Jones's view is of the state driving development and thus removing agency from both merchants and peasants. Having spent years working on economic issues, I was struck by the similarities of the state economic development plans with those of the Muscovite era, rather than the differences that Jones suggests. Jones's interest lies in the evolution of economic thought in Catherine's Russia, but the grain trade might not be the best arena for demonstrating a break from past policies.

MATTHEW P. ROMANIELLO
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Doubt, Atheism, and the Nineteenth-Century Russian Intelligentsia. By Victoria Frede. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2011. xiii, 300 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Photographs. $26.95, paper.

This book aims to show how atheism became a prominent attribute of Russian radicalism. In her engaging narrative of intellectual history from the 1820s to the 1860s, interweaving philosophical searching and discovery with the life experiences of canonical Russian thinkers, their friends, and families, Victoria Frede shows the renunciation of religious faith taking place by stages. Radicals' evolution from religious belief to doubt to unbelief was, Frede argues, an emotional and monumental experience: "The question of the existence of God became the crucible in which the identities of educated Russians were formed and allegiances defined" (4).

In the first section, titled "Doubt," we see a group of early nineteenth-century freethinkers, the *liubomudry* (wisdom-lovers), who embraced doubt as a tool of philosophical inquiry. But their religious questioning stopped at German romantic pantheism; they dared not consider unbelief. For the next generation—Aleksandr Herzen, Nikolai Ogarev, and their associates—Frede claims that "the content of doubt expanded to include the very existence of God" (17), the chief catalyst being Ludwig Feuerbach's *The Essence of Christianity* (1841). Many readers will be surprised to see Herzen only in this section and not in the next, "Atheism." Though many have argued or assumed that Herzen became an atheist during the time of his circle (Martin Malia asserted that this change had occurred by 1842), Frede hardly acknowledges this reigning consensus. She argues persuasively that Herzen's cohort did not begin as nonbelievers—his famous memoir misrepresented his youthful mindset in order to conform to later convictions—and that their growing doubts were accompanied by some torment. But the analysis doesn't seem sufficiently thorough to overturn convention.

Frede dates the emergence of full-blown godlessness to 1849, when three young intellectual parvenus from bourgeois families attached themselves to the Petrashevskii circle and were arrested with them that year. As interlopers in the predominantly aristocratic intelligentsia, they propounded extreme views to get attention: "Social circumstances did not produce atheism, but social resentments facilitated its expression" (16). Though not the first scholar to write about these men, Frede may be the first to assign them such significance, claiming they made atheism "speakable" for intellectuals (11, 118). Their atheism was indeed spoken, not written: Frede's sources are police informants' reports of conversations held in public places as well as trial records. It is impossible to know whether earlier verbal expressions of atheism had occurred in Russia. The attention the "merchant" trio received among intellectuals through the Petrashevskii affair arguably justifies Frede's emphasis, yet her insight that their provocations were driven by social shame, even self-hatred, weakens the plausibility of her claim that they became role models. And Frede leaves unaddressed

previous scholars' descriptions of other Petrashevtsy as atheists: did they emulate the "merchants," or does she dispute their atheism, as she does Herzen's?

The final section, "Two Modes of Living without God," concludes with Dmitrii Pisarev, whose thorough critique of religion in the early 1860s led to an atheism beyond doubt. A nihilist, Pisarev urged readers to accept life's meaninglessness and to live without ideals, which he deemed uniformly illusory. But shortly before his premature death, Frede writes, Pisarev, as the result of falling in love, "came to embrace 'doubt' as the only legitimate stance a person can take" (182). Here one would infer that he retreated from atheism to agnosticism, but soon we learn that although Pisarev now espoused a number of ideals, "the only question about which he never expressed any hesitation was the non-existence of God" (183). Moreover, Frede adopts Herzen's view that Pisarev's doubt strongly resembled his own in the 1830s and 1840s. For Herzen, the observation resembles his claim to have been an atheist early on. But for Frede, who argues that he hadn't, doesn't agreeing with him amount to questioning the centrality of the God question for radicals' worldviews?

By the conclusion, Frede has softened her assertion of this centrality, arguing only that religious questions were always intertwined with social and political ones. Still, this claim seems exaggerated. Historians usually portray the radicals' concerns as less abstract and essentially secular: Russia's identity, its historical role, and its future; who is to blame for injustice, and what is to be done about it; and so on. Under autocracy, their positions on these issues may have required doubt and even godlessness, but few historians claim that theology itself was a central concern. Frede herself writes that atheism "was less a statement about the status of God than it was a commentary on the status of educated people in an authoritarian state that sought ever more forcefully to regulate the opinions and beliefs of its subjects" (15). This seems at odds with her desire to emphasize the inherent anguish of intellectuals' turning against belief and resolving to live without God.

It would be unfair to say that Frede is entirely unconvincing in her interpretation of Russian radicals' intellectual journey and the role of doubt and unbelief in it, however. Frequently, her sources are compelling and moving, her arguments insightful, and her narrative fascinating. But the book would have benefitted from more theoretical, methodological, and comparative discussions of atheism, the challenge of identifying it in history (especially in heavily censored societies), and its relationship to the broader phenomenon of secularization, which recent scholars are careful to distinguish from unbelief. Most importantly, to win readers over to what seem such highly revisionist views demands more direct engagement with competing interpretations than Frede provides.

ROBERT GERACI
University of Virginia

Murder Most Russian: True Crime and Punishment in Late Imperial Russia. By Louise McReynolds. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013. xiv, 274 pp. Notes. Index. Illustrations. Photographs. $35.00 hard bound.

Louise McReynolds's latest work reinforces her position as an important voice in scholarship on late imperial Russian culture and society. *Murder Most Russian* explores the relationships between crime fiction, sensational real-life murder trials, and justice in the context of the transition to modernity after the Great Reforms. Presenting Fedor Dostoevskii's *Crime and Punishment* and Lev Tolstoi's "The Kreutzer Sonata" as a foundation for understanding the Russian outlook on crime, McReynolds