inserts new life into the study of early nineteenth-century Russia, which has also suffered a relative neglect; and opens new vistas on the study of Russian urban life.

Through an examination of such topics as celibacy/virginity, asceticism, and marriage, Paert strives to explore “the gender aspects of the Christian religion in a non-Western context,” in particular the “religious perceptions of sexuality and its impact on sexual difference” and the “impact of religious discourse on the production, change, and interiorization of gender models” (pp. 6–7). Marshalling an impressive discussion of comparative and methodological material from other European and Christian contexts, Paert illuminates the important differences between gender systems in western and central Europe and those that developed in post-Petrine Russia, especially the enduring influence of Eastern Christianity. Rightly, Paert does not confine her study of gender solely to women, but also explores masculinity and manliness.

Paert opens with an excellent overview of the genesis and early history of Old Belief, focusing particularly on the dilemma posed to the sacrament of marriage by the absence of priests ordained according to the old rites and the millenarian expectations of the schismatics. Priestless Old Believers championed celibacy, asceticism, and communality as appropriate ways of life in the age of the antichrist. In the process, they transformed gender hierarchies, allowing both men and women “to locate their social selves outside the traditional markers of identity, such as marriage, motherhood and fatherhood” (p. 232). Religious dissent and sexual asceticism offered women certain forms of empowerment—the possibility for income, authority within the community and in dealings with social superiors, and both physical and social movement—through a break with the traditional restrictions that family, community, and the experiences of repeated pregnancy and childrearing imposed upon women. Men, for their part, found that celibacy and alternate family structures “relieved [them] from the burden of supporting a family and paying social dues” (p. 232).

In exploring the early history of the schism, Paert underscores the prominence of both women and the question of gender, arguing that “the presence of a theological debate in which women played an important role is a suppressed story of Old Belief” (p. 30). In the period of active struggle against the church, Old Believers held up the notion of manliness

\(^1\) Review translated from German by Gary H. Toops.
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(muzhestvo, andreia) as an ideal for both men and women. Women who stood up for their beliefs—whether in rebellion, withstanding arrest and torture, self-immolation, renunciation of motherhood, or escape to the borderlands—were considered to have “left female weakness behind and took on manly wisdom,” as Avvakum declared (p. 29). Paert goes further: “Women’s participation in the religious opposition was, in fact, an assertion of female spiritual authority” (p. 29). Indeed, Old Belief had special appeal for women because it affirmed women’s spiritual equality and the right of women to baptize, lead services, read Psalter, and lead other women in their religious lives.

Two chapters offer case studies of Theodosian and Pomorian gender and family structures as they developed in the first half of the nineteenth century, highlighting the fascinating diversity of gender ideas within Old Belief as well as the intense conflicts between the different priestless communities. In many ways, the Theodosians make a more interesting group because of their continued emphasis on asceticism and the quite different ways that they came to define masculinity and femininity. Unlike the Pomorians, who, in response to greater state toleration, increasingly allowed both marriage and celibacy, Theodosians saw only the choice between celibacy (and especially virginity) and sin.

While many Old Believers believed that baptism ensured the spiritual equality of men and women, offering equal access to grace, Theodosians also “saw men and women as spiritually equal, arguing that gender was ephemeral and secondary to the common humanity shared by both men and women, here keeping to the ideas of the early Christians” (p. 110). They saw “maleness as universal” and “advanced manliness, stoicism, fearlessness and moral strength as universal virtues” (p. 111). Significantly, women were not excluded from such maleness but rather could easily be more “male” than the men around them. Asceticism was the key for women to attain the desired “male” characteristics, empowering women through self-restraint and leading them to “reason.” Importantly, “while the category of ‘male’ was used to describe an ideal to be strived for by both men and women, the category of ‘female’ served to describe natural and spiritual imperfection” (p. 113). Not unexpectedly, the theory of gender roles and the lived practice often diverged, leaving women in disempowered, “traditional” roles. Theodosian views on gender had important ramifications on family structures. They forsook the biological family for a spiritual one located in the community of believers, and offered a different vision of male-female relations: “the chaste marriage of Adam and Eve prior to the Original Sin” (p. 131).

In contrast to the Theodosians, the Moscow Pomorians increasingly abandoned the ascetic approach and doctrine on celibacy and more closely approximated the marriage and gender structures of Orthodox society at large. They developed new teachings on marriage as a non-priestly sacrament that was defined in greatest part by the mutual consent of the couple. They considered celibacy as a “vocation” rather than an obligation for salvation and opposed the Theodosian requirement of celibacy that denied adherents any choice. However, despite the growing idea of the “consensual affectionate” nature of marriage, Moscow Pomorian leaders attempted to impose limits on individual marriage choice and ensure the traditional authority of parents and community. As Paert writes, “The Moscow Pomorians were profoundly skeptical of the possibility of female autonomy outside marriage. In the context of the polemic against the Theodosians, female commitment to celibacy was deemed hypocritical and perverse…. It seems that the Pomorian men could not accept the idea that some women had no interest in sexual relations per se or heterosexual relations in particular” (p. 167).

In the process of redefining marriage and the place of women (and women’s sexuality) in the social fabric, Pomorians also came to enunciate a revised form of masculinity.
“Pomorian men defined their masculinity against the ascetic approach to sexuality as well as against the masculinity of the leisured classes. The concept of manliness (muzhestvo) was used to describe control over physical nature, passions, and desires... However, unlike Theodosian teaching on asceticism, ‘manliness’ was not the property of both genders: it was used for a construction of masculinity” (p. 171).

In the final chapter of the book, Paert changes focus from the theology and gender constructs of the Old Believer communities themselves to government policy. She examines the ways in which, in the first half of the nineteenth century, the tsarist state used gender, and targeted women and the family, as a means to expand their power and control over Old Believer communities and enforce greater social and cultural uniformity. The state was attempting to replace “the horizontal bonds between community members, parents and children” with the “vertical links between the state and its subjects” (p. 235). In the process, “the autocracy fashioned itself as pater familias” (p. 202).

This short sampling does unfortunately all too little to convey the full richness, thoughtfulness and complexity of Paert’s Old Believers. It is to be hoped that her work will be widely read and will spark new interest in these important aspects of the Russian past.

Nicholas B. Breyfogle, The Ohio State University

Keely Stauter-Halsted. The Nation in the Village: The Genesis of Peasant National Identity in Austrian Poland, 1848-1914. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004 (cloth edition—2001). x, 272 pp. Bibliography. Illustrations. Maps. Photographs. Index. Paper.

Many historians have claimed that in nineteenth-century Europe, as well as in the twentieth-century colonial and Third World countries, one of the more important historical dramas was the encounter between nationalism and the peasantry, who constituted the bulk of population. Histories of this encounter followed the fortunes of the historical profession. They enjoyed popularity in the heyday of social science, the era of decolonization, guerrilla wars and newly independent states, while recent “postmodern” times have witnessed a decline of interest, with focus shifting to peasant rebels who managed to avoid the tenets of modern nationalisms. Keely Stauter-Halsted’s account of the incorporation of Polish peasants into the Polish national community in Habsburg Galicia is a welcome exception full of fresh insights.

Unlike some other treatments of similar problems, The Nation in the Village pays serious attention to the peasants as active players in the drama it tells. The book includes alluring ethnographic descriptions of village life, village politics and village culture prior to their integration into the larger world of the national community and makes a point of arguing that the village community was a primeval locus of pre-national peasant loyalties. Using tropes of pre-modern oral culture grounded in custom, familiar in the scholarship on other peasantries, the author describes the initial misunderstanding and gap separating the two cultures immediately after emancipation. At the same time, Stauter-Halsted’s pre-modern peasant culture appears to be more dynamic than in many other studies where the same tropes have been deployed. The village itself is described as a sufficiently complex mechanism with the multiple divisions of status and power, and sophisticated politics. The author even discerns in the village some nascent “civil society,” which seems to be one of the most arguable points made in the book.

Stauter-Halsted tries to maintain a balance between views and constructions of the peasantry’s place in Polish nation from above and from below, by peasants themselves. The
former are disclosed in the analysis of literary and ethnographic works representing and studying peasants, of cultural and political projects trying to influence and organize them. The latter consists of the story of peasants learning constitutional politics, mastering written law and discourses, putting them to their own use, and, in turn, imagining in a certain way the nation to which they were being told they belonged. Describing the Galician village of the constitutional era, Stauter-Halsted notices some developments that have been neglected by historians. Among these, the formation of a separate group of better-off peasant activists with interests and agendas of their own, is of the foremost importance.

Two complementary chapters, “Nation in the Village,” and “Village in the Nation,” describe the mutual impacts of villages’ integration in the larger national community. The author describes the version of Polish identity extendable to peasants, and explains why the peasants found it attractive and how they modified it. These chapters also deal with the role peasants came to play in national politics, the way they figured in the ideologies promising to better peasants’ lot and trying to win their sympathies. Both the symbolic and real positions of peasants in the reinvented national community are explored. Thematically these chapters include a discussion of the popular press and popular celebrations, in which case peasant presence becomes most visible. But in both cases the mechanisms behind peasant participation are not described: it is not clear how and to which extent the peasants involved were able to negotiate their agendas vis-à-vis editors and organizers. The author implies that the peasants were responsible for the xenophobic and irrational stream in Polish nationalism, but at least in some cases the evidence cited in the book seems to suggest the opposite.

In an impressive sweep this book surveys more than half a century of Galician history. Such a scale necessarily implies concentrating on some events and periods and paying lesser attention to the others. Less justified is little discussion of the peculiarities of Eastern Galicia, where ethnically Polish peasants were a minority, and many villages had ethnically mixed populations. In Eastern Galicia some fractions of village population—Greek Catholic petty gentry and Ukrainian-speaking Roman Catholics—were claimed as their kin by both the Polish and Ukrainian nationalisms. Since evidence from East Galicia is used in the book (as in the case of 500 peasant signatures on a petition from one of the most Ukrainian province’s districts [p. 226]), such a discussion would be even more desirable.

Keely Stauter-Halsted’s book should be highly recommended to both experts in Eastern and Central European history and to those looking for some general introduction to the area and historiographical problem. The former will find a rich and sophisticated study to engage with, while the latter a succinct and intriguing story about one of the region’s largest nations.

Andrey Zayarnyuk, Monash University

Andrei P. Tsygankov. *Whose World Order? Russia’s Perception of American Ideas after the Cold War*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004. xv, 205 pp. Tables. Bibliography. Index. $45.00, cloth. $22.00, paper.

In his publications, Andrei P. Tsygankov often stresses that ideas and cultural perceptions, in addition to static material interests, strongly influence international relations. This work is no exception. By using discourse analysis, he examines how two high-profile American theories on the post-cold war world order shaped domestic debates about Russian security, with implications for foreign policy and institutional development, at a time when Russia was redefining its identity and role in world politics. Tsygankov explains in Chapter 2 why
Chapter 3 is especially useful to students of Russian politics and history due to its classification of five key discourses or schools of thought that emerged and evolved between the late 1980s and 1990s, as cultural identities changed. The schools, which often lacked internal consistency, reflected different views of Russia’s identity, external threats, and role in the world. National Democrats (i.e., Mikhail Gorbachev) and Westernizers (i.e., Andrei Kozyrev) represented liberal ideologies that supported more pro-Western notions of security and globalist values. In contrast, Statists (i.e., Evgenii Primakov), National Communists (i.e., Gennadii Zyyuganov), and Eurasianists (i.e., Vladimir Zhirinovskii) embraced conservative, nationalist ideologies that sought to compete with the West, whose culture they viewed as inferior to that of Russia. The hegemonic discourse evolved over three major stages. First, the late 1980s marked the high point of Russian receptivity to Western ideas with the introduction of Gorbachev’s “New Thinking.” Second, Kozyrev’s strategic partnership with the West (1992–1993) was based on a radical Western political and economic liberalization model, but was soon undermined by international (NATO expansion) and domestic (shock therapy failures and the rise of the statist perspective) developments. Lastly, Primakov’s multipolar world approach gained ascendancy in 1995 and is still prevalent today; it is statist in orientation and advocates a pragmatic combination of balancing against the West and co-operating with it, in pursuing Russia’s national interests.

In the next two chapters, Tsygankov analyzes reactions to Francis Fukuyama’s cosmopolitan and expansionist vision of the “end of history” in 1989, with liberal democracies and capitalism as the victors, and Samuel P. Huntington’s realist and isolationist vision in 1993 of a “clash of civilizations.” He chose them because they were “highly influential ethnocentric ideas” that closely-knit Russian academic and foreign policy circles hotly debated (p. 14). Tsygankov finds that, while some Westernizers initially supported Fukuyama’s thesis, all five intellectual currents eventually came to oppose both essentialist theories. Russians deemed them ethnocentric for failing to recognize Russia’s “historical, geopolitical, and institutional distinctiveness,” including its super-presidential system, multi-cultural federalism, oligarchic capitalism, and efforts in building closer ties with states from different civilizations (pp. 2, 108). Tsygankov claims that Fukuyama’s and Huntington’s ideas were at least partly to blame for Russians’ growing perception that the West’s role in the world order was hegemonic and expansionist. In fact, he argues that Fukuyama’s public endorsement of Russian liberals actually undermined their cause, and a growing number of liberals, among them Kozyrev, eventually began to adopt the language of statists. While globalists criticized Huntington for opposing “a genuine pluralism of civilizations,” nationalist schools feared “Russia’s losing its political autonomy to the West” (p. 92). Tsygankov infers from the Russian case—and a comparative analysis of China’s and Iran’s similar rejection of Fukuyama’s and Huntington’s theories—that there is “low cross-cultural receptivity of ethnocentric ideas” (p. 16).

Tsygankov promotes the development of a world order based on the values of cooperation, cultural sensitivity, and pluralism. He argues that influential international relations (IR) scholars such as Fukuyama and Huntington should be held morally responsible for their ethnocentric ideas because of their role in “the rise of Russian discourses of isolation and anti-Western hostility” (p. 128). The obvious problem with his...
recommendation, though, is that it is unenforceable and, in effect, calls for limiting intellectual freedom.

Moreover, Tsygankov does not prove how influential Fukuyama’s and Huntington’s ideas were vis-à-vis those of other IR scholars. Nor does he provide strong evidence of how these cultural perceptions of Western ideas actually changed Russian foreign policy, although he admits that “Russian hard-line Eurasianists emerged before the ‘clash of civilization’ thesis” (p. 136 n 41). It appears that, rather than shaping negative cultural perceptions, Huntington’s and Fukuyama’s ideas reinforced growing negative perceptions of the West which were more directly influenced by developments such as NATO expansion and the failed economic shock therapy program.

Despite these weaknesses, this book adds to our understanding of the evolving nature of Russian foreign policy discourses and their openness to external ideas; it reaffirms the importance of factoring diverse cultural perspectives into analyses of world politics.

Pamela A. Jordan, University of Saskatchewan

David M. Bethea, ed. The Pushkin Handbook. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005. xlii, 665 pp. Select Bibliographies. Index. $60, cloth.

North American and Russian Pushkin scholars differ in their approaches. While Russian scholars at the Pushkin House in Leningrad/St. Petersburg have historically excelled at textological scholarship, North Americans over the past fifty years have generally tried to look at larger issues, both within Pushkin’s writing itself and while placing him in a literary and historical context. The brilliance of The Pushkin Handbook is that it brings together some of the best Pushkinists from both continents under one cover, juxtaposing approaches, ideas, and even languages.2

The articles in the volume, each written by a Pushkin expert of one stripe or another, while “targeted at both the specialist and the general intellectual reader” (p. xxxiv), are all graced with fulsome notes and generous bibliographies. Each Russian language entry is prefaced by an English-language abstract. As editor David Bethea describes in his introduction, roughly the first half of the volume focuses on Pushkin himself (his life, works, thought), and the second half on the traditional “Pushkin and...” topics: “Pushkin and Society,” “Pushkin and Romanticism,” “Pushkin and England.” This division, familiar from Pushkin conferences within and outside of Russia, enables the volume’s contributors to cover both specific generic, scholarly, and biographical topics, and to explore Pushkin in context, whether historical, European, or even more broadly conceived.

The volume opens with Bethea and Sergei Davydov’s discussion of Pushkin’s biography. They argue that historically, among the problems in the biography has been the attempt to distinguish between “gossip” and “facts” about the poet’s life. However, they argue, it is not possible to separate Pushkin’s work from his life; to do so would be to forbid investigations into the “intersection of the autobiographical and the creative.” The next several articles, written by Russian Academy of Science “Pushkinodomovtsy” Sergei Fomichev and Tatiana Krasnoborodko, discuss issues of textology. As Krasnoborodko reminds us, Pushkin once commented that “every line by a great writer becomes a treasure for his descendants.” The repercussions of this statement include the vast archive of Pushkin’s manuscripts, held at the Pushkin House, the detailed descriptions of those

2 The volume is bilingual, with English translations of the Russian texts available (in theory) at a University of Wisconsin website, <http://polyglot.lss.wisc.edu/slavic/resources/pusheent.htm>. My students could not access this site in Winter 2007, nor is it up as of this writing.
archives (facilitated by the fact that early Pushkin scholars were also “competent archivists”), and the publications of facsimile editions of Pushkin’s working notebooks (9 of 18 have been published already). At the same time, as Fomichev explains, expectations of the “Academy edition” of Pushkin’s Complete Collected Works (a new version of which has been in progress for some time) can be inappropriate. It is to the manuscripts themselves, or to the facsimile editions, that scholars and fans should turn when in search of every comma and original spelling from ASP’s oeuvre. The new Academy edition, if it is ever completed, will instead allow us to read Pushkin’s work in a form as near as possible to how Pushkin intended it.

In his discussion of Pushkin and poetic form, M.L. Gasparov argues that Pushkin’s poetry should be studied objectively (which can be done in an interesting way) and in comparison to the poetry of his contemporaries. Olga Murav’eva, in her article on the lyrics, argues that life and art must be separated when studying Pushkin’s lyric poetry. In the past, scholars have sometimes seen Pushkin’s lyrics as being “lightweight” or “contentless”; instead, attention should be focussed on the ways in which Pushkin juxtaposes familiar ideas in simple ways. His lyrics, she suggests, are precisely about suggestibility. In her contribution on the narrative poems, Ekaterina Larionova maintains that through study of the “creative reception history,” one might find that the development of Pushkin’s devices and themes demonstrates the ways in which he transcended his imitators.

In three chapters on Eugene Onegin, Iurii Chumakov describes the English and Russian-language interpretive scholarship on the novel, Douglas Clayton explores three Pushkinian ideas (on the genre of EO, the “chatter” of a novel, and the open-endedness of a fictional work) through which the work’s poetics are revealed, and Leslie O’Bell argues that the novel is the central of three bildungsromane of Pushkin’s career, following Ruslan and Liudmila and preceding The Captain’s Daughter. In it, she maintains, Pushkin’s preoccupation with one particular theme is paramount: “the man of the world in his demonic aspect, compelled to wander but doomed to nostalgia for his lost home.”

Continuing the generic investigations, Maria Virolainen demonstrates that Pushkin’s dramatic works represent an “experiment in historical self-discovery,” while Wolf Schmid explains that Pushkin’s “descent” into prose really represented a prosaicization in poetry and a poeticization of prose. Paul Debreczeny, in his summary of trends in scholarship on Pushkin’s prose, celebrates the fact that the interactions of social groups in Pushkin’s work can now be viewed without the limiting Marxist lens. In considering Pushkin as a historical thinker, Bethea turns to Hayden White and finds that the “poetic plotting of events” was a method Pushkin himself used. Davydov’s article on Pushkin and political thought is illustrated with several drawings from the manuscripts, detailing Pushkin’s attitudes toward his friends the Decembrists, among other topics. Caryl Emerson, in her essay on Pushkin as a critic, points out that this topic has been largely ignored, but is a rich one, through which Pushkin’s trademarks of “brevity, pragmatism, and directness of purpose” can be seen in new light.

In the “Pushkin and...” section of the Handbook, Sergei Bocharov and Stephanie Sandler give two views of how the Pushkin myth has emerged in scholarship and society respectively; William Mills Todd, Harsha Ram, Alexander Dolinin, Larissa Volpert, Oleg Proskurin, Vadim Vatsuro, Boris Gasparov, Vladimir Markovich, Boris Katz and Caryl Emerson give insight into their specializations (from Pushkin and genres—realism, music—to Pushkin and other cultures—English and French Literatures—to Pushkin and the 18th century, Pushkin and his contemporaries, Pushkin and realism, Pushkin and
Romanticism, etc.). The contributors were carefully chosen to truly represent experts in each of these fields of inquiry, and regretfully their essays cannot be explored in full in this short review.

A perhaps unexpected aspect of The Pushkin Handbook at which this review has already hinted is that many of its articles are devoted not to Pushkin per se but to Pushkinistika—Pushkin Studies. “Trends in Scholarship...”; “Iz istorii ponimaniia...”; “Perspektivy izucheniia...”: these are a few of the subtitles to the essays. The last essay, Svetlana Evdokimova and Vladimir Golstein’s “Pushkiniana as an Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Criticism,” argues that studies of Pushkin offer clear reflections of the literary, scholarly, and even general Russian culture of their time. Within Russian “Pushkiniana” since 1966, Evdokimova and Golstein identify a set of “archaists,” “innovators,” religious interpreters, and “iconoclasts,” while the engagement of Western scholars of Pushkin with other branches of Western literary criticism mirrors the “best achievements (as well as limitations)... of contemporary western criticism in general” (p. 621). In conclusion, Evdokimova and Golstein note that dialogue between Russian and Western traditions, and indeed among contemporary Russian Pushkinists themselves, is still lacking. Perhaps this volume will pave the way for that “wishful thinking” which they express. Even more importantly, perhaps the volume will serve as a handbook more broadly understood to the discipline of Russian literary studies as a whole; at any rate, that is the challenge that the volume poses for its readers. Most suitable as a reference in Pushkin seminars on the undergraduate or especially graduate level, the Pushkin Handbook should reside in university and departmental libraries as well as the libraries of faculty interested in Pushkin explicitly or the history of literary studies in Russia and the English-speaking world more generally.

Angela Brintlinger, Ohio State University

Timothy J. Cooley. Making Music in the Polish Tatra: Tourists, Ethnographers, and Mountain Musicians. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2005. xvii, 293 pp. Illustrations. Bibliography. Index. $45.00, cloth.

The music of Poland’s Tatra Mountain region has long been a vibrant symbol of what it means to be Polish both within Poland and in émigré communities around the world. Timothy J. Cooley’s richly detailed account of Podhale music and the musicians who perform it adds a fascinating new dimension to our understanding of góralski music by revealing the diversity that lies beneath its “pure” ethnic forms. Cooley shows how mountain music has absorbed outside influences from Early Modern Slovak and Hungarian travellers to the Rastafarian beats of British bands. In so doing, he reminds us both of the extent to which no region in the modern period is fully cut off from external influences, and of the general danger of seeking “authenticity” in cultural artefacts. While acknowledging the sometimes strategic efforts of Poland’s highlanders to present their music as the product of an ostensibly pure regional culture in order to accommodate tourist expectations, Cooley also captures the elements of innovation brought by the very ethnographers who sought to document the specificity of Góralske practices. The book maintains a comfortable balance between Cooley’s obvious fondness for the music and people of Podhale, and a careful restraint from presenting their music as sacred or immutable. It is this self-conscious tension between insiders and outsiders that represents the chief contribution of this masterfully documented study.
From its earliest settlement, the Tatra mountain region has been the focus of multiple, contested founding narratives. Whether settled by a diverse array of Ruthenian, Wallachian, Slovak, Saxon, and Hungarian migrants who eventually formed a melting pot of ethnically homogenous Górale (Cooley’s preferred thesis), or peopled by Polish-speaking Slavs from north of the Carpathians, local inhabitants agree that the mountain people of today’s Podhale region now comprise a distinct ethnicity. Their culture has been preserved in village costumes, rituals, speech patterns (the Górale dialect), and most especially, *musyka góralaska*. By the early nineteenth century, a “new migration” of tourists and ethnographers overran the Zakopane area and began transcribing customs and songs of the mountaineers, a process that, according to Cooley, helped temporarily freeze cultural forms and closed off the possibility of expanding Górale identity to embrace new outsiders. Although never becoming true mountaineers, tourists often settled for long periods and influenced the evolution of local practices. Cooley recounts numerous tales of his ethnographic predecessors advising in the production or performance of mountain melodies and of Górale themselves citing ethnographic studies to demonstrate “correct” musical forms. Even as the myth of *góralski* cultural purity was being generated and circulated as a much-needed trope during the period of pre-war foreign occupation, the very characteristics promoted as uniquely highlander were in flux through constant interaction with elite Polish intellectuals living and performing among them.

