BOOK REVIEWS

LITERATURE AND FINE ARTS

Smotryc'kyj, Meletij. *Rus' Restored: Selected Writings of Meletij Smotryc'kyj 1610–1630*. Translated and annotated with an introduction by David Frick. Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, English Translations, 7. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005. lxx + 810 pp. $32.50. ISBN 0-916458-64-4.

David Frick has been working on this translation for about twenty years and on the fascinating figure of Meletij Smotryc'kyj even longer. Smotryc'kyj (ca. 1577–1633) was a Ruthenian churchman who studied at Protestant institutions in Germany and also spent three years in Istanbul and the Holy Land. He was the most brilliant polemist on the Orthodox side in the disputes that agitated Polish-Lithuanian Rus' in the wake of the church union of Brest (1596). He later became the most brilliant polemist on the Uniate side of this religious divide. As a result, this book can be highly recommended to graduate students and researchers in East European and Eastern Christian studies or to scholars interested in the age of Catholic Reform, but it cannot at all be recommended to persons wavering between Catholicism and Orthodoxy. The latter will leave the volume even more perplexed, as Smotryc'kyj passionately marshals the arguments first for one side and then for the other.

Of course, it is a good thing to read sources in the original, but this translation is truly excellent. My spot checks against the originals revealed no gaffes; but that is to be expected from someone like Frick, who has written substantially in the past on Smotryc'kyj's linguistic practices. Frick has also managed to find what seems to be the perfect twenty-first century idiom into which to render Smotryc'kyj's seventeenth-century Polish. The style is fresh and economical, not wordy or inflated as in some other translations in this same Harvard series. Frick's translation allows the contemporary reader to appreciate Smotryc'kyj's considerable rhetorical gifts.

The translation is also well annotated and carefully edited after a comparison of different editions of Smotryc'kyj's original works. Almost all scriptural allusions are identified. (In deference to the venerable custom of reviewers' establishing their bona fides by erudite nitpicking, I note that on page 51 the reference to Luke 16:26 was omitted.)

Smotryc'kyj's works are preceded by a detailed introduction situating them in the context of his life and times. It explains the sometimes dramatic biographical circumstances for the composition of each work as well as the intellectual influences and historical background that they reflect. The introduction also identifies how much of a particular text has been translated. A number of works are translated in full, but others are excerpted. The choices seem reasonable.

Appendices include a glossary and bibliography. The book is adorned with old maps and engravings of cityscapes, but it would have been useful for readers had the volume contained a map of the region with all or most of the localities mentioned in the text. The volume also has an index. This translation is part of a multivolume project initiated by the late Omeljan Pritsak to publish all the major works of presecular Ukrainian culture both in the original and in translation. This particular volume is a testimony to his perspicacity.

No book is free of flaws. The most striking one I found was that a page of the list of abbreviations was omitted, so readers have to guess what VL, VOIDR, and VS stand for in the notes. I suspect most of the guesses will be educated guesses.

David Frick has done a tremendous service to scholarship by making so accessible these classic texts of the ambivalent Christianity in Ukraine and Belarus, on the border of the Catholic and Orthodox worlds.

John-Paul Himka, University of Alberta

Druzhnikov, Yuri. *The Life and Death of Alexander Pushkin: A Genius at Odds with Himself.* Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2006. vi + 335 pp. $119.95. ISBN 0-7734-5824-7.

A few years ago, Yuri Druzhnikov produced an unconvincing study of Pushkin's unfulfilled desire to emigrate. His new endeavor focuses on the last seven years of the poet's life, the desire to emigrate playing a predictably important role ("Only one single desire accompanied him his whole life—a craving for the West," p. 263). Pushkin—in Druzhnikov's view—was afflicted by what may be called "visa envy," a syndrome well known to the inhabitants of the late Soviet empire. Druzhnikov imposes upon Pushkin many other Soviet preoccupations, discussing Pushkin's compromises with the tyrannical regime, his complicated love life that led him into problems with the secret police, and so on.

The study's explicit purpose, declared in the title, is to present Pushkin at odds with himself. Underneath this interest in Pushkin's inner conflicts lies a rather prurient interest in the great poet's obsessions, the kind of interest that was so brilliantly explicated by Pushkin himself: "Why do you regret the loss of Byron's notes? ... Thank God that they are lost. ... Leave curiosity to the crowd and side with a genius. ... We know enough of Byron. ... The crowd thirsts for confessions, notes, etc., because in its baseness it enjoys the humiliation of the high, and the weakness of the mighty. ... He is as petty as we are, as revolting as we are! You are lying, scoundrels ... he might be petty and revolting but not like you—differently" (Pushkin XIII, 243).

But "curiosity" of this kind seems to have been a driving force in the creation of this study. Some examples: Musing on the fate of Pushkin had he been allowed to go abroad, Druzhnikov wonders: would Pushkin have returned or stayed in Europe "where gambling casinos and brothels were not worse than they were in his homeland" (p. 284)? We also learn that Pushkin had once invited an English traveler to share dinner with him and Viazemsky and then "slipped away" without paying the bill (p. 86). We are furthermore told that "enmity constituted the most important part of the life of Pushkin ... and periodically—it is terrible to say—the crux of his activities" (p. 226). Pushkin's adherence to the aristocratic code of honor is dismissed as "the great man himself remained a child of his times ... and feared 'false shame'" (p. 238), while Pushkin's burial is rendered by Druzhnikov as a burlesque procedure: "In the church during Pushkin burial service, the women crowding around the coffin, wept and stroked one another, recalling in whispers their and others' affairs with the poet, while his wife absented herself" (p. 233).

Pushkin's sex life is very much in the focus of the study—the poet turned the three Goncharov sisters into his "harem" (p. 201), we are told, and we are given a list of those of Pushkin's friends, whose wives surrendered to Pushkin's amorous advances: "Karamzin, Vyazemsky, Nashchekin, the Smirnovs, the Ficquelmonts" (ibid). The fatal duel also interests the author, and he quotes Skrynnikov's remarks about "Pushkin's ... duplicity and hypocrisy" (p. 234) in the affair, while Pushkin's relationship with Nicholas I and his court, are depicted through Mirsky's: "This lackeydom penetrated to Pushkin's heart" (p. 164).

Pushkin was also a chauvinist, since he was not happy with the Polish uprising of 1830 and even more unhappy with the French criticism of the Russian suppression of it. But what does not emerge in the discussion is that when no less a figure than Viazemsky challenged Pushkin to explain himself, he replied—according to Smirnova-Rosset—that England would not be happy had Russia begun to criticize the way it handled Ireland. Pushkin also added that less than two decades earlier the French (along with Poles and numerous others) had burned down Moscow, so they were hardly in a position to criticize Moscow's behavior. All these considerations make Pushkin's position, if not admirable, then at least not ignoble and it was shared by many of his peers. For Druzhnikov, however, Pushkin is nothing but a servile seeker of compromises with the Third Department (p. 112), a champion of Russia's world dominion (p. 174), a person who marred his reputation by becoming an apologist of Russification and who therefore "lost authority in the best circles of Russian society, for on this issue he had stopped being a European" (p. 115).

Druzhnikov attempts to give his work an academic flavor, but as the quotes above testify, he relies on rather subjective and outdated sources—modern Pushkin scholarship is virtually absent. It

is true that he tries to preserve a scholarly façade behind frequent proclamations of objectivity of the type: "let's not impose today's thoughts on a poet" (p. 159). Yet, today's thoughts and moral judgments are always present in the narrative: "No sort of moral commandments kept him from affairs with other peoples' wives ... but it isn't for us to condemn the poet" (p. 233). On a different occasion, having quoted Pushkin's comment to Briullov on the reasons behind his marriage: "'I wanted to go abroad—they didn't let me; I fell into a situation where I didn't know what I was to do—and got married' (p. 200), Druzhnikov exclaims: "It's hard to hold back your emotions: you want to protest, to strike this phrase from your recall, to make the great Russian poet appear less reprehensible" (ibid). Marrying when there is nothing better to do is a favorite pastime of a lot of people. Why it makes Pushkin particularly reprehensible is not quite clear.

A naïve reader of this biography might wonder when Pushkin had time to write, having devoted all his life to dueling, gambling, or planning to get abroad. In fact, poetry does not play an important role in the book. Druzhnikov declares that he wants to destroy the myths that surround Pushkin (a fairly frequent activity), but he creates new ones about the "wicked" Pushkin, sacrificing in this process one fundamental fact: Pushkin was a poet and thus "wicked in a different way."

In short, this "study" should appeal to readers who feel better knowing that they are more moral and enlightened than Pushkin, who was but a gambler, duelist, womanizer, an abusive personality who would physically vent his frustrations upon his servants (p. 165) or children (p. 181), an awful husband, a nationalist prone to compromise with the tyrannical regime, and a person who could not even get a visa to go abroad. Others need not bother.

Vladimir Golstein, Brown University

Essays in Poetics 30 (Autumn 2005), *Chekhov 2004*, Vol. 1, *Aspects of Chekhov* (Keele: Keele University, 2005). ISBN 0-9509080-9-6.

Essays in Poetics 31 (Autumn 2006), *Chekhov 2004*, Vol. 2, *Chekhov and Others* (Keele: Keele University, 2006). ISBN 0-9553138-0-5.

An essay on Lillian Hellman followed by one on Irish writer Thomas Kilroy, and then on Katherine Mansfield. Sergei Dovlatov found next to Dmitrii Grigorovich and near Mikhail Lermontov. A close reading of a short story followed by the description of stage and movie productions... What is the common subject that brings such unlikely "neighbors" under the cover of one scholarly collection? The answer is Chekhov.

These two volumes under review contain all these names and many others as well. They comprise thirty-four papers, most of which were presented at a 2004 conference at Mansfield College, Oxford, commemorating the centenary of Chekhov's death. The first volume is called *Aspects of Chekhov*, the second—*Chekhov and Others*, but in some cases the distribution of articles seems arbitrary. The collection would have benefited from a more thoughtful organization and grouping of its eclectic essays. An index would also be useful.

The essays focus for the most part on three major issues: the poetics of Chekhov's prose and drama, comparativist aspects of Chekhov's writings, and Chekhov's works on stage and screen. The range of topics and approaches on poetics is impressive: from such ostensibly microscopic subjects as Chekhov's use of punctuation and the role of sound in Chekhov to the survey of his "fictional mansions," from the motif of insanity to the general problem of character, from the role of costume in *The Cherry Orchard* to the question of this play's genre, from close readings of particular texts (*Rothschild's Violin* and *The Death of a Civil Servant*) to such global questions as how we should consider Chekhov: the first modernist or the last great representative of Russian realism?

A frequent participant of Chekhov conferences, or simply a reader acquainted with Chekhov scholarship, would find some of these topics more than familiar. One could quote Laurence Senelick's rather pessimistic view of the current state of Chekhov criticism found in his contribution to the

present collection: “Like the Dante specialists, Chekhov scholars can only scratch the surface of the existing literature, often remaining unaware of their precursors. Consequently, the same or similar statements get made on a regular basis. Almost annually, critics have proclaimed, as if discovering the wheel, that *The Cherry Orchard* is meant to be a comedy, that there are admixtures of *Hamlet* and *The Wild Duck* in *The Seagull*, that Chekhov and Chaikovskii have a lot in common. A separate shelf could be dedicated to essays on aspects of time and space or nature and memory or female characters in Chekhov” (1:164). It is ironic that some of these topics are addressed in the collection next to Senelick’s acute observation.

Fortunately, addressing the old subjects does not necessarily result in “discovering the wheel.” In her contribution “Two-timing Time in *Three Sisters*,” Cynthia Marsh finds a new aspect of this much-discussed topic by focusing on “the interaction between the references to time in the text on the page and aspects of the performance text” (1:105). For his reading of the famous *The Death of a Civil Servant*, Robert Reid applies such unlikely sources as the sociological theories of Pierre Bourdieu and Hegel’s master/slave model from *Phenomenology of Spirit;* surprisingly they work, shedding some additional light on the well-known story.

Harai Golomb is represented by two essays, one in each volume: “Heredity, Inheritance, Heritage: Human De- and Re-Generation in Chekhov’s Major Plays (With Special Reference to *Three Sisters*)” and “The Whole at the Expense of its Parts: Chekhov’s Plays as Structuralists’ Paradise.” Both are ambitious pieces with a developed system of terms and oppositions: the triad of heredity, inheritance, and heritage in the first article is followed by that of the complex, the simple, and the complicated in the second. In the latter, Chekhov’s “unsaturated” complexity is contrasted with Shakespeare’s “saturated complexity” and the “partial saturated complexity” illustrated with the example of Poe’s “The Raven” (2:159). Regardless of how convincing and necessary all this elaborated terminology might seem, there are some insightful observations about the poetics of Chekhov’s drama in both articles. Golomb can be a sharp reader with a special sensitivity to overtones and nuances.

