literature was saturated, both allegorically and directly, with political intent. But Patyk's analysis moves into different territory. It focuses specifically on the politics of violence and fear, and this approach yields a series of fascinating interpretations of familiar texts. Patyk's readings expose Russian literature's long chain of interest in the interrelationship between violence, fear, and power, which she characterizes as "terrorism" *avant le mot*.

Composed in a vigorous and engaging style, this study twists a red thread through many of imperial Russia's best known literary works, from Aleksandr Radishchev's *Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow* and Aleksandr Pushkin's *Bronze Horseman* to Nikolai Gogol′'s *Overcoat* and, by far most importantly here, Fedor Dostoevskii's *Crime and Punishment*, *The Possessed*, and *The Brothers Karamazov*. Patyk argues convincingly that the essential concept of terrorism lies more in the realm of imagination and interpretation than of radical activism, since the label "terrorist" always depends upon the eye of the beholder. She adds to this point that the agitated imaginations of Russia's leading literary lights first raised the specter of political violence and its consequences. Methodologically, Patyk's approach runs counter to many contemporary studies of terrorism. At a time when the term "terrorism" is increasingly under attack as inaccurate, judgement-laden, and in need of replacement, here it is used to refer to virtually all types of political violence from state oppression to bureaucratic bullying to revolutionary bomb throwing. Casting the net wide enables Patyk to shift away from the usual focus on ideology and political authority into more deadly questions about political violence, which still mostly remained in the hands of the state but potentially threatened to work its way into the hands of the state's detractors. One might well describe *Written in Blood* as a study of the menace of political violence that permeated imperial Russian literature, a sense of anxiety that would eventually seem to be prescience in the works of writers like Dostoevskii. Attention to this premonition of political violence is especially powerful in the book's long middle section on Dostoevskii's novels.

While the notion that literature inspired revolutionary terrorism is unlikely to prove the final word in the ongoing debate over the radical populist turn to violence, Patyk's search for answers in literature serves as a demonstration that the case is far from closed. In the meanwhile, as a result of her thoroughgoing analysis of "terrorism" in the evolution of Russian literature, this book will be enthusiastically welcomed by anyone wishing to gain a deeper understanding of the dark forebodings that helped drive imperial Russia's world-historical literary tradition.

Christopher Ely
Florida Atlantic University

Modernizm kak arkhaizm: Natsionalizm i poiski modernistskoi estetiki v Rossii.
By Irina Shevelenko. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2017. 333 pp. Index. RUB 396, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.350

If one were to dream up a book that contextualized Russian modernist literature within rhetorics of nationalism, Irina Shevelenko's book *Modernizm kak arkhaizm* might well be it. In five chapters Shevelenko guides her reader from the turn of the twentieth century to the period of the First World War and the 1917 revolutions. She guides us not merely through these tumultuous decades, but also through a stunning array of art media and art-critical genres: from the Russian expositions at the Paris World's Fair of 1900, to the Abramtsevo artists' colony, the modernist journal

Mir Iskusstva (World of Art), Sergei Diaghilev's "Russian Seasons" and the writings of Aleskei Remizov and Sergei Gorodetskii, the musical experiments of Sergei Prokofiev and Igor Stravinsky, to the reconsideration of icons as aesthetic objects and the ways Russian avant-garde artists appropriated this tradition. In all these spheres the author addresses how Russian artists, critics and thinkers sought to advance Russia's nation-building project, and how competing models of an "aesthetic nationalism" reflected Russia's unique path to national identity.

Shevelenko's book makes important contributions to the study of Russian modernism. First, she analyzes discussions of nationalism and art in Russian periodicals and other genres, most of them not belletristic. She comes from a philological background, with an important tome on modernist poet Marina Tsvetaeva, and, as she notes in her introduction, her methodological approach "resides primarily in the territory of textual analysis" (19). She inspires confidence in her conclusions through precise readings of a wide range of journal articles, editorial statements, exhibition catalogues, manifestoes, and letters. In fact, many of these documents are generously excerpted, making the volume a kind of sourcebook. As she notes, she makes these "secondary" materials primary. Additionally, her work enriches our picture of Russian modernist periodical culture, complementing recent work by Jonathan Stone (*The Institutions of Russian Modernism*, 2017) and others.