Cooley is a self-aware post-modern scholar who places questions about participant observation at the centre of his analysis. He interjects his own presence into the narrative, transcribing his field notes at the beginning of chapters, explaining his visceral dislike of festival performances, and recording his attendance at weddings and funerals. He questions the impact of his own participation in music-making even as he acknowledges that Górale music never has and never will be fully insulated from outside influences and, indeed, that much of its “authenticity” lies in the diverse origins of its forms. The book is structured around the twin dynamics of insider-outsider tensions and two-way cultural permeability, effectively interweaving local with global contexts, the phases of ethnographic (outsider) representation of highlander music with the structure of (local) village performances. Perhaps the most intriguing example of cross-cultural adaptation is the collaboration represented here between a Górale troupe and a Rastafarian reggae band based in London and the resulting “fusion” songs that arguably maintain elements of both reggae and Górale music. The richness of Cooley’s treatment extends to his detailed transcription of musical forms and the 46-song CD of mountain songs included with the volume.

Cooley’s elucidation of the dynamic dialectic that drives the relationship between intellectuals who study “folk” cultures and the cultures they examine is an important perspective for social science research. Just as the urban elite that travelled to the Polish countryside in the nineteenth century in search of the “true” roots of the Polish nation influenced the ongoing cultural practices of peasant communities, so too have ethnographers helped prompt locals to retain certain musical forms and transform others. While one could hope for a more expansive treatment of influences on musical adaptation, such as biographic information about the performers, their day jobs, family life, housing arrangements, or travel patterns, the recognition of insider-outsider interactivity remains a compelling insight and a lasting contribution of this rich and lively volume.

Keely Stauter-Halsted, Michigan State University
Many a visitor to this capital of western Ukraine has doubtless gazed with curiosity at the scene depicted on the back cover of this excellent edited volume. It shows the place in the cobble-stoned central market square (Rynok) where two sets of tram tracks suddenly overlap, in order to accommodate passage—now one-way—through the narrow outlet that is Rus’ka Street. In a way, this image is a metaphor for the city’s unique multicultural history, where often at a given moment one ethnic or religious group came to dominate the others: it was the tram with the right of way, so to speak. The others had to wait their turn, as did the Ukrainians, long finding themselves at the periphery of the city they call Lviv.

Lviv—also known, at various times, as Lwów, Lemberg, Leopolis, or Lvov—has a particularly rich and multilayered history. Positioned on top of the continental divide between the Baltic and Black Sea basins, it has historically been a crossroads, a place of encounter. This is reflected in its centuries’ long multiethnic and multidenominational pedigree (the city has just celebrated its 750th anniversary); in addition to being the seat of three Catholic metropolitans (Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic, and Armenian Catholic) before World War II, the city also had a large Jewish population. Recognition of the cultural wealth of the city has come in the form of its centre being designated a UNESCO monument of world heritage. That this distinction came to the city only as of 1998, when Lviv had become for all practical purposes a monoethnic Ukrainian city, is but a reminder of the challenges facing Lviv today (the past being truly a foreign place)—as well as facing those who wish to write the history of the city, as Yaroslav Hrytsak notes in his chapter. They are challenged to remember, in the words of editor John Czaplicka, that “in Lviv cultures intersected, melded, and contended with each other before any of their carriers became self-consciously ‘national’ or ‘ethnic’” (p. 14). Only later would the city become a place where modern Polish, Ukrainian, and Jewish identities were being forged.

As befits the multicultural cast of the city, the editor has assembled a multinational and multidisciplinary group of scholars. Historians (Hrytsak, Hugo Lane, Waclaw Wierzbieniec, Philipp Ther, Padraic Kenney), literary, religious and cultural scholars (Alois Woldan, Lilian Hentosz, Martin Aberg, George G. Grabowicz), art and architectural historians (Czaplicka, Ihor Zhuk, Jacek Purchla, and Bohdan Tscherkes) all make their contributions to the volume. For the most part, they focus “not on the crimes of the twentieth century that eliminated cultural diversity, but rather on the literature and architecture of the city, on the city’s religions, and on the history of cultural transformations” (p. 18). Readers will find important—and, more importantly, balanced—chapters on all these subjects. Although they cover the full range of Lviv’s history, the majority of the chapters deal with the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, some—such as Kenney’s chapter on the immediate pre-1990 period—presenting quite recent material.

This book may be read with profit not only by those who are interested in Ukrainian history and culture (who will be reminded constantly of the Europeanness of the city, given the long periods of Polish and Habsburg rule). It is a fine addition to urban history or architectural history studies, adding welcome insights into multicultural cities such as Lviv. Individual chapters, such as Wierzbieniec’s work on the Jews of Lviv or Tscherkes’s treatment of Stalin’s plans for transforming the city, can likewise serve as readings in various courses dealing with Central and Eastern Europe. Even Czaplicka’s introductory chapter is far from perfunctory and, indeed, should be read as a chapter in its own right.
An excellent selection of nearly fifty illustrations rounds out this fine edited collection.

Patrice M. Dabrowski, Harvard University

Jorn Holm-Hansen. *The Transferability of Policy Instruments: How New Environmental Policy Instruments Strike Roots in Russia and Latvia.* Oslo: NIBR-rapport; 2005. 249 pp. Tables.

Jorn Holm-Hansen’s book contributes to a growing literature on policy diffusion and the transfer of institutions from West to East. This book examines the “transposition” of new environmental policy instruments (NEPIs) from the West to two mid-size, single-enterprise towns in Russia and Latvia. His goal is to elucidate why institutions take root and function effectively in some contexts and not others. This book focuses on the environment into which, and from which, policy institutions are imported and exported. It emphasizes the contextual conditions and asks whether policy instruments mesh with the surrounding institutional, cultural, moral and political environment. Although this book speaks most directly to the debates on policy diffusion and institutionalism, it also contributes to debates in the literature on ecological modernization and post-Communist transition. The literature review and bibliography cover an impressively broad range of theoretical and empirical work in a handful of languages.

Holm-Hansen identifies three assumptions on the success of borrowed policy instruments. First, there must be a market-like environment in which differentiated actors, like polluters, local governments, and national governments, make cost-benefit calculations. Second, the relevant actors must relate in a non-hierarchical way, such that polluters enter into partnerships with environmental authorities. Third, there must be shared knowledge and a common understanding of the relevant issues. In examining his case studies, Holm-Hansen hypothesizes that actors in his two case studies are not well differentiated, which make market-like calculations difficult. Moreover, he hypothesizes that the existing non-hierarchical patterns among actors undermine the effectiveness of voluntary agreements (for example, in the treatment of pollutants). Finally, he hypothesizes that a lack of widely agreed upon technical knowledge hampers new policy instruments.

The author contrasts the Russian case (Koriazhma) which is “borrower driven” with the Latvian case (Preili) in which the transfer of environmental policy instruments is “lender-driven,” that is pushed by the European Union on new member states. Additionally, in the Latvian case, an entire package of environmental policy reforms needed to be adopted in full, given that this was part of a larger process of EU assimilation. In the Russian case, local actors could pick and choose which reforms to import.

For each case, Holm-Hansen examines the main environmental actors: state environmental authorities, local governments, and polluting enterprises and studies the efficacy of environmental economic instruments, voluntary agreements and informational devices. Ultimately, Holm-Hansen finds that the new policy instruments worked rather well. However, they worked for reasons not anticipated in his initial hypotheses and assumptions, and instead due to methods now seen as “old-fashioned.” He argues that due to the greater reliance on control and inspection and the frequent reference to legal provisions, new environmental instruments worked relatively well. Control as an institutional expectation turned out to be an asset that compensated for the lack of differentiation of actors. These findings apply to both Russia and Latvia, although
somewhat less so to Latvia. He also notes that the lack of differentiation helped in creating a shared knowledge base, even if it detracted from the functioning of environmental policy mechanisms. The lack of differentiation results from both Soviet practices and recent decisions.

In the course of examining and theorizing about the transfer of environmental policy instruments, the book is effective at dispelling some mistaken assumptions. For one, Holm-Hansen argues that efforts to reduce pollution, to protect the natural surroundings and the health of the population, and to use natural resources rationally did not begin in the perestroika or post-Communist era, but during the Soviet era. Soviet environmental instruments were highly developed and thus shaped the import and functioning of foreign models in the late 1990s. Holm-Hansen also identifies the great respect for scientific, technical knowledge and the privileging of the natural sciences over the social sciences under state-socialism as important legacies shaping the transfer of environmental instruments in the post-Soviet era. This legacy created a tendency in which environmental problems were treated as requiring only technical fixes, rather than social and political solutions. More positive legacies of environmentalism under state-socialism include the practice of reaching agreements between officials and producers and the routine of assigning environmental responsibility to the branch ministry or the enterprise itself.

This book is a highly structured and thoughtful analysis of policy transfer. The author’s ability to synthesize clearly and efficiently several theoretical debates and to find important linkages between diverse literatures is commendable. In addition to addressing salient theoretical debates in the social sciences, this study also contributes to the existing empirical pool of information about environmental protection in Latvia and Russia through original interviews with a diverse range of actors in the towns featured in his case studies. This book is recommended reading for advanced students of environmental protection, policy diffusion and post-Communist transition.

Hilary Appel, Claremont McKenna College

Anna Al'fredisovna Komzolova. Politika samoderzhaviia v Severo-Zapadnom krae v èpokhu Velikikh reform. Moscow: Nauka, 2005. 383 pp.

The lands that the Russian empire acquired in the process of Poland’s partition had two different statuses in the imperial bureaucratic mind. On the one hand, the Kingdom of Poland, created in 1815, was understood to have no organic connection with medieval and early-modern Rus' and accordingly enjoyed a distinct legal and administrative order for most of its history. On the other hand, the territories further east had been core elements of Rus' and were therefore construed by officialdom initially as “the provinces returned from Poland” and later as the “western provinces.” These nine provinces were in turned subdivided into the “northwest region” (roughly present-day Lithuania and Belarus) and the “southwest region” (west-central Ukraine). Dominated socially by a Polish and Catholic noble elite and populated primarily by eastern Slavs, Lithuanians, and Jews, these geopolitically crucial territories were of central importance in shaping imperial mentalities for the entire empire. Anna Komzolova’s monograph makes a valuable contribution to our understanding of this region by analyzing “the ideological motives and individual contribution” (p. 6) to government policy of each of the Governors-General in the northwest region in the decade or so following the January insurrection of 1863.

Komzolova’s focus is precisely on the Governors-General in Vil'na, and she ascribes particular significance to the “personal factor” in the elaboration of government policy. Her
account is accordingly rich in material concerning the outlooks of a series of six men who held that post in the years from 1855 to 1880. The author’s central concern is to describe the elaboration and subsequent fate of an array of measures developed by Governor-General M. N. Murav'ev in the two years immediately following the January insurrection. Komzolova is not the first to write in detail about this intriguing figure—also known as “the hangman of Vilna” for his aggressive suppression of the insurrection—but her account is certainly among the most thorough. She focuses primarily on the axis between Vilna and St. Petersburg and thus situates the Governors-General within a set of competing policy orientations among the empire’s most influential officials. Her focus is, therefore, much more on the formulation of policy than on its implementation—an approach informed partly by her inability to work in the archives of Vilnius. This is unfortunate for a book that stresses the role of the Governors-General for state policy, and interested readers should, therefore, also consult new and forthcoming monographs by Darius Staliunas and Mikhail Dolbilov, who draw extensively from local archives.

Komzolova discerns two principal government parties that emerged in the formulation of the government’s response to the insurrection. On the one hand, the “ultra-patriots” coalesced around the policies of Murav'ev and were ardent proponents of Russification of the region through the displacement of the “Polish element” from its social predominance, the promotion of Russian landowning, and a serf emancipation favouring the peasantry. On the other hand, a “cosmopolitan party,” represented most prominently by interior minister P. A. Valuev, continued to regard the nobility as the social foundation for the autocracy in the region, while also seeking to use the ethno-confessional differences between peasant and lord to temper the nobility’s power. To simplify, one could say that the first group gave primacy to national categories in contemplating policy, while the latter group continued to regard social estate as the foundation for the empire’s governance. Komzolova may draw these lines a bit too starkly, but this opposition does reveal a central dilemma facing the autocracy as it sought to pacify the northwest region without abandoning the principles that served more generally as the foundation of the tsarist order.

Komzolova proposes that this opposition continued to shape the formulation of policy long after Murav'ev left his post as Governor-General in 1865. His immediate successor, K. P. von Kaufman (1865–1866), represented a continuation and logical extension of Murav'ev. Indeed, it was under Kaufman’s general-governorship that the state decreed a prohibition on the new acquisition of land in the western provinces by Poles and a number of other provisions designed to transfer land from Polish to Russian ownership. By the end of the 1860s, however, and especially under A. L. Potapov (1868–1874), the “cosmopolitans” were in a position to challenge Murav'ev’s legacy more effectively. Potapov managed to purge many of the cadres who had been installed by Murav'ev and Kaufman, and on the whole the exceptional character of the region’s administration was substantially reduced by the mid-1870s. But for a variety of reasons—most significantly, because of a “powerful inertia” (p. 285) that developed behind Murav'ev’s order—most attempts at revision were unsuccessful. The “cosmopolitans” could only weaken that order, but not dismantle it entirely.

Komzolova never directly answers her own question as to whether the measures under Murav'ev constituted a “system.” Much of her analysis implies an affirmative answer, but she hedges by always putting that term in quotation marks, as if casting doubt on this idea. Polish perspectives, though present to a degree at the book’s outset, largely disappear later on, while Lithuanians and Jews receive little attention. The deeply contested character of the territory in question—above all the clash between imperial Russian and Polish
visions—therefore emerges less clearly than it might have, and the legitimacy of St. Petersburg’s rule of the region is largely taken for granted. Komzolova does not really engage with recent works that explore the western provinces, interrogate the meanings of ‘Russification,’ and examine the collision of different national projects. In short, a more analytically robust conception of the historical problem at stake—beyond the very conventional issue of “the formulation of internal policy” (p. 13)—would have rendered her book more compelling. For all this, Komzolova’s study contains a wealth of information on relationships among various prominent officials and on the considerations that shaped the autocracy’s efforts to manage the complex “Polish question.” It will surely serve as an important resource for scholars who study the problem of empire in Russia’s western borderlands.

Paul W. Werth, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Serhii Plokhy and Frank E. Sysyn, eds. Synopsis: A Collection of Essays in Honour of Zenon E. Kohut. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2005. xii, 476 pp.

The essays gathered in this volume honour Zenon E. Kohut (Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, 1975) on his sixtieth birthday in 2004. A renowned specialist on the history of Ukraine in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and on Ukrainian-Russian relations, he currently serves as the Director of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Alberta in Edmonton.

His major monograph, Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy: Imperial Absorption of the Hetmanate (Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1988) and articles on Ukrainian historiography have generated international interest and acclaim. In addition to his English-language works, he recently published a collection of articles, Korinnia identychnosty: Studii z rannomodernoi ta modernoi istorii Ukrainy (Roots of Identity: Studies in the Early-Modern and Modern History of Ukraine) in Kyiv in 2004.

Throughout his career, he investigated Russian imperial integrationist policies, concluding that the “evolution of the Russian Empire on Western absolutist patterns may be a key to explaining the change in Russia’s policies toward Cossack Ukraine” (cited on p. 9). In his works, he traced the Russian Empire’s successful co-optation of the Ukrainian Cossack elite and this elite’s splintering into assimilationist and traditionalist camps. The latter group sought to reconcile their local interests with imperial ones, as Mark Von Hagen’s excellent assessment of the Pavlo Skoropadsky’s career demonstrates.

Most of the contributors to this volume are historians, hailing from Austria, Canada, Poland, Ukraine, and the United States. Most deal with the early modern and modern periods of Ukrainian history. Of the twenty-three essays in this volume, only eight treat periods before the nineteenth century, Dr. Kohut’s period of expertise. The techniques the authors adopted vary enormously, ranging from short narratives of familiar and unfamiliar events to long interpretative essays. Volodymyr Kravchenko’s perceptive assessment of Kohut’s intellectual biography and Taras Kurylo’s thorough bibliography of his works round out this collection.

For some unexplained reason, however, the editors organized the essays in this collection in alphabetical order by author. Had they placed them in chronological or thematic order, readers might have perceived them as part of a seamless whole. Despite this organizational problem, the overall standard in this volume remains very high.
Although it is difficult to assess each contribution separately in this short review, a small number possess a common theme, the issue of unintended consequences. First systematized by the sociologist Robert K. Merton in 1936, this theory asserts that people and governments often initiate purposeful actions, which produce unanticipated and often undesirable results.

Not surprisingly, the most interesting essays dealing with the issue of unplanned aftereffects (written by Olga Andriewsky, Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak, Volodymyr Kravchenko, Orest Pelech, Alfred J. Rieber, and David Saunders) encompass the nineteenth century. In this critically-important century, the predominantly rural-based Ukrainians encountered modern and industrial environments, which demanded standardization and homogeneity. But the cities and universities—the most radical agents of change—engendered the very opposite, which encouraged the younger generation of Ukrainians to experiment with new identities, leading many to separate themselves from the Poles and Russians.

Andriewsky’s article, for example, traced the evolution of a distinct Ukrainian youth culture at the end of the nineteenth century as an unintentional consequence of the Russian government’s expansion of institutions of higher education during a major demographic explosion in the Ukrainian countryside. Despite the government’s efforts to educate and to integrate these students into a single, imperial ethos, they failed. These alienated students from “Little Russia” became radicalized, helped undermine the unity of the Russian Empire, and formed the leadership of the Ukrainian revolutionary movement in 1917.

Bohachevsky-Chomiak’s short article, based on tsarist police records in Polish archives, discussed how a small number of peasants at the end of the nineteenth century expressed their critical views of the tsar, experienced arrest, subsequent interrogation, isolation and punishment. This repressive process, however, did not stamp out critical thinking. Instead, the “more vigilant the police, the quicker the politicization of their charges,” she concludes (p. 45).

Pelech analyzed the history of the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius within the framework of its members’ professional careers and Russia’s internal politics in the 1840s. He convincingly argued that S. S. Uvarov, the Minister of Popular Enlightenment, created the University of Kyiv in 1834 in order to limit Polish influence in Right-Bank Ukraine. Enthused by this project, two of Uvarov’s hand-picked professors, Panteleimon Kulish and Mykola Kostomarov, discovered an alternative to the master narrative of Russian history. After their arrests in 1847 and release in 1858, Kulish and especially Kostomarov pursued this alternative paradigm of East Slavic history for the rest of their lives. Imprisonment, exile, harassment, and censorship did not suppress this alternative master narrative of Ukraine (p. 344), which became the cornerstone of the modern Ukrainian identity.

Rieber’s contribution focused on the controversy over the construction of a southern railroad that would link the central black-earth agricultural region, the main cities of Ukraine, and the economic regions of Little Russia and New Russia with the ports on the Black Sea. The author skilfully traced and examined the evolution, in the early 1860s, of the public debate over the issue of how to finance this railway and where to build it. Although both antagonists sought to integrate the Ukrainian provinces more closely to the Russian Empire, over the long run the ineptly managed railroads could not maintain the critical links between the empire’s grain-producing and grain-consuming areas, especially during the strain of the First World War. Intended to consolidate the empire’s far-flung regions, this railroad contributed to its collapse in March 1917.
In his assessment of Russia’s Ukrainian policies from the middle of the nineteenth century to the Second World War, David Saunders clarified tsarist and Soviet long-term hostility toward nationally-conscious Ukrainians by concentrating on a tsarist memorandum written on the eve of the anti-Ukrainian edict of 1876. This document pointed out that “the Little Russians” made up 17.5 percent of the Imperial Russian population, second only to the Russian population. According to Saunders, official Russian hostility to Ukrainian culture in the late nineteenth century expressed the tsarist fears that Ukrainian native-language primary education would turn the populous “Little Russians” against the Russians and that this antagonism would undermine the stability of the tsarist order (p. 410). The Ukrainians maintained their demographic weight throughout the Soviet period as well and Stalin and his successors, aware of their demographic size, sought to discourage a greater Ukrainian self-awareness or assertiveness.

The population explosion at the end of the nineteenth century (which Andrewsky first described) produced unintended consequences over the long run. On the one hand, it strengthened the demographic weight of the Ukrainians in the Ukrainian provinces and within the Russian Empire/USSR and encouraged a mass Ukrainian national movement (as she implied in her essay). On the other hand, this demographic upsurge brought severe reprisals.

These five excellent essays dealing with the issue of unintended consequences represent only a small part of this intellectually stimulating festschrift, which contains many more thought-provoking essays. Successfully organized and edited by Serhii Plokhy and Frank Sysyn, this collection describes and analyzes the paradoxes of change, the elliptical nature of history, and the role of historical accidents and human contingency in the history of Ukraine in a masterful way.

George O. Liber, University of Alabama at Birmingham

Boris Ragula. Against the Current: The Memoirs of Boris Ragula as Told to Dr. Inge V. Sanmiya. Footprints Series. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 2005. xiv. 185 pp. Photographs. Bibliography. Index. $34.95, cloth.

Against the Current: The Memoirs of Boris Ragula provides insightful recollections of a postwar medical practitioner refugee to Canada whose life was transformed by international politics during the years after World War I. Two major themes, to which this book provides invaluable sources, can be drawn.

First, this personal account tells about Ragula’s obscure but strengthening identity as a Belarusian, whose homeland fell at separate times under the control of Poland, Germany, and the Soviet Union. For historians of the post-World War I Soviet republics, it provides the first account of how local Belarusians were mobilized forcibly into foreign armies. Although the contemporary media tends to categorize postwar East European immigrants using simplistic terms such as “pro-Nazi” that are imbued with negative feelings, his story suggests to readers that the conflict was so complex and dynamic that labelling makes no sense. The path the author followed in fighting against Germans but later collaborating with them was similar to the experience of thousands of other East European refugees and, therefore, suggests that circumstances determined their lives.

Brought up mainly in Navahrudak (Hrodna region), which was under Polish rule until annexed by the USSR in September 1939, Ragula portrays himself as a conscious Belarusian who aspired to become a doctor. However, he was ordered to serve in the Polish army and was taken prisoner by the Germans. After escaping from the prison, he returned
to Belarus (now under Soviet control), but was arrested by the NKVD, which accused him of being anti-Communist. He avoided execution because of the turmoil caused by the German advance into Minsk in 1941. According to him, his ordeal in the Communist prison motivated him to believe that the only way to bring Belarusians freedom was to serve as a commander of the Belarusian Eskadron with German assistance.

Second, this book provides invaluable insights into postwar medical practices in Canada, and is particularly beneficial for insights into the history of medicine. It describes medical trials and achievements from the eyes of an immigrant doctor who managed to obtain an internship with limited experience, and grew into a skilled physician. His hardships in prison camps and enthusiasm for the new life, he recollects, motivated him to take on challenging tasks in Ontario hospitals and in native communities in the North. His occupational growth is situated in the context of the emerging welfare state through detailed accounts of increasing childbirths, physician-specialist collaborations for new cures, improvements in aboriginal public health, his role as a consultant of new immigrants, and in the successful anti-smoking campaign in hospitals. His account sheds light on how medical practitioners, including new immigrants, played a vital role in defining new Canadian medicine.

The book has some flaws. First, as is often the case with edited memoirs, it reads like a success story with the author moving from oppression to freedom as a heroic figure. His self-portrayal as a persistent fighter for Belarusian freedom and trusted physician conceals some negative aspects of the wartime situation, as well as the inadequacies of public health programs in postwar Canada. Second, readers can easily discern that his memory is largely influenced by contemporary publications, political discourses, and afterthoughts. He tends to situate his personal experiences within the larger war context, mixing them with textbook facts, rather than with his immediate life concerns. Although it would have been very difficult to follow the complex wartime events from the perspective of a small Belarusian village or German or Soviet camps, his story falls effortlessly into the World War II narrative. This might make readers wonder if the story has been adjusted to conform to the known story line. Third, ethnic historians in Canada who might be interested in his growing dual loyalties to Canada and Belarus or strengthening ethnic consciousness might be disappointed. Although the epilogue by Inge Sanmiya emphasizes Ragula’s active post-immigration involvement in the exiled Rada of the Belarusian National Congress, which provided medical assistance to Belarusian victims after the 1986 Chernobyl accident, his story in Canada is solely about his medical practices. Except for his participation in John Diefenbaker’s “vision of the north,” and the fascination of his meeting with Canada’s governor-general, D. Roland Michener, this book rarely discusses his identity questions after immigration. These memoirs could have been richer had they provided the aforementioned point as a rare Belarusian voice in the field of Canadian ethnic history, which tends to be dominated by Ukrainian narratives.