No issue is too small when dealing with Chekhov. Especially revealing for me was Rosamund Bartlett’s pioneering analysis of Chekhov’s “highly idiosyncratic, subtle and quietly iconoclastic use of punctuation” (2:48). This apparently marginal aspect of Chekhov’s style, indicative of the poetic nature of his prose and drama, has been neglected by both critics and translators. The problem of translation is addressed in Robin Milner-Gulland and Olga Soboleva’s useful essay “Translating and Mistranslating Chekhov,” which was derived from a “collective analysis” of the story *Ionych* at the conference. A fine and vivid example of the challenges faced by a translator of Chekhov into English!

Of particular interest are the two articles devoted to women’s issues. Jane Gary Harris’s essay “Image Criticism Revisited: Chekhov’s Reception in the Early 20th Century Russian Women’s Periodical Press” is both informed and informative. Engaging is Henrietta Mondry’s comparison of the portrayal of peasant women’s sexualities in the works of Gleb Uspenskii and Chekhov. My reservation regarding this article is with the somewhat uncritical application of the ideas associated with Chekhov’s unrealized dissertation project *A History of Sexual Dominance* to his mature artistic works. This allows Mondry to assume that “there was a great deal of Chekhov’s own thoughts on the nature of sexuality in the views expressed by the zoologist fon Koren in *The Duel*” (2:265–66). In Chekhov’s artistic world, it is always dangerous to assign characters’ opinions to the author. In the case of this particular character such an assignment would be especially dubious.

On the comparativist side, there is also Katherine O’Connor’s fascinating contribution “Chekhov’s Letter to Lermontov,” in which she convincingly and with a truly artistic insight reads Chekhov’s letter to his brother Mikhail of July 28, 1888, as “an autobiographical fiction ... ingeniously inscribed with a Lermontov watermark” (2:272).

Of the two related essays, “‘It is only Chekhov that one wants to be like’: Chekhov and Dovlatov—The Art of a Storyteller” by Olga Soboleva and “‘The world is ugly and people are sad’: On Chekhov’s Ethics and Aesthetics in the Works of Sergei Dovlatov” by Olga Tabachnikova, my preference goes to the latter, as the more detailed and developed.

Finally, one of the most useful contributions is found on the very last page of the second volume. It provides the reader with details of Peter Henry's Bibliography on Chekhov in English, 1998–2004, which includes a section on critical studies (it can be accessed on the Neo-Formalist Circle page of the British Association for Slavonic and East European Studies website). Hopefully, this bibliography will prevent future students of Chekhov from "discovering the wheel."

Overall, these two volumes do not break any new ground in Chekhov scholarship, although they undoubtedly include some fine essays. Too eclectic and loose in its structure, the collection lacks what Chekhov's old professor from *A Boring Story* would call a "general idea." Its very eclecticism, however, is well representative of the present state of Chekhov scholarship.

Radislav Lapushin, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Ciepiela, Catherine. *The Same Solitude: Boris Pasternak and Marina Tsvetaeva*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006. 304 pp. $29.95. ISBN 978-0-8014-3534-8.

Anticipatory references in recent scholarly literature, as well as critical comments on the dust jacket arouse high expectations of this book, all of which are amply fulfilled. In recent years both Pasternak and Tsvetaeva have been have washed over by various waves of critical attention. Tsvetaeva has been the subject of literary-historical, biographical, and gender studies. Pasternak has similarly been unraveled semiotically and intertextually, and the psychological, philosophical, and other ramifications of his life and work have been explored. Most of this has taken place over the last twenty-five years or so, during which major archival publications have appeared. Thanks to editors' and commentators' efforts the obscurities and *nedoskazannosti* of, say, Pasternak's exchanges with his cousin Olga have been illuminated. However, the heavy psychological undertow of the Pasternak-Tsvetaeva correspondence (including their tripartite communication with Rilke and the now almost complete letters printed in *Dushi nachinaiut videt': Pis'ma 1922–1936 godov*), as well as their mutual poetic exchanges, have left us waiting for Catherine Ciepiela's fascinating monograph to interpret and explain much that was hitherto only half understood.

Ciepiela is magnificently successful in describing the psychological (sometimes almost pathological) mechanism of Pasternak and Tsvetaeva's poetic and personal interaction, and she demonstrates a fine knowledge of both literary texts and the scholarly literature. The setting and details of the two poets' relationship are biographically structured, but this book is not so much a detailed account of their parallel and intertwining lives as the story of their internal and artistic interaction. Consequently, the years of their post-1935 estrangement—years in which Pasternak renounced the "lyricism of pain as power" (p. 241) and in which they ceased to share the "same solitude"—are glossed over fairly quickly in a nine-page conclusion.

Ciepiela's treatment is chronological. It consists of a short Introduction and Conclusion, framing five interpretive chapters, whose titles are a guide to their contents: "The Girl Muse," "The Boy Poet," "The Romance of Distance (1922–25)," "Lyricism and History (1926)," The End of the End (1926–1935)." The first two chapters sketch the lives, works, and personalities of Pasternak and Tsvetaeva up to their first encounter and her departure for Western Europe. In the wake of Simon Karlinsky, Tsvetaeva readers have been aware of the psychological and erotic implications of her early lyrics. Ciepiela's early chapter on Pasternak, however, is a revelation in its analysis of problematic "transsexual" poems such as "Poliarnaia shveia," "Margarita," or "Ofeliia," showing the full extent of his deployment of "hysterical" psychology, phallic symbolism and embracement of an Amazonian muse, and taking us into the full implications of those feminine sensitivities we knew from the "sponge" symbolism of poetry or the choice of a female alter ego in "Detstvo Liuvers."

The third chapter traces the further poetic and epistolary peripeteia of the two poets, who in fact emerge as "greater than their genders" as their creativity increasingly interpenetrates; this is shown in some fascinating readings of several poems that in fact bear an uncanny resemblance to works by the "other" poet. Then, after a memorable non-meeting in Germany, Tsvetaeva is shown

evolving a new myth for herself, born of abandonment and injury; Pasternak meanwhile struggles to retain her as a muse while preserving a conventional marriage that shunned both "poems and catastrophes."

Apart from the already half-familiar episode in which Rilke was drawn into the choreography of the Russian poets' correspondence, in chapters 4 and 5 Ciepiela offers an original reading of Pasternak's *Vysokaia bolezn'* and examines further episodes of "co-authoring," reflected in the rhetoric of their correspondence, in poetic echoes between *Sestra moia zhizn'* and *Poema kontsa,* and in a detailed reading of Tsvetaeva's "S moria." These rapprochements are meanwhile punctuated by several lapses into silence as Pasternak's "maidenly weakness" yields before the Valkyrian force of Tsvetaeva's emotional onslaught.

The dénouement of the relationship is also sensitively described by Ciepiela. In it both poets withdraw from lyricism into "historical" writing—in *Perekop*, *Sibir'*, *Leitenant Shmidt*, and in *Spektorsky*, in which Pasternak pseudonymously inscribes Tsvetaeva as "co-author" and heroine in a revolutionary setting. By the end of the 1920s, though, Tsvetaeva was entering on her "decade of prose" and in his own lyrical "Second Birth," Pasternak found another female inspirer who was invulnerable to, and incapable of inspiring, the hysteric poetics of his earlier verse. The collapse of their kinship and Pasternak's repudiation of hysteria and neurosis was hammered home to Tsvetaeva in their Paris encounter of 1935 and their further meetings after her return to Russia in 1939. While anything but perfunctory, Ciepiela's account of this closing episode is naturally less detailed: after one and a half decades of intense interaction, there was now a more total non-meeting than ever before, which has left little to describe.

This book is compulsive and fascinating reading, and it is a work of impeccable scholarly authority. The only slight blemishes are a few questionable English renderings of the parallel Russian verse texts. Here the versions sometimes strike one as maybe too "creative" for a work of academic discussion—a "ramrod brush" (for *priamaia kist*) is perhaps not needed to reinforce the phallic evidence.

The book is beautifully produced, with virtually immaculate proofreading. There are also photographic illustrations of some of the main protagonists characters and some artwork by Ariadna Efron and Leonid Pasternak (including an attractive dustcover pastel by the latter).

Christopher Barnes, University of Toronto

Boris Groys and Aage Hansen-Löve, eds., with the assistance of Anne von der Heiden. *Am Nullpunkt: Positionen der russischen Avantgarde*. Translated from the Russian by Gabriele Leupold, et. al. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag, 2005. 778 pp. ISBN 3-518-29364-8.

Boris Groys and Michael Hagemeister, eds., with the assistance of Anne von der Heiden. *Die Neue Menschheit: Biopolitische Utopien in Russland zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Translated from the Russian by Dagmar Kassek. Frankfurt: Surhkamp Verlag, 2005. 689 pp. ISBN 3-518-29363-X.

Boris Groys, et. al., eds., with the assistance of Anja Herrmann and Julia Warmers. *Zurück aus der Zukunft Osteuropäische Kulturen im Zeitalkter des Postkommunismus*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag, 2005. 894 pp. ISBN 3-518-12452-8.

The three volumes reviewed here amount to an intimidating total of twenty-three hundred pages. The bulk, however, breaks down to two collections of largely unknown sources on the Russian avant-garde and on bio-political Utopian Projects in the early twentieth century, providing some exciting discoveries that are more topical than might at first seem. Both source-books provide the basis for the third volume, which contains twelve theoretical articles on the post-Commu-nist condition and twelve short literary texts by ex-underground writers. They are the result of an extensive project to analyze the post-Communist condition and the sources of its artistic inspirations, including an

international conference and an art exhibition ("Privatization" www.postcommunist.de). Russian and Central European Western-educated scholars present theoretical studies on "politics, art and everyday life."

The art-historian Boris Groys, who initiated this project, participated in the Moscow Conceptualist underground until he emigrated to Germany in 1975. In his famous controversial essay "Gesamtkunstwerk Stalin" (1988), he first applied the Western concept of postmodernism to Russia by declaring Stalinist communism as a modernist phenomenon and a radical realization of the avant-garde. Together with Mikhail Epstein and the Slovenian philosopher Slavoj Zizek, Groys has become a leading theorist of Russian post-Communist culture.

The title "Back From the Future" ironically refers to a series of American scifi films as well as—the probable target in this context—to Francois Lyotard's book "La condition postmoderne," which in 1979 declared the narrative constructedness of all existing ideologies and thus the impossibility of claiming universal truth for any of them. In a similar vein, Groys states that after the "event" of communism, the East and the West alike face a new epistemological situation. For Groys communism was a real event in history, which has had its effect both on the East and the West. After the fall of communism, the political situation in the West was increasingly perceived and described in terms of the former Soviet communism. Western societies, especially the United States, present themselves as realized utopias. On the global political market societies compete with each other in presenting themselves as more or less realized utopias of democracy.

Groys's project aims at a radical deconstruction of the Communist project, which he sees as the first postnational model of a universal society in history. Groys polemicizes both against the concept of Cultural Studies and against postcolonial terms as inadequate approaches to describe the post-Communist condition. He believes that the concept of Cultural Studies has been misdirected by the idea of a supposedly democratic global society in its dependence on the mechanisms of capitalist market society. The postcolonial "orientalization of post-communist Eastern Europe" (p. 45) is unable to perceive its alternate path to modernism and is therefore bound to ignore the historical lessons for its own present which this experience offers the West. Western post-modernism arguably does not realize how far its exclusive aesthetic preference for heterogeneity is tied in with the capitalist ideology of producing boundless diversity at all cost. Post-Communist societies do not move in one leap from the past to the future, as has been described for postcolonial societies, but they move in the opposite direction: from the supposedly utopian future back into the reality of history.

The majority of the articles in the theoretical volume have certain aspects in common, such as a close connection between cultural theory and artistic practice (literature is involved to a lesser degree). Several articles address excessive consumerism and violence as typical phenomena of post-Communist societies, by recourse to French poststructuralist philosophies of transgression based on the experience of eros and violence. Boyan Manchev analyzes the connection between excessive outbursts of violence and the fact that the people have been excluded as subjects from the process of transformation since the 1990s, as the new elites took over. From the "sacralized collective body" (p. 103) society turned into a mob which now releases all the dark, antimodern underlying patterns that have already been inherent in communist society.

Ivailo Ditchev explains how in Bulgaria consumerism was officially both promoted and rejected by Communist leaders at the same time, but at the same time was rejected, so that a "circle of sadomasochistic desire and repression bonded society." After a brutal transition to urban capitalism, excessive consumerism reigns to substitute identities, which is seen as a sign of the return of repressed desires and guilt complex. Boris Dmitrievich illustrates the transition from the "Great compromise" of Tito's ex-Yugoslavia toward postsocialist consumerism.

It may come as a surprise that, instead of referring to the dissident underground culture as an alternative to Western modernism, today's Russian radical artists often refer to mainstream concepts from the Soviet past. Three articles draw upon the rediscovery of concepts of former official aesthetic and philosophical concepts by artists today, such as the Marxist philosopher Mikhail Lifshits, "revived" by the artist Dmitrii Gutov, while Svetlana Boym explains a fascination with the late Malevich, who was dismissed by most of his Western admirers as deviant. Several scholars reveal

the intentions and concepts of Soviet artists and philosophers to find a positive paradigm, avoiding the negative paradigm of Western modernism. Ekaterina Degot explains the focus on art as a creative process as an alternative to focusing on the product as an object for museums, which is typical for some post-Communist artists' interest in dynamic performance that she interprets as closely connected with Soviet formalism. However, their radicalism bears the risk of increasing isolation on the international art scene. Thus provocation arose when Russian artists did not present objects when invited to exhibitions, or destroyed other artists' works.

