

Kieślowski's *Dekalog* (Decalogue, 1989). Still, Krakus convincingly concludes that death—being portrayed as incompetent (Wisława Szymborska) or pervasive, yet innocuous (Konwicki)—pales by comparison to life, to the exercise of free will, to artists' challenging of "crumbling" monuments, and to the exposure of the vulnerabilities of a "promised utopia" (148). Despite the averred focus on the 1970s and 1980s, Krakus concludes *No End in Sight* with a cyclical process of return in Kieślowski's *La double vie de Véronique* (1991) and trilogy *Trois couleurs* (1993–94) against the backdrop of the nostalgic documentary by Robin Hessman, *My Perestroika* (2010), and Wolfgang Becker's satirical staging of the communist past in *Goodbye Lenin!* (2003). Yet, her discussion of "fear of the files" could have invoked the critically acclaimed *Das Leben der Anderen* (The Lives of Others, 2006) directed by Florian Henckel von Donnersmarck, while Krakus's theses on the circularity of time and the fusion of present and past would have benefited from additional discussion of the celebrated televised series *Decalogue* (199).

Because the monograph does not account in a detailed fashion for diegetic elements (the composition of a shot, film editing, and ambient sound) shaping Polish film within a succession of technological developments (the hand-held camera or the digital revolution) affecting cinema in east and west, it is not recommended for specialists in media studies. All the same, Krakus's analyses of Szymborska's poetry, the prose of Stanisław Lem and Konwicki, and major Polish resistance movements situate this study within broader Polish cultural and artistic movements. Since this monograph broadly surveys cinema from the last two decades of communist Poland, it would be a valuable addition to a European or Polish film studies course.

ELIZABETH BLAKE
Saint Louis University

Xinjiang in the Context of Central Eurasian Transformations. Ed. Onuma Takahiro, David Brophy, and Shinmen Yasushi. Toyo Bunko Research Library, 18. Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 2018. vii, 284 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Plates. Photographs. Figures. Tables. Maps. \$159.95, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2020.226

The Qing conquest of Xinjiang in 1754–59 proved to be consequential. In spite of its often turbulent relations with Beijing after the conquest, the area still remains a part of the People's Republic of China in the early twenty-first century. What exactly did this political reorientation entail? How much did the Chinese conquest change both the settled and nomadic societies of Xinjiang? Written by an international group of experts whose research is in varying stages of development, this collection addresses the important issue of Xinjiang's eastern turn and its impact, legacy, and limitations.

Most if not all of the articles in this collection challenge or qualify the dominant thesis of peripheralization. Most recently represented by Christopher I. Beckwith in his influential survey of central Eurasian history *Empires of the Silk Road: A History of Central Eurasia from the Bronze Age to the Present*, the thesis states that the Chinese and Russian empires' expansions in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries resulted in the partition of central Eurasia, relegating an area that used to serve as a pivotal center of world trade and politics into the exclusive peripheral domain of two land-based empires (260). This volume aims to highlight the persistent local social practices as well as transregional or transnational connections with other parts of Eurasia that continued to shape the life of the people of Xinjiang after the eighteenth century in spite of the region's political integration with China.

Yet it is not clear whether the fascinating pictures of Xinjiang after the eighteenth century that each individual study describes amounts to any consensus, except that it was not a process of simple Sinicization and increase of exclusive connections with China. The individual authors seem to locate the transformations of Xinjiang in discreet, sometimes even conflicting spatial and temporal frameworks. However, the lack of consensus does not appear to be a weakness of the volume. Rather, it is a candid reflection of the productivity and strength of the entire field in which previous theses are reexamined and challenged by new studies that draw on newly-available empirical data.

Overall, the book succeeds in presenting Xinjiang after the eighteenth century as the crossroads of the diverse political and social influences of Eurasia: in this area competing transregional influences, including but not limited to the Chinese one, shaped the life of the Uyghurs, Kazakhs, and other local residents. In so doing, the collection also provides new empirical data drawn from multilingual sources (Turkic, Chinese, Manchu, and Russian), and introduces new historical actors and episodes not known to a wider readership. These are the most significant contributions of the collection as a whole.