These weaknesses nonetheless do not undermine the significance of this book as a self-portrayal of a skilled and educated postwar refugee who survived bitter conflicts in his divided homeland and started a new life in Canada. It adds another perspective to the study of postwar growth of Canada both in medicine and citizenship.

Aya Fujiwara, University of Alberta

Canadian Slavonic Papers/Revue canadienne des slavistes
Vol. L, Nos. 1–2, March–June 2008
Polish-Russian relations are the subject of very complex and difficult discussions both on the political and cultural level. As a result of geopolitical conditions, Polish and Russian history is closely tied yet problematic. Religious and cultural differences have divided the two countries over centuries, and they continue to be the source of hostilities. The contributing writers to *Polish Encounters, Russian Identity* analyze the character of these relations and attempt to clarify how they fluctuated throughout various historical periods and the different political systems in Poland and Russia.

*Polish Encounters, Russian Identity* is a collection of twelve essays, ten of which were presented at a conference on “Polonophilia and Polonophobia of the Russians,” which took place at Indiana University in Bloomington on 16–17 September 2000. The book was edited by the co-organizers of the conference, David L. Ransel, Robert F. Byrnes Professor of History and the Director of the Russian and East European Institute at Indiana University, and Bozena Shallcross, an Associate Professor of Polish Literature at University of Chicago. The editors also co-authored the introduction, which offers an overview of Polish-Russian relations throughout the centuries and a short overview of the essays. Two additional essays enriched the publication: “Repositioning Pushkin and the Poems of the Polish Uprising” by Beth Holmgren and Manon de Courten’s “Vladimir Solov’ev’s Views on the Polish Question: Poland and Reunion of the Eastern and Western Churches.”

The main focus of the book is to explore the formation of Russian identity and to analyze its interactions with and impact on Polish culture (p. 1). The essays cover a wide spectrum of analysis of Russian identity and how it was formed in relation to Poland, and they offer a multidisciplinary approach including music (Halina Goldberg’s “Appropriating Poland: Glinka, Polish Dance, and Russian National Identity”), literature (Megan Dixon, who offers a new interpretation of Pushkin’s poems regarding the Uprising of 1831 in “Repositioning Pushkin and the Poems of the Polish Uprising”); Nina Perlina’s “Dostoevsky and His Polish Fellow Prisoners from the House of the Dead,” as well as “At Home with Pani Eliza: Isaac Babel and His Polish Encounters” by Judith Deutsch Kornblatt). In his essay “Tsar Vasilii Shuiskii, the Staszic Palac, and Nineteenth-Century Russian Politics in Warsaw,” Robert L. Przygrodzki offers an interesting analysis of how the Russian presence in Poland found its expression through architecture.

The volume discusses various elements of Polish-Russian encounters over many centuries from Barbara Skinner’s interesting analysis of the conflict between two Christian fractions in the opening essay “The Irreparable Church Schism: Russian Orthodox Identity and Its Historical Encounter with Catholicism” to Matthew D. Pauly’s contribution on “Soviet Polonophobia and the Formulation of Nationalities Policy in the Ukrainian SSR, 1927–1934.” Pauly writes an engaging essay documenting the hostility between Poland and the Soviet Union in the interwar period and the consequences it had for Soviet policies towards the Ukrainian Republic. “Under the Influence? Joseph Brodsky and Poland,” authored by Irena Grudzińska-Gross, presents Poland as a cultural bridge between Russian intellectuals and “world culture” (p. 192). As the closing essay, it refreshingly focuses on the important role of Poland and the Polish language, so often considered a threat to Russian identity, in bridging Russian and Western culture.

The contributors’ objective “to demonstrate the diversity and complexity of Russian responses to the Polish Other” (p. 5) and analyze the attraction and repulsion pattern in Polish-Russian relations throughout centuries is well executed. The collection is a great
BOOK REVIEWS

resource, touching on a broad range of issues, yet coming together as a cohesive overview of the subject. The essays present a valuable analysis of the development of these relations and at times provide notable insights. Although there are some factual mistakes, e.g. the wrong date of Adam Mickiewicz’s exile in Russia (p. 9), the work on the whole is well researched and makes an important contribution to the field and encourages further exploration and discussion.

Sylwia Szymańska-Smolkin, University of Toronto

Martina Thomsen. Zwischen Hauptwache und Stockhaus. Kriminalität und Strafjustiz in Thorn im 18. Jahrhundert. Materialien und Studien zur Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung 13. Marburg: Verlag Herder-Institut, 2005. viii, 332 pp. Paper.

Just as it seems that interest in the history of deviant behaviour has peaked, this new study of urban crime and punishment proves the continued attraction this topic has among young historians. Martina Thomsen’s doctoral dissertation on criminality in eighteenth-century Thorn (Polish: Toruń)—a city under the crown of Poland until the Second Partition of Poland in 1793, with a mixed, Polish- and German-speaking population—tests several well-established theoretical commonplaces: Norbert Elias’s “civilizing process,” which assumes that violent behaviour declined in the more “civilized” eighteenth century, Michel Foucault’s emphasis on the disciplining of individuals as basis for an increasingly oppressive social control over the whole of society, Pierre Chaunu’s thesis of “violen
c au vol,” which perceived a shift from early modern crimes of violence to crimes against property during the Enlightenment, and Eric Hobsbawm’s stress on gang criminality as “social protest.” Almost three hundred pages and many case-studies later, however, none of these paradigms seems particularly suitable. As Thomsen demonstrates, the reason was not the city’s position in East Central Europe or the specific circumstances of the Culm Law Code (to some extent influenced by Polish law), which applied in the city, but the complexities of social and historical reality which elude rigorously-applied theoretical concepts. This approach is refreshing but constantly clashes with the author’s sometimes superficial and unwarranted attempts to cater to an expectation (by whom?) of a “theoretical underpinning” of the interesting picture she draws of an eighteenth-century urban society.

The author clearly found large bounty in the city archives of Toruń, from which she unearthed 1130 tragic, sometimes quirky, and often desperate individual fortunes in a city under almost constant occupation by Swedish, Polish-Saxon, Russian and Brandenburg-Prussian troops for much of the eighteenth century. The focus on capital and violent crimes, homicide, infanticide, slander and defamation, crimes against property (including arson), sex crimes (including sodomy, bigamy, incest, adultery and rape) as well as witchcraft is based on documents from urban law courts, but with few opportunities to chart variations from earlier centuries as the city archive was almost completely burnt in the Swedish attack in 1703. Many cases, particularly those involving violent crime, rape and attacks against burghers’ honour, involved soldiers who were subject to military but not civilian jurisdiction. Their outcome remains unclear, often because they did not even lead to prosecution.

One result is hardly surprising. Violence played a prominent role in a city used to quarter foreign soldiers in its walls for some length of time (although we are never told exactly for how long foreign regiments lingered in the city and where they were stationed).
The shift towards crimes against property, more perceptible in many West European cities (although there must also have been considerable differences between zones of war and peace), did therefore not apply here. Thomsen’s main thesis, however, is that, in contrast to previous centuries, eighteenth-century punishment adopted a milder approach, as the overall number of death penalties dropped considerably, reflecting a wider European trend. While dishonouring punishments, such as hanging, drowning and quartering were almost entirely abolished, the death penalty (by the sword) for the very worst crimes remained a constant feature. This thesis is well-sustained by a wealth of case studies which are conveyed in a vivid style. Thomsen’s focus on female crime is particularly interesting: her claim that in Thorn a greater percentage of accused women were subjected to punishment is born out by the figures, explained by the fact that many male crimes went unpunished because they fell under military jurisdiction. It is, therefore, regrettable that other aspects of the book work less well: the necessarily limited source basis sits oddly with the author’s comparative ambitions. Thomsen never quite explains how, by treating Thorn as representative of East Central European patterns of criminality—a rather questionable claim without further analysis of criminality in this region—she will reach valid results for a comparison with patterns prevalent in Western Europe. Occasional references to works on criminal justice in Zürich, Frankfurt or London seem hardly sufficient. The city’s political history and its larger Polish context—the king of Poland was the city’s highest lord—find virtually no mentioning. A throw-away line towards the end, that jurisdiction in the countryside was much harsher, particularly in noble estates, raises an interesting but unpursued topic which would perhaps have yielded fruitful comparative elements between urban and noble-dominated areas. Considering the author’s comparative aspiration, the selection of English-language secondary literature in the bibliography is rather disappointing. Another important omission is Hans-Jürgen Bömelburg’s 1995 study of Polish Prussian society between 1756 and 1806. One of the most useful formal features is the excellent index, which provides place names in both Polish and German. The book will still make a useful contribution to our understanding of the functioning of urban society in the Polish-Prussian borderlands in the pre-partition period.

Karin Friedrich, University of Aberdeen

Boris Zabarko. Holocaust in the Ukraine. The Library of Holocaust Testimonies. London and Portland, OR: Vallentine-Mitchell, 2005. xxxii, 394 pp. Bibliography. Index. £45.00 / $67.50, cloth. £17.50 / $27.50, paper.

This volume contains eighty-six short testimonies from Holocaust survivors in Ukraine. Some of the accounts have appeared in Ukrainian publications, while others were recorded in the context of a project collecting audio and video testimonies for the Documentation Center of Yale University. The editor, Boris Zabarko, is himself a survivor of the Shargorod ghetto and director of the Institute for Social and Communal Workers and a senior researcher of the National Academy of Sciences in the Ukraine. The edition first appeared in German in 2004.

The testimonies themselves offer harrowing accounts of the impact of Nazi occupation of Ukraine. Some families seem to have expected the worst from the beginning; others remembered the German behaviour in the First World War and anticipated a reasonably civilized occupation. In contrast to the parts of Poland occupied by Germany since 1939, the transition from initial encounters, through brutal and haphazard ghettoization, to mass murder took place in a matter of weeks. Most of the witnesses in this volume were
teenagers or children when the Nazis arrived. They tended to be spared the worst of the initial days and weeks of occupation, though they observed extraordinary brutality on the streets, and the disappearance of relatives and neighbours. When the mass killings started, their routes to survival varied. Some were caught up in the shootings themselves and survived through extraordinary luck—falling into a mass grave without being shot, or being pulled out at the last minute by a sympathetic guard and sent running into a corn field. Some managed to be taken in, at least for a while, by other relatives away from the affected location, or by non-Jewish acquaintances. Such moves were usually just the beginning of extraordinary odysseys of hardship, improvisation and luck.

Even more than the introduction makes clear, the testimonies themselves reveal the degree to which Jews’ lives were endangered by local collaborators, be it brutal police and guards, or simply neighbours who turned them in. At the same time, almost every survivor in this account owed his or her life to greater or lesser gestures by non-Jewish Ukrainians, who offered shelter and food or who vouched for their non-Jewish status with the Germans. There were some good Germans in this story too. The volume editor himself remembers a German soldier stationed in his apartment who left food and money behind when he moved on.

The edition as a whole is rather haphazard and at times shoddy. The introduction is full of wild statements that should not have been allowed to stand. The tragedy of the Jews was not, as the introduction claims, a “forbidden topic” in post-war USA. There was not, for all Petain’s failings, a “complete mutual understanding” between him and Hitler with regard to the Final Solution. The claim made in the introduction, citing a German historian, that the history of the Holocaust in Ukraine has not yet been written, is more than a decade out of date. That German historian is referred to here as Dieter Paul, in the notes as Paul Dieter, and that is how he is cited in the blurb on the back cover and in the publisher’s publicity on the web. I think the reference must in fact be to the historian Dieter Pohl. Other bibliographical references are not consistent between introduction and bibliography. Moreover, Pohl’s 1994 essay was published before his own work on the Holocaust in the Eastern Galicia, Martin Dean’s researches on the Holocaust in Ukraine, Zvi Gitelman’s account of confronting the Holocaust in the Soviet Union, and many other important recent studies appeared, so using Pohl’s quotation prominently as a guide to where things stood at the time when the present volume appeared is very misleading.

The testimonies themselves are arranged rather randomly (in Cyrillic alphabetical order), preventing any patterns easily emerging in relation to particular locations. Either the translations, or the nature of the original interviews, mean that many passages are hard to understand. In one interview the Monowitz camp at Auschwitz is referred on one page as Monovets, on the next as Monowetz, in what is in any case a very confusing chronological sequence. There seems to have been no standardized approach to collecting the testimonies, so whilst some offer information about family circumstances before and after the war, others do not give similar details. It is hard to fathom why Vallentine-Mitchell, a publishing house with such expertise in this area, did not give the manuscript a much more thorough review. None of this takes away from the power of many of the voices, but it does reduce the collection’s utility as a reference or teaching text.

Mark Roseman, Indiana University
Birgit Beumers, ed. *The Cinema of Russia and the Former Soviet Union*. Preface by Sergei Bodrov Sr. London and New York: Wallflower Press, 2006. 283 pages. Filmography. Bibliography. Index.

The collection of essays *The Cinema of Russia and the Former Soviet Union* is part of a highly original book series launched by Wallflower Press and edited by Yoram Allon and Ian Haydn Smith. The basic structure of the volume on Russian and former Soviet cinema is determined by the series’ general objectives. The title of the series—*24 Frames*—reflects the overall composition of each volume: the cinematographic art of a given country is discussed in twenty-four essays about its 24 most representative films. The number of these “frames” points to the fundamental characteristic of contemporary movie-making, namely projecting 24 frames per second onto a screen in order to create the illusion of movement. In my view, the idea of movement that thus underlies the structure of each volume, accounts for the series’ novelty. Indeed, many monographs and collections of essays in the field of Film Studies focus on the American movie industry and tend to discuss only selected periods in the history of national cinemas. To be sure, except for descriptions of the experimentations of the 1920s in film editing and references to auteur films from the late Soviet period, little can be found in North American Film Studies textbooks on the history of Soviet and post-Soviet film. In other words, a more comprehensive study of Russian film has traditionally been relegated to departments of Slavic Studies. In view of this circumstance, the value of *The Cinema of Russia and the Former Soviet Union* lies in bringing the study of Russian film history to a wider audience.

*The Cinema of Russia and the Former Soviet Union* follows the trajectory of cinema development in Russia and in the former Soviet Union through 100 years, starting with the first Russian features before the Revolution and ending with the most recent titles of the twenty-first century. With Rachel Morley’s highly perceptive essay on the melodrama *A Life for a Life* (1916) by Evgenii Bauer, the volume dips into the “silence” of Russia’s pre-Revolutionary cinema and then offers some fascinating insights into the internationally recognized experimentations by Lev Kuleshov, Sergei Eisenstein, Yakov Protazanov, and Alexander Dovzhenko. Thanks to Birgit Beumers’s excellent editorial decision, the reader can enjoy an expert discussion of lesser known and yet extremely interesting silent features from the 1920s: Kuleshov’s *Extraordinary Adventures of Mr. West in the Land of the Bolsheviks* (1924), Protazanov’s *Aelita* (1924), and Eisenstein’s *Strike* (1925). Beumers’s approach to selecting sound films is no less praiseworthy, for it results in a fragmented but nonetheless very informative picture of Soviet and post-Soviet cinema with highlights on national cinemas from several Soviet republics (Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and Kazakhstan). Quite a few essays are on titles that are little known to Western readership. The volume explores a good mix of different movie genres: musical, slapstick, and lyrical comedies, war films, adventure movies, and melodramas. Equally balanced is the book’s consideration of works by different Soviet and post-Soviet directors, including auteurs such as Andrei Tarkovsky, Kira Muratova, and Sergei Parajanov and directors such as El’dar Riazanov and Leonid Gaidai, creators of immensely popular mainstream Soviet films.

The volume’s essays examine Soviet and post-Soviet cinema as propaganda, entertainment, art, and commodity. Quite predictably, many scholars represented in the volume pay tribute to a Russian-Studies traditional approach of interpreting art from the Soviet Union as either conformist or dissident, i.e. highlighting political circumstances that shaped the directors’ perspectives. At the same time, it is a pleasure to read portions of essays that depart from sociological and ideological interpretations and introduce structural analysis of Soviet blockbusters which, in my opinion, will be especially valuable for
cineastes outside Russian Studies (e.g. Alexander Prokhorov’s essay on *The Diamond Arm* (1969)).

Rather than being a research volume addressed to a small circle of scholars, *The Cinema of Russia and the Former Soviet Union* follows the 24 Frames series’ incentive to introduce the world’s national cinemas to a broad audience. Thus, the essays in the “Russian” volume feature no references and have only token bibliographies to suggest the most important titles for further reading. It is worthwhile noting, however, that while many essays in the collection are in fact summaries of their authors’ previously published monographs on selected topics in Russian film history (e.g. essays by Josephine Woll, Alexander Prokhorov, Birgit Beumers, Richard Taylor), some chapters are summations of research conducted by other scholars (e.g. the essay on Andrei Tarkovsky’s *Ivan’s Childhood* (1962)). Overall, the collection features work of high quality with Susan Larsen, for instance, offering some wonderful insights into the art of Kira Muratova and with Ian Christie’s engaging analysis of Alexander Sokurov’s *Russian Ark* (2002).

*The Cinema of Russia and the Former Soviet Union* may become a valuable supplementary reading in courses offered not only in Slavic Studies departments but also in Film Studies programs and, possibly, in departments of Gender Studies. Above all, the collection is significant because it provides an excellent introduction to the cinema of the former Soviet Union for general public.

Elena Baraban, *University of Manitoba*

**Tom E. Dykstra. Russian Monastic Culture. “Josephism” and the Iosifo-Volokolamsk Monastery 1479–1607.** Slavistische Beiträge, 450. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2006. 264 pp. Bibliography. Paper.

The present volume is a most welcome addition to the study of medieval Russian monasticism. Certainly for its impact on Muscovite ecclesiastical and political culture, and on the historiography of medieval Russia, Iosif Sanin’s monastery of the Dormition deserves the focused attention which Tom E. Dykstra brings in this reworking of his doctoral dissertation. His book joins the burgeoning stream of interest in the Volokolamsk monastery and its literary, economic and architectural contributions to Russian culture by injecting a much needed revision of one of the most enduring and misleading assessments of the work of Iosif Sanin and his monastic community, the belief that he inaugurated a stifling, ritual-bound, and acquisition-obsessed conservatism to the Russian Orthodox Church and Russian political history. The book thus provides a critical reassessment of the work of such leading Soviet historians as M. N. Tikhomirov and A. A. Zimin, and their many western fellow travellers, without, however, succumbing to the temptation to discredit all of their insights; indeed the book is a model of scholarly fairness in its rethinking of what came to be known as Josephism to nineteenth and twentieth century historiography, both secular and ecclesiastical.

Dykstra revisits well-known sources, as well as opening newly-published texts and studies, to create a compelling reconstruction of the social characteristics of the monks who made the Volokolamsk monastery their home. Three areas in particular attract his attention: the social background of the monks who populated the monastery, the innovativeness of Iosif’s foundation, and the vexed issue of non-possession. Cautious in his evaluation of the sources, Dykstra reaches the conclusion that the monks tended to come from a middle segment of Muscovite society, and that while all social levels were represented in the
monastery, social rank had no bearing on a monk’s ascent to an authoritative position in the community. Iosif succeeded in inculcating the spirit and practice of equality among his monks, even if external markings of social hierarchy remained after tonsure. Iosif’s reflections on the office of igumen/hegumen led him to ground in history and theory the council of elders, who served as a necessary corrective to possible autocratic tendencies in a hegumen and who shared with him the responsibility of governing the monastery. His testament, or Rule, codified this system and assured its spread to other monasteries. Finally, non-possession was, as Dykstra shows, clearly an ideal for Iosif and his initial followers, but the material success of the monastery seriously undermined its realization by individual monks. In Dykstra’s reading, the Volokolamsk monastery was a mirror of its own society, neither a “city on a hill” or a bastion of peasant exploitation. Monks, no less that other members of a Christian society, must be concerned about the material success and viability of their adopted way of life. Everything in Iosif’s monastery was geared toward assuring its continued prosperity; charity was not the monastery’s purpose even if individual monks, with Iosif leading the way, did provide material sustenance to those who came to the monastery gates. By drawing attention to this feature, Dykstra makes an extremely helpful corrective to an overly sentimental and idealized historiography of monasticism.

Apart from these broad contributions, the study explores such matters as personal and family names as indicators of social status, the various terms for “monk,” and the economic significance of the systematized commemorations of the dead and book production at the monastery, to name a few. Here Dykstra at times loses sight of the larger picture, as for example, when he comments that young men seeking tonsure were suspect (p. 125). He does not take into account that the episode from Savva Cherny’s “Life of Iosif” he quotes to support this claim is a reworking of the traditional questions posed to an aspirant by the head of the monastery. His lengthy discussion of the term “uchenik” (disciple) curiously makes no reference to its New Testament nuances and subsequent church usage (pp. 139–142). That Iosif’s Rule does not refer to institutional charity (pp. 221, 223) is not as surprising as Dykstra implies. The Rule has a very specific purpose (which Dykstra acknowledges): to form monks in their new way of life. The practice of institutional charity would be regulated in the kormovaia kniga (Book of Feedings connected with commemorations of the dead). Nevertheless this is a very significant piece of historical scholarship which will interest specialists in Russian and monastic history alike.

T. Allan Smith, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies

William C. Fuller. The Foe Within: Fantasies of Treason and the End of Imperial Russia. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006. xiii, 286 pp. Maps. Photographs. Bibliography. Index. $39.95, cloth.

The centrepiece of this fascinating book is the trial and execution in March 1915 of Lieutenant Colonel Sergei Miasoedov, who stood accused of providing the German army with information likely to be of use to the enemy. He was hanged within a few hours of being found guilty by a military court. William Fuller has produced the fullest account to date of the Miasoedov affair, its close connection to the downfall of former Minister of War V. A. Sukhomlinov, and its relationship to broader fault-lines in late tsarist Russia. Miasoedov’s name is probably best known as the subject of a brief chapter in George Katkov’s history of the February Revolution, Russia 1917 (London, 1967) as well as an insightful article by the Russian historian Korneli Shatsillo that appeared in the same year. However, by drawing upon extensive documentation in the Russian State Archive of
Military History Fuller provides not only a more extensive but also a more nuanced account that derives from an overarching thesis about the crystallization of a discourse of patriotism and vigilance towards the “enemy within.”

In the course of a careful analysis Fuller shows how Miasoedov’s enemies constructed a case around his contacts with “German-Jewish business” (his wife was the daughter of a Jewish entrepreneur). He outlines Miasoedov’s early career as a gendarme officer on Russia’s ethnically heterogeneous and porous north-west frontier, where he developed a sideline as a military intelligence officer working on behalf of his future executioners. He goes on to show how their respective wives helped cement a relationship between Miasoedov and Sukhomlinov at a time when (to put it mildly) neither man enjoyed an unblemished reputation in the topmost political circles. Fuller is particularly good at tracing the networks that connected patrons and clients in the last years of the tsarist regime as well as the intense inter-departmental rivalries that fuelled mutual smears and denunciations. The war provided Miasoedov with an opportunity to re-launch his career in military intelligence under the auspices of the Tenth Army, where he was eventually “unmasked” even though, as Fuller points out, he was actually exonerated of the specific charge of treason after the war began. Several other innocent victims followed Miasoedov to the gallows or were sentenced to forced labour. Fuller ends his story with the public trial and humiliation of Sukhomlinov and his wife in August 1917. On 1 May 1918 Sukhomlinov was released by the Bolsheviks on grounds of age and fled to Finland; he died a lonely death in Berlin in 1926. His wife, having divorced him in order to remain in Petrograd with her new lover, was shot by the Cheka in 1921.

Miasoedov and Sukhomlinov were both portrayed as morally depraved, and as having taken money from the enemy in order to finance their sexual gratification. Fuller is particularly interesting on what he terms the “grammar of treason” and spy mania that enveloped the Romanov dynasty during World War One and that afflicted many innocent Jewish and German subjects of the Tsar. His forensically detailed and compelling monograph endorses Katkov’s remarks about “flagrant breaches of normal legal procedure” and concludes that Miasoedov and Sukhomlinov figured in the wartime imagination as exemplars of Russia’s potential vulnerability to “treason” from all corners of tsarist society.

Peter Gatrell, University of Manchester

Anne E. Gorsuch and Diane P. Koenker, eds. Turizm: The Russian and East European Tourist under Capitalism and Socialism. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006. viii, 313 pp. Illustrations. Index.