In Kazakhstan different connections between post-Communist artists and the ancient roots of their culture have created fascinating crossovers. Valeria Ibraeva introduces a variety of young artists who mix the roots of Nomadic and Shamanic culture, and pre-Islamic and Turkish traditions with symbols of the Communist past and Western modernist art in open-air installations, films, self-representations, and happenings. Much of their activities display civil courage in an authoritarian state as is today's Kazakhstan. This art work, together with contemporary art from Moscow and St. Petersburg presented in this volume, was also shown at an exhibition as part of the project and conference in Berlin. Olga Matich concludes the essays with an insightful psychoanalytically oriented analysis of the work and person of the eccentric misogynist writer Eduard Limonov. His short texts, along with four other nonconformist writers, complement the scholarly articles as "literary testimonies."

The two collections of sources "At Point Zero" and "The New Humankind" reveal the amazing extent to which eschatological and metaphysical concerns fuelled revolutionary utopian thinking in early Soviet Russia. Thanks to the extensive and excellent commentaries of the editors Michael Hagemeister and Aage Hansen-Löve, we learn that the radical utopian plans of the Russian avant-garde, to overcome natural boundaries in order to reach immortality and self-salvation, are less absurd and eccentric today than it may seem at first sight.

As Michael Hagemeister explains in his introduction, how most bizarre biopolitical models of "new humankind" inspired a wide range of scientists, such as Konstantin Tsiolkovskii, the father of space technology, the physician Aleksandr Bogdanov, and the psychologist Aaron Zalkind, artists and poets, like Aleksandr Sviatogor, Aleksandr Yaroslavskii and their group of Biocosmists, and even Bolshevik leaders, like Leon Trotsky. All of them saw the ultimate goal of revolution in overcoming the boundaries of time, space, and nature and thus reaching physiological immortality, that is, eternal cosmic harmony.

The philosophy of a "common deal" by Nikolai Fedorov, the founder of cosmism and probably the most influential Russian thinker of all times, opens the twenty-one breathtaking articles on the utopian future Russian style, including a concept of a museum for all living and dead things and peoples of humankind. Fedorov saw himself as a materialist, but his aim was to establish ultimate justice by including the dead of all times in the immortal state of salvation. Fedorov's texts show that totalitarian ideas of utopia emerged long before the revolution, as early as the turn of the twentieth century. It remains a paradox that most of the radical biopolitical utopianists were later persecuted and executed when Stalin came to power, while others were allowed to continue working at least until the 1930s, such as the psychoneurologist Aaron Zalkind, who was so convinced of the unlimited "shapability" of human beings that he planned the large-scale controlled reproduction of men as well as the transfer of sexual energy into projects of building communism—that was until his institute was closed in 1936 for a "vulgar-marxist deviation" (p. 24).

Konstantin Tsiolkovskii, however, was canonized during his lifetime, although the basis of his work, as he himself emphasized, were more than 700 decidedly non-Marxist articles on metaphysics, explaining his bizarre pan-psychic concept of cosmic life, including his own version of a gospel. Tsiolkovskii's "cosmic philosophy" is based on the classical Platonian idea of vertical power as harmony: the mass of mankind is controlled by faultlessly elaborate plans for food and housing as well as marriage and reproduction, while being guided and balanced by selected geniusses ("Suffering and Genius" and "Genius among men"), who, like Gods, determine the process of conquering time, space and death from above. Ultimately all evil, suffering, and disease were to be extinguished.

The third volume presents forty-two articles by poets and artists of the avant-garde, most of them unpublished or hardly accessible before, some quite provocative. Both the selection and the excellent body of commentary by the editor Hansen-Löve reveal screaming paradoxes and an apocalyptic-eschatological artistic fundamentalism, which shed new light on the spiritual undercurrent of the avant-garde and offers a frame of reference for post-communist art. The earliest period in Hansen-Löve's typology, "Utopian art," is represented by a radical clash of viewpoints: Berdiaev's Spenglerian verdict of the decline of art is juxtaposed with Khlebnikov's claim to the "presidency of the terrestrial globe" and Malevich's declaration of a total reshaping of humankind through art from "point Zero." Both esoteric and rigorously analytical, his invective against museums contrasts with Fedorov, who envisions a total museum of all past humankind. But both, like most artists in this first Utopian period share a belief in animated matter. The following periods, "Constructivism at Point Zero of Art" and the "Deconstruction of Constructivism" are represented by less well-known artists such as the photographer Nikolai Tarabukin, the constructivist Aleksej Gan, and an experimental collage-text "Antisexus" by Andrei Platonov suggesting an economic regulation of human sexuality. The last period is the "Point Zero" stage of the absurdist avant-garde with Kharms, Lipavskii, and Druskin.

There are some editorial discrepancies: while the volume on the avant-garde has a huge body of footnotes, the one on bio-political utopias does not offer any. This, however, does not diminish the value of this highly recommendable volume. For the first time young scholars from Central and Eastern Europe, notably from countries like Bulgaria, Serbia, Romania, and Kazakhstan, whose recent developments are much less known in the West, present their views on post-communism and offer self-reflective perspectives which are highly informative and based on rich empirical material.

Birgit Menzel, Johannes Gutenberg University, Germersheim

Blakesley, Rosalind P. and Susan E. Reid, eds. *Russian Art and the West: A Century of Dialogue in Painting, Architecture, and the Decorative Arts*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2007. x + 246 pp. $42.00. ISBN 0-87580-360-1.

This book focuses on the century-long interaction between Russian and Soviet artists and the West, starting from the emergence of the Peredvizhniki movement until the Khrushchev Thaw. Almost completely avoiding the period of Russian avant-garde art with its intensive contacts with European modernist centers as well as widely discussed instances of "exportation" of Russian culture to the West (Sergei Diaghilev or El Lissitzky), this collection widens the traditional discourse on Russian art both in chronological and thematic aspects and reveals the Western (as well as Eastern) influences in Russian and Soviet art and architecture from the 1860s to the 1960s. The volume brings together eleven essays by the editors and their collaborators from the US and Canada, all experts on Russian art, to explore the lesser-known aspects of the Russian artistic dialogue with the French, British, and American trends.

In the opening essay the editors Rosalind P. Blakesley (University of Cambridge, UK), and Susan E. Reid (University of Sheffield, UK) provide a brief elucidation of the significance of the East-West polarization in Russia's cultural identity. In "Promoting a Pan-European Art" Blakesley reveals the impressionistic influence in the art of Il'ia Repin, a trend that was at odds with the programmatic standpoint of the Peredvizhniki group that concerned itself primarily with affirming the national school of Russian realist art. Elizabeth Kridl Valkenier continues the discussion of late-nineteenth century art, exposing new aspects of European connections in the work of Repin and the members of the Mir iskusstva (World of Art) group. The theme of impressionistic trends in Soviet Russian painting is further elaborated in Alison Hilton's essay through an inquiry into the reasons of the permissibility of the deviations from the politicized mainstream Socialist Realism. Continuing the subject of Soviet painting, Susan Reid looks at the short period of relative artistic

freedom during the Khrushchev Thaw, marked with exposure to Western modernist art, the search for a new language of expression, and the emergence of diverse forms of realism.

In “Decoration and Disconnection,” Karen Kettering examines the late-nineteenth century conception of the *russkii stil′* (Russian style), the ways Russian art was showcased at the exhibitions in the United States, as well as the professional responses and the public perception. Charlotte Douglas discusses the parallels in English and Russian art and textile designs on their way to abstraction, revealing the lesser known Russian-British connection.

It is symptomatic that despite its title, even this book does not avoid placing Russian art in a dialogue with the East. Jane Sharp joins the authors who suggest widening the modernist discourse to include national permutations in her discussion of the Eastern sources in Nataliia Goncharova’s art and in her examination of the East-West dialogue in the works of modernist artists in the periphery of Russia. John McCannon analyzes the most enigmatic of Russian painters, Nikolai Roerich, who formulated his own understanding of the East not as the “barbarian” other, but as the treasury of wisdom, which, together with Europe, created the dyad of mutually complimenting parts of the single whole, Eurasia (and Russia).

Two of the essays address the problems of chronologically subsequent, albeit opposing, periods of postwar Soviet architecture. Sona Hoisington traces the American roots (mainly the New York skyscrapers) in the projects of the seven high-rise buildings in Moscow, emphasizing their spatial and compositional similarities. The shift from overly decorative imperial style of the Stalin period to the industrialized building program during the Cold War is the subject of the essay by the late Catherine Cooke, one of the most instrumental figures in American scholarship of Soviet architecture. Written in accessible style by scholars of Russian and Soviet art, this book will find a broad readership among art historians, students, and those interested in Russian and Soviet cultural history, painting, architecture, and decorative arts. It will be especially helpful to readers who have a basic familiarity with the Russian modernist movements and their relationship with the West, as it compliments the traditional discourse on the subject.

Anahit Ter-Stepanian, Sacred Heart University

History

Perrie, Maureen, ed. *The Cambridge History of Russia*, Vol. 1, *From Early Rus' to 1689*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. xxii + 778 pp. $185.00. ISBN 0-521-81227-5.

Intended as part of “a definitive history of Russia,” this very interesting, fat, and expensive book was written for students and scholars already familiar with the general outline of Russian history. Maureen Perrie’s volume, the first of the University of Cambridge’s ambitious three volume set, is essentially a reference work containing detailed essays written by leading specialists covering most important topics from early Rus’ to the accession of Peter the Great. The book incorporates much recent scholarship from Russia and the West and provides an excellent snapshot of the current state of the field of early Russian history. The list of scholars contributing to this volume is impressive, and many of the essays are real gems. The overall quality of scholarship is very high.

Denis J. B. Shaw contributed excellent chapters on “Russia’s geographical environment,” “Towns and commerce,” and “Urban developments.” Curiously, however, in referring to climate deterioration he does not discuss recent scholarship concerning the “little ice age” that helps explain Russia’s late-sixteenth and seventeenth-century crises. He also errs in claiming that Russia’s export of naval stores became significant only in the eighteenth century (p. 40). Jonathan Shepard wrote chapter 3, “The origins of Rus' (c. 900–1015).” Unfortunately, he is so committed to one particular interpretation that he ignores Riurik’s connection to Friesland and the slave trade, and he fails to explain how and

why the rulers of Rus' adopted a Khazarian royal title. In general, Shepard downplays Rus'-Khazar relations, making it difficult to understand his cryptic comment that Rus' owed a clear debt to Khazar political culture (p. 56). He also fails to respond to contradictory information about Riurik and early Rus' found in V. L. Ianin's chapter on "Medieval Novgorod," although that may be the editor's fault.

Simon Franklin provided a fine chapter on Kievan Rus', but I wish he had discussed Iaroslav the Wise's adoption of Church Slavonic as the sacred language of Rus'. Martin Dimnik's chapter on "The Rus' principalities (1125–1246)" is very strong on politics but weak on social history, towns, and the economy. Janet Martin's chapters on "North-eastern Russia and the Golden Horde" and "The emergence of Moscow (1359–1462)" are excellent, but she is curiously silent about Muscovy's devastating raid on Kazan in 1399. V. L. Ianin's chapter on medieval Novgorod is filled with interesting details concerning the town's growth, the evolution of the Novgorodian dialect, the role of Riurik in the development of Novgorod's political culture, and Ivan III's almost accidental conquest of the city (pp. 205-6). Donald Ostrowski's brilliant chapter ("Growth of Muscovy, 1462–1533") is especially strong in describing the Mongol influences on Muscovy and the difficulties Ivan III faced fielding military forces prior to the establishment of his *pomeshchik* militia. Sergei Bogatyrev's chapter on Ivan IV is very good but is weak on the demographic, economic, and social crisis descending on Russia and somewhat perfunctory in describing Ivan's *oprichnina*. Nevertheless, Bogatyrev does an excellent job describing the sacralization of the ruling dynasty and Muscovy's transformation into a "fiscal-military" state.

A. P. Pavlov wrote chapter 11 ("Fedor I and Boris Godunov, 1584-1605"). He claims that Boris Godunov was already in power by 1584 (pp. 265–66) and managed to quickly "resolve the country's internal political crisis" (p. 269). Many historians will strongly disagree. Pavlov is also convinced that Godunov presided over an economic revival during the 1590s (p. 274), but he makes only selective use of E. I. Kolycheva's important book, *Agrarnyi stroi Rossii XVI veka* (1987). Kolycheva actually charted the steep decline of Russian agriculture and grain markets during the 1590s—which saw not recovery but a deepening crisis. That crisis was severe enough to prompt Godunov to enserf the peasants and bind the townsmen. Pavlov makes other dubious assertions as well—for example, that the official report about Tsarevich Dmitrii's death in 1591 was "undoubtedly tendentious" (p. 275), that there is no reason to doubt that the Assembly of the Land legitimately elected Tsar Boris in 1598 (p. 278), and that "Russian and foreign sources unanimously testify" (p. 281) that the initiative for the surrender of towns to the pretender Dmitrii came from the lower classes.