Second, Shevelenko grounds her analysis of these texts in their historical context, providing an important picture of how Russian modernists sought to shape their socio-cultural situation, believing that art and ideas could change the world. Shevelenko indicates that in some ways they were not wrong. Her story crosses back and forth between France and Russia, underscoring the impetus to construct a Russian national aesthetic and rhetoric that would answer other European models. She sets up her narrative within post-Emancipation efforts to conceptualize and realize a "homogenized" national culture through painting, literature, and other arts, but early on she addresses visual and spatial tensions between presenting Russia as empire or as nation at the Paris World's Fair. From this point on the relationship between nation and empire serves as the main drama of the book, as Russians seek to balance the Europe-inspired national-building impulse with geographical, political, and historical exigencies. We find in *Mir iskusstva* a distinct preference for the "national" model and for individualized artistic expressions of the folk element, along with disdain for government-generated versions of a national aesthetic (the "Russian style," which flourished under Alexander III). But after Russia's military loss to Japan and the 1905 Revolution, modernists began gravitating toward an expansive, nearly imperial view of the Russian national idea as a universal idea. Inspired especially by the ideas of Viacheslav Ivanov, writers, critics, composers, painters, and art-world figures like Diaghilev sought to embody—in competing ways—a national "synthesis" of folk and elite, old and new that would actualize this universalizing (that is, messianic) Russian idea, especially as Europe exploded into the First World War and Russia catapulted into revolution.

Shevelenko is faithful to her stated focus on critical discourse and ideas. Indeed, the central protagonists of her project turn out to be Alexandre Benois and Viacheslav Ivanov, most centrally in their capacities as critics and thinkers rather than as artists. In this sense (and perhaps in this sense alone) the project feels unrepresentative of the spirit of Russian modernism, which was all about embodiment, and specifically about the ways that bodies resist, upset, and outstrip mental constructs. Shevelenko's exploration of the stakes of the "barbaric," "primitive," and "wild" for Russian composers, Futurists, and others provides wonderful framing; and yet in a post-Euclidean, post-Nietzschean, post-Freudian world, the frames are precisely what artists were rupturing.

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2018.350 Published online by Cambridge University Press

But this is a quibble with a book that every student of Russian modernism and of theories of nationhood should read. Shevelenko has brilliantly succeeded in revealing the rich and vibrant life of ideas and public discourse centered on nationalism and aesthetics in late imperial and pre-revolutionary Russia.

Martha Kelly
University of Missouri

Isaac Babel: The Essential Fictions. Ed. and trans. Val Vinokur. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2018. xviii, 404 pp. Notes. Bibliography. $21.95, paper.

Judgment: A Novel. By David Bergelson. Trans. Harriet Murav and Sasha Senderovich. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2017. xxxvii, 222 pp. Notes. $18.95, paper.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.351

The lives of David Bergelson (1884–1952) and Isaak Babel′ (1894–1940) had a good deal in common. Both grew up in middle-class Jewish families in the part of the Russian Empire which is Ukraine today, received a traditional Jewish education but later chose a career as secular writers; both spent some time abroad after the October Revolution but eventually decided to come back to the Soviet Union, where they enjoyed privileged lifestyles as prominent Soviet writers in Moscow. In the end, both perished in Stalinist purges, paying with their lives for that privilege. They must have met in person, and Babel′ translated one of Bergelson's stories into Russian. Both writers are deservedly celebrated as daring innovators and meticulous stylists in Yiddish and Russian, respectively. And yet their prose styles are radically different. Babel′'s is straightforward, forceful and clear, reflecting his fascination with his larger-than-life masculine characters and their exploits, be it Jewish gangsters or Red Cavalry Cossacks. Bergelson's is opaque, blurry, and overloaded with heavy syntax. His favorite characters are indecisive, passive, and often depressed men and women. Babel′ was praised and reproved for his daring use of the rough Russian-Jewish Odessa speech which breaks the conventions of Russian literary style. Bergelson avoids Yiddish loquacity, making a very deliberate break with the tradition of his illustrious older contemporary Sholem Aleichem. Indeed, Babel′'s Russian has more in common with Sholem Aleichem's Yiddish (whom Babel′ admired and translated), than Bergelson's highly stylized Yiddish with its added flavors from Gustave Flaubert, Ivan Turgenev, Knut Hamsun, and Anton Chekhov.

While Babel's zesty prose has long been popular among western critics and readers who were rarely bothered by the ethical complacency inherent in his charming narratives, Bergelson's novel *Midas-hadin* was largely dismissed as a piece of communist propaganda unworthy of serious attention, let alone translation. But the novel was not a product of ideological pressure. Bergelson wrote it while he was still living in Berlin and not planning yet to come back to the Soviet Union. He believed in the future of Yiddish culture and Jewish life in the Soviet Union, but his sympathy was not reciprocated by communist Yiddish critics who did not consider him Soviet enough. Without denying the novel's obvious political bias, Harriet Murav and Sasha Senderovich invite us to read it first and foremost as a piece of literature "within the broader set of literary paradigms generally accorded to works of fiction" (xxiv). One of these paradigms is alluded to already in the novel's title as a reference to a complex mystical concept in Judaism which can be approximately translated as "aspect" or "measure" of judgment. The choice of *Judgment* as the English title suggests allusions