In one of his popular humorous sketches, Lev Rubinshtein records a conversation with a member of the younger generation about travel back in the Soviet days. “Tell me, Papa,” his daughter meditatively asks. “Why did you never leave Russia before the 1990s? Was it money problems, or couldn’t you be bothered?” In the era of mass package tours to everywhere from Thailand to Turkey and of ubiquitously advertised goriashchie putevki (last-minute bargain trips), not to speak of unlimited opportunities for independent travel, it is difficult even for people who actually lived at the period to remember just how difficult foreign tourism was for most citizens of the Eastern bloc during most years between 1917 (in the case of Russia) and 1939 (in the case of other places) and the late 1980s. Indeed, at earlier periods of Russian history, leisure travel was not necessarily straightforward either, as both Louise McReynolds (in a general article about tourism in the mid to late nineteenth
centuries) and Susan Layton (in an article about leisure travel among soldiers and officers) reveal. While travel to order (for the purpose of diplomacy, trade, or garnering information about foreign societies) has a long history, and received intensive state support during the reign of Peter the Great, it was only under Catherine II that cross-border leisure travel at will became a possible option for members of the Russian gentry and nobility, and even then rulers were capable of revoking mobility privileges at moments of crisis (as happened under Nicholas I, for example).

Thus, Russia was in signal respects a “special case.” Yet here too, as in other parts of Eastern Europe (and indeed in Western Europe and America), travel abroad embraced both cultural and actual consumption—immersion in exotic landscape and exotic social practices alongside the acquisition of goods not available at home. In the post-war era, as Wendy Bracewell, in particular, reveals in an article on Yugoslav travel writing from the 1950s and 1960s, the theme of “shopping” gradually came predominant; as dramatically overstated by the writer Slavenka Drakulić, “We traded our freedom for a pair of Italian shoes” (p. 250).

The main difference between Eastern European and Western tourists lay in the likelihood of being able to realize acquisitive desires: not only was the cost of travel extremely high (as Anne Gorsuch reveals in her “Time Travellers: Soviet Tourists to Eastern Europe”, a trip to Romania might cost around a sixth of the average industrial worker’s annual pay), but currency limits meant that spending money was tight. It was accordingly fairly common for tourists to take items with them for sale so they could create their own financial liquidity (as also discussed by Bracewell and Gorsuch), something rarer among Western tourists, even in the cash-strapped 1950s and 1960s.

But consumerism was not the only motivation, even after 1945. As Eleonory Gilburd discusses in an article on the Soviet puppet theatre master Sergei Obraztsov, tourists also had cultural ambitions, testing their impressions against their knowledge of foreign literature (in this case London and Dickens), and writing for an audience that might prefer (or have to prefer) armchair travel to the real thing. In addition, the non-permeability of borders also placed a considerable onus on domestic travel, whether it was the many “wild” tourists (i.e. travellers without organizational credentials) who flooded to the Black Sea coast (here portrayed in an article by Christian Noack), or the East German members of hiking societies (discussed by Scott Moranda). This last class of late-socialist tourists were the clearest inheritors of the “serious” tourists of the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries, and of the interwar era, for whom leisure travel was a manifestation of national feeling. In the case of the Latvian tourists discussed by Aldis Purs, or the Hungarians who are the subject of an article by Alexander Vari, this was ethnically as well as nationally focused; for the Soviet alpinists or “proletarian tourists” that appear in articles by Eva Maurer and Diane Koenker, there was a greater stress on leisure travel, particularly hiking—the central meaning of туризм at this era—as a civilizing activity, a way of fostering the universalist values of культурность, or “cultivated behaviour.” A different attitude again emerges in an article by Noah W. Sober on Yugoslav travellers to Czechoslovakia during the interwar decades: here, visitors took a strongly emotional attitude to what they experienced, enthusing about Slav solidarity, cordiality, and warm hospitality, so that travel became a form of self-affirmation through exposure to perceived similarity, rather than a means of contact with exoticism, in the more familiar model of cultural exchange usually adduced with reference to visits abroad.

As well as the subjects already mentioned, themes raised include the function of guide books and behaviour guidance in mediating the tourist experience (Karl Qualls writes on travel guides to Sevastopol’ and Anne Gorsuch’s article includes a discussion of advice for tour leaders and of attempts to discipline wayward or embarrassing members of Soviet
groups, who would keep on wearing outré outfits and shamefully sagging underwear). Some attention is given also (by Wendy Bracewell, and at greater length by Shawn Salmon, in a piece on the Soviet state agency Inturist) to the issue of “selling” Eastern Europe to tourists from the West, though the focus is definitely on the West for the East, rather than the other way round.

This is an excellent collection of essays, which fully justifies the praise expended on it by the authors of the dust-jacket testimonials. The articles are uniformly well written, well researched, and sensitive to international parallels and to insights from the voluminous historiography on tourist experience that has emerged with reference to Western culture over the last twenty to thirty years. Certainly, there are topics that are omitted or constricted (the experience of non-Russian Soviet tourists, or of Romanians and Bulgarians); an afterward dealing with the collapse of socialism (which generated enormous queues for tickets and currency in the USSR, just to begin with) might have been useful. Occasionally, too, minor details of the historical tourist experience are fluffed: to say that Soviet tourists “were usually happy to obtain a one-way ticket to their tourist destinations” (p. 299) obscures the fact that return rail tickets simply did not exist till the start of the twenty-first century. However, all in all this is one of the most impressive multi-handed collections on any subject that I have come across, serving the purpose not just of recording an era that is rapidly vanishing into distant history (the epoch of socialism) and of tracing its historical roots and its evolution, but also of locating turizm with reference to a huge range of other socio-economic, political, and cultural phenomena.

Catriona Kelly, University of Oxford

Loren R. Graham. Moscow Stories. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006. xi, 305 pp. Biographical Notes. Citations. Index. Cloth.

Few Western specialists in Russian studies are better qualified than Loren Graham to write a book of this nature (Geoffrey Hosking also comes to mind). Beginning in 1960 and continuing to the present, Graham—Professor of History of Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology—has visited and sojourned in the USSR and Russia countless times, probably more often than any other American academic. He established an impressive array of contacts with local people as well as resident foreigners. Among the former there are many leading figures in science and politics, while the latter include important American diplomats, journalists and fellow exchange scholars. But even by the standards of the privileged foreign exchange community—which paradoxically for the motherland of socialism elevated mere American graduate students into instant celebrities with access to the upper levels of Soviet society and culture (as well as the First Reading Room of the Lenin Library)—Graham’s experience can only be described as extraordinary. He was allowed to move in elite company, despite a brief period during the 1970s when he was persona non grata.

Altogether it is hard to imagine better connections than Graham’s, from close friendships with Mikhail Gorbachev’s chief lieutenant Alexander Yakovlev and USSR Minister for the Environment Nikolai Vorontsov to acquaintance with the pre-eminent physicist Peter Kapitsa and Nikolai Bukharin’s widow Anna Larina—just to name some of the most prominent. Other Western academics may have had equal or even more extensive contacts within the general scholarly community or among common folk and the Russian countryside but, so far as I know, no one else can boast such a high-level or range of
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intercourse, spanning the Academy of Sciences to the Politburo to the American ambassador to the multi-millionaire philanthropist George Soros.

There are surprising absences from Graham’s roster. It apparently did not include many literary, artistic, or dissident figures. There is no mention of Nadezhda Mandelstam, Pavel Litvinov, Boris Shragin, Valentin Turchin, Roy Medvedev, Andrei Siniavsky, Yuli Daniel or others who were quite well known to participants (including the writer of these lines) of the IUCTG and IREX exchanges during the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s. Some of his fellow exchangees also wrote memoirs, but again not with the chronological or social breadth of the present work. Graham skilfully combines elements of Hedrick Smith, Robert Kaiser and David Remnick with William Taubman and Andrea Lee. Still one would like to know more about whether and how Graham himself changed—especially in terms of his attitudes toward Russia—over the span of the nearly half century of his narrative.

Moscow Stories are fascinating, entertaining, and (and no small virtue under the circumstances) generally accurate. On a personal level they show Graham to be genuinely sympathetic toward and caring about his ordinary Russian friends such as Vitalii, as well as those in higher places. When it comes to his view of Russian history, there is naturally some room for debate. Historians of Russian politics (pace Stephen Cohen) might quarrel with Graham’s benign portrayal of Nikolai Bukharin, as well as with his generally optimistic take on the course of events he witnessed. But I think Graham is right to err on the side of generosity toward his Russian interlocutors.

In any case, Graham’s stories will evoke poignant pangs of recognition and nostalgia for any reader who has also spent extended time in the late not-so-lamented USSR. He quite rightly notes that for all its faults, life in the Soviet Russia of the Brezhnev and Gorbachev eras had an intensity of human connection (a Russian friend from those days once described it to me as “an overlapping of souls”) unknown in the West. The deeply passionate intellectual engagement combined with great dollops of food and drink “around the kitchen table;” the mix was intoxicating at several levels and more than outweighed any surrounding material or civil shortcomings. That ambience was and is a major reason why Western academics like Graham, as well as both graduate and undergraduate students, continue to fall in love with Russia and keep going back.

In sum, this is a book not so much for specialists (who will recognize the truth in many of Graham’s anecdotes but not learn much that is new) as for the interested amateur who wants to get a feel for the place from the American perspective of one of the best old Russia hands. And readers at every level will appreciate Graham’s skills as a story-teller.

N.G.O. Pereira, Dalhousie University

Lisa Kirschenbaum. The Legacy of the Siege of Leningrad, 1941–1995, Myth Memories, and Monuments. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. xiii, 309 pp. Illustrations. Bibliography. Index.

Lisa Kirschenbaum’s book is a “story of the stories” of the Siege of Leningrad rather than a narrative of the Siege itself, one of the many dreadful events of a dreadful war that consumed the world. One of the most refreshing aspects to this interesting and heartfelt book is that the author has drawn on a comparative historiography of war and memory in the twentieth century (though admittedly Europe-specific) to think about her subject, as well as positioning it in the context of Soviet cultural history.

The book outlines how the Siege was commemorated as soon as it began, partly by those who were its victims, and partly by the Soviet state in its morale-boosting
propaganda. As Kirschenbaum rightly explains, this was aided by the fact that “Peter’s
city” has been one of the most heavily “mythologized” cities to have existed. The book
goes on to narrate the suppression and expression of memories of the Siege over time, from
the freeze on memory of the immediate post-war era, through the many stories of
individual suffering allowed in the 1960s and 1970s, the lurid tales of cannibalism of the
_glasnost_′ era to the surprisingly nostalgic laments of some _blokadniki_ in the harsh post-
Soviet world. Chapter 8 contains a particularly fascinating description and analysis of the
debates about renaming the city in the 1990s, with some residents showing a remarkable
faith in the power of names to alter reality.

Rather than a simple story of state lies and suppressed personal memories of the
reality of war through the entire post-war period, Kirschenbaum describes a symbiotic
relationship between the state and the populace. She describes how public images and
events, such as radio broadcasts, posters and photographs became appropriated into
personal narratives. In this view, “the Leningrad myth” of the heroic city was constructed
and shared by state and survivors; Leningraders “recognised themselves and their personal
stories in the state’s productions” (p. 96). Later the developing “cult of the war” found a
genuine response as it matched people’s memories and their own mythmaking. Official
narratives were in turn influenced by Soviet citizens, who also found meaning in the large-
scale state monuments and made spaces of their own within them. They also found an
emotional authenticity when framing their stories in the seemingly “kitsch” language of the
war cult (p. 154). This language still allowed them the consolation of telling personal
stories of sorrow and loss (p. 179). Kirschenbaum’s claims, though, that the experience of
war fuelled dreams of an “‘unruly’ modernity of personal freedom and freely chosen
community” (p. 106) seem slightly tenuous here, as is the suggestion that the myth of
Leningrad was subversive, providing an alternative vision of national renewal and of
potential alternative identities (p.47).

One issue is that by “Leningrader,” Kirschenbaum mainly means Leningrad’s
intelligensia, key figures such as Olga Berggol’ts and Vera Inber and others such as
writers, librarians, archivists, curators and radio programmers. She (perhaps necessarily)
focuses on those who found meaning in their suffering and could then narrate it. Absent or
marginalized from the study are those who did not articulate their story as myth, either
heroic or tragic, or failed to find “meaning” in unimaginable personal suffering. Were there
not also those who found the state’s co-option of their cruel loss into a convenient narrative
unbearable? After all, one of the reasons for allowing the expression of personal war stories
during the 1960s and 1970s was as part of Cold War propaganda, to help build an image of
the Soviet state as anti-militaristic. Unlikely to have become public voices or “blokadniki;”
the stories of those people may now be lost forever. In that sense this book is not so much a
“story of stories” but a story of a story, the creation and upholding of the Leningrad myth.
It ends in 1995, presenting a view of Yeltsin and his followers as liberals and democrats
and a vision of a pluralistic and carnival-like modern St Petersburg society. It would be
interesting to see what new conclusions would be reached if the author brings her research
up to date, as I hope that she does.

Elizabeth White, _Birkbeck College, University of London_
Christina Leluda-Voss. *Die südgriechische Mundart von Kastélli (Peloponnes): Morphosyntax und Syntax. Lexik. Ethnolinguistik. Texte*. Materialien zum Südosteuropasprachatlas, Band 5. Munich: Biblion Verlag, 2006. Tables. Bibliography. 592 pp. €46.00, paper.

The present volume provides a description of the speech of the village of Kastéli, which is situated in the mountainous region of Kalávryta in the northern part of the Peloponnes in southern Continental Greece. The description is based on responses to a questionnaire formulated for the *Kleiner Balkansprachatlas* (KBSA). On the whole, the author has done a good job of collecting, analyzing, classifying and presenting the relevant linguistic material. Nevertheless, I am inclined to make various points of criticism, some of which concern not so much the author’s work per se, but the subject matter of the intended field of research and its connection to the overall aims of the KBSA project.

Despite the author’s statements that Kastéli was chosen “as representative of the ‘southern Greek speech varieties’” (p. 10) and because of its “intermediate position between the Modern Greek standard and the strongly divergent Modern Greek varieties” (p. 12; translations mine—NP), it remains unclear why these facts should have served as criteria for choosing the research location in question, particularly in view of the project’s stated aims. The precise goal of the present work likewise remains unclear from the short introductory remarks on pp. 4–5 and 10. After a long period of recession (i.e., the loss of dialectal features due to the normalizing influence of the standard language) —a process explicitly mentioned in linguistic sources from the first decades of the 20th century onwards— Peloponnesian speech has in most cases become virtually identical to spoken standard Modern Greek, even among older generations of speakers.

Today a considerable amount of Peloponnesian dialectal material is available to researchers who wish to access it—material like that contained, for example, in the collections of the Centre for the Study of Modern Greek Dialects of the Academy of Athens as well as other archives, not to mention a growing number of scholarly publications in recent years on Peloponnesian speech varieties. The dialectal material contained in all these sources reveals the notable differences that primarily existed between those speech varieties and the standard language (albeit not with respect to syntax) before the process of recession began (a few elderly speakers who retain a “pure” form of the variety can, of course, still be found). Admittedly, the older, traditional approach to (Modern Greek) dialectology was unrealistic to the extent that it sought to capture idealized, “pure” and static forms of speech varieties by projecting features back to an indefinable point in the past without reference to sociolinguistic stratification, variation, the frequency of occurrences, or the dynamics of change. Nevertheless, if the speech variety described in the present work is indeed a dialect in the sense of traditional dialectology but, owing to recession, is now virtually identical to standard Modern Greek—except for (parts of) the lexicon and phraseology and a few phonological and morphological features—, then Leluda-Voss’s work does little more than confirm the presence of such features as well as certain lexical and phrasal units and other expressions that survive as pre-recession relics in the speech of Kastéli (some of these lexical and phrasal units and expressions may, however, have been recorded here for the first time regionally, if not generally). In this sense, Leluda-Voss’s work does indeed make a useful contribution to the dialect geography of the Peloponnes, i.e., by providing us with a partial picture of the Kastéli variety as it existed prior to recession. However, with regard to (morpho)syntax—which takes up the bulk of her work (pp. 21–378)—it offers very little that is unknown to spoken standard Modern Greek.
A more thorough preliminary examination of the literature on Modern Greek speech varieties—usually termed ιδιώματα (‘patois’) in the traditional dialectological approach as opposed to the more divergent διάλεκτοι (‘dialects’, such as Pontic, Tsakonian, and others)—would have revealed that, apart from a handful of basic syntactic patterns (for example, clitic placement), the Modern Greek patois do not (and should not be expected to) differ significantly from each other and from the standard language with respect to syntax and overall morphological structure. It is, admittedly, unfortunate that the syntax of varieties of Modern Greek has—for the most part—not been thoroughly studied to date. Nevertheless, if Leluda-Voss intended to provide a strictly synchronic description—i.e., if her aim was to describe here the contemporary speech of Kastélli from the standpoints of modern dialectology and research on language variation without regard to pre-recession features—, then a detailed presentation of standard Modern Greek (morpho)syntax within the context of the southeastern European languages would have been just as informative.

In more specific terms, the description of the Kastélli speech variety presented on pp. 12–17 is good, even though the author fails to mention some important features that actually appear elsewhere in her book—for example, imperfect formations of oxytone verbs such as /váriyane/ ‘(the instruments) played’ (pp. 562 and 564; in the written standard—/várisan(i)e/, 1st-person plural present—/váro/). Moreover, the book—somewhat surprisingly—fails to make note of variation in the phonetic transcription of certain speech sounds. It is, for example, well known that phonetic realizations of the voiced stops /b/ /d/ /g/ in Modern Greek vary between prenasalized and non-nasalized (phonetically: ["b"] ["d"] ["g"] ~ [b] [d] [g]) depending on context, geographic location, age group, style, and speech tempo, with a slight prevalence of one or the other realization according to geographic region. However, in Leluda-Voss’s phonetic transcription of the speech of informants (be it running text or a vocabulary list), no variation between prenasalized and non-nasalized realizations is shown at all. Instead, the author consistently transcribes the indicated phonemes as prenasalized, even in contexts where they are not (or, at least, are not expected to be) prenasalized. And, finally, while the section of the book dealing with the vocabulary of the Kastélli speech variety provides a complete picture of the lexicon, the inclusion of lexemes and formations found in the educated standard—for example, πετρώδης ‘stony’, διακλαδώσεις ‘branchings’, and κατολίσθηση ‘landslide’ (p. 381)—is peculiar. Presumably, one may attribute this to gaps in the knowledge of the local lexicon on the part of Leluda-Voss’s informants or to lexical gaps in the Kastélli variety that more learned informants have chosen to fill with borrowings from the educated standard.

In sum, Leluda-Voss has succeeded in providing one of the most thorough and comprehensive descriptions of local Modern Greek speech. However, it is far from apparent how the author’s compilation of Kastélli language data (especially with respect to syntax and morphosyntax) could conceivably contribute more to the overall aims of a linguistic atlas of Southeastern Europe than would a description of standard Modern Greek itself, from which (with minor exceptions) the Kastélli variety is practically indistinguishable.

Nikolaos Pantelidis, University of Athens (Greece)
Cambridge Histories have a distinguished lineage extending back over a century, in many ways defining the state of various fields of historical knowledge and interpretation since Lord Acton planned the monumental *Cambridge Modern History* at the end of the nineteenth century. The present collection of essays is the middle volume of three on Russia’s history from early Rus’ to the end of the twentieth century, giving Russia far more sustained attention than in any previous *Cambridge History*, and in a remarkably wide-ranging and variegated way. Briefly recalling Acton’s original conception may be relevant here. It is rather a convention when writing about edited collections for reviewers to comment on a volume’s coherence or, most often, lack thereof. Serious questions of methodology in history can be at stake. When Acton was planning the first *Cambridge Modern History* in the late 1890s, he insisted that his goal was a definitive and unified “ultimate history,” realizable “now that all information is within reach and every problem has become capable of solution” (see E. H. Carr’s discussion in *What Is History*?). It did not take long for this empirical and interpretive optimism to collapse. By the time the second edition of the *Cambridge Modern History* appeared in the 1950s, the new editors acknowledged that the search for a complete and accurate vision of the past, in which all the connections are knowable, was a myth. Most historians today—even those who would never consider themselves “postmodern”—eschew Acton’s positivist hubris in thinking that we can construct a unified and final historical account of our topics. In this spirit, the editor of the volume under review, Dominic Lieven, makes no bones about not trying to create a single coherent narrative. “Comprehensiveness” in recognizing the complexity and “diversity” of the historical past is more important than “coherence,” he advises at the outset (p. 2). Indeed, with nearly 700 pages of text and contributions by thirty different authors, the volume is quite varied in its concerns, methodologies, and interpretations of the Russian past (though there are some important emphases and leitmotifs, a subject I will return to).

Lieven concedes that only the rare “martyr” will read this book from cover to cover (p. 4). Book reviewers, of course, are one such category of necessary martyr. This toil is not without its rewards, however; the volume contains a number of exceptionally good contributions. But, as Lieven implies, the book is designed as a reference. Students studying for examinations, for example (including doctoral students preparing for comprehensive exams), will find these articles to be excellent syntheses of a large scholarly literature. Teachers may find it worthwhile to assign students selected chapters (though the high cost of the book makes it impossible to use as a textbook). Scholars or students needing reliable, up-to-date, and compact coverage of key topics in imperial Russian history, ranging from literature and art to diplomacy and the military, will find quite useful articles in these pages. And the bibliography, organized around major topics, enhances this work as a starting point for further reading. Some of the excellent maps from Martin Gilbert’s *Routledge Atlas of Russian History* are also included, as well as two dozen pictures, mostly formal portraits of important individuals but also a number of prerevolutionary tourist postcards.

The volume is organized topically rather than by chronological period or ruler, which enhances the book’s value as a reference work and its potential for interpretive and analytic depth. The scholars Lieven has chosen to contribute chapters include many of the most widely recognized authorities on particular topics and eras, though also some less canonical
choices (sometimes felicitous, sometimes not). Also, to reach beyond the expected topics, Lieven invited a few younger scholars to explore subjects off the main track, such as Alexander Martin’s insightful discussion of the meanings and legacies of 1812, Catherine Evtuhov’s fascinating portrait of the great market town and provincial capital Nizhni Novgorod in the nineteenth century, Michelle Marrese’s exploration of changing and competing definitions of gender in Russian law, and Jonathan Daly’s essay on the often deadly dance between security forces and revolutionaries. These more focused studies are often very revealing about quite significant historical questions.

The first section of the book focuses on Russia as an empire (a theme that recurs, of course), including chapters exploring Russian national identity vis-à-vis the West (another recurrent theme throughout the book) and nationality policies. A section on “culture, ideas, and identities” overviews Russian culture (including a bit of popular culture) and some of the intellectual themes to be found in artistic expression, followed by three chapters on the historical experiences of Ukrainians, Poles, Jews, and Muslims in the empire. The next section contains nine chapters on “society, law and economy,” which focus, from a largely social- and economic-historical perspective, on the experiences and public actions of nobles, educated non-nobles, clergy, women, lawyers, and peasants, and on the institutions and functioning of the economy, banking, agriculture, the Orthodox Church, and law. Oddly, we hear relatively little about merchants and entrepreneurs, and urban workers are left for the final section on reform and revolution (though that chapter focuses mainly on the workers’ movement). Three chapters follow about “government,” which focus on the institutions of central and local administration and the particular but important story of budgetary policy. Characteristically, in this section as throughout the book, the ruling autocrats do not receive systematic treatment but are discussed only in their contextual settings. The next section contains a set of mainly quite authoritative and insightful articles on foreign policy and the armed forces, including chronological chapters on policy development, an analytical history of the reasons for military success and failure, and more focused studies of the motivations driving Peter the Great’s wars and of the navy in the years leading to the disaster of the Russo-Japanese war. The final section is the most explicit in raising the classic teleological question of the potential for continued reform and the growing risk of revolution, with chapters on the historical significance of the Great Reforms, the development of workers’ unrest and organized protest, police and domestic security, and the contributions of the war to the collapse of the old regime.