Richard Hellie contributed three excellent chapters ("The peasantry," "The law," and "The economy, trade, and serfdom"). Hellie fully comprehends the late-sixteenth century crisis that prompted Boris Godunov by "a flourish of a pen" to debase "the legal status of more than nine tenths of the Russian population" (p. 296). Nevertheless, it is difficult to reconcile Hellie's statement that Russia's economy probably recovered "from the Time of Troubles by 1629" (p. 547) with his grim portrayal of the country's descent into a near-caste society consisting of up to 85 percent serfs and 10 percent slaves (p. 546) or with Shaw's equally sobering account of Russian towns in the seventeenth century (pp. 580–99).

Michael Khodarkovsky wrote two fine chapters on "Non-Christian peoples on the Muscovite Frontier" and "Non-Russian subjects." David Miller wrote a very good chapter on "The Orthodox Church," marred only by a few mistakes—for example, Metropolitan Makarii writing to Vasilii III in 1549 (p. 353) and Patriarch Germogen crowning Tsar Mikhail in 1613 (p. 358). Michael Flier provided a fascinating chapter on "Political ideas and rituals." Maureen Perrie wrote very good chapters on "The Time of Troubles" and "Popular revolts" in the seventeenth century. She admits that Tsar Dmitrii may have believed he was the son of Ivan the Terrible and offers the novel argument that he may have become the pretender as "revenge" for Godunov's persecution of the Romanovs (p. 411). Perrie errs, however, in claiming that a conspiracy against Tsar Dmitrii was hatched in his own bodyguard (p. 414). Her use of the term "Bolotnikov rebellion" also seems rather dated.

Marshall Poe penned a brilliant chapter on Russia's "Central government and its institutions," demonstrating how the "remarkable inflation of honours" (p. 435) fundamentally altered Muscovy's political elite and its "royal council" (p. 444). Brian Davies contributed two very good chapters ("Local government and administration" and "Muscovy at war and peace"), and Nancy Shields Kollmann wrote a fine chapter on "Law and society." Robert O. Crummey provided an excellent chapter on "The Orthodox Church and the schism," and the volume ends with the late Lindsey Hughes' fascinating survey of "Cultural and intellectual life" before the reign of Peter the Great. The fifty-eight-page bibliography is up-to-date and helpful, and the fifty-five-page index is excellent and indispensable.

Chester Dunning, Texas A&M University

Naumov, Igor V. *The History of Siberia.* Edited by David N. Collins. Routledge Studies in the History of Russia and Eastern Europe, Vol. 6. New York: Routledge, 2006. xvi + 242 pp. $135.00. ISBN 978-0-415-36819-3.

In the previous four centuries, Siberia has, on occasion, played a significant economic, internal, and foreign policy role in Russian history. Occupying one-third of Asia and in possession of rich natural resources of value throughout the changing world economy of this period, how could it not play a notable role?

Modern attempts to gather the history of Siberia began as early as the seventeenth century. G. F. Muller in the eighteenth century, and a number of the growing Siberian intelligentsia in the nineteenth century, began to tell the history of the region. Under the Soviets additional valuable studies were done, especially on the prehistory and earliest Siberian history. This first comprehensive post-Soviet Siberian history presents a particularly twenty-first Siberian point of view. Established Siberian scholar Igor V. Naumov of Irkutsk State University has written an exceptionally useful one-volume short overview of Siberian history.

At little more than two hundred pages, *The History of Siberia* skims Siberian political history from the Stone Age to the twenty-first century. Three-quarters of the work is given over to an examination of Siberian history under Russian rule. Following a short discussion of historiography, prehistory, and the early Turkic and Mongolian states, Naumov launches into more detailed discussion of Imperial Russian and Soviet Siberian history. His expertise on the Russian Civil War, the twentieth century, and St. Innocent is visible. This book is no place to learn about the original Siberians. James Forsyth's excellent *A History of the Peoples of Siberia: Russia's North Asian Colony 1581–1990* (1992) provides a corrective to that absence.

The History of Siberia's greatest strength lies in its clear depiction of political structures. It is also particularly strong on Siberia's role in international relations, providing a particularly Siberian point of view. Russian influence and expansion in Asia in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is presented often as happenstance (p. 128) with no prior concerted activity on the part of the Tsarist government playing a rule.

Translated by Naumov and colleagues in Irkutsk, the book's few infelicities and odd spellings are not distracting. The many maps, charts, illustrations, glossary, and excellent index are apt and welcome. The inset biographies are especially useful as they go well beyond basic, and generally well-known, characters in Siberian history such as Yermak. In general, the greatest limitation to this work is the absence of references; the few footnotes are explanatory. David Collins served as editor and has added useful, but not extensive, suggestions for further readings. Decidedly designed for beginners, any scholar interested in a good overview of Russians in Siberia should begin here.

Helen Hundley, Wichita State University

Reyerson, Kathryn L., Theofanis G. Stavrou, and James D. Tracy, eds. *Pre-Modern Russia and its World: Essays in Honor of Thomas S. Noonan*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2006. 180 pp. €48.00. ISBN 3-447-05425-5.

Thomas S. Noonan made significant contributions to the economic history of medieval Eurasia with his pioneering studies of the circulation of silver coins between Rus' and the Islamic world and the wider social and political consequences of long-distance commerce. The scope of the articles in this volume is a fitting tribute to someone whose interests ranged so widely. They include sweeping surveys as well as specialized studies, all with broad implications for many disciplines.

One wonders why the final article ("Coins, Commerce, and the Conceptualization of Kievan Rus'") was not placed first. Janet Martin provides a succinct but insightful introduction to Noonan's scholarship, placing it within the context of the Normanist controversy. This is a helpful overview for the non-archaeologist which shows how Noonan "[stepped] outside the terms of the established debates" (p. 162) about the origins of Rus'. Because many of the other contributions situate their approach in some aspect of Noonan's work, this article should be read first to gain an appreciation of his scholarship.

The other articles cover large sweeps of Eurasian history, some in close detail, others with a broader view. What appears to be a narrow study of boat nails ("Identification of the Square Section of Viking Age Boat Nails") offers surprising conclusions and a warning about reading too much into artifacts. Although nails have been classified as round or square in earlier studies, research using X-ray photography shows that corrosion has rendered their shapes largely indistinguishable, and that assumptions about the structure of boats based on nail shape are therefore unfounded. It is unusual to conclude that a problem is *less* nuanced than previously assumed, particularly when technology is involved, and this study's rigorous approach may well be instructive in other fields.

Similarly, two articles about trade ("Traders in the Forest" and "Falconry and the Exchange Networks of Medieval Eurasia") open broad vistas on medieval society. In the first, an excavation in a remote part of the Vologda region reveals a prosperous early medieval village in which the fur trade "was more a means of gaining wealth than a basis of subsistence" (p. 129). Extrapolating from plentiful finds of luxury goods, many of them from the West, the author concludes that "the degree of commercialization of the rural areas and the level of prosperity of the rural settlers were quite high" (p. 131). The second article, after providing a broad introduction to falconry and the trade in gyrfalcons, questions traditional disciplinary boundaries and argues for a more integrated "trans-civilizational" and "trans-ecological" approach in order to understand long-distance social and commercial interactions.

"Closer Encounters with the Byzantine World" and "The Khazar Sacral Kingship" offer somewhat more speculative but meticulously researched insights into governance and international relations. Jonathan Shepard reconstructs the political and cultural role of the Taman peninsula at the intersection of the Rus' and Byzantine worlds with particular reference to two Rus' princes who spent part of their careers there. Despite working with fragmentary evidence, he makes a compelling case for the cultural influence of the region in the heartland of Rus' and its importance as a "springboard" for princes trying to break into high level politics. P. B. Golden surveys evidence from across the steppe world to explain the origin and nature of the Khazar sacral kingship. Although Slavists and Byzantinists may find this study difficult to follow due to its liberal usage of exotic terms and diacritic marks, it repays close reading by illustrating the diversity and complexity of steppe societies, neighbors of the Byzantine Commonwealth which are too often overlooked.

Criticisms of the volume are mainly of a technical nature. One wishes that the editors had decided on uniform spellings for certain terms (Rus, Rus', or *Rus''*?), and a bibliography of Noonan's publications would have been useful. These are, however, small objections to a book which explores exciting new directions in interdisciplinary scholarship.

Monica White, University of Cambridge

Allen, Elizabeth Cheresh. *A Fallen Idol is Still a God: Lermontov and the Quandaries of Cultural Transition.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006. xii + 286 pp. $55.00. ISBN 08047-5370-9.

In setting a basis for her theory of Lermontov as a transitional writer, Elizabeth Cheresh Allen must delve into the murky waters of history and literary periodization, but on more than a merely chronological level. Immediately the problem of conceptualization arises: how do we make sense of the past? Both linear and cyclical models of history use periods, and Allen wants to place Lermontov in a historical context of transition; she is concerned not with "transition in" (what gives rise to a new period, consult Nicholas Riasanovsky's *The Emergence of Romanticism* [1995]), but with "transition out" (what leads an old period to an end). She fastens onto four models of "transition out" (Huizinga, Bouwsma, Bate, and Herzen) that emphasize loss of integrity, including morality. As integrity recedes, the rising generation loses its guidelines, its lodestar, its critical support; its mentality consequently falls into instability, uncertainty, and anomie. The author first has to convince us, however, that Romanticism actually has enough integrity (coherence) that eventually it will have something to break down into and that it would decline to the extent that a writer coming of age in its end times would feel adrift in a sea of insecurity. Was Romanticism that coherent? Was its amorality its morality, its diversity its unity, and its incoherence its coherence? Could one really be set adrift by the decline of Romanticism?

Allen most ably sets out to answer those very questions in detailed and informed analyses of six works that span Lermontov's career: *Korsar, Izmail-Bei, Demon, Masquerade, Hero of Our Time,* and "Shtoss." In each case Allen methodically shows how in spite of developing as an artist, Lermontov remained what he had always been—even at the start of his career—"a remarkable post-Romanticist" (p. 209). She compares Lermontov's *Korsar* and *Izmail-Bei* to Byron's *Corsair*, *Lara*, and *The Giaour* to demonstrate how Lermontov was basically a "non-Byron" whose heroes ponder Romantic heroes rather than act like them. In contrast to the image of evil that is the devil in de Vigny's *Eloa*, Goethe's *Faust,* Byron's *Cain,* and Maturin's *Melmoth the Wanderer*, Lermontov's Demon emerges as a spineless moral cripple too uncertain and pathetic to challenge God. Instead he suffers from what Allen has characterized as post-Romantic anomie. Arbenin, more "morally questionable" (p. 112) than Othello to whom Allen compares him, is too craven to commit suicide; instead he falls into a cowardly stupor. Unworthy of the heroes who have preceded him, Arbenin lacks their will, conscience, love, intellect, and insight. In *Masquerade*, Romantic ideals have turned into mere ideology.

In the transitional *Hero of Our Time*, Pechorin, like the Demon, also falls prey to post-Romantic anomie; his malaise stems from his inability to stand for anything, to define his role in life, to exert his will, to identify exactly who he is. The secondary characters that surround him do hold on to some beliefs, but tend to forgo them in some way after they come into contact with him. Everyone, then, faces disillusionment because of Pechorin. The novel ends with unanswered questions. Allen makes her most convincing case when she analyzes the often overlooked "Shtoss." She argues that this story is neither a Romantic tale of the supernatural nor a Realistic depiction of a descent into insanity; instead it expresses post-Romantic uncertainties that underlie post-Romantic irony where no truths are ever granted. Allen concludes that the post-Romantic age was impoverished and that the transitional quandary therein led the writers to seek art "in a time of insufficient imaginative inspiration" (p. 213). Allen sees convincing parallels between post-Romanticism and post-Modernism. In all, Allen makes an excellent case for her thesis that will no doubt generate healthy debate.

Christine A. Rydel, Grand Valley State University

Pravilova, Ekaterina. *Finantsy imperii: Den'gi i vlast' v politike Rossii na natsional'nykh okrainakh, 1801–1917*. Moscow: Novoe izdatel'stvo, 2006. 454 pp. ISBN 5-98379-048-X.

The volume under review presents an analysis of financial management by the Russian imperial state of its colonial borderlands in the long nineteenth century. The focus is on policies carried out in Congress Poland, the Grand Duchy of Finland, Transcaucasia, and Turkestan. Ekaterina Pravilova seeks to understand imperial priorities in the non-Russian borderlands though what she calls an "institutional approach" (p. 12), and her primary attention is on decision making in formation of budgets; state collection and disbursement of funds, including taxes; monetary policy; and state loans.