For instance, Onuma Takahiro provides strong support to the peripheralization thesis that Xinjiang became an exclusive periphery of China after the Qing conquest. He shows that the Qing empire and Muslim native officials (*begs*) worked together to restrict eastern Turkistan's long-distance trade connections with Eurasian people beyond the Qing border. Rian Thum paints a different picture. While Chinese influence was clearly in ascendance after the Qing conquest, he argues, South Asia remained a major influence in Xinjiang, in particular in the southern oasis town of Yarkand, well into the late nineteenth century. Other authors argue that the arrival of the Russian empire in the nineteenth century and Chinese warlord regimes in the twentieth century added yet another layer of spatial connection to Xinjiang. The colonial connections with Beijing and Moscow significantly changed the political and social identity of local residents in Xinjiang. Thus David Brophy's Tatar intellectual, Gabdulgaziz Munasib (1888–1922), internalized the new political identity as a subject of the Russian empire, and displayed colonial bias in his writing about the Uyghur residents in Chinese Xinjiang. According to Joshua L. Freeman, under the authoritarian regime of Chinese warlord Sheng Shicai, who had strong political ties with Soviet Russia, a new Uyghur identity emerged in large part due to the spread of print capitalism and local newspapers that contributed to the rise of the vernacular Uyghur language.

Ablet Kamalov's chapter on child adoption in Kashgaria highlights the long-term continuity in the realm of social practice in Xinjiang that transcended the eighteenth and nineteenth century divide. Kamalov shows the surprising endurance of the unique institution of bondage and servitude in the oasis society of Kashgaria well into the time of the takeover by People's Republic of China in 1949. However, Rune Steenberg's study on the kinship organization in Kashgar, another study on Uyghur social practices, argues that the mid-eighteenth century constituted a watershed moment in Xinjiang history. The article shows that Uyghur residents strategically transformed kinship practices to consolidate, as the most important social and economic units, affinal relations forged through marriages within neighborhoods. They did so in order to cope with the new political and economic environment introduced by the Qing empire: the introduction of a bureaucratic administrative structure and market-based money economy. These new kinship organizations have generally continued until the present day. In arguing this, Steenberg articulates a parallel pattern between Europe and Xinjiang since the eighteenth century, and puts Xinjiang's transformation in a wider spatial context.

Ironically, the study of the multiple Eurasian connections raises a crucial question about the foundation of the strength and resilience of the Chinese influence

in Xinjiang: why does Xinjiang still remain part of China in spite of the thriving connections with Russia, Central Asia, and South Asia that this collection presents so vividly? An easy and convenient answer would be to emphasize military occupation and top-down political oppression by the Chinese state, increasing Chinese migration into the area, or historical contingency such as Sheng Shicai's opportunistic decision to ally with the Nationalist Party of China. Although these may all be important factors, they are not enough. In order to answer this question, further studies of the local agency of the Xinjiang people and their decision to work with as well as resist the Chinese state may be necessary.

KWANGMIN KIM
University of Colorado, Boulder

On the Periphery of Europe, 1762–1825: The Self-Invention of the Russian Elite.

By Andreas Schönle and Andrei Zorin. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2018. xi, 242 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. \$39.00, paper.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2020.227

This interesting work uses the history of emotions to provide a new synthesis of the Europeanization of the Russian elite, more specifically the noble estate, from 1762 to 1825. Aiming at the general reader but more likely to reach specialists, it provides a clear narrative of the process of how Russian noblemen (only a few women are discussed) became Europeanized through a process of self-fashioning.

Drawing upon an earlier edited volume and the publications of the two authors, the book is organized as a series of case studies discussing where and how Russian nobles became Europeanized. After a short introduction, with fewer footnotes than useful for specialists, the book then turns to a narrative overview of historical events during this period. It then discusses how Russian nobles were exposed to Europe—through travel, reading, material culture, and sociability. Although these practices did create a Europeanized nobility, they widened the gap between that estate and the rest of the Russian population. Next is an interesting chapter on the Russian court, which draws on new work on the topic showing that the court in Russia was smaller, more unstable, and required a higher level of humiliation among its courtiers than in countries in Europe. This helps to explain the intense desire of many nobles to find interior spaces of reflection, even of refuge, from an unpredictable court.

A chapter on the search for true spirituality provides a complex and insightful analysis of the ways in which nobles sought to move beyond the Russian Orthodox Church, for which many felt contempt, to find new ways of spiritual seeking and belonging, sometimes through western European models. They reconciled with the Orthodox Church through the belief that every church provided a way to the truth rather than embracing it as the one way. The Masons and Rosicrucians mentioned in the spirituality chapter are shown to be the main organizers of new educational institutions in Russia, such as the Cadet Corps, Moscow University, and the lyceum at Tsarskoe Selo. The high moral lessons taught at these educational institutions led to a difficult integration into the actuality of Russian court, civil and military life, which in time would lead to the Decembrist Rebellion.

Literature, as the next chapter argues, moved from being under the complete control of the dynasty and court to a patronage situation under Elizabeth to the assertion of an independent, but noble-only, sphere of activity in the 1750s and 60s. Once again, the tensions between the ideals of literature and the realities of Russian life would lead to the criticisms of Aleksandr Radishchev and the Decembrists.