One of the inconsistencies in this book (not necessarily a deficiency, of course) is that the authors diverge in their approaches to telling and interpreting history. In particular, while some authors organize their articles around a largely descriptive narrative of facts, often squeezing in as much factual detail as they can (frequently, though, with exemplary care, reflecting and citing the best recent scholarship), others structure their accounts around interpretive and analytical issues, backed by factual material (I admit to finding these more compelling to read). Among the more analytically oriented articles, I would mention especially Mark Bassin on competing visions of Russian national and imperial identity, Rosamund Bartlett on the highlights and defining themes of nineteenth- and early-twentieth culture, Benjamin Nathans on the experiences and roles of Jews in the empire, Elise Wirtschafter on the in-betweenness of raznochintsy, intellectuals, and professional as markers of autonomous societal development, Gregory Freeze on the challenges faced by the Orthodox Church in modern Russia, Barbara Engel on the changing experiences and roles of women in the family and in public life, Jörg Baberowski on the increasingly significant civic role of law, courts, and the legal profession, William Fuller on the hugely
consequential and revealing histories of military success in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and military failure from 1854 to 1917, Larisa Zakharova on the complex genealogy and long-term significance of the Great Reforms, and the late Reginald Zelnik on the increasing importance of workers’ involvement in strikes and of their growing, if always complex, association with educated revolutionaries.

Thinking about this more interpretive side of the volume, I wish the editor had offered us a more substantial introductory essay on the whole era. It seems to me that these essays—even chapters that are less explicitly analytical—raise a number of critically important interpretive questions for thinking about Russian history from the time of Peter the Great to the revolution, which could have been highlighted. Lieven does valuably emphasize “Russia as empire and European periphery” (p. 1). The question of empire as a category for interpreting Russian history was indeed downplayed and under-theorized until a decade or so ago. Lieven also gives weight to the importance of taking better account of such “crucial but unfashionable” topics as economics, finance, the military, and foreign policy, which are, indeed, exceptionally well covered here. He might have done more, though, to reflect on, and even try to tie together, other major themes that I found weaving through these chapters: for example, the complex triad of modernization, modernity, and modernism (and anxieties about all three); the question of historical “turning points” (and related questions of continuity, traditions, and lost opportunities); the transformative environment of cities; the growth of the public sphere and civil society (and conditions that restricted these); tensions between the local and the central; struggles over the value and place accorded individuals or communities; conceptions and uses of morality, honour, and dignity (both individual and collective); the wide-ranging struggle to define “Russianness” (including the continual ideological use by the government and conservatives of the trinity of “Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality”); religion and spirituality (including as a question of moral meaning and identity); competing notions of emancipation; the dialogue between optimism and pessimism (in everything from political ideologies to art and entertainment); and a great deal of contraditoriness in almost every area of Russian life.

Drawing out such themes for readers would have been useful.

I could quibble with various authors about how they covered their subjects. I would have liked, for example, to see more attention to the periodical press and schooling, to philosophical ideas and values (which were intensely debated in both private gatherings and the press), and to popular religion, as well as greater effort by more authors to highlight the sort of unifying conceptual themes I mentioned in the preceding paragraph. I would have also liked more attention to exemplary individuals—both powerful and not—to illustrate experiences and ideas. But these are matters of authorial interpretation, method, and style rather than of scholarly competence, which is generally very high in this book.

Finally, leaving aside substantive issues for matters of form, I would mention again the prohibitively high cost of this book. Libraries will hopefully buy it, for it is, in most of its parts, an essential statement of the state of the field. But few scholars will. Every book has its minor errors, though one that seemed almost interpretively deliberate is the unattributed use of Vasilii Polenov’s celebrated 1878 painting “Moskovskii dvorik,” with its skyline of Moscow church domes and its carefully crafted idyll of life on the outskirts of the city that represented to many contemporary Russians the nation’s true heart, as a picture of “rural life: a central Russian village scene” (Figure 14). Finally, Cambridge University Press should have taken more care in proofreading. I found a rather surprising number of typographical errors, including one even in large capitals in the table of contents: “identities.” Having once myself worked in printing and later researched
printers’ cultures, I half suspected that this was a compositor’s joke, which often runs toward the ribald.

Mark D. Steinberg, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

James N. Loehlin. Chekhov: The Cherry Orchard. Series: Plays in production. Cambridge, New York etc.: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 248 pp. Illustrations. Works Cited. Index. Paper.

This is the eleventh volume in a series devoted to individual plays by playwrights of the international stage. In the words of the publishers: “Each volume… considers the original theatrical and historical context of a play in relation to its initial performance and reception and examines its subsequent major transpositions on stage, as well as new interpretations for other media…” (back cover). There are 13 black and white illustrations, five of them from the original MAT production.

The primary audience will probably be students of theatre and budding directors facing the challenge of a cornerstone of the repertoire, but there is much here that is valuable and important for those who normally deal with The Cherry Orchard in the literary context. Loehlin provides a detailed and thorough analysis of the text, identifying the various possibilities for the inherent ambiguities and the potential contradictions that emerged already in the conflicts between Chekhov and Stanislavsky. He meticulously explores the consequences of the different choices that can be made (such as taking Trofimov’s utopianism seriously or ironically, for example) for the overall conceptualization of the play. He, like many others, does fall into the trap of the problem of the collective for the siblings; the only thing that Gaev and Ranevskaya cannot be is the “Ranevsky siblings”!

As Loehlin points out in his introduction, this is a play that “has seen a wide range of conflicting interpretations: tragic and comic, naturalistic and symbolic, reactionary and radical” (p. 1). Stanislavsky’s original production at the Moscow Art Theatre deservedly receives detailed attention, both in its own right and for the long shadow it cast on subsequent productions (including the fact that this introduced the concept of ensemble acting to traditions that were more focused on individual talent). He discusses the tours of the theatre in Central Europe and the United States, as well as that of individual members of the original company who worked in exile after the Bolshevik revolution. Nonetheless, the production history is also one of how Chekhov’s last play eventually freed itself from the ballast of the time and place of its composition to become a staple of international theatre.

There is throughout an emphasis on British and American productions, although significant productions elsewhere are not ignored, among them those by Anatoly Efros (with Vysotsky’s Lopakhin), Peter Stein, Giorgio Strehler and Peter Brook’s Paris production, as well as adaptations such as those by Trevor Griffiths or Suzuki Tadashi, or those by Joshua Logan (The Wisteria Trees), Janet Suzman (The Free State) which substituted race for class at the heart of the play. (There are no references to any Canadian productions, such as John Hirsch’s 1965 version at Stratford, which assembled the cream of Canadian acting talent of the immediate post-war generation). The salient features of each
production are presented primarily through extensive quotations from the critics, sometimes with commentary from audience members, the participants or other actors who attended, with an emphasis on the director’s concept and the acting of those in the principal roles. One interesting fact that emerges from this is how rarely Lopakhin is paid the attention one would expect from the fact that Chekhov wrote the part for Stanislavsky, or how difficult a role it is. The numerous quotations, when taken from non-English-language sources, are referenced to English-language versions whenever possible (and it is telling that the vast majority can be so referenced), but there is very little discussion of the various English translations as such. The very last section, devoted to post-Soviet productions, does seem a bit skimpy by comparison with the rest of the book and seems to rely excessively on reviews in *The Moscow Times*, but the discussion of the impact of nostalgia for a way of life that has been lost is interesting.

This book is not intended to replace the rich critical tradition of Chekhov’s last play, but it serves its avowed purpose very well indeed. A theatre student coming to the play as either an actor or director will find here the full range of possibilities that the play and its production history offers in a succinct, well-annotated and clearly presented way.

Nicholas G. Žekulin, *University of Calgary*

**Ingunn Lunde and Tine Roesen, eds. Landslide of the Norm: Language Culture in Post-Soviet Russia. Slavica Bergensia, 6. Bergen: John Grieg, 2006. 303 pp. Bibliography. List of contributors. Index of names. $24.00, cloth.**

This volume is a collection of articles that deal with the concept of language norm as it has been established by the Russian Language Academy of the Russian Academy of Sciences and traditionally defined by Russia’s “language culture.” The collection retraces the history of language norm(s) and the role of this concept in Russian language planning. It subsequently considers the language of several 20th-century Russian writers.

Language planning has been an important part of European language academies. The concepts of language culture and language norm were adduced by Russian linguists in the 1920s and elaborated by the Prague Linguistic Circle, whereby it became a part of the Structuralist theoretical construct used for the study of natural languages. The resulting scheme of language innovation included the following components: native speakers use new lexical and grammatical forms; when these become part of general use, they appear in public and journalistic discourse. When, finally, writers use these innovations in their literary work, linguists codify them as a legitimate part of the official lexicon and grammar—provided that they do not conflict with the existing grammatical structure of the already codified language. A spontaneous norm thus becomes a codified one. Language users’ observance of such a codified norm and the related logicality of the language system are then termed “language culture.” The *kul’tura iazyka* referred to in this collection is that defined by Grigorii Vinokur in his book *Kul’tura iazyka* (second edition, Moscow, 1929).

The present collection of articles was published in response to rapid social and cultural changes in post-Soviet Russia that during the last two decades have greatly influenced the Russian language. It contributes to a public discussion of the direction in which the Russian language has been evolving, incorporating massive amounts of foreign vocabulary in technological fields as well as the Anglicisms and neologisms that commercial advertisers introduce on an almost daily basis. *Landslide of the Norm* is the sixth volume in the “Slavica Bergensia” series produced by the Department of Russian Studies at the University of Bergen, Norway, under the general editorship of Ingunn Lunde. Earlier
volumes investigated language as a tool of prose and rhetorics, particularly in Polish and Russian literatures, as, for example, in the narratives of Lev Tolstoi and the hymns of Kirill of Turov. This latest volume, co-edited by Ingunn Lunde and Tine Roesen, contains articles that explore Russian language policy from Stalin’s time to the end of the 20th century.

In her article “Iazyk-Stalin: Marksizm i voprosy iazykoznaniia kak lingvisticheskii povorot vo vselennoi SSSR” (pp. 263–291), Irina Sandomirskaja presents Stalin’s views of language as an eerie parallel to Christianity. Like Christ-the-Word, Stalin—the Georgian seminarist and politician—embodied a norm for the Russian language, “becoming” in a sense Russia’s linguistics. In his article “Performing ‘Bolshevism’ or the Diverse Minority Idiom of Isaac Babel” (pp. 235–262), Knut Andreas Grimstad examines Babel’s Russian-language style and attributes its descriptive power to Babel’s multilingualism, including his use of Polish, Yiddish, Soviet, Cossack and other registers, which are often veiled in their Russian translations. Martin Paulsen (“Criticizing Pelevin’s Language: The Language Question in the Reception of Viktor Pelevin’s Novel Generation P,” pp. 143–158) examines the language of contemporary Russian prose through the prism of Pelevin’s work, while Annika B. Myhr (“Trends in the Russian Language Debate: The Response of Contemporary Poetry,” pp. 194–212) examines the language of contemporary Russian poetry. Other contributors to this volume suggest that the lack of official academic intervention in regulating language norms in the 1990s and the consequent use of a new, unregulated Russian language in the works of contemporary writers has resulted in a “contrastive style” like that produced by the vulgarisms in the works of Pelevin and Sorokin (Dirk Uffelman in his article “Lëd tronulsia: The Overlapping Periods in Vladimir Sorokin’s Work from the Materialization of Metaphors to Fantastic Substantialism,” pp. 100–125) as well as an “unpretentious style” like that found in the works of Liudmila Petrushevskaia, Andrei Gelasimov, Iurii Buida, Mikhail Elizarov and others (Tine Roesen in her article “Discretion: The Unpretentious Text in Contemporary Russian Literature,” pp. 80–99). In her article “Language Culture in Post-Soviet Russia: The Response of Literature” (pp. 64–79), Ingunn Lunde characterizes the language of post-Soviet literature not only as a response to recent social, political, and ideological developments, but also as a literary reaction to the main currents of contemporary language culture as well as a defining characteristic of Russian literary postmodernism.

Official reactions to today’s spontaneous development of a Russian language norm and the resulting language culture are the topic of Lara Ryazanova-Clarke’s contribution, “The Crystallization of Structures: Linguistic Culture in Putin’s Russia” (pp. 31–63). There have been various calls for a return to the authority of the (earlier) norm after its destabilization in the 1990s. According to some officials, this destabilization came close to making it impossible for Russians to understand each other. Official and academic discussions of language planning and the corresponding overt language policy and prescriptive agenda have assumed two forms: a narrow, prescriptive form, which in the absence of censorship has no chance of succeeding; and a broader approach (advocated, for example, by V. G. Kostomarov) that regards language policy and planning (including traditional forms of language management) as being based on the study of spontaneous use, current opinions and beliefs about language, and public education. Along these lines, Michael Gorham’s contribution “Language Culture and National Identity in Post-Soviet Russia” (pp. 18–30) examines purism as part of an on-going reaction to the latest innovations in Russian verbal production.

Under the close watch of Iosif Stalin and with the help of censorship, authoritarian language planning in the Soviet Union was based on the views of a select few and
ultimately became part of the broader Soviet ideological construct. Authors paid dearly for transgressing against it. Spontaneous innovations, on the other hand, flourished in the oral culture, even if they could not make their way into official discourse. In the 1990s, this reservoir of popular creativity surfaced in newspapers and belles lettres. In addition, open borders, technology-based communication and international travel brought about an onslaught of foreign (mainly English) borrowings. Internal borrowings, calques and innovations, as well as professional argots and slangs, flooded the language of literature, thereby rendering obsolete the older rules governing inclusion in normative language use. Under these new conditions, Russian language authorities have since been in the process of redefining their role in establishing a new language norm. They are not alone. Their European counterparts have been faced with similar tasks for many decades. *Landslide of the Norm* sheds light on this process in the case of Russian.

Míla Šašková-Pierce, University of Nebraska-Lincoln

**Michael Melancon. The Lena Goldfields Massacre and the Crisis of the Late Tsarist State.** The Eugenie and Hugh M. Stewart ’26 Series on Eastern Europe. College Station, TX: Texas A & M University Press, 2006. x, 238 pp. Illustrations. Maps. Tables. Bibliography. Index. $50.00, cloth; $24.95, paper.

Michael Melancon’s painstaking reconstruction of the massacre of hundreds of striking gold miners in the Siberian settlement of Nadezhdensk on 4 April 1912, an event often cited as pivotal to the history of pre-revolutionary labour unrest, is the most detailed available in any language. “Malign intentions and execrable leadership,” Melancon argues “caused the massacre” (p. 110). Chief among the malign characters is the “unsavory” local police official N.V. Treshchenkov, who saw violence as the surest means to put down the miners’ strike. Melancon, though, also assigns blame for the tragedy to key figures in the Lenzoto mining company management and high government officials like Minister of Trade and Industry S. I. Timashev. While Melancon treats the striking miners and their leaders sympathetically (though not uncritically), his deeply-flawed heroes seem to be local government officials like Chief Mining Engineer K. N. Tu'chinskii, who tried to prevent violence on 4 April 1912. Melancon’s main goal, though, is not to assign blame for the tragedy. Rather, he hopes that this analysis of the Lena events and their resonance will push us to re-examine what he considers to be hegemonic and incorrect assumptions about late Imperial Russian society.

The book is divided into three sections. In the first, Melancon analyzes historical contexts of the Siberian gold-mining industry, with special attention to Tsarist labour laws and labour unrest. The Tsarist state used privately-owned firms to satisfy its hunger for gold, while its paternalistic labour regulations combined protective measures with harsh restrictions on miners in the name of order. Miners struggled against horrible living and working conditions, but did so largely free of partisan socialist ideology or leadership, and preferred peaceful resolutions to conflicts. In the book’s second section, Melancon uses archival material to examine the strike and shootings from multiple perspectives, including those of mine workers; local company managers, government officials, and military commanders; and company and government officials in St. Petersburg. He describes his method of comparing construed experiences as the *Rashomon*-Bakhtin approach, after the famous Akira Kurosawa film and Mikhail Bakhtin’s dialogical discourse analysis. In the final section, Melancon uses the contemporary press to chart public responses to the Lena shootings. He finds universal outrage at the massacre, a sentiment that transcended
regional, political, and social class divisions: commentators across the political spectrum agreed that the Lena workers had been treated inhumanely and blamed the shootings on an unholy alliance between the Tsarist state, which exercised a monopoly over the gold supply, and the Lenzoto company, which exercised a near monopoly over gold mining. In the book’s conclusion, Melancon fits his findings into a comparative context.

There is much new and valuable here, particularly regarding relations between mine workers and socialist activists. The heart of Melancon’s argument is that public responses to the massacre reveal a broad social consensus on key political and social questions, which bore the potential for a peaceful, reform-guided path of political development. We therefore should cast aside the (supposedly) hegemonic assumption that late Imperial Russian society was increasingly fragmented and consequently bound inexorably towards revolution. In its place we should consider evidence of social cohesion. Melancon posits that the key to understanding the late Imperial era was the struggle between an increasingly cohesive society and the tsarist state (thus the title’s otherwise unexplained reference to the “crisis of the Tsarist state”).

Melancon likely overestimates the current influence of the argument on social fragmentation that he describes in this volume (a sort of boiled-down version of Leopold Haimson’s famous 1964–1965 Slavic Review article “The Problem of Social Stability in Urban Russia, 1905–1917”). Analysis of Russian social fragmentation, integration and stability has advanced significantly since Alfred Rieber’s seminal discussion (in the early 1980s) of late Imperial society as “sedimentary.” Recent studies on legal cultures, religiosity, civic life, citizenship and subjecthood in late Imperial Russia—many of which concern themselves explicitly with the worlds of rural and urban working people—rarely subscribe to the model of social fragmentation described by Melancon. Indeed, many also challenge the binary opposition of state versus society. General textbook accounts often continue to portray divisions in Russian society in simplistic terms, but that is a common complaint of specialists in other national histories as well.

Melancon might be wrong about recent historiography, but that does not undercut the importance of this exhaustively researched and energetically written study. Melancon makes very valuable contributions to the history of labour, economic development, regional development, political radicalism, state crisis management, and social relations in late Imperial Russia and this book should be recommended to students as well as specialists.

Michael C. Hickey, Bloomsburg University

Ethan Pollock. Stalin and the Soviet Science Wars. Princeton: University Press, 2006. 269 pp. Biographical notes. Index. $47.20, cloth.

The relationship of Soviet science and state in the “late Stalinist” period, usually defined as 1945-53, has long been a favourite subject of historians and other scholars. Traditionally, the “Lysenkoization” of biology has been understood as the complete politicization of science, with the Soviet atomic bomb project interpreted as lending power and autonomy to physicists. The seeming contrast between the two stories has itself long stimulated analysis and puzzlement. That politically-inspired debates existed in other late Stalinist fields of knowledge has further complicated efforts to find a common thread in the science policy of the time. Collectively, these debates, in philosophy, biology, physics, linguistics, physiology, and political economy, are the “science wars” of Ethan Pollock’s title.
The opening of Soviet archives since 1991 freshened attempts to make sense of the broad sweep of science policy, or policies, after World War Two. Nikolai Krementsov in *Stalinist Science* (Princeton, 1997) drew general conclusions about it as a peculiar variety of twentieth-century Big Science. Ethan Pollock focuses only upon those sciences considered of especial importance by Soviet authorities themselves, but even this offers no easy answer. The earlier work of Alexei Kojevnikov (1998) on these “science wars” found coherence between them but only in the ritualistic elements of each debate. Pollock, to his considerable credit, finds common substance to the discussions, or perhaps more accurately, to the intrigue and thinking behind them. Even better, he argues persuasively for a real thematic evolution to the “science wars.”

The most striking aspect of this superb study is how far Stalin’s own intellectual development drives the story. Robert Tucker long ago argued that the demonstration of intellectual originality was a pre-requisite in 1925 for the political heir to Lenin. In Pollock’s account, Stalin is confirmed as a thinker, albeit not one of great originality or coherence, but one who was at least genuine in his intellectual concerns and with sufficient self-awareness to recognize the contradictions that his own interventions in academic disputes would create. Pollock proves definitively that Stalin wrote the post-war academic articles published in his name. More than this, Stalin’s realizations from 1950 onward anticipated those of the post-Stalinist political and academic leadership. Pollock shows that Stalin “turned a corner” by recognizing that science has an objective existence which could not be discovered through ideological rigidity. Yet there were limits to this change: for instance, although Stalin came to this realization, his public musings confused his interlocutors.

In large measure, this is a work of intellectual history. Pollock’s emphasis is not the extent to which Stalinist politics affected Soviet sciences, but what Stalin, Stalinist politicians, and leading Soviet academics thought on the relationship between political and scientific truth. He shows how much the thinking of the interlocutors influenced one another, including the influence of individual academics upon Stalin, and here the work operates as well at the level of cultural and political history with due concern given to patronage, the onset of the Cold War, and other factors.

Previous reviewers have praised the elegance and clarity of Pollock’s writing, qualities which very much impress me as well. My one small reservation is with the chapter on political economy, where a fuller contextual discussion of the basic terms at issue would have been helpful. For instance, the late Stalinist ascription of “the manufacturing period” to economies prior to industrialization appears to diverge from more general economic understanding. Thematically, overall, although Pollock argues that Stalin in part reflected changes in direction in the Science Department, other sections of the Central Committee, and the influence of scientific communities, were there further, subtler shifts at work? Arguably, the Soviet Union crossed a developmental threshold around 1950. The inter-relationship between broad societal development and elite attitudes towards science is very hard to analyze but may have played a role. These are quibbling points: *Stalin and the Soviet Science Wars* is a lucid and authoritative account of Stalin’s later intellectual evolution, how Soviet scientific debate germinated and developed, and the relationship between science and politics in the late Stalinist period.

Chris Burton, *The University of Lethbridge*
Andrei N. Sobolev, ed. *Malyi dialektologicheskii atlas balkanskikh iazykov. Seriia leksicheskaya. Tom II: Chelovek. Sem’ia.* Studien zum Südosteuropasprachatlas, 6. Munich: Biblion Verlag, 2006. Introduction in Russian. 114 language maps. 261 pp. €28.00, paper

This volume is part of a broadly conceived project of mapping linguistic features exhibited by the Balkan dialects. The project, titled *Kleiner Balkansprachatlas* (hereafter, KBSA), has been carried out at the University of Marburg (Germany) under the directorship of Professors Andrej Sobolev and Helmut Schaller. More information about it is available on the Internet at URL <http://staff-www.uni-marburg.de/~sobolev/kbsa/>. Unfortunately, the Web site is not regularly updated. The project includes a concurrent series of grammatical atlases titled *Malyi dialektologicheskii atlas balkanskikh iazykov. Seriia grammaticheskaya.*

The present volume is the second in the KBSA project’s lexical series and the sixth volume in the project overall. (The first atlas in the lexical series addressed the lexicon of spiritual culture [*Leksika dukhovnoi kul’turny*].)

The atlas reviewed here maps selected vocabulary items from the following field locations in the Balkans: Otok (Croatia), Zavala (Montenegro), Kamenica (Serbia), Peshtani (FYR Macedonia), Gega, Gela, Ravna (Bulgaria), Muhurr, Leshnjë (Albania), Erátura, and Kastélli (Greece). It is worth noting that the list of locations encompasses dialect areas such as Serbo-Croatian Neo-Štokavian Ikavian and Zeta-Sjenica, which belong to the Balkan dialect area only marginally. As far as lexical contacts are concerned, it is worth noting that all locations show Turkish lexical influence, while some of them exhibit additional Romance lexical impact. Finally, the same data collection points are included in both the grammatical and the lexical series of the KBSA project.

The atlas establishes a clear inclusion criterion, which concomitantly serves as a basis for comparison; lexical items covered are designations for concepts in the following four lexical taxonomies that relate to people and kinship: “General terms” (pp. 14–35), “Consanguinity” (pp. 36–145), “Conjugal kinship” (pp. 146–209), and “Forms of address” (pp. 210–244). The lexemes belonging to these four fields are appropriately mapped and treated on the indicated pages, while several concepts (pp. 244–258) remain unmapped (i.e., the lexemes are simply listed). The atlas includes an index of maps (pp. 259–261).

The material presented in the volume is rich and of scholarly importance. It skilfully systematizes relevant contrastive lexical and other data. The same can be said about the discussion of linguistic features. Particularly important is the fact that the cartographic treatment represents not only contrastive lexical material, but also etymological, morphological (both derivational and inflectional), and combinatorial information. However, the fact that category names and certain explanations are rendered in Russian may place non-Slavic-speaking Balkanists at a disadvantage; the use of German or English might have been more appropriate.

The atlas contains 114 maps representing various concepts within the above-noted lexical fields. While features are marked clearly with appropriate, distinguishable signs and geographic locations are printed in the native languages, the maps reveal two minor drawbacks that deserve to be mentioned. First, cities and rivers on the map, apart from the data-collection locations themselves, are not given in their local variant, but rather in German (e.g., *Belgrad* instead of *Beograd*); here one would expect the geographic names to

1 Book review editor’s note: The *Leksika dukhovnoi kul’turny* volume was reviewed in *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 48.1–2 (March–June 2006): 222–223.
appear in either their Russian (Russian being the language of discussion) or their native forms. Second, the background of the maps is a rather dark and unclear representation of the terrain. Since terrain is nowhere discussed as a factor influencing the features under discussion, it would have probably been better to use a blank background (and perhaps use such a background to mark relevant isoglosses).