Pravilova explains that the Russian state on the whole used budgetary and financial policies in its imperial peripheries—particularly the centralization of financial administration—to pursue primarily political, not economic goals. While Russia's imperial holdings provided resources and helped to stimulate new growth in some areas—such as in railroads—the cost of empire overall was too high, Pravilova concludes. The failure to develop a unified economic policy toward the borderlands that was also coordinated with internal economic development internally meant that for the Russian Empire territorial expansion came at the cost of furthering industrialization and social modernization in the Russian core. Instead of fostering economic integration of Russian and non-Russian territories, the financial policies of the Russian state were used "as a tool of Russification, for dealing with internal problems of the metropole, and for resolving constitutional and political conflicts, but not at all as part of a strategy for territorial economic development" (p. 301). Thus, imperial expansion was a brake upon economic and social development of Russia as a whole, with the borderlands "hanging like a stone from its neck" (p. 371).

Among primary sources Pravilova relies on documents from the Ministry of Finance and from government committees in St. Petersburg charged with oversight of Poland, Finland, and Transcaucasia. She displays an impressive familiarity with Polish and Western secondary sources, particularly those in English. Her mastery of the literature on the economic history of other European continental and colonial empires enables her to place the financial history of the Russian Empire in a comparative context.

There is perhaps an excessive reliance in this study upon accounts of decisions made from one year to the next by high-level tsarist finance officials both in Petersburg and in these non-Russian regions. Pravilova also makes it clear that her intention is not to conduct any statistical analyses of the economies of these regions under Russian rule and of their role within the wider Russian economy. Nevertheless, Pravilova's "institutional approach" could perhaps have been leavened with more than cursory descriptions of the impact of state financial policies on populations both within the borderlands and Russia proper.

The imperial dimension of Russian economic history is woefully understudied, and this volume thus presents an important contribution to the study of the multiethnic tsarist empire, the above caveats aside.

Bradley D. Woodworth, University of New Haven

Marshall, Alex. *The Russian General Staff and Asia, 1800–1917*. London: Routledge, 2006. xii + 274 pp. $120.00. ISBN 0415355613.

After framing the perception of Asia in the mind and imagination of nineteenth-century Russians, Alex Marshall presents a detailed study of the role of the General Staff in the formation and governance of Russia's Asian empire. Then, Marshall discusses pre-Nicholaevan antecedents of the General Staff while focusing on its role in Asian affairs during the reign of Nicholas I. By the time of the

tsar's 1855 death, a dedicated cohort of staff officers had emerged as Asia specialists whose work assured that Oriental studies would be available to them and to the next generation of interested officers through the empire's military educational institutions. In what the author describes as its "most active stage," (p. 164), that of the post-Crimean War period, Marshall analyzes the "Asian" components of D. A. Miliutin's military reforms. In the final stage of that department's existence in the early twentieth century, the author reveals that General Staff officers had become deeply ingrained in civilian academic circles that studied the Caucasus, Central Asia, and the Far East. Together, these military and academic leaders presented Nicholas II with well-reasoned advice on the far reaches of the empire.

As a result of his research Marshall makes unquestionably clear that an intelligent group of General Staff officers, ranging from D. A. Miliutin and A. I. Maksheev to N. M. Przheval'skii and A. N. Kuropatkin, intensely studied many different aspects of Russia's nineteenth-century Asian empire. Their intellectual endeavors ranged from studying Turkic or Asian languages to creating the science of Military Statistics, an exercise designed to gather information about every other nation/kingdom/empire of the world. Their operational activities included everything from learning how to be a soldier in the hostile Caucasus of the 1830s and 1840s to commanding an army of conquest in Central Asia and then becoming a military governor of the newly conquered territory. And most important of all, these men, Russia's military *vostokovedenie* formed the core of the military agents who would serve across Russia's Asian empire as the first line of intelligence gatherers between 1800 and 1917. They provided the vital information, the human intelligence, that the tsarist government has at its disposal to form its colonial policies.

The author is most interested in presenting his readers with the history of how a select group of Russian General Staff officers gathered, processed, and disseminated information about the empire. Their goal was to have an impact on imperial policy which put officers in the difficult position of articulating ideas about politics and diplomacy to the tsar. Marshall gathers an impressive number of sources that range from numerous *fondy* (with emphasis on District Staff and Regional records) from the Russian State Military Archive (RGVIA), to a broad selection of the voluminous, legally published contemporary primary sources, to the expected comprehensive list of secondary sources. The final product is a book that consists of thick, encyclopedic chapters that frame Asia in Imperial political/military thinking and action. Marshall provides his audience with detailed case studies on the emergence of a "colonial military elite," their tactics for expansion, and how these theories became plans of operation in the Far East, the Caucasus, and Central Asia.

In the end, Marshall's contribution to the literature is a study of the ideas and activities of a very narrow but significant group of General Staff officers who had strong ideas and always potential solutions to the challenges that constructing, maintaining, and ultimately defending the empire posed to the autocracy. Agreeing with much of the literature, Marshall concludes that while well reasoned ideas and plans were always present for the tsar's approval, a combination of factors ranging from the poor vertical flow of information between bureaucratic branches to the confused decision-making practices of Imperial politicians, often beginning with the tsar, prevented this intelligence from having much impact on the formation or development of policy. The scenario that Marshall constructs about the General Staff and Imperial decision making lacks contextualization within the broader strategic picture that dominated the thinking and activities of Russian military leaders of the nineteenth century, particularly in the post- German unification period. From 1871 until 1904 Russian strategists' fixation on their Western frontiers, rendered secondary any Asian questions, despite the construction and consolidation of a massive empire. Marshall, however, presents his readers with an authoritative analysis of the topics that he examines. The result is not only a book on how the Russia General Staff functioned inside one of its departments, but also a very important contribution to the study of the Russian Empire.

John W. Steinberg, Georgia Southern University

Kelly, Laurence. *Diplomacy and Murder in Tehran: Alexander Griboyedov and Imperial Russia's Mission to the Shah of Persia*. New York: Tauris Parke Paperbacks, 2006. xx + 316 pp. £11.99 (paper). ISBN 1-84511-196-6.

This very interesting interdisciplinary book is essentially a work of history, but it verges as well on a biography of Alexander Griboyedov, a description of the Russian literary scene of the 1810s and 1820s, and an examination of the Decembrist uprising and the history of diplomacy and imperial strategy among England, Russia, Persia, and Turkey.

Laurence Kelly frames the narrative in terms of Griboyedov's life, using his dates as the beginning and ending dates of the narrative, but covers every aspect discussed with great thoroughness, including Griboyedov's youth and modest circumstances, family relations, written and planned texts, career in the Foreign Ministry, plans for a Russian-Persian trading company, narrow escape from punishment for being, at a minimum, closely associated with the Decembrists, as well as Russian imperial aims in the Caucasus and Transcaucasus. Historical players always get full and detailed treatment; names are virtually never simply dropped into the narrative. Kelly also pulls back from the immediate circumstances of Griboyedov and Russia to sketch a larger historical view; for example, he puts forward the very persuasive argument that one can "see the Great Game as beginning not, as is commonly assumed, in Central Asia of the 1850s, but in the Persia of the 1820s. London still considered Persia as the insurmountable bastion for the defence of India" (p. 67).

Kelly also includes high-quality maps, numerous portraits and illustrations, and several appendices, such as the Table of Ranks and a discussion of the theory (with which Kelly does not agree) that the British were behind the uprising of a mob in Tehran that killed Griboyedov. As Kelly persuasively argues, the British had reason to help facilitate peace between Russia and Persia, which Griboyedov's death might have derailed, while the shah was motivated to allow the mob to do its work, since it prevented one of his chief officials from leaving Persia with Griboyedov. The shah thus appeared not to be at fault for the massacre of the forty-four members of the Russian mission, ultimately allowing the Treaty of Turkmanchai (the conclusion of which was Griboyedov's mission) to be completed.

For the literary scholar, Kelly writes in a way which is both impressively detailed and knowledgeable yet also leaves one wishing for more; Kelly describes Griboyedov's composition of his works and their circumstances of publication and performance, gives a solid sense of them and even quotes them, but his focus remains always on the general historical circumstances rather than on the literature itself. This approach, however, in many ways brings as much to the table as it leaves off; for instance, Kelly makes clear throughout that Griboyedov's shaky finances put him in a very different situation from many of the rich young men he associated with who did not rely on governmental positions for their income and hence could be more free to criticize and flout the powers that be. Kelly goes far in explaining Griboyedov's contradictory position of simultaneous representing and resenting his government.

Similarly, Kelly does not employ any postcolonial theoretical approaches, but his work is of great interest to those who do. Griboyedov aspired to being a professional translator of Arabic and Persian and remain in the capital. Because he took part in a four-sided duel, he was essentially exiled to Persia. His successful diplomatic career, in which he ultimately attained quite a high rank, had much to do with the fact that he was an Orientalist and his knowledge of Persian fit perfectly into the aims of the empire. Kelly does take on the question of whether Griboyedov, who was closely associated with Ermolov, felt qualms about his brutal ways; Kelly concludes that when Griboyedov had an opportunity to see their effects up close, he questioned Ermolov's slash-and-burn tactics.

Katya Hokanson, University of Oregon

Bobroff, Ronald P. *Roads to Glory: Late Imperial Russia and the Turkish Straits*. New York: I. B. Taurus, 2006. xi + 251 pp. $74.95. ISBN 1-84511-142-7.

The fate of Constantinople and the Turkish Straits was one of the mainstays of nineteenth-century European diplomacy. It was an essential part of the larger Eastern Question, that is to say, how would the various territories of the Ottoman Empire be disposed of once the inevitable collapse of that state occurred. Ronald Bobroff (a visiting assistant professor at Wake Forest University) provides us with a thorough look at the final stages of this issue by looking at the policy of Imperial Russia, one of the main players in the diplomatic stakes.

This is not new territory. Russia's basic policies toward the Balkans and Middle East can be found as part of M. S. Anderson's wide-ranging survey of the Eastern Question, Barbara Jelavich's look at the Balkans, and Andrew Rossos's closer examination of the period before the war, while the influence of the Straits in the question of the origins of the First World War can be found even in older works such as Sidney B. Fay. More recently, the fate of the Straits and its relationship to powers other than Russia has featured in the works of Ulrich Trumpener, F. R. Bridge, and myself. And, in Russian, the works of such Soviet scholars as A. V. Ignat'ev, I. V. Bestuzhev, and V. A. Emets and A. Ia. Avrekh have all dealt with facets of this matter.

Thus, the fact that Bobroff's work breaks entirely new ground is a measure of the value of his book. His careful work in Russian archives, and his focus on a particular (but wide-ranging) aspect of Russian foreign policy allows him to give us new insights both into what Russian policy was and how it was formed. With respect to the latter, Bobroff builds on the insightful work of David MacLaren McDonald, whose *United Government and Foreign Policy in Russia, 1900–1914* (1992) revealed the interdepartmental wranglings that accompanied the formation of policy in late Tsarist Russia. This is especially important because Russian policy toward Constantinople and the Straits was intimately linked with Russia's military, naval, and economic capacities. Bobroff demonstrates how the options of the Russian foreign minister, Sergei Sazonov, were determined by Russia's own strength and the views of the ministers responsible for the military and naval departments as much as by his ability to persuade other nations to accede to Russia's wishes.

This was particularly true in the period covered by Bobroff, which is essentially from 1911 to 1915 (there are brief looks at 1908 to 1911 and 1915 to 1916, but these are to set the scene and consider the aftermath). During this period, Russia's policy with respect to the Straits was determined by wars: the Italo-Turkish War, the two Balkans conflicts and the First World War itself. In each case, Bobroff shows how Sazonov's policy, always with the fixed long-term aim of obtaining the Straits for Russia, fluctuated according to Russia's relative military and financial strength. With Russia weak in 1911–12, Sazonov was loathe to raise the issue of the Straits, particularly as Russia was not certain of the support of either Britain or France. Besides, for wider diplomatic reasons, Sazonov wished to support the Italians. During the Balkan Wars, Sazonov found it necessary to follow a changing course. Since the Russian army and fleet were in no position to secure the Straits for Russia, Sazonov had to ensure that no one else—particularly Bulgaria—could seize Constantinople. At the same time, however, he had, for domestic reasons, to support the Balkan Slavs against the Porte and to ensure that the emerging Balkan states did not turn to Austria-Hungary for support.

During the First World War, Sazonov found his interest in the Straits opposed by the Russian General Staff, who, for the most part, wished to focus their efforts against Germany and Austria-Hungary rather than divert troops to a strategically unimportant strike against the Dardanelles. This left diplomacy. Ironically, Sazonov found that he was pushing against an open door with the British, who feared that, unless Russia was guaranteed possession of the Straits in a postwar settlement, the Tsarist government would not concentrate its efforts against the Central Powers. And, again ironically, it was Russia's close ally, France, that opposed a Russian acquisition of a predominant position in the Ottoman Empire because of French commercial and financial interests in the region.

This is a very good and interesting book that adds considerably to our knowledge of Russian foreign policy. There are two points, however, that might be raised. The first is that Bobroff does

not pay sufficient attention to the impact that the negotiation of Italy's entrance into the First World War had on the complicated diplomacy surrounding the formal granting of the Straits to Russia. The second is that Bobroff outruns his evidence in his conclusion by arguing that Sazonov's desire for the Straits prevented any possibility of a separate peace with Turkey and the consequent freeing up of Russian troops that might have provided the margin of victory if deployed against the Central Powers. This is both speculative and, in my opinion, doubtful. Such a disagreement in no way diminishes the value of Bobroff's book. It is essential reading for anyone interested in international diplomacy of the period.