Compared to previous volumes in this series, the present work reveals significant improvements in phonetic transcription. Previously, Slavic and Greek dialects were transcribed according to the OLA system, while Albanian and Aromanian were transcribed according to local convention. This inconsistency has now been resolved by using IPA transcriptions throughout.

These minor critical remarks of mine notwithstanding, this atlas is an important contribution to contrastive Balkan studies.

Danko Šipka, Arizona State University

Barbara Sonnenhauser. Yet There’s Method in It: Semantics, Pragmatics and the Interpretation of the Russian Imperfective Aspect. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2006. 272 pp. £26.00, paper.

Barbara Sonnenhauser makes an engaging contribution to the ever-growing body of research on Russian aspect. Although the title of her work refers only to the imperfective aspect, she comments on the meaning of the Russian perfective aspect as well (admittedly, it would be difficult to do otherwise, given the interconnected nature of both aspects in Russian) and even examines aspect in Bulgarian and Turkish for comparison. Her thesis revolves around two concepts: first, that the semantics of the imperfective in Russian is highly underspecified, making it difficult to describe in formal terms (despite such difficulty, Sonnenhauser presents a formal description nonetheless); and, secondly, that pragmatic principles—viz., generalized conversational implicatures—constrain the readings of the imperfective not in ad hoc fashion, but in systematic, predictable ways. Sonnenhauser shows how semantics alone cannot explain the various and divergent “meanings” of the Russian imperfective, and she provides the necessary pragmatic framework in which any semantic interpretation of aspect must be embedded.

The book’s layout follows a logical progression: Chapter 1 (the introduction) states the author’s intentions and places Sonnenhauser’s work within the tradition of Radical Pragmatics, which seeks to prove that certain phenomena are better explained using pragmatic, instead of semantic, principles. The formulation and application of such pragmatic principles, however, hinge on an appropriate semantic treatment of aspect. Chapter 2 fleshes out the background for the discussion to follow. Here Sonnenhauser draws a line between actual semantics and interpretation, and she is careful not to use the dominant interpretation of aspectual information in one language as the basis for defining aspect cross-linguistically. Aktionsart is also treated here and is defined as a property of the “aspectless” verb stem that “pertains to the level of event semantics” and that “relates to properties of the denoted event without the contribution of aspect” (p. 35). This definition of Aktionsart is clearly removed from the traditional use of the term in Slavic aspectual studies and brings it closer to more recent, cross-linguistic work on the topic (where it is commonly referred to as actionality). In Chapter 3 the author distinguishes between conceptual and procedural information, gives an account of utterance interpretation aimed at capturing both the stability and flexibility of meaning, and outlines pragmatic inferences needed to enrich and interpret semantically underspecified expression. Of interest is the
notion that pragmatic principles apply at every level of interpretation; there is no specific interface between pragmatic and semantic levels.

The cross-linguistic comparisons begin in Chapter 4. Given the overall scope of the book, Sonnenhauser’s treatment of aspect in Bulgarian and Turkish is of necessity limited; nevertheless, she does a good job of sketching the relevant details for the reader. Her work culminates in Chapter 5, where she makes extensive use of Levinson’s theory of generalized conversational implicatures to embed the foregoing analysis of aspect and Aktionsart. Using the complex relationship between semantic underspecification and the pragmatic principles that resolve the ambiguity resulting from that underspecification, Sonnenhauser provides a detailed account of the potential interpretations of the Russian imperfective aspect and manages to leave enough flexibility in her model to handle aspect across languages (or, at the very least, in the two other languages she examines). Chapter 6 summarizes Sonnenhauser’s main arguments and it is here that she discusses the possible implications of formally explicated aspectual pragmatics for natural language processing.

Only a few minor caveats should be kept in mind when reading this work. The book originated as a doctoral thesis, but, apart from a stylistic concern, this fact has little bearing on the work’s informational value. At times the English is a bit clunky and non-native; however, this does not present a serious impediment to comprehension. From the first chapter the author’s wish to construct a cross-linguistically valid semantic-pragmatic interpretation of aspect is readily apparent—naturally, this will appeal only to readers who believe that aspect can be understood as a reasonably uniform cross-linguistic category. This is not say that Sonnenhauser obscures inter-linguistic differences. On the contrary, she devotes much space to that very problem; here I mean only to underscore the theoretic assumptions underlying her work. Finally, Sonnenhauser’s work is conducted within a formal linguistic framework. While the book will be readily understood by those working within the formalist tradition, it may present a challenge to the non-formalist linguist.

In sum, Sonnenhauser’s work on the Russian imperfective aspect is a commendable work that expands the current understanding of Slavic aspect in general. Her research on the pragmatic principles that constrain a semantically underspecified category like the Russian imperfective is thorough, insightful, and highly informative.

Nicholas LeBlanc, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill

Richard Stites. Serfdom, Society, and the Arts in Imperial Russia: The Pleasure and the Power. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005. 586 pp.

Artistic brilliance has been counted as one of Russia’s greatest contributions to the modern world. But how did such brilliance develop out of a society mired in autocracy, imitative culture and the dehumanizing brutality of serfdom? Richard Stites’s monumental study of the arts in the period before the abolition of serfdom in 1861 goes a long way toward unravelling this conundrum.

For Stites, the 1860s mark both an ending and a point of departure. He accepts the idea of the 1860s as a seminal moment in which a distinctively Russian artistic style came sharply into focus. But rather than concentrating, as others have done, on the artists who embodied this moment—the “mighty handful” in music, Alexander Ostrovsky in theatre, the “itinerents” in painting, to name a few—Stites turns to the preceding period and the milieu out of which this flowering emerged.
Stites’s vision of the arts is encyclopaedic in scope. But unlike other recent surveys he avoids rehashing familiar stories and goes back to the sources to construct a panorama of Russian cultural life from the ground up. After deftly setting the scene in the first chapter with an overview of cultural institutions in St. Petersburg, Moscow and the Russian provinces, Stites presents three intricately detailed investigations of individual branches of the arts—music, theatre and painting—each of which could potentially stand on its own as an autonomous monograph. Stites draws together these strains in his concluding chapter in which he elaborates but also complicates the notion of a “new day” dawning in the arts in the 1860s.

Among the many virtues of this book is its precise title, which neatly encapsulates in three words the central themes. Serfdom, Stites shows, was enmeshed in all facets of artistic production. By enabling the mobilization of vast resources for the pursuit of aesthetic pleasure, serfdom made possible the creation of knowledge, skills and institutions indispensable to the flourishing of the arts. But there is more to the story. Serfdom, Stites argues, lay at the heart of a rigid social hierarchy that formed the contours of Russian society and impeded the emergence of a national community of the arts. The costs of this social order extended far beyond the tragic sufferings of serf artists. Stites vividly recounts the artistic constraints imposed by convention on members of the higher social orders—noble virtuosos, for example, barred from performing in a public for fear of compromising the honour of their estate, or (my favourite story) aristocratic admirers of the great Franz Liszt attempting to lounge about on stage during one of his concerts so as to avoid the indignity of being part of the crowd.

But the arts were not only constrained by the social hierarchy; they also provided a means to transcend it. For the lucky few, there was the possibility of upward mobility—talented serf musicians and actors winning their freedom and becoming honourable members of society. Of broader significance, however, was the movement of ideas, images and norms across social boundaries through art. Theatre, in particular, presented a medium in which nobles, wealthy merchants, students, clerks and even serfs could be exposed to common ideas and respond in common as an audience. Stites’s discussion of provincial theatre is particularly revealing as he shows how it spanned not only the social divides between the various contingents in the audience, but also the physical and cultural gaps between the capital cities and the provinces. The common space engendered by the arts, arising against a backdrop of serfdom, proved remarkably effective, Stites shows, as an incubator cultivating the emergence of a distinctively Russian cultural style.

Stites’s presentation is admirable throughout. His writing is crisp and lively, his research, exhaustive, his analysis, balanced and judicious. The attentive reader will appreciate his keen eye for the hard surfaces of material life, the instruments, the stage settings, the layout of the studio and the influence these subtle details exerted on the artistic production. Nevertheless a few critical observations come to mind.

Stites organizes his material thematically rather than chronologically. This allows him to pursue each point to its natural conclusion, but limits his ability to weave a cohesive narrative. He tends to treat the period from 1800 to 1860 as a synchronic whole leaving the reader little sense of an underlying historical dynamic. Not driven by a clearly articulated interpretative scheme, Stites’s narrative appears at times to meander, taking the reader from province to province, from one artist to the next, without an obvious sense of a larger purpose. But Stites is aware of his choices and has his justification. Eschewing the presence of an overarching telos that might “press the historical muse to the service of drama” in the manner of the build-up to 1917, Stites insists that the import of his story lies not in its denouement, “but in its unrolling, the lives lived, the arts created and experienced” (p.
Fair enough. Certainly the richness of his data and his masterful ability to evoke the texture of everyday life more than compensate for the lack of a grand narrative. Yet the elements of a larger interpretation are present, scattered throughout the 426 pages of dense text, and this reader, for one, would have liked to see them cast into sharper relief. A more explicit discussion of the impact of serfdom on the arts, for example, would have been a welcome addition.

Quibbles aside, Richard Stites has produced a fine piece of scholarship that is both accessible to the general reader and invaluable to the specialist. The production—editing, illustrations, bibliography and notes—is impeccable throughout. I, for one, did not notice a single typographical error in the entire work. Overall, this is a most impressive performance.

Nathaniel Knight, Seton Hall University

Theodore R. Weeks. From Assimilation to Antisemitism: The “Jewish Question” in Poland, 1850–1914. DeKalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press, 2006. 242 pp. Select Bibliography. Index.

Since the landmark 1984 conference in Oxford on Polish-Jewish relations as well as several subsequent international scholarly gatherings, a substantial array of historical works has appeared covering nearly all aspects of the complex history of Polish Jewry and its relations with the surrounding Christian population. Among the several areas of investigation is the topic of Polish-Jewish relations in the nineteenth century, a dramatic period that witnessed the rise of Jewish social integration into Polish society but one that, by 1900, also saw emerging national movements on the Polish and Jewish streets that mitigated against such a merging of the two peoples into one nation.

The book under review, From Assimilation to Antisemitism by Theodore R. Weeks, chronicles the history of Polish-Jewish relations and the Jewish question in the Polish lands between the 1850s and 1914. This is not uncharted territory. Beginning with Jacob Shatzky’s Di yidn in poyln (1946) and his Geshikhte fun yidn in Varshe (1947-1953), and later, for example, with M. Opalski and I. Bartal’s Poles and Jews: a Failed Brotherhood (1992), which used primarily literary sources (Polish, Hebrew and Yiddish) to examine mutual perceptions between the two peoples from the 1850s to 1914, scholars of Polish Jewry have identified this trend of worsening relations. Weeks examines the rhetoric and ideologies of Polish “society” (spoleczeństwo)—a term which in the nineteenth century referred to the educated middle class—and the causes of the deterioration of Polish-Jewish relations by the beginning of the twentieth century. The central focus is the way in which the definition of “Polish society” came, Weeks maintains, to largely exclude Jews by 1900. “While in mid-century the ideology of assimilation… predominated within Polish educated society,” Weeks writes, “by 1914 few Poles or Jews continued to defend assimilation” (p. 3). In addition to the increasingly sharp Polish-Jewish economic competition brought on by rapid urbanization and economic growth in the period under review, Weeks regards the rise of modern antisemitism in Polish lands as a central feature of the era.

Weeks points to economic change, political and cultural repression and the steady increase of national consciousness as factors that led to what he argues was the failure of the assimilationist idea. In addition to general trends, such as the rise of antisemitic Polish thinkers and political parties in the 1880s and 1890s, Weeks argues that there were two crucial turning points that hastened the declines in Polish-Jewish relations and in the way
Polish society viewed the Jews: the 1905 Revolution and the 1912 Fourth State Duma elections, when the Polish Right became publicly and pronouncedly antisemitic.

To determine the cause of the deterioration of Polish-Jewish relations—and particularly the growing call to exclude Jews from the Polish “nation”—Weeks meticulously collected an array of archival and printed primary sources in Poland, Lithuania and Russia revealing the attitudes and positions of the Polish educated classes, while sifting judiciously through the often polemical secondary works. Sources include, among others, contemporary writings, pamphlets, correspondence and a sizable contemporary press collection of some forty-five periodicals. A polyglot, Weeks uses materials in no less than five languages: Russian, German, Polish, Yiddish and Hebrew.

A characteristic of this work is the author’s sensitive treatment of divisive issues. A good example is Weeks’s comment on the attitudes among Jewish national and radical groups to Polish politics and culture. Acknowledging that Poles may have exaggerated the hostility of such groups as the Bund and Zionists, “…the fact remained,” Weeks states, “that by choosing to organize as Jews, these groups separated themselves from Poles” (p. 173). Earlier, Weeks empathetically penetrates the Polish national psyche, commenting on an aspect of Polish-Jewish relations rarely tapped into: “Through the outrage and anger expressed at Jewish nationalism, one senses profound feelings of betrayal: we (Poles) offered them what is most sacred to us, and they rejected us” (p. 6). Thus, by 1900, “…Polish society began increasingly to view the Jews as either indifferent to Polish interests or as actively conspiring against them” (p. 8).

Weeks chronicles in narrative form what has been identified as a breakdown in Polish-Jewish relations that took place between the failed January Insurrection and the end of the century. He shows that the 1870s and 1880s saw both the beginnings of modern antisemitism with the rise of the Judeophobic journalist, Jan Jeleński, along with his many publications. But the same period also saw the rise of the Polish positivist (liberal) writers, such as Eliza Orzeszkowa, Alexander Świętochowski, and Bolesław Prus, who favored the integration of peripheral social elements (peasants, women, Jews) into Polish society. Weeks points to a cluster of events and factors that led to changes in Polish positions on the Jewish question. These include, among others, the 1881 pogroms and their spread to Warsaw, the sharpening of economic competition with rapid industrial growth, the rise of national movements (both Polish and Jewish) in the Polish lands, as well as the events of 1905 and 1912. Among the latter developments, Weeks points to the 1905 Revolution as a major turning point in pre-WWI Polish-Jewish relations. At the same time, Weeks does not discount the 1881 pogroms that reached Warsaw. Drawing upon Jonathan Frankel’s thesis, Weeks points to both the blow to liberalism and the rise of Jewish national sentiments that complicated Polish-Jewish relations.

In his conclusion, Weeks compares Polish with general European antisemitism in the late nineteenth century. He concludes that one of the main differences was the absence of racial antisemitism in the Polish lands (p. 176). Also distinctive about Polish antisemitism, Weeks rightly notes, was the unique context in which it arose. This includes the dense demographic concentration of Jews, the slow pace of linguistic assimilation (only 14% of Warsaw Jewry claimed Polish as their mother tongue in 1897), acute economic competition, and the high visibility of the community due to the maintenance of traditional dress and the Yiddish language.

The persistence of Jewish separateness, Weeks points out, was not the major cause of modern Polish antisemitism. For the latter did appear until the 1880s following the emergence of a substantial Polish-speaking middle-class, acculturated and patriotic Jewish community concentrated in Warsaw. Weeks reminds the reader that many Polish
 antisemites, such as Jan Jeleń and Andrzej Niemojewski, targeted not traditional but assimilated Jews as the most dangerous (p. 177). One of the causes of the receptivity to antisemitism was the abnormal position of Poles who themselves were a stateless oppressed national minority which made them “hypersensitive to any real or perceived threat to their cultural heritage and identity.” Second, in the wake of the failed 1905 Revolution which had dashed Polish hopes for self-rule, Jews were an easy target for venting frustrations, anger and profound disappointments (criticizing the Russian government was not possible). Third, as stated above, Weeks points to Jewish nationalism as a source of Polish resentment, rejection and even betrayal (p. 177).

Despite its clear strengths, a few issues of critique can be raised. There is tension between Weeks’s thesis regarding the (near) death of the ideal of assimilation and his brief discussion of progressive forces on the Polish left, particularly the Polish Socialist Party (PPS). The issue is one of proportion. That is, what percentage of Polish society sympathized with the democratic and anti-antisemitic program of the PPS and other progressive groups? It is revealing that in his analysis of the Polish press, some key titles of the PPS are missing, such as Robotnik, the main underground organ of the PPS in Tsarist Russia, or Kurjier Codzienny, the legal PPS daily during the 1905 Revolution.

As the principal party on the Polish left, the PPS advocated full civil rights for Jews in a future Polish republic while clearly supporting assimilation. Weeks acknowledged that Polish socialists developed “an inclusive, non-chauvinistic vision of a future Poland” that “succeeded in gaining broad support” for a program that called for Jewish social integration (p. 117). That the PPS, which favoured assimilation but did not demand it, had “broad support” in Polish society is at odds with the conclusion that “few Poles or Jews” (p. 3) supported the ideal of Jewish social integration into Polish society by 1900. One could also raise the issue of the book’s title, which implies that assimilation caused the rise of modern antisemitism on the Polish lands. Such a view tends to conceal the fact that the same trend strengthened the progressive movements on the Polish street. Acculturation was on the rise by 1914.

A second issue relates to terminological ambiguity in the use of “Poles” and “Jews.” In various places, we read about “Poles” and “Jews” but also encounter “Jews and Christians” (p. 170) or, for example, “Christians and Jewish Poles” (p. 37). While admittedly difficult and even a sensitive topic (does one call a self-identified Pole of the Jewish faith a “Jew,” a “Pole,” a “Jewish Pole” or a “Polish Jew”?), it would have been helpful if the author had addressed the problem in the forward or introduction and defined his terms.

From Assimilation to Antisemitism, nonetheless, makes an important contribution to the field. By uncovering new sources, Weeks has enhanced our understanding of the complex story of Polish-Jewish relations in the second half of the nineteenth century and in the years leading up to World War I.

Joshua Zimmerman, Yeshiva University

Stephen F. Williams. Liberal Reform in an Illiberal Regime. The Creation of Private Property in Russia, 1906–1915. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 2006. xiv, 320 pp. Glossary. Bibliography. Index. $15.00, paper.

Stolypin and his reforms have enjoyed increased attention during the last twenty years in Russia, as modern reformers have looked back to the first decade of the twentieth century.
and Stolypin’s experience in attempting to reform an autocratic state. Williams’s book is unusual and interesting: the author is a distinguished lawyer who served as a US appeals judge, and he adopts an approach which many historians would shy away from. Williams undertakes a detailed examination of Stolypin’s land reform with the wider aim of analysing how far an autocratic, illiberal regime can take actions that will promote the development of liberal democracy. The book gives a detailed account of the nature of Russian peasant land tenure after the emancipation of the serfs, as well as discussing the condition of the peasantry at the start of the twentieth century. Williams then analyses the new legislature that came into existence after 1905 and the attitudes of Russia’s new political parties to land reform, before embarking on a discussion of the 1906 Stolypin reform itself. He concludes that secure judgments about the impact of the land reform are difficult, since the transition to the new rural order was never completed, interrupted by the First World War. He argues that illiberal regimes are entirely capable of introducing liberal reform—but only, as it were, by mistake. Williams suggests that the Russian government did not fully comprehend the import of what it was introducing and that, in any case, the effect of the reforms was so slow to operate that they had no impact upon the state itself in the eight years between the enactment of the legislation and the outbreak of war in 1914.

The book provides a perspective on Stolypin’s land reform that is based very much on the legal concepts that underlay both land tenure and the reform itself. This approach obscures some of the political and social considerations that determined the nature of the relationship between the state and the peasantry. Williams implies that the 1906 reform was Stolypin’s own creation, without discussing the long history of rural reform that had culminated in detailed analyses of Russian agriculture under Witte’s tutelage. Only in the final pages of the book does Williams recognise that land reform had a vital social purpose for Stolypin: the creation of a new type of Russian farmer who would be entrepreneurial and risk-taking. But there was a political purpose to the reforms that was at least as important as the economic and social aspects; Stolypin’s own experience as a landowner and as a provincial governor during 1905 had taught him that the causes of peasant discontent needed to be addressed if Russia was to avoid further revolution. It was this political aspect that was Stolypin’s particular contribution to the reform process, and this element of rural reform has a bearing on Williams’s wider argument. Stolypin had a very clear conception of the wider changes that he wanted to bring about in Russia; he wanted to see Russia become a Rechtstaat, a state based on law, to extend civil rights, and to create a stable society whose members had no need or desire to rebel. In the context of early twentieth-century Europe, Stolypin’s aims were not so far from Williams’s conception of a liberal democracy. But Stolypin faced two problems. First, he had to deal with a monarch, Nicholas II, who was absolutely opposed to his power being limited by democratic institutions and second, as Williams notes, the new Duma was intransigent and very reluctant to enter into any sort of compromise with the government. The process of transition to a liberal democracy is neither simple nor swift, as evidenced by contemporary Russia, and the eight years that elapsed between Stolypin’s appointment as prime minister and the outbreak of the First World War was hardly long enough for any new order to establish itself. Williams’s book shows very clearly the perils for an autocracy in making reform, but a much broader analysis of despotic regimes is required before reaching wider conclusions about their ability to transform themselves.

Peter Waldron, University of East Anglia
Nancy M. Wingfield and Maria Bucur, eds. Gender & War in Twentieth-Century Eastern Europe. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006. 251 pp. Illustrations. Bibliography. Index. $65.00, cloth. $24.95, paper.

Despite the vast outpouring of ink that has been devoted to the history of warfare in twentieth-century Europe, there are still blank spots in our knowledge of that subject. A glaring example concerns the lack of scholarship on gender and war, particularly in the Eastern European context. Hence, the collection of papers edited by Nancy Wingfield and Maria Bucur is a noteworthy volume that is sure to be read by a number of audiences.

The book begins with an excellent introduction, outlining the general themes that link the various papers. Wingfield and Bucur point out that, by including gender as a frame of reference, analyses of warfare have to move beyond notions of wartime heroism that are exclusively masculine and have to define wars as more than just battles. The focus on Eastern Europe means that comfortable binary oppositions (like the division between home and front) break down. Simply put, in the East, fronts were more fluid and the fighting was often more brutal. Another significant difference that Wingfield and Bucur raise concerns memory and the commemoration of war. Again the situation in the East complicates the overall European picture. Soviet domination of the region meant that official history was often dictated by Moscow and served as a form of political legitimation rather than as a form of local commemoration.

Turning to the articles, the first three are grouped under the rubric “Challenging gender roles/restoring order.” Alon Rachamimov begins by exploring the activities of Austrian nurses engaged in POW relief work in Russia. He notes that with their aristocratic backgrounds these women were entrusted with considerable powers and responsibilities. However, their treatment upset established gender hierarchies so the POWs did not see them as regular nurses but rather as representatives of their social class. Maureen Healy’s study of the process by which Austrian men made (or did not make) the transition back from soldier to civilian after World War I addresses what it meant to lose the war. Loss spelled a crisis of masculinity on two levels: that of the individual family and of society as a whole. She describes how soldiers felt inadequately welcomed home, often leading them to develop a strong sense of nostalgia for male comradeship and to be attracted to paramilitary organizations. Tensions concerning one’s place in post-war society were compounded by competition for jobs and by behaviour that we would term symptomatic of post-traumatic stress disorder. Eliza Ablovatski’s article examines the importance of gender in cultures of remembrance in post-revolutionary Hungary. She argues that both the right wing and the underground left wing saw women as the most vulnerable members of their respected communities. Both groups used stories of rape or moral depravity to exemplify the barbarism of political opponents.

Part Two of Gender & War in Twentieth-Century Eastern Europe turns the focus to questions of collaboration and resistance. Melissa Feinberg’s work on the Czech provinces of Bohemia and Moravia in World War II reveals that the line between resistance and collaboration was decidedly complicated. As she notes, “For many Czechs, the primary struggle during the occupation was not whether to collaborate with or resist the Germans. The battle that most concerned them was the struggle to protect the Czech nation and its interests” (p. 97). Hence, some groups (like the right-wing Women’s Centre) sought to work through the Nazi occupation government to protect what they saw as a distinct Czech way of life. Benjamin Frommer’s article also deals with Bohemia and Moravia, but this time through the lens of legal history. He uses the records of post-war retribution tribunals...
to assess the gendered nature of denunciation, collaboration and fraternization. They reveal that even though denunciation was stereotyped as a female behaviour, most of those charged and convicted of it were men. Men were also more likely to collaborate given that the system of governance established by the Nazis excluded women from administrative, bureaucratic or police work. In terms of fraternization, which could be professional, social or sexual, it was the latter that was most harshly punished. Women who had engaged in sexual relations with Germans were seen to have “aided a Nazi program of Germanization designed ultimately to annihilate the Czech nation, physically or culturally” (p. 121). Mara Lazda’s research on Latvia during World War II shows how the malleability of the concept of the family lent itself to use by two occupation forces with distinctly different ideological programmes. The Soviets declared the “liberation” of Latvian women and promoted the idea that Latvians were part of a Soviet family of peoples. Their rhetoric was undermined by the mass deportations that were seen as direct attacks on Latvian families since men were usually separated from women and children. Since Nazi goals for Latvia included eventual annexation and Germanization, the burning question became whether intermarriage should be allowed.

The final section of the volume, “Remembering war: gendered bodies, gendered stories,” contains four articles. The first, by Melissa Bokovoy, discusses how Serbian women commemorate the Wars of National Liberation (1912–1918). She notes how women’s commemorative acts were used to argue that the Serbs had sacrificed more than other national groups in Yugoslavia. Texts of remembrance also presented an idealized conception of what traits women should possess in times of war. Maria Bucur’s article on Romania demonstrates the contentious nature of memory and commemoration. After World War I, female writers discussed women’s bravery and participation in the conflict in an effort to balance the works of male authors, which marginalized women. After World War II, on the other hand, these kinds of personal narratives were excluded from Soviet-controlled official discourse—a fact which also greatly distorted the historical memory of the war. It was not until 1989 that Romanians were able to have access to personal accounts by veterans. Katherine Jolluck’s research on Polish women in World War II also deals with the impact of Soviet control over Eastern Europeans. In this case though, we are talking about the actual bodies of Polish women deported to the Soviet Union. Polish women wrote abundantly about the hardships of daily life in exile and were able to use their national identity, as well as a sense of shared tragedy, as a coping mechanism. This mechanism broke down, however, when it came to invasions of women’s private spaces (such as prison cells) or of their bodies (body searches, rapes). These offences were seldom discussed, Jolluck argues, because sexual honour affected social standing and, in the end, “the concept of the nation proved so masculinized that it had no room for women to talk about specifically female suffering” (p. 214).

And finally Lisa Kirschenbaum’s research presents a body-centred perspective of the war in the Soviet Union. She focuses on the Siege of Leningrad and notes how it obliterated the line between male and female bodies and behaviours. She describes how the official narrative of the war created silences about bodily suffering: for instance, the physical effects of starvation were not discussed so that Leningraders could retain a heroic sense of themselves. These subjects, to a certain extent, remained taboo even after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Gender & War in Twentieth-Century Eastern Europe is an important volume—one that challenges accepted, Western-centred, conceptions of the impact of warfare in the twentieth century. While it has much to offer specialists in Eastern European or gender
history, the articles should also be of interest to general Europeanists and would fit well into any introductory survey in European history.

Alison Rowley, Concordia University

Denise J. Youngblood. Russian War Films: On the Cinema Front, 1914–2005. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2006. 319 pages. Photographs. Notes. Filmography. Bibliography. Index. $34.95.

Denise Youngblood’s monograph is a scholarly contribution to the field of Russian cultural history. Following Hayden White’s view of film as “a form of historical discourse” (p. 3), Youngblood writes Russian twentieth-century history through the analysis of fiction films about Russia’s major wars: the First World War (1914–1918), the Civil War (1918–1921), the Great Patriotic War (1941–1945), and the wars in Afghanistan (1979–1989) and Chechnya (1994–1996; 1999–2000).

The book is comprised of an introduction, nine chronologically arranged chapters, and a conclusion. Each chapter opens with a summary of key representational strategies adopted by film directors in a particular era. The first chapter features a discussion of Russo-Soviet silent films about the First World War and the Civil War, which were released in 1914–1932. The following three chapters are about war films of the Stalin era, with the second chapter focusing on how the method of Socialist Realism was applied in war films of the 1930s, the third one devoted to film productions during the Great Patriotic War, and the fourth one discussing postwar representations of the Civil War and WWII. After a chapter on war films of the “Thaw” period (1956–1966), Youngblood devotes two chapters to examining the complexities of war representations during the Brezhnev era, with chapter seven concentrating on films that do not fit the widespread view of the seventies as breaking away from the cultural achievements of the Thaw period in favor of explicitly conservative social values. In her subsequent analysis, Youngblood charts the “downward trajectory” (p. 187) of the war film in the Soviet Union’s final decade (1980–1991). The last chapter of the monograph is a study of post-Soviet films about the infamous wars in Afghanistan and Chechnya and of numerous productions that have critically re-evaluated the Soviet experience of WWII.

In comparison to subtle perceptive studies by Yuri Khaniutin, Peter Kenez, Josephine Woll, and Anna Lawton, all of whom inspired Youngblood, Russian War Films: On the Cinema Front, 1914–2005 foregrounds a somewhat predictable argument. According to Youngblood, war films are an extremely important genre in the history of Russian film. Socially, culturally, and politically, the most important war films in Russia are those about the Great Patriotic War. The scholar demonstrates the significance of war films in the Soviet period by showing how a number of popular titles served “to subvert official history in the guise of art or entertainment” (p. 3). Youngblood also shows that despite the Putin government’s efforts to foster patriotism (p. 225), many post-Soviet films about Russia’s distant and recent wars expose the totalitarian nature of the Soviet state and the corruption of post-Soviet Russian authorities.

Written by a historian and structured chronologically, Youngblood’s study is also based on some archival research. Apparently unable to conduct research on historical documents in the archives that would be most relevant for her study (the Russian State Archive of Literature and Fine Arts and the Russian State Archive of Social and Political History), Youngblood has done some work in the Open Society Institute Archives
(Budapest) and has also used selected archival material on wartime films (1941–1945) published in Valerii Fomin’s *Cinema in the War* (2005). Additionally, having chosen not to pursue her primary screening work in Gosfilmofond, the largest collection of Russian films (Belye Stolby, Russia), Youngblood nonetheless gained access to copies of some of the lesser known Russian war films in the Hungarian National Film Archive (Budapest). Youngblood compensates for a somewhat limited archival work with a detailed analysis of a truly impressive amount of secondary sources, numerous film reviews published in Soviet periodicals, and box office data from the film catalogue *Domestique Cinematheque: National Cinema, 1918–1996* by Sergei Zemlianukhin and Miroslava Segida.

Youngblood bases her study on a selection of 160 titles most of which are films about the Great Patriotic War. Nonetheless, although the number of films analyzed in the monograph is remarkable, certain kinds of conclusions the scholar draws require familiarity with a yet larger number of films. For instance, Youngblood claims that in 1942–1944 film directors preferred to focus on “the exploits of the partisans” and “especially” on “the role of women in the partisan movement,” because depiction of the brutality of the war would be too depressing and demoralizing (p. 58; see also the conclusion on p. 235). Youngblood supports her position with examples from two short films (1942) that were not released and from Friedrikh Ermler’s *She Defends the Motherland* (released in May 1943) and Mark Donskoi’s *Rainbow* (1944). A more accurate look at Soviet film production, however, reveals a number of early wartime films that focused on men. Such were, for instance, Alexander Stolper’s *A Lad from Our Town* (released in August 1942); Ivan Pyriev’s *The Party Secretary* (released in November 1942); Konstantin Iudin’s *Antosha Rybkin* (premiered in December 1942); and two titles released in January 1943: Vladimir Pronin’s *Syn Tadzhikistana* and Sergei Gerasimov and Mikhail Kalatozov’s *The Unconquered*. Moreover, within four months after the premier screening of Ermler’s *She Defends the Motherland*, two more films appeared that focused on the army and the navy: Alexander Ivanov’s *Submarine “T-9”* and Leonid Lukov’s *Two Soldiers*.

Regrettably, the monograph has a number of inaccuracies. For instance, Pyotr Todorovsky’s 1993 feature *Constellation Ox* is quoted as a 2003 film (pp. 227 and 253). The names of the characters are occasionally misspelled, so that Uliana Gromova from Sergei Gerasimov’s famous *The Young Guard* (1948) becomes Yuliana (93); the horse Buian from Konstantin Yudin’s *Brave People* (1950) is repeatedly called Bulian (pp. 104–105); and Petr Lopakhin, the protagonist of Sergei Bondarchuk’s *They Fought for the Motherland* (1975), is consistently called Lopakin (pp. 168–169).

One of the undeniable assets of the book is the filmography that lists films by war, director, and by title. It is unfortunate, however, that despite the promise to “strictly” follow the Library of Congress system of transliteration (p. xv), many film titles in Russian are either misspelled or have grammatical mistakes. Page 251, for instance, features eleven such errors and the following two pages have nine and seven misspellings respectively.

Certain weaknesses of *Russian War Films: On the Cinema Front, 1914–2005* notwithstanding, the impressive scope of the material analyzed in the book as well as its lucid language will insure the book’s popularity with general public and with students of Russian history and film.

Elena Baraban, University of Manitoba
Anna Grzymała-Busse. Rebuilding Leviathan: Party Competition and State Exploitation in Post-Communist Democracies. Cambridge Studies in Comparative Politics. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007. xiv, 274 pp. Appendices. Bibliography. Index. $75.00, cloth. $22.99, paper.

Belatedly political scientists and economists who study the post-communist countries of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are recognizing the importance of focussing on the state as a critical determinant of successful transition to democracy. Electoral democracy and market economies alone do not ensure against corruption and predation. Interestingly, as Anna Grzymała-Busse demonstrates in the book under review, there are circumstances in which political parties in new democracies can be induced into strengthening the state, curbing their own exploitation of it, and ensuring thereby their very survival. Competition between political parties conditions their ability to prey upon the state; where it is robust they make the state stronger, more able to resist what otherwise becomes unlimited exploitation of public funds and facilities, and democracy is the better for it.

In new post-communist democracies political parties have no other credible alternative for their sustenance than to rely on the state. The extent, however, of a governing party’s ability to secure access to the resources of the state depends on the competitive situation. This, the author shows, varies in ways that can be predicted or accounted for neither on the basis of the subject countries’ communist legacies nor of conventional comparative politics theory. Basically, the countries included in this study fall into two distinct clusters: “political parties were able to exploit the state far more in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Latvia, and Slovakia than in Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, or Slovenia” (p. 6). Accession to the European Union has not made a significant difference. Whether governing parties are constrained from exploiting the state depends on truly robust competition and an effective opposition, concepts the author takes considerable care to define and apply.

To demonstrate this paradoxical outcome—where governing parties may willingly curb their own predatory impulses by strengthening a previously weak state instead of immediately exploiting it—the author has invested a phenomenal amount of work and ingenuity. Not only has she thoroughly researched the party systems of the nine East European countries concerned, but she has also assimilated and even transcended the comparative literature on party systems in more established democracies, going well beyond what up to now has passed for conventional wisdom on both counts. Among her more significant findings are that: competition has to be assessed by parties’ actual behaviour rather than merely through mathematical formulae of fragmentation and competitiveness; communist parties which reinvent themselves as social democrats are essential for the processes of self-limitation through effective state-building; and domestic politics trumps external influence when it comes to expansion of state administration and the state’s susceptibility to exploitation, which is itself distinct from corruption. In addition to presenting data on all the countries in question, and making comparisons beyond them, she ingeniously selects for in-depth case studies pairs of countries that defy the usual expectations, which immeasurably strengthens her argument.

The study looks at three aspects of parties’ exploitation of the state: the development of formal institutions of oversight and monitoring (using an original database developed by the author); the expansion of public service (state administration) employment; and the funding of political parties from state sources and its regulation. Despite occasional anomalies, by and large the author’s statistical data and historical narratives are convincing
as to the association between robust competition and constraints on state exploitation, even though the relationship is not linear. This is a model study: original in conception and execution, fully researched, and superbly analytical, surpassing even some of the work of its illustrious patrons. No one should look at corruption and the links of politicians to the state in quite the same way again.

So as not to leave the impression of its being totally beyond criticism, I found the author’s habit of footnoting practically every sentence somewhat pedantic (but who in these pages can cast the first stone?) and the bibliographical style of footnoting peculiar and confusing. The proofreading is generally excellent, an exception being a sentence informing us that “seventy-seven of forty-three parties failed to declare assets” (p. 203). An appendix describes a public opinion survey carried out on respondents’ experience with bribery and corruption, but the results of these “anchoring vignettes” cannot be found referred to anywhere in the text. Nothing is perfect, of course, but this book comes very close.

Bohdan Harasymiw, University of Calgary

Ingrid Merchiers. Cultural Nationalism in the South Slav Habsburg Lands in the Early Nineteenth Century: The Scholarly Network of Jernej Kopitar (1780–1844). Slavistische Beiträge, 455. München: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2007. ix, 378 pp.

Ingrid Merchiers has done a balanced job of placing the Slovene scholar Jernej Kopitar within the general context of movements of national cultural revival in Central Europe in the early decades of the nineteenth century. She draws on an extensive bibliography of works about Kopitar and his contemporaries and puts to good use his own works and his voluminous correspondence with scholars and other acquaintances throughout Europe. She also adapts to the Slovene case the well-known three-phase measurement of national revivals among the non-dominant peoples of nineteenth-century Europe devised by Miroslav Hroch. But she does not enter into the debate among modernists, primordialists, perennialists, and historical ethno-symbolists about the origins and nature of nations. Central to her concerns is Kopitar’s role in the Slovene and the broader South Slav cultural revivals. Of his contributions to the Slovene movement, she accords priority to his investigation of the essence of Slovene and his vigorous promotion of a standard literary language based on the “pure” language spoken in the countryside. His other scholarly activities on behalf of the Slovene cause—his devising of a new alphabet to include nine Cyrillic letters to register sounds inadequately rendered by the Latin alphabet; his efforts to establish university chairs of Slovene language; and his explorations of history, which led him to pronounce the Slovenes the oldest of the Slavic peoples—persuade her to place him solidly in Hroch’s phase A as a typical scholar-activist of the time in Central Europe. The account of these matters is also the occasion for her to emphasize an aspect of early nation-formation often ignored by modernists—the continuity between Kopitar and his associates and an earlier generation of enlighteners who laid the groundwork for nation-formation.

Merchiers points to a sharp contradiction in Kopitar’s thought and activities: at the same time he was furthering Slovene interests he had also committed himself to a general Slavic revival. She uses the opportunity to fill in gaps in our knowledge about Kopitar’s relations with Vuk Karadžić and Franc Miklošić and concludes that his influence on both was greater than many scholars have been willing to admit. She argues, for example, that Kopitar drew up a literary program for Karadžić that included the collecting of Serbian folk songs and the writing of a grammar and a dictionary of Serbian, and she points out that
Miklošič shared many of Kopitar’s key concepts and developed them further during his long career. She treats these and other links Kopitar had within the framework of his Austro-Slavism, a subject which until now has received relatively little attention. She emphasizes his conviction that the Slavs could be certain of prosperity and security only if they achieved a kind of cultural unity under the umbrella of Austria with Vienna serving as their capital. Also relevant are her observations on Kopitar’s attitude toward the Illyrism promoted by Ljudevit Gaj (he opposed it because it contradicted his own notions of Slavic unity) and Russia (he thought the tsarist regime oppressive and backward).

In her thoughtful discussion of all these matters Merchiers has added much to our knowledge of Kopitar as a crucial player in stimulating and organizing the South Slav and Slovene national cultural revivals. In assigning him a place as a transitional figure between the Enlightenment and Romanticism, and thus showing him to be eminently a man of his time, she rightly judges the influences of the Enlightenment to have been predominant in his view of the world.

Keith Hitchins, *University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign*

**Michael Moser. „Ruthenische“ (ukrainische) Sprach- und Vorstellungswelten in den galizischen Volksschullesebüchern der Jahre 1871 und 1872. Slavische Sprachgeschichte, Band 2. Vienna: Lit-Verlag, 2007. 272 pp. Bibliography. Index. €24.90, paper.**

This book presents findings resulting from the author’s examination of the language and the content of four textbooks published in Lviv in the years 1871 and 1872: a first-grade primer and three readers that were used in the second, third, and fourth grades, respectively, of elementary schools in Galicia. The language of such textbooks used in Galicia, which at the time of their use was part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, had not been previously studied, although this language was almost the only variety of Ukrainian used in the schools. (In Ukrainian areas belonging to the Russian Empire, publishing books in Ukrainian was prohibited from 1863 to 1905, and school instruction in Ukrainian was virtually non-existent.) Contemporary Standard Ukrainian is based not on a western (Galician), but on an eastern norm; nevertheless, Galicia was where elementary-school textbooks were used in the late 19th century to familiarize broad segments of the population with an incipient Ukrainian scholarly vocabulary as well as with a general Ukrainian national consciousness. They thus contributed to the important task of developing, disseminating and maintaining a Ukrainian literary language.

With respect to the language of the textbooks, Moser’s research reveals that three of the textbooks, while based on earlier versions, had been heavily revised by omitting Russian Church Slavonic elements in favor of Galician Ukrainian features. The fourth textbook (a fourth-grade reader produced by Ostap Levyts’kyi) contained fewer specifically Galician dialectal grammatical features than the other three (for example, it omitted personal endings in the past tense and the conditional mood, substituted stressed personal pronouns for enclitic ones, and eliminated the mobility of the reflexive particle). It thus adhered on the whole to an eastern Ukrainian grammatical norm, even though its author (Levyts’kyi)—perhaps for the sake of his intended (Galician) audience—had been far from consistent in his use of the eastern variety. Indeed, none of the other textbooks actually exhibited such tendencies with absolute consistency, either. Still, they differed considerably in this regard from the previous generation of elementary-school textbooks—a reflection of the Western Ukrainian cultural paradigm’s switch from Russophiles to...
Ukrainophiles or Populists (Narodovtsi). With respect to vocabulary, all four textbooks exhibit a lexis that for the most part has remained in use to the present day, a fact which Moser demonstrates by checking various lexemes against those contained in two 20th-century Ukrainian dictionaries compiled by Kuzelia-Rudnyts'kyi in 1943 (western norm) and Kyrychenko from 1953 to 1963 (eastern norm), respectively. It is worth noting that in the Soviet period a number of these lexemes, which had been created in Western Ukraine and been used in standard Ukrainian since the end of the 19th century, were stigmatized for evoking “nationalistic tendencies,” for producing an “artificial dissimilarity between the Russian and Ukrainian languages,” and for not being “in accordance with the speech of the masses” (p. 244; translations mine—EB).

With respect to content, each of the textbooks included information on Ukrainian history and geography. The primer provided reading practice and grammatical exercises in the form of sentences that informed pupils about Kievan Rus', the principedom of Galicia, important individuals in Ukrainian history, the major cities of Galicia and Eastern Ukraine, and so forth. The readers contained reading passages not only about loyalty to the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the Emperor, but also about Volodymyr Monomakh and Iaroslav the Wise. Along these lines, the most notable textbook was the fourth-grade reader, which in a passage titled “The History of Rus’” offered young readers an account of history that was not merely Ukrainocentric, but specifically Galicia-oriented, in conformity with the views of Galician Ukrainophiles.

Among the many positive features of Moser’s book are its thoroughness and attention to detail. Nevertheless, I would like to have seen more comparisons of the dialectological data. For example, Moser mentions that the textbooks reflect certain dialectal features (like the hardening of i [e.g., before a]) and labels them “widespread” and, hence, characteristic of the territory of Galicia in its entirety (p. 234), whereas in fact such features are shared by only half the Galician dialects (specifically, those spoken to the north of the Dniester River; see Atlas Ukrains'koi Movy [Kyiv, 1988], vol. 2, map 116). I would also have been interested in seeing more comparison with Polish, a language which had a profound influence on the Galician dialects (this is relevant, for example, to Moser’s discussion of the status of infinitives in -ova- versus those in -uva-, since the former may not only be a Russian or a Slavonic feature, but may also be a Polish or even a dialectal Galician feature, even if such infinitives in Galicia are found only in those dialects that border the Carpathian dialects [see Atlas Ukrains'koi Movy, loc. cit., map 166]).

Overall, Moser’s work is an important contribution to the history of the Ukrainian literary language, in terms of both the material he presents and the conclusions he reaches. It sheds light on the development of the language of school instruction, a language that influenced the speech of about fifty percent of children in Galicia (p. 17). Moser’s book therefore deserves a warm welcome and our thorough attention.

Elena Boudovskaia, Columbia University

Jeff Sahadeo. Russian Colonial Society in Tashkent, 1865–1923. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007. x, 316 pp. Map. Illustrations. Bibliography. Index.

This study seeks to apply elements of post-colonial theory in order to probe beneath the surface of previous work on the colonization of Central Asia and uncover the complexities of interaction among what the author calls “the micro-constitutencies” of Tashkent society. His ability to use Uzbek as well as Russian language sources and his access to the local as well as the central archives enable him to place his perspective on firm documentary
foundations. The book has the added merit of crossing the 1917 boundary and exploring comparisons between tsarist and Soviet methods of rule.

The book is organized for the most part along chronological lines. But there are several thematic chapters. Chapter One deals with “ceremonies, construction, and commemoration” with some attention to architecture, urban design and public display, mainly of the early period. Did these visible expressions of Russian power diminish after the 1880s? The author does not tell us. Chapter Two touches lightly on “educated society, identity and nationality.” It reveals the limited degree to which Russians and Central Asians crossed cultural boundaries, despite the author’s gallant attempt to find evidence to the contrary. One of Sahadeo’s major themes is the contradiction between the tsarist and early Soviet versions of a “civilizing mission” and the relations between the Russian and indigenous population which were fraught with tensions arising from differences in race, class and gender. He demonstrates that the civilizing mission was often undercut by the influx of impoverished and unskilled Russian settlers from the central provinces who were themselves scarcely a model of civilization. In addition, Russian bureaucrats proved incompetent or indifferent in dealing with local conditions. Moreover, the indigenous merchants often displayed greater energy and enterprise than their Russian counterparts.

The cholera epidemic of 1892 exposed the profound cultural differences between the colonized and colonizers, leading to one of the most violent episodes in the colonial administration of the region. But the Russian population itself was not homogenous or unified politically. Particularly during after the completion of the Trans-Caspian Railroad in 1888, Russian railroad workers added a radical dimension to social relations, culminating in the revolution of 1905. At the same time reforming Muslims (Jadids) challenged the colonialist stereotype of backward and reactionary locals. But the tsarist administration failed to enlist them as allies in plans to modernize the region.

Sahadeo’s chapter on War and Revolution is particularly good in illuminating the breakdown in “an already fragile balance along lines of gender and class, as well as ethnicity…” (p. 186). Similarly, his treatment of the period of the civil war reveals the further splintering of society. Here I would argue his use of micro-constituencies describes more accurately the disintegration taking place than the triad of class, race and gender. Finally, the early Soviet rule displayed many of the same problems for the Bolsheviks, with both local and central organizations often at odds with one another. Initially hoping to gain the support of the indigenous population, the Bolsheviks turned back to the Russian proletariat that exhibited many familiar features of a colonial mentality. Lenin’s desire to secure supplies of raw cotton for the industries of the centre overrode all other considerations. Although Sahadeo states in his introduction that he seeks to portray the achievements as well as the shortcomings of colonial rule, he ends up placing more emphasis on “the instabilities and imbalances of empire” (p. 234). Sahadeo’s prose does not always help to clarify the real complexities he seeks to portray. Occasionally, too, the invocation of postcolonial discourse becomes a substitute for the analysis of the empirical data. But overall this is a valuable contribution to the growing literature on the diversity and contradictions of imperial rule.

Alfred J. Rieber, The Central European University
Peter Siani-Davies. *The Romanian Revolution of December 1989*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005. xii, 315 pp. Bibliography. Index. $24.95, cloth.

Of all the regime changes of 1989 that ushered in a new era of democracy in Eastern Europe, none was as spectacular and violent, bloody and controversial, chaotic and mysterious as the Romanian Revolution, which left more than 1,000 people dead and some 4,000 others injured, and led to the commando-style execution of Nicolae and Elena Ceausescu on Christmas Day. Given Ceausescu’s tight grip on power, self-delusion, and stubborn refusal to allow dissent, opposition and alternative viewpoints, it is not surprising that political change could be effected only through a major popular upheaval, not a “velvet revolution.” Much less predictable was the outcome of the revolutionary effort. Instead of bringing opposition forces to government, the revolution paradoxically allowed second-echelon Communist Party officials to maintain control over the country and gain renewed legitimacy from street violence.

Based on fieldwork conducted in Romania, this volume minutely reconstructs the rush of events during the three revolutionary weeks of December 1989, explains the role of the most important political figures, the army, the notorious secret political police, the Securitate, and the Soviet Union, deconstructs some of the key myths and rumours surrounding the clashes, and discusses the nature of the events. Candidly recognizing that a definitive historical account of those events may never be possible, the introduction sets the theoretical markers that inform the subsequent narrative and analysis. Without pondering much from the dry literature on revolution and Eastern European anti-communist regime changes, Siani-Davies adopts a multifaceted methodological perspective, combining historical interpretation and political analysis, state and society viewpoints, and formal and informal categories, and relies on personal interviews, official communiqués, governmental inquiry reports, newspaper articles, and secondary literature published in Romanian.

Chapter 1 disentangles the root causes of the revolution by raising some questions to which Romanians have waited for answers ever since. Political repression, economic malaise, popular mobilization, a culture of secrecy and widespread surveillance, and an optimal international context are identified as determinants for the revolutionary spark. Dictator Ceausescu’s undignified flight from Bucharest in the face of popular discontent and abandonment on the part of his close collaborators, the ensuing infighting that engulfed Bucharest and other major Romanian cities, and the way the obscure communist-led National Salvation Front established its hold over the country are discussed in Chapters 2 and 3. The next two chapters explore “the most obscure problem” of the “terrorists” blamed for the loss of life following Ceausescu’s arrest, the Front’s mysterious origins, and the Council it set up to control the machinery of the transitional government. As Chapter 6 recounts how, once violence ebbed, it became apparent that the revolution divided more than it united the Romanians. There was “a marked lack of consensus” on the interpretation of revolutionary events, on their general purpose, and on the direction the country was to follow in the near future. Faced with the Front’s refusal to share power, the opposition lamented that the revolution removed Ceausescu but not the system he had created. Street demonstrations continued, culminating in the June 1990 clashes between peaceful protesters gathered in the University Square in Bucharest and the Front. In the concluding chapter, Siani-Davies returns to the nature of the events and the popular narratives constructed around them. His position is that events resembled a revolution more than an uprising or a coup d’état, although initially the Front leaders were reluctant to embrace the term and behaved as if they had plotted a coup d’état for years. The failure to effect meaningful elite change prompted the opposition to talk about the “stolen” revolution, a
concept assuming that the revolution really had been a popular liberal movement seeking the complete overthrow of the communist system, but hijacked by plotters drawn from the Communist Party second echelon.

Unless sensitive secret archives are opened and extensive interviews are conducted with a significant number of participants, this carefully constructed and thorough study will likely remain the definitive work on the Romanian Revolution of December 1989 for years to come. Siani-Davies skilfully combines the compassion needed to understand the perspective—sometimes emotional—of those who directly participated in the events with the detachment of the independent observer. Written in an accessible style, this rich volume will be of interest to students and academics seeking to understand revolutions, and the Romanian transition from communism to democracy.

Lavinia Stan, Concordia University

Mark D. Steinberg and Heather J. Coleman, eds. Sacred Stories. Religion and Spirituality in Modern Russia. Indiana-Michigan Series in Russian and East European Studies. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2007. vii, 405. Illustrations. Bibliographical references. Index.4

This volume consists of fifteen essays on various aspects of Russian religious modernity and promises to fill a gap in the cultural history of Late Imperial Russia. The authors and editors wittingly shun from analysis of institutionalized religion and church-state relationship. Instead they focus on aspects of popular religion, religion and the individual, religion and art, and on a broader issue of how religion shaped modern identities.

The opening essay by Christine Worobec analyzes 247 press reports of miracles related to three nineteenth-century saints. The article establishes the social profile of the recipients of miraculous cures and provides insight into the popular attraction of sainthood in the modern age. It also analyzes the intentions, as well as the didactic, ideological and moral purposes of the “miracle tales.” Roy Robson’s essay is based on travel accounts to Solovetski monastery by pilgrims. It raises important questions about the changes in popular religion in the Late Imperial period, using the case-study of a remote monastery that turned into a vibrant religious centre capable of accommodating thousands of pilgrims with the aid of modern transportation and skilful monastic management.

Vera Shevzov deals with the narratives related to the Kazan Mother of God icon and demonstrates how through the visual image, liturgy and homily popular perception of the Kazan Mother of God icon was “scripted” by associating the icon with a specific version of national identity and with moral and spiritual norms of individual behaviour.

Gregory Freeze’s article, based on the ‘failed divorce’ cases that were considered by the Vilna consistory and local courts, shows a wide gap between the ‘sacramentalist’ conception of marriage held by the church, on the one hand, and the secularist view of divorce by the laity, on the other. He distinguishes between several types of ‘divorce narratives’ according to class, gender and religion showing profound differences in perception of marriage among the privileged and unprivileged, male and female plaintiffs.

Two contributions to the volume, by William Wagner and Nadieszda Kizenko, bring into focus the gendered aspect of “sacred stories.” Kizenko examines 163 written confessions that have been retained in the personal files of Father John of Kronstadt, 121 of

---

4 Book review editors’ own works are prepared for publication by the editor, Oleh S. Ilnytzkyj.
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which came from women. She points out that women were more prone to internalize the ideas of culpability that were present in the standard Orthodox prayers for penitents and to admit their lack of knowledge of the Orthodox faith. Wagner’s article examines the evolution of the Orthodox discourse about women in the course of the nineteenth century. He demonstrates that by the late nineteenth century even conservative sections of the Orthodox Church recognized women’s social roles, thus expanding the previously limited views of women that focused on their roles as mothers and wives.

Three contributions, by Paul Werth, Heather Coleman and Nicholas Breyfogle deal with the problems of sectarianism and confessional transfer during the era marked by the changes of the official norms of religious tolerance. Werth’s article shows contentious understanding of the “freedom of conscience” by the various groups within Russian officialdom and the uneasiness with which the state reacted to conversions to heterodox faiths and to Christian sectarianism. Coleman’s article addresses the subject of religious violence between sectarians and the Orthodox villagers. It points out that religious dissidence destabilized the social fabric of the traditional community, including family relationship and village administration. However, she remarks, religious violence served different purposes in the discourse of the educated observers: while some emphasized the inadequacy of the laws on freedom of conscience, others advocated the need to protect Orthodoxy.

Breyfogle argues that in the Late Imperial period Molokans underwent communal and religious institutionalization that expressed itself in new attitudes to sacred space. In their struggle with the tsarist state for further civil rights concessions, the sectarians, Breyfogle stresses, “were entering into a larger public sphere in Russia and, in the process, helping to redefine it” (p. 246). Yet, Molokans’ contribution to the Russian public sphere was limited due to internal divisions and narrow communal interests.

Three articles by Sarah Abrevaya Stein, Gabriella Safran and Mark Steinberg deal with the permeable boundary between the secular and religious spheres. While Stein demonstrates how the apparently secular Jewish popular press appealed to a religious readership, Safran dwells on the ways in which secular political activists selectively utilized Hasidic legends. From Steinberg’s elegant essay, the reader learns how Russian worker-poets used the religious idiom in their poetry, promoting a sense of Self that was often modeled on Christian symbolism and imagery. Steinberg interprets the religious language of workers’ poetic language as a way to articulate workers’ emotional worlds that were filled with the experiences of suffering and affliction. It argues that the presence of the “sacred story” in the workers’ creative writing was neither ‘spillage’ nor simply a residue of faith but a complex combination of both.

Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal’s contribution discusses the ironic ways in which the Nietzschean philosophy of “death of God” inspired Russian religious thinkers of the Silver Age, such as Merezhkovskii, Ivanov and Florenskii, who conflated the elements of Nietzsche’s thought with the Orthodox religion. The theme of a dialogue between modernity and traditional religion is continued in the contribution by Alexei Kurbanovsky who discusses the references to Orthodox icon-painting and theology in the art of the Russian avant-garde artist Kazimir Malevich. While the rejection of the linear perspective and mimetic representation were typical features of European twentieth-century art, Malevich’s own search for new aesthetics and artistic language reveals deep mystical awareness that, in the words of Kurbanovsky was a “unique yet characteristic sacred story” of the Russian religious renaissance of fin-de-siècle. The essay by Paul Valliere concludes the volume by underlining just how important was the theme of dialogue between religion and the modern world for the religious thinkers of the Silver Age. He points out that the
search for new theological language in the writings of P. Florenskii, V. Solov’ev and S. Bulgakov should be interpreted not as “Gnostic and theosophical scholasticism” but as a modern Russian theology of culture that sought to overcome “the disjunction between religious tradition and modern secular civilization” (p. 378).

The volume deals unevenly with the one of its central themes, i.e., the sacred narrative: some of these essays treat their sources as transparent, fail to engage with the problems of script and narrative, and present beliefs and identities as fixed rather than “in flux.” On the whole, however, we have a finely edited collection of intellectual, social and cultural histories that will be an invaluable addition to the reading lists of graduate students of Russian history.

Irina Paert, Tallinn University

Klaus Steinke and Xhelal Ylli. Die slavischen Minderheiten in Albanien (SMA). 1. Teil: Prespa, Vërnik, Boboshtica. Slavistische Beiträge, 458. Munich: Otto Sagner, 2007. 374 pp. CD. Bibliography. Maps. €36.00, paper.

The Albanian language is spoken by about three million in the Republic of Albania. In that country there are, however, several other languages in use by ethnic minorities: Greek and Aromanian in the south, Romani used by many members of the Roma community, and several southern Slavic dialects. The present volume, Die slavischen Minderheiten in Albanien (‘The Slavic Minorities of Albania’), is the first in a new series entitled “The Slavic Minorities in Southeastern Europe.”

According to the statistics that the authors regard as acceptable, there are about 27,000 people in Albania whose native language is a form of southern Slavic. They are concentrated in five regions: (1) Macedonian-speakers in Prespa in southeastern Albania; (2) Macedonian-speakers in Golloborda on the Albanian-Macedonian border, south of Dibra, in eastern central Albania; (3) Goran-speakers in the Luma or Gora region southeast of Kukës in northeastern Albania; (4) Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian-speakers from the village of Vraka, north of Shkodra in northwestern Albania; and (5) isolated Slavic-speakers from the village of Borakaj near Durrës in western central Albania. The most prominent and numerous group is the first, the Macedonian-speakers in nine villages on the west side of Lake Prespa, together with the village of Vërnik, to which this volume, Part 1, is devoted.

In their introduction (pp. 9–20), the authors provide detailed statistical information on the presence of Prespa Slavs, contrasting earlier literature on the subject with their own findings. They explain the purpose of their research in this project, which was carried out on several expeditions to Albania in 2002 and 2003, in particular in light of the period of mass migration and urbanisation that changed and is changing the population structure of Albania drastically.

The core of the volume is divided into detailed dialect studies of the language variants spoken in the three sub-regions: the villages of Lake Prespa (pp. 21–252), the village of Vërnik near the Kapshtica border-crossing to Greece (pp. 253–301), and the now largely assimilated village of Boboshtica southeast of Korça (pp. 302–359). The results of their research are particularly copious for the villages of Prespa. After introductory information on the population structure and dynamics thereof, on education, contacts and culture, and the economy of the area, we are offered a well-structured investigation of the phonology and morphology of the dialect(s), as well as eighty pages of recorded texts in transcription from all of the nine villages. Many of these texts are on the accompanying CD, which will
be a delight to anyone interested in Macedonian dialects. Similar material is offered for Vërnik and, though to a lesser extent, for Boboshtica.

The appendix to the book (pp. 360–374) provides one dialect text from the village of Lin on Lake Ohrid, where Slavic is now defunct, two maps of the region, lists of the contents of the CD and of the informants, and a five-page bibliography.

There can be no doubt that this is the most thorough study of the language of the Slavic minority in southeastern Albania to date, and the authors and team are to be congratulated on their ground-breaking work. One already looks forward to the other parts of the study, i.e., on the other Slavic dialects of Albania. The series “The Slavic Minorities in Southeastern Europe,” however, goes beyond Albania. The second study to appear will focus on the Slavic dialects of northern Greece.

Robert Elsie, Olzheim (Germany)

Nikolaos H. Trunte. Minima Graeca: eine Einführung in das Griechische für Slavisten in 15 Lektionen. Slavistische Beiträge, 456. (Studienhilfen, Band 16.) Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2007. xviii, 366 pp. Tables. Illustrations. Greek-German glossary. €24.00, paper.

This book comprises fifteen lessons—equally usable by Slavists and non-Slavists—that treat the phonology and grammar (inflectional morphology, derivational morphology, and syntax) of Greek in synchronic as well as diachronic perspective. The presentation is detailed and comprehensive and thus more valuable than that found in conventional manuals and textbooks on the subject. The book treats not only Ancient and Koine, or Hellenistic, Greek (i.e., the Greek of the early centuries AD, including the language designated as New Testament Greek), but also (albeit to a lesser extent) Medieval and Modern Greek. Each lesson is accompanied by at least one substantial text that has been carefully annotated and glossed. The author notes (p. xiii) that he presents the grammar of Greek with the needs of those who wish to read Church Slavonic (i.e., Old Church Slavonic and/or its Bulgarian recension) in mind (e.g., early presentation of the aorist). Following the lessons, he includes German translations of the texts (pp. 316–336) together with a Greek-German glossary (pp. 317–366).

As an introduction to Greek, this book has much to recommend it. Although it is formatted as a textbook, its attention to detail, to various stages of Greek, and to Indo-European, means that scholars will find it of value as a reference. As an introduction to Greek specifically for Slavists, however, it is of less value. There can be no doubt that the author saw Slavists as his primary audience, as he makes this clear not only in the book’s subtitle, but also in the first paragraph of the Introduction (p. xi), stating that “…die Beschäftigung mit der älteren slavischen Literatur ohne Kenntnis des Griechischen [ist] ein Ding der Unmöglichkeit.” Be that as it may, with respect to the book’s actual content, the major reflection of this claim is restricted to the textual component of the lessons, which include selections that exist in Church Slavonic translation or which “zumindest von Relevanz für die Slavia sind” (p. xiii). Such texts are of obvious importance in a book prioritizing Slavists as its audience, but the author would have achieved this goal with greater success by including—in some, if not all, instances—at least part of the relevant Church Slavonic texts with appropriate grammatical commentary relating them to their Greek sources. Yet no Church Slavonic texts are included, nor is there any general discussion or characterization either of them (e.g., their external history) or of Church Slavonic as such (i.e., its earliest structure, which is in part reconstructed), not to mention the changes it underwent in the transition to its Bulgarian recension. The author may have
assumed that this is knowledge already possessed by Slavists who come to Greek, but many Slavists, especially in today’s academic world, do not have such knowledge, least of all in the important area of syntax, which typically takes second place to morphology and translation in university courses in Church Slavonic and/or medieval texts. Alternatively, the author may have intended that his book be used in conjunction with his own textbook of Church Slavonic (vol. 264 in the Slavistische Beiträge series [5th, rev. ed. Studienhilfen, Band 1. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2001]), but that cannot be presumed. Finally, in summarizing the grammatical structure of Church Slavonic as background, the author might profitably have provided a comparison of it with Greek—in particular New Testament Greek—and treated, even if only in an introductory fashion, problems of translation from the latter relating to structural differences, including areas of Church Slavonic and Greek grammar which are to some extent similar (e.g., the category of aspect, which is common to Church Slavonic and New Testament [and other forms of] Greek). It is true that there are references to Slavic grammar in the commentaries that accompany the texts and in the brief sections on syntax, but there is nothing sustained or detailed enough to provide significant insight into the grammatical system of Church Slavonic relative to its role in the translation of Greek constructions.

In concluding, I wish to emphasize my view that this book, as it stands, is of high quality. The author’s description of his work as a textbook notwithstanding, it offers a scholarly treatment of the structure and history of Greek which will be of use not only to those with an interest in the texts, but also to those with an interest in the system itself and its internal history. The brevity of the author’s treatment of Slavic-related texts and grammatical phenomena in no way detracts from the excellence, depth, and sophistication of his presentation of the Greek data. A more substantial and comprehensive treatment of the Slavic material, however, might have made the work a definitive and much needed self-contained reference work and manual for Slavists who come to it with a knowledge of only the fundamentals of Church Slavonic.

Mark J. Elson, University of Virginia

Alexandre Vatiline et Larissa Malachenko, ed. Dessine-moi un bolchevik. Les Caricaturistes du Kremlin, 1923–1937. Traduit du russe et de l’anglais par François-Xavier Nérard. Préface et compléments de François-Xavier Nérard. Paris: Tallandier, 2007. xv, 223 p. Illustrations. (Traduction française de Piggy Foxy and the Sword of Revolution. Bolshevik Self-Portraits. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006. 224 p. Illustrations.)

Comment se sont nouées et dénouées les intrigues politiques qui, au fil des réunions à huit clos du Politbouro, ont lentement pavé la voie aux purges d’avant-guerre? C’est la principale question à laquelle les historiens moscovites A.Ju. Vatlin et L.N. Malašenko tentent de répondre dans leur ouvrage, en s’appuyant néanmoins sur une documentation pour le moins inusitée. En effet, Dessine-moi un bolchevik est un album reproduisant 181 dessins inédits réalisés par certains membres du Politbouro entre 1923 et 1937, et sélectionnés par les auteurs dans les Archives nationales russes d’histoire sociale et politique (RGASPI) de Moscou. Les dessins reproduits, outre ceux qui ne sont pas attribués, ont principalement été exécutés par V.I. Mežlauk, E.M. Jaroslavskij et N.I. Buharin. Édition en langue française d’une publication déjà parue en langue anglaise aux presses de l’Université de Yale en 2006, Dessine-moi un bolchevik est préfacé par l’historien François-Xavier Nérard, également traducteur de l’ouvrage, comporte une
introduction et deux parties respectivement intitulées « Portraits de chefs » et « Des camarades et des problèmes ». L’ouvrage est complété par de courtes notices biographiques des personnalités représentées dans les dessins, un index des dessins classés par auteurs et une liste indiquant pour chaque dessin les techniques utilisées ainsi que sa localisation dans la collection du RGASPI.

Un certain pragmatisme didactique conditionne l’organisation de l’ensemble de l’ouvrage et, conséquemment, l’analyse du corpus iconographique que proposent les auteurs. Destinée à familiariser le lecteur avec les personnalités représentées dans les dessins analysés dans la seconde partie de l’ouvrage, la partie de l’album intitulée « Portraits de chefs » fait la part belle au portrait, genre de prédilection dans l’iconographie révolutionnaire russe depuis la seconde moitié du XIXᵉ siècle. En tout, 52 bonzes du parti sont présentés dans cette section. Chaque personnalité se voit consacrée deux pages : la première page reproduit un portrait photographique de l’intéressé, accompagné d’une brève notice biographique, alors qu’un voire plusieurs dessins le représentant sont disséminés sur la page opposée, chaque dessin étant adjoint d’une note explicitant son contenu. Le court texte de présentation introduisant cette partie de l’ouvrage renseigne le lecteur sur l’ordonnancement de cette « galerie de portraits » (p. 11), ainsi que la désignent les auteurs. La hiérarchie et l’ordre d’entrée au Politbureau conditionnant la présentation des portraits, ce sont ceux de Lenin, Stalin et des principales figures du bureau politique (Kamenev, Trockii, Zinov’ev, Buharin, Kalinin, Molotov, etc.,...) qui ouvrent l’album. Ils sont suivis par les portraits des anciens membres de l’opposition (Pjatakov, Radek et Smilga), de hauts responsables (Sol’c, Škirjatov et Jaroslavskij) et de présidents de la Banque d’État (Marjasin, Kruglikov, Tumanov et Brjuhanov). Enfin, diverses personnalités économiques et militaires, des collaborateurs du comité central et des hommes de science et de culture complètent ce panthéon du bolchevisme. La présence de Nadežda Krupskaja, seule personnalité féminine représentée dans cette partie de l’ouvrage, vient rappeler à quel point le monde clos du Politburo constituait un univers presque exclusivement masculin, ce que souligne justement l’historien Nérard dans sa préface (p. viii).

La seconde partie de l’ouvrage, intitulée « Des camarades et des problèmes », est consacrée à l’analyse d’un corpus de dessins relatant l’actualité du Politburo. Ces dessins, le plus souvent des caricatures, sont rassemblés dans quatre sections thématiques et analysés dans un court essai. Intitulée « Dérives et oppositions », la première section thématique s’attache à présenter les intrigues politiques sévrissant entre les différentes tendances du parti et les conflits opposant personnellement certains bolcheviks dans la seconde moitié des années vingt. Les auteurs souhaitent expliciter comment les héritiers de Lenin se sont liés, ligués et entredéchirés au sujet de la définition de la ligne générale du parti. Les images relatent principalement les manoeuvres pour écarter l’opposition trotskiste et les dissensions au sein de la « troïka Stalin-Zinov’ev-Kamenev » relativement au sort de la NEP. La seconde section transporte le lecteur au début des années trente, dans une période où le parti semble, selon les auteurs, avoir retrouvé une unité relative, quoique très superficielle si on en juge par le ton de certaines caricatures. Le titre de cette section, « En complément à l’ordre du jour… », semble faire référence au fait que les dessins relèvent essentiellement des événements déjà connus des historiens familiers avec l’ordre du jour des réunions du Politburo, tout en témoignant néanmoins de tensions scrupuleusement omises dans les comptes rendus sténographiques officiels. La section « Grands desseins et goulets d’étranglement » est consacrée aux problèmes économiques qui, si on en croit les auteurs, constituent le thème principal de l’ensemble de dessins de la collection des RGASPI, principalement en raison de la nature des responsabilités octroyées au plus prolifique des dessinateurs du Politburo, V.Mežlauk. C’est également à
Mežlauk que l’on doit la totalité des dessins formant la section qui clôt l’album, intitulée « Le congrès des vainqueurs et le plénum des condamnés ». Pensée par les auteurs comme un « reportage en dessins » (p. 8) du XVIIe congrès du parti tenu en 1934 et du plénum du comité central de février – mars 1937, cette section relate les principales interventions entendues pendant ces deux assemblées, déterminantes dans l’histoire soviétique en ce qu’elles consolidèrent à la fois l’hégémonie de Stalin et la logique de la Terreur au fondement de celle-ci.

Au fil de leur présentation du corpus iconographique que nous fait découvrir Dessine-moi un bolchevik, les auteurs révèlent l’existence, au sein du microcosme que constitue le Politibjuro, d’un cadre inédit de légitimation sociale d’une pratique artistique non moins inusitée. Produits par et pour des bolcheviks, les dessins circulent de main en main entre les membres du bureau politique, étant annotés par les uns et collectionnés par les autres. Toutefois, l’appréciation que les auteurs ont de ce cadre de légitimation est malheureusement empêtrée dans un système de valeurs esthétiques que ce cadre aurait justement permis de remettre en question. Pour cette raison que les dessins des bolcheviks ne procèdent pas de l’activité d’artistes, au sens canonique du terme, les auteurs refusent d’emblée d’aborder l’importante question des motivations justifiant cette production graphique particulière (p. 1) et cantonnent leur jugement de cette production dans une logique quelque peu documentaliste où toute l’importance historique de ces dessins est réduite à leur seul « caractère de mémoires visuels » (p. 4). Une telle réduction condamne malheureusement les dessins à n’être que de simples « reflets du monde de leurs auteurs » (p. 7), postulat qui engendre une certaine banalisation de la valeur historique intrinsèque des images, ce dont témoignent les analyses très succinctes qu’en font les auteurs. Cette banalisation est également perceptible dans l’organisation même des parties de l’ouvrage, en ce que celle-ci sanctionne d’emblée une séparation et une hiérarchisation entre portraits et dessins de nature plus événementielle. En instituant la vraisemblance comme critère d’évaluation du rapport des représentations au réel, les auteurs créent une opposition artificielle entre l’objectivité supposée du portrait photographique et la subjectivité du portrait graphique, signifiée dans la mise en page de la première partie de l’ouvrage et fondée sur la logique contestable voulant que plus un portrait est caricatural, plus son caractère idéologique est évident.

Au-delà de l’érudition historique incontestable dont témoigne son riche contenu factuel, Dessine-moi un bolchevik constitue une des rares publications qui réunit un corpus iconographique permettant de considérer des révolutionnaires « professionnels » en tant que producteurs d’images. En ce sens, l’ouvrage soulève des questions fondamentales en ce qui concerne le rapport particulier des révolutionnaires aux images, sans toutefois parvenir proposer des réponses toujours satisfaisantes. Dessine-moi un bolchevik se démarque néanmoins des nombreuses publications qui, abordant la production artistique soviétique, fondent leurs analyses sur le paradigme relativement galvaudé de l’avant-garde artistique ou qui subissent systématiquement cette production sous la catégorie du réalisme socialiste.

Alexis Desgagnés, Université de Montréal