Arkadi Zeltser, Royal Military College of Canada

Norris, Stephen M. *A War of Images: Russian Popular Prints, Wartime Culture, and National Identity, 1812–1945*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2006. xiii + 277 pp. $40.00. ISBN 0-87580-363-6.

This eminently readable book is not a historical study of the *lubok* (broadsheet) but rather a history of the development of Russian national identity as created and reflected in war *lubki*, a construct Stephen M. Norris cogently argues commenced with the Patriotic War of 1812. *Lubki*, a traditional art form familiar to the masses, made these works the perfect vehicle for shaping people's concepts of what it meant to be Russian, especially during times of war. Norris's argument, that Russian national identity was identified in war *lubki*, is a thread deftly woven throughout the text, one substantiated by his astute analysis of the visual material. Norris's well-researched text, lucidly written and free of theoretical digressions, follows the chronological development of the war *lubok* through Russia's military conflicts from the nineteenth century through the early twentieth century.

The war *lubok*, in its response to Napoleon's invasion, articulated Russian national identity, Norris argues, by establishing the imagery by which all successive war *lubki* would be patterned. The visual paradigm present in *lubki* of the 1812 war depicted peasants, Cossacks, the tsar, and the Orthodox Church as the standard iconography for defining Russian nationhood. The Crimean War, which Norris demonstrates was the first conflict in which new censorship laws were enforced, witnessed the institution of essential subjects critical to the continued development of Russian nationhood: *lubki* showing individual acts of heroism along with those that promoted Orthodoxy as an essential component of Russianness. Themes of racial and cultural superiority for elucidating Russian national identity, although based on earlier broadsheets, only became prevalent subjects with the *lubki* of the Russo-Turkish War and the Russo-Japanese War. In the Turkish case it was the superiority of Russian Orthodoxy over Islam, herein depicted as dominant both culturally and religiously, while with the 1904–5 war it was the purported racial supremacy of the Russians over the Japanese. Norris makes a well-reasoned argument that the racial elements of the Russo-Japanese war *lubki* had their genesis in the earlier representations of the Turkish Moslems as inferior peoples, a characteristic that found its first visual expression during the Crimean War. World War I *lubki*, Norris asserts, consisted of displays of Russian nationhood because these broadsheets utilized motifs based on *lubki* traditions started a century earlier, but, as always, with a new dimension: that of emphasizing the masculinity of individual heroes as well as a greater plethora of Russian symbolism. Norris ends his exploration of national identity in war *lubki* by discussing the Civil War and World War II, both of which are given short shrift and lack the convincing arguments of the preceding sections.

Norris buttresses his insightful analysis of the effect of war *lubki* on Russian nationhood with pertinent discussions of *lubok* artists, such as Dmitrii Moor and Ivan Terebenev, critical arguments of the role played by publishers, most notably Ivan Sytin, and astute descriptions of how *lubki* acted as conduits of news about the wars. Concise but informative accounts of the varied military conflicts are presented at the beginning of each pertinent chapter, providing a contextual foundation for the arguments about the visual material. Norris' critical assessment and assertions are persuasive, although

on occasion he becomes a bit redundant in making these salient points. Sadly, none of the thirty-one images are in color, nor are they reproduced with their explanatory texts. On the whole, Russian national identity is convincingly argued as being embodied in war *lubki*, making this book an important source for those seeking an understanding of the intersection of Russian history, politics, and culture.

K. Andrea Rusnock, Indiana University, South Bend

Altshuler, Stuart. *From Exodus to Freedom: A History of the Soviet Jewry Movement*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlfield Publishers, 2005. xv + 213 pp. $24.95. ISBN 0-7425-4936-4.

The mass emigration of Jews from the USSR and the former USSR since the late 1980s resulted both from serious changes in Soviet policy and from pressure on the Soviet leadership on the part of Western countries. To a large degree this pressure stemmed from the influence of Israel and of Jewish organizations in the United States. The book reviewed here focuses on the activity of American Jewish organizations that fought for Soviet Jews' right to emigrate during the years 1985–91, from Gorbachev's ascent to power to the dissolution of the Soviet Union.

The book's subtitle, "A History of the Soviet Jewry Movement," is confusing as the author is concerned not with the Jewish movement in the USSR but with the policy and activities of American Jewish organizations that participated in the struggle for Soviet Jewry.

Stuart Altshuler asserts that most of those who have studied the American Soviet Jewry movement have not sufficiently appreciated the activity of the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews (UCSJ), in which author was involved for a long time. According to him, "the UCSJ played a remarkable, unique, and oftentimes decisive role in the Soviet Jewry movement ever since the UCSJ brought together the first organizational apparatus on behalf of Soviet Jews in the late 1960s" (p. 190).

The author believes that the history of the American movement for Soviet Jewry largely reflects the opposition of two major camps among American Jewish activists: on the one hand, there were establishment leaders of the National Conference for Soviet Jewry (NCSJ), on the other—the independent activists of the UCSJ. While the former were advocates of "quiet diplomacy and *shtadlanut*—private, discreet negotiations with government leaders by appointed leaders, versus public protests"—the latter were supporters of a policy of "direct intercession" (p. 18). In his opinion their differences, that existed from the 1970s, reflected the general opposition of establishment and non-establishment groups in the American Jewish leadership that were manifest in their different strategies, tactics, priorities, and ideologies.

Altshuler notes that during Gorbachev's perestroika the NCSJ suggested reducing Western pressure on the USSR in order to aid reformers in the Soviet leadership. They proposed a congressional repeal of the 1973 Jackson-Vanik Amendment, which led U.S. extension of liberalized trade conditions to the USSR to that country's liberalization of its emigration policy. Altshuler associates this approach of the NCSJ with Israeli influence and the desire of the latter to renew diplomatic relations with the USSR. In contrast to the NCSJ, the UCSJ activists took the position that the Soviet leaders' stated intention to change their policy toward Soviet Jewry was not genuine. The UCSJ advocated increased American pressure ("to combat naïve uninformed reactions to Soviet realities and to maintain a steady plan of actions on behalf of Soviet Jewry" [p. 42]). The author stresses that the view of the UCSJ coincided with the views of Jewish activists in the USSR and of ex-Soviet Jews already living in Israel.

The question of the destination of Soviet Jews who aspired to emigrate was a central issue that, from 1987 to 1989, caused friction between the NCSJ and the UCSJ. Altshuler notes that establishment organizations supported the Israeli position; this stressed that *aliyah,* immigration to the Jewish state, should be encouraged by organizing direct flights from the USSR to Israel. In contrast, the grassroots UCSJ advocated the freedom of Soviet Jews to choose their country of

destination. (The UCSJ argued that if immigration to America were to be restricted, those Soviet Jews who did not move to Israel either due to economic reasons or to fear for their security would be forced to stay in the USSR and perhaps suffer discriminations or persecution.)

It is also noted that the 1989 decision of the American administration to alter the former practice of granting refugee status to all Jews who, the Soviets claimed, left the USSR for Israel but, on the way, changed their country of destination was not only the result of NCSJ's lobbying in favor of Israeli interests. Altshuler stresses an additional factor: the doubts of the U.S. government about whether the United States could allocate sufficient resources to successfully absorb tens or even hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews, and about whether American Jewish organizations could raise sufficient funds for the newcomers' absorption.

The author's distinctions between the approaches of the establishment NCSJ and the grassroots UCSJ, particularly in regard to their strategies (quiet diplomacy vs. noisy campaign) does not always appear to be borne out. This is the case since the UCSJ not only aroused public opinion to the problems of Soviet Jews and organized mass demonstrations of protest against Soviet policy toward the Jews, but was also busy lobbying for their interests and views in the Congress and with the U.S. administration. In other words, the UCSJ also utilized the *shtadlanut* which author attributes exclusively to the NCSJ.

The book's description of the Jewish movement in the USSR is schematic and simplified. The positions of different groups of "refuseniks" are represented by statements of individual Jewish activists. Furthermore, Altshuler's comment that "the Soviet Jewry activist and emigration movement enormously affected every individual Jew in the Soviet Union" (p. 10) is incorrect. There was never a direct impact of Soviet Jewish activists on the majority of Soviet Jews. An ordinary Jew learned about refusenik activity only from "anti-Zionist" literature published in the USSR or from radio programs broadcast from the West or Israel. The author also incorrectly combines dissidents and refuseniks into a single activist group, with one well-known exception—Natan Sharansky. On the basis of their espoused goals these groups had very different purposes: the refuseniks demanded the opportunity to leave the USSR, while the dissidents struggled to change the Soviet regime.

Altshuler does not examine the way in which decisions were taken within either the NCSJ or his own UCSJ. One of the rare exceptions to this involved what the distinguished historian Martin Gilbert wrote after his visit to the USSR at the beginning of Gorbachev's era. Gilbert doubted the Soviets' intention to alter their hard stand regarding the refuseniks (p. 45). His report may have helped form the UCSJ's position. An additional question not addressed is whether the leaders of the UCSJ had a united position from the start regarding Soviet Jewry, or whether there had been debates among them. For example, did they differ in their attitudes toward perestroika and concerning the country or countries of destination for Soviet Jews? The author writes about differences in the personal and public positions of NCSJ leaders in regard to the shift from advocacy of "free" (that is, to any destination) emigration of Soviet Jews, which they had supported for many years, to a pro-Israeli position (p. 148). However, he does not discuss whether the change in the UCSJ's position on this matter, which took place a short time later, occurred with or without dissent or crises.

Unfortunately, Altshuler barely examines the relations between UCSJ leaders and representatives of the State of Israel, although some of the details mentioned in the book indicate that such contacts did exist. Furthermore, he stressed that such contacts were particularly characteristic of the NCSJ. In spite of the one-sided nature of the book, it is helpful for understanding the place of Soviet Jewish emigration in American-Soviet relations in the Gorbachev era. It illuminates the questions that American Jewish organizations had to decide in their desire to aid Soviet Jews, particularly in regard to the differences in the approaches of the leaders of the NCSJ and the UCSJ during this period.

Arkadi Zeltser, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Lukacs, John. *George Kennan: A Study of Character*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007. x + 212 pp. $26.00. ISBN 978-0-300-12221-3.

We should all have John Lukacs as a friend or at least as our eulogist. Lukacs was a friend, probably an intimate one, of George Kennan, and this review is one long eulogy for his friend. Masterfully written and supremely literate, this appreciation more than acknowledges the many qualities of Kennan's character and some of the reasons why scholars admired him. But it is not the whole man, even though Lukacs clearly discerned some of the more ambivalent sides of Kennan's generally splendid character and intellect. Kennan's ambivalence about democracy, for example, although one has to guess it from the account here, appears to be more than just an intellectual elitism, though there certainly was an elitist strain to Kennan's thinking about democracy and the conduct of diplomacy, something he regarded as a specialized art. This elitism was a common failing of many foreign service officers of a certain generation and often manifested itself in disdainful or cold attitude toward peoples who were not white Anglo-Saxon Protestants. Kennan's comments on Asia and Latin America, not recorded here, clearly indicate that he freely admitted to himself that he could not understand or come to terms with those societies and cultures and extrapolated from that to believe increasingly that the United States could not do so either and should not try too hard to do so.

But this elitism and rejection of the compulsive gregariousness of American politics clearly stemmed from the fundamental shyness and reserve, even introspective nature of George Kennan, although Lukacs leaves it to the reader to discern this. Similarly Lukacs seems to glide over or lose sight of something that clearly jumped out to this reader when he encountered Kennan's magnificent histories of European, Russian, and American diplomacy and later essays on current affairs. On the one hand, as Lukacs admits, and as any reader of Kennan readily sees, Kennan belonged to the old-fashioned school of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Realism, which held that nations or states should pursue their foreign policy based on a cold-blooded and hard-headed, or unsentimental understanding of national interests. Yet, and particularly as he aged, this realism was joined to a deep-rooted moralism and even revulsion from the hurly-burly of politics. In fact, it may be this tension that is the source of what is enduring in Kennan's works and essays.

Lukacs's admiration for Kennan is unbound, calling him a national treasure and the conscience of our country. Based on everything that Lukacs has to say about Kennan it is almost certain that he would have flinched visibly from being addressed in such a fashion even if he would have undoubtedly harbored considerable pride for being so thought of. Certainly, as can be seen here, Kennan's integrity was absolute and his writing and intellectual skills were obviously at an equally high level. But the emotional passion that undergirded those qualities is not brought out here. Rather it has to be inferred along with the less noble dimensions of Kennan's life and career. Thus there really is no need to extol him beyond a limit that he would have been comfortable accepting. It is highly unlikely that Kennan either saw himself or needed to see himself as a national treasure or the conscience of his country. It would have been enough to say, "He was a man. Taken for all and all we shall not look upon his kind again."

Stephen Blank, U.S. Army War College

Social Science, Contemporary Russia, and Other

Rose, Richard, William Mishler, and Neil Munro. *Russia Transformed: Developing Popular Support for a New Regime*. Cambridge University Press, 2006. xii + 226 pp. $29.99 (paper). ISBN 978-0-521-69241-0.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, Richard Rose and various collaborators have been monitoring various aspects of Russian public opinion in general, and the extent and determinants of support for the new regime in particular. In this book, Richard Rose, William Mishler, and Neil Munro utilize, for the same ends, a series of New Russian Barometer surveys, taken from 1992 to 2005. A central focus is changes over time in both the extent of support and in the determinants thereof.

While other students of Russian public opinion during the same time period have tended to emphasize Russians' support, or lack thereof, for democracy, Rose et al. have taken a different slant. They have persistently asked whether Russians support their new regime, without labeling it a democracy. They have, at the same time, assessed Russians' support for democracy at an ideal level, as well their perception that Russia is, or is not, a democracy. This approach has many strengths, including avoiding the assumption that the Russian political system has been, or is, a democracy, and enabling the authors to examine the relationships between Russians' commitment to democracy as an ideal with their support for their existing system.

In making support their most important dependent variable, Rose et al. run into a number of conceptual problems. Their discussion of support often leads the reader to equate it with lack of active resistance to the regime, or "resigned acceptance." Their two empirical measures, however, do not seem to be tapping in either to respondents' actions or to their resigned acceptance. The first is a thermometer scale, running from positive 100 to negative 100. At the time of the first survey, 74 percent of the respondents rated the new system below zero, with only 14 percent positive. In succeeding years, the percentage negative declined substantially. Paralleling that decline was a comparable rise in positive ratings.

Their second measure is stated support for regime alternatives "on offer." They ask: "There are different opinions about how to run the state. To what extent do you think it would be better to: (a) Suspend parliament and elections, (b) Restore the Communist system, (c) Tough dictatorship is the only way out of the current situation, and (d) The army should govern the country" (p. 94). Each of the first three alternatives, over time, seems attractive to about a third of their respondents, with only army rule overwhelmingly unpopular. Such a list, which includes only alternative regimes on the dictatorial side of the existing regime, and ignores alternatives on the more democratic side, underestimates the degree of support for alternative regimes, as the authors later concede when they argue that democratic idealists tend to show, on the thermometer scale, less support for the regime.

The authors, in attempting to get at the determinants of evolving support, examine a number of possible independent variables. They add to the usual list an assessment of the degree of regime corruption and, most important, the impact of time, or, as they characterize it, inertia. Their multivariate analysis suggests that the most powerful of the determinants of regime support are, in a negative direction, commitment to democracy and perception of regime corruption, and, in a positive direction, inertia, or the growth in the feeling that the regime will last, and support for a market economy. This assessment of the magnitude and determinants of regime-support is the heart of the book, is done well, and is a major contribution to the literature on Russian public opinion. Bringing in corruption and inertia as independent variables introduces further sophistication into that literature.

The authors, however, are more ambitious. They provide theoretical chapters on the need for any regime to be in equilibrium. They offer a new typology of regime types, and, using this typology, categorize the various European political systems. They provide a brief history of Soviet/Russian politics. And they end with a speculative chapter on possible threats to Russians' support for their regime. These additional chapters add little to the relevant literatures.

Robert D. Grey, Grinnell College

Tsygankov, Andrei P. *Russia's Foreign Policy: Change and Continuity in National Identity*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2006. xxvi + 218 pp. $24.95 (paper). ISBN 0-7425-2650-X.

A political scientist at San Francisco State University, Andrei Tsygankov has written a relatively brief and well-documented summary of the main directions of Russia's foreign policy from the Gorbachev period through the fifth year of Putin's presidency. He explains that his text is written with teaching needs in mind, and it is intended to differ from the more common treatment of the subject by Western scholars by departing from the "traditional" realist and liberal perspectives. Tsygankov's own perspective is that of "social constructivism," centered on the concept of identity.

In this view, Russia's "national interest" is not a fixed geopolitical reality, but something open to interpretation. In Russia's recent past, Tsygankov argues, there have been four distinct concepts of national interest: New Thinking (Gorbachev), Great Power Integration (Yeltsin and Kozyrev), Great Power Balancing (Primakov), and Great Power Pragmatism (Putin), each of which he describes in a separate chapter. His central argument is that these competing visions, and not Russia's position in the global balance of power or international economy, have shaped the country's foreign policy since the mid-1980s. During each of these phases, moreover, Russia's behavior has been particularly influenced by the behavior of the "identified significant Other" (p. 20)—the nations of the West. "It is therefore domestic identity coalitions competing for influence in the context of Western actions that help to make sense of Russia's foreign policy" (p. xxiv).

This approach is indeed a novel one for undergraduate texts on this subject, and (with rare exceptions) Tsygankov lays out his case clearly, supplementing his argument with a useful chronology and bibliography. His central argument, however, is ultimately unpersuasive, because it fails to correlate shifts among internal political factions ("identity coalitions") with all of the major twists and turns in Russia's policy over the past twenty years. Thus, for example, Tsygankov denies that Russia's initial pro-Western policy was being pursued by Yeltsin, Gaidar, and Kozyrev primarily because of its material weaknesses and desperate need of assistance; rather, he says, they sought a new identity for Russia. And although he correctly shows that the shift away from the "Westernizing" direction in1993 followed on the failure of Western countries to provide the degree of support that Yeltsin had expected, Tsygankov nevertheless contends that the policy was changed only because of the coming to power in 1993 of an identity coalition of "Statists." In truth, however, the major power shift that occurred in Russia in 1993 was the defeat of the anti-Westernizing Supreme Soviet; the "father of Russia's new Statism," (p. 64) Yevgeny Primakov, did not assume control of Russian foreign policy until the end of 1995.

Even more problematic for Tsygankov's argument is his inability to account for the relative continuity in Russia's foreign policy between the time that Putin rose to power in late 1999—at Primakov's expense—and the global policy shifts that followed the terrorist attacks on the United States in September 2001. Although a major shift had already occurred in the "domestic identity coalition," the change in policy from Primakov-style "Great Power Balancing" to what Tsygankov calls "Great Power Pragmatism" occurred only two years later—and (as a realist would recognize) it resulted from a change in the foreign policy orientations of the sole superpower. Equally difficult for Tsygankov to explain using his prism of power shifts among "domestic identity coalitions" is Putin's subsequent backing away from the post-9/11 partnership he had proposed with the United

States. As was the case with the change in Russia's direction in 1993, it was not a shift in "identity coalitions" in Russia but rather the lack of responsiveness to Russia's interests by the United States that brought about the latest (fifth?) phase in Russia's policy.

Indeed, despite the novelty of Tsygankov's social constructivist perspective, the events transpiring in the two years since the completion of his book have further demonstrated that the more "traditional" views of the relationship between Russia's politics and policy provide superior insights into the motive forces behind changes in its global interactions.

Robert H. Donaldson, University of Tulsa

D'Anieri, Paul. *Understanding Ukrainian Politics: Power, Politics, and Institutional Design*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 2007. x + 300 pp. $72.95 (paper). ISBN 0-7656-1812-2.

Paul D'Anieri is one of the leading scholars of the study of contemporary Ukraine, and this volume brings together his expertise in Ukrainian politics and state-building that he has accumulated over the last decade through teaching, research, and academic publications. *Understanding Ukrainian Politics* explains and analyzes the linkage between state- and institution-building, political regime, elections, parliament, president, and civil society and stresses the importance of the Orange Revolution while analyzing why this democratic breakthrough required further reforms to achieve Ukraine's democratic consolidation.

As D'Anieri points out, the 2004-6 constitutional reforms makes authoritarianism unlikely in Ukraine as they reduced the power of the presidency. At the same time, he accurately predicted, as seen in the 2007 constitutional crisis, that the reforms could lead to stalemate and increased presidential-parliamentary conflict. Like most political scientists, D'Anieri believes that the reforms have reduced the possibilities open to Prime Minister Viktor Yanukovych to reestablish authoritarianism as this is linked to super-presidentialism. D'Anieri ignores the possibility that there could also be an authoritarian outcome in a parliamentary system and that Yanukovych's political machine, the Party of Regions, still runs the Donbas as a managed democracy (p. 243). The 2007 crisis was triggered by the Anti-Crisis coalition's attempt to create a constitutional majority through the defection of deputies using tried and tested tactics from the Kuchma era. D'Anieri criticizes these methods in a manner remarkably similar to President Viktor Yushchenko's subsequent justification for disbanding parliament as a distortion of the 2006 election results (p. 189).

This book is the first to integrate political science theory into state- and institutional-building into Ukrainian politics. Previously published books dealing with constitution making and parliamentary politics have only briefly integrated political science theory into contemporary Ukrainian political studies. D'Anieri argues that four factors have driven Ukrainian politics since 1991: Ukraine's institutional legacy from the USSR (referred to in political science as "path dependency"), regional divisions, institutional design, and power politics. The latter transformed into "electoral authoritarianism" in Leonid Kuchma's second term (1999–2004) and has traditionally trumped the first three.

A central question facing Ukraine is therefore whether power politics will continue to trump democratic institutions and the rule of law following the 2004 Orange Revolution. The spring 2007 constitutional crisis, the fifth since Yushchenko was elected, suggests that the process of democratic change initiated by the Original Revolution is still in motion. D'Anieri's book provides an important backdrop to understanding these crises. The last chapter concludes that whereas authoritarianism is now unlikely in the post-Orange Revolution, a successful transition to a consolidated liberal democracy remains an open question. D'Anieri is concerned that political parties, which are crucial to multiparty parliamentary systems, remain weak and are dominated by personalities rather than programs.

The book is divided into an introduction and ten chapters, with the first two chapters devoted to discussing political science theories and their applicability to Ukraine. Chapter 4 surveys political

developments from the 1998 to the 2006 parliamentary elections. This crucial period in modern Ukrainian history covers Kuchma's second term in office, Viktor Yushchenko's election, and the Orange Revolution. Chapter 5 discusses the theoretical and comparative incompatibility of regional divisions in Ukraine and democratization; specifically, whether societal cleavages can negatively affect the consolidation of democracy.

Chapters 6–8 cover the different possibilities for institutional design and state-building in Ukraine in the constitution, regime type (parliamentary or presidential system), and the institution of parliament. Chapters 9–10 survey the growth of "electoral authoritarianism" in Ukraine during Kuchma's second term in office by placing it in a comparative perspective with the former USSR and other regions. Chapter 11 brings the book to the present by discussing the pitfalls and positive aspects of constitutional reforms agreed in 2004 and introduced in 2006 that transformed Ukraine from a presidential to a parliamentary-presidential system.

D'Anieri surveys Ukrainian politics in a masterful manner by investigating how the country's regionalism influences democracy and what institutional design and legislation best fit the country. He concludes that cleavages do not mean that Ukraine cannot build a democracy—something attested to by successful democracies in Canada, Belgium, and Spain. Ukraine's parliamentary voting patterns show left-right cleavages rather than regional ones. Ukraine is, he believes, because of its regionalism and because two party systems best fit presidential systems, D'Anieri believes that Ukraine is destined to have a multi-party parliamentary democracy.

I wholeheartedly recommend *Understanding Ukrainian Politics* for teaching Ukrainian, post-Communist, and comparative politics courses, as well as for journalists and policymakers interested in understanding the dynamics at play in Ukraine. D'Anieri's book makes an original contribution to contemporary studies of Ukrainian politics by integrating political science theory into Ukrainian politics and placing this within a comparative context.

Taras Kuzio, George Washington University

Goltz, Thomas. *Georgia Diary: A Chronicle of War and Political Chaos in the Post-Soviet Caucasus*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 2006. 312 pp. $39.95. ISBN 0-7656-1710-2.

Montana cowboy and actor turned journalist meets Georgian bronco-buster, Eduard Shevardnadze. An interesting clash, and if you are looking for skittish prose or academic analysis this book is not for you. It is the third in the trilogy of diaries written on the Caucasus by Thomas Goltz. The first two were *Azerbaijan Diary* (1998) and *Chechnya Diary* (2003). The latest *Diary* recalls the calamitous disintegration of Georgia in the 1990s and the personal tragedies that accompanied the state's collapse into civil war. It is an adventure told by a journalist looking for stories and getting caught up in the political drama of revolution, civil war, murder, and betrayal that characterized Georgia in the late 1980s and 1990s. Goltz is a gambler who pursues ousted President Zviad Gamsakhurdia into the mountains of Western Georgia (and finally finds him in a coffin), scrambles from Sukhumi in September 1993 as it falls to Abkhazian secessionists, Russian artillery, and Chechen mercenaries, and battles with Georgians and Abkhazians for the last place in a helicopter or bus trying to get out of the war zone.

The value of this book for the scholar is in the events the book describes and in the personalities, both ordinary and extraordinary, that Goltz meets. Each has something to say—whether it is the brief interview with Eduard Shevardnadze that Goltz includes in the text, or the pithy commentary of Georgian political analysts, or the unremitting tragedies of peasants, amateur soldiers, and refugees that fill the book's pages. It reveals that people on the ground often had better solutions than their political masters. One Georgian resident in Abkhazia pointed out that the Georgian army's brutality against Abkhazian civilians in 1993 removed the one "protective umbrella" Georgians living there had against an unmerciful revenge (p. 138).

The book is a picture from an outsider whose Georgian is rather shaky (his pronunciation is reflected in the misspellings of Georgian names and words), but it describes well what happens to people when a state collapses and it raises serious questions about international behavior. The perilous adventures and near-escapes happen within the context of what Shevardnadze described as the "reflexes of Russian imperialism." One might add the other context of political timidity—later repeated in Rwanda and Darfur—of Western powers. Goltz documents this—not from government reports, speeches, and academic analysis—but on the ground in popular commentary, eyewitness accounts, and political asides from top officials unaware, perhaps, of Goltz's notebook.

The book is not entirely about war, warlords, and embattled peacemakers. It deals briefly in the first chapters with Georgia's geopolitical and energy context, and at the end brings us up to date with the Rose Revolution and its hopes and delusions. In the epilogue, Goltz devotes considerable space to the murder of Freddie Woodruff, an American spy mysteriously shot in Georgia in August 1993. But despite confirmation from one of his well-connected Georgian interlocutors that it was no accident and the Georgian government knew exactly who did it, Goltz does not reveal what he was told.

There are other interesting themes in the book—Goltz's constant and mostly losing battles with indifferent editors at the *New York Times* and *Wall Street Journal* to get his stories published, and the life of Western ex-pats in Tbilisi. Goltz is rather cynical about the sincerity of Western journalists and international charity workers who are there to promote careers, and do not understand the culture sufficiently well enough to write accurate stories, or make the right decisions about aid.

This book is a chronicle of the popular voices of revolution and civil war—both victors and victims—in Georgia in the 1990s. It is written by a journalist, not an academic, but that may be its strength. It reveals the forgotten lives and words of the participants themselves.

Stephen F. Jones, Mount Holyoke College

Tismaneanu, Vladimir, Marc Morjé Howard, and Rudra Sil, eds. *World Order after Leninism*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2006. viii + 302 pp. $30.00 (paper). ISBN 0-295-98628-9.

Brought together as a collection of essays in honour of Ken Jowitt, the book has a high degree of coherence and makes a substantial contribution to our understanding of European communist systems and successor regimes. A brief review cannot do justice to the depth of the fourteen chapters, each of which takes an aspect of Jowitt's work to explore a detailed topic. The fact that so many disparate authors in an edited volume have been able to achieve coherence while dealing with distinct subject matter is testimony to the richness of Jowitt's intellectual legacy. The essays demonstrate the power of Jowitt's intellectual formulations, sometimes in contexts far removed from those in which they were originally conceived.

A number of themes emerge from the work. The first focuses on the concept of Leninism as a distinct type of power system. For Jowitt Leninism was neither anti-modern nor an alternative modernity, as Sil and Howard note in the introduction to the book, but a distinct type of modernity in which political power was concentrated in the party of a new type driven by a commitment to the revolutionary transformation of society. Jowitt described in acute detail how this revolutionary regime developed in three stages: transformation of the society; consolidation of party power insulated from society; and inclusion, whereby the party integrates with society while trying to retain its integrity. Inclusion turned out to be rather trickier than this, and as the Brezhnev era demonstrated, the party was unable to insulate itself from society and gradually underwent organizational decay while assuming ever more neotraditional features, including corruption and general moral degeneration. This is a powerful model and its propositions are tested by a number of authors, including Veljko Vujačić for Milošević's Serbia, Barbara Geddes in her discussion of the stages of

development of authoritarian regimes, in Yong-Chool Ha's examination of South Korea's developmental path, and in Calvin Chen's look at Leninism's trajectory in China.

A second theme, closely tied to the first, is what Jowitt called "the Leninist legacy." In his landmark collection of essays *New World Disorder: The Leninist Extinction* (1992) published soon after the fall of the East European communist regimes, Jowitt took a pessimistic view, arguing that Leninism left these societies wholly unprepared for the challenges of liberalism and democracy. He did include one caveat, namely that if the West provided adequate support, then modern democratic orders could be established. For a number of countries in the region the instrument of support was the European Union, and ten former communist countries from the region are now members, although some continue to develop transition agendas even after accession. The Leninist legacy in most of post-Soviet Eurasia, however, continues to exercise a baleful influence, if not always in quite the ways anticipated by Jowitt.

The third theme is one that Jowitt has recently been working on, namely the geopolitical crisis in which we find ourselves, which in some ways is reminiscent of the "twenty years' crisis" between the wars. In his powerful essay on contemporary Iraq and meditation on the "war on terror," Stephen Holmes paints a bleak picture of a world without compass and of a war without end. A fourth theme that may be briefly mentioned is the methodological one, taken up by a number of contributors. Stephen E. Hanson notes that Jowitt's neo-Weberian approach had a strong predictive element, and in his essay Hanson argues that social science is much weakened when it lacks the foundation of empirical testing. To paraphrase rather brutally his sophisticated essay, Hanson basically argues that area studies specialists should reclaim the terrain of political *science*, ceded rather too willingly to the exponents of an abstract scientism that relies more on methodology than on substance. Daniel Chirot in the final chapter notes Jowitt's view that the demise of Leninism represented the end of a whole era, and the contours of the new epoch are as yet still not clear.

There is much more rich material for contemplation in this excellent volume. It is of course the reviewer's duty to nitpick, and one point that probably deserved more analysis is the way that Jowitt's concept of Leninism absorbed Stalinism, a term that is barely mentioned in the book. Another is the "blowback" mechanism whereby Leninism's demise left Western societies exposed and vulnerable to their own morbidities. These and other themes are for the reader to ponder, explore, and enjoy.

Richard Sakwa, University of Kent at Canterbury

Lukić, Jasmine, Joanna Regulska, and Darja Zaviršek, eds. *Women and Citizenship in Central and Eastern Europe*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2007. xvi + 320 pp. $99.95. ISBN 0-7546-4662-9.

This is an engaging book that places women's agency at the center of the analysis of the post-1989 transformation in Central and Eastern Europe. The book's main task is to illuminate how different forces, generated by recent transformations such as the collapse of communism, the emergence of neoliberalism, the resurgence of nationalism and fundamentalism and the creation of noncitizens, and "European" expansion to the east, instigate women to act and react in response to political, social, economic, environmental, and cultural opportunities and challenges. Specifically, its contributors ask how women's agency translates into citizenship practices under the conditions of transformation. How do women accumulate resources, gain access to the political process, confront and challenge state practices, and gain social visibility? How is women's agency shaped not only by material conditions but also as a result of different experiences and political, cultural, and personal dynamics? How is the process of claiming citizenship conditioned by the local and national contexts, as well as the exposure to global and transnational influences?

Organized according to three themes—regimes, agency, and transnational dialogues—the chapters offer a range of answers to these questions. The volume provides a model for scholars to

discuss women's unique role in post-Soviet transition, while maintaining a commitment to the conceptualization of citizenship as an active, multilayered, and historically and locally specific notion. As the coeditors suggest—"the 'horizontal' understanding of difference is key to the acknowledgement of a dynamic and fluid notion of citizenship" (p. 4)—gender is only one dimension to be privileged as an axis along which citizenship is shaped. Class, ethnicity, age, and ability, for example, are also important to address. Contributors thus conduct deep analysis of those regional practices that reify gender expressions, oppressions and resurrections after Soviet-style communism.

Within this framework, each contributor exhibits a consistent regard for the need to address an inherent paradox in doing a gendered analysis of socialist transformation: at the same time that post-Soviet women have expected to gain a redefined citizenship from transition, the fact is that while the institutional and legal frameworks for citizenship have changed, the social reality and the gender relations that generated them have not. Contributors thus confront a range of citizenship practices both emblematic of socialist regimes and nuanced by regional particularities that, when taken together, contribute to an understanding of a larger phenomenon that post-Soviet women face: the "repatriarchalization" of state systems that shape definitions and practice of women's citizenship. Some authors address this phenomenon by historically situating the discriminatory roles of androcentricism, gender-neutrality, and gender-blindness that are characteristic of socialist regimes; others contextualize the resulting underrepresentation of post-Soviet women in contemporary political, legal, community mobilization, and advocacy structures and networks in post-Soviet Europe. Others demonstrate the difficult pathways along which women attempt to claim, find, and negotiate agency within such arenas as the shifting spaces of public life in Poland and Ukraine, election politics in Serbia, food and environmental rights movements in Poland, disability and reproductive decision-making policy in Slovenia, and discussions in Serbia about political responsibility for war violence and genocide. The book concludes with authors identifying important themes of transnational dialogues surrounding women and citizenship in Central and Eastern Europe, such as the roles of the region's intellectuals in challenging the structural gendered violence of post-Soviet nationalist ideologies, the fundamental challenges that East European forms of agency pose to Western feminism, Eurocentrism, Marxism, and other "grand narratives" typically used to frame an understanding of the transition, as well as the contradictory roles that Western nongovernmental organizations play in the space and practice of post-Soviet women's agency.

In the conclusion to the book, Lukić, Regulska, and Zaviršek state that the future of analyzing women's agency in post-Soviet countries should "offer common ground for accommodating ... differences and diversities, but also enrich and signify [women's] critical role in citizen-subject formation processes" (p. 300). When taken as a whole, *Women and Citizenship in Central and Eastern Europe* accomplishes this goal. Just as important, however, the book also successfully operates as a clarifying heuristic at the same time that it offers a flexible construct for thinking about the histories, dialectics, and agonistics of gendered transition.

Rachael Stryker, Mills College

Himka, John-Paul and Andriy Zayarnyuk, eds. *Letters from Heaven: Popular Religion in Russia and Ukraine*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006. x + 286 pp. $60.00. ISBN 0-8020-9148-2.

Russian and Ukrainian peasants were Orthodox Christians and believed that their religious practices were Orthodox as well. This well-crafted collection rests on this assumption and rejects the term *dvoeverie* (dual faith), which has been rightfully criticized for conflating popular religion with paganism. In their introduction, editors John-Paul Himka and Andriy Zayarnyuk provide a concise history of "popular religion" as a framework for studying religion in Ukraine and Russia. They have brought together eight other leading scholars to persuasively demonstrate the need to complicate

our understanding of popular religion, to link it to Orthodoxy, and to blur the lines between official and popular, elite and non-elite religious practice and belief.

The work reflects the recent revival of "popular religion" as a useful, if still problematic, organizing concept for understanding lay, particularly non-elite, religious beliefs and practices. Eve Levin and Christine D. Worobec have led this paradigm shift, and thus it is fitting that they contribute chapters to the collection. Worobec's path-breaking article on Russian and Ukrainian death rituals, originally published in 1994, opens the volume, with a new postscript added to the original text. Levin examines the cult surrounding Saint Paraskeva, whose alleged pagan roots have marginalized it in modern Orthodox practice, demonstrating its fundamentally Christian lineage. In a somewhat similar tone, John-Paul Himka considers Ukrainian icons from the fifteenth through the eighteenth centuries and suggests that icon motifs primarily reflect Byzantine iconography and Biblical imagery and not the social oppression of peasant icon painters, as some Soviet and contemporary Ukrainian scholars have posited.

In keeping with this reexamination of popular religion, several contributions attempt to blur the lines between elite and non-elite religious practices, and between official and popular religion. Paul Bushkovitch's essay suggests that while peasants may have constituted the majority of participants in miracle cults during the reign of Peter I, merchants, landholders, and members of the clergy also participated, while boyars often provided the necessary funding for the monasteries housing the miracle-working icons and shrines. Sophia Senyk comes to a similar conclusion about the use of icon vestments in the Ruthenian Church, which she suggests was not limited to social elites. Vera Shevzov describes how *Akafisty* hymns and Marian icons held a liminal position between official and popular religious practice. Roman Holyk uses miracles to argue against constructing a sharp divide between the medieval and early modern periods.

Natalie Kononenko, a scholar of Ukrainian folklore and the lone non-historian in the group, offers perhaps the most innovative chapter in the collection. Relying primarily on oral interviews, Kononenko engages in a fascinating thick description of death rituals in post-Soviet Ukraine. That said, I might question her characterization of the Soviet era "as a religious vacuum that needed to be filled," which implies that a certain level of religious belief is somehow natural or necessary for all societies (p. 47).

The scope of the work is impressively broad, with chapters ranging from the fifteenth to the twenty-first centuries, and with occasional references to even earlier periods. While the editors wisely chose to limit the book's scope to Russian Orthodoxy, excluding also Old Believers and Orthodox sects, they included Uniatism. Two chapters concern death rituals, three chapters address icons and iconography, and five chapters are centered around what the editors have dubbed "the theme of mentalities" (p. 10). In this vein, Valerie Kivelson explores the intersection of gender, sexuality, and Russian Orthodoxy, while Andriy Zayarnyuk draws connections between religion and national movements.

Overall, the collection makes a worthy contribution to the growing field of scholarship on popular religion, particularly in light of the post-Soviet religious revival in both Russia and Ukraine. Scholars of religious history and folklore wishing to contribute to this field will find this volume essential, as the editors have suggested many promising new directions and new theoretical frameworks for the study of popular religion.

Emily Baran, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill